## PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION DRAFT MINUTES, OCTOBER 5, 2015

<u>PUBLIC HEARING AGENDA Item #11 – Z150901/CP150901 - Zoning Change/Concept Plan-Winding Creek Apartments (City Council District 4).</u> Senior Planner Denice Thomas presented the case report and gave a Power Point presentation to amend the concept plan and uses for Planned Development-29 (PD-29) and Planned Development 231A (PD-231A) Districts to allow multi-family uses. The 22.98-acre property, generally located north of Sara Jane Parkway and west of Bob Smith Parkway, is split-zoned PD-29, PD-231A, and PD-265 and is within the State Highway 161 (SH-161) and Interstate Highway 20 (I-20) Corridor Overlay Districts. The applicant is Bryan Moore, DBA Architects and the owner is Sally Smith, Bob Smith Mgmt.

Mrs. Thomas stated the Planning and Zoning Commission tabled this item at the August 31, 2015, regular meeting to give the applicant an opportunity to work with Staff to resolve some of the outstanding issues and address questions raised by the Planning and Zoning Commission. Since the meeting the applicant has provided additional information that offers a rationale for the reduced setback adjacent to Sara Jane Parkway. Due to environmental and topographical constraints the developable pad site is severely restricted. In an attempt to address the concerns raised by Staff and the Planning and Zoning Commission regarding the close proximity of buildings to the right-of-way, the applicant has provided a 20-foot setback with a variable width landscape buffer that exceeds 20 feet in some locations adjacent to Sara Jane Parkway. The varied landscape buffer and plant materials mitigate for the reduced setback by breaking up the massing adjacent to the right-of-way and allows for development of the property. Staff is supportive of the revised layout with the varied landscape buffer.

Mrs. Thomas stated the PD amendment, will not conform to any of the multi-family designations adopted in the UDC; however, the MF-2 designation is closer than other multi-family designations. The following are deviations to the UDC and the PD ordinance:

- ➤ The minimum living area, as proposed, will be 650 square feet for one-bedroom units, 800 square feet for two-bedroom units, and 1,000 square feet for three-bedroom units. The UDC requires a minimum living area of 690 square feet for one –bedroom units, 980 square feet for two-bedroom units, and 1,100 square feet for three-bedroom units.
- As proposed, façades facing Sara Jane Parkway will be 100% masonry. All other façades, as proposed, will be 80% masonry and 20% comprised of fiber cement board siding. The UDC requires all primary façades, as defined by Appendix F, to be 100% primary masonry (e.g.: brick or stone).
- ➤ Roof pitch throughout the development is 4:12 to 8:12. The UDC requires minimum roof pitch mixture of 6:12 and 10:12 slope.
- ➤ Balconies will be provided on the floors above the ground floor as proposed. The UDC requires patios on the ground level and balconies on all other levels. Staff's recommendation is that the proposal complies with the UDC provisions.
- ➤ The proposed development calculates density based on gross acreage. The UDC and the adopted PD ordinance calculates density based on net acreage; acre excluding roads,

drainage area, and floodplain. The subject site may have floodplain. Calculating based on gross acreage would yield more units than what would be permissible and a higher density than the UDC permits. Staff is not supportive of this request.

- ➤ The front yard setback, as proposed, will be 20 feet. The UDC requires a 40-foot setback for single-story buildings, 60 feet for two-story buildings, and 100 feet for three-story buildings. The proposed buildings will be three stories. The UDC requires a 100-foot setback for the multi-family component of the development.
- ➤ The interior side yard setback, as proposed, will be 20 feet. The exterior side yard setback, as proposed will be 30 feet. The side yard setback for buildings that side onto an arterial are required to have 40-foot wide side yard setbacks for single story buildings, 60-foot wide side yard setbacks for two-story buildings, and 100-foot wide side yard setbacks per the UDC. The buildings proposed are three stories; a 100-foot wide side yard setback is required.
- ➤ The rear yard setback, as proposed, will be 10 feet. The UDC rear yard setbacks are based on the height of the building. Single story apartment buildings are required to have 25 feet or two times the roof height, whichever is greater; two story apartment buildings are required to have 50 feet or two times the roof height, whichever is greater; three story apartment buildings are required to have 75 feet or two times the roof height, whichever is greater. It is unclear how tall the buildings will be, however, a minimum of 75 feet is required for rear yard setbacks by the UDC.
- As proposed, the PD would allow 2" caliper trees to be planted. The UDC requires a minimum of 3" caliper trees to be planted throughout the City of Grand Prairie. Staff is not supportive of this amendment.

Mrs. Thomas stated while the proposed amendment defers to existing UDC regulations, the applicant is requesting deviations to the regulation as part of this proposal. Therefore, Staff cannot recommend full support; however, if it is the desire of the P & Z Commission to recommend approval of this proposal the Development Review Committee recommends the following:

- 1. Development will occur in substantial conformance with the UDC provisions, except where specifically mentioned in the PD ordinance.
- 2. That, unless explicitly indicated in the PD ordinance, all development will be subject to the UDC requirements.
- 3. That, unless explicitly indicated in the PD ordinance, in the event that conflicts occur between the PD and the UDC, the PD ordinance shall prevail.
- 4. That parking requirements for the subject site comply with the UDC as amended.
- 5. Any outstanding comments found in City Case File, #Z150901/CP150901 must be addressed.

Chairperson Garrett noted there were no questions for staff, opened the public hearing, and asked for speakers.

Bryan Moore with DBA Architects, 111 S. Kentucky, Ste 210, McKinney, TX was present representing the case and to respond to questions from the Commission. Mr. Moore stated all of the parking requirements would be met, but are asking some relief on the parking garages.

Mr. Crolley stated multi-family developers usually conduct a market study on the unit sizes.

Commissioner Motley asked when they anticipate construction of the project.

Mr. Moore stated as soon as they can get Council approval.

Chairperson Garrett noted one speaker card submitted in support of this request. Max Coleman, 9 Heritage Court, Grand Prairie, TX.

There being no further discussion on the case, Commissioner Moser moved to close the public hearing and approve case Z150901/CP150901 as presented and recommended by staff granting the applicants requested appeals. The action and vote being recorded as follows:

Motion: Moser Second: Spare

Ayes: Garrett, Johnson, Lopez, Dr. Perez, Philipp, Moser, Motley, Spare, and Womack

Nays: None Approved: **9-0** Motion: **carried.**