

## PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

AUGUST 22, 2017

The Planning and Zoning Commission of the City of McKinney, Texas met in regular session in the Jack Hatchell Collin County Administration Building – Commissioners Court – 4<sup>th</sup> Floor at 2300 Bloomdale Road on Tuesday, August 22, 2017 at 6:00 p.m.

City Council Present: Charlie Philips

Commission Members Present: Chairman Bill Cox, Vice-Chairman Eric Zepp, Janet Cobbel, Deanna Kuykendall, Brian Mantzey, Pamela Smith, and Mark McReynolds  
- Alternate

Commission Member Absent: Cam McCall

Staff Present: Director of Planning Brian Lockley, Planning Manager Samantha Pickett, Planners Danielle Quintanilla and Melissa Spriegel, and Administrative Assistant Terri Ramey

There were approximately 30 guests present.

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

Chairman Cox continued the meeting with the Consent Items.

The Commission unanimously approved the motion by Commission Member Cobbel, seconded by Alternate Commission Member McReynolds, to approve the following Consent item, with a vote of 7-0-0.

**17-833 Minutes of the Planning and Zoning Commission  
Regular Meeting of August 8, 2017**

### **END OF CONSENT**

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

**17-200Z Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on a Request to Rezone the Subject Property from "AG" - Agricultural District and "CC" - Corridor Commercial Overlay District to "C2" - Local Commercial District and "CC" - Corridor Commercial Overlay District Located on the North Side of U.S. Highway 380 (University Drive) and on the East and West Sides of Walnut Grove Road**

Ms. Melissa Spriegel, Planner for the City of McKinney, distributed a letter of opposition to the request before explaining the proposed rezoning request. She stated that the applicant is requesting to rezone approximately 7.78 acres of land, generally for commercial uses. Ms. Spriegel stated that the proposed request is to rezone four lots, each approximately 1.9 acres, from "AG" – Agricultural District and "CC" – Corridor Commercial Overlay District to "C2" – Local Commercial District and "CC" Corridor Commercial Overlay District. She stated that the properties to the west and south are zoned for similar commercial uses, which is appropriate given the adjacency to a major regional highway (U.S. Highway 380). Ms. Spriegel stated that the subject property falls within the bounds of the Northwest Sector Study, which specifically notes that depths of 750 to 1,000 feet should be preserved for non-residential development along U.S. Highway 380 (University Drive). She stated that this allows for a buffer between the residential developments and the major right-of-way. She stated that given the growing development along the major regional highway and increase of non-residential uses in the area, it is Staff's professional opinion that the rezoning request is appropriate for the subject property and will help to develop this portion of the highway for regional commercial uses. Ms. Spriegel stated that Staff recommends approval of the proposed rezoning request and offered to answer questions.

Chairman Cox asked Staff to briefly discuss the Northwest Sector Study. Ms. Samantha Pickett, Planning Manager for the City of McKinney, stated that the study looked at the area north of U.S. Highway 380 (University Drive) and generally west of U.S. Highway 75 (Central Expressway). She stated that a lot of this area was undeveloped. Ms. Pickett stated that the study was looking at the potential for development prior to the City actually growing in this area. She stated that the study shows how we would like to see this area of the City develop in the future.

Mr. Ryan McIntosh, Trinity Partners Commercial Real Estate, 450 N. Kimball Ave., Southlake, TX, stated that they specialize in retail development. He stated that the subject property is just under eight acres. Mr. McIntosh stated that they feel with the increasing development of the U.S. Highway 380 Corridor in both McKinney and Prosper, that this area was well suited for commercial/retail development. He stated that the other corners of the U.S. Highway 380 (University Drive) and Custer Road intersection were

already developed for commercial uses. Mr. McIntosh stated that Lowe's and Kroger were located on the northwest corner of U.S. Highway 380 (University Drive) and Custer Road. He stated that Walmart was located on the southwest corner of the intersection. Mr. McIntosh stated that the southeast corner was zoned "PD" – Planned Development District with a larger commercial development planned. He stated that west of the subject property there were commercial businesses in place. Mr. McIntosh stated that at this time only Jason's Deli had already committed to be a tenant in the proposed development. He stated that they wanted to get the necessary zoning in place prior to going to market to obtain tenants for the development. Mr. McIntosh stated that they were confident that the demand for retail and restaurant in this area will be high. He stated that in the Northwest Sector Study, it is stated that this area should support commercial growth along the U.S. Highway 380 corridor. Mr. McIntosh stated that the proposed development would be a nice buffer between the residents to the north, U.S. Highway 380 traffic, and the other commercial developments in the area. He stated that the subject property had deed restrictions that only permitted single family residential uses. Mr. McIntosh stated that they spent the majority of the past six months working with the Walnut Grove subdivision to come up with a plan for development that they could agree upon and obtain the necessary votes to revise the deed restrictions. He stated that they had various meetings with the residents and had called all of the residents to discuss the project. Mr. McIntosh briefly discussed the agreement with the Walnut Grove subdivision. He stated that they committed to have an intense landscape presence at this project. Mr. McIntosh stated that approximately 15 feet south of the northern property line they plan to construct a 6-foot tall masonry screening wall on top of a 2-foot 4-inch earthen berm for a total height of 8 feet 4 inches. He stated that on the north side of the screening wall they plan to plant evergreen cedar trees, a minimum of 12 feet in height at time of planting and spaced 20 feet apart. Mr. McIntosh stated that on the south side of the masonry screening wall they plan to plant evergreen cedar trees, a minimum of 12 feet in height at time of planting and spaced 20 feet apart, in two rows, staggered, to create a thick screening presence. He stated that they have a planned storm water detention area on the site that will also be screened with additional landscaping. Mr. McIntosh stated that they also plan to provide excess screening on County Road 852. He stated that they plan to widen County Road

852 to a three lane to meet the City's code with two lanes of egress onto U.S. Highway 380 (University Drive) and one lane of ingress into the subdivision. Mr. McIntosh stated that they also agreed to create a subdivision entrance on the edges of the screening wall that front County Roads 852 and 856. He stated that they agreed not to construct any building larger than 50,000 square feet and no vertical parking structures. Mr. McIntosh stated that there would be a maintenance agreement stating that the property owners would be responsible for maintaining their property and a joint maintenance agreement to ensure all of the landscaping is maintained. He stated that there would also be an irrigation system installed for the landscaping. Mr. McIntosh stated that there would be a 30-foot wide landscaping buffer abutting the masonry screening wall and berm located along the northern property line. He stated that they also agreed to implement some use restrictions on the property that would otherwise be allowed in the "C2" – Local Commercial District. Mr. McIntosh stated that the property could not be used for any kind of automotive repair shop, car wash, tire shop, hotel or motel, funeral home or mortuary, halfway house, pet store, veterinary with outside runs, bus station, fuel center or gas station, radio/television broadcast studio, mini-warehouses, commercial amusement center, or theater. He stated that they tried to appease as many residents in the surrounding neighborhood as possible. Mr. McIntosh stated that 32 out of 45 homeowners in Walnut Grove neighborhood signed the document, which was filed at the County. He offered to answer questions.

Commission Member Smith stated that it sounded like they made a considerable effort to get citizen input and incorporated it into their plan. She asked if there were any items that were of concern to the citizens that they were not able to incorporate in the plan. Mr. McIntosh stated that almost everything they asked for they accommodated. He stated that there could have been requests that they were not able to accommodate due to being against City regulations. For example: Building a taller screening wall.

Chairman Cox opened the public hearing and called for comments.

Mr. Matt McDonald, 2124 County Road 852, McKinney, TX, stated that he lived at his home for 15 years. He stated that he lived adjacent to three of the properties being considered for rezoning. Mr. McDonald stated that he was opposed to the proposed rezoning request due to the intensity of the business activity that would be allowed under

the "C2" – Local Commercial District. He stated that his house was built 45 years ago. Mr. McDonald stated that Walnut Grove was a well-established residential neighborhood. He briefly stated that the McKinney Zoning Ordinance stated that "C2" – Local Commercial District was to provide for medium intensity commercial uses which are typically located near where arterial roads intersect with other arterial roads. Mr. McDonald stated that the subject property was not located at an intersection of two arterial roads. He stated that it was at the intersection of U.S. Highway 380 (University Drive) and County Road 852 (Walnut Grove Road). Mr. McDonald stated that County Road 852 was barely wide enough for two cars to pass on it. He stated that there was no center line or storm drains. Mr. McDonald stated that County Road 852 was lined with residential driveways. He did not feel that County Road 852 met the definition of an arterial road as listed in the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. McDonald stated that with the established residential development he did not feel that "C2" – Local Commercial District should be allowed at this location. He stated that he was opposed to any business that would allow an outdoor speaker or ringer. Mr. McDonald stated that drive-thru windows typically come with extended hours of operation. He expressed concerns about increased noise, high traffic, and a large parking lot near his property, which he felt was unreasonable. Mr. McDonald asked that the proposed rezoning request be denied and offered to answer questions.

Chairman Cox asked for clarification on the location on Mr. McDonald's property compared to the subject property. Mr. McDonald stated that he fronted County Road 852. Chairman Cox asked if he was in Walnut Grove 1 or 2. Mr. McDonald stated that he was in Walnut Grove 1. He stated that his property extended the full length of the subject property.

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

Mr. Mark Underwood, 7105 Round Hill Road, McKinney, TX, stated that his wife grew up in the Walnut Grove subdivision and still owns land there. He stated that the applicant for the proposed rezoning request had worked with the property owners to accommodate their requests. Mr. Underwood stated that they felt this was the best opportunity for a win-win situation for as many of the people being affected as possible. He requested that the proposed rezoning request be approved.

Ms. Cynthia Underwood, 7105 Round Hill Road, McKinney, TX, stated that she was in favor of the deed restrictions that were lifted. She stated that she would like to see the proposed commercial development on her land.

Ms. Lisa Walker Schaded, 5536 Caladium, Dallas, TX, stated that she was also in favor of commercial development on the subject property.

Mr. Harvey Graham, 2485 County Road 852, McKinney, TX, stated that he had been working with the developers for almost a year now. He stated that this was about the fourth developer that had looked at developing the property in the past several years. Mr. Graham stated that they would have preferred "C1" - Neighborhood Commercial District; however, ended up accepting the "C2" – Local Commercial District with the removal of certain uses. He stated that there were several points that they were not able to get resolved. Mr. Graham stated that over 60 percent of the residents approved the changes to the deed restrictions for the subject property. He stated that the developer had worked with their request for a berm and trees for a nice buffer. Mr. Graham stated that out of the four previous developers, this group had addressed more of the residential property owners' concerns. He stated that it had not been an easy negotiation back and forth with the developers and there were concessions on both sides. Mr. Graham stated that he supports the proposed rezoning request and he felt that over 60 percent of the Walnut Grove property owners also support it. He stated that the changes to the deed restrictions did not only affect these lots, but also the other lots nearby. Mr. Graham stated that they would have preferred to have seen residential development in this area; however, knew that was probably not going to happen on a busy highway. He stated that they decided to work with the developer to have some influence on the development, instead of just fighting them on it. Mr. Graham offered to answer questions. There were none.

The following three residents turned in speaker cards in favor of the request; however, did not wish to speak during the meeting.

- Barbara Brackeen, 2363 County Road 856, McKinney, TX
- Craig Reavis, 2159 County Road 852, McKinney, TX
- Whitney Wysong, 2256 County Road 856, McKinney, TX

On a motion by Vice-Chairman Zepp, seconded by Commission Member Smith, the Commission unanimously voted to close the public hearing, with a vote of 7-0-0.

Vice-Chairman Zepp asked Mr. McIntosh to address Mr. McDonald's concerns regarding a possible drive-thru business with outside speakers and late hours of operation at the site. Mr. McIntosh stated that he felt that technology has gotten to the point where speaker boxes are not very loud. He stated that there would be an approximate 80-foot buffer from the property line to where any paving or development starts. Mr. McIntosh stated that he felt the screening wall and the three rows of 12-foot evergreen cedar trees will help block noise from their project and noise from U.S. Highway 380 (University Drive). He stated that you can currently see a lot of these houses from U.S. Highway 380 (University Drive) and hear the highway traffic from the houses. Mr. McIntosh stated that what they plan should eliminate some of that noise.

Vice-Chairman Zepp asked how they intend to address any lighting issues that might shine on the other adjacent properties. Mr. McIntosh stated that they would follow the City's lighting ordinance.

Vice-Chairman Zepp asked what type of late hour uses might go in this development. Mr. McDonald stated that he could not say for sure. He stated that it was possible for a fast-food restaurant to go in that had late night hours.

Vice-Chairman Zepp asked if he might be willing to exclude a 24-hour fast food restaurant use from the development. Mr. McDonald stated no.

Chairman Cox asked Staff if a Specific Use Permit (SUP) would be required for a fast food restaurant use on the property and if it would require the Planning and Zoning Commission's approval. Ms. Spriegel stated that a restaurant with drive-thru window did not require a Specific Use Permit (SUP) in the "C2" – Local Commercial District.

Commission Member Cobbel asked about what the Comprehensive Plan showed for this area. Ms. Samantha Pickett, Planning Manager for the City of McKinney, stated that it reflects the use that was on the ground when the update was completed and not necessarily what you would see as proposed in the rest of the Comprehensive Plan.

Commission Member Kuykendall stated that she appreciated the developer working with the citizens.

Commission Member Smith stated that in this scenario she liked to hear that the applicant had made considerable effort to work with the neighboring community to address their concerns. She stated that it sounded like they had come to a consensus on various items. Commission Member Smith stated that it was reasonable to expect that property fronting U.S. Highway 380 (University Drive) would develop as commercial. She stated that with a neighboring residential community, especially like Walnut Grove, she expected to see the buffering enhancement that have been incorporated here. Commission Member Smith stated that it was good that the citizens had held out to work with each potential applicant wanting to develop this property to come up with something that the majority was comfortable with.

Vice-Chairman Zepp stated that as U.S. Highway 380 (University Drive) increases in intensity the proposed buffer will act to mitigate sound from the highway that they are probably already getting.

On a motion by Commission Member Cobbel, seconded by Alternate Commission Member McReynolds, the Commission unanimously voted to recommend approval of the proposed rezoning request as recommended by Staff, with a vote of 7-0-0.

Chairman Cox stated that the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission will be forwarded to the City Council meeting on September 19, 2017.

**17-202Z      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 "C1" - Neighborhood Commercial District, Located on the Northwest Corner of Collin McKinney Parkway and Village Park Drive**

Ms. Danielle Quintanilla, Planner I for the City of McKinney, explained the proposed rezoning request. She stated that the applicant is requesting to rezone approximately 2.4 acres of land from "PD" – Planned Development District and "REC" – Regional Employment Center Overlay District to "C1" – Neighborhood Commercial District, generally for low intensity commercial uses. Ms. Quintanilla stated that the governing "PD" – Planned Development District currently allows retail uses in an urban manner. She stated that the applicant had requested to develop in a suburban manner with the building towards the back of the property and parking in the front. Ms. Quintanilla stated that within the past year, there had been three rezoning requests to the "C1" –



Neighborhood Commercial District near the intersection of Lake Forest Drive and Collin McKinney Parkway. She stated that this intersection is located approximately 1,000 feet east of the subject property. Ms. Quintanilla stated that it was Staff's professional opinion that the rezoning request will remain compatible with the adjacent residential uses and will complement the future commercially planned uses. She stated that Staff recommends approval of the proposed rezoning request and offered to answer questions. There were none.

Mr. Byron Waddey, PE, 1919 S. Shiloh, Garland, TX, explained the proposed rezoning request. He briefly discussed some possible uses on the property. Mr. Waddey offered to answer questions. There were none.

Chairman Cox opened the public hearing and called for comments.

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

Mr. T.J. Nichols, 5004 Devon Drive, McKinney, TX, discussed the area surrounding the subject property being single family residential uses with common areas. He stated that the other commercial development approximately 1,000 feet east of the subject property was located on Lake Forest Drive. Mr. Nichols stated that it was not the same thing as going into the middle of their neighborhood. He stated that the proposed setback changes would have the buildings located close to the adjacent backyards. Mr. Nichols had concerns about increased traffic in the area. He stated that the applicant had not reached out to the neighbors to discuss the proposed development and address their concerns. Mr. Nichols stated that the neighbors that he had spoken to were not in favor of the proposed development of the property.

Mr. Antonio Ferreira Duarte Neto, 5013 Devon Drive, McKinney, TX, stated that he lived close to the corner. He had concerns regarding reducing rear setbacks that would allow commercial buildings to be located next to his backyard. Mr. Neto stated that he preferred to keep the current zoning on the property.

Mr. Mauricio Cardoso, 5017 Devon Drive, McKinney, TX, stated that he also lived adjacent to the subject property. He stated that he has the same concerns as Mr. Nichols about this proposed rezoning request. Mr. Cardoso expressed concerns about changing the setback on the subject property. He worried that it would allow the commercial building to be built right against his backyard. Mr. Cardoso stated that he has an iron

fence and a building that close could block the view and light that they are currently enjoying on their property. He worried that property value could decrease. Mr. Cardoso stated that the developer had not communicated what they planned to develop on the property.

Mr. John Keehler, 5012 Devon Drive, McKinney, TX, stated that there was no commercial development currently on Collin McKinney Parkway between Lake Forest Drive and Stacy Road. He stated that the proposed commercial development located 1,000 feet east of the subject property was located on Lake Forest Drive, which was a major road. Mr. Keehler stated that Collin McKinney Parkway was listed as a minor arterial road on the Comprehensive Plan. He stated that he did not feel that Collin McKinney Parkway currently qualified as a minor arterial and that it was all residential traffic on it. Mr. Keehler stated that there was very little cut through traffic from Lake Forest Drive or Stacy Road, primarily due to there being no stop lights. He stated that he jogged on that road on a regular basis and did not see that many vehicles. Mr. Keehler stated that there have been some maintenance issues with this property since it had been purchased. He questioned the long term viability of a commercial business, in particular retail, that is developed at this location due to the lack of traffic and other commercial development around it. Mr. Keehler stated that they had not received any outreach from the developer.

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 7-0-0.

Alternate Commission Member McReynolds asked about the vacant property directly to the north of the subject property. Ms. Quintanilla stated that property was a common area that was part of the Village Park subdivision. Alternate Commission Member McReynolds wanted to clarify that it was just part of the greenbelt there. Ms. Quintanilla said yes.

Vice-Chairman Zepp asked if the property across the road to the southeast was zoned for single family residential uses. Ms. Quintanilla stated that they rezoned that property to a "PD" – Planned Development District for single family residential uses called the Vineyards. She stated that Phase I of the Vineyards was currently under construction and was located southeast of the subject property.

Commission Member Mantzey asked if the subject property was currently zoned for commercial uses. Ms. Quintanilla said yes.

Commission Member Mantzey asked about the proposed setbacks. Ms. Quintanilla stated that for the "C1" – Neighborhood Commercial District there is a zero-foot rear yard setback. She stated that since the subject property is abutting residential developments on the north and west side of the property that they would be required to provide a 10-foot landscape buffer with trees planted every one per 40 linear feet as well as provide a six-foot tall screening wall.

Commission Member Mantzey wanted to clarify that under the current zoning on the property a screening wall would still be required and that the building would be further away from the property line. Ms. Quintanilla said yes. She stated that the current zoning allows for more intense uses on the property than the proposed "C1" – Neighborhood Commercial District allows.

Commission Member Smith asked about the setback and buffering requirements required on the property under the current zoning compared to the proposed zoning. Ms. Quintanilla stated that the current zoning has a 55-foot rear yard setback. She stated that they could not have a building within 55 feet of the rear yard property line; however, they could have parking and other infrastructure within that 55-foot distance. Ms. Quintanilla stated that the "C1" – Neighborhood Commercial District has a zero-foot rear yard setback.

Commission Member Mantzey and Cobble asked for the side yard setback. Ms. Quintanilla stated that for the proposed "C1" – Neighborhood Commercial District has a zero-foot side yard setback. She stated that a 10-foot landscape buffer would be required due to it being located next to a residential property.

Commission Member Smith asked how long the current zoning had been in place. Ms. Quintanilla said since 2002.

Commission Member Cobbel wanted to clarify that the area to the north was a common area for the subdivision and probably would not have any residential homes built on it. Ms. Quintanilla stated that was correct.

Commission Member Mantzey stated that he was disappointed that the developer did not speak with the surrounding residential property owners about this project. He

stated that if he felt the project affected people to the rear more than he would be against the proposed rezoning request.

Commission Member Smith stated that since the setback would be the same and the proposed rezoning would lessen the intensity of uses she felt it was more in favor of the surrounding residents.

Vice-Chairman Zepp suggested tabling the item and require the developer to discuss the proposed development with the surrounding residents. He stated that it may not change what the developer what to do on the property; however, it might help mitigate some of the surrounding property owner's questions about the proposed development.

Commission Member Kuykendall concurred with Vice-Chairman Zepp's suggestion. She stated that it was important that the applicant work with the residents to bring more understanding to what was being proposed for the property and allow them to weigh in. Commission Member Kuykendall stated that an open dialog between the developer and surrounding residents might remove some of the opposition to this request.

Alternate Commission Member McReynolds stated that he also concurred with Vice-Chairman Zepp and Commission Member Kuykendall's comments. He also wanted to see communication between the developer and the surrounding residents regarding the proposed development.

Chairman Cox stated that he did wish that the developer and surrounding property owners had some dialog about the proposed development on the subject property. He stated that there could still be time for dialog, since this item was scheduled to go before City Council on Tuesday, September 19, 2017 for final consideration. Chairman Cox stated that he would be in favor of approving the request.

Alternate Commission Member McReynolds asked about needing to ask the applicant how he felt about tabling the item.

On a motion by Commission Member Cobbel, seconded by Commission Member Mantzey, the Commission voted to recommend approval as recommended by Staff, with a vote of 5-2-0. Vice-Chairman Zepp and Commission Member Kuykendall voted against the motion.

Chairman Cox stated that the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission will be forwarded to the City Council meeting on September 19, 2017.

**17-203Z      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 "C1" - Neighborhood Commercial District, Located Approximately 265 Feet West of Lake Forest Drive and on the North Side of Collin McKinney Parkway**

Ms. Melissa Spriegel, Planner for the City of McKinney, explained the proposed rezoning request. She stated that the applicant was requesting to rezone approximately 0.72 acres of land from "PD" – Planned Development District and "REC" – Regional Employment Center Overlay District to "C1" – Neighborhood Commercial District, generally for commercial uses. Ms. Spriegel stated that the existing zoning currently allows for retail uses developed in an urban form with a greater rear yard setback to allow for parking in the rear of the lot. She stated that the applicant would like to develop in a suburban form with parking in the front of the lot and the building setback. Ms. Spriegel stated that in the last year two similar rezoning requests were submitted and approved for "C1" – Neighborhood Commercial District for the properties immediately to the east and west of the subject property. She stated that it was Staff's professional opinion that rezoning request would complement the adjacent properties and provide consistency among the developments at this location. Ms. Spriegel stated that Staff recommended approval of the proposed rezoning request and offered to answer questions. There were none.

Ms. Randi Rivera, 111 Hillside Drive, Lewisville, TX, explained the proposed rezoning request. She stated that it was a pleasure working with Staff. Ms. Rivera stated that they had also submitted the site plan for this development. She stated that the site plan entails two office buildings for medical and professional office uses. Ms. Rivera stated that each building was approximately 4,700 square feet and one story in height with pitched roofs. She stated that they felt this was an appropriate use for this area with other commercial uses adjacent to it. Ms. Rivera 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 Smith, the Commission unanimously voted to close the public hearing and recommend

approval of the proposed rezoning request as recommended by Staff, with a vote of 7-0-0.

Chairman Cox stated that the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission will be forwarded to the City Council meeting on September 19, 2017.

**17-208PFR Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on a Preliminary-Final Replat for Lots 1R2, 2R2, 4R2, 7R1 and 10, Block A, of the North Texas Athletic Center Addition, Located on the North Side of Henneman Way and East of Alma Road**

Ms. Danielle Quintanilla, Planner I for the City of McKinney, explained the proposed preliminary-final replat. She stated that the applicant was requesting to replat approximately 57 acres of land from four existing lots to create five total lots. Ms. Quintanilla stated that the preliminary-final replat meets all of the requirements of the Subdivision Ordinance. She stated that Staff recommends approval of the proposed preliminary-final replat as conditioned in the Staff Report. Ms. Quintanilla offered to answer questions. There were none.

Mr. Miles Prestemon, Craig Ranch, 6850 TPC Drive, McKinney, TX, explained the proposed preliminary-final replat. He stated that this would allow for the Dr. Pepper Stars Center expansion, which was recently approved by City Council. Mr. Prestemon stated that they were adding a third sheet of ice. He stated that it would also reconfigure the Michael Johnson Performance Center slightly. Mr. Prestemon stated that Michael Johnson had been a tenant in the building for the last ten years and is now purchasing the property. He stated that they were excited that the purchase will make it a permanent feature for the City. Mr. Prestemon requested approval of the proposed preliminary-final replat and offered to answer questions.

Commission Member Smith asked if Mr. Prestemon was in agreement with Staff's conditions listed in the Staff Report. Mr. Prestemon said yes.

Chairman Cox opened the public hearing and called for comments. There being none, on a motion of Commission Member Smith, seconded by Alternate Commission Member McReynolds, the Commission unanimously voted to close the public hearing and approved the preliminary-final replat request as conditioned in the Staff Report, with a vote of 7-0-0.

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

**END OF REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS AND PUBLIC HEARINGS**

Chairman Cox thanked Staff for their hard work.

There being no further business, Chairman Cox declared the meeting adjourned at 7:09 p.m.

---

BILL COX  
Chairman