

FILE NO.: Z-8170-D

NAME: Pinnacle at Maumelle Long-form Conceptual PCD Revocation

LOCATION: Located at 25616 Highway 10

DEVELOPER:

RET Development LLC
P.O. Box 242116
Little Rock, AR 72223

ENGINEER:

White-Daters and Associates
24 Rahling Circle
Little Rock, AR 72223

AREA: 37.56 acres NUMBER OF LOTS: 6 FT. NEW STREET: 915 LF

WARD: N/A PLANNING DISTRICT: 29 - Barrett CENSUS TRACT: 42.01

CURRENT ZONING: PCD

ALLOWED USES: C-2 and O-2 uses and the allowance of a convenience store

UNDERLYING ZONING: R-2, Single-family

BACKGROUND:

Ordinance No. 19,720 adopted by the Little Rock Board of Directors on April 3, 2007, rezoned the site from R-2, Single-family to PCD. The developer proposed to construct a cul-de-sac northwest through the middle of the property to develop six (6) lots. Lots 1 and 6 were to be developed using C-2, Shopping Center District uses and the allowance of a convenience store on any one (1) of the lots. Lots 2 through 5 would develop using O-2, Office and Institutional District uses with the allowance of ten (10) percent of the total building square footage to be used as an accessory uses as allowed per the O-2, Office and Institutional Zoning District. The request also included utilizing the existing office and parking for an office use, general and professional office, until the property was redeveloped. The lots were indicated in excess of three (3) acres; ranging from 3.01 to 11.49 acres.

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 has stated the development will not occur as planned. The owner is requesting the PCD zoning be revoked and the R-2, Single-family Zoning District zoning be restored.

B. EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The site was formerly used as a golf driving range and there is a single building located near the southwestern portion of the site. The area has a mixture of uses and zoning. A number of the properties in the area are zoned AF, Agricultural and Forestry. There are two commercially zoned properties located to the west, a site zoned C-1, Neighborhood Commercial, which is vacant and a site zoned PCD which is developed with a number of buildings which allows C-1, Neighborhood Commercial uses, limited outdoor storage and auto sales, as allowable uses for the site.

C. NEIGHBORHOOD COMMENTS:

The Nowlin Creek Neighborhood Association was notified of the public hearing.

D. SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE COMMENT: (July 20, 2016)

The applicant was present. Staff presented the item stating the request was a revocation of the previously approved PCD zoning. Staff stated the previously approved development did not occur and the owners were requesting the PCD zoning be revoked and the R-2, Single-family Zoning District zoning be restored. 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 R-2, Single-family Zoning District zoning be restored.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

(AUGUST 11, 2016)

The applicant was present. There were no registered objectors present. Staff presented the item with a recommendation the current PCD zoning classification be revoked and the previously held R-2, Single-family Zoning District zoning be restored. There was no further discussion. The item was placed on the consent agenda and approved as recommended by staff by a vote of 9 ayes, 0 noes and 2 absent.