

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 question 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 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.

Staff finds R-10 zoning consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the Standards for the Exercise of Zoning Power (SFEZP) and therefore recommends approval of R-10 zoning instead, to the City Council.

Commissioner Rountree asked if the interior road would be a public roadway. Ms. Martin responded it would be a private drive. Commissioner J Miller asked what is different with this request from the previous request. Ms. Martin stated it is essentially the same final request made last time, but not what was initially presented in the information packets. Commissioner Bailey inquired about the feasibility of townhomes. Mr. Martin stated townhomes are not allowed in R-10, but 4 “doors” would be available. Commissioner Rountree asked if the new layout would create more buffering. Mr. Martin confirmed but said it also puts the driveways in the front.

There being no further questions for staff, Chairman Miller opened the Public Hearing portion of the case.

Speaking in favor of the request:

- Matthew Inman, Engineer for the Applicant – 2704 N Oak St. Ext.