TOWN OF PROSPER

Prosper is a place where everyone matters.

MINUTES

Regular Meeting of the
Prosper Planning & Zoning Commission
108 W. Broadway St., Prosper, Texas
Town of Prosper Municipal Chambers
Tuesday, May 19, 2015, 6:00 p.m.

1. Call to Order / Roll Call.

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m.

Commissioners present: Chair Mike McClung, Vice Chair Craig Moody, Brian Barnes, John Hema and John Alzner.
Commissioner absent: Chris Keith
Commissioner Snyder arrived at 6:13 p.m.

Staff present: John Webb, Director of Development Services; Alex Glushko, Senior Planner; and Pamela Clark, Planning Technician.

2. Recitation of Pledge of Allegiance.

CONSENT AGENDA

3a. Consider and act upon minutes from the May 6, 2015 Regular Planning & Zoning Commission meeting.

3b. Consider and act upon a Site Plan for seven temporary buildings for Rogers Middle School, on 34.4± acres, located on the northeast corner of Richland Boulevard and Coit Road. The property is zoned Planned Development-25 (PD-25). (D15-0027).

3c. Consider and act upon a Site Plan for a Commercial Stealth Antenna on a Town elevated water storage tank, on 2.8± acres, located on the south side of First Street, 2,200± feet east of Preston Road. The property is zoned Planned Development-6 (PD-6). (D15-0033).

3d. Consider and act upon a Site Plan for a retail building in SJT Addition, Block 2, Lot A, on 0.5± acre, located on the southeast corner of Main Street and Third Street. The property is zoned Downtown Retail (DTR). (D15-0037).

3e. Consider and act upon a Final Plat for Lakes of Prosper, Phase 5B, for 55 single family residential lots, on 15.1± acres, located 1,400± feet north of Prosper Trail, 3,000± feet east of Dallas Parkway. The property is zoned Planned Development-8 (PD-8). (D15-0039).

3f. Consider and act upon a Preliminary Site Plan for the Eagle Crossing Addition, on 9.5± acres, located on the west side of Coleman Street, 1,200± feet south of Prosper Trail. The property is zoned Commercial (C). (D15-0040).

3g. Consider and act upon an Amending Plat for the Prosper Middle School No. 2 Addition, Block 1, Lot 1R, on 36.0± acres, located on the northeast corner of Coit Road and Richland Boulevard. The property is zoned Planned Development-25 (PD-25). (D15-0041).

Motioned by Moody, seconded by Alzner, to approve the Consent Agenda subject to staff recommendations. Motion approved 5-0.

REGULAR AGENDA

4. Conduct a Public Hearing, and consider and act upon a request for a Specific Use Permit for a Utility Distribution/Transmission Facility, on 0.2± acres, located on the south side of First Street, 500± feet west of the BNSF railroad. The property is zoned Planned Development-67 (PD-67). (S15-0004).

Glushko: Indicated the applicant requested the application be tabled indefinitely.

Motioned by Alzner, seconded by Barnes, to table Item 4 indefinitely. Motion approved 5-0.

5. Conduct a Public Hearing, and consider and act upon a request to amend Chapter 2, Zoning Districts and Chapter 4, Development Requirements of the Zoning Ordinance regarding Alternating Single Family Plan Elevations, Exterior Residential Masonry Construction, Impervious Coverage of Residential Front Yards, Single Family Corner Lot Landscaping, Residential Garage Standards, Residential Driveway Standards, Carports and Size of Garages; and amend Chapter 3, Building Regulations of the Code of Ordinances regarding residential fences and exterior masonry construction. (Z15-0005).

Webb: Summarized the request and presented proposed amendments. Discussed the implementation schedule for proposed amendments.

Public Hearing was opened by Chair McClung.

Cap Parry (Resident): Spoke in favor of the ordinance amendments. Expressed concerns that the development standards do not apply to commercial construction. Suggested an incentive to developers for implementing the development standards.

Jack Dixon (Resident): Stated his home already conforms to the proposed standards. Stated the current size of garages are not long enough or tall enough. Expressed support for the board-on-board fencing and opening fencing adjacent to trails and open spaces.

Mike Bennett (Resident): Spoke in opposition to changing the development standards. Expressed a desire for the Town to work on community standards. Stated the expense that residential home owners would incur would be substantially increased.

David Lehde (Dallas Builders Association): Referenced a letter sent to the Commissioners regarding concerns. Opposed the enhanced paving standards due to maintenance. Recommended the owners be allowed to have wooden fencing as long as the residents maintain the fencing. Stated garage doors being setback from the house would decrease the size of the backyard and would create restrictions on the interior. Limiting the elevations could cause design issues. Masonry requirement for the upper level would limit building design

options and building materials that are accepted by all design codes. Discussed the cost for maintaining masonry on the chimneys. Discussed alternative building materials for chimney construction. Stated the changes would hinder Prosper from remaining a competitive market.

David Blom (Developer and Resident): Stated that Town should not need to create an anti-monotony ordinance since developments should be addressing this in their Homeowners Association (HOA) documents. Second story masonry requirements will limit builders design and creativity. Stated current building materials last longer and have improved durability and appearance. Garage doors being set back from the front of the home adds needless cost, and homeowners would not gain anything. The changes would add 50-60 thousand dollars to the price of homes. The chimney requirement is going to require engineered plans. Expressed support for the wrought iron fencing requirement along trails and open spaces. Expressed opposition to the requirement of wrought iron fencing on corner lots due to safety and privacy. Suggested to enact an ordinance regarding the maintenance of fencing and put the burden on the developer and HOA to ensure maintenance and consistent color of staining.

JD Sanders (Resident): Stated that the Town Comprehensive Plan assisted in his decision to move to Prosper. Expressed support for the proposed amendments. Asked if the builders would be required to have a consistent fencing throughout a development. Expressed concerns regarding the financial hardship to require residents to replace fencing with board-on-board fencing.

Clint Richardson (Developer and Prosper Developers Council Representative): Stated the changes are going to be at a considerably greater cost. Expressed concern of implementation on projects that have not been final platted. Suggested that developments that have an approved preliminary plat should be grandfathered.

Trevor Wood (Resident and Developer): Suggested to guard against the standards as a blanket, do not make this a requirement in the older downtown areas. The downtown feel as it is revitalized would be affected and the board-on-board fencing would not match architectural style.

Judy Barnes (Resident): Described current fencing in her subdivision and desire for the fencing to remain the way it is. Expressed the desire to have the freedom to make the decisions for their properties.

There being no other speakers the Public Hearing was closed by Chair McClung.

Commission Discussion:

1. Alternating Single Family Plan Elevations (Anti-Monotony). A minimum of four (4) distinctly different home elevations shall be built on the same side of the street. Similar elevations shall not face each other. The same elevation shall not be within three homes of each other on the same side of the street. Different exterior elevations can be met by meeting at least two of the following criteria: Different roof forms/profiles, different facades consisting of different window and door style and placement, different entry treatment such as porches and columns, different number of stories.
   - Alzner: Agreed as proposed.
   - Snyder: Agreed with no less than four (4) distinctly different home elevations shall be built on the same side of the street.

Moody: Agreed with no less than four (4) distinctly different home elevations shall be built on the same side of the street/clarify if less than four homes on a street.
McClung: Agreed as proposed with clarification of less than four homes on a street.
Barnes: Recommended to clarify "elevations not facing each other."
Hema: Agreed with Commissioners' comments.

2. Masonry Construction for Single Family Facades Facing a Street. Excluding windows, any portion of an upper story facing a street shall be constructed of 100% masonry.
   Alzner: Opposed to the requirement, does not promote diversity of product type.
   Snyder: Agreed as proposed.
   Moody: Agreed as proposed.
   McClung: Noted the 100% masonry is too excessive/proposed no less than 85%-90% masonry.
   Barnes: Agreed as proposed.
   Hema: Agreed as proposed.

3. Impervious Coverage of Front Yards. The cumulative area of any driveway plus any impermeable surface area located between the front property line and any front building wall shall not exceed fifty (50) percent of the area between the front property line and any front building wall. For the purpose of this subsection, the front wall of a j-swing can be used to meet the requirement.
   All Commissioners: Agreed with the language as proposed.

4. Single Family Corner Lot Landscaping. A minimum of two (2), four (4) caliper inch trees shall be planted in the side yards of a corner lot. Where more than two (2) trees are required per lot, the side yard corner lot trees may be used to meet the requirement. Street trees planted adjacent to the side yard of a corner lot may also be used to meet the requirement.
   Alzner: Noted the requirement is excessive, change the wording to provide flexibility.
   Snyder: Recommended to decrease the size requirement to three (3) caliper inch tree.
   Moody: Noted the requirement is excessive.
   McClung: Recommended to decrease the requirement to one (1) three (3) caliper inch tree.
   Barnes: Stated he does not support this requirement.
   Hema: Stated the requirement is excessive.

5. Residential Garage Standards
   i. In no instance shall a garage door directly facing a street be less than 25 feet from the property line.
      All Commissioners: Agreed with the language as proposed.

   ii. Garage door directly facing a street shall not occupy more than fifty percent (50%) of the width of the front façade of the house.
      All Commissioners: Agreed with the language as proposed.

iii. Garage door directly facing a street shall be located a minimum of five (5) feet behind the main front façade of the house.

All Commissioners: Agreed that garage doors directly facing a street must be recessed or flush with the main portion of the house, in lieu of requiring the five (5) foot garage door setback..

iv. Where a home has three (3) or more garage/enclosed parking spaces, no more than two (2) garage doors shall face the street, unless the garage door(s) are located behind the main structure.

All Commissioners: Agreed as proposed – Staff suggested that the language be modified to clarify only two garage spaces can face the street.

6. Residential Driveway Standards
   i. Stamp and stain/patterned concrete, shall be dust-on color application to wet concrete.
   ii. Acid-etched colored concrete for the field with scored colored borders, shall use dust-on color application to wet concrete.
   iii. Colored concrete with scored smooth border, shall use dust-on color application to wet concrete.
   iv. Brick or interlocking pavers or pave stone.

   All Commissioners: Agreed to omit this amendment; except Alzner recommended to utilize the requirement in PD's or at a minimum, require a border or edge.

7. Chimneys. The exterior of chimneys shall be 100% clay fired brick, natural or manufactures stone or stucco.
   Alzner: Opposed to the requirement due to weight of full brick, recommended requiring Hardi-board and "Smartside Siding" as an allowable masonry material for chimneys.
   Snyder: Agreed with the language as proposed.
   Moody: Agreed with the language as proposed.
   McClung: Recommended Hardi-board and thin brick as an allowable masonry material for chimneys.
   Barnes: Recommended thin brick as an allowable masonry material for chimneys.
   Hema: Agreed with the language as proposed.

8. Carports. The support structures of a carport shall be of the same material as the main structure. The roof shall have a minimum roof pitch of 6:12 and be of similar material and (architectural design) as the main structure:
   Alzner: Agreed with the language as proposed.
   Snyder: Agreed with the language but would prefer elimination.
   Moody: Agree with the language as proposed.
   McClung: Recommended allowing only on lots with a minimum of one acre.
   Barnes: Agreed with the language but would prefer elimination.
   Hema: Agreed with the language as proposed.

9. General Fencing Standards. Wooden fences shall be board-on-board with a top rail.

Alzner: Supported board-on-board fencing with new construction, but existing fencing should not require to be replaced with board-on-board fencing. All existing fencing should be grandfathered.

Snyder: Suggested new fencing be board-on-board, and an entire replacement be required to have board-on-board fencing.

Moody: Agreed with new fencing required to have board-on-board and existing should be grandfathered.

McClung: Stated fencing facing the street should be required to have board-on-board, but fences on internal lots between neighbors should be up to the resident.

Barnes: Agreed with new fencing being required to have board-on-board and existing should be grandfathered.

Hema: Agreed with new fencing being required to have board-on-board and existing should be grandfathered.

10. Fencing adjacent to Open Spaces and Hike & Bike Trails. Fences adjacent to open space and hike and bike trails shall be ornamental metal, tubular steel or split rail. Existing wooden fences may be replaced with wooden fence in compliance with the board-on-board requirement.

    All Commissioners: Agreed with proposed amendment with existing, legally installed wooden fencing being grandfathered from the replacement requirement.

11. Fences on corner lots shall be ornamental metal. Existing wood fences may be replaced with a wood fence in accordance with the standards for wood fences as they exist or may be amended. Existing wooden fences may be replaced with wood fences in compliance with the board-on-board requirement.

    All Commissioners (with the exception of Snyder): Opposed the corner lot open fencing requirement.

    Snyder: Agreed with the language as proposed.

12. Garage size. The total area of enclosed garage space shall be a minimum of 426 square feet. The requirement can be met by a garage area separate from the two-car garage.

    Alzner: Agreed with the language as proposed.

    Snyder: Agreed with the language as proposed.

    Moody: Stated the 15% increase appears arbitrary; suggested 400 square feet.

    McClung: Opposed/the size of the garage should be between the builder and the homeowner.

    Barnes: Agreed more square footage is need, but it should be a decision made by the builder and homeowner.

    Hema: Agreed with amendment but suggested a minimum length and width be proposed.

Motion by McClung, seconded by Snyder, to approve Agenda Item 5, subject to the proposed changes as noted. Motion approved 6-0.

6. Possibly direct Town Staff to schedule topic(s) for discussion at a future meeting.

Webb: Noted this was Chairman McClung's final meeting and on behalf of the Town and the staff, expressed sincere appreciation for the years of service and effort put into preparing for every meeting and professionalism chairing the Commission.

7. Adjourn.

Motioned by Snyder, seconded by Hema, to adjourn. Motion approved 6-0 at 8:19 p.m.

Pamela A Clark

Pamela Clark, Planning Technician

Chris Keith, Secretary