

Agenda Item: Decision on Application 2019-696, UDO Text Amendments to Table of Allowed Uses

DATE: May 6, 2019
FROM: Mary Jo Gollnitz

Background/Issue:

- On April 23rd, Planning Board voted 6 to 1 to recommend approval of the text change as presented at the Public Hearing.
- Concern was raised about the unintended consequences of allowing indoor recreational facilities in industrial zones.

Proposal/Solution:

- Staff is supportive of the requested text amendment.

Financial Impact:

None

Related Town Goal(s) and/or Strategies:

Quality of Life

Economic Development/Land Use Planning

Recommended Motion/Action:

Approve Application 2019-696.

DRAFT---FOR APPROVAL

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

ZONING APPLICATION # 2019-696

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 helps Matthews remain a healthy and attractive community. It would allow for existing buildings to be used for athletic activities where outdoor activities are already allowed.

REASONABLE: The text amendment will allow indoor athletic or sports fields in districts that already allow these uses outdoors.

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 text amendment may encourage athletic activities to move completely indoors.

NOT REASONABLE: The text amendment is not reasonable as it would create an expansion of existing athletic activities.

(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: *May 13, 2019*