



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

Z-13-21-6

Date of VPC Meeting	May 4, 2021
Request From	R1-10 (Single-Family Residence District)
Request To	R-O (Residential Office – Restricted Commercial District)
Proposed Use	Medical office
Location	Southwest corner of 44th Street and Calle Feliz
VPC Recommendation	Approval
VPC Vote	17-0

VPC DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDED STIPULATIONS:

Ms. Sofia Mastikhina, staff, provided an overview of the request, including the location, current and surrounding zoning, and General Plan Land Use Map designation. She explained that the site is located within the boundaries of the 44th Street Corridor Specific Plan and the 44th Street Residential Office Study. The 44th Street Residential Office Study found that this site was not suitable for conversion to Residential Office due to the location of the site in relation to an existing single-family neighborhood. However, the proposal is to adaptively reuse the existing single-family residence on the site to convert to a medical office use, minimizing the impact of the building on the neighborhood. Further, the proposed site plan depicts a parking lot to accommodate all employee and client parking on the southeastern portion of the site, near 44th Street, which will address the concern listed in the study. The conceptual site plan submitted with the request will require variances to allow access through the alley and parking spaces within the building setback along 44th Street, as well as a revocable permit for the existing low wall that encroaches into the right-of-way along 44th Street. The proposal is consistent with the other area plans. **Ms. Mastikhina** then presented the staff recommendation for approval, along with the recommended stipulations intended to retain the residential character of the site.

Mr. Brian Greathouse, representative with Burch & Crachiollo, provided an overview of the request, including the location and existing businesses in the area, and explained that the proposal continues a commercial land use pattern as you travel south along the west side of 44th Street. He stated that the site has been operating as a seafood distribution business and law firm for several years and, when his client purchased the property, she wanted to go through the proper rezoning process to open her business in

conformance to all city regulations. He explained the nature of his client's business, which is a medical spa that provides specialty treatments such as skin rejuvenation, injectables, laser treatments, and other non-surgical procedures. He then presented the site plan and landscape plan, pointing out the alleyway access to the parking lot, which has nine parking spaces and one accessible space. He stated that this is more space than what will likely be needed for this business, as all treatments are by appointment only, last one to two hours, and there will only be approximately two employees on site at a time, resulting in a very low intensity use of the site. He then outlined the neighborhood outreach process, which included two neighborhood meetings. One individual attended the first, and was neutral on the matter, only listening in. Three individuals attended the second meeting: one was neutral and had questions about the site, while two attendees had concerns regarding parking and vehicle trips. To address these concerns, the property owner obtained city approval to change the address of the site to a 44th Street address to discourage clients from entering Calle Feliz, and also obtained a vehicle trip generation report from a licensed traffic engineer that showed up to nineteen potential daily trips from the site (nine entering and ten exiting). Staff has received seven letters of support from neighbors that live in the area, including from the property owners directly to the north and south of the site, and one letter in opposition to the case from an undisclosed property owner. He concluded his presentation by stating that the applicant agrees with staff's findings, stipulations, and recommendation, and asked for a recommendation of approval from the committee.

Ms. Hayleigh Crawford stated that only one letter of support was included in the committee's packet and asked where the other ones are. **Ms. Mastikhina** replied that all subsequent letters were received over the previous few days and that they had not yet been forwarded to the committee. She proceeded to immediately forward all correspondence to the committee members via email. **Ms. Crawford** then asked the applicant to clarify the number of parking spaces on the site, as the packet states there are ten, while the applicant stated that there are nine. She also asked where the entrance to the office will be located. **Mr. Greathouse** replied that there are nine spaces, plus one accessible space. The building entrance will be located on the side of the building, to be accessed from the parking lot, and the entrance that fronts the residential street will be locked, so clients will not be able to enter from there.

Mr. Barry Paceley asked what the hours of operation will be. **Mr. Greathouse** replied that they will be Monday through Friday, from 9:00am to 5:30pm.

MOTION:

Mr. Paceley made a motion to approve this case per the staff recommendation. **Mr. Daniel Sharaby** seconded the motion.

VOTE:

17-0; Motion passes with committee members Swart, Fischbach, Abbott, Augusta, Bair, Thraen, Crawford, Eichelkraut, Garcia, Grace, McKee, Miller, Nye, Paceley, Scher, Sharaby, and Tribken in favor.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION & STIPULATIONS:

Staff has no comments.