

FILE NO.: Z-9595

NAME: The Octonary – PD-R

LOCATION: Southeast corner of E. 16th Street and Barber Street

DEVELOPER:

Mike Orndorff Construction, LLC
609 E. 16th Street
Little Rock, AR 72202

OWNER/AUTHORIZED AGENT:

Haybar Properties, LLC – Owner
Mike Orndorff – Agent

SURVEYOR/ENGINEER:

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

AREA: 0.32 acre NUMBER OF LOTS: 8 FT. NEW STREET: 0 LF

WARD: 1 PLANNING DISTRICT: 7 CENSUS TRACT: 46

CURRENT ZONING: R-4

VARIANCE/WAIVERS: None requested.

A. PROPOSAL/REQUEST/APPLICANT'S STATEMENT:

The applicant proposes to rezone the 0.32 acre property from "R-4" Two-Family District to "PD-R" Planned District – Residential to allow an eight (8) lot, zero (0) lot line single family residential development.

B. EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The site is currently undeveloped. There are a few mature trees near the center of the site. Remnants of concrete from a previous development exist at the

northwest corner of the property. A paved alley right-of-way is located along the rear (east) property line.

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 the public hearing.

D. ENGINEERING COMMENTS:

1. Right-of-way maybe required to be dedicated. Provide existing right-of-way widths on the survey on 16th Street and Barber Street.
2. A 20 feet radial dedication of right-of-way is required at the intersection of E. 16th Street and Barber Street.
3. Repair or replace any curb, gutter, sidewalk and access ramps that are damaged and not in compliance with ADA recommendations in the public right-of-way prior to occupancy. Remove all curb cuts where access is not proposed with the plan.
4. Alley should be repaved the entire width of the alley right-of-way from parking area to E 16th Street.
5. Show proposed location for trash collection receptacles for each lot.
6. Label and dimension the dash lines on each side of the center property line. Provide utility and drainage easement on revised plat.
7. Is head-in parking proposed? How many parking spaces are proposed? Show alley on site plan.
8. In accordance with Section 32-8, no obstruction to visibility shall be located within a triangular area 50 ft back from the intersecting right-of-way line (or intersecting tangent lines for radial dedications) at the intersection of 16th Street with Barber Street.
9. The majority of the property is proposed to be impervious with roof and a paved parking area. Provide a Sketch Grading and Drainage Plan per Sec. 29-186 (e).
10. Damage to public and private property due to hauling operations or operation of construction related equipment from a nearby construction site shall be repaired by the responsible party prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.
11. Show proposed location(s) of USPS cluster box units in conformance with USPS and City of Little Rock policy design standards.

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

Little Rock Water Reclamation Authority: Sewer main extension required with easements if new sewer service is required for Lots 5-8 of this project.

Entergy: No comments received.

CenterPoint Energy: No comments received.

AT & T: No comments received.

Central Arkansas Water: No comments received.

Fire Department:

Maintain Access:

Fire Hydrants.

Maintain fire apparatus access roads at fire hydrant locations as per Appendix D of the 2012 Arkansas Fire Prevention Code Vol. 1 **Section D103.1 Access road width with a hydrant.** Where a fire hydrant is located on a fire apparatus access road, the minimum road width shall be 26 feet, exclusive of shoulders.

Grade

Maintain fire apparatus access roads as per Appendix D of the 2012 Arkansas Fire Prevention Code Vol. 1 **Section D103.2 Grade. Fire apparatus access roads shall not exceed 10 percent in grade except as approved by the fire chief. If the grade exceeds 10 percent, approval will be denied and the applicant must submit request to be reviewed by Fire Chief for Approval.**

Loading

Maintain fire apparatus access road design as per Appendix D of the 2012 Arkansas Fire Prevention Code Vol. 1 **Section D102.1 Access and loading.** Facilities, buildings or portions of buildings hereafter constructed shall be accessible to fire department apparatus by way of an approved fire apparatus access road with an asphalt, concrete or other approved driving surface capable of supporting the imposed load of fire apparatus weighing at least 75,000 pounds.

One- or Two-Family Residential Developments.

As per Appendix D, Section D107.1 of the Arkansas Fire Prevention Code Vol. 1, One- or Two-Family dwelling residential developments. Developments of one- or two-family dwellings where the number of dwelling units exceeds 30 shall be provided with two separate and approved fire apparatus access roads, and shall meet the requirements of Section D104.3.

Exceptions:

1. Where there are **more than 30 dwelling units** on a single public or private fire apparatus access road and all dwelling units are equipped throughout with an approved **automatic sprinkler system** in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1, 903.3.1.2 or 903.3.1.3 of the Arkansas Fire Code, access from two directions shall not be required.
2. The number of dwelling units on a single fire apparatus access road shall not be increased unless fire apparatus access roads will connect with future development, as determined by the fire code official.

Fire Hydrants

Locate Fire Hydrants as per Appendix C of the 2012 Arkansas Fire Prevention Code. Section C101 – C105, in conjunction with Central Arkansas Water (Daniel Tull 501-377-1245) and the Little Rock Fire Marshal's Office (Capt. Tony Rhodes 501-918-3757, or Fire Marshal Derek N. Ingram 501-918-3756 Number and Distribution of Fire Hydrants as per Table C105.1.

Parks and Recreation: No comments received.

County Planning: No comments.

F. **BUILDING CODES/LANDSCAPE:**

Building Code: No comments received.

Landscape:

1. Any new site development must comply with the City's minimal landscape and buffer ordinance requirements.
2. A perimeter planting strip is required along any side of a vehicular use area that abuts adjoining property or the right-of-way of any street. A twenty-five (25) percent reduction of the landscape provisions can be taken for developments within mature areas. In these areas it is allowable for perimeter planting strips to be a minimum of six (6) feet nine (9) inches wide. One (1) tree and three (3) shrubs or vines shall be planted for every thirty (30) linear feet of perimeter planting strip.
3. Screening requirements will need to be met for the vehicular use areas adjacent to street rights-of-way. Provide screening shrubs with an average linear spacing of not less at three (3) feet within the required landscape area. Provide trees with an average linear spacing of not less than thirty (30) feet.
4. For parking areas with twelve or more spaces eight percent (8%) of the vehicular use area must be designated for green space; this green space needs to be evenly distributed throughout the parking area(s). The minimum size of

an interior landscape area shall be one hundred fifty (150) square feet for developments with one hundred fifty (150) or fewer parking spaces.

5. Building landscape areas shall be provided between the vehicular use area used for public parking and the general vicinity of the building. These shall be provided at the rate equivalent to planter strip three (3) feet wide along the vehicular use area. One (1) tree and four (4) shrubs shall be planted in the building landscape areas for each forty (40) linear feet of vehicular use area abutting the building.
6. The City Beautiful Commission recommends preserving as many existing trees feasible on this site. Credit toward fulfilling Landscape Ordinance requirements can be given when preserving trees of six (6) inch caliper or larger.

G. TRANSPORTATION/PLANNING:

Rock Region Metro: No comments received.

Planning Division: The request is in the I-30 Planning District. The Land Use Plan shows Residential Medium Density (RM) for the requested area. Residential Medium Density (RM) category accommodates a broad range of housing types including single family attached, single family detached, duplex, town homes, multi-family and patio or garden homes. Any combination of these and possibly other housing types may fall in this category provided that the density is between six (6) and twelve (12) dwelling units per acre. The application is to change R-4 (Two Family District) to PDR (Planned Development Residential) District to allow for the future development of 8 units on 0.32 acres for a density of 25 units/acre. The Land Use Plan shows Residential Medium Density (RM) in all directions from the site. Residential Medium Density (RM) category accommodates a broad range of housing types including single family attached, single family detached, duplex, town homes, multi-family and patio or garden homes. Any combination of these and possibly other housing types may fall in this category provided that the density is between six (6) and twelve (12) dwelling units per acre. The areas to the east, north and south are part of the subdivision making up the Hanger Hill neighborhood. Most of the lots in this area have single-family houses or duplexes on them. To the west is the right-of-way for the Interstate 30-Interstate 630 interchange.

Master Street Plan: To the north is East 16th Street and to the west is Barber Street. Both of these roads are a Local Street 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 rezone the 0.32 acre property located at the southeast corner of East 16th Street and Barber Street from “R-4” Two-Family District to “PD-R” Planned District – Residential. The property is comprised of two (2) platted lots; Lots 11 and 12, Block 31, Masonic Addition. The rezoning is proposed in order to subdivide the lots into eight (8) lots for a zero (0) lot line single family residential development. The proposed lots will be sold individually.

Four (4) of the proposed lots will be 34 feet by 50 feet in area, with the other four (4) lots having an area of 26 feet by 50 feet. Parking will be located at the east end of the lots and accessed from the existing paved alley right-of-way. There will be a 14 foot wide utility and access easement through the center of the property which will allow access from the parking to the residences.

The proposed residences on Lots 1 and 5 will be 22 feet by 35 feet in area. The proposed residences will have building setbacks ranging from four (4) feet to 10 feet.

The proposed residences on Lots 2, 3, 6 and 7 will be 18 feet by 35 feet in area. The proposed residences will have building setbacks ranging from zero (0) feet to 10 feet.

The proposed residences on Lots 4 and 8 will have building areas of 24 feet by 35 feet. These proposed residences will have building setbacks ranging from zero (0) feet to 10 feet.

The proposed residences will be one (1) and two (2) story structures. The structures will not exceed 35 feet in height, which is the typical maximum building height in single family zones. The residences will be constructed using a mixture of brick, Hardie siding, vinyl, metal and wood for the exterior façade materials.

The applicant is proposing 10 parking spaces at the east end of the proposed development to serve the proposed residences. The parking spaces will be accessed from the existing paved alley right-of-way along the east property line. The applicant will need to form a property owners’ association to address maintenance of the proposed parking area. The ordinance typically requires one (1) parking space for a single family residence. One (1) or two (2) of the proposed parking spaces may have to be eliminated to provide required landscaping. Either way, staff believes there is sufficient parking to serve the proposed residences.

The applicant is proposing a mail kiosk along the East 16th Street frontage. The mailbox kiosk location must be constructed in conformance with USPS and City of Little Rock design standards and be ADA accessible.

The applicant also notes that trash will be collected using standard City of Little Rock garbage collection.

There is no signage proposed for this development.

Any site lighting must be low-level and directed away from adjacent properties.

The applicant provided responses and additional information to all issues raised during staff's review of the application. The applicant is requesting no variances with the proposed PD-R zoning.

To staff's knowledge, the only outstanding issue relates to the required sight/distance at the corner of East 16th Street and Barber Street. A portion of the proposed residential structure on Lot 4 is located within the required sight triangle at this intersection. Staff believes this issue can be resolved with a smaller proposed building footprint for this lot. The applicant will need to resolve this issue by proposing a smaller building footprint to be approved by the City prior to application for a building permit.

Staff is supportive of the requested PD-R zoning to allow an eight (8) lot, zero (0) lot line single family residential development. Staff views the request as reasonable. The property is located in an area predominately zoned R-4. There is a scattering of duplex and multi-unit structures throughout this area. A similar small lot single family residential development is located to the southwest across I-30. The proposed development will represent a quality in-fill type development. Staff believes the proposed increased density will have no adverse impact on the surrounding properties.

I. STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the requested PD-R zoning, subject to compliance with the comments and conditions outlined in paragraphs D, E and F, and the staff analysis, of the agenda staff report.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

(JULY 8, 2021)

The applicant was not present. There were two (2) objectors present. Staff informed the Commission that the application needed to be deferred based on the fact that the applicant was not present.

There was a motion to defer the application to the August 12, 2021 Planning Commission agenda. The motion passed by a vote of 8 ayes, 0 nays, 2 absent and 1 open position. The application was deferred.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

(AUGUST 12, 2021)

Mike Orndorff was present, representing the application. There were four (4) persons registered in opposition. Staff presented the item and a recommendation for approval as outlined in the “staff recommendation” above. The applicant deferred to the registered opposition.

Tommie Threats, Judy Smith, Royce McCuien and William Hansen Jr. addressed the Commission in opposition to the application. They expressed similar concerns regarding density – too many houses in one area, congestion and traffic.

Mike Orndorff, addressed the Commission and provided response regarding registered opposition concerns. He stated he has developed forty (40) plus properties in the area for both starter and large scale homes and all have been in compliance with the Code.

Commissioner Hart commented the future of the area is developing and will not remain single-family residences with the growth of the I-30 corridor.

Commissioner Betton asked staff what was its recommendation was regarding several homes located in one area. Staff responded by stating the application is recommended for approval. PD-R zoning is a design with specific criteria and this application complies with PD-R zoning.

Commissioner Rahman asked staff, “what the scattering of R-4 zoning” meant. Staff provided a response stating R-4 zoning is scattered throughout the general area of the proposed development.

Commissioner Hart requested the applicant provide a diagram of the proposed development. The applicant provided an enlarged site plan to the Commission.

Commissioner Brooks ask the applicant if he met with the neighborhood association regarding the proposal. The applicant replied messages were left and signs posted, however he did not get a response from the neighborhood association.

Tommie Threats, Judy Smith, Royce McCuien and William Hansen Jr. addressed the Commission with additional opposition to the application.

There was a motion to approve the application. The motion was seconded. The vote was 10 ayes, 0 nays, and 1 open position. The application was approved.