

LITTLE ROCK PLANNING COMMISSION
PLANNING – REZONING – CONDITIONAL USE HEARING
MINUTE RECORD

MAY 28, 2009

4:00 P.M.

I. Roll Call and Finding of a Quorum

A Quorum was present being ten (10) in number.

II. Members Present: Pam Adcock
William Changose
J. T. Ferstl
Troy Laha
Jerry Meyer
Obay Nunnley, Jr.
Billy Rouse
Candice Smith
Chauncey Taylor
Jeff Yates

Members Absent: Bill Rector

City Attorney: Cindy Dawson

III. Approval of the Minutes of the April 2, 2009 Meeting of the Little Rock Planning Commission. The Minutes were approved as presented.

LITTLE ROCK PLANNING COMMISSION
PLANNING – REZONING – CONDITIONAL USE HEARING

MAY 28, 2009

4:00 P.M.

I. OLD BUSINESS:

- A. LA0027 A Land Alteration Variance request from Section 29-190 for property located at 6900 Cantrell Road.

II. NEW BUSINESS:

<u>Item Number:</u>	<u>File Number:</u>	<u>Title</u>
1.	<u>G-23-409</u>	West Capitol Avenue – Partial Right-of-Way Abandonment 900 West Capitol Avenue
2.	<u>Z-8453</u>	Rezoning from C-3 to R-3 1423 Oak Street
3.	<u>Z-8454</u>	Love Day Care Family Home – Special Use Permit 7618 West 38 th Street
4.	<u>Z-8455</u>	Lewis Day Care Family Home – Special Use Permit 3417 N. Rodney Parham Road
5.	<u>Z-4336-II</u>	Arkansas Children’s Hospital – Zoning Site Plan Review West side Battery Street, between Maryland Avenue and West 10 th Street
6.	<u>Z-8451</u>	Breeding Multisectional Manufactured Homes – Conditional Use Permit North of 10716 Garrison Road and South of 10922 Garrison Road
7.	<u>Z-8452</u>	Allen Multisectional Manufactured Home – Conditional Use Permit 6301 Stagecoach Road
8.		Resolution of Support for the University District Plan

May 28, 2009

ITEM NO.: A

FILE NO.: LA-0027

NAME: Valley Heights Land Alteration Retaining Wall Variance Request

LOCATION: 6900 Cantrell Road

APPLICANT: Valley Heights Apartments II Limited Partnership

APPLICANT'S REPRESENTATIVE: David Henry

CURRENT ZONING: R5

VARIANCES/WAIVERS REQUESTED: An appeal request of the corrective action of a Notice of Violation dated March 3, 2009 requiring removal of the wall or some less minor modifications to comply with the Land Alteration Regulations. A variance request to exceed the maximum retaining wall height, maximum slope, and install alternative landscaping as found in Sec. 29-190 of the Land Alteration Regulations.

A. PROPOSAL/REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting an appeal of the corrective action of a Notice of Violation dated March 3, 2009 requiring removal of the wall or some less minor modifications to comply with the Land Alteration Regulations. The applicant is also requesting a variance from the Land Alteration Regulations to exceed the maximum retaining wall height, maximum slope, and install alternative landscaping as found in Sec. 29-190. The retaining wall is located on the southwest corner of Valley Heights Apartments at 6900 Cantrell Road. The retaining wall was installed during the construction of a new 3 story apartment building. The certificate of occupancy is being held until the issue is resolved to the City's satisfaction.

The retaining wall is out of compliance with the Land Alteration Regulations in the following way:

1. The wall is a total of 33 feet tall. The maximum allowable height of the entire terraced wall is 30 feet with 1 to 2 terraces. Each wall cannot exceed 15 feet in height;
2. The horizontal terrace bench of the wall is about 4.0 feet wide. The minimum allowable width of the horizontal terrace bench is 10 feet for two (2) 15 foot retaining walls;
3. Trees are not planted on the horizontal terrace bench of the wall. The Land Alteration Regulations require 2 rows of evergreen trees to be planted 5 feet between the rows and each tree staggered 15 feet apart.

B. EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The subject property is located on the north side of Cantrell Road just west of N. Hughes Street. The subject property is zoned R5. R2 zoned properties are located to the north. C3 zoned properties are located to the west. One of those properties is the Blackmon Chiropractic Clinic. To the south is Cantrell Road. Further to the south across Cantrell Road are C3 zoned properties such as Stein Mart, restaurants, and others. To the east are condominiums and apartments zoned R5. The retaining wall is only visible from within the property.

C. NEIGHBORHOOD COMMENTS:

Certified mail notices were sent by the applicant to neighboring properties as per ordinance requirements. As of this writing, staff has received various communications from Dr. Chris Blackmon, an adjacent property owner, stating concerns pertaining to the stability of the retaining wall. A phone call was also received from Gary Simmons of the Kingwood Neighborhood Association requesting a general explanation of the violations and other pertinent information.

D. ENGINEERING COMMENTS:

1. Retaining wall design plans prepared by a registered professional engineer have been provided to staff for review. Provide a letter prepared by a registered professional engineer certifying the retaining wall as constructed, not as designed, meets or exceeds necessary safety and stability factors for walls of this type.
2. The design drawings submitted to civil for review does not appear to match what was constructed at the site. Submit in written and electronic form an as-built plan showing:
 - a. the top and toe of the wall;
 - b. edge of excavation;
 - c. edge of clearing;
 - d. corresponding stationing as shown on the design plans; and
 - e. the dimensions of the highest course of the geogrid mats for all walls in the southwest portion of the property.

E. LANDSCAPE COMMENTS:

1. The site is more than 2 acres in size; therefore, any/all landscape plans should be stamped by a Registered Landscape Architect from the State of Arkansas.

2. Any/all newly planted landscaping must have an automatic irrigation system installed.
3. Due to the abnormality of the size and structure of the wall landscaping should included evergreen vegetation growing up the retaining walls, growing down the retaining walls, and include trees and/or large shrubs on the benches of the walls; within the limits of the structural capacity. (to be determined by your landscape architect).
4. Any/all disturbed areas about the wall or below the wall are to be re-established with vegetation to discourage run-off and/or erosion of the area(s).

F. SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE COMMENTS: (April 8, 2009)

Bruce Tidwell of Friday, Eldredge, and Clark and John Johnson of Henry Construction were present representing the applicant. Staff stated the comments as written above. Mr. Tidwell asked questions pertaining to the specifics of the certification and the as-built drawing. Jeff Yates told the applicant's representatives to meet with staff and work thru the comments. There was no further discussion of the item. The Committee then forwarded the item to the full Commission for final action.

G. ANALYSIS:

About half of the approximately 733 linear feet of retaining wall is out of compliance with the Land Alteration Regulation in at least two of the items listed below. The retaining wall is only visible from within the property. At the closest point, the newly constructed apartment building is located 6 inches from the retaining wall. Issues have been raised about the stability of the retaining walls. It is believed the anchoring geogrid mats were not installed at the lengths specified in the design plans.

The retaining walls are out of compliance with the Land Alteration Regulations in the following ways:

1. The walls are a total of 33 feet tall. The maximum allowable height of the entire terraced wall is 30 feet with 1 to 2 terraces. Each wall cannot exceed 15 feet in height;
2. The horizontal terrace bench of the wall is about 4.0 feet wide. The minimum allowable width of the horizontal terrace bench is 10 feet for two (2) 15 foot retaining wall;
3. Trees are not planted on the horizontal terrace bench of the wall. The Land Alteration Regulations require 2 rows of evergreen trees to be planted 5 feet between the rows and each tree staggered 15 feet apart.

The certificate of occupancy is being held until the noncompliance issues are resolved to the City's satisfaction.

During staff's building permit review process, the retaining walls shown on the grading and drainage plan was reviewed and found to be in conformance with the Land Alteration Regulations. However, the structural design drawings were not submitted to staff as required by code.

At some point, the wall design was then modified from the original configuration, however, plans were not submitted to staff for review. Further along in the construction process, the design plans were again revised and again not submitted to staff for review. In summary, a total of three (3) design plans were prepared for the walls and only the original set of plans were submitted to staff for review prior to construction.

Staff has received an as-built drawing of the wall prepared by a licensed surveyor. The wall shows to be constructed about 2.5 feet shorter than shown on the design plans. The lower wall is about 14.5 feet tall with a horizontal terrace of about 4 feet wide. The upper wall above the horizontal terrace is about 18.67 ft tall for a length of about 35 feet. The width requirement of the horizontal terrace is required for aesthetic purposes to provide a flat area for planting evergreen trees. It is not for structural purposes. The as-built drawing also showed the anchoring geogrid mats are shorter than shown on the design plans.

Based on the as-built drawing and visual inspection, the registered engineer who designed the wall submitted to staff a certification of the stability of the wall. He stated, "The overall upper wall stability meets or exceeds the factors of safety used in the original design." He also stated, "The wall should continue to perform in accordance with the standards or practice adequately over the long term." With the certification letter, the engineer also provided engineering analysis assuming the existing conditions of the wall. The analysis shows the strengths of the wall are twice the required factor of safety design strengths for sliding and overturning. The wall also exceeds 10 times the required factor of safety design strength for bearing capacity. The engineer observed visually the retaining wall and did not observe an wall face movement which he says would be indicative of improper geogrid placement.

The retaining wall is only visible from within the property. At the time of writing, staff has not received a landscape plan but has met with a registered landscape architect and agreed on the landscaping to be provided. Staff will receive the landscape plan prior to the hearing for confirmation of the provided landscaping.

Currently, the owner of the neighboring property to the southwest (Blackmon Chiropractic Clinic) and the applicant are in litigation pertaining to the retaining wall because during construction of the wall, it has been alleged that excavation

occurred on the neighboring property and portions of the wall's anchoring geogrid mats are installed on Dr. Blackmon's property. The trespassing on the neighboring property is a civil matter which the City is not a party to. As a result of the lawsuit, if the anchoring geogrid mats are required to be removed the wall will have to be modified or maybe rebuilt.

H. STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff has spent considerable time reviewing this application. Staff has several concerns about this variance. The original building permit plans provided to the City for approval were modified two (2) separate time after the building permit was issued and those changes were never resubmitted to staff for review. The original building permit plans complied with the Land Alteration Regulations. The two (2) revised plans did not.

Staff is concerned that the engineers and contractor designed and built this wall not in conformance with the approved building permit plans. It was known the wall was not in conformance with Land Alteration Regulations but still did not modify the plans to comply with the regulations; did not bring the noncompliance issue to the attention of staff; and proceeded to finish the wall and construct the apartment building just inches away.

Staff has concerns that the as-built drawing does not comply with any of the three (3) plans prepared by the engineer.

Staff is concerned about the lack of documentation by the contractor during the construction process for such a huge liability like a large retaining wall built so close to an apartment building. The documentation of construction of retaining wall is an industry standard.

Staff is concerned about the lack of planning by the engineer and the contractor in designing and building a wall with an apparent encroachment onto the adjacent property.

Staff has concerns about the stability of the wall. While the engineer has provided an as-built certification that the wall stability exceeds all factors of safety, his opinion could only be formed by looking at portions of the wall system. In the engineers words, it would be impossible to look at the entire system without removal of the wall. If the wall slides, overturns or collapses, human safety and property damage are at risk.

Staff recommends denial of the variance request.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

(APRIL 30, 2009)

The applicant was present. There were registered objectors present. Staff presented the item stating the applicant had submitted a request dated April 30, 2009, requesting deferral of the item to the May 28, 2009, public hearing. Staff stated the deferral

May 28, 2009

ITEM NO.: A (Cont.)

FILE NO.: LA-0027

request would require a waiver of the Commission's By-laws with regard to the late deferral request.

There was no further discussion of the item. A motion was made to waive the Commission's By-laws with regard to the late deferral request. The motion carried by a vote of 9 ayes, 0 noes and 2 absent. The chair entertained a motion for placement of the item on the consent agenda for deferral as recommended by staff. The motion carried by a vote of 9 ayes, 0 noes and 2 absent.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

(MAY 28, 2009)

Staff informed the Commission that the applicant submitted a letter on May 13, 2009 requesting the item be deferred to the June 25, 2009 Agenda. Staff supported the deferral request.

The Chairman placed the item before the Commission for inclusion within the Consent Agenda for deferral to the June 25, 2009 Agenda. A motion to that effect was made. The motion passed by a vote of 10 ayes, 0 nays and 1 absent. The application was deferred.

May 28, 2009

ITEM NO.: 1

FILE NO.: G-23-409

Name: West Capitol Avenue – Partial Right-of-Way Abandonment
Location: 900 West Capitol Avenue
Owner/Applicant: Capitol Avenue Properties, LLC/City of Little Rock
Request: To abandon the north 0.3 foot of the 80 foot wide West Capitol Avenue right-of-way adjacent to Lot 7, Block 252, Original City of Little Rock.
Purpose: To recognize encroachment of existing building.

STAFF NOTE:

Capitol Avenue Properties, LLC and the City of Little Rock are requesting to abandon the north 0.3 foot (3.6 inches) of the 80-foot wide West Capitol Avenue right-of-way adjacent to Lot 7, Block 252, Original City of Little Rock. The area of abandonment runs along the north side of West Capitol Avenue for 150 feet. This is an area of 45 square feet or 0.00103 acre. The abandonment is proposed to recognize the encroachment of the existing four (4) story office building at 900 West Capitol Avenue (formerly Dillard's).

STAFF REVIEW:

A. Public Need for this Right-of-Way:

As noted in paragraph G., of the utility companies who responded to staff, none have objection to the abandonment or request an easement. The City's Public Works Department has no comments on the abandonment request.

B. Master Street Plan:

The City's Master Street Plan currently designates West Capitol Avenue as Collector Street, with a minimum of 60 feet of right-of-way required. Over 60 feet of right-of-way will remain after the proposed abandonment.

C. Characteristics of Right-of-Way Terrain:

An existing four (4) story office building (formerly Dillard's) is located in the north 0.3 foot of the West Capitol Avenue right-of-way. The building is in the process of being remodeled.

D. Development Potential:

After development, the north 0.3 foot of the West Capitol Avenue right-of-way will be incorporated into Lot 7, Block 252, Original City of Little Rock to recognize the existing building encroachment.

E. Neighborhood and Land Use Effect:

The general area contains a mixture of uses within the UU (Urban Use) zoning district. There are restaurant uses to the east and southwest. A branch bank, multifamily residences and office buildings of various sizes are also located in the general area.

F. Neighborhood Position:

The Downtown Neighborhood Association was notified of the abandonment request. As of this writing, staff knows of no objectors to the abandonment request.

G. Effect on Public Services or Utilities:

Little Rock Wastewater: No objection.

Central Arkansas Water: No objection to abandonment.

Entergy: No Comment received.

CenterPoint Energy: No Comment received.

Southwestern Bell/AT& T: No Comment received.

H. Reversionary Rights:

This right-of-way was dedicated with the Original City of Little Rock Subdivision. The area of abandonment will eventually be incorporated into Lot 7, Block 252, Original City of Little Rock to eliminate the existing building encroachment.

I. Public Welfare and Safety Issues:

Abandoning this excess area of the West Capitol Avenue right-of-way will have no adverse impact on the public welfare and safety. The Little Rock Fire Department has reviewed and approved the abandonment request.

SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE COMMENT:

(APRIL 23, 2009)

Staff briefly described the proposed right-of-way abandonment. Staff explained that the abandonment was to recognize the existing encroachment of a four (4) story office building.

There being no outstanding issues for discussion, the Committee forwarded the issue to the full Commission for resolution.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the exclusive abandonment of the north 0.3 foot of West Capitol Avenue right-of-way, adjacent to Lot 7, Block 252, Original City of Little Rock.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

(MAY 28, 2009)

The applicant was present. There were no objectors present. Staff presented the application with a recommendation of approval.

The Chairman placed the item before the Commission for inclusion within the Consent Agenda for approval. A motion to that effect was made. The motion passed by a vote of 10 ayes, 0 nays and 1 absent. The application was approved.

May 28, 2009

ITEM NO.: 2

FILE NO.: Z-8453

Owner: Black Community Developers Program, Inc.
Applicant: Darryl Swinton
Location: 1423 Oak Street
Area: 0.14 Acres
Request: Rezone from C-3 to R-3
Purpose: To construct a single family home.
Existing Use: Undeveloped lot

SURROUNDING LAND USE AND ZONING

North – Single family residences; zoned R-3
South – Single family residences (across West 15th Street); zoned R-3
East – Single family residences; zoned R-3
West – Single family residences and vacant lot (across Oak Street);
zoned R-3

A. PUBLIC WORKS COMMENTS:

1. A 20-foot radial dedication of right-of-way is required at the intersection of Oak Street and West 15th Street.

B. PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT:

The site is not located on a CATA bus route. Route #3 (Baptist Medical Center Route) runs along West 12th Street to the north.

C. PUBLIC NOTIFICATION:

All owners of property located within 200 feet of the site, all residents within 300 feet who could be identified, and the Stephens Area Faith, Hope, Pine to Woodrow and Forest Hills Neighborhood Associations were notified of the rezoning request.

D. LAND USE ELEMENT:

This request is located in the I-630 Planning District. The Land Use Plan shows Single Family for this property. The applicant has applied for a rezoning from C-3 General Commercial District to R-3 Single Family District.

The request does not require a change to the Land Use Plan.

Master Street Plan:

South Oak and West 15th Streets are both shown as Local Streets. The primary function of a Local Street is to provide access to adjacent properties. Local Streets which are abutted by non-residential zoning/use or more intensive zoning than duplexes are considered as "Commercial Streets". These streets have a design standard the same as a Collector. 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 in the vicinity.

Neighborhood Action Plan:

This area is covered by the Stephens Neighborhood Plan. Their Housing Goal states a need to "provide affordable housing" in the neighborhood and to beautify the area.

E. STAFF ANALYSIS:

Black Community Developers Program, Inc., owner of the 0.14 acre property located at 1423 Oak Street, is requesting to rezone the property for "C-3" General Commercial District to "R-3" Single Family District. The property is located at the northeast corner of Oak Street and West 15th Street. The rezoning is proposed to allow construction of a new single family residence on the lot.

The 46 foot by 130 foot lot is currently undeveloped and grass-covered. Some old fencing exists within the rear (east) portion of the lot. The property slopes upward slightly from front to back (west to east) and side to side (south to north). There is a paved alley located along the rear (east) property line.

All surrounding properties are zoned R-3, with single family residences located immediately north, south and east. Vacant lots are located immediately to the west and southwest, with other vacant lots in the area.

The City's Future Land Use Plan designates this property as Single Family. The requested R-3 zoning does not require an amendment to the Land Use Plan.

Staff is supportive of the requested rezoning to R-3. Staff views the request as reasonable. The current C-3 zoning at this corner represents an old neighborhood commercial node, which was established many years ago and never developed. Staff feels the rezoning to R-3 with construction of a new home represents the best use of the property. Staff believes the proposed rezoning to R-3 will have no adverse impact on the adjacent properties or the neighborhood.

F. STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the requested R-3 rezoning.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

(MAY 28, 2009)

The applicant was present. There were no objectors present. Staff presented the application with a recommendation of approval.

The Chairman placed the item before the Commission for inclusion within the Consent Agenda for approval. A motion to that effect was made. The motion passed by a vote of 10 ayes, 0 nays and 1 absent. The application was approved.

May 28, 2009

ITEM NO.: 3

FILE NO.: Z-8454

NAME: Love Day Care Family Home – Special Use Permit

LOCATION: 7618 West 38th Street

OWNER: Javier Linares

APPLICANT: Shelia Love

PROPOSAL: A Special Use Permit is requested to allow a Day Care Family Home to be operated in the single family residence located on the R-2 zoned property at 7618 West 38th Street.

A. Public Notification:

All owners of property located within 200 feet of the site, all residents within 300 feet who could be identified, and the John Barrow and Westwood Neighborhood Associations were notified of the public hearing.

B. Staff Analysis:

7618 West 38th Street is located on the north side of West 38th Street, between Whitfield and Stannus Streets. The properties to the east, west and south are zoned R-2 and contain single family residences. There is undeveloped R-2 zoned property to the north. There are several vacant lots in the area.

The applicant's home is a one-story frame single family residence, and is typical of those in the general area. The applicant is in the process of fencing a portion of the rear yard which will provide a safe play area. The applicant proposes to operate the day care family home from 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. The applicant has noted that she will have one (1) part-time employee.

There is a one-car wide driveway from West 38th Street with parking for three (3) vehicles. The applicant has noted (at the suggestion of staff) that, if approved, the driveway will be widened to a two (2) car width within 30 days of the approval. This will provide parking for five (5) vehicles. Staff feels that this will allow sufficient space for drop-off and pick-up of children. On reinspection of the site, staff observed no vehicles parked on unpaved areas. Staff also observed no vehicles on the site which are not operational.

The applicant is currently providing care for eight (8) children at this location, since March, 2009. The applicant is in the process of being licensed by the State for up to ten (10) children.

The principal use of the property will remain single family residential. No signage beyond that allowed in single family zones will be permitted. The applicant submitted a copy of the bill of assurance for the subdivision which was recorded in 1907. The bill of assurance is a handwritten document and not legible. It likely contains no provisions regarding property use.

Section 36-54(e)(3) of the City of Little Rock Zoning Ordinance establishes the site and location criteria for day care family homes as follows:

Day care family home:

- a. This use may be located only in a single family home, occupied by the care giver and which is the full time residence of the care giver.
- b. Must be operated within licensing procedures established by the State of Arkansas. State regulations shall control the number of employees residing off premises.
- c. The use is limited to ten (10) children including the care givers.
- d. The minimum to qualify for special use permit is six (6) children from households other than the care givers.
- e. This use must obtain a special use permit in all districts where day care centers are not allowed by right.
- f. After the effective date of this subsection, no Special Use Permit will be approved for a day care family proposed to be located within 300 feet of a licensed day care center or an operating day care family home for which a Special Use Permit has previously been approved. For the purposes of this subsection, the distance between properties shall be measured in a straight line without regard to intervening structures or objects, from property line to property line.
- g. All day care family homes located in the City of Little Rock are required to obtain a City of Little Rock business license and to pay an annual business tax as specified in Chapter 17. of the Code.

- h. A copy of the day care family home's current State of Arkansas license must be submitted to the City Collector's Office each year at the time of payment of the annual business tax.
- i. All vehicles must be parked on an on-site paved surface.
- j. All vehicles located on the site must be operational.
- k. All pick-up and drop-off of children shall be on the property's driveway and not on the public right-of-way unless otherwise approved by the Planning Commission.
- l. Special Use Permits for day care family homes shall be reviewed by staff every three (3) years for compliance with the development criteria and Planning Commission approval.
- m. The Fire Marshall must approve use of the residence for the proposed day care family home.

Special Use Permits are not transferable in any manner. Permits cannot be transferred from owner to owner, location to location or use to use.

To staff's knowledge, there are no outstanding issues associated with this application. Staff feels that the proposed day care family home at this location will have no adverse impact on the general area. Based on information provided by the State, there are no permitted/licensed day care family homes or day care centers within 300 feet of the site. Additionally, staff has received no complaints from neighbors since the applicant began caring for children at this address, as of March, 2009.

C. Subdivision Committee Comments: (April 23, 2009)

Shelia Love was present, representing the application, along with two (2) parents of children she cares for. Staff briefly described the proposed day care family home use. Staff suggested that the driveway be widened to a two-car width. Ms. Love indicated that the driveway would be widened. Staff also noted that an inspection of the property revealed two (2) vehicles parked in the grass next to the driveway. Ms. Love indicated that the cars were moved and would not be parked on the grass any more.

Commissioner Yates asked how long Ms. Love had been at this location. Ms. Love stated that she has lived there since February, 2009. She explained that she previously had a day care on Kanis Road for three (3) years. She also indicated that she leased the property in question.

Commissioner Laha stated that drop-off and pick-up of children had to be off-street. Ms. Love explained that she and her parents understood.

After the discussion, the Committee forwarded the application to the full Commission for final action.

D. Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommends approval of the Special Use Permit to allow a day care family home at 7618 West 38th Street, subject to the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the site and location criteria in Section 36-54(e)(3).
2. There is to be no signage beyond that permitted in single family zones.
3. Outdoor activities, including playground use, are to be limited to day-light hours.
4. The driveway must be widened and paved to a two-car width within 30 days of the Commission's approval.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

(MAY 28, 2009)

Staff informed the Commission that the applicant did not send the notices to surrounding property owners in a timely manner. Staff noted that the notices were mailed nine (9) days prior to the public hearing, rather than the minimum of 15 days as required by the Commission. Staff recommended deferral of the application to the June 25, 2009 Agenda.

The Chairman placed the item before the Commission for inclusion within the Consent Agenda for deferral to the June 25, 2009 Agenda. A motion to that effect was made. The motion passed by a vote of 10 ayes, 0 nays and 1 absent. The application was deferred.

May 28, 2009

ITEM NO.: 4

FILE NO.: Z-8455

NAME: Lewis Day Care Family Home – Special Use Permit

LOCATION: 3417 N. Rodney Parham Road

OWNER: Rufus and Sarah Thrower

APPLICANT: Christian Thrower-Lewis

PROPOSAL: A Special Use Permit is requested to allow a Day Care Family Home to be operated in the single family residence located on the R-2 zoned property at 3417 N. Rodney Parham Road.

STAFF NOTE:

The applicant submitted a letter to staff on April 15, 2009 requesting this application be withdrawn. Staff supports the withdrawal request.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION: (MAY 28, 2009)

Staff informed the Commission that the applicant submitted a letter on April 15, 2009 requesting this application be withdrawn. Staff supported the withdrawal request.

The Chairman placed the item before the Commission for inclusion within the Consent Agenda for withdrawal. A motion to that effect was made. The motion passed by a vote of 10 ayes, 0 nays and 1 absent. The application was withdrawn.

May 28, 2009

ITEM NO.: 5

FILE NO.: Z-4336-II

NAME: Arkansas Children's Hospital Zoning Site Plan Review

LOCATION: Located on the west side of Battery Street, between Maryland Avenue and West 10th Street

DEVELOPER:

Arkansas Children's Hospital
800 Marshall Street
Little Rock, AR 72202

ENGINEER:

McClelland Consulting Engineers
900 West Markham Street
Little Rock, AR 72201

AREA: 0.28 acres NUMBER OF LOTS: 1 Zoning Lot FT. NEW STREET: 0 LF

CURRENT ZONING: O-2, Office and Institutional District

PLANNING DISTRICT: 8 – Central City

CENSUS TRACT: 10

VARIANCES/WAIVERS REQUESTED: None requested.

BACKGROUND:

On June 22, 2006, the Little Rock Planning Commission approved a request to allow the construction of two temporary parking lots on property owned by Arkansas Children's Hospital. The lots were located at 800 South Marshall Street and 800 South Battery Street

The site located at 800 South Battery Street, the former Transport House, contained a two story yellow brick apartment building which was demolished and nine parking spaces were constructed. The site is located along the northern boundary of the current application request. At the time of the zoning site plan review approval for the northern parking Children's Hospital did not own the lot currently under consideration for site plan review approval.

A. PROPOSAL/REQUEST:

The property is zoned O-2, Office and Institutional District and is being considered for zoning site plan review approval to allow an existing graveled area to be paved. The site contains approximately 1/4 of an acre and is surrounded on three sides by parking owned by Arkansas Children's Hospital. Minor modifications will be made to the existing parking lot and 43 new spaces will be added.

B. EXISTING CONDITIONS:

North, south and west of the proposed development area is currently surface parking. There are residential uses located in the area further west of the site. The area is predominately hospital owned and used property consisting of clinics and surface parking areas

C. NEIGHBORHOOD COMMENTS:

As of this writing, staff has not received any comment from the area property owners. All property owners located within 200 feet of the site, the Central High Neighborhood Association and the Capitol Hill Neighborhood Association were notified of the public hearing.

D. ENGINEERING COMMENTS:

PUBLIC WORKS CONDITIONS:

1. A 20-foot radial dedication of right-of-way is required at the intersection of Maryland Avenue and Battery Street.
2. Repair or replace any curb and gutter or sidewalk that is damaged in the public right-of-way prior to occupancy.

E. UTILITIES AND FIRE DEPARTMENT/COUNTY PLANNING:

Wastewater: Sewer available to this project.

Entergy: No comment received.

Center-Point Energy: No comment received.

AT & T: No comment received.

Central Arkansas Water: Contact Central Arkansas Water if larger and/or additional meter(s) are needed.

Fire Department: Approved as submitted.

County Planning: No comment.

CATA: The site is not located on a CATA Bus Route.

F. ISSUES/TECHNICAL/DESIGN:

Planning Division: No comment.

Landscape:

1. Interior islands must be a minimum of seven and one half feet in width to be given credit towards the minimal landscape ordinance requirements.
2. Eight percent of the interior of the parking lot must be greenspace by way of interior islands; each area to be a minimum of one hundred and fifty square foot in area and to be evenly distributed throughout the site.
3. An automatic irrigation system is required.
4. If the survey reflects the site being larger than two (2) acres then the landscape plan will need the seal of a Registered Landscape Architect.
5. A nine foot (9') wide perimeter landscape strip is required around the sites entirety.
6. Street trees are recommended.

G. SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE COMMENT: (April 23, 2009)

The applicant was not present. Staff presented the item stating there were no outstanding technical issues associated with the request. Staff stated the site was zoned O-2, Office and Instructional District, which required site plan review prior to development. Staff stated Children's Hospital was requesting site plan approval to pave a 50 by 150 foot graveled area located within an existing Children's Hospital parking lot. There was no further discussion of the item. The Committee then forwarded the item to the full Commission for final action.

H. ANALYSIS:

There were no outstanding technical issues associated with the request in need of addressing raised at the April 23, 2009, Subdivision Committee meeting. The request is a zoning site plan review for the placement of surface parking on this site which has previously been graveled. The parking is intended to serve Children's Hospital's employee and patient's.

The new parking lot will contain 186 parking spaces. Currently there are 143 spaces in place and 43 new spaces are proposed. The developers will complete minor modifications to the existing parking areas to allow grade transitions and the addition of landscape islands.

Staff is supportive of the request. Surface parking exists on three sides of the site. The site is proposed to add additional parking to serve Arkansas Children's Hospital employees and patients. To staff's knowledge there are no outstanding technical issues associated with the request. Staff feels the addition of the parking as proposed will not adversely impact the adjacent properties or the area.

I. STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the request subject to compliance with the comments and conditions as outlined in paragraphs D, E and F of the agenda staff report.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

(MAY 28, 2009)

The applicant was present. There were no registered objectors present. Staff presented the item with a recommendation of approval of the request subject to compliance with the comments and conditions as outlined in paragraphs D, E and F of the agenda staff report.

There was no further discussion of the item. The chair entertained a motion for placement of the item on the consent agenda for approval as recommended by staff. The motion carried by a vote of 10 ayes, 0 noes and 1 absent.

May 28, 2009

ITEM NO.: 6

FILE NO.: Z-8451

NAME: Breeding Multisectional Manufactured Homes –
Conditional Use Permit

LOCATION: North of 10716 Garrison Road and South of
10922 Garrison Road

OWNER/APPLICANT: Ken Breeding, Todd Breeding, Matt Breeding

PROPOSAL: A conditional use permit is requested to allow
placement of a multisectional manufactured home on
each of these two, R-2 zoned lots.

1. SITE LOCATION:

The site is located on the north side of Garrison Road, at Ridgefield Lane. The property is located outside of the city limits, within the City's extraterritorial jurisdiction.

2. COMPATIBILITY WITH NEIGHBORHOOD:

The property is located in a rural area that is characterized primarily by single family homes on larger lots or acreage tracts. The style of homes varies, ranging from small frame structures to large brick and frame structures. There are homes immediately in this vicinity that are of a similar style; one story, moderately pitched roofs and siding. There is one home to the northeast that appears to be virtually identical to the homes proposed by the applicant. The lots proposed for placement of the homes are each approximately ½ acre in size. The City of Little Rock owns approximately 600 acres located slightly to the south of this site, which are proposed for development as a City Park. The proposed homes do not appear to be out of character with development in the area.

Notice of the public hearing was sent to owners of all properties located within 200 feet of the site, all residents within 300 feet who could be identified and the Coalition of West Little Rock neighborhoods.

3. ON SITE DRIVES AND PARKING:

The home to be located south of 10922 Garrison Road will utilize an existing driveway. The home to be located behind 10716 Garrison Road will have a new driveway off of Garrison Road. The driveway will be built across a relative's lot. An access easement for the driveway will be recorded prior to placement of the new home.

4. SCREENING AND BUFFERS:

No Comments.

5. PUBLIC WORKS COMMENTS:

No Comments.

6. UTILITY, FIRE DEPT. AND CATA COMMENTS:

Wastewater: Outside service boundary, no comment.

Entergy: No comments received.

CenterPoint Energy: No comment received.

AT&T (SBC): No comment received.

Water: Central Arkansas Water does not serve this area.

Fire Department: West Pulaski Fire Protection District No. 23 responded approved as submitted.

County Planning: Approved as submitted.

CATA: Outside of service area.

SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE COMMENT:

(APRIL 23, 2009)

Ken Breeding was present, representing the application. Staff briefly described the proposed conditional use permit.

Staff noted that some additional information was needed with respect to the proposed manufactured homes (exterior finish, roof pitch, porches, etc.). Staff also noted that a letter would be required from the local volunteer fire department. Mr. Breeding indicated that the information would be provided to staff. Staff explained that no bill of assurance was found for the subdivision.

Commissioner Yates asked if Mr. Breeding's surveyor had checked for a recorded bill of assurance or other documents. Mr. Breeding stated that he had and found none. Commissioner Yates suggested that Mr. Breeding go to an abstract company and obtain a statement to that effect.

May 28, 2009

ITEM NO.: 6 (Cont.)

FILE NO.: Z-8451

Commissioner Fertsl asked if there were other manufactured homes in the area. Mr. Breeding indicated that there were many.

There was a brief discussion relating to the difference between mobile, manufactured and modular homes.

After the discussion, the Commissioner forwarded the issue to the full Commission for final action.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

The applicants are requesting approval of a conditional use permit to allow placement of a multisectional manufactured home on each of the two, R-2 zoned lots located north of 10716 Garrison Road and south of 10922 Garrison Road. The lots are two of several owned by family members. Single family residences occupied by family members are located on several of the lots. The property is located approximately 2 miles west of the city limits, within the City's 3 mile extraterritorial zoning jurisdiction.

The home proposed to be placed on the lot located behind 10716 Garrison Road is to be a new, 32' X 80' home. The home will have vinyl siding and a shingle roof with a pitch ranging from 4/12 to 8/12 depending on the specific model chosen. A porch will be located on the front of the home and a deck will be added to the rear. The home will be placed on a pier and beam foundation with tied steel footings and a color matched split faced block foundation. A driveway off of Garrison Road will provide access. The driveway will cross lots 41 and 41-A, also owned by the family. An access easement for the driveway will be recorded prior to placement of the home. A copy of an approved perk test for the septic system will also be provided prior to the home's placement on the lot.

The home proposed to be placed on the lot located in front of 10922 Garrison Road is to be a new, 32' X 64' home. The home will have vinyl siding and a shingle roof with a pitch ranging from 4/12 to 8/12 depending on the specific model chosen. A porch will be located on the front of the home and a deck will be added to the rear. The home will be placed on a pier and beam foundation with tied steel footings and a color matched split faced block foundation. An existing driveway off of Garrison Road will provide access. A copy of an approved perk test for the septic system will be provided prior to the home's placement on the lot.

The applicant responded to issues raised at Subdivision Committee, some of which were noted above. The 1965 bill of assurance for York Acres includes the following statement:

“no structure of a temporary character, trailer, tent, shack, garage or other outbuilding shall be used on any lot at any time as a residence, either temporary or permanent.”

It is the applicant’s contention, and staff’s belief, that the language noted above does not prohibit manufactured homes. The West Pulaski Volunteer Fire Department has approved the application as submitted. To staff’s knowledge, there are no outstanding issues.

The homes are proposed to be placed in an area containing a variety of housing styles, including some that are similar to the proposed homes. Placement of the homes will comply with ordinance standards. Staff is supportive of the requested C.U.P.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the requested C.U.P. to allow placement of the two proposed multisectional manufactured homes, subject to compliance with the following conditions:

1. Prior to placement of the homes, the following must be provided:
 - a. Copy of recorded access easement from Garrison Road across Lots 41 and 41-A to Lot 42-A.
 - b. Copy of approved perk test for septic system on each lot.
2. Placement of the homes must comply with the following siting criteria from Section 36-254(d)(5) of the Code of Ordinances:
 - a. A pitched roof of three (3) in twelve (12) or fourteen (14) degrees or greater.
 - b. Removal of all transport elements.
 - c. Permanent foundation.
 - d. Exterior wall finished so as to be compatible with the neighborhood.
 - e. Orientation compatible with placement of adjacent structures.
 - f. Underpinning with permanent materials.
 - g. All homes shall be multisectional.
 - h. Off-street parking per single-family dwelling standard.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

(MAY 28, 2009)

The applicant was present. There were several objectors present. Several letters of opposition had been received by staff and forwarded to the Commission. Staff presented the item and a recommendation of approval, subject to compliance with the comments and conditions outlined in the "staff recommendation" above.

The applicant, Kenny Breeding, addressed the Commission. He stated staff had correctly stated the issue and he would reserve his time to respond to concerns raised by the opposition.

Leo Hauser, of 22 Ridgefield Cove, spoke in opposition. He stated he was speaking on behalf of the Ridgefield Estates POA and Board. Mr. Hauser stated one of the proposed manufactured homes would be located directly across the street from the gated entry to his neighborhood and would affect the view of persons coming and going from the neighborhood. He also stated he was concerned that the manufactured homes would decrease property values in the area.

Jae Wilson, of 5450 Ridgefield Estates Lane, stated she did not want to speak but she agreed with the POA's position.

Don Burkett, of 19 Ridgefield Cove, stated many improvements had been made in the neighborhood and he felt allowing the manufactured homes would not continue that trend. He also questioned the notices for the hearing.

Kadelia Hamilton, of 10519 Garrison Road, stated she was opposed because of aesthetic concerns and because of concerns about property values.

Mr. Breeding responded that he was not surprised by the opposition from Ridgefield Estates, a gated community of large, expensive homes. He stated the proposed manufactured homes were of good quality and were better built than some other homes in the area. He noted the proposed homes would be located in close proximity to his own home and he had no desire to do anything that would affect his own property values. Mr. Breeding stated his two sons would occupy the homes. He stated his sons were both members of the area volunteer fire department and would be an asset to the neighborhood.

Ruth Bell, of the League of Women Voters of Pulaski County, spoke in support of the application. She stated there was a difference in mobile homes and manufactured homes. Ms. Bell stated manufactured homes were well built and, when properly sited, were indistinguishable from site built homes. Ms. Bell stated placement of manufactured homes does not necessarily lead to a reduction of property values.

May 28, 2009

ITEM NO.: 6 (Cont.)

FILE NO.: Z-8451

Vice-chair Jeff Yates asked Mr. Hauser if Mr. Breeding's property was well kept. Mr. Hauser responded that it was. Vice-chair Yates asked Mr. Hauser if he had any reason to expect that placement of the manufactured homes would affect the way Mr. Breeding kept up his property. Mr. Hauser responded that he could not speculate on the future of Mr. Breeding's property.

Commissioner Adcock asked who would occupy the new homes. Staff responded that the applicant had stated his sons would. Mr. Breeding confirmed this from across the room.

In response to a question from the Commission, staff explained the notice procedure and stated Mr. Breeding had followed the procedure.

Vice-chair Jeff Yates addressed a question that had been raised about bills of assurance. He stated they were agreements between property owners and the Commission was not bound by their provisions. He stated the Commission would take them into consideration. Staff had earlier stated there did not appear to be a provision in the bill of assurance that specifically prohibited manufactured homes.

A motion was made to approve the application, subject to compliance with all staff comments and conditions. The motion was approved by a vote of 8 ayes, 2 noes and 1 absent.

May 28, 2009

ITEM NO.: 7

FILE NO.: Z-8452

NAME: Allen Multisectional Manufactured Home –
Conditional Use Permit

LOCATION: 6301 Stagecoach Road

OWNER/APPLICANT: Rebekah Allen

PROPOSAL: A conditional use permit is requested to allow placement of a multisectional manufactured home on this R-2 zoned, .46-acre tract.

1. SITE LOCATION:

The site is located on the east side of Stagecoach Road, just north of its intersection with David O Dodd Road.

2. COMPATIBILITY WITH NEIGHBORHOOD:

The property is located in an area of mixed uses and zoning. A PCD zoned convenience store with gas pumps is adjacent to the south. An elementary school is located just to the south of the convenience store. A commercial development containing a convenience store with gas pumps, a car wash and a Laundromat are located on an R-2 zoned tract across Stagecoach Road to the west. Industrial uses are located on Brodie Lane to the southwest of the site. The larger area around the site contains a variety of residential uses, including site built homes of various styles, manufactured and mobile homes and multifamily. This site, until recently, was occupied by a singlewide manufactured home. Staff believes the proposed use is compatible with uses and zoning in the area.

Notice of the public hearing was sent to owners of all properties located within 200 feet of the site, all residents within 300 feet who could be identified and the SWLR United for Progress and Stagecoach-Dodd Neighborhood Associations.

3. ON SITE DRIVES AND PARKING:

A single driveway off of Stagecoach Road will provide access to the site.

4. SCREENING AND BUFFERS:

No comments on this single family residence.

5. PUBLIC WORKS COMMENTS:

No Comments.

6. UTILITY, FIRE DEPT. AND CATA COMMENTS:

Wastewater: Sewer available to this project.

Entergy: No comment received.

CenterPoint Energy: No comment received.

AT&T (SBC): No comment received.

Water: Contact Central Arkansas Water if larger and/or additional meter(s) are needed.

Fire Department: Approved as submitted.

County Planning: No Comments.

CATA: The site is not located on a CATA bus route.

SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE COMMENT:

(APRIL 23, 2009)

Robert Allen and Rebecca Allen were present, representing the application. Staff briefly described the proposed conditional use permit.

Staff noted that the only issue was the 40-foot front setback for the proposed storage building. Staff explained that the ordinance required a minimum front setback of 60 feet for accessory buildings in residential zones, and the applicant needed to move the proposed accessory building to meet the setback or request a variance.

Mr. Allen explained that the accessory building was placed on the site because of an existing fiber optic cable, which ran across the front of the property. The location of the cable was discussed. The Committee determined that the cable was most likely located in the right-of-way of Stagecoach Road.

Mr. Allen explained that he would take measurements on the property and determine if the accessory building could be moved back.

After the discussion, the Committee forwarded the issue to the full Commission for final action.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

The applicant is requesting approval of a conditional use permit to allow placement of a new, multisectional manufactured home on the vacant, R-2 zoned, .46 acre tract located at 6301 Stagecoach Road. Until recently, a singlewide manufactured home was located on the site. That home has been removed.

The proposed home is 56' X 28' with an 8' wraparound porch and a handicap ramp. The home is proposed to have a pitched, shingled roof and vinyl siding. Appropriate foundation and underpinning will be installed. A 20' X 30' accessory storage building will be installed behind the house. Placement of the home and accessory building will meet or exceed all required setbacks. A 4' tall chain link fence will enclose the property. A singlewide driveway will provide access off of Stagecoach Road. There is no bill of assurance for this acreage tract.

To staff's knowledge, there are no outstanding issues. The applicant responded to the issue raised at Subdivision Committee by relocating the proposed storage building. The property is located in an area of mixed uses and zoning. Staff believes the proposed use is compatible with uses in the area.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the C.U.P. subject to the home being placed in compliance with the following siting criteria from Section 36-254(d)(5) of the Code of Ordinances:

- a. A pitched roof of three (3) in twelve (12) or fourteen (14) degrees or greater.
- b. Removal of all transport elements.
- c. Permanent foundation.
- d. Exterior wall finished so as to be compatible with the neighborhood.
- e. Orientation compatible with placement of adjacent structures.
- f. Underpinning with permanent materials.
- g. All homes shall be multisectional.
- h. Off-street parking per single-family dwelling standard.

May 28, 2009

ITEM NO.: 7 (Cont.)

FILE NO.: Z-8452

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

(MAY 28, 2009)

The applicant was present. There were no objectors present. Two letters of support had been received by staff and forwarded to the Commission. Staff presented the item and a recommendation of approval, subject to compliance with the comments and conditions outlined in the "staff recommendation" above. There was no further discussion. The item was placed on the consent agenda and approved by a vote of 10 ayes, 0 noes and 1 absent.

May 28, 2009

ITEM NO.: 8

NAME: University District Plan

REQUEST: Approval of Resolution of support

LOCATION: I-630 to Fourche Creek, Boyle Park to Monroe

SOURCE: University District Partnership

GENERAL INFORMATION:

In 2004, the University of Arkansas at Little Rock (UALR) engaged an urban planning firm to prepare a revitalization plan for the area surrounding the campus. Input was received from residential, commercial property owners and public officials. An outline of the important issues and concerns for the area was developed. UALR and the University District Partnership formed a steering committee to begin the work of creating the University District Plan with the consultants. This committee consisted of public and private sector individuals from the areas surrounding the campus of UALR. A consulting team worked on issues and presented information and recommendations to the steering committee. The Committee guided the consults on important issues and priorities.

Public meetings were held to present information to the property owners and residents surrounding the campus. At these meeting comments were received as well as concerns. The consultants took this information and development recommendations that became the draft plan.

The University District Partnership was formalized with the continuing meetings of property owners, residents, public officials and the university. The overall goal or aim of the effort is to strengthen the residential neighborhoods and revitalize the commercial districts that surround UALR.

The intent of the University District Revitalization Plan (UDRP) is twofold:

- To establish a revitalization framework that will guide both private and public realm new development and adaptive reuse of existing facilities, and;
- To identify logical revitalization scenarios that will address the evolving needs of the district's various constituents, and build a healthy and vibrant urban community.

The revitalization planning team—consisting of community planners, urban designers, landscape architects and market analysts—has worked to maintain an open, engaged, and collaborative process involving broad participation by the University District (UD) community, as well as civic, institutional and business leaders.

ITEM NO.: 8 (Cont.)

Throughout the year-long process, the consultant team met regularly with the University District Partnership (UDP), the UD management team, and local municipal department personnel. At every stage, the UDP was involved through workshops and presentation. In addition, the products of this collaborative process have been available for public view and comment on the UD's website.

At the outset of the process, the consultant team, in collaboration with the UD Partnership and Management team, divided the planning process into the following four phases:

- **Project Orientation**—project initiation and data gathering, understanding the vision and goals, stakeholder interviews, and review of relevant studies and plans
- **Analysis of Existing Conditions and Trends**—assess current physical, regulatory, and market conditions, and identification of dynamics of change opportunities and constraints
- **Concept Development**—explore alternative revitalization framework concepts for land use, urban design, development/redevelopment prototypes, open space and circulation
- **Revitalization Plan**—refinement and documentation of a preferred revitalization framework and prototype projects, development principles, and implementation strategy

THE UNIVERSITY DISTRICT 2004 VISION STATEMENT

In 2014...

The University District is a thriving cultural and entertainment destination, regarded throughout the city as a neighborhood of choice—a walkable in-town district with excellent schools and services, vibrant commercial areas, rich cultural resources, and connections to open space and transit. A mix of single-family and higher-density housing attracts a diverse community, including many UALR faculty and staff who choose to live as well as work in the district. The university's presence in the district is leveraged into resources for improving the area: technical assistance for small businesses, faculty research linked to emerging companies, improved K-12 schools, supporting families in the district, and green space for the community created by the restoration and enhancement of Coleman Creek.

The vision has been structured around seven themes:

- Distinctive district identity
- Commercial vitality
- Strong and diverse neighborhoods
- Safe and attractive streets
- Excellent schools
- Ample open space
- Clear pedestrian and transit links

May 28, 2009

ITEM NO.: 8 (Cont.)

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of a resolution supporting the Goals of the University District Partnership Revitalization Plan.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

(MAY 28, 2009)

The item was placed on consent agenda for approval. By a vote of 10 for 0 against the consent agenda was approved.

RESOLUTION NO. _____

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LITTLE ROCK, ARKANSAS IN SUPPORT OF THE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE UNIVERSITY DISTRICT PARTNERSHIP REVITALIZATION PLAN.

WHEREAS, the University of Arkansas at Little Rock (UALR) working with area residents, Neighborhood Associations, business owners and other interested groups formed the University District Partnership to revitalize the neighborhoods and commercial areas surrounding the UALR Campus; and,

WHEREAS, the University District Partnership engaged in a broad-based inclusive process to develop a Revitalization Plan for the area; and,

WHEREAS, the residents and other “stakeholders” in the area participated in several public meetings to discuss and identify area concerns to include in the plan; and

WHEREAS, after several months of work, goals and objectives were developed and presented to the residents, associations, business groups and other interested parties; and

WHEREAS, this Plan (Goals and Objectives) provides a way for both neighborhood based groups and others working in and around the neighborhoods to advance the desires and meet the needs of the residents;

WHEREAS, comprehensive planning must include not only interests of the neighborhood immediately affected but the interests of the city as a whole; and

WHEREAS, local government encourages and supports neighborhood-based coalitions that develop individual neighborhood organizations, articulate neighborhood views on community-wide issues, and facilitated the planning process; and

WHEREAS, advocacy planning by neighborhoods is an acceptable and legitimate role for citizens and professional planners,

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LITTLE ROCK, ARKANSAS.

SECTION 1. The Planning Commission of the City of Little Rock does support the vision and goals as expressed in the University District Partnership Revitalization Plan.

ADOPTED: _____

SECRETARY

CHAIRMAN

May 28, 2009

There being no further business before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 4:37 p.m.

Date _____

Secretary

Chairman