

I imperfectly raised questions at the prior meeting that did not concisely and adequately convey my concerns. This is a more cogent summary

1. What are the impetus and purpose of this rezoning petition?
 - a. To allow a single petitioner to build garage & apron without variance?
 - b. Only 6 months into our "test drive/shakedown cruise" of new zoning ordinance are we now to start to ferret out all nonconformities in our new ordinance?
 - c. Are such non-conformities bad?
2. Weren't we alerted to the likelihood of such non-conformities persisting even with the adoption of the new ordinance? Did we fail to exert our due diligence in exploring these ramifications? Doesn't this reaction create the impression that we ignored or were oblivious to these ramifications when we explored this matter in our discussions about the new ordinance?
3. Angela M reminded us that our consultant did indeed examine this matter. One of the purposes was to identify the potential for infill development opportunities.
4. Refer to the exhibit our consultant prepared that summarized the "**....APPROPRIATENESS ANALYSIS. (21 September 21).**" This examined different percentages of non-conformity vis-à-vis different dimensional parameters (i.e. lot size, lot width, etc.) of the different zoning classes.
 - a. Our consultant identified that up to 40% non-conformity would remain, especially in the R 1 class, even with minor changes to dimensional parameters. These occur throughout the village west of the railroad. These include other parts of the Ravisloe neighborhood (e.g. Tipton) besides this cluster currently under this consideration. They also occur in the neighborhoods west of Governors Highway.
 - b. I recall therefore that we concluded that this level of non-conformity was acceptable or to be tolerated. In a mature community with established development, not many changes requiring variances are expected.
 - c. These currently non-conforming properties were presumably conforming to their zoning class in effect when their subdivisions were approved and platted.

The answers to these questions reveal the reasons I am opposed to this rezoning. There is another way to accomplish that single petitioner's need for a (dimensional) variance to permit the construction of a garage/apron on a "substandard" lot. The matter of 2143 Ridge is a more convoluted issue. I am not opposed to the possibility of an infill development to construct a new single family house on this larger, consolidated lot. We can rezone this lot now or let the property owner subsequently petition for a variance or rezoning to permit it.

Michael J Cap 7 May 23