

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

FEBRUARY 23, 2016

The Planning and Zoning Commission of the City of McKinney, Texas met in regular session in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Building on Tuesday, February 23, 2016 at 6:08 p.m.

City Council Member Present: Chuck Branch

Commissioner Members Present: Chairman Bill Cox, Vice-Chairman Eric Zepp, Janet Cobbel, Cameron McCall, Brian Mantzey, Pamela Smith, and Mark McReynolds - Alternate

Commission Member Absent: Deanna Kuykendall

Staff Present: Director of Development Services Michael Quint, Director of Planning Brian Lockley, Planning Manager Matt Robinson, Planner II Samantha Pickett, Planners Eleana Galicia and Aaron Bloxham, and Administrative Assistant Terri Ramey

There were approximately 55 guests present.

Chairman Cox called the regular meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. after determining a quorum was present.

Chairperson Cox explained the format and procedures of the meeting, as well as the role of the Commission. He announced that some of the items considered by the Commission on this date would be only heard by the Planning and Zoning Commission and others would be forwarded on to City Council. Chairperson Cox stated that he would advise the audience if the case will go on to City Council or be heard only by the Planning and Zoning Commission. He stated that guests would need to limit their remarks to three minutes and speak only once. Chairperson Cox explained that there is a timer located on the podium, and when one minute of the speaker's time is remaining the light will switch to yellow, and when the time is up the light will change to red. He asked that everyone treat others with respect, be concise in all comments, and avoid over talking the issues.

The Commission unanimously approved the motion by Vice-Chairman Zepp, seconded by Commission Member McCall, to approve the following five Consent items, with a vote of 6-0-0.

**16-248 Minutes of the Planning and Zoning Commission
Regular Meeting of February 9, 2016**

**16-021PF Consider/Discuss/Act on a Preliminary-Final Plat for
Lots 3R, 4R and 5, Block A of the Collin McKinney
Commercial Addition and Leryn Lane Right-of-Way
Dedication, Located Approximately 500 Feet South of
Collin McKinney Parkway and on the East Side of
Custer Road**

**14-
331SU5 Consider/Discuss/Act on a Specific Use Permit
Extension for a Restaurant with Drive-Through
Window, Located on the South Side of Eldorado
Parkway and Approximately 220 Feet East of Ridge
Road**

**14-
332SU5 Consider/Discuss/Act on a Specific Use Permit
Extension for a Restaurant with Drive-Through
Window, Located on the South Side of Eldorado
Parkway and Approximately 550 Feet East of Ridge
Road**

**14-
333SU5 Consider/Discuss/Act on a Specific Use Permit
Extension for a Restaurant with Drive-Through
Window, Located on the South Side of Eldorado
Parkway and Approximately 700 Feet East of Ridge
Road**

END OF CONSENT

Chairman Cox continued the meeting with the Regular Agenda Items and Public Hearings on the agenda.

**15-328PFR Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on a
Request for a Preliminary-Final Replat for Lots 2R and
3, Block A of the Sundance Addition, Located on the
Northeast Corner of Bahnman Drive and Stonebridge
Drive**

Mr. Aaron Bloxham, Planner for the City of McKinney, explained the proposed preliminary-final replat. He stated that Staff recommends approval of the proposed preliminary-final replat as conditioned in the Staff report. Mr. Bloxham offered to answer questions. There were none.

Mr. Tracy LaPiene, Ridinger Associates, Inc., 550 S. Edmonds Lane, Lewisville, TX, concurred with the Staff report and offered to answer questions. There were none.

Chairman Cox opened the public hearing and called for comments.

Ms. Kathy Kline, 1012 Remington Ct., Argyle, TX, filled out a speaker's card in support of the request; however, did not speak during the meeting.

On a motion by Commission Member Smith, seconded by Commission Member Mantzey, the Commission voted unanimously to close the public hearing and approve the proposed preliminary-final replat as conditioned in the Staff report, with a vote of 6-0-0.

Chairman Cox stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission was the final approval authority for the proposed preliminary-final replat.

16-026PFR Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on a Preliminary-Final Replat for Lots 2R2 and 2R3, Block A, of Stonebridge Parcel 903 Addition, Located on the Northwest Corner of Eldorado Parkway and Alma Road

Ms. Samantha Pickett, Planner II for the City of McKinney, explained the proposed preliminary-final replat. She stated that Staff recommends approval of the proposed preliminary-final replat as conditioned in the Staff report. Ms. Pickett offered to answer questions. There were none.

Ms. Audra Maticcik, 5900 Waterview Ct., McKinney, TX, concurred with the Staff report and offered to answer questions. There were none.

Chairman Cox opened the public hearing and called for comments. There being none, on a motion by Commission Member Cobbel, seconded by Commission Member McCall, the Commission voted unanimously to close the public hearing and approve the proposed preliminary-final replat as conditioned in the Staff report, with a vote of 6-0-0.

Chairman Cox stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission was the final approval authority for the proposed preliminary-final replat.

16-018Z Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on a Request to Rezone the Subject Property from "C" - Planned Center District, "PD" - Planned Development District, "AG" - Agricultural District, and "CC" - Corridor Commercial Overlay District to "GC" - Governmental Complex District and "CC" - Corridor Commercial Overlay District, Located on the Southeast corner of Hardin Boulevard and McKinney Ranch Parkway

Mr. Aaron Bloxham, Planner for the City of McKinney, explained the proposed rezoning request. He stated that Staff recommended approval of the proposed rezoning request and offered to answer questions. There were none.

Mr. Bob Roeder; Abernathy, Roeder, Boyd & Hullett, P.C.; 1700 Redbud Blvd.; McKinney, TX; explained the proposed rezoning request. He stated that the McKinney Independent School District (MISD) owned the subject property; therefore, it was no longer on the tax rolls. Mr. Roeder stated that signs had been posted on the property that

it could be the future home to a McKinney Independent School District's football stadium. He stated that the ultimately use of the property would be decided by the McKinney Independent School District, which is a sovereign governmental entity that is allowed to make those decisions. Mr. Roeder requested a favorable recommendation and offered to answer questions. There were none.

Chairman Cox opened the public hearing and called for comments.

The following three residents spoke in favor of the proposed rezoning request.

Mr. Jim Healer, 912 Hidden Springs Ct., McKinney, TX, stated that McKinney was the 17th largest city in the State of Texas, growing at a pace of 20% per year. He stated that McKinney is ranked 157th in the United States, which is ahead of municipal populations for half of the state capitals and the metropolitan populations of 11 of those stated capitals. Mr. Healer gave examples of some of these well-known metropolitan cities where McKinney was larger than them. He stated that McKinney was not a small town anymore. Mr. Healer felt that the success of our students contributed to McKinney's growth. He stated that a new stadium would play a critical role in helping some students excel. Mr. Healer stated that the proposed site would help elevate some of the issues with safety, security, traffic congestion, parking capacity, ingress, and egress. He stated that a new stadium would open up new opportunities and gave the example of regional events. Mr. Healer stated that it was the most convenient location for visitors to McKinney. He stated that a new stadium would increase revenue for the school system and McKinney. Mr. Healer stated that the current stadium was landlocked and we had outgrown it. He stated that the proposed site was already owned by the McKinney Independent School District and was located near the gateway to McKinney. Mr. Healer felt the proposed location was an ideal location for a new football stadium.

Mr. Jeff Markiewicz, 7012 Tilbury Ct., McKinney, TX, briefly discussed the surrounding development around the proposed property and that he would like to see this trend change. He stated that building a stadium and athletic facility at this location would spur highly desired development in the area and add to the amenities in McKinney. Mr. Markiewicz stated that he was part of a committee that had evaluated the needs of the school district and looked into an investment in McKinney children. He stated that they had selected 20 projects that will be presented to the school board, along with a two cent

reduction in the property tax rate. Mr. Markiewicz stated that McKinney voters will then ultimately decide whether or not to approve the bond on Election Day on May 7, 2016. He stated that this hearing to consider the rezoning of the property was not part of the bond process. Mr. Markiewicz stated that this was a project that we should support. He stated that surrounding cities had already built new stadiums and gave examples.

Ms. Cindy Evans, 8517 Beech Ln., McKinney, TX, stated that she was very excited about the possibility of a stadium at this location. She stated that it would be the second pillar to the gateway to McKinney. Ms. Evans reiterated that this public hearing was about the rezoning of the property and not about the bond election for a stadium. She felt it would be a great economic development for McKinney. Ms. Evans stated that this was the best possible location for traffic flow. She mentioned various activities that could be held at this location if a new stadium was built. Ms. Evans stated that a new stadium would address issues with parking and safety. She stated that it was time McKinney did something new and spectacular for the School District. Ms. Evans stated that she had heard comments about why a new stadium was not being proposed in northern McKinney where the land was less expensive and the area was not as populated. She stated that area would eventually be populated.

The following five residents spoke in opposition to the proposed rezoning request.

Mr. Ken Sipiora, 1801 Pembroke Ln., McKinney, TX, stated that the proposed use was inconsistent with the highest and best use for the subject property. He stated that it represents some adverse financial consequences to our citizens. Mr. Sipiora stated that a \$60 million football stadium owned by the McKinney Independent School District does not generate tax revenue for the City of McKinney; however, a taxable use could generate approximate \$1.56 million in tax revenues. He stated that there would also be 20 years of bond debt service of approximately \$3.5 million a year. Mr. Sipiora stated that it would make the cost of the project a little over \$5 million per year or over a \$100 million over a 20 year period. He stated that he was a sports fan and had three children that went to McKinney High School. Mr. Sipiora requested that the request be denied due to the numbers alone.

Mr. Kyle Whaley, 4205 Timberview, McKinney, TX, stated that the proposed property currently does not have direct access to US Highway 75 or State Highway 121.

He stated that two of the three high schools would need to drive through town to get to the stadium instead of driving down US Highway 75. Mr. Whaley stated that building this type of stadium at this location did not fit into the City's moto of being Unique by Nature. He stated that it was just copying other Cities. Mr. Whaley stated that it was not the best use of the land and felt that were better alternatives available. He stated that he had not seen traffic control patterns for the proposed site. Mr. Whaley felt there would be backflow issues through the surrounding streets due to traffic issues. He stated that the Future Land Use Plan (FLUP) discussed a height limitation that had not been addressed yet. Mr. Whaley stated that press boxes and light poles at stadiums were very tall. He expressed concerns regarding lighting and noise issues for the surrounding area. Mr. Whaley stated that he did not expect a stadium at this location to generate much money for McKinney. He stated most people would eat and shop at the nearby restaurants and stores in Fairview and Allen, that would be closer than some located in McKinney. He requested denial of the proposed rezoning request to allow the McKinney Independent School District to consider another location for a stadium.

Ms. Laura Lutek, 2901 Cedar Ridge Dr., McKinney, TX, expressed concerns regarding the impact to the surrounding neighborhoods. She stated that she spoke with a School Board member who told her that he would not want a stadium located in his backyard. Ms. Lutek stated that none of the School Board members live near the proposed property and that a stadium at this location would not affect them. She expressed concerns regarding decreasing the surrounding property values, additional traffic, noise levels, and nuisance to the surround neighbors. Ms. Lutek felt that there could be blighted neighborhoods surrounding the stadium after a period of time. She also requested denial of the proposed rezoning request.

Mr. Mike Giles, 3213 Gillespie Rd., McKinney, TX, stated that signage had been installed on the property off of Gray Branch Rd. where lighted fields were proposed that let people know what was planned at that location so people could decide if they wanted to purchase land next that site. He stated that the proposed property already has surrounding property owners living near it that were not given advanced warning that a Stadium could be going in on the property. Mr. Giles stated that a stadium next to their properties would deteriorate their property values. He stated that the proposed location

was very close to the edge of McKinney and about a half mile from Allen, which was not centrally located in McKinney. Mr. Giles stated that there would be houses located very close to a stadium at this location. He expressed concerns regarding lighting, noise, and traffic issues. Mr. Giles stated that stadiums typically had various activities going on throughout the week, so the surrounding neighbors would be affected multiple days a week. He stated that it was his understanding that the McKinney Independent School District (MISD) owned approximately 34 acres of land near the McKinney North High School that was originally purchased to build a football stadium. Mr. Giles stated that it would have better access off of US Highway 75. He felt this location was a better alternative. He requested denial of the proposed rezoning request.

Mr. David O'Connor, 2500 Brinlee Branch Ln., McKinney, TX, stated that he lived in McKinney since 1999. He stated that he recalled a sign in front of the Bus Barn that stated the property off of Gray Branch Rd. was the future site for a stadium. Mr. O'Connor stated that this other site would have easy access to US Highway 75. He stated that there is already a baseball/softball stadium near there. Mr. O'Connor stated that there is additional parking located at Scott Johnson Middle School, McKinney North High School, and Bus Barn Facility. He expressed concerns about building a stadium so close to the City of Allen. Mr. O'Connor stated that it would waste a lot of gas with everybody driving there, when there were closer alternatives. He stated that the center of McKinney would be further north once the city is built out and that should be taken into consideration. Mr. O'Connor asked if McKinney Independent School District had looked into renovating the Ron Poe Stadium. He expressed concerns over losing huge amounts of tax revenue at the proposed site by rezoning it for lesser use on such a value piece of real estate. Mr. O'Connor stated that we need businesses in McKinney. He felt that building a new stadium would be more appropriate in northern McKinney, where there were two schools already built and available vacant land. Mr. O'Connor asked that the Commission do the right thing for tax payers and homeowners and recommend denial of the proposed rezoning request.

The following five residents turned in speakers cards in favor of the proposed rezoning request; however, did not wish to speak during the meeting:

- Ms. Angela Bado, 7002 Old York, McKinney, TX

- Mr. Matthew Bado, 913 Boyd Creek Rd., McKinney, TX
- Ms. LynDella Healer, 7112 Bryce Canyon Dr., McKinney, TX
- Mr. Carl Macero, 1204 Canyon Wren Dr., McKinney, TX
- Mr. Rod Rodriguez, 709 Moss Cliff Cir., McKinney, TX

The following three residents turned in speakers cards in opposition of the proposed rezoning request; however, did not wish to speak during the meeting:

- Mr. Rick Wise, 4427 Durango Ln., McKinney, TX
- Ms. Alice McCaulley, 2706 Summerwood Ct., McKinney, TX
- Mr. Paul Gage, 4403 Shadywood, McKinney, TX

On a motion by Vice-Chairman Zepp, seconded by Commission Member Smith, the Commission voted unanimously to close the public hearing, 6-0-0.

Vice-Chairman Zepp stated that the Commission was being asked to vote of the rezoning of the property for an unknown purpose. He stated that a bond election would be needed to approve building a stadium. Vice-Chairman Zepp stated that this property could be used for any number of purposes or even rezoned and sold at a later time. He stated that the Commission needed to focus on the issue at hand.

Commission Member McCall asked why the McKinney Independent School District (MISD) was requesting the proposed rezoning of the property. Mr. Bloxham stated that they were requesting three properties be rezoned to the same zoning regulations. He stated that "GC" – Governmental Complex District does have restrictions that they must follow.

Vice-Chairman Zepp asked how far the subject property was located to State Highway 121. Mr. Bloxham stated that it was approximately 500' from the southern property line.

Vice-Chairman Zepp asked if there would still be room for commercial development in front. Mr. Bloxham said yes.

Commission Member Mantzey asked if the property had been removed from the tax rolls because it is owned by the McKinney Independent School District (MISD). Mr. Bloxham said yes.

Vice-Chairman Zepp asked if the property directly to the east was an Oncor substation. Mr. Bloxham said yes.

Vice-Chairman Zepp stated that one of the speakers had mention that McKinney Independent School District (MISD) would be paying for infrastructure improvements if a stadium was built at this location. He asked what improvement that might entail. Mr. Bloxham stated that he had not heard any specifics at this time and suggested that the applicant might be better at answer the question. Mr. Roeder stated that the property currently does not have a sanitary sewer infrastructure; therefore, whatever is developed on the land would need that brought to the site. He stated the property would also need adequate road systems. Mr. Roeder stated that all of that would be determined during the site plan and platting processes.

Vice-Chairman Zepp asked if the McKinney Independent School District (MISD) was exempt from impact fees or doing improvements that a regular developer would be required to do to development the property. Mr. Roeder stated that they were asking for straight zoning with no variances. He stated that they plan to abide with the regulations in the existing Zoning ordinance.

Commission Member Smith stated that she appreciated all of the citizens attending the meeting and voicing their opinions. She stated that the Commission was not considering approving a stadium on the subject property during this meeting. Commission Member Smith reiterated that the Commission was addressing a rezoning request made by the McKinney Independent School District (MISD). She stated that the school districts were uniquely challenged when they review their buildout plan, facility needs, and acquiring various sites.

Chairman Cox agreed with Commission Member Smith's comments. He stated that the McKinney Independent School District (MISD) abides by the City's Development Guidelines. Chairman Cox felt the use was appropriate for the subject property. He stated that he appreciated everyone attending the meeting and also the McKinney Independent School District (MISD) keeping up with the growth of McKinney. Chairman Cox stated that he was supportive of the rezoning request.

Vice-Chairman Zepp stated that he did not feel this was an appropriate location for a stadium in McKinney; however, he did not see a reason to deny the rezoning request.

He stated that the subject property was already off of the tax rolls, since the McKinney Independent School District (MISD) already owns it.

Commission Member Mantzey stated that he was supportive of the rezoning request. He stated that the consideration of a stadium on the subject property would be decided during a bond election at a later time.

On a motion by Commission Member Smith, seconded by Commission Member Cobbel, the Commission voted unanimously to recommend approval of the rezoning request as recommended by Staff, with a vote of 6-0-0.

Chairman Cox stated that the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission will be forwarded to the City Council meeting on March 15, 2016.

15-335Z Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on a Request to Rezone the Subject Property from "PD" - Planned Development District and "REC" - Regional Employment Center Overlay District to "PD" - Planned Development District, Generally to Modify the Development Standards, Located on the Northeast Corner of Weiskopf Avenue and Van Tuyl Parkway

Mr. Aaron Bloxham, Planner for the City of McKinney, explained that Staff recommends that the public hearing be continued and the item be tabled to the March 8, 2016 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting due to a Staff noticing error. He stated that Staff would re-notice prior to the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.

Chairman Cox opened the public hearing and called for comments. There being none, on a motion by Vice-Chairman Zepp, seconded by Commission Member Smith, the Commission voted unanimously to continue the public hearing and table the proposed rezoning request to the March 8, 2016 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting as recommended by Staff, with a vote of 6-0-0.

16-020Z Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on a Request to Rezone the Subject Property from "PD" - Planned Development District and "RS 60" - Single Family Residence District to "C2" - Local Commercial District, Located on the Southeast Corner of U.S. Highway 380 (University Drive) and Kentucky Street

Ms. Eleana Galicia, Planner for the City of McKinney, explained the proposed rezoning request. She stated that Staff recommended approval of the proposed rezoning request and offered to answer questions.

Chairman Cox asked for clarification the location of the current zoning on the property. Ms. Galicia pointed out on an Existing Zoning exhibit, displayed on the

overhead and included in the Staff report, that the blue section was currently zoned as "PD" - Planned Development District and the red cross-hatched section was currently zoned as "RS 60" – Single Family Residence District.

Mr. Siamak Hasiri, 1302 N. Church St., McKinney, TX, briefly explained the proposed rezoning request and offered to answer questions. There were none.

Mr. David Surdukan, Surdukan Surveying, Inc., 13970 County Road 480, Anna, TX, offered to answer questions. There were none.

Chairman Cox opened the public hearing and called for comments.

Mr. Jeff Johnson, 1306 N. Church St., McKinney, TX, filled out a speaker's card in support of the request; however, did not wish to speak during the meeting.

On a motion by Commission Member Mantzey, seconded by Vice-Chairman Zepp, the Commission voted unanimously to close the public hearing, with a vote of 6-0-0.

On a motion by Commission Member Mantzey, seconded by Commission Member McCall, the Commission voted unanimously to recommend approval of the rezoning request as recommended by Staff, with a vote of 6-0-0.

Chairman Cox stated that the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission will be forwarded to the City Council meeting on March 15, 2016.

15-243Z Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on a Request to Rezone the Subject Property from "PD" - Planned Development District and "REC" - Regional Employment Center Overlay District to "PD" - Planned Development District, Generally to Allow for an Independent Living Facility, Assisted Living Facility and a Memory Care Center, and Commercial Uses, Located on the Southwest Corner of McKinney Ranch Parkway and Ridge Road

Ms. Eleana Galicia, Planner for the City of McKinney, explained the proposed rezoning request. She stated that Staff recommended approval of the proposed rezoning request with the special ordinance provisions listed in the Staff report and offered to answer questions.

Chairman Cox asked for clarification on the location of this property. Ms. Galicia displayed the Aerial Exhibit on the overhead display and described the location in more detail.

Mr. Levi Wild, Sanchez and Associates, LLC, 402 N. Tennessee St., McKinney, TX, concurred with the Staff report, thanked Staff for their work on this request, and offered to answer questions. There were none.

Chairman Cox opened the public hearing and called for comments. There being none, on a motion by Vice-Chairman Zepp, seconded by Commission Member McCall, the Commission voted unanimously to close the public hearing and recommend approval of the rezoning request as recommended by Staff, with a vote of 6-0-0.

Chairman Cox stated that the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission will be forwarded to the City Council meeting on March 15, 2016.

16-025SP Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on a Site Plan for an Auto Parts Store (Advanced Auto Parts), Located on the Northeast Corner of U.S. Highway 380 (University Drive) and Church Street

Mr. Aaron Bloxham, Planner for the City of McKinney, explained the proposed site plan request. He stated that site plans could typically be approved by Staff; however, the applicant was requesting variances to reduce the landscape setbacks along major thoroughfares from 20 feet to 10 feet which must be considered and acted upon by the Planning and Zoning Commission. Mr. Bloxham stated that Staff recommends approval of the proposed site plan request and associated variances as conditioned in the Staff report. He offered to answer questions.

Chairman Cox briefly commented about the proposed setback.

Ms. Anna Blackwell, Carrillo Engineering, 301 Commerce St., Ft. Worth, TX, concurred with the Staff report, explained the variance request, asked for a recommendation of approval, and offered to answer questions. There were none.

Chairman Cox opened the public hearing and called for comments. There being none, on a motion by Commission Member Smith, seconded by Commission Member McCall, the Commission voted unanimously to close the public hearing and approve the proposed site plan and associated variances as conditioned in the Staff report, with a vote of 6-0-0.

15-316SP2 Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on a Site Plan and Facade Plan Appeal for a Multi-Family Development (Avilla McKinney), Located on the North Side of White Avenue and on the East Side of Community Avenue

Ms. Samantha Pickett, Planner II for the City of McKinney, stated two letters of support were distributed to the Planning and Zoning Commission prior to the meeting. She explained the proposed site plan request and facade plan appeal. She stated that Staff recommends approval of the proposed site plan as conditioned in the Staff report. Ms. Pickett explained that Staff recommends denial of the façade plan appeal that would allow the building elevations longer than 30 feet not be required to provide a full height façade offset that is a minimum of five feet deep and ten feet wide and the development shall not be required to provide the minor architectural and site enhancements. She stated that the applicant requested a variance to not provide four of the enhancements listed in the Staff report; however, had provided several alternate options instead. Ms. Pickett stated that while the applicant had provided one enhancement from the ordinance, Staff was of the opinion that the remaining features were not comparable to the enhancements provided in the Zoning Ordinance.

Chairman Cox asked for some ways the applicant could provide four of the eleven enhancements listed in the ordinance. Ms. Pickett gave some examples.

Vice-Chairman Zepp asked about the proposed primary siding material. Ms. Pickett stated that the proposed primary building material would be brick or stone. She stated that the proposed secondary material was fiber cement.

Vice-Chairman Zepp asked if the applicant was proposing 100% masonry. Ms. Pickett said no. Vice-Chairman Zepp asked for a rough percentage of masonry being proposed. Ms. Pickett stated that it was approximately 60 – 70% and possibly higher on some of the elevations.

Mr. Jon Van De Voorde, Nexmetro Communities, 6688 NCX, Dallas, TX, explained the proposed site plan request and facade plan appeal. He briefly discussed the proposed development and their residents' demographics. Mr. Van De Voorde discussed the possible community economic benefits from this development. He stated that they were willing to have an offset of one foot to two feet to provide architectural interest. Mr. Van De Voorde stated that they would propose an eight foot masonry wall in lieu of a six foot wall. He stated that they propose to install landscaping in front of the eight foot masonry wall. Mr. Van De Voorde stated that they asked for a variance to the minor enhancement. He stated that they had made some alterations, so they could meet the

100% masonry requirement for elevations adjacent to right-of-way. Mr. Van De Voorde stated that they liked the idea of a brick pattern; however, felt that an eight foot masonry wall would obscure it from view. He stated that they would like to propose having 25% patterned brick on the masonry wall. Mr. Van De Voorde stated that they proposed to have shutters on all windows over two feet. He stated that they agreed to provide molding around the windows. Mr. Van De Voorde stated that they propose to vary the roof pitches to create visual interests. He stated that they propose to build a four foot wide internal pedestrian trail and four covered park benches to add to the overall amenities of the site. Mr. Van De Voorde displayed some potential floor plans for the units. He stated that they felt the articulation in side walls and rear walls and the addition of the porches in front meets with the scale which they felt was the intent of the five foot by ten foot facade offset on traditional multi-family.

Ms. Beth Braht, 5459 Vanderbilt Ave., Dallas, TX, briefly discussed the proposed changes to the designs as mentioned by Mr. Van De Voorde. She briefly discussed the minor enhancement variances.

Mr. Van De Voorde stated that they were trying to fit multi-family requirements into a project that was clearly a not multi-family other than how it was operated. He stated that they were proposing a reduced density of 11 units per acre versus the 28 units per acre allowed by the zoning, which was a benefit to the site. Mr. Van De Voorde stated that the adjacent property owners had seen the proposed elevations and were in support of the development. He offered to answer questions.

Vice-Chairman Zepp asked the applicant if they considered using two types of masonry on the exterior of the building. Ms. Braht stated that the units had a lot of architectural enhancements already with the porches, front overhangs, and shutters. She stated that they felt adding another material would appear busy and not enhance the design. Ms. Braht stated that the proposed range of neutral color schemes for the exterior of the units added variety. Mr. Van De Voorde stated that they would prefer to have 100% masonry to have a consistent appearance.

Vice-Chairman Zepp asked for the length of the proposed units. Mr. Van De Voorde stated that the unit sizes vary; however, on average they are 28 feet wide by 44 feet long. He stated that the rear of the duplex units would be screened by the eight foot

masonry perimeter wall and landscaping. Mr. Van De Voorde stated that the front of the duplex units would be broken up with the inset doors and porch.

Commission Member Cobbel wanted to clarify that the rear of the duplex units would be less than 30 feet. Mr. Van De Voorde stated that the unit would be larger than 30 feet. He stated that they were not proposing to eliminate the bump out entirely; however, they wanted to make sure that it matches the scale of the building.

Chairman Cox opened the public hearing and called for comments. There being none, on a motion by Commission Member Mantzey, seconded by Vice-Chairman Zepp, the Commission unanimously voted to close the public hearing, with a vote of 6-0-0.

Chairman Cox asked Ms. Pickett to address the applicant's proposed changes to the site plan request and facade plan appeal. Ms. Pickett stated that the applicant was now offering to provide 100% masonry and to emphasized windows and seals, which were two of the minor site and architectural enhancements listed in the Zoning Ordinance. She stated that the applicant still needed to satisfy two more options. Ms. Pickett stated that the applicant had offered the following enhancements: build a masonry eight foot wall with patterned brickwork, providing shutters on all windows over two feet, have varied roof pitches, build a four-foot wide internal pedestrian trail, and have private backyards. She stated that if the Commission felt that any two of these enhancements qualified then the applicant would have satisfied the requirement.

Commission Member Mantzey asked Ms. Pickett what she thought about using the standard multi-family requirements for this proposed single-story development, since it was not exactly like typical multi-family developments. Ms. Pickett stated that this was a unique product for McKinney; therefore, it was hard to say what the precedent would be for this type of development. She stated that Staff evaluated the submittal and determined that some of the requirements were not unique to a single-story building. Ms. Pickett stated that McKinney has several single-story, single-family homes that meet similar requirements. Commission Member Mantzey asked if these requirements would be required on new homes building in McKinney. Ms. Pickett stated that they would not be required on a detached single family home; however, there were "PD" – Planned Development Districts that provide these as an enhancement.

Vice-Chairman Zepp asked if the requirement could be met by extending a portion of the foundation and installing a covered patio. Ms. Pickett stated that it could; however, some of the proposed back patios already extend into the landscape buffer. She stated that when you bring the roofline out that could become an issue.

Commission Member Mantzey asked for clarification on Staff's position on the facade offset for building elevations longer than 30 feet. Ms. Pickett stated that Staff stands by their recommendation that the offset be provided. She stated that it would be hard to say exactly how it could be implemented without getting into the site design.

Vice-Chairman Zepp asked if the applicant would need to impinge into the living room space of the units to satisfy the requirement. Ms. Pickett stated that we were trying to squeeze a set design into McKinney's standards, instead of the other way around. Mr. Van De Voorde stated that they did not want to eliminate the facade bump out, just keep it to scale with the units. Vice-Chairman Zepp asked what type of bump out they proposed. Mr. Van De Voorde stated that based on the size and scale of the units that it could be one to two feet. He stated that the plate height of the single-family units was ten foot. Mr. Van De Voorde stated that there would be an eight foot masonry wall and landscaping along Community Avenue and White Avenue; therefore, there would only be a two-foot gap where you possibly could see the bump-outs. He did not feel it was practical to have the bump-outs. Mr. Van De Voorde stated that there was landscaping proposed in the backyards and along the right-of-way that would further obscure that benefit. He stated that they were happy to accommodate the one to two feet; however, he did not feel that it would provide much benefit for those driving past this development.

Vice-Chairman Zepp asked to see the general layout of the proposed development. Mr. Van De Voorde explained the proposed layout. He stated that they incorporated single-story one-bedroom, two-bedroom, and three-bedroom units. Mr. Van De Voorde stated that they were not always able to make this configuration; however, that is where the flexibility in the site plan comes into play. He stated that residents choose their properties due to the privacy. Mr. Van De Voorde stated that their developments are very similar to single family residential developments. He stated that they would have a combination of garage, covered, and surface parking areas. Vice-

Chairman Zepp stated that this concept reminding him of older sections of Los Angeles, Hollywood Hills, and West Hollywood. He stated that this would be unique for McKinney.

Vice-Chairman Zepp stated that he could see the applicant's comment about only having about two feet visible between the eight-foot masonry wall and the ten-foot roofline where a bump-out could be seen. He did not have an issue with not having offsets in some of the units.

Commission Member Mantzey asked which units would require bump-outs. Ms. Pickett stated that it would be all of the units, regardless of where they located on the property. Commission Member Mantzey stated that the benefit of the offset would be there; however, just not at the same scale.

Commission Member Smith asked Staff to explain how the proposed development was not unique and Staff's recommendation of denial on the variance requests. Ms. Pickett stated that the proposed development was unique to the area; however, Staff was of the opinion that the actual design of the individual buildings was not unique. She stated that she would not discount the interior units needing offsets and using multiple materials creating depth and architectural interest.

Commission Member Smith asked if all of the proposed units were required to have an offset. Ms. Pickett stated that all units over 30 feet would be required to provide a full height facade offset, regardless of where they were facing. Vice-Chairman Zepp asked if that was primarily the duplex units. Ms. Pickett stated that the rear of the duplex units were currently not featuring any offsets. She stated that the proposed two-bedroom and three-bedroom units have offsets; however, they are not of the depth of what the Zoning Ordinance requires.

Chairman Cox asked Staff to go over the changes that had been agreed upon during the meeting. Ms. Pickett restated them.

On a motion by Vice-Chairman Zepp, seconded by Commission Member Cobbel, the Commission unanimously voted to recommend approval of the site plan with a variance to allow windows within 150 feet of single family residential property to face single family residential property, and approval of the façade plan with the conditions that they be revised to provide two-foot deep by four-foot wide offsets on the one-bedroom (duplex) units, provide an eight-foot tall solid masonry wall around the perimeter of the

property featuring 15% pattern brickwork, provide 100% masonry finishing materials on all elevations facing right-of-way and residential property, provide molding on all windows, provide shutters on all windows over two feet in width, and provide varied roof pitches among the buildings, with of vote of 6-0-0.

END OF THE REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS AND PUBLIC HEARINGS

16-249 Focus North Texas 6 Update

Commission Members Smith and Cobbel discussed what they found very helpful and informative from the Focus North Texas 6 training that some of the Commission Members attended. Copies of three of the Focus North Texas 6 training handouts were distributed to the Commission prior to the meeting.

Commission Member Smith stated that she also looks forward to the various topics presented by Staff at upcoming Work Sessions.

Chairman Cox thanked Staff for their hard work.

There being no further business, Chairman Cox declared the meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

BILL COX
Chairman