

Council Agenda Item ZC-068-2026, proposing rezoning Lots 4, 5, 8, and 9, Block 470, Eastern Division, located at 317 East Eistetter Street and 316 and 318 East Bustamante Street, from B-1 (Limited Business District) to B-3 (Community Business District)

1. Level of Alignment

- ☐ Strong
☐ Moderate
☒ **Weak/None** – Lacks identifiable alignment or conflicts with existing verbatim goals or policies.
-

2. Supporting Goal(s)/Policy(ies)

Goal 1.3

“Ensure the Future Land Use Map and zoning ordinance are aligned and consistently applied.”

Page 60

Source: *Viva Laredo City of Laredo Comprehensive Plan*

Relevance:

The Future Land Use Map designates the subject property as **High Density Residential**, which the staff report states supports **R-3, R-2, B-1R, B-1, and R-O** zoning districts, but **does not include B-3 zoning districts**. The proposed rezoning is therefore inconsistent with the adopted Future Land Use Map.

Policy 6.1.1

“Encourage development that is compatible with surrounding land uses and contributes to a cohesive urban form.”

Page 285

Source: *Viva Laredo City of Laredo Comprehensive Plan*

Relevance:

The proposed B-3 zoning district would introduce higher-intensity commercial uses into an area that is predominantly residential. The staff report concludes that the proposal **"may introduce uses that are not compatible with the established residential character"** and that it **"may be anticipated to have a negative impact with the surrounding area or neighborhoods."**

Policy 3.2.1

“Direct higher-intensity commercial uses to major corridors and arterial roadways where infrastructure can adequately support such development.”

Page 93

Source: *Viva Laredo City of Laredo Comprehensive Plan*

Relevance:

The proposed B-3 zoning does not satisfy this policy because **East Eistetter Street and East Bustamante Street are identified as local streets**, not minor or principal arterial roadways. The staff report specifically states that the proposal **"does not meet the Laredo Land Development Code location requirement"** for B-3 zoning, which is intended to be located along arterial streets.

Policy 4.1.2

“Encourage additions to existing neighborhoods that diversify housing options while preserving neighborhood character.”

Page 282

Source: *Viva Laredo City of Laredo Comprehensive Plan*

Relevance:

Although this policy primarily addresses residential development, it emphasizes preserving neighborhood character. The staff report finds that the proposed B-3 zoning could generate increased traffic, noise, and lighting that would adversely affect adjacent residential properties and diminish neighborhood character.

3. Summary of Alignment

The proposed rezoning from **B-1 (Limited Business District)** to **B-3 (Community Business District)** demonstrates **Weak/None** alignment with the *Viva Laredo Comprehensive Plan*. The proposal is inconsistent with the **Future Land Use Map**, which designates the area as **High Density Residential** and does not identify B-3 as an appropriate implementing zoning district. Consequently, the request conflicts with **Goal 1.3**, which calls for consistency between adopted land use policy and zoning decisions.

The proposal also conflicts with **Policy 3.2.1**, as the site fronts **East Eistetter Street and East Bustamante Street**, both of which are classified as **local streets** rather than minor or principal arterials. Additionally, the staff report concludes that the proposed B-3 zoning would introduce higher-intensity commercial uses incompatible with the surrounding residential neighborhood, potentially increasing traffic, noise, and lighting while creating an isolated zoning district. These

findings are inconsistent with **Policy 6.1.1**, which promotes compatible development and cohesive urban form.

The proposal intersects with broader planning themes related to **land use compatibility, neighborhood preservation, mobility, traffic management, and orderly commercial development**. Based on the adopted Comprehensive Plan and the findings contained in the staff report, the proposal does not support the City's long-range planning objectives.
