

Wylie Historic Review Commission Regular Meeting

April 25, 2024 – 6:00 PM

Council Chambers - 300 Country Club Road, Building #100, Wylie, Texas 75098



CALL TO ORDER

COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Any member of the public may address Commission regarding an item that is not listed on the Agenda. Members of the public must fill out a form prior to the meeting in order to speak. Commission requests that comments be limited to three minutes for an individual, six minutes for a group. In addition, Commission is not allowed to converse, deliberate or take action on any matter presented during citizen participation.

PRESENTATIONS

CONSENT AGENDA

All matters listed under the Consent Agenda are considered to be routine by the Commission and will be enacted by one motion. There will not be separate discussion of these items. If discussion is desired, that item will be removed from the Consent Agenda and will be considered separately.

- A. Consider, and act upon, the approval of the March 28, 2024 meeting minutes.

REGULAR AGENDA

1. Consider and act upon a recommendation to the City Council regarding a request to renovate an existing commercial structure, located at 110 East Oak Street, within the Downtown Historic District.

WORK SESSION

RECONVENE INTO REGULAR SESSION

EXECUTIVE SESSION

RECONVENE INTO OPEN SESSION

Take any action as a result from Executive Session.

ADJOURNMENT

CERTIFICATION

I certify that this Notice of Meeting was posted on April 19, 2024 at 5:00 p.m. on the outside bulletin board at Wylie City Hall, 300 Country Club Road, Building 100, Wylie, Texas, a place convenient and readily accessible to the public at all times.

The Wylie Municipal Complex is wheelchair accessible. Sign interpretation or other special assistance for disabled attendees must be requested 48 hours in advance by contacting the City Secretary's Office at 972.516.6020. Hearing impaired devices are available from the City Secretary prior to each meeting.

If during the course of the meeting covered by this notice, the Commission should determine that a closed or executive meeting or session of the Commission or a consultation with the attorney for the City should be held or is required, then such closed or executive meeting or session or consultation with attorney as authorized by the Texas Open Meetings Act, Texas Government Code § 551.001 et. seq., will be held by the Commission at the date, hour and place given in this notice as the Commission may conveniently meet in such closed or executive meeting or session or consult with the attorney for the City concerning any and all subjects and for any and all purposes permitted by the Act, including, but not limited to, the following sanctions and purposes:

Texas Government Code Section:

§ 551.071 – Private consultation with an attorney for the City.

§ 551.073 – Discussing prospective gift or donation to the City.



Historic Review Commission

AGENDA REPORT

Department: Planning Item: A

Prepared By: Gabby Fernandez

Subject

Consider, and act upon, the approval of the March 28, 2024 meeting minutes.

Recommendation

Motion to approve as presented.

Discussion

The minutes are attached for your consideration.

Wylie Historic Review Commission Regular Meeting

March 28, 2024 – 6:00 PM

Council Chambers - 300 Country Club Road, Building #100, Wylie, Texas 75098



CALL TO ORDER

Chair Sandra Stone called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m. In attendance were Chair Sandra Stone, Vice-Chair Allison Stowe, Commissioner Kali Patton, Commissioner Anita Jones, Deputy City Manager Renae Ollie, Community Development Director Jasen Haskins and Former Administrative Assistant Mary Bradley. Absent were Commissioner Krisliegh Hoermann and Commissioner Laurie Sargent.

COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Any member of the public may address Commission regarding an item that is not listed on the Agenda. Members of the public must fill out a form prior to the meeting in order to speak. Commission requests that comments be limited to three minutes for an individual, six minutes for a group. In addition, Commission is not allowed to converse, deliberate or take action on any matter presented during citizen participation.

None approached the Commission.

CONSENT AGENDA

All matters listed under the Consent Agenda are considered to be routine by the Commission and will be enacted by one motion. There will not be separate discussion of these items. If discussion is desired, that item will be removed from the Consent Agenda and will be considered separately.

A. Consider and act upon the approval of the December 28, 2023 Meeting Minutes.

Commission Action on Consent Agenda

A motion was made by Vice-Chair Stowe and seconded by Commissioner Patton to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. A vote was taken and carried 4 – 0.

WORK SESSION

WS1. Provide WEDC Project Update

WS2. Discuss a proposed new residential construction located at 111 Keefer Road

WS3. Discuss and Review Amendments to Section 6.3 of the Zoning Ordinance

Commission Discussion on WS1

Deputy City Manager Renae Ollie presented an update on the Economic Development Corporation project. She stated that she attended the EDC Board Meeting the week prior. 104 South Ballard, which is the old pawn shop, was approved to be demolished but the Board wanted to have the mural saved. She explained that the EDC staff met with the artist who suggested it was time for the mural to be replaced in order to keep it up. She explained that instead, they will be working with the Downtown merchants, the City Manager's Office and the marketing

team to take pictures, maybe make postcards and such. She stated that they are in the process of preserving the mural. There has not been a date set on when demolition would take place. The house on 300 North Second has been demolished. There is nothing yet on what will happen with the property but the house is gone. Chair Stone stated that she thinks it would be a good idea to preserve those pictures or postcards to put them in the Welcome Center to which Deputy City Manager Ollie agreed.

Commission Discussion on WS2

Community Development Director Jasen Haskins presented to the board stating that last year there was an applicant who had proposed to build a property at 111 Keefer Road. It was recommended for approval by the HRC Commission and was denied by City Council. The applicant has made changes to the development, she decreased the size of the house, increased the size of the front porch, made appropriate window treatments, and decreased the size of the garage. Director Haskins stated that before the applicant goes through the submittal process again, she wanted to get the HRCs input on the new design. He explained that the applicant was in attendance in case the board had any questions and that this was just for informational purposes, no vote would be taken this evening.

Vice-Chair Allison Stowe stated that she had looked over the plans and it looks like the house was slightly reduced by 7 sq. ft. The porch was increased by 3 sq. ft. The garage was cut in half from a two-car garage to a one-car garage. She stated that she did not think the house was significantly smaller in square footage. She stated that a large part does not meet the ordinance. An issue being the one-car garage. Vice-Chair Stone asked if it was in the City Ordinance that there has to be a two-car garage, to which Director Haskins answered that it states that you have to provide two parking spaces in residence on a single family and that they just have to be tandem. Vice-Chair Stowe stated that it is still an attached garage so it is still the same issue. She stated that if we have ordinances, we should try to stick with them as much as possible. Director Haskins asked if the Board would explain what other things are not meeting the criteria. Vice-Chair Stowe stated that the design, such as the windows were exactly the same as the plans presented before. She stated that if the ordinances, as written now, the porch is not the way it's supposed to be and that it is specifically stated that the sidewalk is supposed to be expanded to 6 ft. She said that she does not think that is the homeowner's responsibility however she questioned if that would be done as it was not on the plan. Chair Stone stated that she does not see any difference in the windows from the old packet versus the current packet. In the old picture, there were two posts, in the new picture, there are three posts and to Chair Stone, it almost looks lopsided. The two posts seemed more symmetrical. Three posts feel like it's missing an outer post on the other side to make it look proper. Chair Stone questioned if the applicant, just not knowing if the brand of the windows is American Craftsman style windows if she is feeling that that is a craftsman window as the title of the window is American Craftsman. She wanted to make sure there was no confusion there and that these just looked like flat windows. She stated that they were 6 over 6 which is a start, but needed to be trimmed out around the window and not just a flat window against the siding. She stated that would go a long way to making it look like a craftsman window. There is a sliding glass door which is not indicative of a craftsman style. She stated that if you want a double door, a double French Craftsman door would work if that was the kind of door the applicant wanted. Vice-Chair Stowe stated that the current ordinance, it specifically states that houses are supposed to have some kind of skirting or plants around to hide the foundation, which this house does not have either of those. Chair Stone stated that she understands the applicant wants a big house on a small lot and until a smaller house is addressed on the lot, there is not going to be room for a detached garage. She stated that the detached garage is going to stop it every time and she believes that was one of Council's biggest things as well. Vice-Chair Stowe stated that in the City Council meeting, Council member Mulliqi had asked if the garage could be converted into a bedroom and the reply was that the ordinance requires two enclosed parking spaces. Vice-Chair Stowe questioned if it was or was not required to enclose the parking spaces because that is what was said at Council. She stated that the ordinance did not state that, it just said accessory buildings have to be detached. It did not give a requirement for the amount. She stated that she wanted to understand which one is the prevailing requirement. Director Haskins stated that the ordinance says that there are two parking spaces and normally outside of the Historic District, a 500 sq. ft. garage is required which would fit two cars. He stated that he would have to look in the detail to make sure that in the Downtown Historic District, you could not have a smaller garage. Deputy City Manager Ollie stated that in the Ordinance now, it says that parking for residential uses is on-site and shall provide a minimum of two parking spaces that are not

necessarily in a garage. Director Haskins stated that new homes outside of the Historic District have to have a 500 sq. ft. garage and that is probably where the question was answered during the City Council meeting referring back to Vice-Chair Stowe's question about what was said in the City Council meeting. The Committee discussed that the parking did not have to be covered. Deputy City Manager Ollie stated that she does believe the HRC ordinance needs to be reworded as it used to specify two enclosed parking spaces, however now it says just two parking spaces so that does need to be clarified and cleaned up in the ordinance. Chair Stone explained that she is always going to argue for architecture, specifically Historic Architecture. She stated that these homes have separate garages. She stated that a new build in the Historic District needs to have a detached garage. Chair Stone explained that she wants to be able to say in 50 years that we have more contributing structures and not this many more non-contributing structures. She stated that to her, if it is contributing it will have all of the elements to it. Vice-Chair Stowe stated that she did not think the garage would be a big deal if the home was very classic craftsman in all the other ways. Such as craftsman-style windows. She explained that if the house was more craftsman style, she did not think the garage would be a big deal. Commissioner Jones stated that she liked that the applicant put the garage from the front corner to the rear corner so it is not as visible. She mentioned that she appreciated that there was an accommodation made to the property. She stated that the only option for a detached garage would be to change the square footage of the house. Director Haskins stated that he thinks there would be some room to move the entire house to the East. The setback is it might be over 25 while some of the other houses in that area are less than 25. Commissioner Jones stated that she thinks that would maybe satisfy everybody if the house could be shifted just a little bit in order to detach the garage. Commissioner Patton questioned if with the Ordinance, if moving the house, would there still be enough room for what is required between the house and garage to still have the detached garage. Director Haskins stated that the Zoning Ordinance does not have anything specifically but in the building code, it is normally 5 ft. Director Haskins stated that there would be a discussion to figure out how much the size of the house would have to be brought down for the detached garage. The applicant approached the Commission questioning what exactly needed to be done to get this approved. She stated that she went to her architect regarding the detached garage and her architect reviewed the plans and was not sure how that could be done with the amount of space on the property. She questioned if the amount of space between the house and garage would be enough to be considered detached. Chair Stone questioned if that would have to be a consideration to which Director Haskins answered that the code would not allow it as there's no space to walk between. Commissioner Jones stated that there would probably have to be enough room for the door to swing open for entry to the garage and entry to the house. Chair Stone asked the applicant if she had considered lessening the square footage of the house so that there was enough room for what needed to be done to get it approved. The Commission discussed they were not sure how much the house would be reduced to fit the detached garage. Director Haskins explained that the applicant had certain requirements on size based on family members who are going to be living in the home. Chair Stone stated that she can appreciate the desire and the number of family members that are trying to be accommodated for, not trying to be mean in what she says but the applicant bought a small lot and to buy a small lot, you have to be okay with not having a giant house on a small lot to ensure that it meets all the requirements. Vice-Chair Stowe stated that the frustrating part for her was that the lot is X amount in size and the architect is saying that she cannot make it give everything to abide by the Ordinance, instead of trying to abide by the Ordinance, goes in the direction of let me get the house that I want without regard to the ordinance. Vice-Chair Stowe explained that she understands what is needed out of the house but in her opinion, what is needed is not in this lot and does not align with requirements. Chair Stone stated her job is to go by the Ordinances. The applicant stated that it is really not a small lot. What affects the lot is that it had two fronts. She stated that there is a house on Oak that was built recently and looks very similar to the one being presented and has an attached garage and it is a newer home. Vice-Chair Stowe stated that there definitely houses in the Historic District that do not meet the Ordinance today but she feels that is the point of having the Board, to preserve what they can. She explained that not all of the homes meet the Ordinance and they are not asking for the applicant's home to meet all of the requirements but for her to vote, the home would need to meet more of the requirements. Director Haskins stated that the point of the work session was to get everybody's opinion and make sure that the applicant knows what needs to be discussed moving forward. Chair Stone asked if it could be figured out how to detach the garage and the windows to look proper, to which the applicant asked what was needed on the windows. Chair Stone explained that it was the trim out, the 6 over 6 or 3 over 1. She stated that it was not just a flat window against the siding of the house. The applicant stated that the Ordinance stated you have to have at least two of the following items and she stated the design has about four different items. Chair Stone stated the design still has an attached garage which is going to wipe it out. Vice-Chair Stowe

explained that she thinks there is two different components. One being the craftsman component and then everything else in the ordinance like the attached garage. She stated that the issue for her was there are so many elements that do not abide by the ordinance and with the little bit of craftsman there is, it makes it all quite not up to it. Director Haskins stated that he feels like he has enough information the help the applicant decide on how we need to move forward.

Commission Discussion WS3

Deputy City Manager Ollie presented to the Commission regarding amendments to Section 6.3. of the Zoning Ordinance. She stated that the work session was not necessarily to address every single thing or get it corrected, but to start a conversation so staff can know what changes the board might want to see. The Commission discussed E.2.c. Chair Stone asked for clarification on what the wording means. Deputy City Manager Ollie explained that if someone wanted to build a big storage or garage, that would be an accessory structure, and HRC would have oversight over that. Chair Stone questioned if someone wanted to build a second home on their property if that would go into this Ordinance as well, or if this was just strictly about a new accessory structure to which Deputy Manager Ollie stated that it could, but a lot of that would fall back on the Zoning Ordinance because not every district allows a second residential structure.

The Commission began discussing E.2.d. Chair Stone questioned how replication equated to our compared architectural style because while we are not trying to replicate a house, you still want all the architectural elements of the style of the house. Deputy Chair Ollie stated that she thinks it goes back to what was said about a structure not meeting every single thing of a craftsman-style home if it is built today but there is a majority of the elements wanted brought to the new structure and to her, that is what this says. Vice-Chair Stowe stated that she liked the way this was redone. She stated that it's sort of broad but telling applicants to try to meet the standards. Commissioner Patton stated that this is just saying the majority of it has to be craftsman but we should be able to tell that it was built in 2024.

Chair Stone discussed E.3.a. stating that it sounded good because before it stated that a letter from a structural engineer was required period as to now stating it is required if the request is based on lack of integrity and structural soundness.

The Commission discussed E.4.b.iii. Deputy City Manager Ollie explained that in her mind, new meant a new build. Or if her house is already existing in the Historic District, regardless of what style it was, it was already there but now she wants to build a garage or shed or a greenhouse, which is a new accessory structure. Not a new main primary and it has to meet these criteria. Commissioner Patton confirmed that this would apply to new builds and only if the main structure was already there. Commissioner Jones stated that she thinks this needs to be changed to something along the lines of accessory structures constructed after June of 2024 because this is going to be from this point forward and so there is no confusion as to the house being old but the structure being new. She mentioned new accessory structure constructed after the date must be detached. Deputy City Manager Ollie stated that the date will already be there because the date will be the date that the ordinance is adopted. Anything that is changed only becomes effective the day that the ordinance is adopted. Vice-Chair Stowe stated that she thinks it needs to be clearly defined as to what an accessory structure is. Director Haskins stated that the current definition according to the Zoning Ordinance is accessory structure means structures that are incidental to and located on the same lot as a principal building and this includes but is not limited to and gives a list of other structures. Chair Stone stated that she is fine for anything to be built outside of the Historic District, but in the District, we need to make sure it is what it is supposed to be. Deputy City Manager Ollie agreed that we need to truly define what accessory means. Vice-Chair Stowe agreed.

The Commission discussed 6 ft. sidewalks. Vice-Chair Stowe questions why they were included if it can't be enforced. Director Haskins stated that if there wasn't a sidewalk that already existed, they would ask the homebuilder to build a sidewalk and make it 6 ft. If there is already a sidewalk there, through his interpretation, it is not required to tear that sidewalk out and put in a new one to meet the 6 ft requirement. Only if there is no sidewalk there. Vice-Chair Stowe questioned when that was going to be enforced. Deputy City Manager Ollie stated that the reason for the 6ft sidewalk requirement was because the idea was that Downtown needed to be

more walkable and focusing on Ballard and Jackson. She stated that when the extension to Keefer happened, this was not addressed. Vice-Chair Stowe stated that she would like to see that we try to move to the 6ft sidewalks. She stated that she does not it should be forced upon the homeowner. Deputy City Manager Ollie stated that they would get together with staff and bring up the recommendations to get more information.

The Commission discussed parking for non-residential and if this was feasible with smaller lot configurations in the Downtown Historic District and whether should it be worded differently. Deputy City Manager Ollie stated that she believes there will be instances where there's parking that may not need to be concrete. She stated that in her opinion, it is almost better to get rid of it altogether as this statement is a bit confusing right now. Commissioner Jones stated that there is not the real estate in downtown to provide parking. Chair Stone mentioned the important thing to make sure of is that handicapped residents have spaces to park. Director Haskins stated that if the commission's wish was to think about doing away with required parking, staff would look into federal law to find out handicap requirements. Chair Stone stated that she is open to that and making it easier for people to walk in Downtown but she does want to make sure we are providing some space for handicapped people close to where they need to be. Commissioner Patton stated that she believed removing parking would be a great thing for businesses as people are going to walk and see things that they would not normally see.

The Commission discussed residential structures within the Historic District and that it states it shall have identifiable features appropriate to the architectural style of the building. Chair Stone questioned control when coming to planting to which Director Haskins answered that if it was now part of the ordinance, Code Enforcement would go out and could be able to write a zoning violation if it is in the zoning ordinance. Deputy City Manager Ollie stated that she did not think this could be enforceable. The Commission discussed that it could be enforceable if there was an HOA. The Commission discussed that it would be hard to enforce planting requirements. Deputy City Manager Ollie stated that staff would look at this and look at local government to see the language that was addressed on landscaping.

The Commission discussed item 10 regarding the choice of color for the primary facade. Deputy City Manager Ollie stated that she wanted the Commission to look and see if they wanted to add anything or if anything needed to be reworded because she didn't want for someone to look at the ordinance and think that they were limited and that these were examples. She mentioned not making it part of the ordinance but having a sample book for the applicants to view.

Deputy City Manager Ollie thanked the Commission for being informative and having conversations that gave a lot of good information.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Commissioner Patton and seconded by Commissioner Jones to adjourn. A vote was taken and carried 4 – 0. Chair Stone adjourned the meeting at 7:45 p.m.

Sandra Stone – Chair

ATTEST

Gabby Fernandez - Secretary



Historic Review Commission

AGENDA REPORT

Department: Planning

Account Code: _____

Prepared By: Jasen Haskins, AICP

Subject

Consider and act upon a recommendation to the City Council regarding a request to renovate an existing commercial structure, located at 110 East Oak Street, within the Downtown Historic District.

Recommendation

Motion to recommend (**approval, approval with conditions, or denial**) as presented

Discussion

OWNER: BBHS Holdings, LLC.

APPLICANT: Blake Herpeche

The Owner/Applicant proposes to make major renovations to the exterior facade as well as interior changes to accommodate a hair salon on the subject property. The applicant is proposing to paint the exterior brick with either a black or white color from a historic palette. The front double doors and garage door are to be removed and replaced with decorative pivot doors.

According to available records, the property was originally developed in 1910. However, it appears that the current structure was built sometime later as the brickwork is at least mid-twentieth century if not newer. Until 2021 the property was owned by Ladylike, LLC., a company with some historic significance to Wylie.

Generally, painted brick is not recommended in historic areas and the Zoning Ordinance discourages it (Section 6.3.E.2.d.1.). Currently, the building does not have pediments along the top of the facade, palistares on the facade, nor decorative or architectural detailing on the windows as the structure was built before the DTH Ordinance was adopted. The remodel is not proposing to add these features.

This item will be considered at the May 14th City Council meeting.



APPLICATION FOR HISTORIC REVIEW

Date: 03/14/2024

NOTICE TO APPLICANT

1. Completed applications and drawings must be in the Planning and Engineering Office no later than 10 days before the meeting. (Regular meetings are held on the 4th Thursday at 6:00 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers, or Special Called Meetings as needed.)
2. It is imperative that you complete this application in its entirety. Incomplete applications will be returned and could delay the commencement of your project.
3. The presence of the applicant or his/her agent as designated herein is necessary at the Historic Review Commission Meeting.

APPLICANT INFORMATION

Name: Blake Herpeche Phone: 972-655-6138
 Mailing Address: 307 N Jackson Ave
 Email: ~~blakeherpeche@collin.org~~ blakeherpeche@gmail.com Fax: _____

PROPERTY OWNER INFORMATION

Name: Blake Herpeche Phone: 972-655-6138
 Mailing Address: 307 N Jackson Ave
 Email: ~~blakeherpeche@collin.org~~ blakeherpeche@gmail.com Fax: _____

PROJECT INFORMATION

Name of Business (if applicable): Lo & Be Salon
 Current or intended use of the building: Salon - hair only
 Address of Project: 110 e Oak Street

(The below information (Lot, Block, Subdivision, and Frontage) can be obtained on the County Appraisal District's website by entering the physical address of the property: <http://collincad.org> or <http://dallascad.org> or <http://rockwallcad.com>. If you do not have access to the Internet or cannot locate this information on the website, contact the Planning Department at (972)516-6320 for assistance.

Lot 7A 7B Block 18 Subdivision Railroad Current Zoning Commercial-Res

Which District is the property located within?

- Downtown Historic District
- South Ballard Overlay District
- Other _____

SCOPE OF WORK

Remodeling/Renovating

Provide a detailed description of the nature of the proposed alterations and /or repairs (attach additional sheets if necessary):

Interior and exterior remodeling. Plans attached

Are you painting an exterior feature? Yes No

If Yes:

	Describe Feature	Color Name	Sample Attached	
Example	Brick and door frames	White (no. 7665)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
	Brick, exterior	White or black from the historic palette	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No

Are you replacing an exterior feature? Yes No

If Yes:

	Describe Feature	Current Material	Proposed Material	Sample Attached	
Example	Window Frame	Wood	Vinyl	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
	Gutters	Copper look	Painted black	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
				<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
				<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No

New Construction

Are you replacing an existing structure? Yes No

If Yes, complete "Demolition" below

Demolition

Describe the condition of the existing structure:

What is the estimated cost of restoration or repair of the existing Structure? 100 - 150k

Explain why the property is being demolished as opposed to restored or renovated for adaptive reuse:

What do you plan to do to mitigate the loss of the landmark structure?

[Empty text box for mitigation plan]

Sign

Type of Sign:

- Attached Sign
- Pole Sign
- Temporary Sign
- Banner
- Monument Sign
- Other _____

Sign Dimensions: TBD Total Square Footage 2100

Will the sign be connected to electricity or lit in any way? Yes No

If Yes, what is the method of lighting? _____

Will this sign project over a public sidewalk? Yes No

If Yes, what is the distance from the sidewalk to the bottom of the sign? 14 feet

Have you submitted an application for a Sign Permit to Building Inspections? Yes No

Fence

What is the proposed material and style of fence you intend to install?

[Empty text box for fence material and style]

What is the proposed height of the fence? _____

Are you replacing an existing fence? Yes No

If Yes, what is the current fence material? _____

Have you submitted an application for a Fence Permit to Building Inspections? Yes No

Provide a detailed description of the nature of the proposed project (attach additional sheets if necessary):

Remove garage door, replace with exterior windows.
Consideration needs to be given to the current windows,
Keep them or replace? HRC to weigh in on this decision.

REQUIRED ATTACHMENTS:

- Current photographs of the property
- If available, historic photographs of the property
- Site Plan indicating the following:
 - Dimensions of the lot on which the building will be located, including setbacks (check official plat records and Zoning Ordinance)
 - Location and width of all easements (check official plat records)
 - Location and dimensions of all existing and proposed buildings, parking areas, and existing signs (if any)
 - Architect’s rendering or elevations of proposed construction
- Sample board of materials and colors to be used
- Site Plan Fee \$350.00 - Check/Card/Cash (Check made payable to City of Wylie)

Intended start and finish dates: Start: 5/1/2024 Finish: 9/1/2024

I have carefully read the complete application and know the same is true and correct. I understand the ordinances governing the activity described in this application, and I agree to comply with all provisions of the City ordinances, State laws, and all property restrictions, whether herein specified or not.

X  _____
(Owner or Authorized Agent Signature)

RETURN TO:

**City of Wylie
Planning Department
300 Country Club Road, Building 100
Wylie, Texas 75098
(972) 516-6320**

