AGENDA
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Thursday, September 19, 2019 @ 3:00 PM
City Hall Council Chambers
101 First Street SE, Cedar Rapids, IA 52401

Call Meeting to Order
Roll Call

A. Approval of the Minutes
B. Adoption of the Agenda
C. Action Items

1. Case Name: 804 5th Street SE (Conditional Use)
   COND-029523-2019; Case Manager: Dave Houg
   Consideration of a Conditional Use for an outdoor service area in a U-NG, Urban Neighborhood General District as requested by ETO Construction (Applicant) and KN Properties 7, LLC (Titleholder).

2. Case Name: 4201 42nd Street NE (Major Design Exception)
   ADMD-029515-2019; Case Manager: Dave Houg
   Consideration of a Major Design Exception for reduced setback in an S-MC, Suburban Mixed Use District as requested by 42nd and Edgewood LLC (Applicant).

3. Case Name: 4827 Dostal Court SW (Preliminary Plat)
   PRPT-029527-2019; Case Manager: Vern Zakostelecky
   Consideration of a Preliminary Site Development Plan for Hawks Point 10th Addition in an S-RMF, Suburban Residential Medium Flex District as requested by Community Savings Bank (Applicant).
4. **Case Name:** 2311 33rd Avenue SW  
(Rezoning)  
*RZNE-029510-2019; Case Manager: Vern Zakostelecky*  
Consideration of a Rezoning from A-AG, Agriculture to S-RLL, Suburban Residential Large Lot District as requested by Cynthia and David Guckenberger (Applicant).

5. **Case Name:** 1900 Stoney Point Road SW  
(Rezoning)  
*RZNE-029481-2019; Case Manager: Dave Houg*  
Consideration of a Rezoning from S-RMF, Suburban Residential Medium Flex District to S-MC, Suburban Mixed Use Community Center District as requested by Stoney Point Meadows, LLC (Applicant).

6. **Nominations and Election of City Planning Commission Co-Chair.**
OWNER/APPELLANT INFORMATION

OWNER Name: KN Properties 8, LLC

MAILING/PROPERTY ADDRESS: 804 5th Street SE

CONDITIONAL USE REQUEST

Outdoor service area within 300’ of a Residential District

OUTSTANDING ISSUES AND STANDARDS FOR APPROVAL

Location is less than 300’ from a Residential Zone District.
Service Area may operate outside the hours of food service.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval.
FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. KN Properties 8, LLC is the owner of record of the subject property.

2. The Future Land Use Map designation is Downtown.

3. The property is zoned Urban Neighborhood General District.

4. The property is 8,400 sf in size, and is described as CARPENTER’S 2ND STR/LB 1 7

5. The property owner filed the conditional use request with the Development Services Department on August 30, 2019.

CRITERIA:

32.05.09.G, of the Cedar Rapids Municipal Code requires that ALL of the following criteria for the granting of a conditional use be met:

1. The conditional use is permitted in the district where the property is located.

   Staff Conclusion: The conditional use as requested is permitted within the U-NG District.

2. The application complies with all use-specific standards applicable to the use, as listed in Sec 32.03, Use-Specific Standards.

   Staff Conclusion: The site development plan conforms to all applicable requirements of Chapter 32, The City’s Zoning Ordinance.

3. The application complies with all other applicable standards of this Code.

   Staff Conclusion: The site development plan conforms to all applicable standards.

4. The proposed use and development will be consistent with the intent and purpose of the Future Land Use Map and other elements of the Comprehensive Plan.

   Staff Conclusion: This area is designated as “Downtown” on the City’s Future Land Use Map. The requested use is in accord with this LUTA.

5. There is sufficient compatibility with the adjacent properties and the overall neighborhood. When considering aspects unique to the proposed use as compared to other permitted uses within the same zone district, the reviewing body should consider:
a) Whether the proposed development of use will be located, designed, constructed, and operated in such a manner that it will be compatible with the immediate neighborhood and will not interfere with the orderly use, development and improvement of surrounding property.

b) Whether the proposed use or development will have adverse effects on existing traffic conditions, parking, utility and service facilities, and other factors affecting the public health, safety, and welfare.

c) Whether the impacts of the proposed use or development extend beyond that of development that would be permitted by-right in the same zone district.

d) Whether any additional impacts that may be created as a result of the proposed use or development are acceptable and not a detriment.

e) Whether any additional impacts that may be created as a result of the proposed use or development have been considered by the applicant and adequate steps have been taken to eliminate or mitigate these impacts.

Staff Conclusion:
The location is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. The immediate area is developed with commercial uses. The nearest residentially-zoned property is separated by 2 intervening lots and a public street. The effects of the proposed conditional use are expected to be compatible with the existing conditions in the surrounding area.

6. Adequate conditions can be placed on the approval to eliminate or mitigate any adverse impacts of the proposed use or development.

Staff Conclusion: Staff recommends approval subject to 3 conditions.

STAFF CONCLUDES: The requested conditional use is recommended for approval.

ALTERNATIVES:
The Board of Adjustment may consider the following alternatives:

1. Grant the requested conditional use subject to conditions or modifications.
2. Table the requested motion to give the applicant time to modify the application.
3. Deny the requested conditional use.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

STAFF RECOMMENDS APPROVAL SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. THE OUTDOOR SERVICE AREA SHALL BE CLEARLY DELINEATED BY A FENCE, WALL OR SIMILAR FEATURE THAT MEETS THE DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR THE ZONE DISTRICT. CHAIN LINK FENCE OR TEMPORARY FENCING SHALL NOT BE PERMITTED.
2. THE SERVICE AREA IS SUBJECT TO THE LICENSING REQUIREMENT OF CHAPTER 51 OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE.
3. MUNICIPAL CODE CHAPTER 60A SURVEILLANCE CAMERAS FOR BUSINESSES REQUIRES INSTALLATION OF A VIDEO SURVEILLANCE SYSTEMS.

IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE APPLICANT TO COMPLETE ALL CONDITIONS, AS OUTLINED IN THIS STAFF REPORT, PRIOR TO FINAL APPROVAL OF THE CASE. IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS REGARDING A CONDITION, CONTACT THE DEPARTMENT UNDER WHICH THAT CONDITION IS LISTED. THE CONTACTS’ NAMES AND PHONE NUMBERS ARE LISTED BELOW. ITEMS IN THE COMMENTS SECTION ARE NOT A REQUIREMENT TO BE MET PRIOR TO APPROVAL. THEY ARE INTENDED TO INCREASE YOUR KNOWLEDGE AND AWARENESS OF ISSUES THAT MAY POSSIBLY EXIST ON THE PROPERTY.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

MAJOR DESIGN EXCEPTION

CASE MANAGER: David Houg

OWNER/APPELLANT INFORMATION

OWNER / APPLICANT: 42nd and Edgewood, LLC
MAILING/PROPERTY ADDRESS: 4201 42nd Street NE

MAJOR DESIGN EXCEPTION REQUEST

Request to provide a 7.5’ street front landscaping yard in lieu of the required 15’ depth.

OUTSTANDING ISSUES AND STANDARDS FOR APPROVAL

Site is too narrow to provide for required parking, drives and street-front landscaping setback along Edgewood Road NE.

Vacation and purchase of excess right-of-way is proposed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the Major Design Exception for a reduced street front landscaping yard depth.
MAJOR DESIGN EXCEPTION – CASE # ADMD-029515-2019
Board of Adjustment Meeting: October 14, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:
1. 42nd and Edgewood, LLC is the owner of record of the subject property.
2. The Future Land Use Map designation is Urban Medium Intensity.
3. The property is zoned S-MC, Suburban Mixed-Use Community Center District.
4. The subject property is approximately 5.7 acres in size, and is described as Lot 12, Life Investors Office Park 4th Addition and Parcel A, P.O.S. #1989
5. The property owner’s representative filed the Major Design Exception request with the Development Services Division on August 29, 2019.

LEGAL PRINCIPLES:
32.05.12.E, of the Cedar Rapids Municipal Code requires that ALL of the following criteria for the granting of a major design exception be met:

1. The requested exception is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and any plans, studies or reports which are adopted by City Council and may provide guidance on the exception.
   
   Staff Comments: The proposed development with a 7.5’ street front landscaping yard will be compatible with surrounding commercial properties.

2. The requested exception does not have the effect of permitting a pattern of development inconsistent with the intent of the base district and design areas that would be more consistent with another base district or design area. For example, permitting suburban development characteristics in an urban or traditional district.
   
   Staff Comments: The requested exception will not have the effect of permitting a pattern of development inconsistent with the intent of the base district.

3. The requested exception does not have the effect of perpetuating a pattern or style of development which is intended to be replaced by development consistent with this Code.
   
   Staff Comments: The requested exception will not perpetuate a development pattern that is inconsistent with the Code. Reduced setbacks are specifically considered for Major Design Exceptions in the Zoning Ordinance.

4. The requested exception can be demonstrated to meet one of the following:
a. The requested exception is reasonably necessary for this property as it can be found that unique site circumstances make it likely that this exception would be required for a broad range of uses, structures, or layouts that may be otherwise permitted on the property.

b. The requested exception alleviates a practical difficulty to accommodating a particular use, structure, or layout that is permitted on the property and where the intent of this Code is not to limit or prevent the establishment of the use, structure, or layout at a location with the characteristics of the subject property.

c. The requested exception allows for architectural design which is unique and of high quality that meets or exceeds the intent of the code.

Staff Comments: The requested exception alleviates “b", a practical difficulty with layout and use. The design for a 2-story, 17,407 sf medical office building proposed for this site requires lot width that cannot accommodate the required 15’ landscape yard.

5. The requested exception represents the minimum deviation from the applicable regulations necessary to accommodate the requested development and that any practical difficulties related to the subject property cannot be overcome by any feasible alternative means other than an exception.

Staff Comments: Reducing the required street front landscaping yard depth by up to 50% is an allowable Major Design Exception per the Zoning Ordinance section 32.05.12.B.2.a.(ii).

STAFF CONCLUDES: The requested exceptions are consistent with other setback reductions and uses enjoyed by other properties in the neighborhood.

ALTERNATIVES:
The Board of Adjustment may consider the following alternatives:

1. Grant the requested major design exceptions subject to conditions.
2. Grant relief less than or different from the requested major design exceptions.
3. Deny the requested major design exceptions.
4. The requested exceptions will not set a precedent that would be uncharacteristic to the surrounding area.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends approval for the following reasons:

1. Granting the request will allow the development of a proposed medical facility with required client parking and associated drives.

IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE APPLICANT TO COMPLETE ALL CONDITIONS, AS OUTLINED IN THIS STAFF REPORT, PRIOR TO FINAL APPROVAL OF THE CASE. IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS REGARDING A CONDITION, CONTACT THE DEPARTMENT UNDER WHICH THAT CONDITION IS LISTED. THE CONTACTS’ NAMES AND PHONE NUMBERS ARE LISTED BELOW. ITEMS IN THE COMMENTS SECTION ARE NOT A REQUIREMENT TO BE MET PRIOR TO APPROVAL. THEY ARE INTENDED TO INCREASE YOUR KNOWLEDGE AND AWARENESS OF ISSUES THAT MAY POSSIBLY EXIST ON THE PROPERTY.

Staff recommends the following condition:

1. Vacated right-of-way shall be combined with the existing parcel so as to constitute a single zoning lot.
STAFF REPORT TO CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Major Preliminary Plat

CPC Date: September 19, 2019

To: City Planning Commission
From: Development Services Department

 Applicant: Community Savings Bank
 Titleholder: Community Savings Bank

Plat Name: Hawks Point 10th Addition
Location: 4827, 4833, 4839, 4845 and 4907 Dostal Court SW

Request: Consideration of a Major Preliminary Plat in an S-RMF, Suburban Residential Medium Flex District

Case Manager: Vern Zakostelecky
Case Number: PRPT-09527-2019

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
The applicant is requesting approval of a Major Preliminary Plat for land located at 4827, 4833, 4839, 4845 and 4907 Dostal Court SW. The property is currently undeveloped and zoned S-RMF, Suburban Residential Medium Flex District. The applicant wishes to subdivide the property for development of five single family detached homes.

The preliminary plat as submitted includes the following:
➢ The total site area – 1.15 acres
➢ Total lots –6 including one lettered lot and 5 building lots.
➢ Storm water management will be provide with regional detention facility.
➢ Access to existing Dostal Ct. SW

FINDINGS:
The City Planning Commission shall review the application based on the following criteria:

1. That the proposed use and development will be consistent with the intent and purposes of the Comprehensive Plan and other applicable codes and regulations.

   Staff Comments: The proposed uses and development are consistent with the intent and purposes of the Comprehensive Plan. The property is shown as “Urban Medium-Intensity” on Future Land Use Map in EnvisionCR, the City’s Comprehensive Plan. The proposed subdivision and zoning would be in accord with the Future Land Use Map.
designation and the goals and objectives of the City’s Comprehensive Plan. Future development will comply with all other applicable codes, regulations and approvals.

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS:

If the City Planning Commission approves the proposed major preliminary plat, adoption of the following conditions as recommended by Development Services should be considered. The City Planning Commission may approve with additional conditions.

1. PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF A FINAL CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY, for the lot(s) through which overland conveyance of the 100-year storm event will occur, the property owner shall provide certification by a civil engineer licensed in the State of Iowa verifying the runoff from the 100-year storm event can be conveyed through the site without damage to building structures, OR, The property owner shall provide a certification by a Civil Engineer or Land Surveyor licensed in the State of Iowa the drainage way has been constructed in accordance with drainage plans approved by the City.

2. The Developer shall maintain the public storm water detention basin(s) following acceptance of all maintenance bonds for a minimum of one year or until erosion and sediment control is established and accepted by the City. Following City acceptance and maintenance of said detention basin(s), the Developer will use all reasonable measures to protect detention basin(s) from sediment runoff and damage. All construction activities are subject to the Municipal Code Chapter 71 “Erosion and Sediment Control for Construction Sites” until such time that all disturbed areas are completely stabilized and developed. The Developer agrees to remove sediment from, reseed, and otherwise repair said detention basin should development related damage occur after the basin has been accepted by the City.
PRELIMINARY PLAT
FOR
HAWKS POINT TENTH ADDITION
(RE-PLAT OF LOTS 13-17 OF HAWKS POINT 9TH ADDITION)
IN THE CITY OF CEDAR RAPIDS, LINN COUNTY, IOWA

NOTE

LEGAL DESCRIPTION

SHEET INDEX

DIMENSION STANDARDS: S-RMF

LANDSCAPING

STREET CLASSIFICATIONS

HALL AND HALL PROJECT NUMBER: 9401-C58

HALL AND HALL ENGINEERS, INC.
1860 BOYSON ROAD, HIAWATHA, IOWA 52233
PHONE: (319) 362-9548  FAX: (319) 362-7595

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE
LAND DEVELOPMENT PLANNING
## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

REZONING – A-AG, Agriculture District to S-RLL, Suburban Residential Large Lot District

CASE MANAGER: Vern Zakostelecky, Development Services Department

### OWNER/APPELLANT INFORMATION

OWNER/APPLICANT: Cynthia and David Guckenberger

MAILING/PROPERTY ADDRESS: 2311 33rd Ave. SW, Cedar Rapids, IA. 52404

### REZONING REQUEST

A-AG, Agriculture District to S-RLL, Suburban Residential Large Lot District

### OUTSTANDING ISSUES AND STANDARDS FOR APPROVAL

1. Compliance with applicable provisions of the Zoning Ordinance.
2. Compliance with the Subdivision Ordinance.
3. Compliance with SUDAS Standards.
4. Compliance with applicable Building and Fire Codes.

### STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the rezoning request.
REZONING – A-AG, Agriculture District to S-RLL, Suburban Residential Large Lot District
CASE # RZNE-029510-2019
City Planning Commission Meeting: September 19, 2019

FINDINGS OF FACT:
1. Cynthia and David Guckenberger are the owners of record of the subject property.
2. The Future Land Use Map designation is Urban Low-Intensity.
3. The property is zoned A-AG, Agriculture District.
4. The property is 4.57 acres in size, and is described as the NW SW NE E 5AC-EX RD 6 82 7 in Section 6, Township 82 North, Range 7, West of the 5th P.M., Linn County, Iowa.
5. The property owner filed the rezoning request with the Development Services Department on August 28, 2019.

CRITERIA:
32.05.04.E.3, of the Cedar Rapids Municipal Code requires City Planning Commission to consider the following criteria in making a recommendation:

1. Correction of a technical mistake.
   a. A rezoning may be approved if the action is necessary to correct a technical mistake or omission in the zoning map.

   Staff Conclusion: This amendment is not to correct a technical mistake on the existing Zoning Map.

2. Consistency with Comprehensive Plan and other studies.
   a. Whether the rezoning is consistent with the Future Land Use Map, other elements of the Comprehensive Plan, and any other adopted plans or studies.
      i. All rezonings shall be to a district permitted by the Future Land Use Map as shown in 32.02.01.B.
      ii. The proposed zone district should be consistent with the general intent of the Comprehensive Plan, as well as any area plans or studies adopted by the City Council.

   Staff Conclusion: The subject property is shown as Urban-Low Intensity on the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) in EnvisionCR, the City’s Comprehensive Plan. The requested zone change to S-RLL, Suburban Residential Large Lot District is in accord with the Future Land Use Map designation and the general intent of the Comprehensive Plan.

3. Public facilities, Services and Suitability.
   a. The property should be suitable for the development of structures and uses permitted in the proposed district.
   b. Adequate public facilities and services (including sewage and waste disposal, water, gas, electricity, police and fire protection, and roads and transportation, as applicable) will be available to serve the subject property while maintaining adequate levels of service to existing development.
   c. Development should ensure effective and adequate utilization of existing or planned public facilities and services.

   Staff Conclusion: The property is suitable for residential development and will be served by all City services. Adequate levels of services to the existing development in the area will not be impacted.

4. Character.
a. The proposed district should be compatible with the existing or planned character of the surrounding area. Compatibility can be achieved by a rezoning to:
   I. Districts of the same character type (Urban, Traditional, Suburban, etc). Changes between character areas should be carefully reviewed for compatibility.
   II. Districts of a similar use type (Residential, Mixed-Use, etc), particularly when transitioning between character areas.
   III. Other transitions may be appropriate depending on other review criteria and conditions which may be placed on approvals.

b. The proposed rezoning should be consistent with the existing or planned character of the surrounding area.

c. A variety of housing types and a mix of land uses should be provided in all neighborhoods. A change in intensity or type of use is most appropriate between rear yards, at corners, or along higher classified streets.

d. Whether the rezoning is consistent with the characteristics of the surrounding area, including any changing conditions.

e. Whether the proposed rezoning will protect existing neighborhoods from nearby development at heights and densities that are out of scale with the existing neighborhood.

Staff Conclusion: The proposed district and allowed uses should be compatible with the existing or planned character of the surrounding area. The surrounding area will be developed in the future with the same suburban residential character. Staff will be working with the property owner of the vacant lot to assure a new home built on the lot will be positioned so as to not hinder the ability to further subdivide and develop the property.

STAFF CONCLUDES:
Staff believes the requested zone change and uses allowed within the S-RLL Zoning District will be compatible with the existing and contemplated development for this area.

ALTERNATIVES:
The City Planning Commission may consider the following alternatives:
1. Grant the requested rezoning.
2. Grant the requested rezoning subject to conditions.
3. Table the requested rezoning and ask for more information.
4. Deny the requested rezoning.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends approval for the following reasons:
The requested zone change and uses allowed within the S-RLL Zoning District will be compatible with the existing and contemplated development for this area.

IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE APPLICANT TO COMPLETE ALL CONDITIONS, AS OUTLINED IN THIS STAFF REPORT, PRIOR TO FINAL APPROVAL OF THE CASE. IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS REGARDING A CONDITION, CONTACT THE DEPARTMENT UNDER WHICH THAT CONDITION IS LISTED. THE CONTACTS’ NAMES AND PHONE NUMBERS ARE LISTED BELOW. ITEMS IN THE COMMENTS SECTION ARE NOT A REQUIREMENT TO BE MET PRIOR TO APPROVAL. THEY ARE INTENDED TO INCREASE YOUR KNOWLEDGE AND AWARENESS OF ISSUES THAT MAY POSSIBLY EXIST ON THE PROPERTY.

Condition(s):
1. Prior to issuance of a building permit for proposed Lot 2 a concept plan showing future development on the site to meet the minimum development standards of 2 dwelling unit per acre shall be submitted to the Development Services Department.
Site Plan
Guckenberger First Addition, Cedar Rapids, Linn County, Iowa
233 33rd Avenue SW Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52404
NE 06-82-7

Proposed Lot 1
Lot Area: 0.78 Acres
Existing House: 10431 SF
Existing Shed: Owner Occupied

Proposed Lot 2
Area: 3.81 Acres
Vacant

Legend
- Boundary Line
- Utility Easement
- Section Line
- Proposed Lot Line
- Existing Lot Line
- Found Section Center
- Found Monument
- Set 2"x30" Ring
- W/Orange Cap #17774
- Measured (W)
- Recorded (R)
- Point of Beginning (P.O.B.)
- Point of Conspicuity (P.C.C.)

Traffic Impact
Existing Traffic:
One Single Family Home (One Lot): 10 Trips per Day

Future Traffic:
Two Single Family Homes (Two Lots):
Additional Traffic: 10 Trips Per Day
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**REZONING – S-RMF to S-MC**

**CASE MANAGER:** David Houg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OWNER/APPELLANT INFORMATION</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OWNER / APPLICANT:</strong> Stoney Point Meadows, LLC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAILING/PROPERTY ADDRESS:</strong> 1900 Stoney Point Road SW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REZONING REQUEST</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-RMF, Suburban Residential Medium Flex District to S-MC, Suburban Mixed Use Community Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTSTANDING ISSUES AND STANDARDS FOR APPROVAL</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Compatibility with the surrounding area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Elimination of a required bufferyard between disparate zoning districts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAFF RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff recommends approval of the rezoning request.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. Stoney Point Meadows, LLC is the owner of record of the subject property.
2. The Future Land Use Map designation is Urban Medium Intensity.
3. The property is zoned S-RMF, Suburban Residential Medium Flex District.
4. The property is approximately 6 acres in size, and is described as MEADOWRIDGE LOT 1.
5. The property owner filed the rezoning request with the Development Services Department on August 23, 2019.

CRITERIA:

32.05.04.E.3, of the Cedar Rapids Municipal Code requires City Planning Commission to consider the following criteria in making a recommendation:

1. Correction of a technical mistake.
   a. A rezoning may be approved if the action is necessary to correct a technical mistake or omission in the zoning map.

   **Staff Conclusion:** This amendment is not to correct a technical mistake on the existing Zoning Map.

2. Consistency with Comprehensive Plan and other studies.
   a. Whether the rezoning is consistent with the Future Land Use Map, other elements of the Comprehensive Plan, and any other adopted plans or studies.
      i. All rezonings shall be to a district permitted by the Future Land Use Map as shown in 32.02.01.B.
      ii. The proposed zone district should be consistent with the general intent of the Comprehensive Plan, as well as any area plans or studies adopted by the City Council.

   **Staff Conclusion:** The subject property is shown as Urban Medium Intensity on the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) in EnvisionCR, the City’s Comprehensive Plan. The requested zone change to S-MC, Suburban Mixed Use Community Center District, would be in accord with the Future Land Use Map designation and the general intent of the Comprehensive Plan.

3. Public facilities, Services and Suitability.
   a. The property should be suitable for the development of structures and uses permitted in the proposed district.
   b. Adequate public facilities and services (including sewage and waste disposal, water, gas, electricity, police and fire protection, and roads and transportation, as applicable) will be available to serve the subject property while maintaining adequate levels of service to existing development.
   c. Development should ensure effective and adequate utilization of existing or planned public facilities and services.

   **Staff Conclusion:** The property is served by all City services. Adequate levels of services to the existing development in the area will not be impacted.
4. **Character.**
   a. The proposed district should be compatible with the existing or planned character of the surrounding area. Compatibility can be achieved by a rezoning to:
      I. Districts of the same character type (Urban, Traditional, Suburban, etc). Changes between character areas should be carefully reviewed for compatibility.
      II. Districts of a similar use type (Residential, Mixed-Use, etc), particularly when transitioning between character areas.
      III. Other transitions may be appropriate depending on other review criteria and conditions which may be placed on approvals.
   b. The proposed rezoning should be consistent with the existing or planned character of the surrounding area.
   c. A variety of housing types and a mix of land uses should be provided in all neighborhoods. A change in intensity or type of use is most appropriate between rear yards, at corners, or along higher classified streets.
   d. Whether the rezoning is consistent with the characteristics of the surrounding area, including any changing conditions.
   e. Whether the proposed rezoning will protect existing neighborhoods from nearby development at heights and densities that are out of scale with the existing neighborhood.

*Staff Conclusion: The proposed district and allowed uses will be compatible with the existing character of the surrounding area.*

**STAFF CONCLUDES:**
Staff believes the requested zone change and uses allowed within the S-MC, Suburban Mixed Use Community Center District, will be compatible with the existing and contemplated development for this area.

**ALTERNATIVES:**
The City Planning Commission may consider the following alternatives:

1. Grant the requested rezoning.
2. Grant the requested rezoning subject to conditions.
3. Table the requested rezoning and ask for more information.
4. Deny the requested rezoning.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**
Staff recommends approval for the following reasons:
The requested zone change and uses allowed within the S-MC, Suburban Mixed Use Community Center District, will be compatible with the existing and contemplated development for this area.

**IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE APPLICANT TO COMPLETE ALL CONDITIONS, AS OUTLINED IN THIS STAFF REPORT, PRIOR TO FINAL APPROVAL OF THE CASE. IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS REGARDING A CONDITION, CONTACT THE DEPARTMENT UNDER WHICH THAT CONDITION IS LISTED. THE CONTACTS’ NAMES AND PHONE NUMBERS ARE LISTED BELOW. ITEMS IN THE COMMENTS SECTION ARE NOT A REQUIREMENT TO BE MET PRIOR TO APPROVAL. THEY ARE INTENDED TO INCREASE YOUR KNOWLEDGE AND AWARENESS OF ISSUES THAT MAY POSSIBLY EXIST ON THE PROPERTY.**

There are no staff-recommended conditions.