



MINUTES
Prosper Planning and Zoning Commission
Regular Meeting
Prosper Town Hall – Council Chambers
250 W. First Street, Prosper, Texas
Tuesday, September 1, 2026
7:00 PM

1. Call to Order / Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 7:03 p.m.

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

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 – Terrence S. Welch, Town Attorney

2. Recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

CONSENT AGENDA:

- 3a. Consider and act upon the minutes from the August 18, 2026, Planning and Zoning Commission work session meeting.**
- 3b. Consider and act upon the minutes from the August 18, 2026, Planning and Zoning Commission regular meeting.**
- 3c. Consider and act upon a request for a Final Plat of Brookhollow Townhomes, on 20.1± acres, located 500± feet north of University Drive and 2,585± feet west of Custer Road. (DEVAPP-25-0076)**
- 3d. Consider and act upon a request for a Final Plat of Anvita Addition, on 16.4± acres, located on the southeast corner of Coit Road and First Street. (DEVAPP-25-0148)**
- 3e. Consider and act upon a request for a Site Plan for a Drive-Through Restaurant on Westside Addition, Block A, Lot 3, on 0.9± acre, located on the east side of FM 1385 and 290± feet north of University Drive. (DEVAPP-26-0024)**
- 3f. Consider and act upon a request for a Final Plat of Westside Addition, Block A, Lot 3, on 0.9± acre, located on the east side of FM 1385 and 290± feet north of University Drive. (DEVAPP-26-0029)**
- 3g. Consider and act upon a request for a Facade Plan for a Drive-Through Restaurant on Westside Addition, Block A, Lot 3, on 0.9± acre, located on the east side of FM 1385 and 290± feet north of University Drive. (DEVAPP-26-0016)**

Commissioner Hamilton made a motion to approve Items 3a and 3b with corrections and Items 3c through 3g. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Carson. The motion was carried unanimously by a vote of 7-0.

CITIZEN COMMENTS:

Mayor David Bristol spoke in opposition to Item 4.

REGULAR AGENDA:

- 4. Conduct a Public Hearing and consider and act upon a request for a rezoning from Agricultural to a Planned Development for a Data Center on a portion of Parvin 1385 Addition, Block A, Lot 2, on 37.3± acres, located 1,590± feet south of Parvin Road and 855± feet east of FM 1385. (ZONE-26-0007)**

Mr. Hoover presented Item 4 to the Commission.

Jeff Eigenbrood with White Rose Partners, the applicant, presented the request to the Commission. Mr. Eigenbrood introduced the project team and stated that White Rose Partners and its affiliated consultants had experience developing data center projects throughout Texas and the United States.

Mr. Eigenbrood stated that the proposal consisted of one approximately 225,000-square-foot data center building. He highlighted the applicant's transparency, project scale, noise controls, and closed-loop cooling system. Additionally, he stated that the proposed Planned Development would establish a maximum noise level and require closed-loop cooling.

John Varin, White Rose Partners, provided an overview of data centers and their role in supporting internet, financial, healthcare, communications, and other technology services. He discussed the proposed employment and economic benefits, projected tax revenues, and associated economic activity. He also highlighted the proposed hike-and-bike trail and the project's proximity to the existing electrical substation.

Bill Dahlstrom, with Jackson Walker, addressed the land-use request. He stated that the property currently has multiple Comprehensive Plan designations, including high-density residential and retail and neighborhood services. The applicant requested a Comprehensive Plan amendment to Business Park and a Planned Development district specifically tailored to the proposed data center use. Mr. Dahlstrom stated that the Planned Development would establish site-specific standards, including building size, buffers, screening, open space, lighting, noise, and water-use requirements. He stated that the open-space area between the proposed data center and the electrical substation would remain undeveloped unless subsequently amended through the Planned Development process.

Michael Carlisle, with Kimley-Horn, presented the preliminary site design, building elevations, screening, setbacks, landscaping, and noise study. He stated that the proposal included an eight-foot wrought-iron security fence, an eight-foot masonry wall around the generator yard, rooftop equipment screening, preservation of existing trees where feasible, additional landscaping, increased setbacks, and a hike-and-bike trail along the eastern portion of the property.

Mr. Carlisle discussed the preliminary sound study. He stated that preliminary modeling considered rooftop chillers, emergency generators, varying ambient temperatures, and generator operation. Additionally, he added that the model did not include existing or proposed vegetation or certain required equipment screening.

Geoff Overholt, DFW Consulting Group, discussed the proposed mechanical, water, and electrical systems. He stated that the project would use closed-loop cooling rather than evaporative cooling and would connect to the Town's water system instead of relying on wells or aquifers. Mr. Overholt also discussed the proposed electrical service from the adjacent Brazos Electric Cooperative substation and stated that required substation improvements would be funded by the project.

Mr. Varin discussed the projected economic benefits, including capital investment, jobs, projected annual tax and franchise-fee revenues, and estimated long-term revenues to local taxing entities.

Mr. Eigenbrood stated that no end user or tenant had yet been identified. He added that the proposed facility would be designed for a single tenant and that could include various data-processing applications. Additionally, he explained that the project's power availability would establish a limit on the facility's size and associated infrastructure requirements.

The Commission questioned the proposed 50% maximum lot coverage. Mr. Eigenbrood stated that the 50% provision was derived from the base zoning of Commercial and acknowledged that the applicant did not anticipate needing the full amount. He stated that the provision could be reduced. He further stated that the preliminary building size was approximately 225,000 square feet and could ultimately be smaller depending on available electrical capacity.

The Commission questioned building height and rooftop equipment. Mr. Eigenbrood stated that the office portion would be two stories while the primary data hall would be single story. The proposed building height was approximately 40 feet, with rooftop mechanical equipment and screening potentially extending above the roofline. The applicant stated that the 20-foot rooftop-equipment allowance was conservative and that approximately 15 feet might ultimately be sufficient. The applicant further stated that rooftop equipment would be screened with materials intended to complement the building façade.

The Commission discussed potential noise impacts and requested clarification regarding the type, frequency, and duration of noise generated by the facility. The applicant stated that the principal sources would be mechanical HVAC/chiller equipment and backup generators. Chillers would operate according to ambient conditions, while generators would operate primarily during extended power outages and periodic testing. The applicant stated that the limit proposed in the Planned Development was intended as an enforceable maximum and that additional refinement of the noise study could potentially support a lower limit.

The Commission questioned whether the modeled facility noise could be compared directly with existing traffic noise. The applicant clarified that the preliminary modeling treated the proposed facility separately from existing ambient conditions and did not calculate the combined future noise level. Mr. Eigenbrood stated that the applicant would work with its acoustical engineer to provide a more readily understandable analysis and anticipated that the study would be finalized as the design and equipment selections progressed.

The Commission asked about generator screening. The applicant stated that generators would have individual sound enclosures and would also be located behind the required masonry screening wall. Mr. Carlisle stated that applicable screening requirements required the screening wall to be at least as tall as the equipment being screened.

The Commission questioned the proposed accessory uses. The applicant stated that the listed accessory uses were intended to be comprehensive for the proposed facility. Rooftop antennas would generally consist of weather-monitoring equipment rather than standalone towers. Battery systems would be designed and protected in accordance with applicable fire codes and would include monitoring and detection systems. Equalization basins would provide temporary chilled-water capacity during power interruptions and could be located inside the building. Generator fuel would be diesel, with approximately 24–72 hours of storage anticipated. The laydown yard would be used temporarily for construction materials and would be removed after construction. Water storage could include chilled-water and/or fire-water storage, subject to applicable requirements.

The Commission questioned electrical capacity and the proposed substation improvements. The applicant stated that preliminary discussions with CoServ and Brazos indicated that the required power could be accommodated through improvements within the existing substation footprint. The applicant stated that a new transformer and related design, engineering, equipment, and construction costs required to serve the project would be funded by the applicant. No new overhead transmission lines were anticipated. The applicant stated that final capacity and

engineering requirements remained subject to the utility providers' ongoing design and review process.

The Commission asked whether the project could affect electrical rates for surrounding customers. Mr. Eigenbrood stated that the applicant would be responsible for infrastructure costs necessary to serve the project and that the applicant did not anticipate other customers subsidizing those costs. He stated that the project would provide a consistent electrical load but acknowledged that the utility, rather than the applicant, would determine applicable rates.

The Commission asked about the ultimate tenant and whether an artificial-intelligence-oriented use could result in greater power, water, or noise impacts. Mr. Eigenbrood stated that no tenant had yet been selected. He explained that the Planned Development would establish limits on the use and infrastructure, including closed-loop cooling and the available electrical capacity, and that the facility could be reduced in size if less power were ultimately available. He stated that the project would not operate as a carrier hotel but could support edge computing, artificial intelligence, or other data-processing applications.

The Commission questioned potential impacts on surrounding property values. Mr. Eigenbrood stated that the applicant had not commissioned a site-specific property-value study but referenced studies from other jurisdictions, including Northern Virginia, that the applicant stated found no discernible impact on nearby residential property values.

The Commission asked about discussions with Toll Brothers concerning the property to the east. Mr. Eigenbrood stated that the applicant had met with representatives of Toll Brothers to discuss project details and neighboring concerns. He stated that Toll Brothers had not expressed a position for or against the proposal.

Chair Jackson asked about the long-term viability of the proposed facility and potential changes in technology. Mr. Eigenbrood stated that data center buildings can be adapted over time but that any change to a use not permitted by the Planned Development would require an amendment to the zoning. He stated that the applicant anticipated continued demand for computing capacity and electrical infrastructure over the long term. The Planning and Zoning Commission took a brief recess at 8:55 p.m.

The Planning and Zoning Commission reconvened the meeting at 9:00 p.m.

The public hearing was opened at 9:00 p.m. for those in favor of Item 4.

- Mark Nias, 4720 Lopiano, Prosper, TX, spoke in favor of Item 4.
- Randal Zigler, 8961 Marigold Lane, Prosper, TX, spoke in favor of Item 4.
- Cara Matson, 6205 Crownmere Drive, Aubrey, TX, spoke in favor of Item 4.

The public hearing closed for those in favor of Item 4 at 9:11 p.m.

The public hearing was opened at 9:11 p.m. for those in opposition to Item 4.

- Monica Barlow, 1709 Gold Mine Trail, Aubrey, TX, spoke in opposition to Item 4.
- Aileen Blachowski, 3790 Dewberry Lane, Prosper, TX, spoke in opposition to Item 4.
- Nicolas Strain, 2501 Wheeler Avenue, Aubrey, TX, spoke in opposition to Item 4.
- Walt Lewis, 4610 Acacia Parkway, Prosper, TX, spoke in opposition to Item 4.
- Diana Spector, 4411 Autumn Sage Drive, Prosper, TX, spoke in opposition to Item 4.
- Sandy Suzuki, 501 Esperanza Drive, Prosper, TX, spoke in opposition to Item 4.
- Joseph Mayes, 101 Red Oak Drive, Aubrey, TX, spoke in opposition to Item 4.
- Vincent Spreuwenberg, 301 Pearland Drive, Prosper, TX, spoke in opposition to Item 4.
- Donna Morris 3517 Juniper Drive, Aubrey, TX, spoke in opposition to Item 4.
- Daniel Harrerra, 2208 Hubbard Park Lane, Prosper, TX, spoke in opposition to Item 4.
- Richard Abraham, 1812 Hackamore Lane, Aubrey, TX, spoke in opposition to Item 4.

The public hearing closed at 10:12 p.m. for this in opposition to Item 4.

The Commission discussed the proposed development, with several expressing concerns regarding the Town's limited remaining developable land and the long-term implications of rezoning agricultural property. The following themes were identified:

- **Land Use and Long-Term Planning:** Commissioners emphasized the limited amount of remaining developable land in Prosper and the importance of making land-use decisions that will remain appropriate over the long term. Several Commissioners noted that the proposal is inconsistent with the current Future Land Use Plan and expressed concern about making a significant change from agricultural use to a data center/business park use.
- **Location and Proximity to Residential Areas:** Commissioners expressed concerns regarding the proposed location and its proximity to existing and planned residential neighborhoods. Several noted that data centers may be appropriate in certain locations but questioned whether this site was appropriate.
- **Noise and Environmental Impacts:** Noise was identified as a significant concern. Commissioners indicated that additional expert analysis and more detailed information was needed regarding noise, environmental impacts, accessory uses, and other potential impacts of the development.
- **Utilities and Infrastructure:** Commissioners discussed concerns regarding electricity consumption and the potential impacts on local utility infrastructure. Additional information from CoServ and greater detail regarding utility impacts were requested. **Water-Use Concerns:** Commissioners noted that information presented during the meeting addressed previously raised concerns regarding water consumption.
- **Economic and Community Benefits:** Commissioners acknowledged the potential economic and tax benefits of data centers but questioned whether the overall net benefit to Prosper justified the proposed land-use change. Commissioners also noted that their primary responsibility is to the Town of Prosper while recognizing the regional implications of the project.
- **Public Input:** Commissioners expressed appreciation for the significant public participation and correspondence received regarding the proposal. Some noted that public input was valuable while also expressing concern regarding misinformation contained in some submissions.
- **Need for Additional Information:** Several Commissioners stated that they were not comfortable making a recommendation without additional studies, expert testimony, utility information, and a more comprehensive evaluation of the proposal.

Chair Jackson, Vice Chair Carson, Secretary Blanscet, Commissioner Butler, Commission Hamilton, Commissioner Furay, and Commissioner Daniel each expressed opposition to approval of the proposal, citing various combinations of the concerns outlined above. Chair Jackson stated that additional information, studies, expert input, and a broader work session involving Town Staff, the Town Council, the Commission, and residents would be beneficial.

Commissioner Hamilton made a motion to deny Agenda Item 4. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Daniel. The motion carried unanimously by a vote of 7-0.

5. Conduct a Public Hearing and consider and act upon a request to amend the Future Land Use Plan from Medium Density Residential and Retail and Neighborhood Services to Business Park, on 37.3± acres, located 1,590± feet south of Parvin Road and 855± feet east of FM 1385. (COMP-26-0001)

Mr. Hoover presented Item 5 to the Commission.

The public hearing was opened at 10:30 p.m.

Bill Dahlstrom, representing the applicant, stated that the applicant had submitted a letter addressing the seven criteria applicable to a Comprehensive Plan amendment and was available to answer questions.

Mr. Hoover explained to the public the purpose of the Town's Future Land Use Plan, noting that it serves as a long-range guide for desired land uses and development patterns rather than establishing the current zoning of individual properties. He stated that amendments to the Future Land Use Plan are generally considered in conjunction with a proposed change in land use.

Mr. Hoover stated that, because the Commission had recommended denial of the associated rezoning request, there was no longer a corresponding end use supporting the requested Future Land Use Plan amendment. He recommended that the Commission deny the Comprehensive Plan amendment as well.

Mr. Hoover further stated that the Comprehensive Plan amendment and associated zoning request should be considered together and recommended denial of Item 5, the Comprehensive Plan amendment.

- Donna Morris, 3517 Juniper Drive, Aubrey, TX, spoke in favor of Item 5.
- Diana Spektor, 4411 Autumn Sage Drive, Prosper, TX, spoke in opposition to Item 5.
- Marina Vice, 1405 Starlight, Aubrey, TX, spoke in opposition to Item 5.
- Alexander Gorokhovskiy, 4411 Autumn Sage Drive, Prosper, TX, spoke in opposition to Item 5.
- Donna Freeman, 1061 Copper Canyon Drive, Prosper, TX, spoke in opposition to Item 5.

The Public Hearing closed at 10:40 p.m.

Commissioner Furay clarified that his earlier reference to Agricultural zoning was not intended to suggest that the property should remain undeveloped. He stated that development under Agricultural zoning presents a different set of considerations and provides the Town additional flexibility to ensure an appropriate future use. Commissioner Furay noted that the existing Future Land Use Plan identifies several potential uses for the property and stated that, in his view, the existing Future Land Use Plan should remain unchanged.

Commissioner Furay made a motion to deny Agenda Item 5. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Butler. The motion was carried unanimously by a vote of 7-0.

6. 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.

7. Adjourn.

Commissioner Hamilton made a motion to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Daniel. The motion was carried unanimously by a vote of 7-0.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:47 p.m.


Michelle Crowe, Senior Administrative Assistant


Glen Blanscet, Secretary