

Petition 2021-139 by Boulevard at 1800 Central, LLC

To Approve:

This petition is found to be **consistent** with the *2040 Policy Map* (2022) based on the information from the staff analysis and the public hearing, and because:

- The policy map recommends Community Activity Center for the site.

Therefore, 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 currently developed with a recently constructed building for various commercial uses, though portions of the building remain vacant.
- The existing minimum parking standards for the pedestrian overlay district require 1 parking space per 125 square feet of EDEE uses and 1 parking space per 600 square feet of all other non-residential uses. This petition's optional provision for a standardized 1 space per 600 square feet of all non-residential uses allows for greater flexibility in the ratio of EDEE uses to other non-residential uses without necessitating the construction of more parking in an area that is shifting to transit and pedestrian-friendly development.
- A decrease in the overall required parking at this site supports the goals of the pedestrian overlay district to "promote a mixture of uses in a pedestrian-oriented setting of moderate intensity...to support economic development along business corridors."
- This optional provision to lower minimum parking standards align with the goals of the pedestrian overlay district as well as the planned transit routes in this area which will directly contribute to a diversity of transportation options. The petition is located along the proposed Gold Line route on this portion of Central Avenue and will also be within a ½-mile walk of the proposed Pecan Station for the Silver Line.

To Deny:

This petition is found to be **consistent** with the *2040 Policy Map* (2022) based on the information from the staff analysis and the public hearing, and because:

- The policy map recommends mixed uses including retail, multi-family residential, and office.

However, 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: