

CITY COUNCIL MEMO

2023-502

MEETING OF MARCH 21, 2023

TO: Mayor Jordan and City Council

THRU: Susan Norton, Chief of Staff

Jonathan Curth, Development Services Director Jessica Masters, Development Review Manager

FROM: Donna Wonsower, Planner

DATE:

SUBJECT: RZN-2023-0004: Rezoning (2910 N. OLD WIRE RD. / VAN SCYOC, 255): Submitted by

JORGENSEN AND ASSOCIATES for property located at 2910 N Old Wire Rd in WARD 3. The property is zoned RSF-4, RESIDENTIAL SINGLE-FAMILY, FOUR UNITS PER ACRE and R-A, RESIDENTIAL AGRICULTURE, contains approximately 14.70 acres. The request is to rezone the property to R-A, RESIDENTIAL AGRICULTURE on 5.75

acres and NC, NEIGHBORHOOD CONSERVATION on 9.54 acres.

RECOMMENDATION:

City Planning staff and the Planning Commission recommend approval of a request to rezone the subject property as described and shown in the attached Exhibits 'A' and 'B'.

BACKGROUND:

The subject property is located in east Fayetteville, roughly 700 feet west of the intersection of N Crossover Rd. and N Old Wire Rd. The property's zoning is currently split between RSF-4, Residential Single-Family, Four (4) Units per Acre on the western half and R-A, Residential Agriculture on the eastern half. Except for a one single family house, the three parcels (cumulatively 14.7 acres) are undeveloped. The entire property is covered with extensive tree canopy. The eastern half is part of the streamside protection zone / floodplain & floodway of Niokaska Creek and is largely designated as part of the Enduring Green Network.

Request: The request is to shift the alignment of the existing R-A, Residential Agriculture zoning district to follow the boundary of the 100-year flood line, and to rezone the remainder of the property to NC, Neighborhood Conservation.

Public Comment: Five (5) members of the public offered comments in opposition of the item via email. Among their concerns were the potential increase in traffic, environmental concerns, negative impact on home values and neighborhood character, and lacking existing infrastructure including schools. One (1) member of the public emailed in support of the project. Additional members of the public spoke in person at the meeting, a summary of which is included below.

Land Use Compatibility: Staff finds the request to be compatible with the surrounding context. Residential uses and densities located near the subject property vary substantially. Neighboring properties are of a variety of sizes but generally follow a cul-de-sac development pattern. The existing and proposed zoning districts have

Mailing address:

similar allowable uses, but the NC includes urban form setbacks rather than traditional setbacks. When compared to RSF-4, rezoning to NC will decrease the lot area minimum for single and two-family uses from 8,000 and 12,000 square feet respectively to 4,000 sf. In addition, NC would have a build-to zone of 25 feet rather than a front setback of 15 feet, and a rear setback of 5 feet rather than 15 feet. NC requires a 40-foot lot width minimum while RSF-4 requires a 70-foot lot width minimum for single-family dwellings and an 80-foot lot width minimum for two-family dwellings. Conversely, both NC and RSF-4 include up to a three-story height limit.

Since the subject property contains roughly 8.14 acres of RSF-4, a maximum of thirty-two (32) units are permitted under current entitlements, where the proposed rezoning to 9.54 acres of NC would increase the density cap to ninety-five (95) units. That said, any future development would be subject to, and limited by, minimum parking requirements, tree preservation, drainage, and access management standards.

Land Use Plan Analysis: Staff finds the proposal is consistent with the goals in City Plan 2040 and the future land use designation for this location. Rezoning from RSF-4 to NC serves to contribute towards City Plan 2040 Goal #1– Appropriate Infill; #4– Growing a Livable Transportation Network, #5– We Will Assemble an Enduring Green Network, and #6– Create Opportunities for Attainable Housing. The site scores moderately on the Infill Scoring Matrix due to water/sewer access, public parks and trails, and the proximity of fire station #5. The RSF-4 and NC have similar allowed uses. However, because of the flexible zoning regulations associated with the NC district, rezoning may allow for redevelopment or added density while maintaining more tree canopy and natural areas than would be possible under the more Euclidean RSF-4 zoning district.

CITY PLAN 2040 INFILL MATRIX: City Plan 2040's Infill Matrix indicates 5 attributes for this site that may contribute to appropriate infill. The following elements of the matrix contribute to the score:

- Adequate Fire Response (Station #5, 2979 N Old Wire Rd.)
- Near Sewer Main (8" sewer main, N Old Wire Rd.)
- Near Water Main (6" water main, N Old Wire Rd.)
- Near City Park (Gulley Park)
- Near Paved Trail (Niokaska Creek Trail)

DISCUSSION:

At the February 27, 2023 Planning Commission meeting, a vote of 5-2-1 forwarded the request to City Council with a recommendation of approval. Commissioner Brink made the motion and Commissioner McGetrick seconded. Commissioner Holcomb recused himself for this item. Commissioners in favor of the rezoning found the intent of Neighborhood Conservation to be compatible with RSF-4, allowing for more flexible, walkable development. They also noted that although the property is not directly located in an urban growth center on the 2040 plan's growth concept map (designated on a scale of 1-3 depending on intensity), it is between a tier 2 and a tier 3 center on a high-activity corridor. Per the plan, the tier centers identify key growth nodes and major areas that should be conserved for natural resources and open space (City Plan 2040, pg. 12). The commissioners voting in favor of the rezoning also cited the logical re-alignment of the R-A zoning with the floodplain. Commissioners Garlock and Madden voted no citing a low infill score, limited possibility for connectivity to surrounding properties, and the property not falling within the bounds of the tier 2 center, and misalignment with the future land use map and master street plan regional link.

Seven (7) members of the public spoke during the meeting. Discussion from the public focused primarily on compatibility with the existing neighborhood, drainage and flooding, density, increased traffic, environmental impact, insufficient schools, and the public hearing process.

