## Petition 2019-105 by The Greenstone Group, LLC

## **To Approve:**

This petition is found to be **inconsistent** with the *Prosperity Hucks Area Plan* (2015), based on the information from the staff analysis and the public hearing, and because:

• The plan recommends residential uses up to eight dwelling 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:

- At 15 dwelling units per acre, the residential component of this petition is denser than the eight dwelling units per acre that the adopted area plan recommends for the site. However, the proposed development will provide an appropriate transition between existing single family and commercial uses.
- The plan notes that a secondary retail and/or office component facing Benfield Road is appropriate if designed and integrated with the residential uses to create a unified walkable place. The petition includes ground floor retail uses integrated in the building with residential uses and has committed to pedestrian pathways through the site to encourage pedestrian interaction from Benfield Road.
- The petition's commitment to a 15,000 square foot office building is a complementary secondary use to the residential/ retail component.
- The petition provides a buffer and step-down commitments to three-stories along Summer Creek Lane to address concerns regarding the transition to adjacent singlefamily homes to the rear of the site.

The approval of this petition will revise the adopted future land use as specified by the *Prosperity Hucks Area Plan* (2015), from residential uses at up to eight dwelling units per acre to residential/office/retail uses for the site.

## To Deny:

This petition is found to be **inconsistent** with the *Prosperity Hucks Area Plan* (2015), based on the information from the staff analysis and the public hearing, and because:

• The plan recommends residential uses up to eight dwelling units per acre.

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: