

Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes of March 28, 2017:

17-012SUP Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on a Specific Use Permit Request for a Mini-warehouse Facility (Public Storage), Located approximately 220 Feet North of Bois D' Arc Road and on the West Side of U.S. Highway 75 (Central Expressway)

Mr. Matt Robinson, Planning Manager for the City of McKinney, explained the proposed specific use permit to allow for a 133,739 square foot mini-warehouse facility (Public Storage) on approximately 3.07 acres. He stated that the zoning requires a specific use permit in order for a mini-warehouse to be operated on the property. Mr. Robinson stated that as part of the development standards for the specific use permit there were four requirements that must be satisfied. He stated that the four requirements were that no overhead bay doors or loading areas be visible from an adjacent use or public right-of-way; each building be covered with 100% masonry materials (brick or stone); proposed mini-warehouse buildings located directly adjacent to residential uses or zones be limited to a single story; and proposed mini-warehouse buildings located directly adjacent to single family residential uses or zones feature a pitched roof (minimum 4:12 slope). Mr. Robinson stated that the applicant has satisfied the first two standards; however, was requesting variances on the building height and roof pitch standards. He stated that the applicant has proposed a three-story building with a flat roof. Mr. Robinson stated that in addition to the waivers for these standards the applicant was requesting a waiver to the requirement of a 6' screening wall along the western property line adjacent to the single family residential uses due to environmental constraints associated with the creek. He stated that Staff has a number of concerns regarding the proposed specific

use permit. Mr. Robinson stated that the main concern was the development of a mini-warehouse facility along a major commercial corridor along U.S. Highway 75 (Central Expressway). He stated that Staff felt the subject property was better suited for more meaningful commercial development. Mr. Robinson stated that even though the property does not have immediate access via a U.S. Highway 75 (Central Expressway) ramp. He stated that this situation was not unique to this property; however, it exists throughout the City. Mr. Robinson stated that Staff had concerns regarding the building height, roof pitch, and screening. Mr. Robinson stated that the existing vegetation along the creek is deciduous and would not provide adequate screening to the residential uses to the west. He stated that Staff was recommending denial of the proposed specific use permit given all of these factors. Mr. Robinson offered to answer questions. There were none.

Mr. Maxwell Fisher, Masterplan, 900 Jackson Street, Dallas, TX, explained the proposed specific use permit and gave a PowerPoint presentation. He stated that Public Storage was established in 1972 and was the largest self-storage company in the U.S. Mr. Fischer stated that Public Storage was the highest rated real estate company in the U.S. He stated that Public Storage owns and operates all of their facilities through the life of the use. Mr. Fisher stated that it was an indicator of wealth when one of these facilities wants to come to your city. He stated that Staff had noted that there were 11 self-storage facilities within a three mile radius. Mr. Fisher stated that when you are driving many of the facilities were over three miles away. He stated that they did not consider many of the self-storage facilities on the east side of McKinney to be in their market area, since it serves a different area. Mr. Fischer stated that a lot of the existing self-storage facilities in McKinney are the old, first generation facilities that are smaller,

and do not have climate control. He stated that they feel there are five self-storage facilities that would be their competitors. Mr. Fischer stated that the area to the west was devoid of storage with only two options. He stated that the proposed self-storage facility would serve much of the residents and businesses located on the west side of U.S. Highway 75 (Central Expressway). Mr. Fischer discussed the supply and demand for the area. He felt that area could handle another self-storage facility. Mr. Fischer stated that the subject property was a destination tract and not an impulse tract, given its mid-block location. He stated that the subject property also has access challenges and described how visitors would need to exit the highway going either direction and do a U-turn to get to the property. Mr. Fischer stated that a lot of retailers would pass on this site because it was too far for their customers to go. He discussed some of the surrounding developments. Mr. Fischer stated that there were site challenges due to the irregular shape, grade change, utility and easement locations and that there was an erosion hazard setback at the back of the property. He stated that approximately one acre of the three acres of the property was unusable. Mr. Fischer stated that it would be difficult for retail to develop on the property. He stated that Public Storage could design their building to meet the site. Mr. Fischer stated that they did not feel that the site was residential adjacent, since there was an intervening parcel that was zoned residential, but that is actually a drainage parcel. He stated that there was a huge tree area. Mr. Fischer stated that the subject property was approximately 200' from the edge of the townhomes to the proposed self-storage building. He stated that there were a number of evergreen trees located between the two properties. Mr. Fischer stated that they proposed to plant additional trees on the subject property. He stated that the reason that they did not want

to do a screening wall was that it would be down in a ditch, which would not be allowed due to the drainage requirements. Mr. Fischer stated that they would be willing to build a screening wall next to the fire lane; however, they did not feel it was necessary given the distance to the residential uses. He stated that they felt the trees would be a better option. Mr. Fischer stated that they were proposing indoor storage. He stated that there would be no outside storage at the facility. Mr. Fischer stated that this would be one of the least intensive, quiet use options for this site. He stated that they would have basically eight to ten trips a day to the facility. Mr. Fischer stated that the customers would be unloading their items in a corridor and taking them up an elevator inside the building to their storage unit. He stated that customers typically do not visit their storage units that often. Mr. Fischer stated that they were proposing a flat roof on the self-storage building, which would have a lower profile. He stated that they did not feel that a gabled roof would be beneficial to the surrounding residential neighborhood due to the distance between them. Mr. Fischer stated that a gabled roof would increase the massing and height of the building. He stated that storage buildings typically were 11' per story. Mr. Fischer stated that the proposed use is a needed use in the community given the demand and high occupancy rates. He stated that it may not be as attractive or appealing as a restaurant or bar; however, it is definitely a use that is necessary. Mr. Fischer stated that the site was visible from the highway; however, it was not appropriate for impulse retail. He stated that the site would be difficult for other development. Mr. Fischer stated that the proposed use would have a low impact on traffic. He stated that the self-storage use would be a high tax generator. Mr. Fischer stated that the proposed self-storage facility would be

valued at approximately \$8,000,000 and would generate a lot of tax revenue. He offered to answer questions.

Commission Member McCall asked if there was only one entrance off of the access road. Mr. Fischer stated that the only access point that Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) would only allow the one access point off of the access road. He stated that they do have a cross access point through Care Now; however, this second access point would be for emergencies only.

Commission Member McCall asked if they were proposing to have 45 parking spaces. Mr. Fischer stated that they were proposing 25 parking spaces and were only required to provide 8 parking spaces. He discussed the amount of parking spaces required by other surrounding cities for this type of use.

Commission Member McCall wanted to clarify that they were proposing to build a three-story self-storage building on the subject property. Mr. Fischer stated that it would be three-stories and about 40' in height. He stated that it would have a parapet roof. Mr. Fischer stated that they were 200' away and on the highway. Mr. Fischer stated that they were not really different from a two to three-story office building.

Alternate Commission Member McReynolds asked if Cypress trees were evergreens and if they shed in the winter time. Mr. Fischer stated that they do shed in the winter. He stated that they would also be willing to plant Live Oak trees or another type of evergreen material instead of Cypress trees for the screening.

Vice-Chairman Zepp opened the public hearing and called for comments. There being none, on a motion by Commission Member Mantzey, seconded by Commission

Member Smith, the Commission unanimously voted to close the public hearing, with a vote of 7-0-0.

Commission Member Mantzey stated that it concerns him when you start looking at the availability of a certain product in a City and measuring whether as a whole we should allow something based on the number of competitors. He gave some examples of banks, drugstores, and many other businesses from being developed. Commission Member Mantzey stated that he knew that Staff's concerns were from feedback from the community regarding the amount of self-storage facilities being developed. He stated that he had been very open to other self-storage facilities along the way; however, he felt that self-storage had a place on hard tracts of land that are usually less prominent, had some barriers, were one-story, brick, and a transitional space. Commission Member Mantzey stated that he would be siding with Staff on this request.

Commission Member Kuykendall stated that she also agreed with Staff's recommendations and would not be supporting the request.

Alternate Commission Member McReynolds stated that he agreed with Commission Member Mantzey's comments. He stated that the City has other development ideas for the area and the proposed self-storage facility does not seem to fit with the aesthetic or preferred use for the area.

Vice-Chairman Zepp stated that there use to be another self-storage facility located north of Lake Forest. Commission Member McCall stated that it was still there.

Vice-Chairman Zepp stated that the subject property was in a very exposed area. He stated that it was a hard piece of property to develop with the grade in the back and only one access point off of the frontage road. Vice-Chairman Zepp stated that he was

reluctant to support another self-storage facility along U.S. Highway 75 (Central Expressway). He stated that it would be nice to have City Council direction on what they want the Planning and Zoning Commission to do with similar properties.

Commission Member McCall stated that he had concerns about the one entrance to the site. He also had concerns about it being three-stories, even though there was a buffer. Commission Member McCall stated that he would also be supporting Staff's recommendation for denial.

Commission Member Smith stated that she agreed with Staff's recommendation. She expressed concerns about the proposed building being three-stories and having a flat roof. Commission Member Smith did not feel that having public storage along U.S. Highway 75 (Central Expressway) was appropriate.

On a motion by Alternate Commission Member McReynolds, seconded by Commission Member Smith, the Commission unanimously voted to recommend denial of the proposed specific use permit as recommended by Staff, with a vote of 7-0-0.

Vice-Chairman Zepp stated that the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission will be forwarded to the City Council meeting on April 18, 2017.