

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION DRAFT MINUTES AUGUST 3, 2015

PUBLIC HEARING AGENDA Item #10 - Z150703/CP150702 - Zoning Change/Concept Plan - Polo Residential (City Council District 6). Senior Planner Denice Thomas presented the case report and a Power Point presentation for approval to amend the concept plan for Tract Number 20 of Planned Development-136 (PD-136) District. The 8.98-acre property, located at 4603 S. Carrier Parkway, 4607 S. Carrier Parkway, and 4611 S. Carrier Parkway, is zoned PD-136. The owner/applicant is William Pohl.

Mrs. Thomas stated the applicant proposes to develop the property in substantial conformance with the SF-6 adopted standards of the Unified Development Code; except where specific deviations are called out in the proposed PD development standards. The entire property is within an existing Public Improvement District and a Homeowners Association is required. The proposed PD development standards include a requirement for creation of an HOA. Additionally, at Staff's request, the applicant has contacted the PID #1 Board to make them aware of the change in use.

Mrs. Thomas stated residential subdivisions in the City are reviewed against the provisions of Resolution 3924 in addition to other applicable provisions of the Code of Ordinances. The applicant meets many of the provisions of Resolution 3924, but proposing 14 deviations to Resolution 3924; three of which are more restrictive than 3924. The requested exceptions to Resolution 3924 are less restrictive:

- Section II(F) states: "Residential streets with a paved width of 27 feet shall not intersect arterial or collector thoroughfares unless the paving width is flared to 37 feet at the point of intersection with said thoroughfare. The 37-foot paved width shall taper back to a standard 27-foot paved width at a certain distance back from said thoroughfare in accordance with applicable provisions contained in Section 23, Master Transportation Plan, of the Unified Development Code (UDC)." As proposed the applicant is proposing one entry with two 24-foot-wide lanes divided by a median off of Polo Road. The Transportation Division Staff has reviewed the proposal and has no objection to the proposed access.
- ✓ Section II(A)(1)(a) and (b) requires minimum lot sizes of 7,800 to 8,999 square feet for 80% of the total platted lots with 20% of the total lots being a minimum of 9,000 square feet. As proposed 30% of the lots are between 7,800 and 8,999; 29 of the 41 lots are smaller than 7,800 square feet. As proposed 14% of the residential lots are greater than 9,000 square feet; six of the 41 lots are over 9,000 square feet.
- Section II(A)(2)(a) states, "minimum lot width to be 65 feet." The minimum lot with proposed is 50 feet.
- Section II(A)(3) requires maximum lot coverage of 60%; as proposed, maximum lot coverage will be 65%.
- Section II(A)(4) requires interior side yard setbacks to be a minimum of six feet; as proposed, five feet interior setbacks are provided.

- Section II(A)(7)(b) requires corner lots with a rear yard that abuts the front yard of another lot to have a front yard along both street corners. As proposed a front yard of 25 feet will be provided on one frontage and 15 feet will be provided on the second frontage.
- Section II(A)(8) requires lots with front-entry garages to have a setback of 25 feet with an additional two-foot setback. As proposed a setback of 20 feet for front facing garages is provided.
- Section II(A)(12) requires a 20-foot-wide rear yard setback for lots that back or side onto a right-of-way greater than 50 feet. As proposed, 10-foot-wide rear setbacks are provided for all lots and 15-foot wide for one frontage of corner lots is provided.
- Section II(A)(2)(b) states, “Lots facing a “T” type street intersection shall have a minimum width of 80 feet.” There are two lots that are affected by this provision; neither of which are 80-feet-wide.
- Section II(D)(6) limits the percentage of front entry garages. As proposed, all 41 lots will have front-entry garages.
- Exhibit C-1 requires a minimum lot depth of 120 feet. As proposed the lot depth for the development will be 110 feet.

Mrs. Thomas stated on July 23, 2015, the Development Review Committee recommended approval of the zoning change and concept plan for this property subject to conditions.

Chairperson Garrett asked what type of fence would be required along Carrier Parkway and Polo Road.

Mrs. Thomas replied they are required to put in a Type 1 fence, a masonry screening fence.

Commissioner Spare noted there would be a 5 ft. setback separation from the side property lines, which would make it a 10 ft. separation between the two structures.

Mrs. Thomas replied yes.

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

Peter Verdicchio, 4201 W. Parker Lane, Building A, 201, Austin, TX was present representing the case and to respond to questions from the Commission. Mr. Verdicchio noted the owner has owned this property for the past 10 year and has sat vacant for many years, the property is zoned General Retail, they did proposed some townhomes at one time, but the neighborhood was in opposition. Mr. Verdicchio noted the homes would be of high quality.

Commissioner Womack asked if there would be any green space for families with children.

Mr. Verdicchio replied no, there would be some landscaping where the mailboxes would be located.

Leo Devora, 4585 Mountain Laurel Drive, Grand Prairie, TX stepped forward in opposition, but after listening to staff's presentation he would be in support of the residential development.

Michelle Madden, 4588 Mountain Laurel Drive, Grand Prairie, TX stepped forward in opposition to this request. Mrs. Madden stated a few years ago this area was proposed for townhomes, but is glad to hear they are proposing single family residential. Mrs. Madden noted her concern is the lot size as well as the homes square footages, and asked that the fence be similar to the existing Westchester fence.

LaSandra Stroman, 4544 Mountain Lane, Grand Prairie, TX stated she too was opposed to the zoning change, but is in favor of the single family residential.

Commissioner Spare noted this development is proposed to be built with single family residential not a multi-family use.

There being no further discussion on the case, Commissioner Lopez moved to close the public hearing and approve case Z150703/CP150702 as presented and recommended by staff. The action and vote being recorded as follows:

Motion: Lopez

Second: Johnson

Ayes: Garrett, Johnson, Lopez, Philipp, Spare, and Womack

Nays: None

Approved: **6-0**

Motion: **carried.**