

**Petition 2018-013 by Westcore Properties AC, LLC**

**To Approve:**

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

- The petition is inconsistent with the *Northeast District Plan* recommendation for institutional land uses as amended by a previous petition.

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 proposed parking lot is inconsistent with the institutional land use recommended for this site by a previous rezoning. The institutional use was never implemented.
- The subject property is located between single family residential uses along Penninger Circle and a parking lot and building formerly used for office/research in the Research Park.
- The proposed parking and existing parking lots will be connected and will provide additional parking that will be needed if the building is used entirely for office purposes.
- The proposed parking area will be screened and buffered from the residential areas along Penninger Circle by a 75-foot Class B buffer.
- Vehicular connections from the site to Penninger Circle will be allowed only when three of the five parcels of land located on the west side of Penninger Circle (across from the site) are redeveloped for multi-family or non-residential uses.

**To Deny:**

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

- The petition is inconsistent with the *Northeast District Plan* recommendation for institutional uses as amended by a previous petition.

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 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: \_\_\_\_\_