

FILE NO.: Z-8262-C

---

NAME: Rowan Village Long-form PCD Revocation

LOCATION: Located on the east side of South Shackelford Road in the 2700 Block

DEVELOPER:

Rowan Development LLC  
12206 West Markham Street  
Little Rock, AR 72211

ENGINEER:

Crafton, Tull, Sparks  
10825 Financial Center Parkway  
Little Rock, AR 72211

AREA: 22 ± acres      NUMBER OF LOTS: 41      FT. NEW STREET: 1,563 LF

WARD: 6      PLANNING DISTRICT: I-430      CENSUS TRACT: 24.08

CURRENT ZONING: PCD

ALLOWED USES: Single-family, Multi-family, Office and Commercial

UNDERLYING ZONING: MF-12

---

BACKGROUND:

On November 8, 2007, the Little Rock Planning Commission reviewed a request for the rezoning of this site from MF-12 to PCD, Planned Development Commercial. The Board of Directors approved the rezoning request at their December 4, 2007, public hearing by the adoption of Ordinance No. 19,867.

The approval rezoned a 22 acre tract of land for a mixed use development. The development was proposed in three (3) phases. The first phase consisted of five (5) lots of commercial development located along Shackelford Road. The Phase II portion of the development consisted of residential townhouse units and the third phase indicated 30 lots for detached single-family residences.

The uses approved for the commercial lots were those allowed in C-3, General Commercial District excluding several specifically listed uses. The use of outdoor speakers or sound amplification systems was prohibited on the property except for one-half hour before and after the owner's or occupant's hours of being open to the general public. The operation of any such speaker and system was limited to those that did not emit sound that was plainly audible from Camp Aldersgate or a distance of 200 feet or more from the source of such sound.

The Phase II townhouses were attached structures three (3) stories in height with garages. The Phase III single-family residences were on lots which average 50-feet in width by 100-feet in depth with an alley system for rear loading garages. Buffers of existing and enhanced vegetation would be preserved between the development and Camp Aldersgate as well as adjacent to the skilled nursing facility to the east.

As a part of the application process the City's Future Land Use Plan (LU07-11-03) was amended and the alignment for Aldersgate Road was relocated to the north through the Camp Aldersgate property.

Ordinance No. 19,995 adopted by the Little Rock Board of Directors on July 15, 2008, allowed a revision to the previously approved PCD, Planned Commercial Development, request. The developers requested the following amendments and clarification to the previously approved PCD:

1. The original Lot 2 has been split into 2 separate lots as shown on the revised plans. The proposed Lot 2 will contain of a 2-story structure with 15,000 square feet total. The second floor will be at parking lot grade that faces Shackelford and the first floor will be at parking lot grade that faces east toward the creek. Lot 1 and Lot 3 will comply with the building square footage allowed by C-2, General Commercial Zoning District. The lots will also comply with the City's minimum landscape and buffer ordinance requirements. The maximum building height proposed is 27-feet as approved in the original PCD.
2. The original Lots 4 and 5 have been combined to make up a single Lot 5. The proposed Lot 5 will contain of a three (3) story structure with 45,000 square feet. All landscaping buffers will be as were originally approved.
3. The original Lot 3 will now be called out as Lot 4 and is proposed as a mixed use building. The building is proposed four stories with the first floor being a parking garage, the second floor containing office and retail and the third and fourth being town homes. The building footprint and overall layout have remained the same.
4. In order to build the streets and lots along Shackelford Road in Phase I, advanced grading in portions of Phase II and Phase III will be required. The request includes a variance from the Land Alteration Ordinance to allow grading of future phases with the initial development.

The overall residential density, allowed uses, agreements, conditions and landscape buffers that were approved with the original PCD, Planned Commercial Development, were to remain the same.

The applicant has indicated the development as previously proposed is not a viable project. The development has not occurred and the time for submission of the final development plan as expired. The request is for a revocation of the PCD, Planned Commercial Development zoning and the restoration of the underlying MF-12 Zoning District.

A. PROPOSAL/REQUEST/APPLICANT'S STATEMENT:

Per Section 36-454(d) The owner of an approved PD or PUD may, for cause, request repeal of the ordinance establishing the development when it has been determined that the development will not occur. A written request may be filed with the City staff at any time up to three (3) years after the date of adoption of the ordinance creating the PUD or PD. The request shall set forth the cause of the repeal.

According to the ordinance, the Planning Commission recommendation on the repeal request shall be forwarded to the Board of Directors for their consideration. The Board of Directors may grant or deny the request or return the request to the Planning Commission for further study. If the request is approved, an ordinance shall be adopted repealing the PUD or PD.

The owner is requesting the PCD zoning be revoked and the underlying MF-12, Multi-family District zoning be restored.

B. EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The site is a wooded site located on the east side of Shackleford Road near the intersection with Shackleford Pass. To the east of the site is Good Shepard Residential facilities with the skilled care nursing facility located along the eastern boundary of the site. To the west, across Shackleford Road, a 100 acre site which has developed as a shopping center development with office uses located along the southern boundary of the development. To the south of the site is vacant office zoned property and Our Way residential development. North of the site is Camp Aldersgate.

C. NEIGHBORHOOD COMMENTS:

The John Barrow Neighborhood Association was notified of the public hearing.

D. SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE COMMENT: (June 28, 2017)

The applicant was not present. Staff presented the item stating the request was a revocation of the previously approved PCD zoning. Staff stated the development previously proposed for the site was no longer a viable project and the current property owner was requesting the revocation. There was no further discussion of the item. The Committee then forwarded the item to the full Commission for final action.

E. STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends the current PCD zoning classification be revoked and the previously held MF-12, Multi-family District zoning be restored

---

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

(JULY 20, 2017)

The applicant was present. There was one (1) person present with concerns. Staff presented the item with a recommendation the current PCD zoning classification be revoked and the previously held MF-12, Multi-family District zoning be restored.

Mr. Jacob Chi stated he would yield his time to Ms. Murphy.

Ms. Sonya Murphy, CEO of Camp Aldersgate addressed the Commission with concerns. She stated the camp served children with special needs. She stated the integrity of the camp was the most important thing. She stated this camping experience was the only camping experience and time away from home that a number of the children experienced. She stated Camp Aldersgate was not opposed to the revocation but were concerned with how the site would develop in the future. She stated the concerns were traffic, lighting, building height and buffering.

Mr. Chi stated his family was very supportive of Camp Aldersgate and the service they provided. He stated in the past as well as in the future his family would work with Camp Aldersgate to develop a plan which would least impact their property. He stated his family did not buy property to flip or develop properties to sell. He stated there was not a development plan for the site. He stated once a plan was put in place he would return to the Commission for approval but not without support of Camp Aldersgate.

There was no further discussion. The Chair entertained a motion for approved of the item as recommended by staff. The vote carried by a vote of 9 ayes, 0 noes and 2 absent.