Sec. 86-47

- (f) Contents of planning commission report.
 - (1) *Rezoning amendments.* 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:

a. Whether the proposed change is in conformity to the comprehensive plan.
 With the adoption of the concurrently filed Comprehensive Plan text amendment, the proposed change is in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan.

b. The existing land use pattern.

The subject property, setback from Laurel Road in excess of 650 feet, and adjacent to the City's waste water treatment plan is well suited for the proposed use.

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

The proposed ILW zoning is not unrelated to nearby zoning districts and the proposed use has operated in harmony with the neighborhood for in excess of 15 years.

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

The proposed rezoning will not increase or overtax the load on public facilities.

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

Not applicable. The prior annexation to the City of Venice and the need to rezone to a City of Venice zoning designation makes the amendment necessary. The proposed ILW zoning is the logical zoning for the property which has operated as a welding business for in excess of 15 years.

- f. Whether changed or changing conditions make the passage of the proposed amendment necessary. The prior annexation to the City of Venice and the need to rezone to a City of Venice zoning designation makes the amendment necessary.
- g. Whether the proposed change will adversely influence living conditions in the neighborhood.
 The proposed change will not adversely influence living conditions as the existing use will remain on the property.

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

The proposed change will not create or excessively increase traffic as the existing use will remain on the property.

i. Whether the proposed change will create a drainage problem.

The proposed change will not create a drainage problem.

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

The proposed change will not reduce light and air to adjacent areas.

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

The proposed change will not adversely affect property values in the adjacent area.

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

The proposed change will not be a deterrent to the improvement or development of adjacent property in accord with existing regulations.

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

The proposed change will not constitute a grant of special privilege to an individual owner as contrasted with the public welfare.

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

The annexation into the City necessitates a rezoning to a City of Venice zoning district.

o. Whether the change suggested is out of scale with the needs of the neighborhood or the city. The change suggested is not out of scale with the needs of the neighborhood or the city.

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

Not applicable. The prior annexation into the City necessitates a rezoning to a City of Venice zoning district.