

Petition 2020-003 by Fairview Builders

To Approve:

This petition is found to be **inconsistent** with the *Belmont Area Revitalization Plan* with respect to proposed land use, based on the information from the staff analysis and the public hearing, and because:

- The plan recommends single family residential uses up to five dwelling units per acre (DUA).

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 project closely resembles the lot configuration approved through petition 2017-083 (which surrounds the subject property along its eastern and southern property lines) and will frame out currently vacant land with a similar residential unit type.
- The proposed duplexes are compatible with surrounding residential and mixed uses. Although the parcel is zoned industrial, the likelihood that the subject property develops, both due to its proximity to residential uses and the size of the property, as an industrial use is low.
- Although the requested density (20 DUA) is higher than the proposed land use density for these parcels (5 DUA), the request for residential uses is in line with the plan recommendations.
- The area plan identifies vacant lots along Seigle Avenue in the Belmont Community, including the parcel in this petition, as ideal for infill development. Even at a higher density, the petition satisfies the plan's recommendation for infill development.

The approval of this petition will revise the adopted future land use as specified by the *Belmont Area Revitalization Plan* (2003), from single family residential uses up to five DUA to residential uses up to 22 DUA.

To Deny:

This petition is found to be **inconsistent** with the *Belmont Area Revitalization Plan* with respect to proposed land use, based on the information from the staff analysis and the public hearing, and because:

- The plan recommends single family residential uses up to five dwelling units per acre (DUA).

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:

2ND:

Vote:

Dissenting:

Recused: