

VARIANCE 1: TABLE 12.A: T5: STANDARDS, BUILDING PLACEMENT

1. Explain requested variance.

Variance from Table 12.A: T5 Standards, Building Placement. T5 transect district requires a 12' maximum front setback for primary, 0' front setback for secondary, 6' maximum side setback and 3' minimum rear setback. The Applicant would like to request a variance to exceed the maximum building setbacks as shown on the site plan.

2. There are exceptional and extraordinary conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property in question, due to its size, shape or topography.

The existing steep topography of the site, in addition to a large quantity of subsurface rock, prohibit the building location from complying with the T5 transect district requirements.

3. The application of these regulations to this particular piece of property would create a practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship.

The proposed use on this site is for a 148,000 +/- Costco Warehouse retail store. There are extreme development constraints existing on the site, specifically the topography and rock materials prohibit a building of the size from meeting the literal interpretation of the code. The Applicant also finds that by meeting the literal interpretation of this code section would put the safety of pedestrians at risk due to vehicular traffic at the store front.

4. Such conditions are peculiar to the particular piece of property involved.

The conditions identified in the response #2 and #3 above are peculiar to the particular piece of property due to existing topographical constraints and unsuitable development materials on the property involved.

5. A literal interpretation of this ordinance would deprive the applicants of any rights that others in the same district are allowed.

A literal interpretation of Table 12.A: T5 Standards, Building Placement would deprive the Applicant of rights that others in the same district are allowed. There is a significant hardship placed on the Applicant by requiring the Applicant to meet the literal interpretation of the table due to existing conditions on the site. Furthermore, following the literal interpretation of the Table would put the safety of pedestrians at significant risk due to vehicular traffic at the store front.

APR 03 2015

- 6. Relief, if granted, would not cause substantial detriment to the public good, or impair the purposes and intent of this ordinance.**

Relief from the literal interpretation of Table 12.A would not cause substantial detriment to the public good, or impair the purposes and intent of Ordinance.

- 7. Special circumstances or conditions applying to the building or land or building and land in question are peculiar to such premises and do not apply generally to other land or buildings in the vicinity.**

There are special conditions applying to the building and land in questions that do not apply generally to other buildings and lands in the vicinity. The land is burdened by extreme topography and unsuitable soil materials that create a hardship on the Applicant to comply with the literal interpretation of the code. The hardship created by Table 12.A is further exacerbated by the size of the building. The building size, which is proposed at 148,000 +/- square feet, was not contemplated during the writing or approval of the Ordinance. As such, the Applicant believes particular variances from Table 12.A should be considered to maintain the health, safety and welfare of pedestrians.

- 8. Granting of the application is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a property right and not merely to serve as a convenience to the applicant.**

Granting the request for a variance in the setback requirements of Table 12.A is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a property right and not merely to serve as a convenience to the applicant.

- 9. The condition from which relief or a variance is sought did not result from willful action by the applicant**

The condition from which relief or a variance is sought did not result from willful action by the applicant.

- 10. Authorizing the variance will not impair adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property or unreasonably increase the congestion of public streets, increase the danger of fire, imperil the public safety, unreasonably diminish or impair established property values within the surrounding areas or in any other respect impair the health, safety, comfort, morals or general welfare of the inhabitants of the City.**

Authorizing the variance will not impair adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property or unreasonably increase the congestion of public streets, increase the danger of fire, imperil the public safety, unreasonably diminish or impair established property values within the surrounding areas or in any other respect impair the health, safety, comfort, morals or general welfare of the inhabitants of the City.

SITE

Variance #1: Building Setbacks

T5 transect district requires a 12' maximum front setback for primary, 0' front setback for secondary, 6' maximum side setback and 3' minimum rear setback. Costco would like to request a variance to exceed the maximum building setbacks as shown on the site plan. The existing steep topography of the site, in addition to a large quantity of subsurface rock, prohibit the building location from complying with the T5 transect district requirements. The current building location on the site plan will provide for full fire access around the building.

Variance #2: B-grids

Costco would like to request a variance to the typical B-grid section in front of the building based on the nature of its use. Costco's customers will mostly require the use of large shopping carts or flat-bed carts to and from the warehouse entrance and will need easy access to the drive aisles and their vehicles. The grid system proposed in front of the building will provide connectivity to the A-grid system of the overall development. As a result there will be breaks along the B-grid for vehicular and pedestrian access. Costco has proposed larger landscape islands at the end of each drive aisle with sidewalks to promote pedestrian access and safety. Costco would also like a variance to increase the maximum percentage of B-grid frontage from 30% to approximately 70%. The rear drive aisle behind Costco will not have a grid designation since it is for fire and Costco delivery access only. Costco will provide a pedestrian access from the drive aisle to the frontage of Ridgewalk Parkway where the B-grid "dead-ends" into the edge of the parking lot.

Variance #3: Stormwater Pond Walls

Costco would like to request a variance to provide two (2) stormwater management facilities (walled detention ponds) along the frontage of Ridgewalk Parkway. These ponds are currently locate at the low points of the site where storm runoff currently discharges from the property. The pond walls will have heavy landscaping/screening along the roadway view corridors with the intent to have low visibility from the street elevation. Retaining walls will be required in this area regardless of stormwater detention requirements based on the topography of the site.

Variance #4: Parking

The Costco parcel will have three different transect district designations (T4, T4O and T5) which will limit the maximum parking allowed to 306 (based on 2 spaces per 1000 sf). Costco has over 700 warehouses throughout the world and has a good understanding of their customer base. Costco customers tend to stay longer than the normal retail customer; therefore, parking becomes a premium during peak shopping times – many warehouse have 650 parkway spaces. Costco would like to request a variance to exceed the maximum parking to provide 625 parking spaces.

APR 03 2015

BUILDING

Based on the standards set forth in the Woodstock Land Development Code, 18.412 Architectural Standards, we are requesting the following variances:

Variance #1: (Section 3a): Building wall materials may be combined on each façade only horizontally, with the lighter above more substantial materials.

Given the horizontal nature of the building typology, the design needs a vertical break to provide a visual relief and interest for the viewer. The design is keeping with the overall intent of the code section and expresses the horizontal nature with only minor variation. Largely the lighter material is placed above the more substantial and darker colored base material in compliance with this section. We therefore request that the design approach be accepted as in compliance with the intent of this code section.

Variance #2 (Section 3c & 3d): The storefront private frontage shall be no less than 50% glazing. All glass shall be clear and free of color.

Adding clear glazing to the building will not have the desired effect of transparency at the pedestrian level that the code is seeking to incorporate into the building. The merchandising of the building is such that the product is placed along the exterior perimeter wall and therefore would block out any views into the building. And present to the streetscape a jumbled assortment of products. Clear glazing at the ground level also presents a security concern for Costco Wholesale. The design would potentially open up the possibility to access the product through the windows where the employees would be unable to supervise. We therefore request that the requirement for clear glazing be waived for this application.

Variance #3 (Section 3h): The exterior finish material on all facades shall be limited to brick, wood siding, cementitious siding, stucco and/or stone. No more than two materials shall be combined on any façade.

In order to facilitate speed of construction and integration with the pre-engineered structural system of the building, we are proposing the use of a metal panel system for the building. The metal is a recycled material from both pre and post-consumer recycled content and Costco receives a 30-year warranty on this product which is beneficial to maintain the appearance of the building into the future without a lot of maintenance required. This also supports the overall sustainability of the building, aside from the recycled content of the metal panel system, they are able to achieve much higher insulation (R-Values) for the wall system. The system can provide a 20 R-Value as opposed to about 6 R-Value you get with a standard Brick or Masonry wall. With the increasingly stringent requirements for the energy code it becomes more and more difficult to meet the insulation requirements with a standard Brick or Masonry wall for a building of this size and type. We therefore request that the use of metal panels be allowed for the design of the building.

APR 03 2015