REZONING

Case Coordinator: Michael McCauley

GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

SITE ZONING: PD-63 for the (SF-12/20) Single-Family Residential District

	SURROUNDING ZONING	**SURROUNDING LAND USES**
NORTH	PD-63 for the (SF-12/20) Single-Family Residential District	Church
SOUTH	PD-63 for the (SF-PH) Single-Family Patio Home District	Single-Family Residential Subdivision
EAST	PD-63 for the (MF-15) Multi-Family Residential District	Apartment Complex
WEST	PD-63 for the (SF-12/20) Single-Family Residential District	Elementary School

REQUEST: Approval for an amendment to PD-63 to change the zoning on a 3.4-acre tract from (SF-12/20) Single-Family Residential District to (SF-TH) Single-Family Townhouse Residential District with special development standards

PROPOSED USE: Townhouse Residential development

ACRES/LOTS: 3.4 Acres/36 residential lots

LOCATION: Vicinity of southwest corner of Frankford Road and McCoy Road

HISTORY: PD-63 was established in 1980 as a 525-acre master plan with various residential, retail and office uses.

PD-63 was amended in 1983 to change the Office Zoning District to Single-Family Detached (SF-PH/Single-Family Patio Home District) for the property bordering the southern perimeter of this site.

PD-63 was amended in 1992 to change the (O-2) Office District to (SF-12/20) Single-Family Residential District for this site.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: Single-Family Detached

TRANSPORTATION PLAN: McCoy Road is designated as a (C2U) Two-Lane Undivided Collector.

OWNER: Redeemer Evangelical Covenant Church, Inc.

REPRESENTED BY: Harlan Properties, Inc.

STAFF ANALYSIS

PROPOSAL/BACKGROUND

This is a request for approval for an amendment to PD-63 to change the zoning on a 3.4-acre tract from (SF-12/20) Single-Family Residential District to (SF-TH) Single-Family Townhouse Residential District with special development standards for a 36-lot townhouse development without alleys.

PD-63 was established in 1980 as a 525-acre master plan with various residential, retail and office uses. It was amended in 1983 to change the Office Zoning District to Single-Family Detached (SF-PH/Single-Family Patio Home District) for the property bordering the southern perimeter of this site. The Planned Development was later amended in 1992 to change the (O-2) Office District to (SF-12/20) Single-Family Residential District for this site.

The following table provides a comparison of the current (SF-12/20) Single-Family Residential District standards, proposed (SF-TH) Single-Family Townhouse Residential District and the proposed standards from the applicant. Other than the base zoning in PD-63, the Planned Development does not provide any restrictions or limitations to the property.

Requirements	(SF-12/20) Current Standards	(SF-TH) Current Standards	(SF-TH) Proposed Standards
Minimum Lot Area (sq. ft.)	12,000	3,500	2,500
Maximum Building Coverage (%)	45	45	70
Minimum Lot Width (ft.)	90	35	25
Minimum Lot Depth (ft.)	120	100	100
Minimum Front Setback (ft.)	35	20	20
Minimum Rear Yard Setback (ft.)	20	10	10
Minimum Brick or Stone Content (%)	70	70	86
Alleys Required/Proposed	Yes/Yes	Yes/Yes	Yes/Yes

INITIAL ELEMENTS TO CONSIDER

- The subject property has a 30 foot ingress/egress easement and 15 foot utility easement used by the church and the adjoining elementary school from McCoy Road. As shown by the applicant, the proposed townhouse development will be over the easements.

  The City Engineering Department stipulated a separate easement and driveway be provided along the northern perimeter of the proposed development between McCoy Road and the Rainwater Elementary parking lot to avoid access from Joy Drive (proposed). This will eliminate any possible stacking and congestion on Joy Drive caused by vehicular traffic to and from the school and church. The applicant informed staff that the Church will not sell the developer any additional land.

- Appropriate transitional methods should be considered at all locations where the development of higher-density residential land uses abuts lower-density residential property (either built or zoned). In general, transitions between different types of intensities of land use should be made gradually, particularly where natural or man-made buffers are not available.

  The applicant is not providing a transitional buffer.

- The retention of trees, natural vegetation, and environmentally sensitive areas whenever possible to separate low-density residential developments from other more intensive land uses, such as townhouse development, should be applied wherever possible.

  The applicant is not proposing any landscape buffering between the residential uses.

- Avoid the use of fences as a sole means of providing screening and buffering.

  The applicant is providing an 8' brick screening wall along the northern perimeter of the development site and a 6' brick wall along the eastern perimeter. Further, the applicant is providing a 6' cedar fence along the rest of the developments perimeter.

- Because of the narrowness of townhouse development lots, garage access should be from the rear via an alley.

  The applicant is not proposing alleys with the townhouse development.

- "Minimized emphasis" on garages facing the front should be considered when single-family residential development is considered.

  The applicant's proposal maximizes the garages on the front façade.

- Townhouse developments require 1 guest parking space per 4 dwelling units. The applicant is required to provide 9 guest parking spaces.

  The applicant is not providing any guest parking spaces.

- Due to the applicant's proposal, they are not able to provide a 15 ft. landscape buffer along McCoy Road as requested by staff.

- The city's driveway ordinance requires the driveway location to be a minimum 40 feet from the intersecting property lines from McCoy Road and Joy Drive. Appeal to the Director of Engineer for the distance reduction is required.

  The applicant has not asked the Director of Engineering for a reduction.

- The applicant has stated that the building elevations will be consistent with his Shoals Creek Trails townhouse development project in Garland.

  Shoals Creek is a master-planned townhouse development with guest parking and a community pool. This proposal has neither.

The city has approved a few residential townhouse developments with lot widths less than 25 feet. Below is a listing of some of these residential townhouse developments and their design features:

Subdivision Name	Lot Width	Guest Parking	Alleys	Front Entry Garage
Parkview Villas	22.00	Yes	Yes	No
Austin Woods Phase 1	30.00	Yes	Yes	No
Raiford Crossing	25.00	Yes	Yes	No
Estates of Indian Creek, Phase 4	27.50	Yes	Yes	No
Mustang Park, Phase 7	22.00	Yes	Yes	No
Quail Creek North, Phase 1	25.00	Yes	Yes	No

ELEMENTS TO CONSIDER WITH RESUBMITTAL

The applicant initially submitted a design illustrating 36 lots. The development proposed 35 townhome lots and one lot for on-site retention. Since the Council's initial review last month, the applicant has revised their layout to use all lots (36) for townhome development and transfer their development's drainage into the storm water drainage system along McCoy Road. This concept would be contingent on an engineering study demonstrating that the McCoy Road stormwater system can handle the additional demand.

The revised site plan shows the proposed lots on the south side of Joy Drive having alley access to the existing alley. As such, no masonry screening wall along that alley would be provided. Instead, the individual lots would install their own privacy fences in accordance with City codes.

Lots along the north side of Joy Drive would have access to a new alley to be constructed. As this alley will face undeveloped land to the north and be very visible from public rights-of-way, a masonry screening wall along the north side of this alley will be constructed by the developer. The north alley will also tie into the access easement serving the Rainwater Elementary School parking lot. While this solution is not ideal and theoretically could allow for residential traffic to "cut through" the school property, staff does not feel that this will be a major problem.

Because the applicant is changing to alley-loaded homes, Council had indicated that reducing the minimum required front yard setback from 25 feet to 10 feet to allow for rear parking and driveways would be acceptable. The revised images reflect this request.

Further, the applicant has agreed to the following additional stipulations:

1. Fencing/screening along the rear property lines shall be made of masonry and be consistent throughout the subdivision. Details to be approved by staff.

2. No parking shall be permitted on the north side of the proposed street between the hours of 7:00 a.m. – 9:00 a.m. and 2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. on school days. Modifications to "no parking" may be made through an Engineering study.

The applicant has submitted a revised exhibit showing rear-entry garages with alley access on the northern and southern borders of their development proposal, as well as a utility easement at the end of each lot for utility boxes and provided the Council with revised colored building elevations.

CONCLUSION

Staff believes the applicant has addressed the Council's reasons for continuing the case, which was to allow the applicant time to address front entry garages, location of utility boxes and provide quality, four-sided colored building elevations for Council's review.

If the Council decides to approve the applicant's request, staff recommends the Council consider the Planning Commission's recommended stipulations and consider adding the following stipulations:

1. Fencing/screening along the rear property lines shall be made of masonry and be consistent throughout the subdivision. Details to be approved by staff.

2. No parking shall be permitted on the north side of the proposed street between the hours of 7:00 a.m. – 9:00 a.m. and 2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. on school days. Modifications to "no parking" may be made through an Engineering study.