



ZONING MAP AMENDMENT
Petition Number: 16-06RZ
SHYD LLC
Staff Report

Owner: SHYD LLC

Agent: Greg Roberts, Klingbeil & Roberts, P.A.

Parcel ID s#: 0404-05-0002, 0404-12-0001, and 0404-12-0002 **Parcel Size:** 19.39± acres

Existing Zoning District: Sarasota County Open Use Estate 2 (OUE-2)

Proposed Zoning District: City of Venice Residential, Multiple-Family 3 (RMF-3)

Concurrent Applications: Annexation Petition 16-01AN
Comprehensive Plan Amendment 16-02CP

Proposed Stipulation: If approved, the subject petition is contingent upon approval of the concurrently processed Annexation (Petition No. 16-01AN) and Comprehensive Plan Amendment (16-02CP) petitions.

Technical Review Committee (TRC): The subject petition has been reviewed by the TRC and compliance with all regulatory standards applicable to the subject petition has been confirmed.

I. REQUEST


Greg Roberts, the authorized agent for property owner SHYD LLC, has petitioned the city to amend the city's zoning map for property totaling 19.39± acres near 1041 Albee Farm Road. The request is to change the current Sarasota County zoning designation of Open Use Estate 2 (OUE-2) to a City of Venice designation of Residential, Multiple-Family 3 (RMF-3). The zoning amendment is being requested in order to allow for future multi-family residential infill development on the subject properties.

II. SUBJECT PROPERTIES/SURROUNDING PROPERTY INFORMATION

Subject Properties Information:

SHYD LLC owns three contiguous parcels of land along Albee Farm Road, north of Lucaya Avenue. A submitted survey identifies the three parcels as Parcel A (PID 0404-05-0002), Parcel B (PID 0404-12-0001), and Parcel C (PID 0404-12-0002). These parcels represent the *subject properties* referred to in the request for a zoning map amendment (see Map 1). Parcel A is 0.19± acres, and Parcels B and C are both 9.60± acres in size.

MAP 1: Aerial Photograph



Following are a series of photos which show on-site conditions and properties adjacent to the subject properties.



Magnolia Park Condos, looking northeast from Albee Farm Road.



Bird Bay Condos, looking west across Albee Farm Road.



Driveway entrance to Parcel B looking east across Albee Farm Road.



Entrance to Parcel A looking east from Parcel B driveway.



Sheds/outdoor storage use on Parcel A looking northeast.



Pastureland for cattle grazing use on Parcel C looking east.

Existing Use of Subject Properties:

Parcel A is currently being used as outdoor storage of equipment and contains four shed structures. Parcel B contains a single-family residential structure and is also being used as outdoor storage for heavy equipment which will be considered nonconforming if the rezoning petition is approved. The Planning Commission may want to inquire as to the status and future of this use. Similarly, Parcel C is vacant and being used as pastureland for cattle grazing, which is also a nonconforming use. As a stipulation of the Annexation Petition (Petition No. 16-01AN) applicable to this parcel, the property owner has been notified that they will need to remove the cattle off Parcel C in order to not create a nonconformity.

As seen in Map 1, Parcels B and C have direct access to Albee Farm Road. The smaller Parcel A has indirect access via a paved driveway that traverses the northern portion of Parcel B. Staff typically reviews access to individual parcels during the development review process (i.e., preliminary plat or site and development plan). However, given the unique character and location of Parcel A, staff is recommending a stipulation that if Parcel A and Parcel B were ever sold independently the owner of Parcel B must dedicate an access easement across the northern portion of the parcel to allow Parcel A to have its own dedicated access to Albee Farm Road. This stipulation is part of the concurrently filed Annexation Petition.

Surrounding Property Information:

The character and land development patterns of the surrounding properties include manufactured homes to the east (Bay Indies); a combination of multi-family residential (Magnolia Park) and vacant woodlands to the north; multi-family residential to the west (Bird Bay); and a combination of single-family residential, pastureland for cattle grazing, and outdoor storage to the south (Sandler Ranch).

Table 1 below identifies the existing land use, current zoning and the future land use designation of surrounding properties.


Table 1: Surrounding Land Use, Zoning and Future Land Use Designations

Direction	Existing Land Use(s)	Existing Zoning District(s)	Future Land Use Designation(s)
North	Multi-family residential (Magnolia Park) and vacant woodlands	Sarasota County Open Use Estate 2 (OUE-2) and City of Venice Residential Multiple Family 3 (RMF-3)	Sarasota County Low Density Residential and City of Venice Medium Density Residential
South	Single-family residential, pastureland, and outdoor storage	Sarasota County OUE-2	Sarasota County Low Density Residential and City of Venice Medium Density Residential
East	Manufactured homes (Bay Indies)	City of Venice Residential, Manufactured Home (RMH) and Sarasota County OUE-2	City of Venice Medium Density Residential
West	Multi-family residential (Bird Bay)	City of Venice Planned Unit Development (PUD) and Sarasota County OUE-2	Sarasota County Low Density Residential and City of Venice Medium Density Residential

Future Land Use:

Parcels A and C are enclaves within Sarasota County and have an existing Sarasota County future land use designation of Low Density Residential (see Map 2). Map 2 inaccurately depicts Parcel C (PID 0404-12-0002) as being within the City of Venice incorporated area. Staff is uncertain as to when this inaccuracy occurred, but believes it may have taken place around 2001 when a draft Interlocal Agreement between the city and Sarasota County was developed. The city's future land use map has always recognized these parcels as having a City of Venice future land use designation of Medium Density Residential in anticipation of any future annexation.

MAP 2: Existing Future Land Use (Sarasota County)




In 2002, Section 171.046, Florida Statutes, states that in order to expedite the annexation of developed or improved enclaves of 10 acres or less into the most appropriate incorporated jurisdiction, a municipality may annex an enclave by interlocal agreement with the county having jurisdiction of the enclave. The city and county developed an Interlocal Agreement between the City of Venice and Sarasota County Regarding Annexation of Enclaves and County Property. The draft agreement originally included a list of 158 properties identified for involuntary annexation, including all three of the subject properties.

However, after meeting with affected property owners regarding vacant lots, staff reduced the number of properties on the list to 118. The reduced list no longer included Parcels A and C because they were undeveloped or unimproved. Staff believes that when the original listing of properties was produced, both the city and county future land use maps were altered to show that Parcels A and C were being annexed into the city, but then the maps were not revised once the reduced list of properties was produced. This is the only explanation staff can provide as for why both future land use maps show Parcel C as being within the city's incorporated area.

Parcel B was involuntarily annexed into the city in 2002 through Resolution 2002-26. This parcel has an existing City of Venice future land use designation of Medium Density Residential (see Map 3). Map 3 also inaccurately depicts Parcel C (PID 0404-12-0002) as being within the city's incorporated area. As previously mentioned, staff is uncertain as to when this inaccuracy occurred, but believes it may have taken place around 2001 when the draft Interlocal Agreement between the city and Sarasota County was developed.

MAP 3: Existing Future Land Use (City of Venice)




Existing Zoning:


All three parcels have an existing Sarasota County zoning designation of Open Use Estate 2 (OUE-2). Maps 4 and 5 show the existing Sarasota County and City of Venice zoning maps respectively. Map

4 inaccurately depicts Parcel C (PID 0404-12-0002) as being within the City of Venice incorporated area. As previously mentioned, staff is uncertain as to when this inaccuracy occurred, but believes it may have taken place around 2001 when a draft Interlocal Agreement between the city and Sarasota County was developed.

MAP 4: Existing Zoning (Sarasota County)



MAP 5: Existing Zoning (City of Venice)



Flood Zone Information:


The 2016 FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) shows the majority of subject properties within X-Unshaded and X-Shaded flood zones. The X-Unshaded and X-Shaded flood zones are low and moderate risk flood areas respectively and not identified as Special Flood Hazard Areas. Parcels B and C do contain small areas with AE flood zones with base flood elevation varying from 11.1 feet to 13.0 feet. The AE flood zone is a high risk flood area identified as a Special Flood Hazard Area. Flood insurance is mandatory in Special Flood Hazard Areas for most mortgages that are secured by loans from federally regulated or insured lenders. City of Venice regulations require that the minimum finished floor elevation be higher of base flood elevation or 15 inches above the adjacent grade. A survey is required to establish the finished floor elevation and crown of road and an elevation certificate will be required for new construction. Development of the properties will be subject to compliance with FEMA requirements.

III. PLANNING ANALYSIS

Evaluation of Proposed Zoning Map Amendment:

Consistent with the requirements of the pre-annexation agreement, the subject properties are required to be rezoned to a city designation prior to development. The applicant is proposing to change the zoning from the current Sarasota County designation of OUE-2 to a City of Venice designation of Residential, Multiple-Family 3 (RMF-3) which is consistent with the applicable City of Venice future land use designation of Medium Density Residential (see Map 6). The applicant has not yet submitted a development proposal, but has indicated the desire to pursue a future multi-family residential infill development. An RMF-3 zoning designation would allow the properties to be developed at a density similar to adjacent properties.

MAP 6: Proposed Zoning Map



The Sarasota County OUE-2 designation allows only one dwelling unit per two acres, or a total development potential of 10 dwelling units for the subject properties. The City of Venice RMF-3 zoning designation would allow up to 13 dwelling units per acre, or a total development potential of 252 dwelling units on the subject properties.

As previously mentioned, an RMF-3 zoning designation provides for a development pattern consistent with the majority of surrounding properties. The Bay Indies Mobile Home Park to the east is developed

at a density of 6.38 dwelling units per acre. Magnolia Park to the north is developed at a density of 9.98 dwelling units per acre. The Bird Bay condominiums to the west is developed at a density of 5.64 dwelling units per acre. The only surrounding property that is not consistent with the proposed RMF-3 zoning designation is south of the subject properties, which has a current Sarasota County zoning designation of OUE-2 and is limited to one dwelling unit per two acres. However, the city's future land use map identifies this property as Medium Density Residential consistent with the proposed future land use designation of the subject properties, which would provide similar development potential of the subject properties.

Table 2. Evaluation of Existing and Proposed Designations

	Designation	Maximum Gross Intensity/Density	Total Dwelling Units/Acre (19.39± Acres)
Existing Zoning	Sarasota County OUE-2	1 dwelling unit per 2 acres	10 dwelling units
Proposed Zoning	City of Venice RMF-3	13 dwelling units per acre	252 dwelling units
Existing Future Land Use Designation	Sarasota County Low Density Residential	Less than 2 dwelling units per acre	Less than 39 dwelling units
	City of Venice Medium Density Residential	5.1 to 13 dwelling units per acre	99 to 252 dwelling units
Proposed Future Land Use Designation*	City of Venice Medium Density Residential	5.1 to 13 dwelling units per acre	99 to 252 dwelling units

* Applicant has submitted a concurrent Comprehensive Plan Amendment to request a change in future land use designation for all three parcels from Sarasota County Low Density Residential to City of Venice Medium Density Residential, consistent with the city's current future land use map.

Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan:

Parcels A and C have an existing Sarasota County future land use designation of Low Density Residential. Parcel B has an existing City of Venice future land use designation of Medium Density Residential. The applicant has submitted a concurrent Comprehensive Plan Amendment petition (Petition No. 16-02CP) requesting to change Parcels A and C to a City of Venice future land use designation of Medium Density Residential. The city's future land use map has always recognized these parcels as having a City of Venice future land use designation of Medium Density Residential in anticipation of any future annexation. Medium density residential land uses are intended to accommodate a variety of single- and multi-family residential uses. High intensity and auto-centric uses are prohibited. Consistent with the city's Medium Density Residential future land use designation, under the proposed City of Venice RMF-3 zoning, the maximum residential density is 13 dwelling units per acre.

Applicable provisions of Policy 8.2 of the Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use & Design Element include considerations of protecting single-family neighborhoods from the intrusion of incompatible uses, and densities of proposed uses as compared to the densities of existing uses. Compatibility review requires evaluation of the following as listed in Policy 8.2:

- A. Land use density and intensity.
- B. Building heights and setbacks.
- C. Character or type of use proposed.
- D. Site and architectural mitigation design techniques.

At the rezone stage of a project, Policy 13.1 of the Comprehensive Plan regarding residential uses indicates that a positive finding must be made by City Council on the following consideration, E thru H, from Policy 8.2, Land Use Compatibility Review Procedures, in order for a project to obtain approval at the maximum allowable density. The applicant has provided responses to E thru H, after which staff has provided comments if applicable.

- E. Protection of single-family neighborhoods from the intrusion of incompatible uses.

Applicant's Response: *The closest single-family neighborhood is Pinebrook South and the Bay Indies Mobile Home Park is located between the subject property and Pinebrook South.*

- F. Prevention of the location of commercial or industrial uses in areas where such uses are incompatible with existing uses.

Applicant's Response: *The multi-family use will not allow for commercial or industrial uses.*

- G. 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's Response: *The property is undeveloped and a multi-family development would be consistent with surrounding uses.*

- H. Densities and intensity of proposed uses as compared to the densities and intensities of existing uses.

Applicant's Response: *The proposed amendment for multi-family residential will be consistent with surrounding uses.*

Based on the above evaluation of Policy 8.2, Land Use Compatibility Review Procedures and Policy 13.1, Residential Future Land Uses, there is adequate evidence on which to determine confirmation of compatibility with the surrounding properties and to make a positive finding on considerations E through H. However, the existing pastureland for cattle grazing use does warrant consideration. A determination of whether mitigation techniques, as identified in Policy 8.2 and 13.1, may be necessary to buffer the properties. They are as follows:

- I. Providing open space, perimeter buffers, landscaping and berms.

Applicant's Response: *Open space, perimeter buffers, landscaping and berms (if applicable) will be finalized and evaluated during the S&D process.*

- J. Screening of sources of light, noise, mechanical equipment, refuse areas, delivery and storage areas.

Applicant's Response: Screening of sources of light, noise, mechanical equipment, refuse areas, delivery and storage areas (if applicable) will be finalized and evaluated during the S&D process.

K. Locating road access to minimize adverse impacts.

Applicant's Response: Road access will be finalized and evaluated during the S&D process.

L. Adjusting building setbacks to transition between different uses.

Applicant's Response: Building setbacks will be finalized and evaluated during the S&D process.

M. Applying step-down or tiered building heights to transition between different uses.

Applicant's Response: Permitted building heights on the subject property will not exceed permitted building heights as allowed on adjacent properties.

N. Lowering density or intensity of land uses to transition between different uses.

Applicant's Response: The proposed amendment to allow for multi-family residential development will be a reduction in the intensity in use as compared to the adjacent mobile home park and consistent with multi-family uses to the north and west of the property.

Concurrency/Adequate Public Facilities:

In response to request from the Planning and Zoning Division, city Technical Review Committee (TRC) reviewed the proposed zoning map amendment for potential impacts on city services and facilities. Staff has conducted a preliminary concurrency analysis based on responses from the TRC departments. The TRC review indicated adequate public facilities are available to accommodate the proposed rezone. Addition review for concurrency, including the issuance of a certificate of concurrency, will be required prior to development of the subject properties.

Compliance with the Land Development Code:

Section 86-47(f)(1) of the Land Development Code states "When pertaining to the rezoning of land, the report and recommendations of the Planning Commission to the City Council shall show that the Planning Commission has studied and considered the proposed change in relation to the following, where applicable:" To facilitate the Planning Commission's review of the subject petition staff has provided commentary for each of the following considerations, and when appropriate staff has provided comments with additional information:

- (a) Whether the proposed change is in conformity to the comprehensive plan.

Applicant's Response: The City Property is currently designated as Medium Density Residential allowing for 5.1 to 13 units per acre. The non-City Property is designated at Low Density Residential on the Sarasota County Future Land Use Map however the City of Venice Future Land Use Map designates it as Medium Density Residential. Concurrent with this application, the Applicant has filed an application for a comprehensive plan amendment requesting a change to the future land use to a City of Venice Designation of Medium Density

Residential. A zoning designation of RMF-3 would be consistent with the current and proposed future land use designation.

Staff Comment: *The “city property” the applicant is referring to is Parcel B. This parcel was involuntarily annexed in 2002 and has an adopted City of Venice future land use designation of Medium Density Residential. Parcel A and Parcel C are enclaves within unincorporated Sarasota County and have an adopted Sarasota County future land use designation of Low Density Residential. The city’s future land use map has always recognized these parcels as having a City of Venice future land use designation of Medium Density Residential in anticipation of any future annexation. The applicant has submitted a concurrent Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposing to change the future land use designation for Parcels A and C to City of Venice Medium Density Residential. If approved, the City RMF-3 zoning designation would be consistent with the proposed Medium Density Residential future land use designation.*

- (b) The existing land use pattern.

Applicant’s Response: *Bird Bay, a multi-family development (PUD) is west of the properties. North of the properties is a condominium development (RMF-3) and vacant land and on the east boundary is the Bay Indies Mobile Home Park (RMH). Vacant land is located adjacent to the property on the southerly boundary, however further south is a multi-family development zoned RMF-4. RMF-3 would be consistent with the existing land use pattern.*

Staff Comment: *The subject properties are in the vicinity of other multi-family residential developments, such as Magnolia Park (RMF-3), Bird Bay (PUD), Las Palmas and Las Casas (RMF-3) and is adjacent to the Bird Bay Mobile Home Park.*

- (c) Possible creation of an isolated district unrelated to adjacent and nearby districts.

Applicant’s Response: *As described above, a rezone to RMF-3 will not create an isolated district unrelated to adjacent nearby districts.*

Staff Comment: *See staff comment above.*

- (d) The population density pattern and possible increase or overtaxing of the load on public facilities such as schools, utilities, streets, etc.

Applicant’s Response: *The proposed rezoning will not cause overtaxing of public facilities such as schools, utilities and streets.*

Staff Comment: *A zoning change does not increase the load on public facilities. During review of the subject petition, TRC departments reviewed the proposed rezoning for potential impacts on city services and facilities. Staff has conducted a preliminary concurrency analysis based on responses from city departments and concluded that there currently are adequate public facilities available to accommodate the proposed rezoning. Additional review for concurrency, including the issuance of a certificate of concurrency, will be required prior to further development of the subject properties.*

- (e) Whether existing district boundaries are illogically drawn in relation to existing conditions on the property proposed for change.

Applicant’s Response: *The district boundaries are not illogically drawn in relation to existing conditions.*

Staff Comment: *The existing boundaries are not illogically drawn in relation to the existing conditions and provides a continuation of residential zoning from the adjacent city zoned properties.*

- (f) Whether changed or changing conditions make the passage of the proposed amendment necessary.

Applicant's Response: *There is very little new multi-family construction in this area of the City. Since the housing crisis of recent years, there is a great demand for rental units. Although an end use for the property has not been finalized, RMF-3 would allow condominiums or rental apartments on the property.*

Staff Comment: *The applicant has submitted a concurrent Annexation petition requesting the two enclave properties be annexed into the city. If the annexation is approved, the properties must be given a proper city zoning designation. The applicable pre-annexation agreement requires the properties to be rezoned prior to any development order approval.*

- (g) Whether the proposed change will adversely influence living conditions in the neighborhood.

Applicant's Response: *This change will not adversely influence living conditions in the neighborhood since multi-family units are located on three sides of the property.*

Staff Comment: *The proposed RMF-3 zoning district is comparable to the existing residential development in the vicinity of the subject properties and is consistent with the future land use designation surrounding the properties.*

- (h) Whether the proposed change will create or excessively increase traffic congestion or otherwise affect public safety.

Applicant's Response: *Access to the Property is via Albee Farm Road which is designated as a Major Collector in the Comprehensive Plan (Map TRANS-1). The additional units allowed to be constructed will not excessively increase traffic congestion or otherwise affect public safety.*

Staff Comment: *A zoning change does not increase traffic congestion or affect public safety. The impact on traffic and public safety will be evaluated during review of a future Site and Development Plan petition. Staff is requesting that one stipulation be included with the petition, that should Parcel A be sold independently from Parcel B, that Parcel B grant an access easement across the northern portion of the parcel to provide direct access to Albee Farm Road to Parcel A. Currently, Parcel A may only be accessed via a paved driveway that traverses Parcel B.*

- (i) Whether the proposed change will create a drainage problem.

Applicant's Response: *All drainage issues will be addressed by the site and development plan once an end use has been identified.*

Staff Comment: *A zoning change does not create a drainage problem. Applicable stormwater management design and permits will be required prior to the development of the subject properties.*

- (j) Whether the proposed change will seriously reduce light and air to adjacent areas.

Applicant's Response: Any development will meet all elements of the Comprehensive Plan and Land Development Code and will not reduce light and air to adjacent parcels.

Staff Comment: The applicant has not yet submitted a development petition for the subject properties. Staff will evaluate impacts of any proposed development during review of the future Site and Development Plan.

- (k) Whether the proposed change will adversely affect property values in the adjacent area.

Applicant's Response: The proposed change will not adversely affect property values in the adjacent areas since most of the surrounding properties are utilized or designated for multi-family developments which will be consistent with the proposed change.

Staff Comment: The zoning change is not expected to adversely affect property values in the surrounding area. The proposed RMF-3 zoning is consistent with the proposed City of Venice Medium Density Residential future land use designation and comparable to existing multi-family designations in the adjacent area. In addition, the city is obligated to provide a zoning designation for the subject properties prior to development as required by the approved pre-annexation agreement.

- (l) Whether the proposed change will be a deterrent to the improvement or development of adjacent property in accord with existing regulations.

Applicant's Response: Much of the surrounding property has already been developed and the future land use designations for the vacant property includes medium density residential and high density residential allowing for RMF development. This proposed zoning map amendment will not have any impact to the improvement or development of the adjacent properties.

Staff Comment: The proposed RMF-3 zoning is in compliance with the proposed Medium Density Residential future land use designation and no deterrent to improvement or development of adjacent properties under these regulations is anticipated.

- (m) Whether the proposed change will constitute a grant of special privilege to an individual owner as contrasted with the public welfare.

Applicant's Response: The proposed zoning change will not constitute a grant of special privilege to any individual owner.

Staff Comment: Approval of the requested RMF-3 zoning will not constitute a special privilege to the owner of the subject properties. The applicant has submitted a concurrent Annexation petition requesting the two enclave properties be annexed into the city. As indicated above, the city is obligated to provide a zoning designation for the subject properties prior to development as required by the approved pre-annexation agreement.

- (n) Whether there are substantial reasons why the property cannot be used in accord with existing zoning.

Applicant's Response: Current zoning is based on Sarasota County zoning designations. A zoning map amendment designating a City of Venice zoning category is necessary to develop the property.

Staff Comment: The applicant has submitted a concurrent Annexation petition requesting the two enclave properties be annexed into the city. As indicated above, the city is obligated to

provide a zoning designation for the subject properties prior to development as required by the approved pre-annexation agreement.

- (o) Whether the change suggested is out of scale with the needs of the neighborhood or the city.

Applicant's Response: *RMF-3 is not out of scale with the needs of the neighborhood or the City.*

Staff Comment: *The proposed RMF-3 zoning change is not out of scale with the needs of the neighborhood or the city. The proposed zoning is consistent with the proposed Medium Density Residential future land use designation and comparable to the other existing multi-family districts in the adjacent area.*

- (p) Whether it is impossible to find other adequate sites in the city for the proposed use in districts already permitting such use.

Applicant's Response: *While it is not impossible to find other sites in the City for the proposed use, this site is close to schools, employment centers and recreation venues and would be appropriate for apartments or other multi-family uses.*

Staff Comment: *There are other districts in the city that provide for types of uses included in the proposed district. However, the applicant is the owner of the subject properties and is making the rezoning request consistent with the future land use and requirements of the pre-annexation agreement.*

Summary Findings:

The following summary findings provide an overview of the analysis included in this report:

- i) **Finding (Compliance with the Comprehensive Plan):** *The rezoning of the subject properties is required by the approved pre-annexation agreement. The proposed City of Venice RMF-3 zoning designation is consistent with the proposed future land use designation of Medium Density Residential. Therefore, the proposed rezoning may be found consistent with the policies of the City of Venice comprehensive plan.*
- ii) **Finding (Concurrency/Adequate Public Facilities):** *Currently, there are adequate public facilities available to accommodate the proposed rezoning. Further concurrency analyses and the issuance of a certificate of concurrency will be required prior to development of the subject properties.*
- iii) **Finding (Compliance with the Land Development Code):** *The proposed rezoning may be found consistent with each of the rezoning considerations contained in Section 86-47(f)(1)a-p, of the Land Development Code and the subject zoning map amendment may be found in compliance with the Land Development Code.*

IV. CITY ACTION ON ZONING MAP AMENDMENT PETITION NO. 16-06RZ

Upon review of the petition and associated documents, Comprehensive Plan, Land Development Code, staff report and analysis, and testimony provided during the public hearing, there is sufficient information on the record to take action on Zoning Map Amendment Petition No. 16-06RZ.