

the transition then work its way southward in logical but controlled manner. There is also the immediate concern that Nan Street is a substandard local street with narrow inverted crown pavement – that is not conducive for commercial traffic. Good site planning will help alleviate this, but it should also be weighed as a limiting factor for the short term.

The applicant's rezoning proposal is truly speculative. It has the potential to be a catalyst for the kind of redevelopment/infill that is being sought, but its size (proposed depth) also has the potential to allow commercial development that is perhaps too large or intrude too deeply into the existing neighborhood – or too prematurely. Staff believes the parcels fronting River Street have the strongest argument in favor of commercial zoning, but believes the Nan Street parcels need to be protected at least a little while longer or until there is a non-speculative proposal being put forth. Placing office or multi-family residential zoning on these parcels would greatly enhance their marketability from R-10, but still protect the remaining neighborhood from an over-intrusion.

Staff finds a combination of C-C and R-P zoning consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the Standards for the Exercise of Zoning Power (SFEZP) and recommends approval to the City Council for the rezoning of the existing parcels fronting River Street (1.18 acres) to C-C, and the parcels solely fronting Nan Street (0.76 acres) to R-P.

Speaking in favor of the request:

- Richard Hill, Applicant – 2419 S. 40

Mr. Hill stated that he had originally requested C-H zoning, explaining that the surrounding R-10 zoned area will likely be zoned commercial in the future and would therefore like the entire subject properties to be approved for commercial zoning. He further stated that the conceptual plan shows all buildings oriented toward River St. and R-P zoning would prohibit retail use.

Commissioner James Miller inquired whether or not the conceptual plan is a site plan for definite use of future spaces. Mr. Hill replied it is strictly a conceptual plan. Commissioner Rountree asked for verification that Retail use is not allowed in R-P zoning. Mr. Martin confirmed but that the southern building on the site plan is the only building that would be affected.

No one spoke in opposition to the request.

Vice-Chair Steve Miller asked about other restricted uses in C-H and R-P zonings. Mr. Martin stated C-H zoning allows for automotive intensive uses and R-P is generally utilized for offices and multi-family use.

There being no further discussion, Chairman Hightower called for a motion. Commissioner Bailey made a motion to recommend approval to rezone all subject parcels to C-C zoning. Commissioner Wildes second. All voted in favor, no one opposed (8-0). Motion carried.

All voted in favor, no one opposed (5-0). Motion carried.