Development Review Service Analysis 2024 Update

Prosper, Texas

Updated December 16, 2024

matrix consulting group

Table of Contents

1. Introduction and Executive Summary

The Matrix Consulting Group was originally retained by the Town of Prosper in the summer of 2021 to update their development review services customer survey from 2017. The customer survey highlighted several changes related to the services provided by the Town. In December 2021, the Town contracted with the Matrix Consulting Group to conduct a deeper dive into their development review, permitting, and inspection operations. In the Spring of 2024, the Town requested additional services to evaluate current development review approaches and identify staffing needs.

This updated study (Phase 3) focused on the following areas:

- Review the implementation of the 2022 (Phase 2) study recommendations.
- Reach out to recent customers and conduct phone call conversations to gauge how services, processes, and approaches have evolved since the previous study.
- Conduct a comparative assessment with six other North Texas jurisdictions to understand their current development review timelines.
- Review workload and performance and align staffing needs with service level expectations.

Matrix conducted interviews with staff from Building Inspection, Engineering, Fire Marshal Office, Planning, and Parks. The intent of the interviews was to develop an understanding of current processes, technology utilization, and performance goals. These conversations served as a baseline for current operational approaches.

This study includes a detailed evaluation of the current development review and related operations, a roadmap to enhance services, including the identification of operational, technology, and staffing needs.

1. Key Strengths of the Development Process

While many of this report's recommendations focus on improvement opportunities, it is important to highlight the strengths of the organization's development review functions and processes, which include:

- The implementation of the new permitting software system in December 2022, enhanced the development process for the public (applicant) and staff. Once fully implemented, all development review, permitting, and inspection processes will

occur through the platform. The process has become more efficient since the phased implementation of the new software system.

- Staff provides consistent review comments and adequate information for the applicant to correct their application.
- The Town has robust turnaround times for all application types and generally meets these performance expectations.
- Adopted performance metrics align with or exceed many other North Texas communities.
- Prior customers identified several recent improvements to the development review processes that focused on enhanced communication and customer service approaches.
- Approximately half of the Phase 2 study recommendations have been implemented over the past two years. The components that have not been implemented primarily focused on technology, website, and training recommendations.
- The Town continues to strive for exceptional customer service and has established customer service metrics. Examples include responding to phone calls and emails within one to two business days, establishing the designated developer program, enhancing online services, etc.

Overall, the Town provides strong development review, permitting, and inspection services to the community. The recommendations discussed in this report are focused on strengthening existing practices and leveraging technology and process improvements to create greater operational efficiencies.

This report is outlined in the following order:

- Stakeholder Feedback Summary
- Technology Evaluation
- Process Improvements
- Staffing Analysis
- Previous Study Recommendation Implementation Review
- Comparative Assessment

2. Summary of Recommendations

Based on Matrix's assessment and analysis, there are several recommendations related to the process, technology, and staffing needs. All recommendations are summarized as they are presented in the report and include prioritization level and implementation time frame.

Rec.#	Recommendation	Priority	Implementation Season
	Technology Analysis		
1	Create standardized workload and performance reports for leadership, staff, and the public.	High	Summer 2025
2	Review the workload timestamps fields in EPL to ensure they are configured properly to support performance reporting goals.	High	Summer 2025
3	Review all workflows to ensure they align with current business processes.	High	Winter 2024 / 2025
4	Modify the workflow configurations in the permitting software system to consolidate individual application types for applications that currently require multiple applications.	High	Spring 2025
5	Provide development staff with EPL training and user support to ensure that the software is configured to promote operational efficiencies.	High	Winter 2024 / 2025
6	Update the way that applications are identified in the customer portal.	High	Winter 2024 / 2025
7	Add a glossary of terms in the customer portal and clarify the "state" and "status" meaning for applications.	High	Spring 2025
8	Evaluate and implement a policy on linking parent and child permits in the permitting software system.	Medium	Fall 2025
	Process Improvements		
9	Review the Town's certificate of occupancy process to identify improvement opportunities and greater consistency.	High	Winter 2024 / 2025

10	Provide written feedback after a pre-application meeting.	High	Immediately
11	Transition to an application case management approach. Which will be facilitated by the primary department's reviewer.	High	Spring 2025
12	Equip application intake staff with application checklist and training to conduct a thorough completeness check at application submittal.	High	Spring 2025
13	Modify the approach to the development and zoning application review process to ensure that all DRC members have a minimum of seven business days to review small/simple applications and 10 business days for large/complex applications.	High	Winter 2024 / 2025
14	Increase the timeframe to complete the civil plan application review to 15 business days for initial review and 10 business days for resubmittals.	High	Immediately
15	Planning should be the steward of the entire subdivision and platting process from initial application to final signature.	Medium	Winter 2024 / 2025
	Staffing Analysis		
16	Add one full time fire plan reviewer/inspector immediately.	High	FY 25/26
17	In one to two years, add a part time plan reviewer/inspector position that will eventually transition to a full time position.	Low	FY 27/28
18	Maintain the current allocation of 9 Building Inspectors and 1 Chief Inspector.	High	Ongoing
19	Maintain the current allocation of one Chief Plans Examiner and 3 Plans Examiner.	High	Ongoing
20	Add one additional Engineer to the Engineering – Development Review team.	High	FY 2026

21	Maintain the current allocation of five positions assigned to Planning.	High	Ongoing
22	Over the next five years, a dedicated advanced planning position should be added to focus on long planning efforts. Alternatively, advanced planning duties can be assigned to multiple planners based on skill set.	Low	FY 29/30
Prior Study Recommendation Implementation			
23	Continue the implementation of the Phase 2 study recommendations, especially recommendations 2, 8, 21, 22 – 26, 28, 31, 32, and 34 – 35.	Medium	Ongoing

2. Prior Customer Feedback

As part of this engagement, the project team reached out to prior customers to obtain their perspective and feedback on the provision of development review, permitting, and inspection services provided by the Town. As part of this effort, the project team emailed 19 past customers of the Town and requested to schedule a phone conversation. The team reached out in early June and followed up in late July with those who had not responded. A total of seven conversations were held with prior customers. Each of these individuals have significant experience with the Town's development processes. These individuals included engineers, architects, and contractors for both residential and commercial development activities. The following points outline the key themes of these conversations.

- Recent changes have included improved consistency and level of service for Engineering review. Recent staff changes have improved the engineering review process but there are still issues with meeting timeline goals.
- Planning has had significant staff turnover, and this has resulted in additional challenges with Planning and Zoning reviews. The process is wildly inconsistent and the level of scrutiny for applications is highly dependent on individual staff members.
- Concerns were noted over a shift with the quality of reviews for development applications. There has been an uptick in significant comments being received on third or fourth review rounds for elements that were unchanged from the initial application. There is a perception that staff are not conducting a thorough initial review to meet their review timelines because they know they will have multiple review attempts. Note: this may be a result of the turnover of several key positions and new staff becoming more versed in the Town's development standards.
- The new online application portal has both positively and negatively impacted the application submittal process. Common complaints with the portal focused on the nomenclature used in the system, challenges with accessing online accounts and review comments, the use of the DevApp# as the project identifier is unclear and creates confusion for applicants with multiple applications/permits. There was a general consensus that EnerGov/EPL was not implemented well in Prosper when compared to other jurisdictions the applicants have worked with. These challenges have impacted the efficiency of the overall process.

- Concerns were discussed related to level of detail needed for site plans/infrastructure early in the application process. This level of detailed was deemed excessive for the initial applications. There was a desire to limit the level of detail for initial planning applications, and individuals would rather be required to submit a concept plan at this stage versus full civil plan sets.
- Building permit review and inspection approaches have been consistent over the past few years. The consensus was that building permit reviews are completed within outlined timelines.
- The fire plan review process and inspection customer service have improved dramatically over the past two years. Several individuals noted significant improvements in customer service approaches and willingness to resolve challenges in a proactive manner.

Similar to previous customer service feedback, there are mixed opinions with service levels, processes, and approaches deployed by the various development review teams. There have been fluctuations in which teams are working well and others that may have more challenges now than previously noted.

3. Technology Systems Evaluation

In the fall of 2022, the Town implemented a new permitting and inspection software system. This system is referred to as EnerGov and/or EPL and both are used interchangeably. This platform will eventually be used for all development review, permitting, and inspection activities and processes. So far, the Town has implemented all building and planning workflows in the software and is finalizing the fire processes and tasks as well.

The EPL system is a robust permitting and inspection software program that has the capability to implement all the key functionalities found in the most robust permitting software systems. Prosper is in the process of implementing many of these features. The following table summarizes the key functionalities of highly functional permitting software systems and the project team's understanding of what has been implemented.

Best Practice Functionality	Implemented	In Progress
Provides a robust online system for the public.	☑	
Submittal of all development application types utilizing the online portal.		☑
The applicant's online portal should include access to review comments, status updates, and the ability to request inspections. The portal should also allow the applicant to see the status of individual reviews of their application.	☑	☑
Online feature for the general public to search application and development activity status (e.g., the status of an application, view approved site plans for new commercial development, etc.).		☑
Integrates the Town's development process and workflow so that progress can be tracked by staff from application submittal to certificate of occupancy.	☑	
Seamless integration with the Town's plan review software system (BlueBeam).	☑	
Calculates application and permitting fees and accepts payment through the software and/or online portal.	☑	
Allows review staff to receive notifications regarding new tasks, deadlines, and status updates by application.	☑	

Best Practice Functionality	Implemented	In Progress
Allows for the uploading of review comments (both on the plan sheet and in the permit record) and monitors the status of individual reviewers All users should be able to see other reviewer's comments and markups.	☑	
Feature that allows the Town development review staff to notify the applicant if there are delays in the review with an updated completion time.	☑	
Utilizes templates to prepopulate standardized information for review comment checklist, staff reports, permits, etc., including checklists, ability to link to ordinances, codes, and design standards, automate public notices, etc.	Partially implemented	☑
Has a searchable database by address or other approved identifier such as parcel number.	☑	
Contains approved and constructed/as-built plan sets that are linked to the permit file.		☑
The mobile version of the software program allows field staff to remotely access the system to consult approved plan sets, inspection results, and determine open permits and violations. Access should include those in code enforcement.	☑	
Ability to upload photos via mobile version and link to the permit file.	☑	
A web-based access portal for staff to access the system remotely.	☑	
Allows for the integration of the Town's GIS system and links to the permit file by identifier.	☑	
The ability for inspectors to be able to automatically develop daily routes for their assigned inspections.	Not identified as feature to be implemented.	
Allows for an automatic notification (text or email) to be sent from the system for the next inspection appointment.	Not identified as feature to be implemented.	
Allows for managers to run performance/workload reports from the system. Ideally, the system could link to a performance dashboard on the Town's website.	☑	☑

The following subsections provide additional opportunities to enhance technology systems to improve the development process.

1. Create better performance monitoring reports.

By moving all development review applications, permits, and inspections to a single platform, it is important to monitor workload and performance. Prosper continues to experience significant growth and development and this trend is expected to continue for the foreseeable future. By proactively monitoring the development workload and performance, leadership can be more proactive in identifying process improvements, workload reallocation, and staffing modifications. Continuous workload and performance monitoring is critical to addressing potential issues quickly and effectively.

To be able to monitor workload it is critical to create standardized reports for managers, staff, and the public. Standardized report templates allow each user to quickly and easily review relevant data points. The development review leadership team should develop standardized workload and performance report templates in the permitting software platform. Example data points include:

- Key workload identifiers such as applications submitted, permits issued, average turnaround times, inspections passed/failed, etc. Reports should be detailed by functional area/group and include both annual (calendar or fiscal year) and year to date totals.
- Performance metrics should be monitored by application type and functional area. Data points should be provided for the most recent time period (e.g., weekly, monthly, quarterly) and trends over a defined time period such as the last six months. Reports should present the data graphically and numerically. Ideally, a visual indicator should be used to indicate if trends are heading in a positive or negative direction.
- Staff should have access to reports that provide an oversight of their individual workload and performance.
- A public portal should be created that provides an overview of workload and performance. Recent trends should be presented to show which way performance is heading. This information should be presented in a graphical format and published on the Town's website. This should be a dynamic dashboard that allows the user to search and sort the data they are searching for. This would replace the existing monthly workload reports posted on the Town's website.

Standardized reports may also be shared with Town appointed and elected officials so they can speak about recent workload and performance trends. These reports are critical to presenting the high workload volume, performance of the team, and can be used to

highlight the strengths (or weaknesses) of the organization. Reports should be standardized for all respective departments/divisions.

Recommendation #1: Create standardized workload and performance reports for leadership, staff, and the public.

2. Use EPL to capture better timeline data.

The first recommendation in this study was to create standardized performance reports for management, staff, and the public. For these reports to be successful, it is important that the right data points are captured initially in the software system. As part of the data download for this study, there were several challenges with the timeline data. There were several dozen instances where applications had negative application dates, which means the application/permit was approved prior to being submitted. These errors were generally for less common application types and included small sample sizes. It is important to ensure the platform is configured properly to capture the relevant data points accurately.

Recommendation #2: Review the workload timestamps fields in EPL to ensure they are configured properly to support performance reporting goals.

3. Ensure all process steps are included in workflows.

In several interviews, staff referenced a few components of key processes were not included in the EPL workflow. For example, it was referenced that the pre-construction meeting and checklist is not included in the permit and/or inspection process. This is a critical step in the permitting and inspection process for certain application types. All review disciplines should take a comprehensive assessment of their processes and identify which steps may not be incorporated into their EPL workflow. Workflows should be modified to align with their current processes.

Recommendation #3: Review all workflows to ensure they align with current business processes.

4. Consolidate the number of application types in the application portal.

A key issue that was noted during customer conversations and through staff interviews, was the number of application types that may be selected during the application process. This was especially noted for engineering applications. Several different applications are required to be submitted as separate submittals, but all must be submitted at the same time for a complete development application. This includes the final plat, site plan, landscape, and façade plans. Instead of having separate submittals for each plan set

type, these requirements (or plan sheets) should be part of the submittal requirements and can be submitted as part of a single application package. This will clean up the number of individual applications that must be submitted as part of a single permit application. Staff should review the application submittal requirements and consolidate them into fewer application types with an emphasis on a consolidated application.

The Town was intentional in specifying more application types when they implemented the software platform. Considering the deliberate efforts by the Town to provide very specific applications, consideration should be given to linking the workflows behind the scenes and to integrate the individual applications more holistically. This would require linking the individual applications to the workflow and application requirements for the application types that require additional supporting documentation/applications. This approach would help streamline the application submittal process for the applicants and reduce the workload for staff as they would have fewer applications to process and approve. The review timeline for review staff would remain the same but the administrative time for application acceptance, processing, and approval/issuing would be slightly less.

Recommendation #4: Modify the workflow configurations in the permitting software system to consolidate individual application types for applications that currently require multiple applications.

5. The software should clearly identify application resubmittals.

A key issue noted in EPL was staff's challenge to identify resubmittals versus new application types. This was an issue with all application and permit types. It is important for staff to view their pending workload and understand what is a new submittal or resubmission. Some application types have a short review timeframe for processing resubmissions, and this is noted in the workflow and due dates, but it is important for staff to be able to easily distinguish the type of review. If staff can understand what is in their queue, they can work more efficiently as they can better control their workflows and meet deadlines. Frequently, a resubmission is a quick review to address only a few items and if staff can clearly see the resubmission in their pending work items, they may address these items quickly.

Staff provided various feedback on whether EPL clearly identifies if an application is the initial or a resubmittal. This issue may be attributed to staff's training with the software, their customization of their respective settings, or a permissions setting. Staff who are responsible for administering/maintaining the EPL platform should investigate this issue and work with staff to customize their individual portals/account needs within EPL.

Recommendation #5: Provide development staff with EPL training and user support to ensure that the software is configured to promote operational efficiencies.

6. Update project identifiers and terminology in the customer portal.

Prior customers shared a concern about how their applications are named in their EPL online accounts. All applications are identified as a DevApp#, and the level of detail provided by supporting columns is inconsistent. For example, in screenshots shared with the project team, approximately one-third of the applications had an address linked to the application. Addresses are not always available for some development projects until after it is approved/permitted so this identifier is not always available. With no other identifier, it requires additional steps (inside and outside the platform) to know which application the project is for. There is a project column in the My Plans/Permits view, but they are blank. It is difficult for the customer to identify their application through their portal when they have multiple applications/permits with the Town.

Another issue noted was that there are multiple rows for the same Plan Number (or application), and they have the same identifier in the Plan Type column. It is clear, for customers who have multiple applications in process, the concurrent configuration is cumbersome to navigate and to easily view their applications by project.

There are several improvement opportunities for the customer portal to better identify customer's applications. These improvements include:

- Utilize an identifier that provides more details than the Plan Number.
- Populate the "Project" column in the portal to either clearly identify the project name, type, etc. If this column will not be populated, then it should be removed from the view.
- Consolidate rows for the same "Plan Number" so that all relevant information for each application is in a single row or linked together (see next section on parent/child linkage).
- Clarify what the Status and State columns represent and what the terminology means. The terminology used is confusing and the two columns appear to contradict each other. For example, the status column may indicate approved, but the state column indicates "attention, pending (on hold, review not approved)". A glossary of terms should be provided to clearly identify the meaning of project status/state.

The customer portal should be cleaned up and provide relevant and clear information to the customer. These efforts will benefit both the customer and staff.

Recommendation #6: Update the way that applications are identified in the customer portal.

Recommendation #7: Add a glossary of terms in the customer portal and clarify the "state" and "status" meaning for applications.

7. Link parent and child permits in the permitting software.

An issue that was noted by both staff and customers was challenges with linking child (sub) permits to previous applications/permits in the permitting software. Many new development applications require multiple applications and permit types. It is important that these secondary or sub permits be linked properly to the primary planning, zoning, and/or development application/permit. This can be completed in several formats and is highly dependent on the Town's approach to identifying projects (e.g., parcel number, address, initial planning case file, etc.). All development activities associated with a particular parcel or address must be linked together. This ensures that all applications and permits have been reviewed and approved before additional activities occur. It is also critical for future (re)development on the site to understand the historical context of past development activities.

Staff should review the current configuration of the EPL system to understand how to better link parent and child applications/permits in the system. Then a standard operating procedure should be developed to provide staff with direction on the approaches to linking these applications and permits together in the system.

Recommendation #8: Evaluate and implement a policy on linking parent and child permits in the permitting software system.

4. Process Improvements

This section of the analysis will identify process improvements. Process improvements will emphasize a predictable, consistent, and timely approach to providing service.

1. Simplify the Certificate of Occupancy (CO) Process

The certificate of occupancy process has been a sticking point throughout the previous two studies and issues were once again identified as part of this assessment. Recent improvements to the certificate of occupancy process were cited as strengths by prior customers and staff. For example, the elimination of the blue card signature process has provided a more streamlined approach. There are still opportunities to improve the certificate of occupancy process. Potential improvement areas include:

- Modification or elimination of the required pre-certificate of occupancy planning meeting between Town staff and the application for permit types that require such meeting.
- Replace the need to have all "final" mechanical, electrical, and plumbing inspections completed and require these inspections to be conducted again as part of the CO inspection. If the trades have signed off on their inspection, then a cursory review to confirm that these are completed shall adequately suffice for compliance. An internal review by permitting or inspection staff that all required inspections have been completed and passed is a common practice in most jurisdictions.
- A checklist should be created and used as part of the CO process. The checklist would identify all necessary requirements for the contractor to be eligible to request a CO. This would include all as-builts, fees paid, and completion of preliminary inspections. The checklist may be incorporated into the respective workflows (i.e., separate checklists for residential and commercial permits, etc.) and required to be reviewed and accepted by the contractor before they can request a CO.
- All necessary review disciplines should be included in the CO workflow. This would include building, fire, planning, parks, and engineering staff who are responsible for inspections and compliance with adopted standards.
- As-built requirements should be included as part of the CO process. As-builts should be linked to the permit file and accessible to all applicable staff. As-builts

should be provided before a CO is issued. Alternative approaches may be considered based on the Town's record-keeping policies for as-builts.

The Town should take a comprehensive assessment of their certificate of occupancy process and identify improvement opportunities. Several relevant examples have been noted above and should serve as a starting point for an in-depth review.

Recommendation #9: Review the Town's certificate of occupancy process to identify improvement opportunities and greater consistency.

2. Modify the Pre-Application meeting approach and provide written feedback.

The Town has a pre-application process that includes three meeting slots each Thursday. The pre-application meeting includes representatives from the development review committee (DRC), which aligns perfectly with best practices. One pre-application meeting approach that has changed through the year is related to providing written comments after the pre-application meeting.

Pre-application meetings can vary greatly in the types of conversation and feedback provided to the potential applicant. As such, it is important for staff to document the conversation points and key themes from the pre-application meeting. Memorializing the key talking points and takeaways is critical when a formal application is submitted, and this helps prevent potential conflicting comments from the Town. By providing written feedback it will provide clarity on the talking points and what was discussed. The intent is to prevent issues if a similar application is submitted. This is important as the reviewer who attended the pre-application meeting may not be the same reviewer for the formal application. This continuity of operations will help prevent future issues with the review process.

Recommendation #10: Provide written feedback after a pre-application meeting.

3. Implement an application case manager approach.

The three primary review teams deploy different approaches to managing their respective application review processes. The recommended approach is for the primary department's staff (or team who intakes the application) to serve as the application case or project manager.

This approach will create greater ownership throughout the review process and provide a primary point of contact for the applicant. This will require the planner, plan reviewer, or engineer reviewer to serve as the application case manager. With this approach, they will serve as the facilitator for the application, resolving issues when different reviewers

have conflicting comments, address the timeliness of providing review comments, and working with the applicant to resolve issues if they arise. Also, the case manager will be tasked with reviewing the review comments prior to distribution to the applicant. This will increase ownership of the review process by the case manager. By transitioning to an application case management approach, it will provide enhanced customer service to the applicant.

An additional benefit of the case management approach is that staff will have a greater understanding of each reviewer's role and responsibilities in the development review process. This knowledge will help all staff have a greater understanding of the entire development review process. Which will ultimately lead to better customer service from all development review staff.

The Town currently takes a more hands on approach through the Designated Developer program that was implemented a few years ago. For applicants who are new to the process or the process in Prosper, local stakeholders, located in the downtown core, or small business, staff will take the applications, and a designate staff member (designated handler) will be assigned to work with the applicant through the development process. This level of ownership of the process by staff, creates a strong dynamic centered on high level of customer service. The intent of the application case management approach is to enhance accountability in the development process and empower staff to take ownership of their individual and collective roles.

Recommendation #11: Transition to an application case management approach. Which will be facilitated by the primary department's reviewer.

4. Conduct application completeness checks for all application types.

The project team was provided with conflicting information regarding application completeness checks for new and resubmitted applications. The level of application completeness checks varies by department, and this may be a result of new or inexperienced staff. Irrespective, a thorough application completeness check should be conducted prior to the Town accepting an application and starting their review. A robust application completeness check is intended to prevent staff from wasting their time on reviewing an application that does not include all required materials. Each department should develop its own application checklists, conduct a thorough review of the application within 1 (or 2) business days, and then start the timeline for completing their review.

A strong completeness check process is critical to ensuring that staff focus their efforts on complete applications. It will also result in fewer resubmissions through the

application review process. This will shorten the overall processing time and decrease staff's work efforts.

Recommendation #12: Equip application intake staff with an application checklist and training to conduct a thorough completeness check at application submittal.

5. Modify the DRC review process for development and zoning submittals.

A key strength of the development review process is the Town's approach with the Development Review Committee (DRC). The DRC is used to review development and zoning applications that come through the Planning Department. The current approach is for all development and zoning applications that are received by 5 p.m. on Thursday will be reviewed at next week's DRC meeting and comments will be provided the following Monday.

This is a between a two and six business day processing timeframe for development and zoning applications. These applications are generally very extensive and require significant site and development plans (as discussed previously in this report). Additionally, it was noted by some reviewers that often these applications are not processed immediately by Planning staff, and they may only have one or two business days to review the application before the DRC meeting. Especially if there is a holiday or they are away from the office between the application submittal and the DRC meeting. Also, there is a hard deadline for providing comments by close of business the Monday following the DRC meeting. This timeline is aggressive and may potentially lead to quality control issues by intake and review staff. The initial review is the most important review of the process and must be a thorough evaluation of the application. It was noted by customers that they are starting to receive significant comments on review round three or four that should have been identified previously. This results in both customer and staff frustration and prolongs the review process. A thorough review should occur with the initial review, and this may help prevent the "late hit" review comments.

A potential modification to the development and zoning review process is to implement a rolling seven business day window for review completion. This would require a modification to the timing of key activities. These changes include:

- Application must be submitted at least six business days before the DRC meeting. The day of week for the submission would change around holidays.
- Review comments are provided within 10 days of the application being deemed complete and the review shot clock starts.

These two slight adjustments can reduce the reviewer's frantic rush to provide comments by Monday at 5 p.m. and would truly provide a minimum of seven business days for all application reviews to occur.

An alternative option may be to have two application tiers for planning and development applications. More complex applications may have 15 review days versus the 10. Another potential modification may be the reduction of the elements required for review at this stage in the review process. This issue is referenced in the stakeholder comments section.

Recommendation #13: Modify the approach to the development and zoning application review process to ensure that all DRC members have a minimum of seven business days to review small/simple applications and 10 business days for large/complex applications.

6. Change the review timeline to 15 days for Civil Plans.

Prosper has robust turnaround and performance goals for the processing of all development applications and permits. One area where Prosper was exceptionally shorter than many of their peer communities was with Civil Plan submittals. Prosper has a 10 business day processing time for engineering site plan review. This is the one area where Prosper has consistently struggled to meet their adopted performance goals for development review. This is not surprising considering the vastness and project scale of many of the developments occurring within the Town. Major commercial and large scale subdivision applications have significant site and infrastructure review requirements and require a significant review effort by staff.

The comparative peer assessment indicated that four of the five jurisdictions' processing goals for engineering site plan review were between 21 and 30 calendar days. McKinney had a 15 calendar day processing time. It is recommended that Prosper modify the engineering site plan review timeframe to at least 15 business days for initial review. This will provide staff additional time to conduct a more thorough review of these highly complex applications. For resubmittals, the current 10 business day review timeline should be maintained. This approach will maintain a high level of service.

Recommendation #14: Increase the timeframe to complete the civil plan application review to 15 business days for initial review and 10 business days for resubmittals.

7. Define the final plat process.

The final plat process in any community can be difficult as it requires multiple signatures before it can be filed. Prosper is no different in that it can be difficult to obtain the

signatures at the right time in the final plat check review process. Additionally, it was unclear which department (Planning or Engineering) is responsible for the final review and signature review process. With unclear expectations and understanding of the process, it has resulted in a delayed final platting process on multiple occasions.

The final plat process should be clearly defined. Since Planning is the initial department for application submittal at the beginning of the subdivision process, they should be the team that is responsible for seeing plats through the end of the process. Planning should outline the plat process, incorporate it into EPL as a workflow, and be responsible for the entire plat process from preliminary plat application to final signature and receiving of the final recording documentation.

Recommendation #15: Planning should be the steward of the entire subdivision and platting process from initial application to final signature.

5. Staffing Analysis

This section of the report will review the workload and identify the staffing levels for each development review team.

1. Fire Marshal's Office

The Fire Marshal's Office (FMO) includes a total of three staff who are responsible for conducting plan review and inspection activities for new development. Also, this team is responsible for conducting annual fire and life safety inspections, fire prevention programming, and investigations for the Fire Department. Development review and inspections are the majority of the team's workload, and this includes annual inspections for previously occupied buildings.

The Fire Marshal's Office workflows are still being implemented into the new EPL system and their historic workload was captured in their own respective platform. The FMO has historically captured a very detailed allocation of their time for specific work activities. This summary for 2022 and 2023 is presented in the following table.

2022 and 2023 Workload Activity Time

Activity	Total Hours	Annual hours
Annual Fire & Life Safety	1,996.5	998.2
Code Modification / Variance	1.3	0.7
Code Research	219.6	109.8
Courtesy Inspection	48.4	24.2
Designated Handler Consultation	253.8	126.9
Designated Handler Pre-Plan Meeting	4.1	2.0
Emergency Reporting / Software Update	42.2	21.1
Emergency Responder Radio System	0.8	0.4
Final Access Control - Building	10.1	5.1
Final Access Control - Gates	12.5	6.3
Final Electric Fire Pump	0.9	0.4
Final Exhaust Hood Suppression System	3.8	1.9
Final Fire & Life Safety	201.6	100.8
Final Fire Alarm System	41.1	20.6
Final Sprinkler Suppression System	55.7	27.8
Final Underground Fire Service	52.7	26.4
Fire Drill	1.8	0.9
Fire Investigation	40.7	20.3
Fleet Maintenance	7.3	3.6

Activity	Total Hours	Annual hours
Follow-up	3.8	1.9
Food Preparation Vehicle	10.6	5.3
Foster Family Fire & Life Safety	4.9	2.4
Fuel Tank & Dispensing Operations	3.5	1.8
Hydrant Flow Test	24.6	12.3
Hydro-Visual Sprinkler Suppression	158.8	79.4
Knox Box/Key Maintenance	29.5	14.7
Mandatory Continuing Education	195.6	97.8
Meeting	33.6	16.8
Open Burn	1.3	0.7
Ordinance Violation	10.0	5.0
Ordinance Writing	139.6	69.8
P & D Plan Review	976.2	488.1
Plan Review	242.1	121.1
Pre-Application Meeting	174.3	87.1
Pre-Wire, Box & Device Placement	31.7	15.9
Project Management	2,613.3	1,306.6
Re-inspection	0.3	0.2
Release for Vertical Construction	38.3	19.2
Special Event	55.8	27.9
Special Event Application Review	90.5	45.3
Temporary Membrane Structures, Tents	1.5	0.8
Third Party Inspection	1,107.4	553.7
Total Hours	**8,942.1**	**4,471.0**

Overall, the FMO averages a total of 4,471 hours of work per year related to development review and new construction/annual inspections.

Prosper is in a transition phase and has experienced significant commercial development in the past 12 to 24 months. Where historically development has been for single family residential units, which have no reoccurring inspections. As new commercial growth occurs, this will have a continuous impact on the FMO as they will be required to complete more life safety inspections for commercial properties. Also, there are several new schools under construction or will soon be. This continued growth and development for commercial properties (including schools and their ancillary buildings) will have a lasting impact on the FMO workload. The following assumptions are used to calculate the staffing needs for the FMO.

- Staff are available to work 1,300 hours per year when accounting for leave (average of 250 hours per year), training (average 200 hours annually), administrative, and investigation needs.
- The annual inspection workload will increase from an average of 998 hours annually to 1,450 hours over the next five years.
- Development review and new construction inspections workload will remain constant over the next five years.
- The total workload hours for the FMO related to development review, new construction, and annual inspections will be 4,923 hours annually.

The total staffing needs is 3.8 full time equivalents. This is an increase in one full time plan reviewer/inspector immediately. Over the next two to three years and part time plan reviewer/inspector position should also be added to address additional workload and allow the Fire Marshal to serve in a supervisor capacity and complete more administrative tasks.

Recommendation #16: Add one full time fire plan reviewer/inspector immediately.

Recommendation #17: In one to two years, add a part time plan reviewer/inspector position that will eventually transition to a full time position.

2. Building Inspectors

A total of nine building inspectors and one chief inspector are authorized to conduct building inspections for new construction and other building related complaints that are reported. The following table summarizes the 2023 building inspector workload.

2023 Building Inspections Completed

Inspection Type	Total Inspections
4' Brick	415
Banner Final (removal)	9
Banner Installation	15
Brick Wall Ties	10
Building Final Only (no trades)	423
Building TCO	14
C.O. Final Inspection	44
C.O. Final Inspection (No Scoring)	1
Ceiling Cover (Electrical)	65

Inspection Type	Total Inspections
Ceiling Cover (all trades)	10
Ceiling Cover (Building)	78
Ceiling Cover (Mechanical)	67
Ceiling Cover (Plumbing)	53
CIP Engineering Site Inspection	2
CIP Landscaping	1
CIP Roadway Inspection	4
CIP Utilities Inspection - Sanitary Sewer	1
CIP Utilities Inspection - Storm Sewer	1
CIP Utilities Inspection - Water	1
Concrete Approach (pre-pour)	727
Concrete Flatwork (pre-pour)	1,012
Concrete Footing (pre-pour)	88
Concrete Foundation (pre-pour)	1,175
Concrete Leave Out / Saw Cut (pre-pour)	57
Concrete Pier (pre-pour)	239
Courtesy Inspection	18
Development Daily Inspection	93
Drywall	829
Electrical Meter Release	1,070
Electrical Rough	515
Electrical T-Pole	943
Electrical Underground	501
Engineering TCO	16
Erosion Control Inspection	12
FBI Complaint Inspection	1
Final Building	855
Final Demolition	20
Final Electrical	549
Final Energy	1
Final Engineering	35
Final Fence	497
Final Fire	181
Final Foundation	39
Final Health	32
Final Irrigation	521
Final Landscape	40
Final Mechanical	223
Final Medical Gas	5

Inspection Type	Total Inspections
Final Planning/Zoning	42
Final Plumbing	520
Final Pool	165
Final Public Works	766
Final Right of Way	166
Final Roof	42
Final Sign	103
Fire Inspection	13
Fire TCO	15
Fireplace	3
Follow-up Inspection	13
Follow-up Inspection (No Scoring)	1
Frame Only (no trades)	485
Frame Seconds (all trades)	2,077
Gas Meter Release	911
Gas Test	69
Gas Underground	438
General Code Enforcement	1,974
General Complaint Inspection Food	1
General Complaint Inspection Food (no score)	9
General Pools/Spas Complaint Inspection	1
Grading	1
Grease Trap	19
Health Pool Construction Inspection	1
Health TCO	3
Inflatable Installation	1
IPMC Code Enforcement Inspection	495
Irrigation Rough	7
Landscape TCO	14
Lath	116
Mechanical Duct Rough	119
Medical Gas Rough	17
Medical Gas Underground	1
Mobile Food Inspection	43
Multi Family Code Enforcement Inspection	25
Multi-Family Rental Inspection	72
Planning TCO	15
Plumbing Rough	1,638
Plumbing Top Out	129

Inspection Type	Total Inspections
Plumbing Top-Out	15
Pool Belly Steel / Placement	320
Pool Deck Steel / Bond	242
Pool P-Trap	75
Pool Pre-Plaster / Barrier	245
Pre-Construction Inspection	245
Preliminary Inspection	81
Preliminary Inspection (No Scoring)	2
Public Works TCO	17
Retail Food Establishment Inspection	85
Retail Food Establishment Inspection (No Scoring)	23
Roof Drains	1
Routine Pool Inspection	37
Routine Splash/PIWF Inspection	8
Sheathing / Braced Walls	1,461
Site Visit	9
Storm Water Inspection	1
Temporary Food Inspection	58
Type I Hood Inspection	17
Type II Hood Inspection	4
Warranty Inspection	1
Total	**24,985**

To determine the staffing needs for building inspectors, the following assumptions were used.

- Inspectors will complete an average of 13 inspections per day. This is the midpoint of the best practice to conduct between 12 and 15 inspections daily.
- Each inspector is available to work 210 days per year when accounting for leave and training.
- The Chief Inspector is available up to 50% of their time to assist with inspections and/or backfill when staff are on vacation.

Based on the assumptions above, a total of 9.2 inspectors are needed for an average of 25,000 inspections per year. The current allocation of 9 Building Inspectors and 1 Chief Inspector is appropriate to accommodate the current inspection workload.

Recommendation #18: Maintain the current allocation of 9 Building Inspectors and 1 Chief Inspector.

3. Building Plan Reviewers

The Building Plan Review team is comprised of a Plans Examiner Manager and 3 Plans Examiners. The following table summarizes the 2023 plan review workload completed by the team and the average time per review.

2023 Plans Examiner Workload

Review Type	# of Reviews	Time per Review (HR)	Total Time
Accessory Review	543	1	543
Commercial Building (New) Review	99	4	396
Commercial Building (New) Review Finish Out	121	2	242
Commercial Building Remodel Review	13	2	26
Commercial Building Remodel Review - Alt/Other	59	2	118
Demolition Review	16	0.5	8
Electrical Review	67	0.5	34
Fence Review	186	0.5	93
Generator Review	96	0.5	48
Irrigation Review	51	0.25	13
Miscellaneous Development Review	1	4	4
Plumbing Review	20	0.5	10
Pool Review	371	2	742
Residential (New) Review	1,397	2	2,794
Residential Remodel Review	487	2	974
Sign Review	331	1	331
Solar Review	212	1	212
Special Event Review	7	1	7
Town Review	12	8	96
Trailer Review	22	1	22
Total	**4,111**		**6,712**

A total of 6,712 workload hours are needed for building permit review. Based on an assumption that plans examiners are available 80% (1,670 hours) of the year to conduct plan review, the current allocation of 4 plans examiners is appropriate. Especially since the Chief Building Official conducts some plan review and provides additional support during peak workload periods.

Recommendation #19: Maintain the current allocation of one Chief Plans Examiner and 3 Plans Examiner.

4. Engineering Development Review

The Engineering – Development Services team is comprised of two staff who are focused on engineering plan review and a team of three staff that are tasked with right-of-way permit review and infrastructure construction inspections. The following table provides a summary of the 2023 plan review and work hours.

2023 Engineering Workload

Review Type	# of Reviews	Time per Review (HR)	Total Time
Civil Development Review	239	8	1,912
Commercial Building (New) Review	2	2	4
Development Review	500	4	2,000
Easement Review	1	0.5	1
Fence Review	37	0.25	9
Land Disturbance Review (Eng Development)	55	0.5	28
Land Disturbance Review (Stormwater)	58	0.5	29
Pre-Application Meeting Review	12	1.5	18
Residential (New) Review	5	0.5	3
Residential Remodel Review	1	0.5	1
Solar Review	1	0.5	1
Town Review	1	2	2
Zoning Review	47	0.5	24
Total	**959**		**4,029**

A total of 4,029 hours of workload for engineering plan review. Based on the assumption of 80% availability (1,670 hours) annually, a total of 2.4 engineering plan reviewers are needed. Considering that one of the primary development review engineers is also the Assistant Director, it is recommended to add one plan review engineer position.

Recommendation #20: Add one additional Engineer to the Engineering – Development Review team.

5. Planning and Development Team

Planning is responsible for shepherding the Town's development review, entitlement, and zoning processes. This includes the intake and routing of development, subdivision, and zoning applications. Planning is comprised of a Planning Manager, Senior Planner, Planner, Planning Technician, and a Landscape Planner. The following table summarizes the 2023 workload and task hours.

2023 Planning Workload

Application Type	# of Applications	Time per Review (HR)	Total Time
Annexation	1	16	16
Building Permit Landscape Review	126	2	252
Building Permit Zoning Review	873	1.5	1,310
CIP	1	8	8
Civil Development	86	4	344
Comprehensive Plan Amendment	3	24	72
Development Agreements	10	8	80
Development Application	207	12	2,484
Easements	1	4	4
Miscellaneous Development	1	8	8
Pre-Application Meeting	78	1.5	117
Subdivision Ordinance Text Amendment	1	16	16
Waiver	2	4	8
Zoning	37	2	74
Zoning Verification Letter	16	0.75	12
Total	**1,443**		**4,805**

There is a total of 4,805 hours of work associated with development review, building, and permitting applications. Current planning tasks generally comprise between 50 to 75% of the work of a planning team. Planning often has additional duties that are outside of current development activities such as special projects, comprehensive plan development, transportation planning, ordinance review and updates. As such, planner's utilization rate is assumed to be 60% of their available time or 1,248 hours per year. Based on this assumption, there is a need for 3.85 planning positions. The current allocation of 5 planning staff is appropriate for the current workload.

It is recommended that the Town consider adding one long range / advance planner in the next five years. As the Town continues to experience growth and comes closer to full build out, the needs of the Town will evolve. This may include redevelopment/infill growth, other development pressures/impacts, and a need for different planning and development services. It is important for the Town to take a more proactive long range planning approach. Proper long range planning efforts are important to ensure that

strategic growth, initiatives, and issues are addressed creatively, practically, and efficient. Advanced planning efforts will help guide the Town to think strategically as the Town continues to expand rapidly and become more urbanized.

Advanced planning efforts may be accomplished through a dedicated advanced planner or a portion of the duties of several other planners. Dedicating staff time to long range planning, special projects, and strategic efforts is important for the longevity of the municipality. Advanced planning efforts are often pushed aside to current planning workload, timelines, and leadership pressures to prioritize current planning over long range for staff that are tasked with both functions. By having a dedicated long range planner, it will allow for a continued focus on long range planning and special project efforts.

Recommendation #21: Maintain the current allocation of five positions assigned to Planning.

Recommendation #22: Over the next five years, a dedicated advanced planning position should be added to focus on long planning efforts. Alternatively, advanced planning duties can be assigned to multiple planners based on skill set.

6. Previous Study Implementation Status

This study included a review of previous recommendations from the Phase 2 report. After interviews with staff and a review of the data, a table was created identifying areas that Prosper had efficiently implemented the previous recommendations and where they had fell short. The project team determined that 17 of the 35 recommendations had been fully implemented at the time of the study. 18 of the 35 recommendations received either a "Not Implemented", "Partial", or "In Progress". A higher percent of Technology and Website recommendations have not been implemented, indicating a need to focus in these areas.

The table below shows the recommendations and their implementation status along with minor notes. Those that were not fully implemented are bolded.

Rec. #	Recommendation	Implementation Status	Notes
	Process		
1	All applications should include a completed and signed checklist of required application materials. If checklist is missing the application will be deemed incomplete.	Implemented	Planning is now taking applications on a weekly basis. DRC teams meet weekly. Bluebeam is fully implemented.
2	An application should be checked for completeness before being accepted. Incomplete applications should be rejected and returned with notes indicating missing components.	Partially Implemented	Greater consistency is needed from all review teams.
3	All review comments should be provided in the same color for consistency.	Implemented	Consistent within departments but each department uses a specific color to identify themselves.

Rec. #	Recommendation	Implementation Status	Notes
4	Comments made by reviewers should be consolidated into a checklist that is provided to the applicant for use during the resubmittal process. The checklist should be returned when the application is resubmitted.	Implemented	EPL provides consolidated checklist. Bluebeam forces them to acknowledge checklist.
5	Applicant should submit a cover sheet with the resubmittal to outline any design changes made to plan not previously shown or commented on.	**Partial**	Only require vague response to changes, not formal cover sheet. It is difficult to quickly determine what changes have been made when comparing plans on Bluebeam. Bluebeam allows for document comparison, and this should be implemented.
6	Review comments should be standardized and consistent in their format and approach. Specific standards/ordinance/code should be referenced in the comment, especially if the code is a locally adopted variation or deviates from industry norm.	**Ongoing**	Staff turnover has impacted this approach, but it was noted that greater consistency has been seen by applicants.
7	A standardized and consistent approach to reviewing calculations should be provided by all reviewers. If calculations are deemed acceptable then they should not be included on any returned or approved application materials.	**Not Implemented**	Non-Issue
8	The reviewer contact information should be included on the returned plan set and other materials. The reviewer will serve as the point of contact for their department or function.	**Partial**	Name is Identified but not contact information.
9	A policy should be established that, after the third review, an applicant must meet with staff prior to resubmittal. An exception can be made in cases where only very minor modifications are needed.	**Partial**	Not consistently applied.

Rec. #	Recommendation	Implementation Status	Notes
10	An additional review fee should be established for cases in which an application is submitted more than three times. The fee should be charged for every resubmittal that occurs after the third attempt.	Partially Implemented	Have included in fee schedule.
11	The fee schedule should be updated and reflect established cost recover goals for Building Inspection, Planning, Engineering, and Parks/Landscape.	Implemented	Next update scheduled in FY 26/27
12	Revise the residential accessory use permit application resubmittal to a five day review timeline versus the current three day turnaround.	Implemented	
13	Separate processing times for residential new construction (single family) and single family remodel/renovation applications. Establish a processing timeline of 5 business days for single family remodel/renovation applications.	Implemented	10 days for new construction / 5 days for remodel and accessory.
14	Create tiered performance metrics for high volume applicants.	**Not Implemented**	This issue is less common as less new housing applications are being processed.
15	A single department should be responsible for zoning compliance review. Currently Building Inspections handle residential applications while sharing commercial applications with Planning.	**Not Implemented**	Issues have subsided.
16	Upon implementation of the new permitting software system, create workflow process diagrams for key applications including external and internal processes. Flowcharts should be incorporated into the Development Guide.	Implemented	

Rec. #	Recommendation	Implementation Status	Notes
17	Managers should be provided with weekly and monthly performance reports (all disciplines) regarding application review and current processing times.	Implemented	EPL reports are provided weekly but there are opportunities for better reporting metrics.
18	The Development Guide should be expanded to all include all development applications versus primarily focusing on Planning applications.	Completed	
19	Create a development review authority matrix that includes applicable review departments and decision-making authority by application type.	Implemented	Configured into EPL.
	Technology		
20	Develop a user guide and frequently asked questions brochure for the new software system.	Implemented	EPL implemented 12-22 with brochures for staff and public.
21	Provide contact information in the user guide, brochure, and on the Town's website for individuals who can assist the public with using the online system.	Partially Implemented	
22	Develop a training program for the public on how to use the online capabilities of the system to submit applications, pay fees, check application status, review comments, and request inspections.	**Not Implemented**	Limited online guides/resources provided.
23	Establish an internal training program for new hire software orientation.	**Partially Implemented**	Training is provided as requested; no formal program exists.
24	Ensure that staff receive ongoing training for the software as new updates and features are implemented.	**Partially Implemented**	Provides some information when new system updates are released.
25	Provide training for managers on how to utilize the software system and performance metric features.	**Partially Implemented**	Training on request.

Rec. #	Recommendation	Implementation Status	Notes
26	Develop weekly & monthly reports that are created automatically and distributed to management that includes workload, processing timelines, and other relevant performance metrics.	**Partial**	Weekly reports are created but not automatically generated.
27	Appoint a Development and Infrastructure Services staff member to serve as the software administrator and internal reference for all permitting software issues.	Implemented	There is an internal IT staff member who supports the development review teams. They are the primary administrator of EPL.
	Website		
28	Create a more robust and centralized development review webpage.	**Not Implemented**	Work with Communications to develop approach to creating a webpage.
29	Establish a consistent approach to including application overview information - either within the application PDF or as a separate document.	Implemented	Checklist is outside of portal.
30	Development staff contact information should be provided in a consistent format on each departmental webpage. Information should include name, title, email address, and phone number.	Implemented	IT policy does not allow for email addresses to be listed online.
31	The fee schedule should be included on all development review departmental webpages.	**Partially Implemented**	Current fee schedule is difficult to find online.
32	Each department's webpage should provide an overview of the processes that it manages.	**Partially Implemented**	Continue to work on improvements
33	Designate an individual staff member from each development review department to maintain their respective webpage.	Implemented	Each department has 1 or 2 designated staff.

Rec. #	Recommendation	Implementation Status	Notes
34	Establish a consistent approach to providing development information links on departmental webpages. Include a consistent depth of information on the primary information page and provide links to secondary sources.	**Not Implemented**	In progress
35	All development webpages should have a link to take the user back to the centralized development webpage.	**Not Implemented**	In progress

Based on the status of the previous recommendations and changes in current operational approaches, including technology systems, it is encouraged to implement the following recommendations from the previous study.

- Recommendation #2: Application completeness
- Recommendation #8: Reviewer contact information
- Recommendation #21: Enhanced development review staff contact information
- Recommendations #22 – 25: Staff and public training programs for permitting software programs.
- Recommendation #26: Standardized workload and performance reports.
- Recommendations #28, #31, #32, #34, #35: Development review webpage improvements.

Recommendation #23: Continue the implementation of the Phase 2 study recommendations, especially recommendations 2, 8, 21, 22 – 26, 28, 31, 32, and 34 – 35.

7. Comparative Assessment

The Town of Prosper contracted the Matrix Consulting Group to update a development review process study previously conducted for the organization. As part of this project, a comparative assessment of development review processing timelines in other North Texas jurisdictions was performed.

A comparative assessment of development review performance timeframes for seven other North Texas jurisdictions was completed and compared to the Town of Prosper's review timeline goals. The outreach to the other communities focused on obtaining performance goals for planning, building, and engineering application reviews and inspections. The review timeline metrics obtained were for each jurisdiction's adopted or published performance goal. The project team requested actual performance information for each comparative community, but only a few data points were attained, and the accuracy of the information was questionable. Therefore, this information was excluded from the comparative survey. This high-level assessment does not provide granular details of the comparative jurisdiction's operations and processes.

North Texas is a growing region with a thriving business and development environment, a booming healthcare sector, and a growing residential population. The project team and Town staff agreed on the following seven organizations for use as comparable peer cities:

- Allen
- Celina
- Fairview
- Flower Mound
- Frisco
- McKinney
- Southlake

These jurisdictions were selected because of their proximity to the Town of Prosper and face similar regional development pressures. Each community experienced significant growth over the past three years except for Southlake.

Jurisdiction	Population (July 2023 estimate)	Growth Percent (July 2020 – July 2023)
Allen, TX	111,620	6.7%
Celina, TX	43,317	156.7%
Fairview, TX	10,790	4.0%
Flower Mound, TX	79,445	4.6%
Frisco, TX	225,007	12.2%
McKinney, TX	213,509	9.3%
Southlake, TX	31,137	-0.4%
Prosper	**41,660**	**38.1%**

The following analysis summarizes each development review discipline discussed with the staff of the peer cities.

1. Planning

Information was obtained about planning application reviews. The table on the following page compares the different peer communities. If a response for the comparable jurisdiction was not received, it is shown on the table as "No Response".

Planning Application Comparison

Application Type	Development & Zoning Applications	Planned Development	CUP/SUP
Allen	12 days (Cal)	12 days (Cal)	12 days (Cal)
Celina	14-21 days (Cal)	14-21 days (Cal)	14-21 days (Cal)
Fairview	No Response	_	_
Flower Mound	15 days (Bus)	15 days (Bus)	15 days (Bus)
Frisco	7 Days (Bus)	15 Days (Bus)	10 days (Bus); Final 15 weeks (Cal)
McKinney	10 days (Bus)	10 days (Bus)	10 days (Bus)
Southlake	14 days (Cal)	14 days (Cal)	14 days (Cal)
Prosper	**10 days (Cal)**	**10 days (Cal)**	**10 days (Cal)**

The Town of Prosper exceeds all comparable jurisdictions in timeliness, except for Frisco's planning and development application timeline, which is slightly faster at 7 business days (approximately one day faster). All cities indicated their actual timelines were in alignment with their desired timelines.

Some cities and towns have these timelines published in publications that are made available to the public:

Allen (*Zoning & Development Handbook*, Page 19, "Zoning Review & Submittal Calendar")

Frisco (2024 Development Review Schedules)

Southlake (2024 Development Submittal Schedule)

2. Building

The following table compares the processing timelines for various building permit types.

Building Permit Comparison

Application Type	1 & 2 Household Residential	1 & 2 Household Residential (Resub.)	Accessory Structure	Accessory Structure (Resub.)	New Commercial	New Commercial (Resub.)
Allen	10-15 (Bus)	Same	7-10 (Bus)	Same	15-20 (Bus)	Same
Celina	25-30 (Bus)	Same	25 (Bus))	Same	15 (Bus)	Same
Fairview	1-3 (Bus)	Same	1-3 (Bus)	Same	3-7 (Bus)	Same
Flower Mound	7 (Bus)	5 (Bus)	7 (Bus)	5 (Bus)	10 (bus)	5 (Bus)
Frisco	7-14 bus	2-3 bus	7-14 bus	–	14-21 bus	–
McKinney	10 days (Bus)	Same	10 days (Bus)	Same	10 days (Bus)	Same
Southlake	10 days (Bus)	Same	–	–	10 days (Bus)	–
Prosper	**10 (Bus)**	**5 (Bus)**	**5 (Bus)**	**5 (Bus)**	**20 (Bus)**	**10 (Bus)**

Fairview and Flower Mound have shorter review timelines for residential application types than the Town of Prosper (by 3-9 days). Frisco indicated a range that may be faster than the Town of Prosper. Compared to the Town of Prosper, all cities have adopted shorter or equal timelines for new commercial application types. All, except Celina, have adopted longer review timelines for resubmittals on new commercial applications.

The following table describes how building inspections are scheduled for each jurisdiction.

Building Inspections Scheduling Comparison

Application Type	Building Inspections
Allen	Schedule by 4 p.m. for next day inspection - same day for emergency electric and gas
Celina	Next day if scheduled by 3:30 p.m.
Fairview	Schedule by 4 p.m. for next day inspection (with exception on weekend which is scheduled Tuesday)

Application Type	Building Inspections
Flower Mound	Schedule 7:30 a.m. morning to get same day (E Track It)
Frisco	Schedule 7 a.m. morning to get same day (E Track It)
McKinney	–
Southlake	Request through portal by 7 a.m. for same day, or otherwise next business day
Prosper	Same day if scheduled before 7 a.m.

The Town of Prosper allows same-day building inspection scheduling if the request is received by 7:00 a.m. Flower Mound, Frisco, and Southlake also allow inspections scheduled by 7:00 or 7:30 a.m. to receive a same-day inspection. Other cities require prior day notification to be scheduled the following day. Celina recently changed to a four-day workweek. However, they have building inspectors on schedule daily to ensure they can have inspections scheduled Monday – Friday.

3. Engineering

The following table compares the timelines of engineering permits and applications.

Civil Permit Plan Review Timelines Comparison

Application Type	Civil Plan	Engineering Site Plan (Resub)	Land Disturbance	Land Disturbance (Resub)
Allen	30 days (Cal)	30 days (Cal)	2-3 days (Bus)	2-3 days (Bus)
Celina	3-4 weeks (Cal)	2-4 weeks (Cal)	2 weeks (Cal)	1 week (Cal)
Fairview	30 days (Cal)	30 days (Cal)	2 days (Bus)	2 days (Bus)
Flower Mound	10 days (Bus)	5 days (Bus)	10 days (Bus)	5 days (Bus)
Frisco	No Response	–	–	–
McKinney	15 days (Cal)	7 days (Cal)	15 days (Cal)	7 days (Cal)
Southlake	No Response	–	–	–
Prosper (Cur)	10 (Bus)	10 (Bus)	10 (Bus)	10 (Bus)
Prosper (Rec)	15 (Bus)	10 (Bus)	10 (Bus)	10 (Bus)

Data for civil plan reviews was received on both calendar and business days and is distinguished in the table. The Town of Prosper has shorter civil plan review timelines for original submittals, with the exception of Flower Mound, which is also 10 business days. For civil plan resubmittals, Flower Mound and McKinney were faster in their review (approximately 5 – 7 days). Land disturbance applications are processed faster in Allen and Fairview, while the remaining comparative communities are very similar to the Town of Prosper timeline.

4. Conclusion

Overall, the Town of Prosper generally leads peer municipalities with the shortest review processing timeline targets for planning, building, and engineering (site plan) applications. While the actual performance timeline of some Prosper applications may be slower than the adopted performance goals, comparative municipalities could not provide actual performance data; therefore, the project team was unable to compare actual performance.