

## **Agenda Item: Decision on Application 2017-676**

**DATE:** April 4, 2018  
**FROM:** Jay Camp

### **Background/Issue:**

On March 27<sup>th</sup>, Planning Board voted 5-2 to recommend approval of the rezoning request. The recommendation was based on several changes that have occurred since the Public Hearing.

1. The carport structures have been relocated to the rear of the parcel occupied by the dealership.
2. The applicant has committed to hours of operation from 7am -7pm with no outdoor music allowed.
3. As a result of concerns over water quality, ecofriendly products will be used to detail cars.

### **Proposal/Solution:**

Since carports are a temporary structure in nature, staff recommends a sunset provision that would allow them to remain onsite for up to 3 years. A condition of the plans, should the owner agree, could be that a permanent accessory building could be constructed eventually to replace the carports. Staff recommends a three-year sunset on the carports. This solution allows the current subcontractor to continue operations and allows the dealership time to plan for a permanent building for detailing activity.

### **Financial Impact:**

None

### **Related Town Goal(s) and/or Strategies:**

Quality of Life

Economic Development/Land Use Planning

### **Recommended Motion/Action:**

Discuss potential sunset provision with the applicant.

**DRAFT---FOR APPROVAL**

**STATEMENT OF CONSISTENCY WITH LOCAL ADOPTED GROWTH  
POLICIES**

**Final Decisions on Zoning-Related Issues**

**ZONING APPLICATION #** 2017-676

**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:** with Matthews Land Use Plan. It provides a location for auto detailing at a large auto dealership, which is an allowed and expected B-H use along US74.

---

**REASONABLE:** The rezoning change of conditions is reasonable as it creates a dedicated area for an accessory use at the car dealership.

---

**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:**

---

**NOT REASONABLE:**

---

---

**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 **April 9, 2018**

DRAFT---In opposition

**STATEMENT OF CONSISTENCY WITH LOCAL ADOPTED GROWTH  
POLICIES**

**Final Decisions on Zoning-Related Issues**

ZONING APPLICATION # 2017-676

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)  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 the Matthews Land Use Plan.

**NOT REASONABLE:** The rezoning request would allow temporary structures that are not in keeping with the existing architecture of the site and surround businesses.

---

**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 **April 9, 2018**