### THE CITY OF KEY WEST PLANNING BOARD Staff Report



То:	Chair and Planning Board Members
From:	Ginny Haller, Planner II
Through:	Patrick Wright, Planning Director
Meeting Date:	April 19, 2018
Agenda Item:	<b>Variance – 2600 N. Roosevelt Boulevard (RE# 00065010-000000) -</b> A request for a variance to parking requirements to forty-three (43) vehicle parking spaces and seven (7) bicycle parking spaces for the expansion of an existing three-story self-storage building on property located in the Commercial General (CG) Zoning District pursuant to Section 90-395, 108-574, and 108-572(17) of the Land Development Regulations of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Key West, Florida.
Request:	The applicant is requesting a variance to 43 vehicle parking spaces and 7 bicycle spaces in order to construct a three-story expansion of an existing three-story self-storage building.
Applicant:	Summit Construction Group, the General Contractor
Property Owner:	Monarch Properties, Ltd.
Location:	2600 N. Roosevelt Boulevard (RE #00065010-000000)
Zoning:	Commercial General (CG) & Conservation Mangrove (CM)



**Background:** The property is located at 2600 N. Roosevelt Boulevard. In order to allow the proposed expansion of the existing self-storage facility, several development approvals would be necessary.

- Variance to parking requirements to allow forty-three (43) vehicle spaces and seven (7) bicycle parking spaces for the expansion of the self-storage facility.
- Major Development Plan review is required due to the expansion of the self-storage facility of equal to or greater than 5,000 square feet of gross floor area pursuant to Section 108-91.B.2(b) of the Land Development Regulations (LDRs) of the Code of Ordinances (the "Code") of the City of Key West (the "City").
- Conditional use review is required for the expansion of the self-storage facility which is considered a light industrial use within the CG Zoning District, pursuant to City Code Section 122-418(17).
- The applicant is also requesting a waiver to landscape buffer requirements, pursuant to City Code Section 108-347.

The proposal is for the construction of a three-story 25,730 square foot expansion at the rear of the existing Choice Storage Centers. The property is approximately 6.06 acres with an existing three-story 44,482 square foot climate-controlled self-storage facility with associated parking, loading area, and outside storage of vehicles, boats and trailers. Ingress and egress to the storage center is on North Roosevelt Boulevard. The existing developed area is approximately 2.33 acres and approximately 3.73 acres of conservation/mangrove land.

The existing vehicle parking is 37 spaces and the proposed is 43 vehicle spaces with a required of 1 space/600 square feet of gross floor area and 7 bicycle spaces for the expansion of the existing self-storage facility.

Dimensional Requirement	Required/ Allowed	Proposed on Plan	Change / Variance Required?
Vehicle Off-street Parking	1 space per 600 SF = 117 existing and proposed spaces	43 vehicle spaces	Variance
Bicycle Parking	10% of Vehicle Parking	7 bicycle spaces	Variance

### Process:

Planning Board:	April 19, 2018
Local Appeal Period:	10 days
DEO Review:	Up to 45 days

### Analysis – Evaluation for Compliance with the Land Development Regulations:

The criteria for evaluating a variance are listed in Section 90-395 of the City Code. The Planning Board before granting a variance must find all of the following:

1. Existence of special conditions or circumstances. That special conditions and circumstances exist which are peculiar to the land, structure or building involved and which are not applicable to other land, structures or buildings in the same zoning district.

The land, structures, and building involved are located on property within the CG Zoning District. As stated in the staff report for the Major Development Plan the trip generation for the expansion of the Choice self-storage (mini-warehouse) would have a minimal impact on ingress and egress traffic onto North Roosevelt Boulevard. According to the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) the proposed expansion of the mini-warehouse by 25,730 square feet would increase the total weekday trips by 65 (existing 111 trips + 65 proposed = 176 in total). However, there are no special conditions or circumstances that exist peculiar to the structures or buildings involved.

### NOT IN COMPLIANCE.

# 2. Conditions not created by applicant. That the special conditions and circumstances do not result from the action or negligence of the applicant.

The decision to increase the need for parking on site by the expansion of the self-storage facility is created by the applicant.

### NOT IN COMPLIANCE.

**3.** Special privileges not conferred. That granting the variance requested will not confer upon the applicant any special privileges denied by the land development regulations to other lands, buildings or structures in the same zoning district.

The Code of Ordinances does not have specific parking requirements for self-storage facilities, however Section 108-572 (17) identifies the parking requirements for warehousing and manufacturing as 1 space per 600 square feet of gross floor space. According to the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) the proposed expansion of the mini-warehouse by 25,730 square feet would increase the total weekday trips by 65 (existing 111 trips + 65 proposed = 176 in total).

Granting a variance to parking requirements would confer special privileges upon the applicant denied by the land development regulations to other lands, buildings or structures in the same zoning district.

### NOT IN COMPLIANCE.

4. Hardship conditions exist. That literal interpretation of the provisions of the land development regulations would deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties in this same zoning district under the terms of this ordinance and would work unnecessary and undue hardship on the applicant.

Literal interpretation of Section 108-572 (17) would not deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same district, nor would it work unnecessary and undue hardship on the applicant. Other commercial uses in the CG Zoning District would have to meet parking requirements. Although hardship conditions do not exist, the applicant states that the requiring an excessive amount of parking spaces under the warehouse standard would require more impervious surface area for parking and thereby reduce the amount of open space and landscape area on the site.

### NOT IN COMPLIANCE.

# 5. Only minimum variance granted. That the variance granted is the minimum variance that will make possible the reasonable use of the land, building, or structure.

The variance requested is not the minimum required that will make possible the reasonable use of the land, building, or structure. However, they are the minimum necessary to accommodate the request.

### NOT IN COMPLIANCE.

6. Not injurious to the public welfare. That the granting of the variance will be in harmony with the general intent and purpose of the land development regulations and that such variance will not be injurious to the area involved or otherwise detrimental to the public interest or welfare.

Although the applicant is not in compliance with all of the standards for considering a variance, the proposal to construct more storage space is not injurious to the public welfare.

### IN COMPLIANCE.

7. Existing nonconforming uses of other property not the basis for approval. No nonconforming use of neighboring lands, structures, or buildings in the same district, and no permitted use of lands, structures or buildings in other districts shall be considered grounds for the issuance of a variance.

Existing non-conforming uses of other properties, use of neighboring lands, structures, or buildings in the same district, or other zoning districts, are not the basis for this request.

### IN COMPLIANCE.

### **Concurrency Facilities and Other Utilities or Service (Section 108-233):**

It does not appear that the requested variance would trigger any public facility capacity issues.

### The Planning Board shall make factual findings regarding the following:

That the standards established by Section 90-395 of the City Code have been met by the applicant for a variance.

The standards established by Section 90-395 of the City Code have not been fully met by the applicant for the variances requested.

That the applicant has demonstrated a "good neighbor policy" by contacting or attempting to contact all noticed property owners who have objected to the variance application, and by addressing the objections expressed by these neighbors.

No public comments have been received to date.

The planning board shall not grant a variance to permit a use not permitted by right or as a conditional use in the zoning district involved or any use expressly or by implication prohibited by the terms of the ordinance in the zoning district.

Light industrial is a conditional use in the CG Zoning Districts.

No nonconforming use of neighboring lands, structures, or buildings in the same zoning district and no permitted use of lands, structures, or buildings in other zoning districts shall be considered grounds for the authorization of a variance.

No such grounds were considered.

# No variance shall be granted that increases or has the effect of increasing density or intensity of a use beyond that permitted by the comprehensive plan or these LDRs.

No density or intensity of a use would be increased beyond that permitted by the comprehensive plan or these LDRs.

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

Based on the criteria established by the Comprehensive Plan and the Land Development Regulations, the Planning Department recommends the request for variance be **denied**.