



GLPC AGENDA ITEM # 7

AUGUST 31, 2026

Planned Development approval by RST Construction File #: VA-2026-10

RST Construction is requesting Planned Development master plan approval of a non-conventional residential development in a Single-Family Residential (R-15) zoning district. The subject property consists of two parcels totaling 30.63 acres located at the NW corner of Cherry Creek Road and Lake Laurie Drive. The property is currently undeveloped. The applicant is proposing to replat and develop the property with 87 single-family dwellings in phases on small individual lots, arranged throughout a designated open space area along a private street system that has gated access from the public streets outside the development. Lot sizes will average just a little more than 6,000 square feet, with homes mandated to be at least 2,100-sf of indoor heated floor area and a maximum of 2 floors. The overall development will feature a perimeter buffer yard with walking trails, an HOA with restrictive covenants, lots of open space with onsite amenities. Please refer to the attached draft master plans and schematics (7 pages), as well as the Letter of Intent for additional development details.

On the Future Development Map of the Comprehensive Plan, the subject property is split between a **Parks/Recreation/Conservation (PRC)** Character Area for the western lake parcel (8.46 acres), and an **Established Residential (ER)** Character Area for the remaining large parcel (22.17 acres). R-15 is a compliant zoning district within each of these Character Areas.

The subject property has had a history of two (2) controversial Zoning-related requests. The first of these was in 2007 by a different applicant/owner (file # VA-2007-25, applicants = Mark Courson and Cove Partners LLC) for the 22-acre main parcel. This was a request to rezone to PRD to allow a very similar planned development consisting of 78 single-family homes on small lots. This request generated a tremendous amount of controversy with the nearby property owners, and after some tablings, it was eventually withdrawn by the applicant before reaching final public hearing by the City Council. The second of these requests was nearly 19 years later (this past spring) (file # VA-2026-02, by the current applicant) to rezone a 5.20 acre portion of the main parcel from R-15 to R-M. The main purpose of this request was to set the stage for a future “mixed-residential” Planned Development request, by increasing the potential density of the overall property and introducing a multi-family residential component to the proposal. This request also generated a large amount of controversy with nearby property owners, and it was withdrawn on March 27th by the applicant before reaching the GLPC public hearing.

In spite of the apparent high-quality nature of this proposal, and all the proposed amenities of the development which go beyond the minimums required by R-15 zoning, planning staff has some very major concerns about the overall density of the proposed development and stretching the limits of what should be considered eligible for Planned Development under R-15 zoning.

The entire subject property totals 30.63 acres. When dividing this raw acreage by R-15 density (15,000-sf lot size), the result is 88 lots which is considered the “absolute maximum” that can be considered for such a Planned Development without utilizing any potential bonus densities that might otherwise be requested. However, when more realistically considering this in terms of conventional R-15 development, this reduces to a maximum total of 66 lots (when assuming a typical 25% acreage reduction due to the use of rights-of-way for internal access, some open space areas and some of the lots exceeding the R-15 minimum areas). However, this analysis is still somewhat misleading by virtue of the fact that the 8.46 acre “pond parcel” is mostly unbuildable area. When calculating the maximum allowable # dwelling units for just the 22.17 acres, the total gross acreage would yield just 64 units. When subtracting-out 25% for rights-of-way etc., this number reduces to a maximum of 48 dwelling units. Therefore, in terms of just the raw numbers, it is clear that the proposal for