

## Petition 2017-133 by Mattamy Homes

### To Approve:

The Zoning Committee finds the petition to be **inconsistent** with the *University Research Park Area Plan* and **consistent** with the *General Development Policies*, based on information from the staff analysis and the public hearing, and because:

- The *University Research Park Area Plan* recommends office land use. The *General Development Policies* support the proposed density of 4.40 units per acre.

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:

- Although the area plan recommends office uses for this site, the University Research Park has continued to evolve since the plan was adopted in 2010 with the addition of multi-family into the predominately office and research environment; and
- If the site is to be considered for residential, the *General Development Policies* (GDP) indicate that a density of up to six units per acre is appropriate; and
- This proposal will provide another housing choice in the Research Park by allowing townhome development close to numerous employment opportunities; and
- The proposed residential development will have significantly lower traffic impact than the office development recommended by the plan; and
- The petition also commits to an internal network of streets that will help support City Council's connectivity goals; and
- The petition provides an extensive open space network including a linear park, pocket park, pedestrian trails, and a large common open space.

### To Deny:

The Zoning Committee finds the petition to be **inconsistent** with the *University Research Park Area Plan* and **consistent** with the *General Development Policies*, based on information from the staff analysis and the public hearing, and because:

- The *University Research Park Area Plan* recommends office land use. The *General Development Policies* support the proposed density of 4.40 units per acre.

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 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: \_\_\_\_\_