

Joseph Moss

Subject: FW: 190077z Hardin Lakes Estates

From:
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 8:16 AM
To: Joseph Moss
Subject: 190077z Hardin Lakes Estates

Dear Mr. Moss,

I am writing to express my concerns about the proposed Hardin Lakes Estates development. My concern is the density, which is too high for the small area that would only have Sorrell Road for its residents to enter in and exit from. This would log jam all Sorrellwood Park residents of which I am one. I live at

Please work to lower the number of houses that can be built on the property. I also do not want a bike or walking path behind my house. Criminals could easily come through the park and gain access to my and my neighbors homes undetected. I was also promised a green belt lot when I purchased my home so removing trees to make a path is not acceptable in my opinion.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter. Please keep me posted on this issue. I never received the postcard that some of my neighbors received.

Sincerely,

Lori Breece

Joseph Moss

Subject: FW: Rezoning request for proposed Hardin Lake Estates

From: Frank Bures

Sent: Tuesday, September 10, 2019 11:09 AM

To: Scott Elliott

Cc: Joseph Moss

Subject: Rezoning request for proposed Hardin Lake Estates

Scott,

I oppose the Rezoning request for proposed Hardin Lake Estates for the following reasons:

1. The proposed zoning for smaller lots and homes will devalue my property in Hardin Lake.
2. Having an additional ninety (90) plus homes built on Sorrell road with the only exit being via Sorrell road will cause a traffic backup at Sorrell road and Hardin road. There is some back up now during peak times with traffic exiting the Sorrelwood and Hardin lake subdivisions. What will happen when the traffic back up happens with the proposed addition homes is the traffic will cut through the Hardin Lake neighborhood via Albany Dr. to Snyder to Piersall to the traffic light that is being installed now at Hardin road. I do not want cut through traffic coming through my street. I purchased my property feeling secure that it would not have any additional traffic other than neighborhood traffic.

In my opinion the proposed Hardin Lake Estates zoning change request from RS-84 to SF-5 allows for too much traffic for the two lane Sorrell road to properly accommodate.

Please contact me if you have question or would like any additional information.

Your full consideration in this matter is expected and would be appreciated.

Thank you,

Frank Bures

McKinney, TX 75072

Joseph Moss

Subject: Pending rezoning application for 30 acres of the Ragsdale Farm property just to the north and west of Hardin Lake

From: Tin Chan

Sent: Monday, September 9, 2019 3:52 PM

To: Joseph Moss

Subject: Pending rezoning application for 30 acres of the Ragsdale Farm property just to the north and west of Hardin Lake

The developer of this property is asking that the property which is currently zoned as RS-84, which requires minimum single family home lots to be 70'w X 110'd, to be rezoned to allow SF-5, which would allow for minimum size lots of 40' X 80'd, and SF-7.2, which would allow for minimum size lots of 50'w X 90'd. **This rezoning is unfair to all the homeowners of the Hardin Lake community**, who purchased their homes 5 years ago with no forewarned knowledge whatsoever that houses with lot sizes allowed under SF-5 would be built just north and west of Hardin Lake on the topographical high of this area of McKinney. If this this rezoning is allowed, it will definitely reduce the property values of homes in the Hardin Lake Community. If the developer is successful in this rezoning application, it might yet be embolden to further apply for rezoning to build houses on even smaller lots! I am sure McKinney's honorable city councillors will not allow a greedy developer to profit on the back of the Hardin Lake homeowners!

Sincerely,

Melissa Chan and Tin Chan

Joseph Moss

To: John Davis
Subject: RE: Zone Case 2019-0077

From: John Davis
Sent: Thursday, September 5, 2019 10:41 AM
To: Joseph Moss <jmoss@mckinneytexas.org>
Subject: Zone Case 2019-0077

We have just purchased a house in Sorrell Lake Park and were surprised at the plan to rezone the property adjacent to our development. I can honestly say we would not have purchased the property had we known that we were going to be encircled by 5,000 SF lots. Our lot is 7500 SF and it is as close to zero lot line as you would ever want to get. This will surely diminish the desirability of our neighborhood thus impacting the values.

We back up to Sorrell Circle. There are two one million dollar homes and as I understand it the plan is to rezone the lots between them into 5000 SF. That makes no sense. It destroys the continuity of the entire neighborhood.

I am opposed to the rezoning plan. It would be my preference that the zoning remain the same as it is today. I plan on attending the meeting on the 10th.

Thank you for your consideration.

Joseph Moss

Subject: FW: Ragsdale/Brown Re-Zoning Request

From: Bob Given

Sent: Sunday, September 8, 2019 10:47 AM

To: Joseph Moss

Subject: Ragsdale/Brown Re-Zoning Request

As a five year homeowner in Hardin Lake subdivision, I was pleased to learn about the original plan to subdivide Dr. Ragsdale's property into large lots having large homes. It would fit nicely into the Sorellwood and Hardin Lake subdivisions.

But now, we are all enraged by the recent request to re-zone into much smaller lots having much smaller homes. I suspect that a HUD grant has been made available to the developers which would allow for a way to maximize their gain at the expense of us local homeowners.

This is not a neighborhood that wants to see a subsidized housing development placed right in the middle of two very nice subdivisions. We have all seen this happen before and it has always caused existing home property values to drop significantly. No one wants to buy a home near subsidized government housing.

We will do everything we can to vigorously oppose any approval for this re-zoning request.

Bob & Judy Given

Joseph Moss

Subject: Rezoning near Hardin Lake

From: Scott Jones
Sent: Monday, September 9, 2019 8:22 PM
To: Joseph Moss
Cc: Patti Jones
Subject: Rezoning near Hardin Lake

Although we are not within 200 ft of the proposed rezoning of the Ragsdale property on Hardin Blvd, we oppose this rezoning. The reduction of lot sizes will reduce the property values in the area, which will have a detrimental effect on the property values in the Hardin Lake community. This change is not consistent with the surrounding area, which includes several communities with higher priced homes.

Again, just so we are crystal clear, we are vigorously opposed to this rezoning and ask you to disapprove it.

Winston S & Patricia M Jones

Joseph Moss

Subject: FW: Ragsdale Rezoning Request

From: Ellen Landrum

Sent: Tuesday, September 10, 2019 8:41 AM

To: Joseph Moss ; Scott Elliott

Cc: Molly McLeay

Subject: Ragsdale Rezoning Request

To All,

I live on Piersall Drive, Hardin Lake subdivision. It has come to my attention that there is a proposal for zoning change on Ragsdale's property. The rezoning proposal would allow much smaller lots/homes to be constructed. This will have a negative impact on existing home values in the surrounding area. My house is not within 200 feet of the Ragsdale property but my house value will undoubtedly negatively impacted also as I am located in the same Hardin Lake subdivision, Comp..

The subdivisions along Hardin Blvd. and Sorrell Road all have large lots with large homes. The city should **Not** approve this zoning change request considering the negative financial impact it will have. Please leave the current zoning as is. Making the requested change is unacceptable.

Regards,
Ellen Landrum

Hardin Lake

Jennifer Arnold

From: Michael Lestage
Sent: Wednesday, December 4, 2019 2:10 PM
To: Joseph Moss; Jennifer Arnold
Subject: Zoning Case 19-0077Z

My name is Michael Lestage. I live at _____ in the Hardin Lake Subdivision. My property backs up to the Ragsdale property within 200 feet. This communication is to notify you that I am in opposition of the rezoning of the Ragsdale property that is scheduled to be presented to the Planing and Zoning meeting on December 10, 2019.

Joseph Moss

Subject: Rezoning Request

From: Molly McLeay

Sent: Monday, September 9, 2019 2:15 PM

To: Joseph Moss

Subject: Rezoning Request

Hello Joe - I am a homeowner of the Hardin Lake community and directly backing up to the land parcel. I am within 200 feet and will be signing the protest documents regarding the rezoning to SF-5. I am also President of the Hardin Lake HOA and heard many many complaints about this rezoning.

Personally I was very annoyed with the short notice. I travel a fair amount for my job and was recently attending to the nightmare of my 87 and 89 year old parents readjusting to assisted living. It felt like this notice (delivered last Thursday) was trying to take advantage of us without any significant notice. Annual meetings require 30 day notice to homeowners for our HOA and this significant change should not be less. Apparently it is. From the notice delivery to the meeting is less than a week. This has angered many homeowners and made them suspect from the start..

Previously we had been approached and comfortable with the current zoning RS 84. . The SF-5 high density does tend to lower surrounding property values (which we really don't like since we have all invested a tremendous amounts in our homes) but more importantly, this design should consider endangering (a higher count of) future owners or tenants due to access. It makes no sense to put this kind of density in this particular land parcel. Land (with better access) is abundant in McKinney and would be prudently, conservatively located there. Access to this particular piece of land is challenging without ANY direct thoroughfares like Hardin-Virginia or University 380. First responders would be slowed winding through several streets and neighborhoods and could be delayed in reaching citizens. Homeowners should be advised but tenants might not be saavy enough to consider this. The city should protect this.

The SF-5 density change is totally unacceptable Very happy to see this land developed but it needs to well thought out and be on significantly larger tracts of land.

Molly McLeay

McKinney TX

McKinney, TX 75072
September 18, 2019

City of McKinney Planning & Zoning Commission
c/o Mr. Joseph Moss, Planner
222 N. Tennessee Street
McKinney, TX 75069

Re: Rezoning Case #19-0077Z

Dear Commission Members & Planning Staff:

As residents of the City of McKinney and as adjoining property owners with a clear view at the rear of our home of and to the property which is the subject of this rezoning case, we are writing to express our very strong objection to this requested property rezoning from "RS-84" to "SF 5."

First, it is helpful to remember the purposes for even having a zoning regime in the City of McKinney. It is manifestly NOT to ensure that a property owner maximizes just the property's sale or development values. It also is manifestly NOT to bail out a property owner that has previously "spun off" parts of its property over the years for economic benefit, but resulting in a residual property occupied for years as a bucolic estate but which, by the owner's own actions, has now been "painted into a corner" with only a narrow driveway remaining to connect it to the public roadway system.

As succinctly stated in Sec. 146-2 of the McKinney Code of Ordinances:

"It is the purpose of [these regulations] to lessen congestion in the streets; to secure safety from fire, panic, and other dangers; to promote health and the general welfare; to provide adequate light and air; to prevent overcrowding of land; to avoid undue concentration of population; to facilitate the adequate provision of transportation, water, sewerage, schools, parks, and other public requirements, all in accordance with the comprehensive urban plan for the city." [emphasis supplied]

It is impossible to see how this drastic rezoning of existing single-family residential property from RS-84 to SF 5 will truly serve these purposes as set forth in McKinney ordinances.

Below you will see a basic table to contrast just "as of right" features of the two zoning classifications, as set forth in city regulations, which includes a row showing dramatic reduction of lot size attributes should the requested rezoning be granted.

In making such a comparison, it is important to also remember that this case does NOT present a green field zoning matter involving semi-rural property where the "neighbors" consist mostly of cows, birds, snakes and bugs. The fact is that this specific property is situated in a core, established residential area of McKinney, and is already surrounded by SIX other residential subdivisions (Provine Farms Estates, Stonegate Phase #2, Eldorado Lakes, Sorrellwood Park, Sorrell Estates and Hardin Lake), (FIVE of which require minimum lot sizes of 7,200 s.f.).

Zoning	Individual Minimum Lot Area	Individual Minimum Lot Width	Individual Minimum Lot Depth	Minimum Front Yard Setback	Minimum Rear Yard Setback	Minimum Side Yard Setback (Interior Lots)	Minimum Side Yard Setback (Corner Lots)
<i>RS-84 (existing)</i>	<i>8,400 sq. ft.</i>	<i>70'</i>	<i>110'</i>	<i>25'</i>	<i>25'</i>	<i>10'</i>	<i>15'</i>
<i>SF-5 (requested)</i>	<i>5,000 sq. ft. (1)</i>	<i>40' (2)</i>	<i>80'</i>	<i>20' (3)</i>	<i>15' (4)</i>	<i>0' (5)</i>	<i>15' (4)</i>
<i>Reduction %</i>	<i>-40%</i>	<i>-43%</i>	<i>-27%</i>	<i>-20%</i>	<i>-40%</i>	<i>-100%</i>	<i>n/a</i>

COMPARISON OF AS OF RIGHT ZONING CHARACTERISTICS – CASE #19-0077Z

NOTES

- (1) The mean & median lot size for the neighborhood shall be a minimum of 7,200 square feet.
- (2) Garages that are accessed from the front of a lot with a width of less than 50 feet shall not be permitted. Garages for these lots (< 50' wide) shall be accessed via alleys adjacent to the rear of the lot. A driveway with a minimum depth of 20' shall be provided in front of the rear entry garage door.
- (3) A 10' encroachment zone shall be permitted between the building setback and the property line within which porches, patios, and similar structures may be constructed. For these purposes, porches and patios shall mean covered, open air recreation spaces which may or may not feature railing and/or low walls (~ 30" to 40" in height) to create a sense of enclosure. Covered, open air spaces that feature floor to ceiling walls with or without windows or other openings (e.g. sun rooms, sun porch, solarium, greenhouse) shall not constitute a porch or patio.
- (4) Rear or corner side-entry garages shall adhere to a 20' building setback in order to accommodate a 20' driveway between the garage door and the alley or street.
- (5) A minimum building separation of 10' shall be maintained between dwelling units. If a zero-lot line product is to be constructed, the desired zero lot line side of each lot indented to accommodate such a residential product shall be indicated on an approved records plat, minor plat, minor replat, or amending plat which shall be filed for record.

These are some specific objections (in no particular order of priority) to the proposed rezoning, offered in the context of the City's own statement of purposes of zoning itself:

- Rezoning to SF 5 could add, as a matter of right, substantially more than 100 new homes on a property that is today already zoned to accommodate 40% fewer single-family detached homes on minimum 70' (frontage) by 110' lots (depth) with a minimum overall lot area of 8,400 sq. ft.
 - How would this rezoning "lessen congestion in the streets" of today's existing residential neighborhood?
 - How would this rezoning help "to secure safety from fire, panic and other dangers"?
 - How would this rezoning help "to provide adequate light and air"?
 - How would this rezoning "prevent overcrowding of land"?
 - How would this rezoning "avoid undue concentration of population"?
 - How would this rezoning "facilitate the adequate provision of transportation, water, sewerage, schools, parks, and other public requirements"?
- Rezoning of lots already zoned RS-84 and previously sold by an affiliate of this owner to private individuals but now controlled by the owner or an affiliate apparently just to make SF 5 possible by converting a simple narrow driveway to a public street and converting two cul-de-sac single-family lots to a public street is an inappropriate use of City zoning power.
 - Specifically, 629 Sorrell (Ragsdale Addition, Block A, Lot 6), which is located facing Sorrell Road and, like the rest of Ragsdale Addition is already zoned RS-84, in no way should be included in any SF 5 rezoning since doing so would only work to provide the owner with the legal means to turn a driveway into a city street carrying hundreds of cars, trucks, construction vehicles, garbage trucks, recycling trucks and other traffic each day.
 - Similarly, the cul-de-sac lots located on Sorrell Circle (also Ragsdale Addition and zoned RS-84) should not be rezoned only to provide the owner a legal means to establish an ingress / egress roadway to a new SF 5 subdivision.
- Moreover, rezoning of the remaining open area in Ragsdale Addition to SF 5 would introduce a real risk of incompatible use by right of the property to construct a residential product on 40' wide lots, perhaps some with zero lot lines. This risk is amplified by the new state law (H.B. 2439, effective as of September 1, 2019) which prohibits local governments (such as the City) from establishing and/or enforcing residential or commercial architectural standards.
 - In effect, the outcome of the SF 5 zoning change combined with H.B.2439, could result in construction of quite small single-family homes on very small lots, perhaps including zero lot line structures, with outside architectural details and materials unlike all surrounding, existing residential neighborhoods.
- Needless to say, rezoning all or parts of Ragsdale Addition RS-84 lots facing Sorrell Road or Sorrell Circle to SF 5 would drastically affect those lots with substantial homes already built and valued on the City and Collin County tax rolls up to \$1.4 million.
- Similarly, the homeowners like me, along Albany Drive and Lockhart Drive, would be adjacent to such homes, if rezoned to SF 5 and built to minimum rights.
 - This would actually create street crowding on Sorrell Road, Albany Drive and Snyder Drive, cause much higher levels of noise, light pollution, vehicle pollution and destroy the bucolic nature of the area as well as further burden established public facilities such as public parks, fire and police coverage, water and other public services for the area.

All in all, a vote by the Planning & Zoning Commission to recommend City Council approval of this SF 5 rezoning request would hardly be a vote for consistency in zoning, evenly applied, consistent with the stated purposes by the City in establishing a zoning regime in the first place, and unworthy of the City of McKinney's public face – *"Unique by nature."*

We respectfully request that the City of McKinney Planning & Zoning Commission refuse to recommend this rezoning from RS-84 to SF 5 to City Council.

Sincerely yours,



G. Russell Mortenson



Beth A. Mortenson

Jennifer Arnold

From: diana owens
Sent: Wednesday, December 4, 2019 2:04 PM
To: Joseph Moss; Jennifer Arnold
Subject: Notice2-1202 Ragsdale Farm.

Good afternoon I would like to provide notice of our opposition to the proposed development and plan as proposed.

Thank you.
Joel & Diana Owens

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

Joseph Moss

Subject: FW: Reference Case 19-0077Z - Hardin Lakes Estates

From: Erik Simonsen
Sent: Tuesday, September 10, 2019 5:07 PM
To: Joseph Moss
Subject: Reference Case 19-0077Z - Hardin Lakes Estates

Sir,

Unfortunately neither my wife or I am available for the meeting tonight regarding the Hardin Lakes Estates re-zoning request. I would like to pass along my concerns from what I have been able to review.

1. Adequacy of the roads/planned roads for so much additional traffic. Sorrell Road does not seem to be designed for so much additional traffic, since it seems to be the only route for the new traffic to get on and off Hardin Blvd. Additionally there are already times where the traffic and parking can create congestion on Sorrell Road, and with some limited visibility over the rise I wonder if Sorrell can handle that congestion safely. Also the turn onto Hardin from Sorrell seems to be an awkward angle, where I have already observed some close passes between traffic. It seems with this additional traffic the number of hazardous events will increase at this intersection. Overall it seems like another route of travel is required from this neighborhood in order to handle the additional traffic safely.

2. Value of our property. This land appears to be shoehorned back between two neighborhoods and depending on design my property value could be reduced. If the developer does not integrate their' building in an attractive, integrated way with the other neighborhoods then our neighborhoods will look less attractive to future buyers. If privacy is reduced making my neighbors houses less appealing we will not be able to recover the lost value.

Overall I realize they will develop this land, however, I worry about traffic safety and congestion. Along with that I don't believe the developer is necessarily concerned about maintaining my homes value as part of their plan, so I want to ensure they integrate their development in an attractive and commensurate way. I appreciate your consideration.

Very Respectfully,
Erik and Julee Simonsen

McKinney, Texas 75072

Joseph Moss

Subject: FW: REQUEST FOR DELAY on Hardin Lake Estates approval for pending EIAs

From:

Sent: Wednesday, September 4, 2019 1:01 PM

To: Joseph Moss <jmoss@mckinneytexas.org>

Subject: Re: REQUEST FOR DELAY on Hardin Lake Estates approval for pending EIAs

Thank you for your response.

You may notice that Richard Ragsdale's previous bifurcations would now be categorized in the SF12, SF10, SF8 zoning code.

"Existing neighborhoods should be continued and promoted."

"Any infill development that occurs within this District should be consistent and/or compatible with the existing built conditions."

-- quotes from the Strategic Direction page of One McKinney 2040 masterplan.

The existing "neighborhood" of bifurcated premium lots Richard Ragsdale designed himself have anywhere from 300' to over 360' contiguous property boundaries to the proposed development. SF5 would unreasonably permit 7-8 homes to back up to a (currently valued) \$2M home with an almost 300' boundary. On our property, that shares 360' boundary, it would have the unacceptable view of 9-10 homes on SF5's 40' allowable width lots.

You can be assured none of the bifurcated lot owners were ever told there was going to be tract homes squeezed onto the Ragsdale Farm when we made our purchase and build decisions. We bought premium lots on the front of an estate.

Protect our neighborhood by rezoning to SF12, SF10, and SF8 lots.

Protect our wildlife habitats by saving the forested area as open space.

Either protect our property values or provide life of dwelling property tax abatements for the bifurcated lot owners.

Protect our air quality. Minimize noise and traffic. We are not anti-development. We are pro Neighborhood Integrity for the entire Ragsdale Addition/Farm/Hardin Lake Estates.

Respectfully,
Paul and Karen Sowards

Jennifer Arnold

From: Kathy Wright
Sent: Monday, December 2, 2019 7:55 AM
To: Joseph Moss; Jennifer Arnold
Subject: FW: Zoning case # 19-0077Z

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

FYI

*Katherine Wright
City of McKinney
Planning Department
221 N. Tennessee Street
McKinney, TX 75069
972-547-7409*

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/mckinneyplanningfeedback>

CITIZEN SELF SERVICE IS HERE!

A NEW WAY OF DOING BUSINESS

Click [Here](#) to Login to CSS

Click [Here](#) for Tutorials and Guidance



**CITY OF MCKINNEY
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

Together we'll make it happen.

From: Paul Sowards
Sent: Saturday, November 30, 2019 12:56 PM
To: Contact-Planning <Contact-Planning@mckinneytexas.org>
Subject: Zoning case # 19-0077Z

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed rezoning request listed above. I own the property just north of the proposed zoning change. When we purchased the property we were required to accept and abide by covenants governing our property and the surrounding properties as part of an HOA. Those covenants included the property (lot 6) located just north of us. The covenants and zoning were intended to protect the investment homeowners made in their residential properties. The proposed zoning change significantly modifies the nature of future development and violates the covenants that were in place when we purchased the property (lot 5) and other surrounding properties.

I request the developer be required to abide by the covenants and restrictions that have been in place for several years regarding lot 6.

The proposed zoning changes also raises significant questions for future traffic and access.

Paul A. Sowards

Joseph Moss

Subject: RE: 701 Sorrell Rd.

From: Catherine Stanford

Sent: Wednesday, September 4, 2019 2:00 PM

To: Joseph Moss <jmoss@mckinneytexas.org>

Subject: Re: 701 Sorrell Rd.

Thank you Joseph for your response. I realize that they are only applying for rezoning at this time and that there are no "formal" plans filed with the city, but we are also aware of some informal plans floating around. We disagree with the need to rezone at all given the minimum requirements for RS-84 UNLESS someone is looking to divide the property into smaller lots which we oppose. I am aware of other zoning options, SF12, SF10, and SF8, that are the more in line with the current zoning and would be more in line with adjacent properties.

Catherine Stanford

e

McKinney, TX 75072

Jennifer Arnold

From: Scott Jones
Sent: Thursday, December 5, 2019 11:38 AM
To: Joseph Moss
Cc: Jennifer Arnold
Subject: #19-0077Z

Dear Mr. Moss:

We object to the proposed zoning change #19-0077Z. This change would dramatically alter the nature of our neighborhood.

Winston S and Patricia M Jones