

87 dwelling units pushes these calculations to the extreme, and is well-beyond what would be normally expected for a proposed Planned Development under R-15 zoning.

Section 212-1 of the City's Land Development Regulations (LDR) spells out the purpose and intent of the Planned Development approvals and the prescribed objectives (see pages 6-7 for the complete text). One of these objectives is that they should "maintain general integrity and compatibility with the underlying zoning districts and their prescribed standards of use and development density." Section 212-2 of the LDR pertains to the relationships between Planned Development approval and the underlying zoning district. Included in this is the statement that "Planned Developments shall closely conform to the allowable uses and the development density standards of the zoning district which already applies to the subject property" (see page 7 for more of Section 212-2). This Section also states that all proposed deviations from the City's development standards shall be itemized and depicted as part of the proposal. These deviations are much like "variances" and for this particular case, they are itemized and described on page 4. Most of these deviations pertain to the basic (minimal) dimensional standards of R-15 zoning, such as lot sizes and minimum building setbacks. It should be clearly noted that for this Planned Development request, the ONLY basic R-15 zoning standards that are not being deviated, are the single-family residential use of the properties, the minimum dwelling floor area requirement of 1,200 square feet, and that only two (2) of the proposed 87 lots meeting the R-15 minimum lot width requirement of 100 feet. None of the 87 lots meet the minimum lot size requirement of 15,000 square feet. Only one (1) lot meets the R-10 standard of 10,000 square feet. The average lot size for all 87 lots combined (12.13 acres) is only 6,073 square feet. If you subtract the 2 largest lots of the proposed development, this average for the remaining 85 lots falls to just 5,960 square feet which does not even meet the minimum requirement of R-6 zoning. It should also be noted that the minimum lot widths for 84 of these lots are depicted as ranging from 45 feet to 58 feet, which is far less than the 100 feet normally required in R-15 and even less than the 60 feet required in R-6. However, the applicant is proposing a minimum dwelling unit size of 2,100 square feet which far exceeds the minimum 1,200 square feet requirement of R-15. However, to accomplish this on such smaller lots, the applicant is proposing greatly reduced minimum building setbacks from all sides of the lot; 10 feet in the front, 5 feet on both sides, and a range of 3-5 feet in the rear. (refer to the lot information table on the master plan drawings for more detail).

The applicant has also submitted a series of building schematics/renderings that appear to be borrowed from another residential development in another community. These are very conceptual in nature and intended to simply give example of the proposed architectural styles being contemplated for this particular development. Staff's concern is that without this conceptual nature being clearly understood, these schematics/renderings seem to be misleading in terms of how the buildings appear to be spaced farther apart and farther from the street, than what is actually being depicted in the proposed layout (site) plans. For example, the proposed minimum development standards indicate dwellings with pitched roofs that are 2-story (and potentially 30 feet) tall, only 10 feet apart from one another, only 10 feet back from the street curb, and therefore very likely to have short driveways that are not adequate to contain most vehicles.

Again, in spite of the apparent high-quality nature of this proposal, planning staff is very concerned about its overall high density elements which are inconsistent with R-15 zoning, inconsistent with the established development pattern of the adjacent Cherry Creek Hills subdivisions, as well as the purpose and intent of the City's Planned Development process.

Staff Recommendation: Find inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the Planned Development Review Criteria, and recommend **DENIAL** to the City Council.