

Alexis Russell

To: Community Development; Sarah Hensley; Calvin Eddleman
Subject: RE: Case No. ZONE -2409-0006 Mountain Blue PD

From: Leslie Sagar [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2024 1:28 PM
To: Community Development <communitydevelopment@cityofkeller.com>
Subject: Case No. ZONE -2409-0006 Mountain Blue PD

As an adjacent property owner to the proposed Mountain Blue PD, I have the following comments and concerns and request they be forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Commission and the City Council:

1. The submittal documents posted on the City's website for this agenda item materially changed sometime after 3:17pm Sunday, October 20. The document I reviewed on Sunday was dated August 29, 2024 and proposed 3 accessory structures. The fencing proposed was an 8 ft. wood fence except along the boundary with my property, where it was shown to be a 6 ft Ameristar Montage Plus (wrought iron) fence. When I reviewed the submittal document again last night, I discovered it had changed from what had been originally posted. The revised submittal has a date of October 18, 2024 and proposes six (6) accessory structures and all fencing is proposed to be 8 ft. wood fence. The wrought iron fencing was removed. These are material changes to the submittal that occurred after the 72-hour agenda notice. In my opinion, PD application submittals should follow the same noticing requirements as Specific Use Permits and the submittals should not be allowed to materially change after the 72-hour agenda notice is posted.
2. After reviewing Article 9.07 – Fencing, I am not opposed to the 8 ft. perimeter fence. In my opinion the 10.6 acre lot is a corner lot with the front entrance located on Lambert Lane East. Therefore, I am not opposed to the frontage on Lambert Lane West being treated as a side yard. Given the length of the fence facing Lambert Lane East and Lambert Lane West, I think landscaping in front of the fence would improve the appearance.
3. I am opposed to having a wood fence on my boundary with the subject property. I have cattle and my property is fenced with barbed wire and t-posts. Cattle will knock down a wood fence, and I cannot maintain my barbed wire fence if it has a wood fence immediately behind it. My neighbors in Westlake along my far north boundary have 6 ft. wrought iron fencing immediately adjacent to my barbed wire fence (photo attached), which is an acceptable alternative that was removed from the original submittal. I am open to considering other reasonable fencing options if the applicant wishes to propose an alternative other than wood.
4. When I reviewed the original submittal and saw the request for 3 accessory structures, I was not opposed to them. Although 2 are quite large (3000sf and 9500sf), I took the lot size which exceeds 10 acres into consideration. The revised submittal proposes up to 6 accessory structures, 3 of which are what were originally defined and shown, and 3 of which are not defined or shown. For this reason, I oppose more than 3 accessory structures.
5. If the rationale for using a PD for a single lot residential development (UDC says it is for multiple residential lot development, not single) is to permit "special conditions or restrictions which would not otherwise allow the development to occur," what exactly are those special conditions and restrictions in this case that would not have been achievable through the normal platting and SUP process?

Thank you for your attention and for the opportunity to provide comment.

Leslie V. Sagar
2190 Ottinger Rd.
Keller TX 76262