## To Approve:

(<u>I move that the</u>) Zoning Committee finds the northern portion of the site to be *consistent* with the Northeast *Area Plan* but the density *inconsistent* with both the adopted area plan and the *General Development Policies* criteria, and the southern portion of the site to be *inconsistent* with adopted policy plan, based on information from the staff analysis and the public hearing, and because:

- The northern portion of the petition is consistent with the *Northeast Area Plan* recommendation for residential land use but inconsistent with the recommended density of four dwelling units per acre. In addition, it does not meet the *General Development Policies* criteria for more than four units per acre.
- The southern portion of the petition is inconsistent with the *Northeast Area Plan* recommendation for research/office/retail land uses.

(<u>However, we find</u>) 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 subject property is located on Galloway Road between single family residential developments and Interstate 85; and
- Recently approved rezoning petition 2016-139 allows the development of a multifamily development at 12 dwelling units per acre, across the street from this site on Galloway Road; and
- For the eastern portion of the site abutting Interstate 85, the plan recommends research/office/retail land uses, which are no longer appropriate at this location considering that it will be surrounded by residential uses along a local street; and
- While the plan recommends residential use for the western portion of the petition, it does not meet the *General Development Policies* criteria for density above four units per acre. However, the proposed townhome development will provide a transition between the recently approved multi-family development, and the existing single family neighborhoods in the area; and
- In addition, the site plan commits to a network of public and private streets, a pedestrian network, open space, and design standards that are compatible with the surrounding single family development.

Consistency: Maker: 2<sup>№D</sup>: Approve or Deny

Vote: Dissenting: Recused: Recommendation: Maker: 2<sup>ND</sup>: Approve or Deny

Vote: Dissenting: Recused:

## To Deny:

(<u>I move that the</u>) Zoning Committee finds the finds the northern portion of the site to be *consistent* with the Northeast *Area Plan* but the density *inconsistent* with the adopted plan and the *General Development Policies* criteria, and the southern portion of the site to be *inconsistent* with adopted policy plan, based on information from the staff analysis and the public hearing, and because:

- The northern portion of the petition is consistent with the *Northeast Area Plan* recommendation for residential land use but inconsistent with the recommended density of four dwelling units per acre. In addition, it does not meet the *General Development Policies* criteria for more than four units per acre.
- The southern portion of the petition is inconsistent with the *Northeast Area Plan* recommendation for research/office/retail land uses.

(<u>However, we find</u>) 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)