

The subject property is located within an Established Residential (ER) Character Area on the Future Development Map of the Comprehensive Plan, which allows the possibility of R-6 zoning.

** In addition to the repeated Rezoning request from 2 months ago (# VA-2025-11), this is also the same request (same applicant & property) that was submitted by the applicant in 2020 for rezoning to R-6 (file # VA-2020-06). That request was recommended for denial by the GLPC (9-1 vote) and was later denied by the City Council on August 6, 2020 (6-0 vote). The only difference in the proposals is that in 2020, the applicant was proposing a mixed-residential development with a total of 15 dwelling units as part of a Planned Development request (if the rezoning to R-6 was approved). Now, the applicant is proposing an all townhouse (single-family detached) development consisting of 16 dwelling units. However, the applicant's conceptual site plan does not comply with all the "conventional" development standards for Townhouse development (mainly unit width, and private street design), and this proposal can only be achieved through either a Planned Development proposal (separate request) or through a series of Variances approved by ZBOA. Most significantly of these, the minimum lot width for R-6 townhouses is 24' and the applicant is only depicting 13.5' on their site plan, and the access to each lot must be through a conventional right-of-way.

Density and infill development discussion. The subject property is a classic example of a proposal for infill development. Under R-15 zoning, the property has enough land area (78,500 square feet) for up to 5 single-family lots. However, it does not have enough road frontage along Eager Road for more than one lot (each lot must be at least 100' wide and contain at least 15,000 s.f. of land area). The only solution for subdividing this property conventionally under R-15 zoning is to construct a new street (50' right-of-way) along the eastern property line with a cul-de-sac 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.