

Agenda Item: Decision on Application 2018-685 Phillips Road Subdivision

DATE: November 7, 2018
FROM: Jay Camp

Background/Issue:

- On September 25th, Planning Board voted 6-1 to recommend approval of the rezoning request with the condition that the front porches within the development be designed with a 6' minimum depth.
- The project now consists of 17 lots.
- Side yards have been increased to the minimum of 6' and 8'. A flexible design request still remains to reduce the rear yard from 30' to 25' minimum.
- A garage door setback of 5' behind the front porch is proposed.
- A minimum of 13 homes will have a front porch.

Proposal/Solution:

- The density of the development has been reduced from 3.8 units per acre to 2.9.
- A pedestrian refuge connects residents directly to Purser Hulseley Park while multiuse path is provided along both Highway 51 and Phillips Road.
- The applicant has obtained a PCO Concept Plan approval from Mecklenburg County.
- A note should be added indicating future Council approval of additional home elevations.

Financial Impact:

None

Related Town Goal(s) and/or Strategies:

Quality of Life

Economic Development/Land Use Planning

Recommended Motion/Action:

Approve Application 2018-685.

DRAFT---FOR APPROVAL

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

ZONING APPLICATION # 2018-685
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 by allowing an R-VS single family development to be built in an area of existing single-family homes.

REASONABLE: The rezoning creates new housing opportunities in an area that is within convenient walking distance to Purser Hulsey Park. The development, surrounded by undeveloped land, is designed with stub streets for future connectivity.

OR

DRAFT – FOR DENIAL

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: The rezoning is inconsistent with the lower density, single family neighborhoods in the area and is not appropriate for this site. No new homes should be constructed until road and school concerns are resolved.

NOT REASONABLE: The rezoning is not reasonable and would cause additional congestion to area roads while overburdening the school system.

(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: *November 12, 2018*