

(5) Is the proposed rezoning in conformity with the policy and intent of the Greater Lowndes Comprehensive Plan ?	
<i>Applicant:</i>	Yes, the proposed R-M zoning is a permitted zoning classification here..
<i>Staff:</i>	Yes, R-M zoning is allowable in the Community Activity Center (CAC) character area.
(6) What existing or changing conditions affecting the use and development of this property, support grounds for either approval or disapproval of the proposed rezoning ?	
<i>Applicant:</i>	The subject property has single-family / multi-family residential to the north, east, and south. It is justified for rezoning to R-M, as it is still remaining residential for the area with increasing density needs of families.
<i>Staff:</i>	There are no existing or changing conditions that support disapproval of the proposed rezoning.
(7) To what extent will the proposed rezoning result in significant adverse impacts on the natural environment (including trees, wetlands, floodplain, groundwater, air quality, water quality, etc...) ?	
<i>Applicant:</i>	The proposed development will not occur within existing flood zones or wetland areas. It will not have an adverse impact on the natural environment.
<i>Staff:</i>	No adverse impacts.
(8) Will the proposed change constitute a grant of special privilege to the individual owner as contrasted with adjacent or nearby property owners or the general public ?	
<i>Applicant:</i>	The proposed rezoning meets characteristics of surrounding properties and will not grant any special privilege.
<i>Staff:</i>	The proposed rezoning would not be considered a grant of special privilege

Supplemental Standards of the LDR Applicable to the Proposed Use

< none >

Development Review Comments

The following comments are provided by the reviewing departments and are only intended to provide the developer with useful information for planning purposes. This list should not be considered all-inclusive as additional items may appear during the plan review process.

Engineering:

- Typical COV residential road section requires 2-12’ lanes, 18” CG, 2’ vegetative strip, and 5’ SW on one or both sides of R/W. The proposed configuration shows 24’ road BC-BC. 40’ R/W puts standard configuration of public infrastructure 6” outside the R/W. Even if we went with an 18” vegetative strip to bring the SW onto the R/W line, we have no room to maintain and repair sidewalk in the future without construction easements. For this reason, my preference is a 50’ R/W with a sub-standard building setback.
 - Traffic calming raised concrete speed tables at pedestrian crosswalks.
 - Connect SW loop at south exit of neighborhood to existing SW
 - Stormwater management facilities, private sidewalk loops, and other common areas to be owned and maintained in perpetuity by HOA.
 - Lots 24 & 43 to access off end of hammerhead? SW maintenance access needs to be ensured. Potentially shared access.
 - MB Cluster location?

Landscaping: No issues or concerns

Utilities: < No comments received >.

Building Plan Review: No comments or concerns

Public Works: No issues or concerns

Police: < No comments received >

Fire: No comments or concerns