

Petition 2020-034 by Charles Gray

To Approve:

This petition is found to be **inconsistent** with the *University City Area Plan* with respect to land use, based on the information from the staff analysis and the public hearing, and because:

- The plan recommends residential uses up to 22 dwelling units per acre (DUA) for the site.

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 request for retail uses at this site matches the land use context of three of the four corners (with the fourth being controlled by the university) at the intersection of John Kirk Drive and University City Boulevard.
- The request maintains existing retail and zoning uses that were previously in operation on this corner.
- The petition is consistent with land use and development policy (policy area 10c). While it recommends this area as a "Primarily Residential Character Area", it acknowledges supportive land uses such as retail, office, and civic/ institutional uses along University City Boulevard.
- The amendment's commitment to exclude fueling stations is consistent with land use and development policies regarding retail uses in area 10c.
- The current conditional plan for this site severely limits the types of uses permitted at a location that is walkable for students and residents. Approval of this plan amendment would assist the owners in finding a suitable tenant for a long-closed former student bookstore.

The approval of this petition will revise the adopted future land use as specified by the *University City Area Plan* from residential uses up to 22 DUA to retail uses for the site.

To Deny:

This petition is found to be **inconsistent** with the *University City Area Plan* with respect to land use, based on the information from the staff analysis and the public hearing, and because:

- The plan recommends residential uses up to 22 dwelling units per acre (DUA) for the site.

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 the Zoning Committee)

Motion:

Approve or Deny

Maker:

2ND:

Vote:

Dissenting:

Recused: