

Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes of February 24, 2015:

15-025ME Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on a Meritorious Exception for Holiday Inn Express, Located Approximately 1,865 Feet East of Alma Road and on the South Side of Henneman Way

Ms. Eleana Galicia, Planner for the City of McKinney, stated that there was a typographical error in the case number listed on the agenda and in the packet for this item. The correct case number was 15-025ME and was noticed accordingly. She distributed a revised Staff report that revised the approval process listed. Ms. Galicia explained the proposed meritorious exception and Staff's concerns. She stated that Staff recommends denial of the proposed meritorious exception due to the lack of masonry exterior finishing materials used in the construction of the building. Ms. Galicia stated that the applicant submitted architectural renderings for informational purposes only.

Mr. Randy Hullett; Abernathy, Roeder, Boyd & Hullett, P.C.; 1700 Redbud Blvd.; McKinney, TX; explained the proposed meritorious exception. He stated that the applicant would like to use stucco and some cultured stone around the exterior of the proposed Holiday Inn Express. Mr. Hullett stated that the franchise usually dictates the materials to be used on the building. He stated that the franchise initially wanted to use EIFS (Exterior Insulation and Finish System) on the exterior; however, the owner persuaded them to approve stucco instead. Mr. Hullett stated that the franchise wanted a more contemporary look at this location to enhance the ability of this location to attract hotel guests, which he felt would benefit the City and the residents. He stated that it would be the first prototype of this design. Mr. Hullett stated that they were trying to

distinguish themselves from competing hotels. He did not feel that the use of the proposed exterior materials would have an adverse or negative impact on the surrounding property uses or property values. Mr. Hullett felt that the proposed structure would complement the surrounding properties and uses and would make a positive contribution to the existing structures that are already in place. He stated that stucco had been approved as a primary exterior material in other cases. Mr. Hullett felt that accepting alternate exterior materials, in the place of brick and stone, embraced adversity. He stated that at the time they filed this application, they were unaware that the City was considering updating the Architectural and Site Standards in the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Hullett stated that they were trying to comply with the current requirements. He requested that the Commission approve the proposed meritorious exception as presented.

Commission Member Gilmore asked for the percentage of masonry materials being proposed on the exterior of the building. Mr. Hullett stated that it was about 11% on the front and back elevations and about 27% on the side elevations of the building. Mr. Brandon Opiela, Planning Manager for the City of McKinney, stated that the percentages were calculated by elevation and not by the exterior walls. He stated that not all walls had masonry materials. Mr. Opiela stated that the proposed Architectural and Site Standards ordinance requires at least 25% masonry per elevation for four-story buildings; however, it also had some other requirements that must be met that are not in the current ordinance. He stated that this request would not meet the proposed Architectural and Site Standards ordinance.

Commission Member Stevens stated that Craig Ranch was a legacy to future McKinney residents. He briefly discussed an apartment complex that was approved with a stucco exterior. Commission Member Stevens stated that he would prefer to see this project have a higher percentage of masonry materials used on the exterior of the building, especially since it would be located in Craig Ranch. Mr. Hullett stated that they would have to go back to the franchise to see if they would approve a change in the exterior materials being used on the project.

Commission Member Stevens asked Mr. Hullett if he would consider tabling the request to allow them time to discuss increasing the amount of masonry materials being used on the exterior of the building with the franchise. Mr. Hullett stated that he would prefer to table the request versus it being recommended for denial. He felt it would not take much to increase the amount of masonry on the ends of the proposed building to increase the percentage to 25% masonry per elevation to meet the new ordinance regulations. Mr. Michael Quint, Director of Planning for the City of McKinney, stated that the new ordinance would have additional requirements that would also need to be met that the current ordinance does not require. He did not feel that the proposed request would meet all of the new ordinance requirements.

Chairman Franklin asked if this request was tabled to the next Planning and Zoning Commission meeting if it would still need to follow the current ordinance requirements or if it would then need to follow the proposed Architectural and Site Standards ordinance. Mr. Quint stated that the request could be tabled to the next Planning and Zoning Commission meeting and would still be under the current ordinance. He stated that the proposed Architectural and Site Standards ordinance

should be going to City Council for consideration on March 17, 2015. He stated that if they approve it, then the new ordinance would go into effect the following Monday.

Mr. Hullett asked for clarification on the percentage of masonry that the Commission Members preferred to see on this project. Chairman Franklin and Commission Member Gilmore stated that they preferred to see at least 25 % masonry used on each exterior of the building. Commission Member Kuykendall asked if there would be any other requirements that must be met. Mr. Quint stated that if the Commission wanted to see the project have 25% masonry per elevation, then it would not meet the current ordinance. He briefly explained that the current ordinance required 50% masonry per wall and the use of varying masonry to achieve the required 85 points. Mr. Quint stated that the new ordinance had other requirements not currently required, so the 25% masonry per elevation would not meet that ordinance either. Commission Member Stevens felt that a franchise would allow upgrades to a project. He stated that he would like to see the request tabled and the applicant come back with at least 50% masonry per elevation and other improvements to the project.

Commission Member Stevens asked if this project would be allowed under Craig Ranch's architectural standards. Mr. Hullett stated that he spoke with Mr. David Craig this afternoon and that Mr. Craig preferred stone on the exterior. He stated that Mr. Craig approved the proposed building as presented.

Commission Member Zepp stated that he preferred to see at least 50% masonry per elevation and suggested that the request be tabled to allow the applicant to discuss the situation with the franchise.

Alternate Commission Member McCall asked to clarify that if the request was tabled which ordinance version would need to be followed. Mr. Quint stated that it depended on which meeting the request came back before the Commission. He stated that if the request came back before the new ordinance became in effect, then it would still be under the current ordinance. Mr. Quint stated that if the request came back before the Commission after the new ordinance went into effect, then it would be under the new ordinance.

Chairman Franklin asked Mr. Hullett if he was okay with tabling the request. Mr. Hullett said yes.

Mr. Opiela asked to clarify that Commission Member Stevens preferred 50% masonry used per wall or elevation. Commission Member Stevens stated that he preferred 50% masonry per elevation.

Chairman Franklin opened the public hearing and called for comments. There being none, on a motion by Commission Member Zepp, seconded by Alternate Commission Member McCall, the Commission voted unanimously to continue the public hearing and table the proposed meritorious exception to the next Planning and Zoning Commission meeting scheduled for March 10, 2015, with a vote of 7-0-0.