

Agenda Item:
Decision on Application 2018-683, CrC to CrC², Multiple Crestdale Owners

DATE: June 1, 2018
FROM: Mary Jo Gollnitz, Planner

Background/Issue:

Planning Board recommended approval of the request at their May 22nd meeting. There were no changes to the conditional notes.

Proposal/Solution:

Planning Board unanimously recommended approval of the request.

Related Town Goal(s) and/or Strategies:

Quality of Life
Economic Development/Land Use Planning

Recommended Motion/Action:

Approve rezoning application 2018-683 as submitted.

***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 # 2018-683

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 in that it encourages a mix of land uses in appropriate and well-planned locations. It provides a range of housing styles, protects and preserves the character of the Crestdale neighborhood.

REASONABLE: the rezoning will remove the properties from the special use requirements no longer available in Matthews and bring the properties into a current zoning classification compatible with the surrounding properties.

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 **June 11, 2018**

Draft--in opposition

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

ZONING APPLICATION # 2018-683

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 Matthews Land Use Plan in that it encourages a mix of land uses in appropriate and well-planned locations. It provides a range of housing styles, protects and preserves the character of the Crestdale neighborhood.

NOT REASONABLE: The properties already have a zoning district assigned to them.

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 **June 11, 2018**