

### **July 5, 2017, Planning and Zoning Commission Special Called Meeting Minutes**

Public Hearing – Conduct a Public Hearing and consider a request to amend the Development Regulations of District D of Planned Development “PD” No. 108 and adopt a Concept Plan, Screening Plan, Roadway Plan, and Building Elevations relating to a 33.66± acre tract of land situated in the Catherine Parsons Survey, Abstract No. 711; generally located southwest of Exchange Parkway and Watters Road. (Z-8/1/16-59) [Village at Twin Creeks Phase 4]

Mr. Lee Battle, Acting Director of Community Development, presented the item to the Commission. He stated the item is a Public Hearing for a PD amendment for the Village at Twin Creeks Phase 4. He stated that the property is generally located southwest of Exchange Parkway and Watters Road. The property to the north (across Exchange Parkway) is zoned Planed Development PD No. 108 Mixed-Use MIX. The properties to the west and south (across Kennedy Drive) are zoned Planned Development PD No. 108 Single-Family Residential SF. To the east (across Watters Road), the properties are zoned Planed Development PD No. 54 Industrial Technology IT.

Mr. Battle noted that the property is currently zoned Planned Development PD No. 108 Single-Family Residential SF. He stated that the original PD was adopted in October 2011, and the subject property falls within District D of PD No. 108. Mr. Battle stated that in 2014, a Concept Plan was adopted for the development of The Villages of Twin Creeks, but it did not include this northeast quadrant of District D. He stated that this was intentional to allow for changes to the property as time went on. He noted that the Concept Plan originally contemplated retail at the corner and lots as small as thirty-one feet but that neither are included in this request. He stated that the request this evening, is for 40’-45’ lots.

He stated that the applicant has submitted a Concept Plan and Development Regulations for the development of this final phase of The Village at Twin Creeks. He stated that the request is to amend the Development Regulations of District D of Planned Development PD No. 108 and adopt a Concept Plan, Screening Plan, Roadway Plan, and Building Elevations, to establish design standards for a residential community.

Mr. Battle stated that there are a total of three access points into the development. He explained that there are two access points on Kennedy Drive and one access point on Watters Road. He stated that the Roadway Exhibit depicts the internal streets with a 50’ right-of-way. He stated that there would also be an alley that consisted of 12’ pavement and 16’ right-of-way, which is standard throughout the city.

Mr. Battle showed the approximately 4.9± acres of open space distributed around the perimeter of the property and throughout the development. He noted that amenities such as benches and playground equipment will be provided within the open space areas. Additionally, he showed the 10’ Hike and Bike trail proposed along Exchange Parkway. He stated that this trail connects to existing trails on the western and eastern sides of this property. He showed that the proposed trail also continues as a proposed 8’ Hike and Bike Trail along Watters Road.

Mr. Battle showed that the screening for the property will consist of an 8’ masonry screening wall on the northern property boundary along Exchange Parkway and on the eastern property boundary along Watters Road. He stated that an 8’ stone parapet wall and a wrought-iron fence will also be constructed along the northeastern portion of the property. He stated that the screening would be very similar to the existing development’s screening wall and showed pictures demonstrating the landscaping and design.

Mr. Battle stated that the proposed residential development is approximately 33.66± acres. He showed the Concept Plan with a total of 242 lots with three single-family product types:

1. Approximately 106 units (44% of the total lots) will be Townhome (TH) lots, with a minimum lot size of 25'X95' and a minimum dwelling unit size of 1,400 square feet.
2. Approximately 70 lots (29% of the total lots) will be single-family detached R-7 lots (Type 1), with a minimum lot size of 45'X95' and a minimum dwelling unit size of 1,800 square feet. These lots will be front-entry.
3. Approximately 66 lots (27% of the total lots) will be single-family detached R-7 lots (Type 2), with a minimum lot size of 40'X110' and a minimum dwelling unit size of 1,800 square feet. These lots will be rear-entry.

Mr. Battle stated that several building elevations will be incorporated in the development. He noted that all sides of all elevations will be 100% masonry with primary building materials such as stone, brick, and stucco. The 100% masonry requirement exceeds the ALDC standards. Additionally, he noted that the elevations will be further enhanced through treated driveways and carriage-hardware designed garage doors.

Mr. Battle noted that no on-street parking will be permitted along streets with townhome frontage – this restriction will be marked by “No Parking” signage. Parking for the townhome lots is provided as off-street parking. He stated that this restriction would also be in the deeds of the homes, making it enforceable through the deed as well.

Mr. Battle stated that the Development Regulations stipulate that there must be two shade trees per lot. In locations where the shade trees may not be successfully planted on the lot, there are options to plant them in other places throughout the development.

Mr. Battle stated that the Development Regulations include building elevation standards, lot design criteria and setbacks, screening, roadway, the no parking restriction, tree planting, and cluster mailbox regulations. He noted that other modifications to PD No. 108 also include removing the regulation to deed restrict the property to individuals over 55 years of age.

Mr. Battle noted that, through the Technical Review Committee, the Allen Independent School District did have questions about the impact of this development. Mr. Battle stated that the applicant utilized a school demographer to produce additional data, which indicated a low impact from this type of development.

Chairman Cocking opened the public hearing.

Chairman Cocking closed the public hearing.

1<sup>st</sup> Vice-Chair Trahan stated that he had gone out to drive the site and, while it has no bearing on his decision, when driving down Kennedy Drive to go north on Watters Road, the median was difficult to see. He felt that there needed to be a marker or indication of the median so that people did not drive over it.

Mr. Battle stated that it was noted and that the feedback would be shared with the Engineering Department.

Commissioner Hollingsworth stated that he had no questions.

2<sup>nd</sup> Vice-Chair Platt stated that he felt the development was a great continuation of what has already started.

Commissioner Orr agreed that what has been completed so far has been extremely nice and that, if it continues, the development will be a great addition to the City.

2<sup>nd</sup> Vice-Chair Platt stated that the screening wall was one of the nicest that he has seen in a while, and that it sets a high standard.

Commissioner Hollingsworth questioned who would be allowed to park in the public parking provided within the development and if there was any mechanism to monitor that area to ensure that people are not leaving things there indefinitely.

Mr. Battle stated that it was a good question but that he was unsure of the deed restrictions.

Jed Dolson, 2805 North Dallas Tollway, Plano, TX, 75093, stated that the deed restrictions were approved by the City Attorney for Phase 1 and Phase 2 of Village at Twin Creeks. He noted that this section would be annexed into the existing development. He noted that it prohibits things like parking boats in the public spaces.

Commissioner Hollingsworth questioned who monitors the public parking and if the City or the HOA would be responsible for enforcement.

Mr. Dolson confirmed that it was the HOA's responsibility to monitor the deed restrictions. He also noted that the HOA has the ability to fine, which seems to be more effective in enforcement than just warning letters.

Chairman Cocking commended the step away from small lots and the transition between the 40' lots and the 30' lots across the street. He stated that he did not like the townhome rows. He noted that the Commission has done a lot of great work in preventing rows of thirty-four houses or townhomes on a long streak. Additionally, he noted that the twenty-five foot lots with eighteen-foot driveways leave only seven feet of grass per lot. He reiterated that there has been a lot of work put into establishing curves along residential roads and that the townhomes do not meet this. He stated that recent urban residential will look better than this row of townhomes.

Chairman Cocking noted that he cannot fault the developer for the townhomes as the Allen Land Development Code is outdated. He noted that this can be built in our town according to our Land Development Code. He stated that the code needs to be updated. He noted that the residential areas have done well and that the urban residential has been recently updated, but that he does not want to see townhomes that look like prison barracks. He stated that Allen deserves better. He noted that while the townhomes meet the Land Development Code, it does not fit the City of Allen.

Chairman Cocking stated that he has put a request in with the staff to update the Land Development Code so that townhomes never have to look like this again. He stated that he will move forward with this one but that he believes the Commission can do so much better for the town. He stated that it will be eighteen-foot of driveway, seven-foot of grass, repeating, and that he would not want to live on street like that even though he is actively looking for townhomes in the City. He stated that he would prefer to live in an apartment complex than on that street. He emphasized the need to update the Land Development Code.

Mr. Battle stated that he always appreciates input from the Commissioners. He stated that they have been contemplating how they might change townhomes and how they might improve those standards.

Commissioner Ogrizovich asked to clarify how the townhomes would look.

Mr. Battle stated that the rendering provided in the packet is very similar to what the townhomes would look like.

Commissioner Ogrizovich disagreed with Chairman Cocking, stating that he did not believe that the townhomes looked like army barracks. Commissioner Ogrizovich stated that they were attractive, though the Chairman was correct about the amount of pavement. He emphasized that he felt it was an attractive elevation.

Chairman Cocking clarified that the elevations were not accurate, as the elevations did not show only seven feet of grass on a twenty-five foot lot. He stated that the elevations are provided to give an idea of what the townhomes would look like but that they were not accurate.

Commissioner Ogrizovich asked when the Commission would see the real elevations.

Mr. Battle stated that the elevations would be given to the City when the developer applies for a building permit. He stated that, through the zoning process, they are conceptual elevations, meaning that this is what they will generally look like. Once the developer comes in with the final designs, the final designs will be compared to the conceptual elevations to ensure that they are very similar or very close, knowing that the product might change a little bit.

2<sup>nd</sup> Vice-Chair Platt stated that he believed that means that the Commission will not see the final designs.

Mr. Battle confirmed that this is correct.

Chairman Cocking stated that the elevations needed to be architecturally similar but not exact. He stated that he is at a point in life where he is looking at townhomes, and he noted that there is a difference in the community and feel of a townhome where the townhome is treated like a 4,500-square foot house. He noted that if this was a 4,500-square foot house, they would not provide only ten feet of green space. He stated that they would not allow a long street like that for residential. He stated that part of the problem was that townhomes are allowed to be six in a row, and he believes that is too many. He reiterated that the applicant followed Allen Land Development Code says. He stated that he would not want to walk down that street as it would be like walking across driveways for thirty-four homes.

**Motion:** Upon a motion by 1<sup>st</sup> Vice-Chair Trahan, and a second by 2<sup>nd</sup> Vice-Chair Platt, the Commission voted 5 IN FAVOR, and 1 OPPOSED to recommend approval of the request to amend the development regulations of District D of Planned Development “PD” No. 108 and adopt a Concept Plan, Screening Plan, Roadway Plan, and Building Elevations; generally located southwest of Exchange Parkway and Watters Road, for Village at Twin Creeks Phase 4.

**The motion is carried.**