

**Excerpt from Draft Minutes
Planning & Zoning Commission
Meeting of March 5, 2015**

14. Hold A Public Hearing And Consider A Resolution For An **Amendment To The Comprehensive Plan And The Future Land Use Map** To Change An Approximately 3.4-Acre Site From Single-Family Residential Detached To Single-Family Residential Attached Located In The Vicinity Of The Southwest Corner Of Frankford Road And McCoy Road. **Case No. 03-15MD1 McCoy Villas**/Harlan Properties, Inc. Case Coordinator: Michael McCauley.

15. Hold A Public Hearing And Consider An Ordinance **Amending PD-63** Changing The Zoning Of A Certain Tract From (SF-12/20) Single-Family Residential District To (SF-TH) Single-Family Townhouse Residential District With Special Development Standards; Amending Accordingly The Official Zoning Map. The Approximately 3.4-Acre Tract Is Located In The Vicinity Of The Southwest Corner Of Frankford Road And McCoy Road. **Case No. 10-14Z3 McCoy Villas**/Harlan Properties, Inc. Case Coordinator: Michael McCauley.

McCauley presented the two cases in detail and advised that staff received three letters in opposition to the request. He stated that staff felt the development was too dense for the location and that it should remain as single family detached, which would provide a lower density than the townhouses. He referred to proposed stipulations in the event the Commission chose to approve the request.

Jim Dewy, JDJR Engineers, 2500 Texas Drive, Irving, stated the applicant understands the stipulations but didn't agree with some of the comments presented by staff. He noting it was an in-fill development and felt it was an appropriate buffer between the single family development and the multifamily development. He explained that one reason they did not propose alleys was because the homeowners association to the south did not want to share the alley and talked about the easement. He noted that a buffer between single family developments was not required and felt the screening wall was a sufficient buffer between the townhomes and the single family neighborhood. With regard to the stipulations, he stated they could not agree to the stipulation with regard to the separate easement and driveway to the north of the site but could agree with the remaining stipulations. He talked about the economics of the proposal and requested the Commission's approval.

Discussion was held with regard to the traffic impact on Joy Drive due to the proximity of and access to the elementary school and church. While reviewing each of the stipulations, Mr. Dewy noted that none of the existing homes in the neighborhood had enhanced driveways but if required, they would prefer to use exposed aggregate. With regard to the front building setback, he stated the garage would have a 25 foot setback but was requesting a 20 foot front building setback. With regard to school buses being able to make the necessary turns from Joy Drive to the school, he said there were fire lanes on the property and said since fire trucks could navigate the turn, then it should be able to accommodate school buses turning.

McCauley noted a correction to the case report in that Lots 2 – 10 had less than the required minimum depth of 110 foot. Mr. Dewy stated the Code required 100 feet and noted that most were 110 foot, but a few were even a little less.

Stotz voiced concern with the 25 foot lot width and felt that the City needed to maintain the 35 foot lot width requirement. Mr. Dewy noted that they try to break up the garage door look by using single and double garage doors and felt the 25 foot lot width would be a good product for the area. Concern was also voiced by the Commission with regard to amount of concrete at the front of the homes because the yard would be in the back. Mr. Dewy felt that the people who would buy the product don't want much yard maintenance and won't have a problem with the amount of concrete.

Chair McAninch opened the public hearing and invited speakers to the podium.

The following individuals spoke in favor of the request:

Randall D. Chrisman, 1501 Broken Bow Tr., Carrollton, TX
Coby & Shari Sparks, 2357 Highlands Creek Rd., Carrollton, TX
Gene Burks, 3704 Standridge, Carrollton, TX
Gabe Cruz, 2909 Panorama Dr., Carrollton, TX
Mark Mohrweis, 1533 Brighton Dr., Carrollton, TX
Marcia Seebachan, 2019 Stefani Ct., Carrollton, TX
Edwin Bayard, 1404 Golden Gate, Carrollton, TX

The following people were in support but didn't wish to speak:

Jan Erickson, 1737 Delaford Dr., Carrollton, TX
Heather Erickson, 1737 Delaford Dr., Carrollton, TX
Barbara Shell, 4253 Hunt Dr., Carrollton, TX
Cliff Erickson, 1737 Delaford Dr., Carrollton, TX
J. Steven Walker, Dallas, TX

The following person did not wish to speak but was in opposition:

Anna Gosling, 1602 E. Frankford Rd., Carrollton, TX

In rebuttal and closing comments, Mr. Dewy requested the Commission's support for the request as presented.

Chair McAninch opened the floor for discussion. In response to a question from Nesbit, McCauley stated that the preliminary plat reflects a 20 foot front building setback and a 25 foot garage door setback which is what is required by City Code for front loaded homes but because

the lots were more narrow, staff felt it would be more appropriate to have a 25 foot front building setback. McCauley also said that staff would support a 100 foot lot depth.

Chair McAninch advised the Board that legal counsel recommended another stipulation as part of the zoning case as follows: provide the City with a letter from the School district agreeing to the abandonment of the existing 30 foot wide ingress and egress easement prior to the City Council consideration of the zoning case and as an abandonment of such easement at the time of platting of the property executed by the School District. Mr. Dewy stated he understood the stipulation and asked that it be required at the time of platting.

**** Stotz moved to close the public hearing and approve Case No. 03-15MD1 McCoy Villas Comprehensive Plan amendment; second by Kiser and the motion was approved with a 7-2 vote, Chadwick and McAninch opposed.***

**** Stotz moved to close the public hearing and approve Case No. 10-14Z3 McCoy Villas with staff stipulation Nos. 2 – 11 specifying that No. 6 - the driveways shall be constructed of decorative pavers; No. 9 - the entry ribbon shall be constructed with decorative pavers, and the stipulation proposed by legal counsel; second by Daniel-Nix.*** Chair McAninch stated she agreed with the Church trying to do something with the land but did not think the proposed plan was the right choice due to the density. Chadwick stated that he supported the Church but could not support the reduced setbacks.

Rob Guarnieri, Dev. Services Sr. Engineer, noted that a 15 foot landscape buffer is required on McCoy which was not reflected on the preliminary plat and also that the first driveway had to be 40 foot from the intersecting property lines from McCoy and Joy Drive to be in compliance with the Driveway Ordinance. He stated that these issues would normally surface when the plans are submitted for review. Adam D. Lathrom, Attorney, suggested a possible continuance to address the raised issues.

Chair McAninch noted that Stotz did not wish to withdraw the motion and called for the vote. The motion was approved with a 5-4 vote; Kraus, Chadwick, McAninch and Romo opposed.