



City of CHARLOTTE

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor Lewis and City Council Members

FROM: Gregg Guetschow, City Manager

SUBJECT: Rezoning of Hayes Green Beach Memorial Hospital

DATE: October 6, 2017

City Council previously held the first reading of a zoning map amendment from OS-1 Office Service District to PD Planned Development District for the main campus of Hayes Green Beach Memorial Hospital on Harris Street. The Planning Commission held a hearing on this matter on October 3 and recommended approval of the zoning map amendment. In addition, the Planning Commission approved the final site plan for the development.

You will recall from a previous memorandum that the process associated with creating a planned development district is more complicated than the usual rezoning action. The key distinction is the relationship between the zoning map change and the site plan. I had previously provided Council with a schedule of actions that included Council's approval of the site plan. This was inaccurate. A more careful reading of the zoning ordinance makes it clear that adopting the zoning map amendment ties that change to the site plan approved by the Planning Commission. In other words, you don't get one without the other.

We included in an earlier agenda packet the site plan for this redevelopment project. In a nutshell, it shows the demolition of portions of the building near the intersection of Harris Street and Lansing Road that house Urgent Care and other functions and the construction of an addition to the south end of the building near Harris Street to expand areas for out-patient surgery and endoscopy services.

The primary reason for pursuing the zoning map amendment is to gain the flexibility in site development offered in the Planned Development District. This flexibility is useful when, as in this case, there are multiple buildings and uses occurring on a single, large parcel. That flexibility includes a front yard building setback that is about 10 feet less than would be found in a typical development.

Public hearings were advertised and held for both the site plan and the rezoning. One neighbor on Harris Street came to our offices to review the site plan. No comments were received from her or any other neighbors on either issue.

To assist the Planning Commission in its deliberations regarding the rezoning, I prepared the following suggested findings of fact:

	YES	NO	N/A
1. Would the rezoning be consistent with other zoning and land uses in the area?			
2. Is the rezoning consistent with development trends in the area?			
3. Are uses in the proposed zoning district equally or better suited to the area than the current uses?			
4. Is the proposed rezoning consistent with both the policies and uses proposed for that area in the master plan?			
4.1 If the proposed rezoning is not consistent, is the plan current and reasonable?			
4.2 If the proposed rezoning is not consistent, does it need to be updated			
5. Will the redevelopment be substantially in accord with the goals and objectives of the future land use plan for the City?			
6. Will the redevelopment provide a desirable environment?			
7. Will the redevelopment be harmonious to the general surrounding uses?			
8. Will the rezoning permit flexibility in overall development?			
9. Will the rezoning and redevelopment insure adequate safeguards and standards for public health, safety, convenience and general welfare?			

The Planning Commission did not address each of these issues but questions were asked and answered during the meeting regarding whether the proposed development was in harmony with residential character of the surrounding neighborhood. I also addressed these questions in some detail in a memorandum to the Planning Commission. The relevant portion of the memorandum follows:

I wish to briefly discuss those few questions related to the conformance of the proposed rezoning to the Master Plan. The area of the HGB campus is

shown on the map on page 64 as “public and institutional.” As you know, this does not correspond to any specific zoning district. Instead, it is intended to refer to the character of the use. The text of the Master Plan on page 71 says this about public and institutional uses:

The Charlotte future land use plan includes the existing public and institutional facilities. The recent renovation of the Charlotte High School and the construction of the Charlotte Middle School has [sic] been a very successful addition to the community. As new residents are drawn to the city, additional churches and public organizations will be needed. When growth exceeds the existing services new areas will need to [be] set aside for such uses. However, at this time, the schools, churches and other institutions are meeting the needs of the community. Additionally, these uses are usually located within existing neighborhoods due to the community-based nature of their operations.

The area in question falls within two areas that are addressed in the “Implementation Strategies” section of the Master Plan beginning on page 79. The first is the Oliver/Washington Neighborhood described on page 90. HGB is acknowledged as being a part of this neighborhood. The identified strategies do not appear to conflict with the continued existence and redevelopment of the site by HGB.

The second implementation strategy area is “Establish a Corridor Improvement Authority along Lansing Road” found on page 92. The focus of this area strategy is on commercial uses in the corridor and HGB is not mentioned, perhaps because it is on the fringes of the zone. The rezoning action does not appear to be inconsistent with the creation of a corridor improvement authority. Further, it appears that HGB’s plans contemplate improvements consistent with the overall aims identified in the strategy as it related to redevelopment of existing properties.

In brief, I concluded that the Master Plan recognizes Hayes Green Beach Memorial Hospital is a part of the Oliver/Washington area and that it is appropriate for an institutional use such as this to be located within existing neighborhoods. Its continuing in that location is also consistent with the emphasis the Master Plan places on making Charlotte a more walkable community.

As previously noted, the Planning Commission did not attempt to address all of the findings of fact that I listed. I think a strong case can be made for answering each of them in the affirmative. This provides strong support for the proposed zoning map amendment should Council choose to approve the request.