NAME: Cross Street Elderly Housing – PD-R Revocation

LOCATION: 1012 S. Cross Street

DEVELOPER:

Mansamusa Empire, LLC
1012 S. Cross Street
Little Rock, AR 72202

OWNER/AUTHORIZED AGENT:

Clarshun Beyah – Owner/Applicant

SURVEYOR/ENGINEER:

N/A

AREA: 0.51 acre      NUMBER OF LOTS: 1 zoning lot      FT. NEW STREET: 0 LF
WARD: 1              PLANNING DISTRICT: 8           CENSUS TRACT: 5
CURRENT ZONING: PRD
VARIANCE/WAIVERS: None requested.

BACKGROUND/REQUEST:

Ordinance No. 19,406 adopted by the Little Rock Board of Directors on September 20, 2005, established Cross Street Elderly Housing Short-form PD-R. The applicant proposed the rezoning of three lots located on the northwest corner of 11th Street and Cross Streets from R-4 to PD-R to allow the development of four units of elderly housing contained in two duplex structures. Only persons 55 and older may be considered as potential residents. The development would occur on two of the lots with the remaining lot being left vacant for future development. The applicant indicated single-family or two family as possible future uses for the vacant lot. A tenant vegetable garden was proposed as a part of the development.

Ordinance No. 19,612 adopted by the Little Rock Board of Directors on October 17, 2006, revised the previously approved PD-R to allow a small portion of the site to be removed
from the overall approval area. The property was a 42.5-foot by 64-foot area located along
the eastern portion of the site. The approved site plan indicated this area as a tenant
vegetable garden for the residents of the duplex units. The property owner located to the
north of the garden area was seeking to purchase this land area and include the area in
their existing lot through a replat. All other portions of the PD-R would remain as were
previously approved. None of the development previously approved had occurred.

Ordinance No. 19,875 adopted by the Little Rock Board of Directors on December 4,
2007, allowed a revision to the PD-R zoning to establish the building footprint for the third
lot. The applicant indicated the construction of a third duplex on the lot. The building
footprint and construction materials would match the previously approved buildings.

On May 30, 2013 the Planning Commission denied a requested revision to the original
PD-R zoning. The applicant requested to remove the age restriction requirement for the
duplex units. The applicant noted that the contractor did not construct the units to be
handicap accessible.

The applicant does not wish to pursue the previously approved PD-R development, and
is requesting that the PD-R zoning be revoked and the property be restored to its original
R-4 zoning.

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.

Staff is supportive of the requested PD-R revocation. Staff views the request as
reasonable. The property is in an area containing a mixture of single family and duplex
uses. All of the surrounding residential property is zoned R-4, with the exception of a one-
lot PD-R located across Cross Street to the northeast. Just further northeast and north
are properties zoned O-3 and C-3. Staff believes the proposed PD-R revocation and
restoration of the property to its original R-4 zoning will have no adverse impact on the
surrounding properties or the general area.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the PD-R revocation request.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION: (APRIL 8, 2021)

The applicant was not present. There were no persons registered in attendance. Staff
informed the Commission that the applicant submitted a letter to staff on March 24, 2021
requesting this application be deferred to the May 13, 2021 Planning Commission
agenda. Staff supported the applicant’s request. There was no further discussion. The
item was placed on the Consent Agenda and deferred as recommended by staff. The
vote was 9 ayes, 0 nays, 0 absent, 1 abstention (Vogel), and 1 open position.
The applicant was present. There were no persons present registered in support or opposition. Staff presented the item and a recommendation of approval as outlined in the “staff recommendation” above. There was no further discussion. The item was placed on the Consent Agenda and approved as recommended by staff, including all staff comments and conditions. The vote was 10 ayes, 0 nays, 0 absent and 1 open position.