

## Petition 2019-001c by Ascent Real Estate Capital, LLC

### To Approve:

- The property is within a portion of the unincorporated area of Mecklenburg County and was previously designated as in the Sphere of Influence of the Town of Pineville. Neither Pineville or Charlotte have accepted extraterritorial zoning jurisdiction for the property. Therefore, no adopted plans specifically addressing future land use recommendations exist. The petition is inconsistent with the adjacent single family detached and attached residential uses; however, the proposal with an institutional use is more compatible with the surrounding uses and zoning than the previously approved petition.

([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 building heights are limited to 1 story and 35 feet, five feet less than base height in the surrounding residential zoning.
- The buffer abutting the single family neighborhoods has been increased providing more transition between the uses.
- The proposed daycare, an institutional use, will provide a service to people living in the area.
- The proposed office square footage has been reduced and commits to architectural standards that ensure building design is more consistent with the predominately residential character of the area.
- The site is not part of an existing residential subdivision and is located on Lancaster Highway, a major thoroughfare not conducive to single family detached development.
- The site provides a mixture of uses; and the proposed uses are reasonable and similar to existing uses in either direction along Lancaster Highway.

### To Deny:

- The property is within a portion of the unincorporated area of Mecklenburg County and was previously designated as in the Sphere of Influence of the Town of Pineville. Neither Pineville or Charlotte have accepted extraterritorial zoning jurisdiction for the property. Therefore, no adopted plans specifically addressing future land use recommendations exist. The petition is inconsistent with the adjacent single family detached and attached residential uses; however, the proposal with an institutional use is more compatible with the surrounding uses and zoning than the previously approved petition.

([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:**

**2<sup>ND</sup>:**

**Vote:**

**Dissenting:**

**Recused:**