

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

Hold A Public Hearing And Consider An Ordinance To **Establish A New Planned Development District For The (SF-5/12) Single Family Residential District** On An Approximately 94.4-Acre Tract Of Land Located On The East Side Of Old Denton Road North Of Indian Creek; Amending Accordingly The Official Zoning Map. The Site Is Currently Zoned For The (LI) Light Industrial District. **Case No. 11-15Z2 Singer Ranch**/Bright Realty, LLC. Case Coordinator: Christopher Barton.

Chair McAninch advised that Items 12 & 13 were companion items and would be heard simultaneously but would have separate action.

Barton stated Item 12 would amend the Comprehensive Plan which was a higher level documentation of the general development expectations of the City in the long term. Staff recommended approval of the change to single family uses. He explained that Item 13 involved the actual zoning designation for a proposed single family residential subdivision. He stated that it was a complicated case because the applicant was requesting variations to the base zoning and development standards. Also while the land is located in Carrollton it would be an additional phase of Castle Hills, which is not in Carrollton.

Aaron Ketchand, VP of Development at Bright Realty, 2520 King Arthur Blvd., Lewisville, distributed a hard copy of the presentation to the Commission. He felt the highest and best use for the land was single family and noted that the property was surrounded by single family use. Entries into the development will be from Josey, Highway 121, Old Denton, FM 544 and Hebron Parkway. Bright Realty intends to develop approximately 314 single-family residential lots with homes ranging from \$375,000 to \$550,000 and expected build-out in approximately three years.

He talked about the amenities provided in Castle Hills and talked about the concept plan for the Singer property. He stated that the street profile, density and the product mix matches multiple previous phases in Castle Hills which has proven to be quite successful. He provided photographs of homes currently in Phase 8 of Castle Hills that would be offered in the proposed plan. He also provided some renderings of proposed product elevations.

He reviewed the Old Denton right-of-way exhibit pointing out that the current right-of-way for Old Denton Road was noted by the amount of setback that was already available and for the vast majority of frontage along Old Denton Road they were in excess of 15 feet. He explained that from the area to the north where it was a little short of the 15 feet, it lined up with the homes north of the property which is Castle Hills; the setback north of Old Denton in front of previous Phases 4 and 5. He further stated that they would be trying to reclaim some of the topography and there would be retaining walls within the community.

He advised that a flood study was underway stating they purposely put more depth on the lots that back up to the creek to have room to adjust the rear lot line depending on the flood study. He stated they were very comfortable with the concept plan stating it was very close to what they would like to do.

With regard to the width of the streets, he stated they have a purposeful parkway tree desire; the look, the feel and the streetscape is intentional. He stated it was a little bit of a wider profile. He stated there was no amenity center in the proposed phase noting the homes were already provided for and underscoring that all residents within the Castle Hills HOA have access to all amenities.

Chris Bright, Bright Realty, stated he runs the HOA meetings. He stated they have strict enforcement requiring homeowners to maintain their areas up. He talked about the general concept and character of Castle Hills as a whole and that it was important for Carrollton to know that they were not choosing designs just to increase density. They were doing it to provide for families and to address a need that they think will make the character of the community and make the neighborhood sustainable.

Nesbit voiced his appreciation for the architectural controls and the strict way that Castle Hills is adhering to the architectural designs. He asked about the 75% lot coverage on the 41 foot lots. Mr. Bright stated that in general, they don't cover that much of the lots and many of the design guidelines have coverage limits that are less than the actual zoning ordinance. He stated they try to focus on managing the front yard setback. He noted that the front yard setback is dependent on a variety of factors such as if there is a front porch or if it is a one or two-story home. He underscored that they want this property to feel like the rest of Castle Hills and still meet the intent of regulations of Carrollton.

With regard to the garage doors, Nesbit asked if they allow glass windows and Mr. Bright replied that he did not know that he would preclude glass windows and advised that the design guideline requires decorative wood garage doors.

Nesbit noted the amount of front entry garages in the proposed development stating he would prefer the homes have an alley but also realize that the Commission has recently approved front entry developments. He stated he likes that Castle Hills tries to offset the front elevations to a certain extent noting his concern with the proposed 11 foot setback. He voiced a concern with windows on front entry garage doors and suggested a stipulation to prohibit it. Mr. Bright stated he would not have an issue with such a stipulation.

Kraus stated he drove through Phase 8 and thought the product offered was great but had concern about the grading of the property and the effect it can have on the overall appearance of the product. Mr. Bright stated that the grades were part of what they try to save because he feels it adds more interest. He stated it would increase the cost to the builder and the developer but it increases the natural beauty of the site.

Chair McAninch opened the public hearing and invited speakers to the podium; there were no speakers.

McAninch asked about why they were not adding a landscape buffer along Old Denton Road. Mr. Bright explained that it more seamlessly translates into where the Castle Hills walls currently are. He acknowledged that the lots that back up to Old Denton would be harder to sell because of the noise issue regardless of the easement but that the walls and the landscaping would act as sound barriers. They said they would be open to doing some landscaping along Old Denton if required.

McAninch advised that the Council has denied another request with an easement less than 15 feet. She also noted the lack of alleys and Mr. Bright explained their intent to push the activity to the front of the house but understand the need for some privacy in back yard spaces.

McAninch asked if he could require 50 foot lots rather than 41 foot. Mr. Bright replied that they want the diversity of the product. He stated that none of the 41 foot lots will have three-car garages. He also noted that the parks in Castle Hills are dedicated to the public. With regard to existing trees on the site, he didn't think they would be able to be saved due to the amount of grading that would be required on the site. With regard to lot coverage, Mr. Ketchand explained some of the 41 foot lots were odd shaped, thus the desire to have some flexibility but the vast majority of the lots would be at 55% coverage or below. Mr. Bright stated he would be open to looking at variances for those specific lots if necessary. With regard to the radius point for driveways, Ketchand referred to an exhibit addressing the four spots that needed the provision based on the conceptual plan.

Kiser asked the applicant if he would consider eliminating Items No. 17 and 18 from their list of requested alternatives to the Subdivision Ordinance with regard to the accessory buildings. Mr. Bright replied yes and that if they needed something specific for a specific lot, they would be willing to deal with it with a variance.

In closing, Mr. Bright requested the Commission's support and stated they were looking forward to being a part of Carrollton and Carrollton's future.

Chair McAninch closed the public hearing and opened the floor for discussion or action.

*** *Daniel-Nix moved to close the public hearing and approve the amendment to the Comprehensive Plan for Case No. 11-15MD1 Singer Ranch; second by Kraus and the motion was approved with a unanimous 8-0 vote (Romo absent).***

Nesbit voiced concern about the landscape buffer on the street; suggested 65% minimum lot coverage rather than 75%; require an 11 foot minimum front yard setback and eliminate the four foot encroachment language; prohibit windows on the garage doors and delete requested Items Nos. 17 and 18.

Kiser made suggestions which may give a little more latitude as far as the landscaping along that line. With regard to lot coverage, he stated he would prefer 60% and minimum of 10 foot on the right-to-way; and agreed with deleting requested Items Nos. 17 and 18.

Chadwick voiced his agreement with Nesbit with regard to the buffer zone and with Kiser regarding 60% lot coverage.

- * *Nesbit moved approval of Case No. 11-15Z2 Singer Ranch with the amendments listed with some changes; Item 2 – landscape buffer along Old Denton Road would need to be at least 10 feet along the entirety of the property that fronts Old Denton from back of curb; Item 7 – maximum coverage for single family detached lots shall be 60% of the lot area; Item 12 – the minimum front yard setback for single family lot shall be 11 feet and delete the remaining language and not allow any encroachment past that or closer than that; Item 16 – all garage doors shall be decorative wood panel doors as conceptually shown on the photos and would exclude any glass windows; requested Items Nos. 17 and 18 which involve accessory buildings be deleted entirely; second by Averett.*

Ravi Shah asked for clarification and Nesbit stated the 60% coverage was only for the main building and with regard to accessory buildings the prohibition was referring to such items as granny flats and not outdoor sheds.

The motion was approved with a unanimous 7-1 vote (Chadwick opposed, Romo absent).