

## Petition 2018-028 by Pollack Shores

### To Approve:

The petition is found to be **inconsistent** with the *Dixie Berryhill Strategic Plan*, based on information from the staff analysis and the public hearing, and because:

- The petition is inconsistent with the recommendations of the *Dixie Berryhill Strategic Plan* for park/open space and office/retail/light industrial uses.

However, we find this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest, based on the information from the staff analysis and the public hearing, and because:

- The site is located across Shopton Road from the Charlotte Premium Outlet Mall; and
- This major development was not contemplated when the *Dixie Berryhill Strategic Plan* was adopted; however, it has significantly changed the area's development pattern by adding retail to an area initially recommended for light industrial; and
- The subject site is a desirable location for multi-family development as it is in walking distance to an elementary school, regional park, public transportation, church, and retail uses, including the Charlotte Premium Outlet Mall; and
- The multi-family development is not adjacent to any single family development, but is in close proximity to parcels built or approved for 12 dwellings per acre and for 17 dwellings per acre; and
- The proposed site plan includes a 7.41 acre portion, which constitutes 26.4% of the site, as tree save, and will be adjacent to a future regional park.

### To Deny:

The petition is found to be **inconsistent** with the *Dixie Berryhill Strategic Plan* based on information from the staff analysis and the public hearing, and because:

- The petition is inconsistent with the recommendations of the *Dixie Berryhill Strategic Plan* for park/open space and office/retail/light industrial uses.

Therefore, we find this petition to not be reasonable and in the public interest based on the information from the staff analysis and the public hearing, and because:

- (To be explained by Zoning Committee)

Motion by: Friday, Spencer, Majeed, McClung, Nelson, McMillian, or Sullivan

Motion to: Approve, Deny, Defer to \_\_\_\_\_.

Choose one: as it appears before us.  
as presented by \_\_\_\_\_  
as modified as follows: \_\_\_\_\_

And the adoption of the consistency statement

Choose one: as it appears before us.  
as presented by \_\_\_\_\_  
as modified as follows: \_\_\_\_\_

Second by: Friday, Spencer, Majeed, McClung, Nelson, McMillian, or Sullivan

Vote: \_\_\_\_\_ Recused: \_\_\_\_\_ Absent: \_\_\_\_\_