

## Petition 2018-018 by Unique Southern Estates, LLC

### To Approve:

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

- The area plan as amended by a previous rezoning recommends retail uses for the existing VanLandingham Estate. While the proposed uses for the site are consistent with the plan recommendation, the townhomes are inconsistent with the area plan.
- The plan recommends single family uses for the two single family developed parcels at the southern edge of the site zoned R-5.

(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 majority of the subject site is a historic landmark, which has been used as an event facility and five-room hotel in recent years. The remainder of the site is developed with two single family detached dwellings in single family residential zoning, one fronting Nassau Boulevard and one fronting The Plaza; and
- The proposal retains the historic landmark identified as the “Main House”, and adds up to 22 single family attached dwellings on the edge of the estate and on the two single family lots abutting the estate; and
- The addition of the proposed townhomes to the site increases the mix of housing types available in the neighborhood, while allowing the historic main house to remain on the site; and
- Site and building design will be reviewed and approved by Historic Districts Commission and Historic Landmarks to ensure compatibility, context and appropriateness of exterior features.

### To Deny:

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

- The area plan as amended by a previous rezoning recommends retail uses for the existing VanLandingham Estate. While the proposed uses for the site are consistent with the plan recommendation, the townhomes are inconsistent with the area plan.
- The plan recommends single family uses for the two single family developed parcels at the southern edge of the site zoned R-5.

(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: \_\_\_\_\_