



GLPC AGENDA ITEM # 6 MARCH 30, 2026

Rezoning Request by RST Construction File #: VA-2026-02

RST Construction (Rusty Trancygier), on behalf of Connell Cabinets Inc. (Phillip Connell), is requesting to rezone 5.20 acres from Single-Family Residential (R-15) to Multi-Family Residential (R-M). The subject property is a proposed parcel of land located along the north side of Lake Laurie Drive, approximately 200 feet west of Cherry Creek Road. The property is currently vacant, and the applicant is proposing to develop the site with an upscale multi-family residential complex, consisting of eight (8) four-story buildings with eight (8) dwelling units each, for a total of 64 dwelling units. The actual size of each dwelling is unknown, but each is proposed to be a 3-bedroom unit. Each unit is proposed to be marketed and sold individually (as condo style).

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-M zoning.

** The subject property was part of a controversial Rezoning request (for about 22 acres) which was to rezone from R-15 to Planned Residential Development (PRD), for a proposed high-density single-family development (casefile # VA-2007-25, applicants = Mark Courson and Cove Partners LLC). That request was initially tabled by the Planning Commission & City Council for one month, and then WITHDRAWN by the applicant before reaching a final vote by City Council. No other public hearings on the subject property have since been held.

For this current rezoning proposal, it is very important to note that this is for only a PORTION of the overall property that was being considered in 2007, and there is no proposed change to the remaining R-15 zoning area in terms of use or development standards. The applicant's proposed conceptual site plan for this 5.2 acre site depicts the 8 proposed buildings along with 128 surface parking spaces. The applicant has indicated there will also be 8 parking spaces beneath each building, in the form of subterranean (below grade) parking areas. This yields a total of 192 parking spaces, which matches the total # proposed bedrooms. See attached conceptual drawings. It should also be emphasized that these plans are CONCEPTUAL, and have not yet been fully engineered nor submitted for any formal plan review process for actual permitting. Based on staff's cursory review for this rezoning request, a few deficiencies have been identified in terms of Zoning regulations. These include issues relating to buffer yards and building setbacks, distances between parking spaces and assigned dwelling units, as well as roof pitch of the proposed buildings. Staff believes all of these issues can be easily resolved by the applicant prior to formal plan review, or otherwise some specific Variances can be sought by the applicant through a separate public hearing process.

As a matter of procedure, rezoning requests are reviewed by staff for consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and the Standards for the Exercise of Zoning Power (SFEZP). Summary details of these items and their respective recommended findings are articulated on the following pages. Typically with most Rezoning requests, there will be some items that support the request and others that will not. Staff's overall findings in this particular case are mixed, but most of the rationale seems to lean against approval. It should be noted that the subject property and most all of its surroundings to the west of Cherry Creek Road, have been zoned R-15 for more than 35 years and developed as single-family residential for most of this time. There is no multi-family residential development nearby, and most of the developed properties exceed the minimum development standards of R-15 in terms of minimum lot size and minimum house size.

Staff strongly believes the development of this property should be residential, and it is simply just a question of how dense it should be. Given the surrounding geography and the property's proximity to a major neighborhood entrance, there is an argument to support at least a modest increase in density. However, the applicant's proposal is 3 levels higher than the existing R-15 (skipping over R-10 and R-6 zoning densities). This should truly be considered "spot zoning" and staff considers this disparity to be too excessive in light of the surrounding land use and zoning patterns which are very well-established.

Staff Recommendation: Find inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the Standards for the Exercise of Zoning Power (SFEZP), and recommend **DENIAL** to the City Council.