

Moonstone 65 - unit Subdivision

Demonstration of Need

1. Could the proposed amendment promote substantial amounts of low-density, low intensity, or single use development in excess of demonstrated need?
 - a. No, the proposed amendment promotes slightly denser development as it changes the current land use designation from RL-1 undeveloped to RL-4 developed. Therefore, it would not promote substantial amounts of low-density, low-intensity, or single use development in excess of the demonstrated need.
2. Will the passage of the proposed amendment allow a significant amount of urban development to occur in rural areas?
 - a. No. The surrounding neighborhoods include built out residential neighborhoods. The change to RL-4 allows for uses similar to other residential uses and density types in the surrounding area.
3. Does the proposed amendment create or encourage urban development in radial, strip, isolated, or ribbon patterns emanating from existing urban development?
 - a. No. The proposed change allows for uses comparable to the existing surrounding residential area.
4. Does the proposed amendment fail to adequately protect adjacent agriculture areas?
 - a. No. Actually, the site is not adjacent to any agricultural areas. Any development to the property once modified to RL-4 land use is consistent with adjacent residential areas.
5. Could the proposed amendment fail to maximize existing public facilities and services?
 - a. The proposed residential development is similar in use and density will only allow a maximum of 65 homes.
6. Could the proposed amendment fail to minimize the need for future public facilities and services?
 - a. No. This proposed amendment will have a minimal impact to existing or future public facilities based on the proposed density.
7. Will the proposed amendment allow development patterns that will disproportionately increase the cost of providing public facilities and services?

- a. No. This change will somewhat increase the needs for public services, but not public facilities with the proposed density.
8. Does the proposed amendment fail to provide clear separation between urban and rural uses?
- a. No. The proposed RL-4 designation is surrounded by consistent residential areas, with no rural areas adjacent to the site.
9. Will the proposed amendment discourage infill development or redevelopment of existing neighborhoods?
- a. No. This proposed change may be considered consistent infill with the surrounding adjacent land uses and density.
10. Does the proposed amendment fail to encourage an attractive and functional mixture of land uses?
- a. No. This change adds a similar type of land use by changing the use from RL-1 to RL-4 with respect to residential density.
11. Could the proposed amendment result in poor accessibility among linked or related land uses?
- a. No. The RL-4 land use is similar to the surrounding existing residential uses.
12. As a result of approval of this amendment, how much open space will be lost?
- a. There will always be a loss of open space when development occurs, whether the development is within the RL-1 or RL-4 designation. Anything built on property once zoned to RL-4 would still need to meet all the open space code requirements for that type of land use.