



GRV Task Force | 08-27-2022

Key items that are non-compliant with the Garland Road Vision Study:

STRATEGIC OPPORTUNITY VISION AREA 2 SECTION

1. **Page 72 of the GRV Study:** *“Strategic Opportunity Vision Area 2 is located at the northeast corner of Garland Road and East Centerville Road.... The maximum height of development at this location would be approximately 36’ or 3 stories, and there is a potential to reduce the height of the development adjacent to East Centerville Road to approximately 24’ to be more compatible with existing single family residential uses across the street.”*

Conclusion: The proposed complex is 59’ tall, and 4 stories. This is **non-compliant**.

FUTURE LAND DEVELOPMENT VISION SECTION

2. **Page 41 of the GRV Study:** *“ stakeholders expressed a CLEAR desire to protect existing residential areas from commercial encroachment, but also expressed a desire for new businesses and developments that would be encouraged to locate in the existing commercial areas along the corridor.”*

Conclusion: It is safe to assume that “commercial encroachment” includes limiting the height of a structure so that it is not visually intrusive/encroaching on established neighborhoods. Any structure over 36’ is non-compliant. Therefore, a 59’ tall complex next to an existing residential area is an encroachment and **non-compliant**.

In addition, The study ONLY mentions locating new developments in existing commercial areas along the corridor. This property is, and has been for 65 years, in a single family zone/area. Attempting to build developments in a single family zone area is **non-compliant**.

3. **Page 41 of the GRV study:** *“The Future Land Development Vision plan suggests that these structures be retained and rehabilitated, as needed. Also, some local stakeholders expressed a desire for some of the remaining underutilized parcels in the area to become community gardens.”*

Conclusion: The photo next to the sentence above that is shown in the study as THE example to be retained and rehabilitated is the Shoreline Church. Of all the several buildings along the Garland Rd. Corridor, the GRV picked Shoreline Church as “Exhibit A” to be preserved and not demolished. This is undeniable and **non-compliant**.

Not nearly as important, but should be included - there is no Community Garden offered, which was recommended by the GRV. This is **non-compliant**.

4. **Page 43 of the GRV study:** *The Land Development Vision Plan Figure clearly indicates where Mixed Use is to be developed.*

Conclusion: Attempting to build a development with mixed use outside the chosen boundary is **non-compliant**.

