

Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes of January 28, 2020:

19-0072Z3 Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on a Request to Rezone the Subject Property from "AG" - Agricultural District, "PD" - Planned Development District and "REC" - Regional Employment Center Overlay District to "PD" - Planned Development District, to Allow for Multi-Family Residential and Commercial Uses and to Modify the Development Standards, Located 600 Feet South of Stonebridge Drive and on the East Side of Custer Road. Mr. David Soto, Planner I for the City of McKinney, explained the proposed rezoning request. He distributed a letter of opposition from the Stonebridge Ranch Community Associations, Inc. to the Commission prior to the meeting. Mr. Soto stated that the applicant was requesting to rezone the subject property generally to allow for commercial and multi-family residential uses. He stated that the applicant was asking to modify the height, density, screening requirements, parking, and landscaping requirements for the proposed multi-family residential uses. Mr. Soto explained the proposed exceptional qualities. He stated that while Staff appreciates the applicant's proposal and enhancements for the site, there were remaining concerns about the request. Mr. Soto stated that the proposed multi-family does not align with the placetype of Professional Campus, as designated by the 2040 Comprehensive Plan, which calls for office and employment uses that keep residents within the City. He stated that it also would provide a number of employment opportunities. Mr. Soto stated that Staff has concerns of introducing multi-family uses in this area, which could lessen the non-residential

development opportunities along Custer Road. He stated that given these factors, Staff was unable to support the proposed rezoning request. Mr. Soto explained that the written protest received in November was no longer valid since the applicant had modified the footprint of the proposed rezoning request; therefore, it no longer includes signatures from owners representing required 20 percent of property owners within 200 feet of the property. He offered to answer questions. Commission Member Kuykendall asked about how many property owners still qualified. Ms. Jennifer Arnold, Director of Planning for the City of McKinney, stated that there are approximately 10 – 11 property owners still within the qualifying boundary. Mr. Bob Roeder; Abernathy, Roeder, Boyd & Hullett, P.C.; 1700 Redbud Boulevard; Suite 300; McKinney, TX; explained the proposed rezoning request. He explained why he did not feel that this site was appropriate for a professional or corporate campus use. Mr. Roeder felt that the proposed multi-family residential development was the best alternative for the site. He explained that they were seeking a variance for the masonry columns on the screening fence along the north side of the property. Mr. Roeder stated that future development of adjoining sites were not an issue in this case. He requested a favorable recommendation on the proposed rezoning request and offered to answer questions. Alternate Commission Member Woodruff asked for the acreage of Tract A. Mr. Roeder stated that it was two acres. Commission Member Taylor asked how many units the proposed multi-family residential use might yield. Mr. Roeder stated that they were capping it at 22 units per acre, which he thought would be approximately 400 units. Alternate Commission Member Woodruff asked if they were proposing four stories.

Mr. Roeder stated that they were requesting four stories; however, they have a two-story maximum building height within 250' of the rear building line of the single family residents across the creek. He stated that he does not believe that they will need to build any two story units due to the setbacks being at least 300'. Alternate Commission Member Woodruff asked about the proposed parking for the multi-family residential development. Mr. Roeder stated that they would be meeting the City's standard parking requirements. Commission Member McCall asked if they plan to alter the creek area. Mr. Roeder stated that the creek area would pretty much stay the same. He discussed some of the proposed general improvements to the City Hike and Bike Trail in order to enhance the proposal. Commission Member McCall asked if they were proposing one entrance on Custer Road. Mr. Roeder stated that was correct. Chairman Cox opened the public hearing and called for comments. Mr. Rob Ahnemann, 3508 Butterfield Trail, McKinney, TX, felt there were currently too many apartments located near his residential community. He expressed concerns about decreased property values. Mr. Ahnemann worried that there could be more than 400 multi-family units built on the property. Mr. Bill Short, 3813 Cascades Drive, McKinney, TX, also expressed concerns about decreased property values. He questioned why apartments need to be built backing up to single family residential properties. Mr. Short stated that there were a lot of other areas in McKinney where the apartments could be built that would not impact residential properties. He stated that there were 1,648 available apartments in McKinney today, not counting the apartment complexes currently under construction. Mr. Short expressed concerns regarding

existing traffic on Custer Road. Mr. Joe Closs, 1104 Royal Oaks Drive, McKinney, TX, read the letter of opposition from the Stonebridge Ranch Community Association, Inc. that Mr. Soto distributed to the Commission prior to the meeting. The letter stated that these projects will bring additional traffic and noise to the area. It would disturb the neighborhoods of single-family homes to the east of the property. The proximity to these homes and to one of the main entrances to Stonebridge Ranch Community Association, Inc. is not acceptable nor in keeping with the goals of the master planned community. Appropriate zoning protects Stonebridge Ranch Community Association, Inc. as part of the hometown feel of McKinney. Mr. Josh White, 3525 Marquette Street, Dallas, TX, stated that this property had been listed for over three years. He stated that there had not been any interested expressed from an office developer during that time. Mr. White stated that there had been a lot of interest in developing the property for residential uses. He expressed why he felt the property was better suited for multi-family development. Mr. White discussed why JPI had been chosen for the project. On a motion by Vice-Chairman Mantzey, seconded by Commission Member McCall, the Commission unanimously voted to close the public hearing, with a vote of 7-0-0. Commission Member Taylor stated that the proposed property has a lot of challenges. He did not see a corporate style campus at this location. Commission Member Taylor stated that he was in support of the proposed rezoning request. Alternate Commission Member Woodruff stated that he felt some office uses might be able to be developed, he didn't see a major corporate campus at this site. Chairman Cox concurred with Commission Member Taylor and Alternate Commission Member Woodruff's comments.

Commission Member Kuykendall stated that she was not in support of the proposed rezoning request and that she agrees with Staff's recommendation for denial. Vice-Chairman Mantzey did not feel that this site would be developed as a corporate campus. He stated that you can't get much better of a buffer between single family residential development and apartments than having a creek and floodplain with hike and bike trails separating them. Vice-Chairman Mantzey stated that there is not direct access into the adjacent residential development. He stated that he was in support of the proposed rezoning request. Commission Member McCall concurred; however, expressed concerns about increased traffic and having one entrance onto Custer Road with the proposed multi-family development. He stated that there would be a nice buffer between the single family residential development and the proposed multi-family development with the creek, tree line, and setbacks. Commission Member McCall stated that he could not see a professional campus built at this site. Commission Member Kuykendall stated that the proposed development would have a major impact on the adjacent single family residential property owners. Alternate Commission Member Woodruff asked Staff to reiterate the major issues with the case. Ms. Jennifer Arnold, Director of Planning for the City of McKinney, stated that Staff does not have any major issues with the proposed development standards with a couple of exceptions. She stated that Staff's major issue was with the proposed use. Ms. Arnold stated that Staff agrees that a large professional campus at this location was highly unlikely; however, there were other commercial and office uses allowed within this placetype. She stated that Staff has concerns about locating multi-family development at this site. Alternate

Commission Member Woodruff stated that he could see office uses at this location. Chairman Cox expressed concerns about access off of Custer Road. Vice-Chairman Mantzey stated that he felt multi-family uses fit overall at this site. He stated that there are employees within McKinney that can't afford to live in McKinney. Vice-Chairman Mantzey stated that these would not be cheap apartments. On a motion by Vice-Chairman Mantzey, seconded by Commission Member McCall, the Commission voted to recommend approval of the proposed rezoning request as requested by the applicant, with a vote of 6-1-0. 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 February 4, 2020.