

## Petition 2019-148 by Branful, LLC

### To Approve:

This petition is found to be **consistent** with the *Central District Plan* (1993), based on the information from the staff analysis and the public hearing, and because:

- The plan recommends retail uses on the northern parcel and non-residential uses on the southern parcel, as amended by prior rezoning petitions 1988-089 and 2015-134.

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 site is currently used as an eating, drinking, and entertainment establishment with one accessory drive-through window. This petition limits the uses to 5,000 square feet of gross floor area of retail and eating, drinking, and entertainment establishment uses with one accessory drive-through window. The petition is seeking an increase in developable square footage, not a change in use or an increase in accessory drive-through windows.
- The petition commits to enhancing the pedestrian environment through site design elements which include walkways from all entrances to sidewalks along public streets and building orientation.
- This petition commits to additional transportation improvements through coordination with CATS to construct an ADA compliant bus stop waiting pad on West Sugar Creek Road as part of site redevelopment.
- The intent of the Neighborhood Service District is to provide for uses that directly serve the neighborhood in which they are located. The Neighborhood Service District is considered compatible with the adjacent commercial and single-family development as the permitted uses are already existing on the site today.

### To Deny:

This petition is found to be **consistent** with the *Central District Plan* (1993), based on the information from the staff analysis and the public hearing, and because:

- The plan recommends retail uses on the northern parcel and non-residential uses on the southern parcel, as amended by prior rezoning petitions 1988-089 and 2015-134.

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:**

**Approve or Deny**

**Maker:**

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

**Vote:**

**Dissenting:**

**Recused:**