

**CITY OF COPPELL
PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

STAFF REPORT

CASE NO.: PD-197R3-H, Old Coppel Townhomes, Lot 1, Block A & Lot 1, Block B

P&Z HEARING DATE: April 21, 2016 (**Held under advisement for applicant modification and resubmitted for an October 20 hearing**)

C.C. HEARING DATE: May 10, 2016 (**November 8, 2016**)

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

LOCATION: NEC & SEC of S. Coppel Road & McNear Drive

SIZE OF AREA: 0.527 total acres of property

CURRENT ZONING: PD-197R-H (Planned Development-197 Revision-Historic)

REQUEST: A zoning change request to PD-197R3-H (Planned Development-197 Revision 3-Historic), to amend the Concept Plan and attach a Detail Site Plan to allow a total of six (6) live/work units.

APPLICANT:	OWNER Ron Robertson 569 S. Coppel Road Coppell, TX. 75019 (972) 393-2152 Email: none	APPLICANT Ron Lustig 733 Creek Valley Court Allen, TX. 75002 (214) 914-4251 email: rlustig@msn.com
-------------------	--	---

HISTORY: In April of 2002, council accepted the *Old Coppel Master Plan* as a guide for development of the subject property. In July of 2003, a Conceptual Planned Development (PD-197) was granted on the parcel reflecting 19 townhomes, 2 free standing residential lots, private open space, and two commercial lots facing Coppel Road on 3.8 acres of land. In December of 2003, a Detailed Site Plan for the townhouses and the recreational portion of the PD was approved. In November of 2005 two single family residences were approved by council on the two vacant residential lots. The only remaining vacant land are the two lots facing Coppel Road and the subject of this request. Up until this request, the subject lots have generated no zoning activity. **Because of several inconsistencies in the proposal and concerns of staff which warranted modification of the plan, on April 21 the Planning Commission held the case under advisement to allow the applicant an opportunity to alter the plan, address stated staff issues, and come into conformance with codes and ordinances.**

HISTORIC COMMENT: Staff has found nothing of historic significance on this property—it is vacant land, and has been so for a number of years.

TRANSPORTATION: Coppell Road is a recently completed C2U, concrete two-lane undivided street with curb and gutter contained within a 60-foot right-of-way. McNeal Drive is a concrete residential street with curb and gutter contained within a 50-foot right-of-way.

SURROUNDING LAND USE & ZONING:

North: vacant and residential; Planned Development 197R-H, Historic

South: commercial metal building; “H”, Historic

East: single family residences: Planned Development 197R-H, Historic

West: commercial swimming pool contractor; Planned Development 186R2-LI

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:

Coppell 2030, A Comprehensive Master Plan, shows this property as appropriate for Old Coppell Historic District uses.

DISCUSSION:

The uses proposed here, six work/live condo units on two lots, are one’s staff could normally support. The problem with this proposal, however, is that it is an incomplete submission, the application of work/live use is questionable as submitted here, and required exhibits for review are lacking.

Specifically, required landscape calculations are missing in the Perimeter Landscape chart and needs to be addressed, the applicant must recognize and place on all exhibits that these structures will be sprinklered, a tree well along Coppell Road is needed on the South Lot, parking calculations for each lot and use are not shown, and provision of a materials board has not been met, among others.

Perhaps the most serious problem staff has with this request is the fact that a certain amount of “poetic license” has been taken relative to what a work/live unit entails. In review of the floor plans for this proposal, it appears that the “work” element contains 217 square feet at best, and the remainder of the first floor—the “live” portion, calculated at 517 square feet, is twice the size of the “work” area. If these units are to be true work/live facilities, the square footage space should be reversed with the majority of “live” on the second floor, the majority of “work” on the first floor. In addition, rather than tucked away at the back of the structure, the “work” element should be the first activity one observes upon entering the building. Also one will recall when council approved our first work/live request, they made it very clear that the first floor should be primarily a work unit. If the floor plans are redesigned, the work element is enlarged to be the primary use on the first floor, and calculations are provided regarding required parking, this proposal would make a lot more sense. One more point regarding parking. It would be advisable to include a tree island in front of the South Lot (similar to that shown on the North Lot) to better address the 50% landscaping requirement of front yard landscaping normally required in similar cases. The applicant must also be cautious regarding the vast side window areas shown with buildings only 5 feet apart. Building codes have strong regulations regarding openings (penetrations) along exterior walls. Finally, in review of the elevations of these structures, they have a strong resemblance to ordinary single family units, a use our *Comprehensive Master Plan*

does not support along Coppell Road. A more “commercial” facade would be recommended—raised porch, larger/redesigned windows on first floors, more commercial style doors, better thought out signage size, design, and location would all help to exacerbate the residential impression and feel one would experience along Coppell Road with this design.

To summarize, and this is not all inclusive, if the units are redesigned to better reflect the concept behind work/live units, the incomplete application is finalized, the missing calculations regarding required landscaping is provided, notes are added to the exhibits as requested above, parking counts that reflect code mandated numbers are shown, a more commercial design “feel” is presented, and a true materials board is submitted, staff could review this proposal in a different light. Until all information is provided, however, we cannot support this request.

As stated in the modified HISTORY section of this report, we have a zoning case that has been pending since April 21, 2016. Planning Commission held the case under advisement to allow the applicant an opportunity to make alterations to the plan including revision to landscape calculations, reflection of a true “work/live” proposal, bring consistency to the proposal, provide a material board (remember the sack exhibit) to show building materials, among others.

On several occasions, the applicant has requested additional time to address staff concerns. On August 17 plans were resubmitted that were identical to the case held under advisement back in April. When advised the resubmittal did not address concerns expressed in April, the applicant requested the case be postponed once again. Staff complied with the applicant’s request and on September 21, a third effort was submitted—still with major staff concerns.

On October 6, staff met with the applicant face-to-face at our scheduled Development Review Committee meeting and discussed a number of issues with the request. Included in that discussion:

- **first floor restroom must meet commercial ADA requirements**
- **sewer service cannot go thru/under proposed buildings**
- **mutual access easement on east side of project must be a 24-foot-wide fire lane**
- **tree mitigation numbers were wrong**
- **minimum 15-foot side yard setbacks are required**
- **lack of providing all room dimensions**
- **discrepancy in building air conditioned square footage**
- **at least 50% of first floor must be true work area**
- **square footage stated on plan and measured square footage do not track**
- **major inconsistencies in drawings—sidewalks, handicap parking spaces, etc.**
- **submission of materials board**

Generally, when an applicant receives written detailed staff review of a proposed zoning case, the applicant appears before our Development Review Committee with responses to staff concerns. The fact that this applicant had appeared before the DRC on two prior occasions would suggest that familiarity with the review system was understood. Unfortunately, the applicant again stated that he had not had enough time to respond to staff issues.

As further background of staff's attempt to guide the proposal through the development process, this applicant was advised his final revised plans needed to be in our office by noon, Tuesday, October 11, a scheduling requirement for all planning case submittals. On Tuesday morning, the applicant advised staff he could not comply with the noon deadline. At that point the Planning Director gave him a 10:00 am Wednesday deadline, and if the revisions were not in by that time, the case would be recommended for denial because of non-compliance with city ordinances. At 12:20 Wednesday afternoon revised plans were submitted.

After an analysis of those plans, this proposal still does not meet city codes and ordinances. Of the eleven detailed concerns discussed on October 6, the applicant has complied with only four (tree mitigation, room dimension figures, drawing exhibit consistencies, material board). That being the case, the fact that the applicant has had more than ample time to comply with our codes, and the additional fact that staff has reviewed, re-reviewed, and re-reviewed this proposal for over nine months with no substantial code requirement changes, we recommend the case be denied.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION:

Staff is recommending taking this case UNDER ADVISEMENT to such date that the applicant can address staff concerns. If the applicant cannot make substantial changes to this request, staff would recommend DENIAL of the proposal as submitted.

Because of failure to comply with our codes and ordinances relative to work/live structures, staff recommends this case be DENIED.

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. Site Plan
2. Live/Work Lofts Floor Plans (Sheet A-1)
3. ~~Live/Work Lofts Floor Plans (Sheet A-2)~~ **This exhibit was eliminated from the resubmittal packet**
4. Live/Work Lofts Elevations (Sheet A-3)
5. Tree Preservation/Mitigation (Sheet L-1)
6. Landscape Plan (Sheet L-2)