Land Use Compatibility Analysis- Chapter 87 Section 1.2.C.8

a. Demonstrate that the character and design of infill and new development are compatible with existing neighborhoods. The compatibility review shall include the evaluation of the following items with regard to annexation, rezoning, height exception, conditional use, and site and development plan petitions:

i. Land use density and intensity.
Applicant Response: *While the rezone is not speaking to redevelopment or infill development at this time, the density of the proposed zoning district (Laurel East) would increase to 13DU per acre and the intensity would increase to .50 FAR. The current County Zoning district is OUE-1 which has the density of 1 DU/5acres.*

ii. Building heights and setbacks.
Applicant Response: *The building heights would remain at the height by right of 35 feet. Side yard setback would change from 50 feet to a min/max of 10 feet/50 feet in the proposed zoning district. Rear setbacks would change from 50 feet to a min/max of 10 feet/ none. Front/street setback would change from 50 feet to a min/max of 15 feet to 100 feet under the proposed new zoning district.*

iii. Character or type of use proposed.
Applicant Response: *There is no new proposed development through this rezone petition. It is being brought forward to provide a City zoning for the property owner that is consistent with the future land use (FLU).*

iv. Site and architectural mitigation design techniques.
Applicant Response: *The proposed zoning of Laurel East has architectural standards that would apply to any new development that may come in the future.*

b. Considerations for determining compatibility shall include, but are not limited to, the following:

i. Protection of single-family neighborhoods from the intrusion of incompatible uses.
Applicant Response: *Mixed use districts are not considered to be incompatible with traditional use districts.*

ii. Prevention of the location of commercial or industrial uses in areas where such uses are incompatible with existing uses.
Applicant Response: *Rezoning of the subject property would bring the property to the proper implementing district for the existing FLU for the property.*

iii. The degree to which the development phases out nonconforming uses in order to resolve incompatibilities resulting from development inconsistent with the current Comprehensive Plan.
Applicant Response: *As mentioned, the rezoning of the subject property would bring the property to the proper implementing district for the existing FLU for the property; doing so allows for the property to be developed to the standards of the current Comprehensive plan for the mixed use corridor.*

iv. Densities and intensities of proposed uses as compared to the densities and intensities of existing uses.

Applicant Response: *Density of proposed zoning district would be consistent with the density and intensity of properties to the north, east (in part), and west of the subject property. The Government zoned property to the south does not have an intensity limit and is a non-residential zoning district to which density does not apply.*