

FILE NO.: Z-9566

NAME: Hat Properties, LLC – PRD

LOCATION: 300 South Valentine Street

DEVELOPER:

Brian Teeter
315 Crystal Court
Little Rock, AR 72205

OWNER/AUTHORIZED AGENT:

Hat Properties – Owner
315 Crystal Court
Little Rock, AR 72205

SURVEYOR/ENGINEER:

Brooks Surveying, Inc.
20820 Arch Street Pike
Hensley, AR 72065

AREA: 0.06 acres

NUMBER OF LOTS: 1

FT. NEW STREET: 0 LF

WARD: 3

PLANNING DISTRICT: 9

CENSUS TRACT: 48

CURRENT ZONING:

R-3

VARIANCE/WAIVERS:

None requested.

A. PROPOSAL/REQUEST/APPLICANT'S STATEMENT:

The applicant proposes to update the zoning classification of the property to reflect the historical use of the property.

B. EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The property is located at the southwest corner of S. Valentine Street and West 3rd Street. The subject property contains of a four-plex apartment building which has existed on the property for over 40 years.

C. NEIGHBORHOOD COMMENTS:

All owners of property located within 200 feet of the site and all neighborhood associations registered with the City of Little Rock were notified of public hearing.

D. ENGINEERING COMMENTS:

1. A 20-foot radial dedication of right-of-way is required at the intersection of 3rd Street and Valentine Street.

E. UTILITIES/FIRE DEPARTMENT/PARKS/COUNTY PLANNING:

Little Rock Water Reclamation Authority: Sewer available at this site.

Entergy: No comments.

CenterPoint Energy: No comments.

AT & T: No comments received.

Central Arkansas Water: No comments received.

Fire Department: No comments.

Parks and Recreation: No comments received.

County Planning: No comments received.

F. BUILDING CODES/LANDSCAPE:

Building Code: No comments received.

Landscape: No comments.

G. TRANSPORTATION/PLANNING:

Rock Region Metro: No comments.

Planning Division: The request is in the I-630 Planning District. The Land Use Plans shows Residential Low Density (RL) for the requested area. The Residential Low Density (RL) category provides for single family homes at densities not to exceed 6 dwelling units per acre. Such residential development is typically characterized by conventional single-family homes but may also include patio or garden homes and cluster homes, provided that the density remains less than 6 units per acre. The application is to change R-3 (Single Family District) to PRD (Planned Residential Development) District to recognize the existing four-unit use of this property.

The Land Use Plan shows Residential Low Density (RL) in all directions from the site. The Residential Low Density (RL) category provides for single family homes at densities not to exceed 6 dwelling units per acre. Such residential development is typically characterized by conventional single-family homes but may also include patio or garden homes and cluster homes, provided that the density remains less than 6 units per acre. An existing single-family subdivision is in this area with homes on the lots.

Master Street Plan: To the north is 3rd Street and to the east is Valentine Street, both are Local Streets on the Master Street Plan. The primary function of Local Streets is to provide access to adjacent properties. Local Streets that are abutted by non-residential zoning/use or more intensive zoning than duplexes are considered as "Commercial Streets". These streets may require dedication of right-of-way and may require street improvements for entrances and exits to the site.

Bicycle Plan: There are no bike routes shown in the immediate vicinity.

H. ANALYSIS:

The applicant proposes to update the current zoning classification of property located at 300 South Valentine Street from "R-3" Single-Family Residential to "PRD" Planned Residential District. The existing two-story structure located on the property is comprised of a one (1) two-bedroom apartment and three (3) one-bedroom apartments. There are four (4) separate, exterior entrances with long established addresses located above each door. According to the applicant, "the property is currently being used as a four-plex and appears to have been operating as a four-plex for more than 40 years."

The City classifies the existing four-plex use of the property as nonconforming, based on the fact that the current use has existed for over 40 years. According to Section 36-152 (c) of the City's Zoning Ordinance... "Any rezoning of a property occupied by a nonconforming use shall be accomplished only through a planned development process." Therefore, the applicant is simply requesting the PRD zoning to recognize the historic use of the property.

The typical parking requirement for a four-plex property is six (6) off-street parking spaces. Currently, there is a one-story, two-car garage at the northwest corner of the property. There is also a parking pad for two (2) vehicles located in front of the garage. On-street parking is allowed on both sides of most of the streets in this area including South Valentine and 3rd Streets. Historically, the residents of this property have used on-street parking as well as on-site parking. Other residential properties in this general area also utilize on-street parking. Staff believes that parking is sufficient for the continued use of the four-plex.

The applicant provided responses and additional information to all issues raised during staff's review of the application. To staff's knowledge, there are no outstanding issues associated with this application. The applicant is requesting no variances with the proposed PRD rezoning.

Staff is supportive of the requested PRD rezoning to allow the continued use of the subject property as multi-family residential, containing one (1) four-plex structure. Staff believes the proposed PRD zoning and continued use of the property will have no adverse impact on the general area.

I. STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the requested PRD zoning, subject to compliance with the comments and conditions outlined in paragraph D, and the staff analysis, in the agenda staff report.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

(MARCH 11, 2021)

The applicant was present. There were no persons present registered in support or opposition. Staff presented the item and a recommendation of approval as outlined in the "staff recommendation" above. There was no further discussion. The item was placed on the Consent Agenda and approved as recommended by staff, including all staff comments and conditions. The vote was 11 ayes, 0 nays and 0 absent.