Agenda Item: Decision on Application 2017-673 Eden Hall Change of Conditions

DATE: February 5, 2018
FROM: Jay Camp

Background/Issue:
On January 23rd, Planning Board voted unanimously to recommend approval of this zoning application. The applicant agreed to several new conditions as a result of discussion at the meeting.

1. Future Council approval of elevation drawings for homes facing Marion Drive

2. Provision of notes or drawings to show what the Marion Drive streetscape will look like with the proposed homes. A new Marion Drive streetscape plan is attached.

3. The applicant will install landscaping or fencing between homes to prevent children from falling down the hillsides between the homes. The grade change between Marion Drive and Downton Court was the reasoning behind this new note.

4. The applicant agreed to correct tree canopy and storm water calculations on the submitted plans prior to Council decision on the rezoning. Staff has reviewed the calculations and what is provided on the new rezoning documents matches what is on the recorded subdivision plat. After the initial rezoning in 2014, net land disturbance increased by about 148,000 square feet while tree canopy preservation decreased by about 30,000 square feet. Some of these changes can be attributed to the Administrative Amendment granted by Council that allowed removal of the proposed tree save along Fullwood Lane. The 10% tree preservation at the site is still in excess of the minimum 8% required by code.

Proposal/Solution:
The applicant has included a color streetscape plan that will be part of the approval package. Note changes on the revised site plan match the items the applicant agreed to at the Planning Board Meeting. Staff have no further comments or concerns at this time.

Financial Impact:
None

Related Town Goal(s) and/or Strategies:
Quality of Life
Economic Development/Land Use Planning

Recommended Motion/Action:
Approval Application 2017-673
Large Maturing Trees, Typ.
Groundcovers, Typ.
Evergreen shrub, Typ.
Foundation Planting, Typ.
Sidewalk, Typ.
4' Tall Black Aluminum Fence, Typ.
**Please note: We have been asked to provide possible language for motions both in favor of, and in opposition to, this Zoning Application. These 2 optional pages are enclosed here, with suggested language regarding this case’s Consistency with adopted land use plans and policies, and whether it is Reasonable. Feel free to add or revise these statements to make them fit your Board's conclusions.**
DRAFT---FOR APPROVAL
STATEMENT OF CONSISTENCY WITH LOCAL ADOPTED GROWTH
POLICIES
Final Decisions on Zoning-Related Issues

ZONING APPLICATION # 2017-673
ZONING MOTION # ________________
ADMINISTRATIVE AMENDMENT ________________________

Matthews Board of Commissioners adopts the checked statement below:

A) ___x__ The requested zoning action, as most currently amended, is **approved**, and has been found to be **CONSISTENT** with the Matthews Land Use Plan (or other document(s)), and to be **REASONABLE**, as follows:

**CONSISTENT**: with Matthews Land Use Plan in that it provides for multiple housing styles within a well-designed R-VS development. It meets the Land Use Plan goal of allowing R-VS infill development in the Highway 51 area.

**REASONABLE**: The rezoning will allow single family homes where only townhomes were previously approved. The applicant has agreed to elevation approval of future single family homes along Marion Drive.

OR

B) _____ The requested zoning action, as most currently amended, is **not approved**, and has been found to be **INCONSISTENT** with the Matthews Land Use Plan (or other document(s)), and **NOT REASONABLE**, as follows:

**INCONSISTENT**: 

**NOT REASONABLE**: 

OR

C) _____ The requested zoning action, as most currently amended, is **not approved**, although it has been found to be **CONSISTENT** with the Matthews Land Use Plan (or other document(s)), it is **NOT REASONABLE**, as follows:

**CONSISTENT**: 
D) The requested zoning action, as most currently amended, is approved. This action also concurrently amends the Matthews Land Use Plan as specifically outlined below. (Provide explanation of the change in conditions making the Matthews Land Use Plan inconsistent to meet the development needs of the community, and include reference to specific text in Plan document):

AMENDMENT TO LAND USE PLAN:

(Reasonable)

(REASONABLE:

(In each case, the Statement must explain why the Board deems the action reasonable and in the public interest (more than one sentence). Reasons given for a zoning request being “consistent” or “not consistent” are not subject to judicial review.)

Date February 12, 2018
DRAFT---In opposition

STATEMENT OF CONSISTENCY WITH LOCAL ADOPTED GROWTH
POLICIES
Final Decisions on Zoning-Related Issues

ZONING APPLICATION # _____2017-673_________________________
ZONING MOTION # _________________________________________
ADMINISTRATIVE AMENDMENT _______________________________

Matthews Board of Commissioners adopts the checked statement below:

A) _____ The requested zoning action, as most currently amended, is approved, and has been
found to be CONSISTENT with the Matthews Land Use Plan (or other document(s)), and to be
REASONABLE, as follows:

CONSISTENT:

________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________

REASONABLE:

________________________________________________________

OR

B) _____ The requested zoning action, as most currently amended, is not approved, and has been
found to be INCONSISTENT with the Matthews Land Use Plan (or other document(s)), and NOT
REASONABLE, as follows:

INCONSISTENT:

________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________

NOT REASONABLE:

________________________________________________________

OR

C) ____X____ The requested zoning action, as most currently amended, is not approved, although it has
been found to be CONSISTENT with the Matthews Land Use Plan (or other document(s)), it is NOT
REASONABLE, as follows:

CONSISTENT: with Matthews Land Use Plan in that it provides for multiple housing styles within a well-
designed R-VS development. It meets the Land Use Plan goal of allowing R-VS infill development in the
Highway 51 area.

NOT REASONABLE: The rezoning is not reasonable as it does not fit with the vision created in 2014 for a
community with only townhomes.

OR

D) _____ The requested zoning action, as most currently amended, is **approved**. This action also **concurrently amends** the Matthews Land Use Plan as specifically outlined below. (Provide explanation of the change in conditions making the Matthews Land Use Plan inconsistent to meet the development needs of the community, and include reference to specific text in Plan document):

**AMENDMENT TO LAND USE PLAN:**

**REASONABLE:**

(In each case, the Statement must explain why the Board deems the action **reasonable and in the public interest** (more than one sentence). Reasons given for a zoning request being “consistent” or “not consistent” are not subject to judicial review.)

**Date**  February 12, 2018