

Rezoning Decision: Application 2019-706 Comfort Inn

TO: Mayor and Board of Commissioners

FROM: Darin Hallman, Planner

DATE: February 10, 2020

Background/Issue

- The applicant is requesting a zoning map amendment for 1718 Windsor Crossing Drive from Conditional to B-3 (CD).
- No changes are being proposed to the building footprint, parking configuration, traffic circulation, or stormwater runoff.
- Since the Public Hearing, a correction was made to the Site Plan, Conditional Note #7, where the front setback was mistakenly listed as 50 feet instead of 40 feet. No other changes have been made.
- On Jan. 28th, the Planning Board recommended approval of the rezoning in a unanimous vote.

Proposal/Solution

This rezoning is part of the Town's ongoing undertaking of updating older "Conditional" districts to their modern counterparts.

Financial Impact

None

Related Town Goal

Quality of Life and Economic Development/Land Use Planning

Recommended Action

Staff recommends approval of Application 2019-706 with the proposed conditional requirements.

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

ZONING APPLICATION # 2019-706
ZONING MOTION # _____
ADMINISTRATIVE AMENDMENT _____

Matthews Board of Commissioners adopts the checked statement below:

DRAFT---FOR APPROVAL

- 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: The rezoning is consistent with Matthews Land Use Plan; the plan allows for commercial uses along US74.

REASONABLE: The rezoning is reasonable because it allows for the continued use of a business and continues to limit the driveway access along US74.

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 because the proposed changes would not encourage redevelopment of existing retail centers into mixed use concepts.

NOT REASONABLE: The rezoning is not reasonable as it would maintain the status quo of the area commercial center.

(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: *February 10, 2020*