

Petition 2020-172 by Alex Ransenberg

To Approve:

This petition is found to be **inconsistent** with the *Central District Plan* with respect to proposed land use, but **consistent** with *General Development Policies (GDP)* recommended density, based on the information from the staff analysis and the public hearing, and because:

- The plan recommends single family uses up to five dwelling units per acre (DUA) for the site.
- GDP recommends up to 12 DUA for the site with design standards.

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:

- While over the District Plan's recommended density, the petition meets the General Development Policies locational criteria for consideration of up to 12 dwellings per acre.
- The petition is similar in density and type to previously approved rezoning petitions (2002-008; 7.4 DUA and 2004-078; 8 DUA).
- The request commits to the construction of three single-family detached residences with similar lot frontage width. For those reasons, this request is contextually appropriate with the surrounding community.
- The request for infill residential development at this location is in alignment with the Central District Plan's policy recommendation of promoting "more urban scale infill development".

The approval of this petition will revise the adopted future land use as specified by the Central District Plan from single family uses up to five DUA to residential uses up to 12 DUA.

To Deny:

This petition is found to be **inconsistent** with the *Central District Plan* with respect to proposed land use, but **consistent** with *General Development Policies (GDP)* recommended density, based on the information from the staff analysis and the public hearing, and because:

- The plan recommends single family uses up to five dwelling units per acre (DUA) for the site.
- GDP recommends up to 12 DUA for the site with design standards.

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:

2ND:

Vote:

Dissenting:

Recused: