



**Zoning Committee**

---

**REQUEST**

Current Zoning: R-3 (single family residential)  
Proposed Zoning: UR-2(CD) (urban residential, conditional)

**LOCATION**

Approximately 3.01 acres located on the north side of Runnymede Lane, east of Selwyn Avenue.  
(Council District 6 - Bokhari)

**PETITIONER**

Hopper Communities, Inc.

---

**ZONING COMMITTEE  
ACTION/ STATEMENT  
OF CONSISTENCY**

The Zoning Committee voted 6-1 to recommend APPROVAL of this petition and adopt the consistency statement as follows:

This petition is found to be consistent with the *Central District Plan*, based on the information from the staff analysis and the public hearing and because:

- The plan recommends residential uses up to four dwelling units per acre.

Therefore, we find this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest based on information from the staff analysis and the public hearing and because:

- The petition limits the number of townhome units to 26 and the density to 8.65 units per acre, which is consistent with the General Development Policies; and
- The rezoning will allow the property to serve as a transition between the Runnymede Lane, a major thoroughfare, and single family detached uses to the rear of the site; and
- Architectural standards for the proposed units address building materials and include proposed building elevations; and
- The proposed development improves the site frontage with an eight-foot planting strip and 12-foot multi-use path which will improve both safety and the pedestrian experience; and

Motion/Second: McClung / Spencer

Yeas: Majeed, McClung, McMillan, Nelson, Spencer, and Sullivan

Nays: Fryday

Absent: None

Recused: None

**ZONING COMMITTEE  
DISCUSSION**

Staff provided a summary of the petition and noted that at the public hearing staff recommended approval upon resolution of the outstanding issues. Applicant had made some progress in addressing most of the issues. The petition is consistent with the *Central District Plan* and the General Development Policies for increased density.

Several commissioners had questions about density, buffers, and impact on the adjacent single-family homes on the eastern and western property lines.

Staff responded that the density was consistent with the General Development Policies (GDP) and the townhome development would provide a transition along Runnymede Lane. Staff explained that the developer provided a 30-foot tree save area with additional tree and shrub plantings along the western property line to screen the proposed retaining walls. The petitioner lowered the height of the walls adjacent to the existing single-family home on the western property line.

During the discussion staff noted that the urban residential district does not require a buffer but one is typically requested by staff during the rezoning process when the subject site is adjacent to existing single-family neighborhoods. Staff noted that the retaining walls are needed due to the design, topography, and layout of the site.

The Commission discussed how the site could develop under the current R-3 (single family residential) zoning and compared it to the request. One Commissioner noted that they did not have an issue with the density and the architecture is good. The challenge is dealing with the topography..

One Commissioner noted that they could not support the petition due to the lack of buffers along the western and eastern property lines and height of the proposed buildings along Runnymede Lane due to the grade changes.

Commissioners considered deferring the petition to allow more time for compromise on the buffers to the east and west, acknowledging that this was a difficult site. They suspended the rules to ask the petitioner if he was willing to defer. The applicant indicated willingness, but said that economics were tight already, and there was little more he could do to increase the distances. The Applicant was asked why the tallest building product was placed where the retaining walls were already highest along Runnymede, and the reply was it the product they wanted there.

There was no further discussion of this petition.

**MINORITY OPINION**

The dissenting commissioner indicated their objection to the tall retaining walls compounded by the tallest structure there, and lack of distance to adjoining properties to the east and west.

**Planner**

Solomon Fortune (704) 336-8326