

AGENDA ITEM

TO: Planning and Zoning Commission

THROUGH: Brandon Opiela, Senior Planner

FROM: Abra R. Nusser, Planner

SUBJECT: Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on the Request by Standard Pacific of Texas, Inc., on Behalf of Standard Pacific of Texas, Inc. and Coit/Plano Parkway, J.V., for Approval of a Request to Rezone Approximately 83.29 Acres from “PD” – Planned Development District and “REC” – Regional Employment Center Overlay District to “PD” – Planned Development District and “REC” – Regional Employment Center Overlay District, Generally for Single Family Residential Uses and to Modify the Development Standards, Located on the East Side of Alma Road and on the North Side of Silverado Trail.

APPROVAL PROCESS: The recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission will be forwarded to the City Council for final action at the March 15, 2011 meeting.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends denial of the proposed rezoning request due to a lack of conformance with the “REC” – Regional Employment Center Overlay District. Staff feels that by removing the office component of the current zoning’s mixture of uses, by eliminating the required garage/façade offset for a large portion of the proposed lots, and for proposing a dead-end street, the rezoning request in direct conflict with the design guidelines and intent of the REC.

APPLICATION SUBMITTAL DATE: October 25, 2010 (Original Application)
January 6, 2011 (Revised Submittal)
January 10, 2011 (Revised Submittal)
January 24, 2011 (Revised Submittal)
January 26, 2011 (Revised Submittal)
February 2, 2011 (Revised Submittal)
February 10, 2011 (Revised Submittal)

ITEM SUMMARY: The applicant is proposing to rezone the subject property from “PD” – Planned Development District and “REC” – Regional Employment Center Overlay District to “PD” – Planned Development District and “REC” – Regional Employment Center Overlay District, generally for single family residential uses and to modify the development standards. The applicant is proposing 354 single family residential lots on approximately 83.29 acres, located on the east side of Alma Road and on the north side

of Silverado Trail. A general development plan showing the general configuration of the development and three plans showing landscaping concepts and architectural features are included in the proposed planned development district. Open space as required by the REC is proposed which includes an entry plaza/trail head along Alma Road, a potential amenity center, and enhanced landscaping with pedestrian amenities within common areas throughout the property.

PLATTING STATUS: The subject property is currently unplatted. A record plat or plats, subject to review and approval by the Director of Planning, must be filed for recordation with the Collin County Clerk, prior to issuance of a development permit.

The applicant will be responsible for all drainage associated with the subject property, and for compliance with the Storm Water Ordinance, which may require on-site detention. Grading and drainage plans are subject to review and approval by the City Engineer, prior to issuance of a development permit.

ZONING NOTIFICATION SIGNS: The applicant has posted zoning notification signs on the subject property, as specified within Section 146-164 (Changes and Amendments) of the City of McKinney Zoning Ordinance.

SURROUNDING ZONING AND LAND USES:

Subject Property: “PD” – Planned Development District Ordinance No. 2008-07-071,
 “PD” – Planned Development District Ordinance No. 2004-01-002,
 and “REC” – Regional Employment Center Overlay District

| | | |
|-------|---|--------------------------------------|
| North | “AG” – Agricultural District and “REC” – Regional Employment Center Overlay District | Undeveloped Land |
| | “PD” – Planned Development District Ordinance No. 2006-07-092 (Single Family Residential Uses) and “REC” – Regional Employment Center Overlay District | City of McKinney Fire Station |
| South | “PD” – Planned Development District Ordinance No. 2004-01-002 (Commercial and Multiple Family Uses) and “REC” – Regional Employment Center Overlay District | Undeveloped Land |
| | “PD” – Planned Development District Ordinance No. 2002-06-068 (Single Family Residential Uses) and “REC” – Regional Employment Center Overlay District | Harvest Bend Residential Subdivision |

| | | |
|------|--|---|
| East | “PD” – Planned Development District Ordinance No. 2001-07-078 (Single Family Residential Uses) | Brookstone Residential Subdivision |
| West | “PD” – Planned Development District Ordinance No. 2001-02-017 (Single Family Residential Uses) and “REC” – Regional Employment Center Overlay District | Craig Ranch North Residential Subdivision |

PROPOSED ZONING: The applicant is requesting to rezone the subject property from “PD” – Planned Development District and “REC” – Regional Employment Center Overlay District to “PD” – Planned Development District and “REC” – Regional Employment Center Overlay District, generally for single family residential uses and to modify the development standards. The applicant is proposing to utilize the REC’s Single Family Detached, Standard Lot guidelines, except as noted herein.

Replacing Office Uses with Single Family Residential Uses: The current governing planned development districts for the subject property, established in 2008 and 2004, reflect single family residential, office, and open space uses with specific architectural standards for the single family residential uses. The subject property is part of a larger development, generally on the northeast corner of Alma Road and Silverado Trail, which has an approved general development plan (08-163GDP) which provides a mixture of multi-family, commercial, office, single family residential, and open space uses. As proposed, the request removes the 17.45 acre office component and utilizes the entire 83.29 acre area for single family residential lots.

Staff agrees that residential uses are appropriate for the current residentially zoned portion of the subject property (66.65 acres), but a key principle of the Regional Employment Center Overlay District is to provide fully integrated pedestrian-oriented neighborhoods, corridors, and districts by providing, among other components, shopping, recreation, and basic neighborhood services which are accessible by non-vehicular means to neighboring residents. It also encourages a mixture of uses and housing types in close proximity to one another to create an urban design which facilitates the compatibility of different uses. Removing the office use designation from the existing mixture of uses from the larger neighborhood development would inhibit the goals of the REC. Staff feels that the property currently designated for office uses along Alma Road should remain in close proximity to adjacent neighborhoods in order to maintain a mix of uses within a walkable distance and support a diverse tax base in the area.

Development Standards: Listed below is a general representation of the existing zoning development standards for the single family portion of the subject property and the proposed zoning development standards for the entire subject property that the applicant is proposing to change:

| Criteria | Existing | Proposed | Proposed |
|--------------------------|---|---|------------------|
| | All Lots | 50' x 110' Lot | 62' x 115' Lot |
| PD Base Zoning | RS 45 | REC Standard Lot | REC Standard Lot |
| Maximum Lot Count | 315 | 191 | 163 (total 354) |
| Density | 4.7 du/ac | 4.2 du/ac | 4.2 du/ac |
| Typical Lot Depth | n/a | 110' | 115' |
| Minimum Lot Depth | 85' | 100' (1) | 105' (1) |
| Minimum Lot Width | 40' | 50' | 62' |
| Minimum Lot Area | 3,750 s.f. | 5,000 s.f. | 6,510 s.f. |
| Front Yard Build-to-Line | Per REC* | 20' | 10' |
| Rear Yard Setback | 5' | 10' | 10' |
| Garage Access | Alley Product | Front Entry (2) | Side Swing (2) |
| Garage Offset | 20' | 0' | 20' |
| Masonry | 75% overall plus other standards with attached elevations | 100% first floor, 100% front elevation, and 75% overall | |

**The build-to-line must be no greater than 1/3 and no less than 1/10 the width of the average residential lot width along the street and shall be complied with by at least 80 percent of the linear footage of the buildings along the street block. Twenty percent may be set back farther than the build-to-line.*

(1) More than 90% of the lots will be at the typical depth. On street elbows and other isolated areas, some lots may be slightly less than the typical depth, but in no case will the depth be less than the minimum shown here.

(2) Front entry two-car garages shall have two single doors; three-car garages on 62' x 115' lots may be provided with a "two and one split" with the third bay facing street as shown on General Development Plan. Refer to comments in Letter of Intent regarding proposed home product for justification of these provisions.

As reflected in the table above, the applicant has proposed an increase in the size of the lots with regard to minimum lot depth, minimum lot width, and minimum lot area from the existing planned development district (Ordinance No. 2008-07-071) for the property. It is important to note that the applicant has also included a provision that requires specific percentages of masonry on the front elevation and first floor of each structure, as well as an overall percentage for the entire structure. The existing planned development district for the residential portion of the property contains elevations regulating the appearance of the housing product, whereas elevations are being omitted from this rezoning request and therefore will not be regulated by ordinance.

The only items in the proposed development standards above that Staff is not comfortable supporting are the garage/facade offsets, the associated build-to-lines, and a dead-end street (discussed further below). Staff is comfortable with all other proposed development standards as listed.

Garage/Façade Offsets: The Regional Employment Center Overlay District's Residential Site Design standards require that attached garages accessed by driveways from the front of the house be set back at least 20 feet from the front façade of the house. The purpose of the REC design standards is to allow for the development of fully integrated pedestrian-oriented neighborhoods. The garage/façade offset, as described, not only provides for a more aesthetically pleasing product, but it creates a usable public/private open space addressing the street, providing the opportunity for pedestrian interaction within the neighborhood.

Although the applicant is proposing to generally comply with this standard for the larger lots in the development, the applicant is proposing that the required garage/façade offset be eliminated on the smaller proposed lots which comprise 191 lots out of a total of 354 lots (approximately 54 percent). REC single family detached standard lots require a build-to-line to be no greater than 1/3 and no less than 1/10 the width of the average residential lot width along the street and shall be complied with by at least 80 percent of the linear footage of the buildings along the street block, and 20 percent may be set back farther than the build-to-line. With no offset provided, the 50-foot wide lots would require a 20-foot build-to-line in order to provide the required 20-foot long driveway.

With the aforementioned build-to-line requirement, the placement of these homes will be set back from the street beyond the maximum permitted build-to-line for properties within the REC. The existing planned development district (Ordinance No. 2008-07-071) for the residential portion of the subject property also requires a porch or outdoor living space at the front of the property; however, the proposed rezoning request has omitted this requirement. Coupled with the elimination of a required garage/facade offset, Staff is concerned that any meaningful public/private open space may also be eliminated if a covered porch or courtyard area is not provided/required, and is therefore not comfortable supporting the applicant's requested elimination of the garage/façade offset for the proposed 50-foot wide lots.

Cul-de-sac: The REC requires that all streets terminate at other streets at both ends, and cul-de-sacs are only allowed due to a topographical or other environmental issue. The applicant is proposing a street that runs north-south in the southwestern portion of the subject property and does not connect to another street on its north side. The dead-end street is not proposed due to a topographical or environmental issue that would necessitate a cul-de-sac at this location so the dead-end street is not allowed. Staff is not comfortable with the proposed street configuration in this area and feels that the street should connect with the east-west street to the north, which could be accomplished through a redesign of the layout in that particular area of the neighborhood, and could provide for better pedestrian and vehicular connectivity within the development.

As such, Staff recommends denial of the proposed rezoning request due to a lack of conformance with the “REC” – Regional Employment Center Overlay District. Staff feels that by removing the office component of the current zoning’s mixture of uses, by eliminating the required garage/façade offset for a large portion of the proposed lots, and for proposing a dead-end street, the rezoning request is in direct conflict with the design guidelines and intent of the REC.

CONFORMANCE TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: The Future Land Use Plan (FLUP) designates the subject property for medium density residential uses. The Future Land Use Plan Modules Diagram designates the subject property as suburban mix within a significantly developed area. Although the Future Land Use Plan originally anticipated the subject property developing as medium density residential, Staff feels a mixture of residential and office uses are appropriate at this location and would complement the nearby residential and commercial uses without creating an over-concentration of any one use. The Comprehensive Plan lists factors to be considered when a rezoning is being considered within a significantly developed area:

- **Comprehensive Plan Goals and Objectives:** The proposed rezoning is consistent with some of the goals and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan and at odds with others. In this case, the Comprehensive Plan does recognize the need for an “Attractive Hometown that Promotes McKinney’s Character” through the stated objective of providing “Homes and Buildings Complying with City Standards and Codes” and also calls for “Land Use Compatibility and Mix” by providing “A Mix of Land Uses that Provides for Various Lifestyle Choices.” Staff is of the opinion that the proposed rezoning request is in direct conflict with these stated objectives of the Comprehensive Plan.
- **Specific Area Plan or Studies:** The subject property is within the “REC” – Regional Employment Center Overlay District’s Neighborhood Zone. As detailed above, Staff feels that by removing the office component from the current zoning’s mixture of uses, eliminating the required garage/façade offset for a large portion of the proposed lots, and by proposing a dead-end street, the rezoning request is in direct conflict with some of the key design concepts/guidelines of the REC.
- **Impact on Infrastructure:** The water master plan, sewer master plan, and master thoroughfare plan are all based on the anticipated land uses as shown on the Future Land Use Plan. The Future Land Use Plan designates the subject property generally for medium density residential uses. The proposed rezoning request should have a minimal impact on the existing and planned water, sewer and thoroughfare plans in the area. While Staff examined the impact that the proposed uses would have on the infrastructure in the area, it is not a determining factor in Staff’s recommendation of denial.
- **Impact on Public Facilities/Services:** Similar to infrastructure, public facilities and services are all planned for based on the anticipated land uses shown on the Future Land Use Plan. The Future Land Use Plan designates the subject

property generally for medium density residential uses. The proposed rezoning request should have a minimal impact on planned public services, such as schools, fire and police, libraries, parks and sanitation services. While Staff examined the impact that the proposed uses would have on the public facilities/services in the area, it is not a determining factor in Staff's recommendation of denial.

- Compatibility with Existing and Potential Adjacent Land Uses: The properties located adjacent to the subject property are zoned for a mix of uses including multi-family, commercial, and single-family residential uses. Although the proposed rezoning request will remove the office component from the subject property and replace this designation with additional single family residential, the additional residential will not be incompatible with the existing and potential adjacent land uses.
- Fiscal Analysis: The attached fiscal analysis shows a negative net cost benefit using the expansion method of \$7,754. The expansion method of calculating public service cost is used for project specific cost of service. This method is used to determine the cost to provide city services to a specific development project. It takes into account only those costs directly attributable to that project and, therefore, is a good measure of the impact of a single zoning decision.

The full cost method shows a positive net cost benefit of \$3,527. The full cost method of calculating public service cost is useful for citywide modeling and forecasting. This method takes the entire city budget into account, including those costs that cannot be attributed to any one project such as administrative costs and debt service on municipal bonds. Because the full cost method takes into account all costs, it is useful in tracking the city budget to determine if the citywide tax revenue is sufficient to pay for the operating costs to the city.

- Concentration of a Use: The proposed rezoning should not result in an over concentration of residential land uses in the area. Currently, the surrounding properties are zoned for a mix of uses including multi-family, commercial, and single-family residential uses.

CONFORMANCE TO THE MASTER PARK PLAN (MPP): The proposed rezoning request does not conflict with the Master Park Plan.

CONFORMANCE TO THE MASTER THOROUGHFARE PLAN (MTP): The proposed rezoning request does not conflict with the Master Thoroughfare Plan.

OPPOSITION TO OR SUPPORT OF REQUEST: Staff has received no comments or phone calls in support of or opposition to this request. There have been several inquiries as to what the request involves, and several nearby residents have expressed the need for an additional elementary school in the area. The applicant is showing a proposed Frisco Independent School District elementary school site to the south, on the north side of Silverado Trail. Frisco ISD intends to build a school in that location but has

not yet made any formal submittals to the Planning Department. As such, the layout may change from what is currently shown. The potential school site is not included in the proposed rezoning request and is not located on the subject property.

ATTACHMENTS:

- [Location Map](#)
- [Aerial Exhibit](#)
- [Letter of Intent](#)
- [Property Owner Notice](#)
- [Property Owner Notification List](#)
- [Fiscal Analysis](#)
- [Existing "PD" – Planned Development District Ordinance No. 2004-01-002](#)
- [Existing "PD" – Planned Development District Ordinance No. 2008-07-071](#)
- [Proposed Zoning Exhibit A – Location Map](#)
- [Proposed Zoning Exhibit B – General Development Plan](#)
- [Proposed Zoning Exhibit C – Landscape Concepts](#)
- [Proposed Zoning Exhibit D – Development Standards](#)
- [Planning and Zoning Commission PowerPoint Presentation](#)

Action: