Petition 2020-103 by Fielding Homes/DRB Group

To Approve:

This petition is found to be **inconsistent** with the *South District Plan*. However, the *General Development Policies* support the requested density of less than or equal to 8 DUA based on the information from the staff analysis and the public hearing, and because:

- The plan recommends residential use at 3 units per acre; and
- The proposed density is 7.4 DUA.

(<u>However, we find</u>) 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 *General Development Policies* would support residential use up to 12 DUA for the site. This petition proposes attached single family residential uses with a density limited to 7.4 DUA.
- The maximum building height is limited to 44 ft., with building setbacks increased to accommodate additional height, similar to single family zoning.
- The plan provides buffers adjacent to single family homes, setbacks along public streets and building separations from single family use/zoning larger than Ordinance minimums, and architectural design requirements that mitigate the project's impact on surrounding single family homes.
- The site is located on a major thoroughfare at the intersection with a minor thoroughfare and has access to transit services.
- The proposal limits vehicular access to Providence Road, preventing conflicting turning movements on Alexander Road.

The approval of this petition will revise the adopted future land use as specified by the *South District Plan*, from Single Family <=3 DUA to Residential <=8 DUA for the site.

To Deny:

This petition is found to be **inconsistent** with the *South District Plan*. However, the *General Development Policies* support the requested density of less than or equal to 8 DUA based on the information from the staff analysis and the public hearing, and because:

- The plan recommends residential use at 3 units per acre; and
- The proposed density is 7.4 DUA.

(<u>Therefore, we find</u>) 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: