STAFF REPORT

Case No.: 20-SP-09
Request: Conduct a public hearing and consider the request for a Detailed Site Plan and associated Special Exceptions for a restaurant located on an approximately 0.307-acre tract of land at 2429 Valley View Lane; and take appropriate action.
Applicant: Md. Mozharul Islam, P.E.
Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting: September 14, 2020

Background:

The applicant is proposing to build an approximate 2,429 square feet, single-story, restaurant and associated improvements on a 0.307-acre property, located at 2429 Valley View Lane. There will be no alcohol sales within the restaurant and no drive-through operations are proposed. The property is currently vacant and includes an approximately 30-foot wide Oncor utility easement along the west property line. An Oncor transmission tower is also located on the west property line, near the southwest corner of the property.

The property is zoned Planned Development District No. 86 (PD-86), also known as the Station Area Code. Restaurants are allowed by right within the PD-86 zoning district. The applicant is requesting special exceptions related to driveway spacing, open area, street trees, required building frontage, and roof design.

Subject Property:

Site acreage: 0.307 acre

Location: 2429 Valley View Lane; generally located on the north side of Valley View Lane and approximately 125 feet west of Denton Drive.

Proposed Development:

The applicant is proposing to build an approximate 2,429 square foot speculative restaurant building with related site improvements. The building is roughly rectangular in shape and is proposed to sit parallel to the east property line. The main entrance to the building is on the west side and a second entrance is proposed on the south side. There will be a service door on the north side in proximity to the dumpster area. Operating hours of the restaurant will be 6 a.m. to 9 p.m. daily. A seven-foot-wide sidewalk is proposed along Valley View Lane. There will also be a continuous, minimum four-foot-wide sidewalk around the building, except along the east wall which is the rear side of the building.

The proposed location of the dumpster raises some concern as the sanitation truck will potentially have to make difficult maneuvers to exit the site in a forward-facing manner onto Valley View Lane. However, the applicant has shown with a truck turning exhibit that the proposed maneuvers are achievable. The dumpster area will be screened with a seven foot tall masonry wall with double doors. One of the advantages of the proposed dumpster location is that the area will be completely hidden from view from Valley View Lane by the proposed building.

The applicant has coordinated with Oncor regarding approval of improvements proposed within their 30-foot wide easement. Currently surface parking, pavement, and low height landscaping materials are proposed within the easement. Oncor has reviewed the proposed detailed site plan, landscape plan and plant materials, and has indicated their approval of the proposed improvements within their easement.

| Direction | Zoning District | Land Use |
|-----------|--|---------------------------------|
| North | Planned Development District No. 86 (PD-86) | Office |
| South | Planned Development District No. 86 (PD-86) | Vacant; across Valley View Lane |
| East | Planned Development District No. 86 (PD-86) | Motor Vehicle Repair |
| West | Planned Development District No. 86 (PD-86) | Restaurant |

Adjacent Zoning Districts and Land Uses:

Access:

The development will be accessible from Valley View Lane through a proposed 30-foot wide driveway. Staff has expressed concern regarding this proposed driveway location. It is not only too close (within 25 feet) to the existing driveway west of this property, it also does not align with the existing median opening within Valley View Lane. This may result future motorists attempting to drive in the wrong direction on Valley View Lane to enter this site after turning left through the median opening. Additional discussion related to access is provided later within this report – refer to Special Exception #1.

Parking:

Lots under 20,000 square feet in land area have no parking requirement as per PD-86 ordinance. This site is approximately 13,373 square feet in size, thus no parking is required. However, the applicant is proposing 13 parking spaces, including one ADA accessible space.

Site Landscaping:

PD-86 requires 15% contiguous open space in order to provide for meaningful and useable open space on private property. The proposed landscape plan includes 16% of non-contiguous landscaped area, consisting of one Cedar Elm, three Eve's Necklace, five Yaupon Holy and several

shrubs. Additional discussion related to open area is provided later within this report – refer to Special Exception #3.

Street Trees Required:

PD-86 requires street trees along Valley View Lane not greater than 30-feet on center. Based on the length of this property along Valley View Lane, 3 street trees (shade tree) selected from the street tree list provided for in PD-86 are required. The applicant has not proposed any street trees. However, three Yaupon Hollys (ornamental trees) are proposed within the Oncor easement along Valley View Lane. Additional discussion related to street trees is provided later within this report – refer to Special Exception #2.

Building Elevations:

Building exterior material will be comprised primarily of brick and stucco. Metal awnings are proposed above window openings on the south and west façades and above the entryways. A minimum 4-foot tall parapet wall has been proposed to screen roof-top mechanical equipment. The parapet wall will be raised to 7 feet to accentuate the main entrance on the west wall. Additional discussion related to the proposed roof line is provided later within this report – refer to Special Exception #5.

Special Exceptions:

The following special exceptions are being requested by the applicant.

Special Exception #1 – Chapter II.B. Curb cuts shall be limited to no more than one per 200 feet for all Type A street frontages.

PD-86 limits one driveway per 200 feet along Type A street frontage, which Valley View Lane is a Type A street. The existing driveway on Valley View Lane, west of this site is within 25 feet from the proposed driveway. If the applicant could have collaborated with the adjacent property owners to the west of this site, the existing driveway could have been utilized as a shared driveway allowing for an improved site layout, including improved site circulation and additional building frontage along the street. It is staff's understanding that the applicant contacted the neighboring property owner who declined to coordinate shared access at that time while they were finishing site construction. As an alternate option, the applicant could have coordinated with the adjacent property owner to the east to consolidate existing drive approaches into one shared drive to improve access for both properties.

Ideally, the subject property would be consolidated with adjacent properties to the east and/or north for greater development densities and compliance with ordinance requirements. Additionally, since an access easement was not extended to the subject property from the adjacent site to the west, access to the subject property is challenged absent any coordination with adjacent property owners. Lastly, given the proposed site layout and the building being located near the east property line, this site layout precludes any opportunities for coordinated access with the adjacent property to the east in the future. As infill properties develop, collaboration with adjacent property owners

is necessary particularly when it comes to access, circulation, and infrastructure. Not all properties will be able to have their own driveway hence why the Station Area Code has minimum driveway spacing requirements at every 200 feet. Within a walkable, pedestrian-oriented development, allowing frequently spaced driveways are not conducive to promoting walkability.

Special Exception #2 – Chapter II.B. Streetscape standards related to street trees along Type A street frontage.

PD-86 requires street trees (i.e. shade trees selected from the PD-86 street tree list) along all Type A street frontages to be planted at the time of development at no greater than 30 feet on center. Valley View Lane is a Type A street and based on the length of this property along Valley View Lane, three street trees are required. The applicant has not proposed any street trees. Instead, three Yaupon Hollys are proposed within the Oncor easement along Valley View Lane. Oncor does not allow shade trees within their easement hence the proposed ornamental tree variety. Towards the east end of the property there are existing utility service lines and not enough land area to accommodate a shade tree while also ensuring that the tree will survive. Should the applicant have coordinated shared access with the adjacent property to the west, this could have potentially resulted additional street trees being provided along the street frontage since the drive approach would not have been consuming street frontage.

Special Exception #3 – Chapter III.B. Building Envelope Standards for Shopfront Colonnade Sites - Related to Open Area

PD-86 requires minimum 15% of total buildable area to be contiguous open area in order to provide for meaningful and useable open space on private property. The proposed layout does not meet this requirement. The applicant is proposing 16% of the site to be landscaped, but the landscaping is not contiguous. Given the planting limitations imposed through the Oncor easement, the applicant has provided adequate site landscaping. Should the applicant have coordinated shared access with the adjacent property to the west, this could have potentially resulted improved useable open space for the subject property.

Special Exception #4 – Chapter III.B. Building Envelope Standards for Shopfront Colonnade Sites - Related to Street Facade

PD-86 requires buildings located along Valley View Lane to be constructed at the Required Building Line (RBL) for a distance equivalent to 85% of the required RBL. The proposed layout does not meet this requirement. Only 30% of the required RBL will be occupied by the proposed building. Referring back to Special Exception #1, if the applicant could have arrived at an agreement with the neighboring property owner to utilize the existing driveway as a shared drive for this site, the building could have been oriented with increased street frontage along Valley View Lane and this Special Exception request could have potentially been avoided. When compared with the recently developed site to the west, this site does have greater building frontage at the RBL.

Special Exception #5 – Chapter V.C. Roofs and Parapets

PD-86 requires all buildings to have a pitched roof configuration. The proposed building will have a flat roof configuration. Given the architectural design and contemporary style of the building, the flat roof is a more suitable configuration.

Special Exceptions Summary

The majority of the special exceptions being requested are a result of the proposed driveway configuration and to some extent, the existing Oncor easement. Given the size of the lot and the Oncor easement, layout and design flexibility of the site has been limited. As infill properties continue to develop and/or redevelop, coordination with adjacent property owners is important regardless if located within the Station Area or elsewhere within the city.

The reason for special exceptions is to allow applicants to propose an alternate site layout when the site layout is not able to fully achieve the development standards required by the applicable zoning district, yet recognizes and allows for a site layout that still achieves the intent of the zoning district. PD-86 grants approval authority of special exceptions to the Planning and Zoning Commission. Should the Commission find that the requested special exceptions are acceptable, then staff recommends the Commission approve the special exception requests. If the Commission denies any of the requested special exceptions, the applicant may appeal the Commission's decision to City Council.

Other Items for Consideration:

PD-86 allows for administrative approval of a Detailed Site Plan provided that the plan complies with all of the development standards within the ordinance. In the event the applicant is not able to comply with certain development standards, special exceptions may be considered and approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission as previously stated.

Comprehensive Plan Recommendation:

The Central Area Plan designates the subject property as DART Station District as provided for on the Future Land Use Map. This land use designation recommends that this area serve as a more urban, pedestrian friendly environment. A mixture of restaurants, retail, services and office space is recommended with the district.

The proposed restaurant use is consistent with the plan recommendation.



Public Response:

On September 4, 2020, eight zoning notification letters were mailed to the surrounding property owners, in addition to both Carrollton-Farmers Branch and Dallas school districts. A zoning notification sign was also placed on the site on the same day. As of writing of this report no written correspondence has been received by the city.

Staff Recommendation:

Should the Planning and Zoning Commission find that the requested special exceptions are acceptable, then staff recommends the Commission approve the special exception requests.