

**CITY OF COPPELL
PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

STAFF REPORT

CASE NO.: PD-133R5-SF-7, Magnolia North Addition

P&Z HEARING DATE: February 21, 2013

C.C. HEARING DATE: March 26, 2013

STAFF REP.: Gary L. Sieb, Director of Planning

LOCATION: South side of S.H. 121, approximately 260 feet west of North Denton Tap Road

SIZE OF AREA: 5.41 acres of property

CURRENT ZONING: PD-133-HC (Planned Development-133-Highway Commercial)

REQUEST: A zoning change to PD-133R5-SF-7 (Planned Development-133-Revision 5-Single Family-7), to allow the development of 28 single-family lots and three (3) common area lots and to amend the Land Use Map of the *Coppell 2030 Comprehensive Master Plan* from “Freeway Special District” to “Urban Residential Neighborhood”.

APPLICANT: TCCI Land Dev., Inc.
Tommy N. Cansler
3930 Glade Road
Suite 108-322
Colleyville, TX. 76034
(469) 688-8224
Email: 111tcci@att.net

OWNER: AMBE Hospitality Group
Amit Patel
2750 Hillview Drive
Lewisville, TX. 75067

HISTORY: There has been no recent development activity on the subject tract, although a Planned Development (PD-133) was approved for residential and retail development in 1994. The residential portion (Magnolia Park) has been completed, and the first phase of the retail including the strip

center that faces Denton Tap and the bank at the corner of Denton Tap and 121 were constructed some time ago.

TRANSPORTATION: Denton Tap Road is a P6D, six-lane divided thoroughfare in a 120-foot right-of-way. S. H. 121 is a freeway with one-way access roads in 450 feet of right-of-way.

SURROUNDING LAND USE & ZONING:

North: S. H. 121; HC, Highway Commercial

South: Magnolia Park residential development; PD-133R-SF-9 single family detached neighborhood

East: bank building; PD-133R3-HC; planned development for commercial use

West: Magnolia Park residential; PD-133R-SF-9 single family residences

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:

Coppell 2030, A Comprehensive Master Plan, shows this property being developed as “Freeway Special District” which suggests commercial/retail development.

DISCUSSION:

This request cannot be supported by staff as it runs counter to a number of sound planning principles. First, it ignores the land use outlined in the Comprehensive Plan which states Freeway Special District as the appropriate land use. Second, it attempts to increase density by providing a sub-standard right-of-way of 30 feet for a 28-lot residential subdivision. Although we were supportive of this reduction in two other developments submitted by this same developer, it should be remembered that those subdivisions were already zoned residential (and had been for several years), they were seven to eight lot projects, and were surrounded by residential development. Third, it does not respect the density of the surrounding residential community, being almost twice the existing density. Fourth, lot sizes are substandard, are 2/3rd the size of the adjacent community and call for reduced side, rear and front yard setbacks. Fifth, the presence of the S. H. 121 service road does not lend itself to residential development. Sixth, when the property to the east of this parcel was developed, an access road was stubbed into this property to accommodate anticipated compatible uses which were envisioned to be office, retail, commercial, as outlined in the Master Plan. Seven, the closest Magnolia Park residence to the west is 50 feet inside lots 1-11 and 28, making the proposed lots unbuildable if comparable setbacks from S. H. 121 are recognized. Finally, the presence of a one-way service road has not discouraged development of the same roadway on the north side of S. H.

121, nor to the east of this property. This is just the wrong use at the wrong location. Staff strongly recommends denial of this request.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION:

Staff is recommending DENIAL of this case for the numerous reasons stated above. It is the wrong land use, it is too dense, it has inadequate lot size, it does not provide enough buffer from S. H. 121, it does not recognize the existing access points from the east, it ignores the Comprehensive Master Plan.

ALTERNATIVES:

1. Recommend approval of the request
2. Recommend disapproval of the request
3. Recommend modification of the request
4. Take under advisement for reconsideration at a later date

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Proposed PD Conditions
2. Zoning Exhibit and Site Plan
3. Landscape Plan (Sheets L-1 and L- 2)
4. Screening Wall and Fence Details