

Brian Buzby – I vote to approve.

DeDreana Freeman – Where would the chemicals be held?

David Harris – Voted for approval.

Armeer Kenchen – Consistent with comprehensive plan and compatible with existing and future land use.

Tom Miller - The council should approve both the change to the FLUM and the zoning requested by the applicant in these cases. The changes are supported by policies 2.3.1a, 2.3.2a, and 2.4.2c of the Comprehensive Plan. The property borders land which is zoned for light industrial and commercial uses on three sides and for office uses on one side. It is served by a major state highway which connects it to an interstate highway nearby.

My only reservation about these cases concerns the multifamily residential project in the neighboring property which is zoned O-I. My reservations are not sufficient to cause me to recommend against denial of the applicant's requests, but I think it points out a flaw in the UDO. We should not allow residential uses in O-I under certain circumstances. While it is reasonable to have O-I districts in close proximity to heavy commercial and industrial areas, it is not always a good idea to have residential projects in those same areas. Unfortunately, our current O-I zone allows it and the results can be incongruous. Under the old zoning code, we had two O-I zones. One was suited to situations where residential and offices uses would be in close proximity and the other contemplated more intense office uses – larger buildings and settings which were predominantly non-residential. I believe we would benefit from having two levels of O-I again. One suited to urban and suburban residential settings in which some residential uses should be allowed and another, more intense O-I zone which would be suited to commercial and industrial neighbors in which no residential uses would be allowed.

Melvin Whitley – I voted to approve.