

**AGENDA ITEM**

**TO:** Planning and Zoning Commission

**THROUGH:** Brandon Opiela, Planning Manager

**FROM:** Samantha Pickett, Planner II

**SUBJECT:** Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on the Request by Shaddock Developers, Ltd., on Behalf of Frances Melton and Clyde and Lucretia Geer, for Approval of a Request to Zone Fewer than 30 Acres to "PD" – Planned Development District, Generally for Single Family Residential Uses, Located Approximately 1,900 Feet North of Eldorado Parkway and on the East Side of Custer Road

**APPROVAL PROCESS:** The recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission will be forwarded to the City Council for final action at the September 16, 2014 meeting.

---

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends denial of the proposed zoning request due to lack of conformance with the Comprehensive Plan.

**However, the applicant is requesting approval of the following special ordinance provisions:**

1. The subject property shall develop in conformance with Section 146-105 ("SF5" – Single Family Residential District) of the Zoning Ordinance, and as amended, except as follows:
  - a. The maximum density shall be 4.5 dwelling units per acre.
  - b. The minimum mean lot size shall be 7,160 square feet and the minimum median lot size shall be 7,000 square feet.
  - c. All dwelling units shall be 100 percent masonry (brick or stone) on the first floor, and 50 percent masonry (brick or stone) above the first floor, exclusive of openings, architectural awnings, trim, iron fixtures, wood accents, cantilevered areas, and wood column-supported sections.
  - d. Street trees shall be planted at one tree per thirty (30) linear feet along Custer Road.

**Staff's professional opinion is that while residential uses may be appropriate in this location, Staff sees no reason why the subject property is unable to conform to the maximum density and minimum mean and median lot sizes outlined in the Comprehensive Plan.**

**APPLICATION SUBMITTAL DATE:** May 27, 2014 (Original Application)  
June 18, 2014 (Revised Submittal)  
August 1, 2014 (Revised Submittal)  
August 14, 2014 (Revised Submittal)

**ITEM SUMMARY:** The applicant is requesting to zone approximately 29.02 acres of land, located approximately 1,900 feet north of Eldorado Parkway and on the east side of Custer Road, to "PD" – Planned Development District, generally for single family detached residential uses. Additionally, the applicant is requesting approval of modified development regulations regarding the maximum density, minimum mean and median lot sizes for the subject property, architectural standards, and landscaping.

The request for zoning will be forwarded to the City Council for final consideration at the September 16, 2014 meeting along with the 3<sup>rd</sup> and final public hearing for the associated annexation case (14-144A3) and associated development agreement.

**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: Unzoned (City of McKinney ETJ)

North	"PD" – Planned Development District Ordinance No. 2003-02-015 (Multi-Family and Single Family Residential Uses)	Regency at Stonebridge Ranch and Fountainview Subdivision
South	"PD" – Planned Development District Ordinance No. 2003-02-015 (Multi-Family and Single Family Residential Uses)	Fountainview Subdivision
East	"PD" – Planned Development District Ordinance No. 2003-02-015 (Single Family Residential Uses)	Fountainview Subdivision
West	City of Frisco	Winding Creek Estates Common Area

**PROPOSED ZONING:** The applicant is requesting to zone the subject property “PD” – Planned Development District, generally for single family detached residential uses. As proposed, the subject property will generally develop according to the “SF5” – Single Family Residential District rules and regulations, with increases to the maximum density and minimum mean and median lot sizes. The applicant is requesting that the maximum density be increased from 3.2 dwelling units per acre (with the ability to achieve 3.4 dwelling units per acre if Design for Density criteria are met in accordance with the City’s Comprehensive Plan) to 4.5 dwelling units per acre, and the minimum mean and median lot size be decreased from 7,200 square feet to 7,160 and 7,000 square feet, respectively. It should also be noted that the City Council recently adopted new residential zoning districts (including the “SF5” district) that mandate a minimum mean and median lot size of 7,200 square feet, with a maximum density of 3.2 dwelling units per acre (with the ability to achieve 3.4 dwelling units per acre if Design for Density criteria are met in accordance with the City’s Comprehensive Plan). Given that all future (re)zoning requests will be required to meet the same standards for density, Staff feels that supporting this requested increase in density and lower minimum mean and median lot size would be contrary to the Council’s goals and objectives.

Section 146-94 (“PD” – Planned Development District) of the Zoning Ordinance states that no proposed PD District may be approved without ensuring a level of exceptional quality or innovation for the associated design or development. In effort to meet this requirement, the applicant has proposed that all single family homes on the subject property shall 100% masonry (brick or stone) on the first floor on all elevations, and 50% masonry (brick or stone) above the first floor. Additionally, street trees shall be planted along the Custer Road frontage at one tree per 30 linear feet. The requested special ordinance provisions for exterior finishing materials and additional trees along Custer Road frontage were not a determining factor in the recommendation for denial.

Staff is supportive of the subject property being zoned for residential uses; however, Staff is of the opinion that the requested development standards are not in line with the principles set forth in the City of McKinney’s Comprehensive Plan, and sees no reason why the subject property cannot be developed in conformance with the prescribed density and minimum mean and median lot sizes contained therein. As such, Staff recommends denial of the request.

**CONFORMANCE TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:** The Future Land Use Plan (FLUP) designates the subject property for low density residential and medium density residential uses. The FLUP modules diagram designates the subject property as Suburban Mix within a significantly developed area. The Comprehensive Plan lists factors to be considered when a zoning request is being considered within a significantly developed area:

- **Comprehensive Plan Goals and Objectives:** The proposed zoning request for residential use is generally in conformance with the goals and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan. In particular, the proposed zoning change would help the

community attain the goal of “Land Use Compatibility and Mix” by creating a “land use patterns that complement one another.”

- Impact on Infrastructure: The proposed zoning request should have a minimal impact on the existing and planned water, sewer and thoroughfare plans in the area.
- Impact on Public Facilities/Services: The proposed zoning request should have a minimal impact on public services, such as schools, fire and police, libraries, parks and sanitation services.
- Compatibility with Existing and Potential Adjacent Land Uses: The properties located adjacent to the subject property are zoned for similar residential uses. The proposed zoning request will not alter the land use from what has been planned for the subject property.
- Fiscal Analysis: The attached fiscal analysis shows a negative cost benefit of \$81,410 using the full cost method.
- Concentration of a Use: The proposed zoning request should not result in an over concentration of residential land uses in the area, as the FLUP anticipates residential use of the property.

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

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

**OPPOSITION TO OR SUPPORT OF REQUEST:** Staff has received one letter in support of the zoning request.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

- Location Map and Aerial Exhibit
- Letter of Intent
- Letter of Support
- Fiscal Analysis
- Comprehensive Plan Maps
- Surrounding Zoning Information
- Proposed Zoning Exhibit
- PowerPoint Presentation
- Applicant PowerPoint Presentation