

Agenda Item: Decision on Rezoning Application 2019-699, 1364 Matthews-Mint Hill Road

DATE: October 8, 2019

FROM: Jay Camp

Background/Issue:

- On September 24, Planning Board unanimously recommended approval of the rezoning request.
- Since the Public Hearing, the applicant has added additional conditional notes that state the following:

“Any proposed lodging use shall include elements supportive of the Matthews Sportsplex. Such elements might include items such as a pool, meeting room, meeting space, onsite food and beverage options, or other guest services. Permitted uses in the ENT district shall be subject to such limitations and additional requirements (specifically to include limitations and additional requirements regarding lodging uses) as the Matthews Town Council may hereafter adopt.”

Proposal/Solution:

- Staff recommends approval of the rezoning as it is consistent with the ENT Small Area Plan.

Financial Impact:

None

Related Town Goal(s) and/or Strategies:

Quality of Life

Economic Development/Land Use Planning

Recommended Motion/Action:

Approve Rezoning Application 2019-699

DRAFT---FOR APPROVAL

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

ZONING APPLICATION # 2019-699
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 as it allows uses that are envisioned in the ENT Small Area plan and will facilitate the development of the long-planned ENT district.

REASONABLE: The rezoning is reasonable because it establishes ENT zoning on a parcel within the boundaries of the ENT Small Area Plan and provides the property owner with a broad list of uses that may one day be developed at the site.

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 Land Use Plan and could generate too much additional traffic to and from the property.

NOT REASONABLE: The rezoning is not reasonable as it provides little detail regarding what future use or uses may be established on the property

(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: *October 14, 2019*