

approximately $\frac{3}{4}$ of the distance into the lot, and then subdivide lots off of the new street. [see attached schematic drawings as a comparison for R-15, R-10 and R-6 conventional layouts for single-family homes] The main problem here is that the new street right-of-way would consume nearly $\frac{1}{3}$ of the total land area and therefore the new subdivision would yield a total of only 3 lots under R-15. A very similar kind of scenario would apply under R-10 zoning. The property is still not wide enough along Eager Road to have more than one lot (each lot must be at least 80' wide and contain at least 10,000 s.f.), and it must use the same kind of street design to subdivide and develop the property with more than one lot. Because of the smaller lot widths allowed in R-10 zoning, this scenario would instead allow a subdivision with 4 lots along the new internal street. Ironically, in this scenario each lot would average approximately 13,000 s.f. due to irregular lot shapes and net buildable areas caused by the cul-de-sac. Under the proposed R-6 zoning, this scenario dramatically increases to perhaps 8 lots – depending on actual lot design – but probably more comfortably at 7 lots maximum. However, it should also be noted that R-6 zoning allows the additional possibility of duplexes if the lots are at least 9,000-sf in area, and staff can envision a maximum of 6 duplex lots here. It should be further noted that R-6 also allows conventional townhouses as well, and staff can envision up to approximately 14 of these, provided they are without garages and 2-bedroom maximum, and depending on the private street layout.

Most of these scenarios are intended to illustrate a main point, which is that conventional development (for single-family development) which includes a new standard internal street is “cost-prohibitive” and is wasteful of land, when considering the net result of only a few lots and unimaginative design. Given the property’s characteristics, it is truly a prime candidate for some type of “Planned Development” approach, perhaps with a mixture of residential types – as was proposed in 2020. The only significant questions in all of this however, is DENSITY.

The existing land use pattern along Eager Road is dominated by single-family residential subdivisions of various shapes and sizes. There is no question that the residential land use pattern should continue. In terms of zoning pattern, most all of the properties along the north side of Eager Road are zoned R-15. However, it should be pointed out that this is a little deceiving in that the abutting small subdivisions along Jadan Place and Walmar Place are nonconforming in that $\frac{1}{3}$ of their lots do not meet the R-15 minimum requirements. By today’s standards, they would be zoned R-10 instead. Other nearby developments with a little higher density include those along the south side of Eager Road where there is a mixture of R-15, R-10, and PRD-10 zoning, as well as the Langdale Place development which has R-P zoning. However, the most recent and the most significant development in all of this is the 2013 rezoning of the property about 300' to the west at #316 Eager Road. This property is the exact same dimension and size (1.80 acres) and was successfully rezoned to R-10, and also received a Planned Development approval for 8 dwelling units. Given the actual R-10 nature of the abutting properties to the east and west, using this prior rezoning approval as a benchmark seems like a logical solution and still leaves open the “possibility” of up to 9 dwelling units with a quality Planned Development proposal.