

Agenda Item: Decision on Application 2018-689 Rice Road Subdivision

DATE: November 7, 2018
FROM: Jay Camp

Background/Issue:

- On October 23rd, Planning Board voted unanimously to recommend approval of the rezoning request.
- The site plan has been modified in the vicinity of the half cul de sac/eyebrow feature, resulting in the loss of one lot. The development now consists of 31 building lots.
- The attached home elevations have been modified with additional color schemes and painted brick.
- The applicant will create a three way stop along Ritz Lane to provide traffic calming.

Proposal/Solution:

- A PCO Concept Plan has not yet been submitted to Mecklenburg County for approval. Staff has repeatedly reminded the applicant for several months that these plans should have been submitted much earlier in the process. The engineering firm for the applicant has disregarded these reminders. Staff informs all applicants of this requirement during the pre-submittal process as well as during the staff comment period.
- The Board may choose to:
 - Deny the rezoning request, as the applicant has not attempted to comply with the requirement to obtain a PCO Concept Plan.
 - Defer the decision until January 14, 2018 (To allow adequate time for County review of PCO)

Financial Impact:

None

Related Town Goal(s) and/or Strategies:

Quality of Life

Economic Development/Land Use Planning

Recommended Motion/Action:

Although the development has a favorable recommendation from Planning Board and conforms with the Land Use Plan, Planning staff cannot recommend approval as the applicant has not satisfied all requirements of the rezoning process as stated in the rezoning instructions.

ARCHITECTURAL ELEVATION EXAMPLES:



DRAFT---FOR APPROVAL

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

ZONING APPLICATION # 2018-689

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 Rice Road Park and creates new street connections within the Matthews street network.

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.

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*