

**G. Coleman Professional Services –  
Supportive Housing Acquisition and New Construction**

Coleman Professional Services is seeking funds for the acquisition of property within the City of Kent and will leverage additional public and private funds for the construction of a 4-unit housing structure on the property that will provide permanent supportive housing for four (4) low income persons who suffer from a chronic mental illness and are at risk for homelessness.

Funding Requested: \$37,500.00  
*FY2010 CDBG Funding: \$0.00*

**Funding Recommended: \$37,500.00**

**H. Kent Regional Business Alliance (KRBA) –  
Business Incubator & Small Business Development Center**

Funding will provide continued support for the Business Incubator and the Small Business Development Center operated by the Kent Regional Business Alliance. These programs provide counseling and technical assistance for low-to-moderate income Kent residents who are interested in entrepreneurship or who have just started their own business. Special programs are also available for women and disadvantaged business enterprises.

Funding Requested: \$55,000.00  
*FY2010 CDBG Funding: \$30,000.00*

**Funding Recommended: \$30,000.00**

**I. City of Kent, Community Development Department –  
Grant Administration**

These funds are used to cover grant administration costs such as a portion of CDBG related payroll, supplies, advertising, postage, copying, travel costs for trainings, and other related costs. Funding for this activity is limited to 20% of the CDBG program year allocation.

**Funding Recommended: \$33,000.00**  
*FY2010 CDBG Funding: \$30,000.00*

**J. City of Kent, Community Development Department –  
Fair Housing Implementation**

These funds will be used to cover the cost associated with the provision of fair housing services by Fair Housing Contact Service, Inc. of Akron. The agency provides fair housing counseling services, landlord-tenant mediation, investigates fair housing complaints, and provides a variety of public education and outreach services in the City.

Funding for this activity is included in the Administration 20% funding limitation.

**Funding Recommended: \$19,000**  
*FY2010 CDBG Funding: \$19,000*

Cc: CDBG 2011 Annual Action Plan file

**PY2011 Proposed CDBG Allocation**

<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Project</b>	<b>CDBG Request</b>	<b>2011 Funding Recommended</b>	<b>Funds Awarded in PY2010</b>
Engineering Dept.	Pine Street Reconstruction	\$ 125,000	\$ 120,000	\$ 87,000
Parks & Recreation	Redmond Bridge Renovation	\$ 90,000		\$ 50,000
Police Dept.	Community Policing Program	\$ 27,013	\$ 25,500	\$ 24,000
CAC	Targeted Furnace Replacement	\$ 50,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000
F&CS	PATH	\$ 15,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000
F&CS	Homeless Shelter Services	\$ 15,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000
Coleman Professional Serv.	New Hsg Construction	\$ 37,500	\$ 37,500	\$ -
KRBA	SBDC and Business Incubator	\$ 55,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000
Administration	Administration		\$ 33,000	\$ 30,000
Fair Housing Contact Serv.	Fair Housing		\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$ 414,513</b>	<b>325,000</b>	
Anticipated Allocation:	\$ 325,000			
Public Service Cap (15%):	\$ 48,750		\$ 45,500	
Administration Cap (20%):	\$ 65,000		\$ 52,000	



# CITY OF KENT, OHIO

---

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

February 8, 2011

TO: Dave Ruller  
City Manager

FROM: Gary Locke  
Community Development Director

RE: Council Review of Proposed Changes / Revisions / Additions  
Zoning Code Update

Starting in the Fall of 2008, the City began a comprehensive review of its Zoning Code. Many of you have been involved in one or more meetings since that time where we have reviewed and discussed parts of the zoning code by topic. The last comprehensive update to the zoning code was started in the late 1970's and culminated with the adoption of a new zoning code in 1985. There have been a number of amendments to the zoning code since that time. Much of the current zoning code is rooted in the conventional thought of the 1970's (or prior to that) so it is important that the City evaluate, modify and even supplement the zoning code so that it can best reflect the current needs, goals and objectives of Kent. The code also needs to reflect contemporary land uses, operations and concerns that may not have been present even ten years ago. As such, the review and update is both timely and necessary. The following points summarize what has been done to this point and our proposed direction for the future with regard to this undertaking:

1. Staff has prepared drafts of the affected zoning code chapters that directly relate to what has been discussed so far. Each of the chapters are summarized in the second portion of this communication.
2. After a period of open public comment, staff was able to finalize changes to the enclosed Chapters. These are now coming before Council for review and approval. On January 18, 2011 the Planning Commission recommended approval of the proposed amendments to Council via a 3-0 vote.
3. Eventually, all of the sections of the zoning text and zoning map will be reviewed as time permits.

**Summary of Changes / Comments (By Chapter)**

Formatting / Graphics

Page numbering will be done by chapter so that if future chapters, sections or pages are added, the entire numbering of the document will not have to be re-done. We are hoping to be able to include hypertext links within the entire document to allow quick and easy navigation between linked terms and sections but this is still work in progress and will not be completed until the various sections are ultimately adopted by ordinance.

Chapter 1101 – Title, Interpretation and Conflict

*Currently Numbered as Chapter 1107.* No major changes.

Chapter 1103 – Definitions

*Currently Numbered as Chapter 1109.* While many of the definitions from the previous code have been maintained or slightly modified, there have been a number of changes and additions made to this chapter. Most of the definitions pertaining to specific types of signs have been moved to the Chapter related to signage so that the reader does not have to flip back and forth between chapters. Definitions related to some of the other proposed Chapters have been added or modified to reflect some of the content in those chapters. To the degree possible, wording used in conjunction with permitted and conditionally permitted uses will be tied to the definitions and terms listed in this Chapter. Wording in several definitions was tweaked at the request of the Planning Commission when they completed their review at the January 18, 2011 meeting.

*Commentary:* The definitions have not been lettered or numbered as subsections and can be referred to by name rather than by section number.

Chapter 1105 – Administration and Enforcement

*Currently Numbered as Chapter 1111.* There were no major changes to this Chapter other than the reference to the Civil Infraction enforcement process in Section 1105.12.

*Commentary:* None.

**Pg. 3**  
**Proposed Zoning Code Update**  
**Summary of Changes**  
**February 8, 2011**

Chapter 1107 – Conditional Zoning Certificates and Specially Permitted Uses

*Currently Numbered as Chapter 1113.* There were several changes made to this chapter worth noting. One set of changes to the Application Procedures (1107.02) section provides the Community Development Department with the specific authority to request additional information from the applicant AND for the Planning Commission to do the same. An incomplete submission at the time of application may be rejected by staff. There is also reference added to the Architectural Review process and the need to submit a copy of the Certificate of Appropriateness issued as approval from the Architectural Review Board at the time of application. The other significant change to this Chapter extends the Planning Commission approval period to two (2) years instead of the current approval period of one (1) year.

*Commentary:* The additional wording with regard to application procedures has been updated to reflect current practice being used by staff in receiving applications. Some flexibility in this regard is practical but the ability to reject incomplete submittals is also necessary in dealing with applicants who attempt to submit incomplete information. With references to the Design Review process included, Chapters 1120 and 1121, as well as the Design Guidelines (enforcement version) need to be adopted concurrently.

Chapter 1109 – Board of Zoning Appeals

*Currently Numbered as Chapter 1115.* This proposed chapter is very similar to the existing Chapter 1115 with regard to content, with only several notable changes. Reference is made in Section 1109.09 (d) to other duties and responsibilities that the Board may have which are outside of the zoning code and have been assigned through ordinance.

Chapter 1111 – Zoning Amendments

*Currently Numbered as Chapter 1117.* This chapter is also very similar to the existing chapter related to zoning amendments. There were no significant changes.

Chapter 1113 – Site Plan Review

*Currently Numbered as Chapter 1119.* There were several significant changes to the Site Plan Review process. The first of these concerned establishing two different procedures for site plan review relating to “minor” projects and “major” projects. This is being proposed pursuant to some of the discussions with the joint committee where we discussed the idea of looking at two different review tracks, one for lesser projects and one for more significant projects.



**Pg. 4**  
**Proposed Zoning Code Update**  
**Summary of Changes**  
**February 8, 2011**

To this end we defined the “minor” projects based on size of building, smaller parking lot additions, minor driveway or curb cut relocations, all of which would be conditioned on the premise that the construction is not closer than 50 feet to an abutting residential property. Our thinking is that by defining a “minor” project in this way, we can still address technical issues through internal staff review on projects that are not necessarily contentious without having to run those projects through the more extensive public meeting / notification process. In addition to defining what is minor and major, the respective application and review procedures are spelled out as well.

The Site Plan Review process was also modified to respect the requirements of the Design Review Process and the review to be conducted by the Architectural Review Board where such review is applicable to a project. As with Conditional Uses, we have also extended the approval period from one to two years and have included the provision of using the Civil Infraction process as an enforcement mechanism for site plan violations.

Chapter 1119 – Home Based Businesses

*This is a New Chapter.* With this Chapter we have included the requirements related to the existing two versions of Home Based Businesses into a single zoning code chapter. Both the Limited Home Business and the more extensive Home Occupation are addressed in this Chapter, along with their definitions, regulations and operations. We cleaned up some of the wording found in the current code, especially as it relates the amount of floor area that a home occupation can occupy in a residential structure. While we maintained the number of people outside of the household that could work at the home occupation (this is currently 1), we did provide wording that would allow the Planning Commission to increase this number if the applicant could show that the increase would not adversely affect the surrounding neighborhood. We also created a similar provision allowing the Planning Commission to consider use of accessory structures for home occupations at its discretion.

Chapter 1120 – Architectural Design Review

Chapter 1121 – Architectural Design Review Overlay Districts

*These are New Chapters.* These Chapters establish the actual review process for projects in designated Design Overlay Districts (identified in Chapter 1121) for compliance with the Design Guidelines (Appendix A) applicable to the Overlay District (if any) in which the project is located. The review process spells out the procedure for review by the Architectural Review Board and refers to the Guidelines adopted.

**Pg. 5**  
**Proposed Zoning Code Update**  
**Summary of Changes**  
**February 8, 2011**

Both Chapters were set up with allowing for the possibility that there could be more than one overlay district and each overlay district could have different guidelines, although as currently proposed, there is only one overlay district covering the downtown and the immediate West River area. The chapters will also reference the approved Design Guidelines which we expect to be somewhat modified (from the original version) for enforcement purposes.

For the first time, the Architectural Review Process will be separated from the review authority of the City's Planning Commission and create a process where the Architectural Review Board has autonomy and can act in reference to actual written guidelines. Application fees and submission requirements are defined in Chapter 1120 as well as review procedures.

Chapter 1122 – Rooming and Boarding Houses

*This is a new Chapter.* All the regulations pertaining to Rooming and Boarding Houses have been combined into a single chapter. This too will allow the reader to understand all the requirements for such uses without having to flip back and forth between various sections of the zoning code.

The changes to the regulations are significant in regard to defining households and determining household status. This reduces the dependence of defining such uses on the basis of familial relationships and puts more of the emphasis on defining the specific factors defining the characteristics of persons living together as a single, more permanent household compared to those who are more short-term or transient in nature. This change is especially important for enforcement purposes and in defining legal versus illegal uses.

The chapter also attempts to identify more practical dimensional requirements (lot size, open space) for these uses based on size of operation and existing elements both on the property and adjacent to the property with regard to open space and the Planning Commission is given some latitude to determine what is adequate in regard to open space rather than having to abide by hard numbers that were often impossible to satisfy and almost always required variances.

The requirements for parking are also better defined with regard to location, number of spaces required and setback from property lines. The size and layout of parking spaces is addressed and front yard parking spaces are prohibited since they can produce some of the most blighting factors seen with such uses.

Reference is also made to the Environmental Housing Code (as it exists) which is enforced by the Health Department.

**Pg. 6**  
**Proposed Zoning Code Update**  
**Summary of Changes**  
**February 8, 2011**

*Commentary:* The major revisions to Zoning Code proposed herein do not constitute changes to the licensing of these units. The current regulations in the Environmental Housing Code still apply as would any future revisions. Staff has discussed with Council and the Joint Zoning Committee the concept of attempting to broaden and expand the rental licensing requirements to all rental properties and this possibility will continue to be evaluated. Staff hopes to bring some proposals back to Council to consider, most likely in 2011. The changes also do not modify which districts these uses are allowed in from what is currently in place.

Chapter 1165 – Signage & Appendix B – Sign Design Guidelines

*No change in Chapter Numbering.* Numerous, significant changes to the current sign regulations are proposed in this draft. Definitions for various types of signage have been moved to this Chapter from the Chapter on Definitions (1103). The proposed chapter also creates much more detail in both general and specific requirements for signs, including temporary signs.

The proposed chapter also introduces the concept of a Comprehensive Sign Plan. The Comprehensive Sign Plan would be more applicable to larger scale, multiple tenant properties where the traditional number and size of signage may not be practical. Rather than have such proposals go through a zoning variance process, where such decisions are made on the basis of hardship or practical difficulty demonstrated by the applicant, the Comprehensive Sign Plan process allows the Planning Commission to consider larger, more numerous sign packages for a site based on scale and design. This should give business interests and property managers more flexibility in designing sign packages for a site while at the same time giving the Planning Commission and the Architectural Review Board the ability to review the proposed package with more flexibility to modify and work with changes. This should prove to be more effective in obtaining more aesthetic signage in scale with the property than was previously the case by running such cases through the Board of Zoning Appeals for variances.

There are a number of other changes too numerous to summarize here. We have also created Appendix B which contains proposed design guidelines for signage. These proposed sign design guidelines were developed with the overall Design Guidelines in mind along with some additional standards and detail.

The sign design guidelines as we propose them would be applicable to the entire City to the extent feasible but we would also recommend that they be mandatory within any designated Design Overlay District.

To our knowledge, this is the first attempt by the City to emphasize design related criteria to signage.





# CITY OF KENT, OHIO

---

## DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

**Date:** February 9, 2011

**To:** David Ruller, City Manager  
David Coffee, Finance Director

**From:** Dan Smith, Economic Development Director

**Subject:** Kent Mini Loan- Loan Loss Fund

The City of Kent, in conjunction with local banks (currently six and as many as eight) and the Kent Regional Business Alliance, has operated the Kent Mini Loan program that assists small businesses in making affordable credit available to existing and start-up businesses in the City of Kent, at lower than conventional interest rates. The program originated (original contact) in the fall of 1996. The program was amended on December 1, 2005 to realign the lenders. The banks included: First Merit, Sky Bank, First Place Bank, Key Bank, Portage Community Bank, Home Savings Bank and Huntington National Bank.

In accordance with the agreement, the original promissory note of \$250,000 was made available for loans on September 26, 1996. As part of the agreement, the City of Kent was to establish and maintain a security fund. All lending and loans were to be approved and reviewed by a committee of the lenders, KRBA and City representation, which has been the case. The agreements state that if the banks suffer a loss on a loan, the City shall be responsible for 10% of the balance of the loss. Summarizing the agreement, a loss exists with respect to a loan when judgment has been entered against all parties to the loan notes and any guarantees applicable to said loan and all collateral for said loan has been liquidated.

The Kent Mini Loan has been in existence and utilized by many small businesses/entrepreneurs since 1996. In November, the KRBA held a meeting with the banking partners to reconcile the program and update the status of all loans. While some loans remained active and in good standing, there were outstanding loans that have defaulted and become bad debts. The banks are in the process of charging off the bad debt and have requested the use of the City's loan loss provision per the terms of the agreement.

Upon the request, I have explored our past participation and made the following observations: 1) The loan loss fund(s) per the terms of the original contract were never set up or encumbered, 2) From the programs inception, we have never remitted funds per the City's loan loss provision, 3) The banks are currently charging off approximately \$65,000 in bad debt of which our obligation would be 10% (see attached spreadsheet).

To that end, I am respectfully requesting we encumber funds to cover Kent Mini Loan loan loss fund provision in the amount of \$10,000. While it is not anticipated to have additional bed debt/loans in the immediate future, this level of encumbrance will appropriately cover our participation and obligation in the Kent Mini Loan program, now and into the foreseeable future. While I never like to see start up businesses fail, it is a reality that the program contract anticipated. This program remains an important development tool and has assisted many local businesses and entrepreneurs over the past fifteen years. I think the Kent Mini Loan has been a good investment in aiding numerous local entrepreneurs.

Total Charge of Per Bank

**Charge Off Amount:**

First Merit	\$ 24,931.19
Huntington (Second National & Sky Bank)	\$ 19,098.39
Huntington Bank	\$ 14,849.80
KeyBank	\$ 24,931.19
Home Savings	\$ 24,931.19
First Place Bank	\$ 15,914.19
Portage Community Bank	\$ 15,914.19
Chase (Bank One)	\$ 9,017.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 149,587.14</b>

**Kent Mini Loans Paid-Off:**

First Merit	\$ 26,597.46	16.09%	\$ 13,616.67
Huntington Bank (Sky Bank)	\$ 11,622.61	7.03%	\$ 5,950.24
Huntington (Second National)	\$ 17,549.84	10.62%	\$ 8,984.71
Huntington Bank	\$ 24,022.46	14.53%	\$ 12,298.39
KeyBank	\$ 26,597.46	16.09%	\$ 13,616.67
Home Savings Bank	\$ 23,264.13	14.07%	\$ 11,910.16
First Place Bank	\$ 9,047.62	5.47%	\$ 4,631.96
Portage Community Bank	\$ 5,714.29	3.46%	\$ 2,925.45
Chase (Bank One)	\$ 20,883.17	12.63%	\$ 10,691.22
Sub Total	<u>\$ 165,299.04</u>		<u>\$ 84,625.46</u>
Principal/Interest Paid	80,673.58		
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 84,625.46</b>		

**Total To Be Charged Off Per Bank:**

First Merit	\$ 11,314.52	<b>Total Based on %:</b>
Huntington (Second National & Sky Bank)	\$ 4,163.45	
Huntington Bank	\$ 2,551.41	
KeyBank	\$ 11,314.52	
Home Savings	\$ 13,021.03	
First Place Bank	\$ 11,282.23	
Portage Community Bank	\$ 12,988.74	
Chase (Bank One)	\$ (1,674.22)	
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$ 64,961.68</b>	

and amounts of all payments received by KRBA on each Loan covered by the disbursement, an itemization of the fees retained by KRBA as authorized by this Agreement, the net amount of the disbursement, and the amount paid to each Bank. KRBA's failure to make payments as and when provided herein shall constitute a default of this Agreement and the Note entitling the Banks and the City to exercise any and all remedies they may have by reason of such default under this Agreement, the Note, at law or in equity.

2.9 Recoveries: If all or part of any payment made to any of the Banks with respect to any Loan is recovered or returned from or by KRBA for any reason, then each Bank shall pay to KRBA their share thereof upon demand together with interest and/or penalties thereon to the extent KRBA is required to pay interest and/or penalties on the amount so recovered or returned. The amount so paid by the Banks to KRBA shall be added to and become part of the principal balance of the Credit Line and the Loan with respect to which such payment was made.

### SECTION 3: SECURITY FUND

3.1 The Fund: To induce the Banks to participate in the Loan Program, the City shall establish and maintain a separate fund (referred to as "Security Fund") with a lending institution approved by the Loan Committee. The balance of the Security Fund shall at all times be equal to 10% of the aggregate original principal balance of all outstanding Loans; provided however that at no time shall the City's total obligation for contributions to the Security Fund exceed \$25,000.00.

3.2 Use of the Security Fund: If the Banks suffer a loss on a Loan, the City shall pay to the Banks from the Security Fund an amount equal to the amount of the loss or 10% of the balance of the Loan existing at the time of the loss, whichever is less. A loss exists with respect to a Loan when judgment has been entered against all parties to the Loan Notes and any guarantees applicable to said Loan (unless rendition of such judgment is prevented by applicable law, such as death or bankruptcy) and all Collateral for said Loan has been liquidated; provided however, that it shall not be necessary to liquidate any property acting as Collateral if the Loan Committee determines that pursuing and liquidating such property would not be cost effective. For the purpose of determining the amount of loss, "the balance of the Loan existing at the time of the loss" shall be the sum of the unpaid principal balance of the Loan, plus accrued and unpaid interest, plus extraordinary costs advanced by the Banks with respect to the Loan.

#### SECTION 4: LOAN COMMITTEE

4.1 Establishment of Loan Committee: There is hereby established a loan review committee (referred to as "Loan Committee") which shall consist of one representative from each of the Banks, KRBA, and the City. KRBA and the City shall be non-voting members of the Loan Committee.

4.2 Authority of Loan Committee: The Loan Committee shall be the final authority with respect to all applications for Loans and the administration of all Loans, including the collection and enforcement of Loans. Without limiting the generality of the





# CITY OF KENT, OHIO

## DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

**To:** Dave Ruller, City Manager

**From:** David A. Coffee, Director of Budget and Finance

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "David Coffee".

**Date:** February 9, 2011

**Re:** FY2011 Appropriation Amendments, Transfers, and Advances

---

**The following appropriation amendments are hereby requested:**

**Fund 001 – General**

Increase	\$ 4,140	Police (Services) / Other (O&M) – Reappropriate 2010 funding for Ammunition per Chief Lee’s request – unexpended bal.
Increase	\$ 10,000	Economic Development / Other - Funding for “Mini Loan” program loss reserve
Increase	\$ 244,870	Clean Ohio Assistance Fund / Other – matched with 2010 COAF grant award – 100 % reimbursement driven

# KENT POLICE DEPARTMENT

319 SOUTH WATER STREET • KENT, OHIO 44240

330-673-7732

MICHELLE A. LEE  
Chief of Police

TO: Dave Coffee  
Director of Budget & Finance

FROM: Michelle A. Lee   
Chief of Police

Date: February 1, 2011

Subject: Re-appropriation of Funds

The purchase order 144446 from 2010 was closed inadvertently last week. The amount released was \$4136.39. Although my office was not aware, items from the vendor were still on back order from the order which was originally placed in April 2010. My office was notified yesterday, January 31, that a shipment from that back order is being delivered and the invoice has already arrived. We are able to use 2011 funds for the time being but due to the issues surrounding ammunition purchases, we are going to need those funds during this year. I am respectfully requesting the re-appropriation of unused funds from 2010, line 00101051001-45 to that same line for 2011.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me.



\_\_\_\_\_  
Manager approval

2/2/11  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**KENT CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
BUSINESS MEETING  
FEBRUARY 15, 2011**

**COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
KENT CITY HALL  
325 S. DEPEYSTER STREET  
7:00 P.M.**

**AGENDA**

- I. **CALL TO ORDER**
- II. **ROLL CALL**
- III. **READING OF PREAMBLE**
- IV. **ADMINISTRATION OF OATH**
- V. **MINUTES:** December 7, 2010 and January 18, 2011
- VI. **CORRESPONDENCE**
- VII. **OLD BUSINESS**
- VIII. **NEW BUSINESS**

- A. **PC11-003 ESCOTT COMPANY  
628 S. Water Street  
Conditional Zoning Certificate & Site Plan Review**

**The applicant is requesting a Conditional Zoning Certificate and Site Plan Review & Approval in order to construct a building addition. The subject property is zoned R-C: High Density Multifamily-Commercial Urban Residential District.**

- 1) *Public Hearing*
- 2) *Planning Commission Discussion/Action*

- IX. **OTHER BUSINESS**
- X. **ADJOURNMENT**



# CITY OF KENT, OHIO

---

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

**DATE:** February 9, 2011  
**TO:** Kent City Planning Commission  
**FROM:** Jennifer Barone, PE, Development Engineer  
**RE:** Staff Report for the February 15, 2011 Planning Commission Meeting

The following items appear on the agenda for the February 15, 2011 Planning Commission meeting:

### **NEW BUSINESS:**

**CASE NO:** PC11-003

**APPLICANT:** ESCOTT COMPANY

**SITE LOCATION:** 628 South Water Street

**STATUS OF APPLICANT:** The applicants, Richard Tinker and Al Stefanov, are the owners of the property.

**REQUESTED ACTION:** Conditional Zoning Certificate and Site Plan Review & Approval to construct a building addition.

**ZONING:** R-C: High Density Multifamily - Commercial Urban Residential District

**TRAFFIC:** The property is accessible from Alley #12 off of South Water Street.

**SURROUNDING LAND USES:** The property is surrounded by residential uses to the south and east and by commercial (church) to the north and west.

**APPLICABLE CODE SECTIONS:** Chapter 1113, 1119, 1137 and 1171 of the Kent Codified Ordinance

## ANALYSIS:

### *PROJECT DESCRIPTION:*

On January 5, 2010 Planning Commission granted a request to Escott & Company for a Conditional Zoning Certificate and Site Plan Approval to construct a 2,267 SF building addition. They have outgrown their existing facility. Since that time, they had modified the request to reduce the size of the addition for cost saving reasons. They are now back before the Commission to request a Conditional Zoning Certificate and Site Plan Approval to construct a 1,138 SF building addition. Professional service offices are a conditional use in the R-C District.

Assuming the Planning Commission agrees, the proposed use appears to meet the specific conditions listed below as set forth in Section 1171.01 of the Zoning Code.

- (4) There shall be no more than one advertisement oriented to each abutting road identifying the activity.
- (5) No lighting shall constitute a nuisance or in any way impair safe movement of traffic on any street or highway; no lighting shall shine directly on adjacent properties.
- (8) Such developments shall be located adjacent to nonresidential uses such as churches, parks, industrial or commercial districts.
- (10) Site locations shall be preferred that offer natural or man-made barriers that would lessen the effect of intrusion into a residential area.
- (11) Such uses shall be properly landscaped to be harmonious with surrounding residential uses.
- (46) The architectural design should be developed with consideration given to the purposes of this district and commercial uses shall be so designed as to minimize possible disruptive effects on the character of properties in adjacent residential zones. Parking shall be provided for each commercial use according to the provisions of Chapter 1167. Parking for commercial uses shall be in addition to that required for the multifamily dwellings.

### *TRAFFIC/PARKING:*

The applicant had purchased the adjacent lot to the north in order to facilitate this addition. No additional parking is proposed since the existing 37 parking spaces exceed the 18 spaces required for the existing and new building addition in total. The plans depict 23 spaces are required. Staff believes this was inadvertently copied from the last submission where the building addition was larger. In either case, sufficient parking is available.

### *UTILITIES:*

The property is already served by City utilities and that little additional capacity will be utilized for the building addition.

### *STORMWATER:*

The stormwater management system consists of a landscaped bioretention facility which discharges to the existing storm water system in Alley No. 12. The pipe crosses Trinity Lutheran Church property. The applicant has been advised to seek an easement from the church.