

Canopy Over City Property – 135 South Main Street (Shenandoah Bicycle Company)– Staff Comments

Community Development – Planning & Zoning (Thanh Dang)

1. Can Public Works confirm whether the awnings will have any impact to vehicular travel through the parking lot or is this something the applicant should hire a registered design professional to illustrate on plans for review? I don't know if deliveries by larger vehicles get made here or not and we should ask SBC. I would think they get their deliveries in the back. Where does Jimmy Madison's receive their deliveries?

Community Development – Building Inspections (Ron Schuett)

My comments are as follows:

- A building permit will be required.
- Projections from the building face must be at least 6'-8" above a walking surface where they extend more than 4" away from the wall.
- Structural footings below the frost line must be provided.
- The design will be required to be engineered.

Outside my realm, but probably will be noted by someone else, it appears to be too low for vehicles making the turn. The outside rafter tail is also not noted but is lower than the identified beam. Also, the snow accumulation will not be uniform and will be deeper on the sidewalk at the edge of the roof on the sides.

Community Development – Director (Adam Fletcher)

1. While not a comment associated with the actual request, the review materials identifying the location of the requests refers to the City-owned properties as "parking lot and alley," however, there is no actual "alley" in this area. The property that appears to have once been an alley is actually fee simple property.

Thanh Dang's response: I will update the Site Map to remove the word alley.

2. I anticipate that the Building Code will require special construction material since the "awnings" will be constructed on a property line. While not necessarily a concern, I am also curious to know if this type of construction and improvement is always referred to as an "awning." This type of improvement seems much more substantial than what I typically think of as an "awning."

Ron Schuett's response: It doesn't really matter to me what they call it. I would call it a canopy, which is described on the construction plan. The structural frame is thick enough to resemble the type of construction that has an inherent fire rating due to its thickness (Type IV) which is an option, as well as fire retardant or non-combustible. I kind of took the same position I had taken earlier when I approved in concept the wood frame deck on City property at the barbecue place downtown, adjacent to the parking lot. Since it is City property, if we ever have a need for the area, we can just have them remove it. Hopefully I am being consistent. A deck does not have the same fire rating or retardant issues that walls and a roof have, which is why they are a little different.

3. I anticipate that the maintenance, construction, and development agreements that would be created would be similar to what we did for the patio dining area that was constructed on TM 34-Y-4. The proposed construction is, for all intents and purposes, permanent construction. I presume this process will move forward without the agreements completely being established? It would be nice if they were, but I do not think those agreements need to be worked out before this request is reviewed by City Council.

Thanh Dang's response: The license agreement for TM 34-Y-4 was drafted and presented to City Council for review at the same time that staff's recommendation and the applicant's request was presented to City Council. Once we get staff's questions answered through this review process, I will forward the information to Wesley Russ and work with him on the agreement details. Building permitting would come after City Council's approval.

4. If I am interpreting the drawings that were submitted correctly, it appears the construction will project 5 feet 4 inches from the building. The applicant states that this improvement will not disrupt the traffic flow, but is that true? I doubt fire apparatus would be able to maneuver through that area. Does the Fire Department need to circle through this area or can they simply pull in and back out when emergencies occur?
 - a. What about delivery vehicles? Can they safely maneuver through this area with the improvement in place?

Thanh Dang's response: See PW and HFD responses below.

5. There appears to be stormwater infrastructure in this area that could be impacted by the installation of the supporting beams. They need to ensure this infrastructure is not impacted.

Thanh Dang's response: Cantilever design. No impact.

6. With regard to the main entrance awning structure, will the structure extend over the sidewalk that extends to the parking area that is connected through the pass-through area between Shenandoah Bicycle Company and Clementines/Ruby's?
7. With regard to the Pulp entrance, the drawings do not demonstrate that there is a utility pole near the edge of the building; how will the proposed structure be constructed with regard to that utility pole?
8. Is there any reason to believe that the proposed structure in some way would inhibit access to the northern side of the Shenandoah Bicycle Company/Pulp building? In other words, the access to the rear portion of the parcel identified as 26-B-5A.

Fire Department (Matt Tobia)

I drove the parking lot today and it is already incredibly tight – an engine could not make the turn at the bottom of the “U”. I am not sure what deliveries get made in the parking lot but I am

suspect that any truck could deliver in the parking lot. It is very tight there with vehicles present.

Hope this helps. In my mind the presence of an awning will not impact FD operations.

Police Department (Wayne Westfall)

The only issue I see is can a truck make the turn with the awning. Box trucks make deliveries in that area and may not clear the awning when turning through the parking lot.

Thanh Dang's inquiry to Tom Hartman: When you reviewed the subject request, did you consider whether a UPS, FedEx, or similar type of box truck that could maneuver around the canopy? Wayne Westfall says that box truck deliveries are made from this parking lot. I think that the trucks would be too tall to go under the canopy and I don't know how wide of a turn they would need to make and whether or not they would avoid the canopy. Your thoughts? Thank you.

Tom Hartman's Response: Yes we looked at that from a snow plow perspective, as we occasionally take a salt spreader through this lot. We didn't see any potential issues with that maneuver. There is an existing curbed planter located along the building between the 2 main doors and the awning would not extend out past this curbing and from our review that was far enough away from the drive isle that it wouldn't pose a problem. In our opinion if they hit the awning they would be running into the front doors as well.

Public Works Department (Tom Hartman)

I met with BJ and Glenn out on site this afternoon and reviewed the plan. I had mistakenly thought there were support beams in the parking lot, but after review they are using a cantilever design, so there will be no obstruction within the parking area. The height of the awning will not pose any issues with vehicle movements. We have no concerns with the installation of this structure.

Public Utilities (David Gray)

I don't see any objection to the Bicycle awning. We don't have any Public Utilities assets to be impacted.

City Attorney (Wesley Russ)

No comments.