MINUTES

Prosper Planning and Zoning Commission
Regular Meeting
Prosper Town Hall – Council Chambers
250 W. First Street, Prosper, Texas
Tuesday, August 18, 2026
6:30 PM

1. Call to Order / Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 6:46 p.m.

Commissioners Present: Chair Damon Jackson, Vice Chair Josh Carson, Secretary Glen Blanscet, John Hamilton, Matt Furay, and Deborah Daniel

Commissioner(s) Absent: Brett Butler

Staff Members Present: David Hoover, AICP (Director of Development Services), Suzanne Porter, AICP (Planning Manager), Dakari Hill (Senior Planner), Jerron Hicks (Planner), Michelle Crowe (Senior Administrative Assistant)

Other(s) Present – Terrance S. Welch, Town Attorney

2. Recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

CONSENT AGENDA:

3a. Consider and act upon the minutes from the August 4, 2026, Planning and Zoning Commission work session meeting.

3b. Consider and act upon the minutes from the August 4, 2026, Planning and Zoning Commission regular meeting.

3c. Consider and act upon a request for a Site Plan for Office/Warehouse Buildings on Prosper Flex Park, Block A, Lot 1, on 10.8± acres, located on the south side of Prosper Trail and 700± feet east of Mike Howard Lane. (DEVAPP-26-0018)

3d. Consider and act upon a request for a Replat of Prosper Flex Park, Block A, Lot 1, on 10.8± acres, located on the south side of Prosper Trail and 700± feet east of Mike Howard Lane. (DEVAPP-26-0019)

Commissioner Hamilton made a motion to approve Items 3a through 3d. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Carson. The motion was carried unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

CITIZEN COMMENTS

The public is invited to address the Commission on any topic. However, the Commission is unable to discuss or take action on any topic not listed on this agenda. Please complete a "Public Comment Request Form" and present it to a Staff member prior to the meeting. Please limit your comments to three minutes. If multiple individuals wish to speak on a topic, they may yield their three minutes to one individual appointed to speak on their behalf. All individuals yielding their time must be present at the meeting, and the appointed individual will be limited to a total of 15 minutes.

- Curt Mooney 1230 Packsaddle Trail, spoke regarding notification process
- Ilean McCousie Windsong Ranch, opposition to Data Center
- Katrena Price 1200 Clipston Drive, did not receive the mailed Public Notice

REGULAR AGENDA:

If you wish to address the Commission, please fill out a "Public Comment Request Form" and present it to the Chair, preferably before the meeting begins. Pursuant to Section 551.007 of the Texas Government Code, individuals wishing to address the Planning and Zoning Commission for items listed as public hearings will be recognized when the public hearing is opened. For individuals wishing to speak on a non-public hearing item, they may either address the Commission during the Citizen Comments portion of the meeting or when the item is considered by the Planning and Zoning Commission.

4. **Consider and act upon a request for a Preliminary Site Plan for Office, Restaurant, and Retail Buildings on Frontier Gateway, Block A, Lots 1-12, on 34.6± acres, located on the southwest corner of Dallas Parkway and Frontier Parkway. (DEVAPP-24-0110)**

Vice Chair Carson made a motion to remove Item 4 from the table. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Furay. The motion was carried unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

Mr. Hicks presented Item 4 to the Commission, noting the orientation of the building on Lot 5 had been changed and the drugstore drive-through had been removed.

Mr. Bond, the applicant's engineer, thanked the Commission and Staff.

Commissioner Blanscet requested clarification regarding roadway/parkway between the buildings along the tollway and the open space and parking changed. He also asked if there has been any thought to traffic driving through the pedestrian area and if there would be consideration to add bollards. He stated that when the site plan is submitted, more definition regarding the amenities for this development should be provided.

Mr. Bond stated that the service areas have been moved and the buildings have been pushed closer to the drive without a curb, and the area is open for emergency services. There is no parking between the open space and the buildings along the tollway to create a pedestrian boulevard. With regards to any type of bollard, a conversation will have to take place with the Fire Marshal. The preference would be to have a removable barrier. Details regarding the amenities will be discussed in the future.

Vice Chair Carson made a motion to approve Item 4. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Blanscet. The motion was carried unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

5. **Conduct a Public Hearing and consider and act upon a request for a Replat of Park Place, Block C, Lot 1X, on 1.3± acres, for the development of an Amenity Center, located on the southeast corner of Aster Drive and Park Place. (DEVAPP-26-0040)**

Mr. Hicks presented Item 5 to the Commission.

The Public Hearing was opened at 7:09 p.m.

No comments were made.

The Public Hearing closed at 7:09 p.m.

Vice Chair Carson made a motion to approve Item 5. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hamilton. The motion was carried unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

6. **Consider and act upon a request for a Site Plan for an Amenity Center on Park Place, Block C, Lot 1X, on 1.3± acres, located on the southeast corner of Aster Drive and Park Place. (DEVAPP-26-0038)**

Mr. Hicks presented Item 6 to the Commission.

Commissioner Furay made a motion to approve Item 6. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Daniel. The motion was carried unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

7. Conduct a Public Hearing and consider and act upon a request to amend a portion of Planned Development-31 to create a new Planned Development on Saddle Creek Commercial, Block A, Lots 2R and 3, for non-residential uses (office, restaurant, retail), on 13.6± acres, located on the west side of Preston Road, 225± feet north of Prosper Trail. (ZONE-25-0003)

Vice Chair Carson made a motion to remove Item 7 from the table. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hamilton. The motion was carried unanimously by a vote of 6-0. Item 7 was removed from the table at 7:12 p.m.

Ms. Porter presented Item 7 to the Commission.

Scott Kanaga, the applicant’s architect, presented the proposed plan and compared it with the 2006 approved plan associated with the current zoning.

- The 2006 plan permits approximately 165,000 square feet of building area. The proposed plan reduces this to approximately 118,000 square feet, a reduction of 46,750 square feet.
- Building setbacks have been increased to approximately 125 feet from residential lots to the west and 90 feet from residential lots to the north.
- Open space has increased by approximately 2% and includes ponds and proposed amenitized areas with seating, patios, and covered areas.
- Dumpster enclosures have been relocated away from residential properties and into parking areas.
- Restaurants are proposed to be located at least 100 feet from residentially zoned properties.
- Patios are oriented inward toward the development, ponds, or central site areas rather than toward adjacent residential properties.
- The applicant explained that the existing zoning is primarily office-oriented and that the proposed amendment would allow for a more retail-centric, blended-use development consistent with current market conditions and zoning practices.
- To address visibility and impacts to neighboring residential properties, second-story buildings have been set back farther from residential lots. Additional landscape buffers and more mature trees are proposed to supplement the existing masonry wall and provide increased screening.
- The applicant stated a willingness to consider adjustments to proposed uses based on recommendations from the Commission.

Commissioner Blanscet stated that the concept plan shows every building with the potential for a restaurant and asked how many restaurants are envisioned in the development and whether the applicant would be open to restrictions on the total number of restaurants.

Commissioner Furay asked whether the amount of restaurant space shown on the concept plan exceeds what is currently allowed under the development standards.

Vice Chair Carson asked about the proposed primary and secondary building materials, being in support of staff’s recommendation for 80 percent primary materials, and requested that stucco be moved to the secondary materials category. He also noted that the site plan shows a significant number of dumpsters and asked whether that number reflects the required number of dumpsters.

Commissioner Hamilton requested that the ordinance language be revised to reflect a 150-foot setback from the property line and that the language on the north side be revised to reflect a 90-foot setback from the property line. He also asked for clarification regarding the potential retaining wall along the western side of the property and how it would look.

Mr. Kanaga explained that the number of restaurants will be market-driven and has not yet been determined. He stated that the intent is for restaurants to be located on the ground floor of the two-story buildings along the pond amenity, primarily in the center portions of those buildings. He confirmed that no restaurants are proposed on the second floor. He added that the building at the southwest corner of the site is expected to include approximately 4,000 square feet of restaurant space, primarily on the eastern portion, with the remainder of the building likely used for retail or office space.

Mr. Kanaga stated that there was no issue with the request to modify the building material requirements.

Regarding the dumpsters, Mr. Kanaga explained that the locations shown on the conceptual plan placed them more interior to the site. They are placeholders and more dumpsters where shown compared to what may ultimately be needed. The concept plan currently reflects a pair of dumpsters per building, with the intent that one could be used for trash and the other for recycling. He noted that buildings containing restaurant and office/retail uses may require separation of wet trash from dry trash.

Regarding the western retaining wall, Mr. Kanaga explained that the residential lots to the west are currently at a higher elevation than the remainder of the site, which slopes downward toward Preston Road. Based on the proposed grading, an approximately 7-foot retaining wall would be located along the back of the parking area where it terminates on the western side. A landscape buffer with a primary row of trees intended to provide a living screen is located behind the retaining wall.

Chair Jackson opening the Public Hearing at 7:40 p.m.

1. Dale Jelinek 1251 Packsaddle Trail, spoke in opposition
2. David Adams 1311 Packsaddle Trail, spoke in opposition
3. Brandon Watson 1260 Clipston Drive, spoke in opposition
4. Michael Villalva 1210 Packsaddle Trail, spoke in opposition
5. Andrew Coonradt 911 Packsaddle Trail, spoke in opposition
6. Greg Acker 1140 Circle J Trail, spoke in opposition
7. Sara Cozart 1310 Clipston Drive, spoke in opposition
8. Alison Morrison 1241 Clipston Drive, spoke in opposition
9. Kenny Warren 931 Packsaddle Trail, spoke in opposition
10. Riika Justus 1260 Packsaddle Trial, spoke in opposition
11. Bonnie Jelinek 1251 Packsaddle Trail, spoke in opposition
12. Ruinder Kaur 940 Circle J Trail, spoke in opposition
13. Purvi Patel 1201 Clipston Drive, spoke in opposition
14. Julie Travis 1161 Clipston Drive, spoke in opposition
15. Victoria De La Cruz 1260 Circle J Trail, spoke in opposition
16. Austin Brennen 1401 Blackpool Lane, spoke in opposition
17. John Naccarato 1240 Clipston Drive, spoke in opposition
18. Max Yudegar 1140 Clipston Drive, spoke in opposition
19. Katrina Price 1200 Clipston Drive, spoke in opposition
20. Cody Cunningham 960 Packsaddle Trail, spoke in opposition
21. Curt Mooney 1230 Packsaddle Trail, spoke in opposition

Planning and Zoning Commission took a brief recess at 9:37 p.m.

Planning and Zoning Commission reconvened the meeting at 9:46 p.m.

Chair Jackson closed the Public Hearing at 9:46 p.m.

Mr. Brad Burns, the applicant, discussed the details and intent of the proposed development with the Commission, including the rationale behind the development and the proposed uses. He reviewed the list of uses and identified uses he was willing to remove. Mr. Burns also further clarified questions and addressed concerns raised by the Commission, with assistance from Mr. Kanaga.

The following topics were discussed:

- Current zoning versus proposed Planned Development: Clarification that the property can already have retail, restaurants, and two-story office/medical uses under the existing zoning. The primary current limitation is that retail/restaurant uses are limited to 6 acres within the initial 15-acre area. There is currently no limit on the number of restaurants within those 6 acres.
- Building height: Current zoning permits 2 stories or 40 feet. The proposed Planned Development allows 2 stories or 45 feet, including architectural roof forms and parapets. The applicant indicated the buildings would likely be approximately 35 feet plus an 8-foot parapet to screen mechanical equipment (about 43 feet total).
- Setbacks and screening: Commissioners noted that the proposed development provides greater setbacks, additional landscaping, screening, trees, ponds, and open space than what could be built under the current zoning. The applicant stated that the buildings were moved farther from the residential area and additional screening was added to reduce visibility from neighboring homes.
- Traffic: Commissioners asked whether a traffic study or additional traffic signals had been considered. Staff stated that no traffic signal determination has been made and that Preston Road and Prosper Trail are designed to accommodate this type of development. It was uncertain whether the applicant had conducted a separate traffic study. The applicant stated that no traffic study was performed by him but that TxDOT would have considered the development at this intersection in designing the adjacent streets and intersections.
- Restaurants and drive-through: Commissioners generally acknowledged that restaurants are already permitted under the current zoning, but several expressed concerns about the number of restaurants and the proposed drive-through use. Multiple commissioners indicated support for removing the drive-through and limiting restaurant uses.
- Proposed uses: Commissioners discussed removing or narrowing several of the proposed uses. Staff explained that some zoning categories, such as retail, are broad and that the Development Services Director determines whether an unlisted use fits within an existing category, subject to an appeal to the Board of Adjustment.
- Alcohol sales: The Commission discussed the types of alcohol sales permitted in the Town and the applicable state and local requirements. Staff explained that various alcohol sales have been authorized through previous local elections and that certain locations remain prohibited by state law.
- Applicant presentation: The applicant stated that the proposed development is intended to provide a higher-quality architectural design, similar to the existing dental office, along with additional ponds, open space, landscaping, and reduced building square footage. The applicant also noted that previous resident concerns were incorporated into the revised concept plan.
- Commissioner comments: Commissioners generally recognized improvements in setbacks, screening, open space, and overall site design, while expressing concerns about certain proposed uses, particularly the drive-through and the quantity of restaurants.
- Use list dialogue: The Commission discussed specific uses to be removed from the proposal, taking into consideration resident concerns. Town Attorney Welch confirmed that the Town Council could later restore or modify a use removed by the Commission.

- Restaurant limitation: The Commission continued discussing how to limit the number of restaurants and how that limitation should be incorporated into the recommendation/motion.

Vice Chair Carson made a motion to approve Item 7. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hamilton. The motion was carried unanimously by a vote of 6-0, subject to the following modifications:

a) A minimum of 80% masonry building materials with stucco reclassified from masonry to non-masonry material for the purposes of the PD.
b) A maximum of 20% non-masonry materials on each façade.
c) Removal of the follow permitted uses:
   - 9. College University Trade or Private School
   - 10. Commercial Amusement, Indoor
   - 11. Commercial Amusement, Outdoor (S)
   - 14. Fraternal Organization, Lodge, Civic Club, Fraternity, or Sorority
   - 19. Hotel, Full Service (C)
   - 23. Outdoor Merchandise Display, Incidental (S)
   - 24. Outdoor Merchandise Display, Temporary (C)
   - 27. Retail/Service Incidental Use
   - 30. Restaurant with a Drive-Through
d) Reclassification of Permitted Use 13. Farmers Market, to requiring a Special Use Permit.
e) Edit Permitted Use 3. with the removal of Used Furniture, to only reading Antique Shop.
f) Edit Permitted Use 29. Restaurants shall be permitted by right only in buildings fronting east Prosper Trail or north Preston Road. Any restaurant located in the two-story buildings on the west side of the development shall require a Special Use Permit.
g) Increasing the minimum setback adjacent to the residential zoned property to 150 feet on the west and north perimeters.
h) Amend the Lot Coverage to 20%
i) Prohibiting balconies on any building façade facing residentially zoned property.

Planning and Zoning Commission took a brief recess.

Planning and Zoning Commission reconvened back into the meeting at 11:28 p.m.

8. Conduct a Public Hearing and consider and act upon a request to amend a portion of Planned Development-42 (Tract 16) and rezone a portion of a Commercial Tract (Tract 17) to create a Mixed-Use Planned Development on the Collin County School Land Survey, Abstract No. 147 and J. Yarnell Survey, Abstract No. 1038, Tracts 16 and 17, on 143.0± acres, located on the northeast corner of Dallas Parkway and University Drive. (ZONE-26-0009)

Mr. Hoover presented Item 8 to the Commission.

Mr. Jeff Blackard, applicant, presented the proposed Planned Development for the approximately 144-acre site, describing it as a significant gateway into Prosper. The concept includes a 15-acre lagoon, promenade/public-square area, retail and office uses, structured parking, and a mix of residential products. Mr. Blackard stated that the design was developed around the site's unique location and is intended to create a village environment supported by sufficient residential population.

Commissioners discussed the proposed approximately 4,400 residential units, including the high percentage of one-bedroom multifamily units. Mr. Blackard and Mr. Hoover explained that approximately 2,500 units are multifamily, with the remainder consisting of condominiums, villas, single-family residences, and other residential types. They stated that the residential mix may be adjusted during development based on market conditions and that the project is intended to serve a niche market and support the proposed commercial uses.

Commissioners also discussed parking, the proposed Performing Arts Center, building heights, and the potential for additional office uses. Mr. Blackard stated that structured parking would serve the development, the Performing Arts Center site could accommodate retail if the facility is not constructed, and the larger buildings would provide visual and sound buffering from surrounding highways.

Mr. Hoover explained that the request is conceptual and that final building locations, dimensions, and configurations may be adjusted during subsequent engineering and site-plan review. He stated that all development remains subject to engineering, fire, life-safety, emergency access, and other applicable requirements.

Commissioner Blanscet emphasized the importance of the lagoon, promenade, public-square concept, structured parking, architectural character, and building materials to the overall development vision. Mr. Blackard confirmed that the lagoon is planned as part of the first phase and would also function as a detention facility.

Town Attorney Welch noted that architectural features and materials would also be addressed through a development agreement.

Mr. Blackard stated that the first phase could potentially begin within one year following approval. Commissioners expressed support for the project's unique design while continuing to discuss residential density, unit mix, enforceability of the exhibits and development standards, building heights, and preservation of the overall development concept.

The Public Hearing was opened at 12:54 a.m.

Mr. Alaistair Hernandez 3367 FM1385, Aubrey TX provided comments and suggestions.

The Public Hearing was closed at 12:56 a.m.

Commissioner Hamilton made a motion to approve Item 8. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Daniel. The motion was carried by a vote of 4-2 (Chair Jackson and Vice-Chair Carson supported the project, but both indicated that they would have preferred to review the draft development agreement prior to approval and wanted a little more information.)

9. Review actions taken by the Town Council and possibly direct Town Staff to schedule topic(s) for discussion at a future meeting.

Mr. Hill Informed the Commissioners of past Town Council actions and upcoming cases for Planning and Zoning Commission consideration.

10. Adjourn.

Commissioner Hamilton made a motion to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Daniels. The motion was carried unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:25 a.m.

______________________________________ ______________________________________
Michelle Crowe, Senior Administrative Assistant Glen Blanscet, Secretary