

AGENDA

FLOWER MOUND TOWN COUNCIL

WORK SESSION

SEPTEMBER 15, 2016

**FLOWER MOUND TOWN HALL, 2121 CROSS TIMBERS ROAD
FLOWER MOUND, TEXAS**

6:00 P.M.

An agenda information packet is available online at www.flower-mound.com/AgendaCenter

Please silence or turn off all electronic devices in the Council Chambers.

A. CALL WORK SESSION TO ORDER

B. INVOCATION

**C. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE AMERICAN FLAG AND TO THE TEXAS FLAG
*"Honor the Texas flag; I pledge allegiance to thee, Texas, one state under God, one and indivisible."***

D. WORK SESSION ITEM

1. Presentation and discussion involving Town development standards including the Urban Design Plan, sign standards, landscape standards, undergrounding of overhead utilities, detention and retention pond standards, and discussion of the Town's process and options for administrative approvals.

E. ADJOURN WORK SESSION

I do hereby certify that the Notice of Meeting was posted on the bulletin board in Town Hall of the Town of Flower Mound, Texas, a place convenient and readily accessible to the general public at all times and said Notice was posted on the following date and time: September 12, 2016, at 9:30 a.m., at least 72 hours prior to the scheduled time of said meeting.



Theresa Scott, Town Secretary

Pursuant to Section 551.071 of the Texas Government Code, the Town Council reserves the right to consult in a closed meeting with its attorney and to receive legal advice regarding any item listed on this agenda. The Flower Mound Town Hall and Council Chambers are wheelchair accessible. Requests for accommodations or interpretive services must be made 48 hours prior to this meeting by contacting Theresa Scott, Town Secretary, at (972) 874-6076.



MEMORANDUM – SEPTEMBER 15, 2016

TO: Town Council

FROM: Tommy Dalton, Assistant Town Manager

THROUGH: Doug Powell, Executive Director Development Services

RE: Presentation and discussion involving Town development standards including the Urban Design Plan, sign standards, landscape standards, undergrounding of overhead utilities, detention and retention pond standards, and discussion of the Town's process and options for administrative approvals.

The Town Council conducted their Strategic Planning Session (SPS) on July 22, 2016. As a follow-on to the SPS, staff is requesting further review and discussion by the Council on the following items, as well as prioritization and timing of bringing these items forward, if so directed.

1. Urban Design Plan (Architectural Standards)
2. Sign standards
3. Landscape standards
4. Undergrounding of overhead utilities
5. Detention and retention pond standards
6. Administrative approvals

During the work session, staff will recap the summary information below, provide examples where applicable, and discuss with the Council any concerns and consensus with moving forward with the initiatives, prior to dedicating staff time and resources.

SUMMARY INFORMATION

Item 1: Urban Design Plan – The Town last reviewed its Urban Design Plan (UDP) in 2010. One of the recommendations of the 2006 Master Plan Update Steering Committee was to review the Town's Urban Design Plan (UDP) component. To that end, the Town staff conducted three work session meetings with the Planning and Zoning Commission (June 28, 2010, September 13, 2010, and October 11, 2010), primarily focused on the updates to the Architectural Standards of the Urban Design Plan.

The Architectural Standards section of the [UDP](#) provides for exterior design direction for non-residential buildings. There are nine various elements to the Architectural Standards that cover building materials, colors, façade articulation, pedestrian scale, the design of building entry points, building orientation, unified design, massing and form, and the design of roofs. The text changes proposed in 2010 clarified how the Town historically administered the design direction. The Town adopted new images more illustrative of the design intent for each element of the Architectural Standards. The new images provide examples of compliant and non-compliant architecture for each element.

Also, the UDP adopted with the Master Plan in 2001 recommended "that a third party peer review group consisting of five people be established by the Town to determine the suitability of meritorious design that might not comply exactly with these standards, but that is of exceptional enough design quality that it would be a desirable addition to the Town." This section of the UDP is commonly referred to as the "meritorious design exception." An "architectural review committee" had not been used since 2003. Instead, the Town has considered individual master plan amendments to accommodate specific projects that do not meet the technical requirements of the UDP. The 2010 amendments to this section intended to leave final determination of compliance with the UDP to ultimately the Town Council after review by



MEMORANDUM – SEPTEMBER 15, 2016

Town staff and a recommendation by the Planning and Zoning Commission. The amendment allowed a “meritorious design exception” for developments that do not meet one or more requirements of the UDP. The current design review section reads as follows:

1. Design Review

1.1. Determination of a proposed building design’s compliance with these standards will be made by the Town’s staff and/or Planning and Zoning Commission and Town Council.

1.2. In considering conformance to these standards, the Town will evaluate the suitability of meritorious design that might not comply exactly with these standards, but that is of exceptional enough design quality that it would be a desirable addition to the Town.

The first project to utilize the new meritorious design exception was the Explorations Preparatory School in 2011 (SP 06-11). This request included the addition of a new classroom building adjacent to the historic Flower Mound Presbyterian Church. The main structure was originally constructed of wood siding. With the expansion of the church on March 13, 2000, (SP 19-99), the staff report mentioned materials proposed for the expansion (hardi-plank) were being proposed to keep the continuity of the historical church. Ultimately, the entire building was refinished with hardi-plank siding. The classroom building proposed the same type of material for the same purpose on the new building. The new building is located at the back of the property and visibility from Flower Mound Road is limited. The applicant matched other elements including roof pitch and building color in order to mimic the design of the church building. Under these circumstances, the project was granted a meritorious design exception.

The next project to utilize the exception was Mi Dia in 2015 (SP15-0028). The project received exceptions from the minimum requirements for façade articulation, materials (glass wall overlooking a patio), and a pitched roof. Overall, the project was of unique design and quality thus receiving the exception.

Recently, a Wells Fargo bank at the northwest corner of Flower Mound Road and Long Prairie Road (SP15-0030) indicated that the Town’s roof pitch requirements prevented them from pursuing green building certification. Although they did not request a meritorious design exception, the comment prompted the Council to direct staff to review the Town’s standards for impediments to green building standards. In the Wells Fargo case, the Town’s pitched roof standards allegedly prevented the use of solar panels on top of the building.

Finally, Prairie Commons (SP16-0005) initially requested a meritorious exception to allow a higher percentage of stucco on two of the proposed interior buildings. Ultimately, the project was approved with material percentages that met the Town’s Architectural Standards. However, the developer is amending the elevations in an attempt to apply for the exception that provides design elements beyond the increased use of stucco.

The purpose of this discussion is to clarify the intent of the meritorious design exception, and review the other requirements of the Architectural Standards. For example, if a project is only requesting the reduction of one standard, regardless of green building certification, what is the process for such a request and does it reach the threshold for meritorious design? The intent for this exception was not to be used for deviations that simply reduce the Town standards due to financial hardship, or to be used as a universal exemption. Alternatively, does the Council want to review specific standards such as material requirements and allow the use of secondary materials (i.e. stucco and EIFS) at greater percentages? Similarly, are there different scenarios in which a flat roof may be appropriate on buildings less than 15,000 square feet (i.e. adjacent to roadways), but still require pitched roofs adjacent to existing or planned residential uses?

Item 2: Sign Standards – This topic was raised by the Planning and Zoning Commission (P&Z) during their February 22, 2016 Board input session (Input Session). The main concern was reviewing the standards to address current technology



MEMORANDUM – SEPTEMBER 15, 2016

such as LED lighting. It was felt that LED lighting mimics neon lighting which circumvented the spirit of the ordinance since neon is currently banned.

Item 3: Landscape Standards – This topic was raised by staff and presented to the P&Z during their Input Session. Staff is proposing a review of the Town’s Landscape regulations to update and include standards for Texas SmartScape planting design, maintenance standards, and enforcement. This issue arose from the use of crushed granite material within commercial centers in lieu of grass sod. The Town’s code does not address the use of this material within required landscaped areas, and there are concerns about aesthetics, and the installation and ongoing maintenance of the material. Aside from this specific issue, the larger discussion involves creating standards for low maintenance drought tolerant native landscaping.

Item 4: Undergrounding of overhead utilities – The requirement for undergrounding overhead utilities began with the adoption of SMARTGrowth. Language below:

B. CRITERION: On-Site Utility Distribution Facilities. No development application or project shall be approved unless all on site utility distribution facilities are designed to be placed underground, including the land-wire distribution facilities of electrical, cable, telephone and telecommunications providers.

Exceptions to the standard have come forward due to cost, or poor aesthetics (more poles had to be erected). Most of those exceptions have been approved. Further, existing lines do not have to be buried if they are located within the right-of-way. Since the adoption of this standard, all new service lines within a development have been placed underground.

Item 5: Detention and retention pond standards – In 2007 the Town updated its standards for detention/retention ponds which included aesthetic elements (dry detention; wet retention). The purpose of this discussion is to review those aesthetic elements that have been in place for the last nine years. The current standard requires only retail and residential to be wet.

Item 6: Administrative approvals – The Council has requested that staff discuss the Town’s development process and where administrative approvals may improve efficiency and eliminate superfluous steps in the process. Staff will present a few examples to begin the discussion.