

## PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MAY 23, 2017

The Planning and Zoning Commission of the City of McKinney, Texas met in regular session in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Building on Tuesday, May 23, 2017 at 6:00 p.m.

City Council Present: Travis Ussery

Commission Members Present: Chairman Bill Cox, Vice-Chairman Eric Zepp, Brian Mantzey, Cam McCall, Pamela Smith, and Mark McReynolds - Alternate

Commission Member Absent: Janet Cobbel and Deanna Kuykendall

Staff Present: Director of Planning Brian Lockley, Planning Managers Samantha Pickett and Jennifer Arnold, Planner II Steven Doss, Planner 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 Vice-Chairman Zepp, seconded by Commission Member McCall, to approve the following two Consent items, with a vote of 6-0-0.

**17-545 Minutes of the Planning and Zoning Commission  
Regular Meeting of May 9, 2017**

**16-371GDP Consider/Discuss/Act on a General Development Plan  
for Honey Creek, Located on the Northwest Corner of  
F.M. 543 (Weston Road) and County Road 229**

### END OF CONSENT

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

**17-099SUP Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on a  
Specific Use Permit Request for a Personal Service  
(Pamper Me Salon Spa Studios), Located on the  
Southwest Corner of Collin McKinney Parkway and  
Piper Glen Road**

Ms. Melissa Spriegel, Planner I for the City of McKinney, explained the proposed specific use permit. She stated that the applicant was requesting a specific use permit to

allow a personal service (salon and spa) located in the Southern Hills Office Park. Ms. Spriegel stated that the applicant was requesting to operate the personal service use within one suite of the office park on the subject property. She stated that the specific use permit, if approved, would apply to the property as a whole. Ms. Spriegel stated that the properties located to the west and north of the subject property are zoned for similar retail uses. She stated that the properties to the east are zoned for office uses and a common area is located adjacent to single family residential uses. Ms. Spriegel stated that the property to the south is zoned for multi-family residential uses. She stated that Staff did not anticipate that this specific use permit request would have a negative impact on adjacent development. Ms. Spriegel stated that Staff recommends approval of the proposed specific use permit and offered to answer questions. There were none.

Ms. Melissa Ndubko, 8951 Collin McKinney Parkway # 504, McKinney, TX, stated that she purchased the unit and had it built to salon specifications. She gave a brief history of her dream to open a salon and stated that she had worked hard towards her goal.

Chairman Cox opened the public hearing and called for comments. There being none, on a motion by Vice-Chairman Zepp, seconded by Alternate Commission Member McReynolds, the Commission unanimously voted to close the public hearing and recommend approval of the proposed specific use permit as recommended by Staff, with a vote of 6-0-0.

Chairman Cox stated that the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission will be forwarded to the City Council meeting on June 20, 2017.

**16-389SP Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on a Site Plan for Restaurants and Retail Buildings (380 Crossing at Headington Heights), Located Approximately 975 Feet East of Hardin Boulevard and on the North Side of U.S. Highway 380 (University Drive)**

Ms. Samantha Pickett, Planning Manager for the City of McKinney, explained the proposed site plan request. She stated that the applicant is proposed a multi-tenant building for retail and restaurant uses on approximately 38 acres. Ms. Pickett stated that site plan could typically be approved by Staff; however, the applicant is requesting approval of two variances. She stated that the first request was to allow a living plant screen to be used as a screening device for the overhead doors and loading dock on the

north side of the building. Ms. Pickett stated that these docks are approximately 215' away from the single family residential development. She stated that there is a 6' tall masonry screening wall required along the property line and a 10' buffer that will feature trees (one tree per 40'). Ms. Pickett stated that Staff feels there is adequate screening. She stated that the second variance request was for the loading dock that faces towards a non-residential property (Costco) to the west. Ms. Pickett stated that there is a fire lane, so locating screening on the property in this location was not feasible. She stated that this loading dock would only be visible to the wall adjacent to the property and not from any adjacent right-of-way or nearby single family residential properties. Ms. Pickett stated that Staff recommends approval of both variance requests and offered to answer questions. There were none.

Mr. Carlos Cabré, 5117 Heather Court, Flower Mound, TX, explained the two variance requests. He stated that he was the Civil Engineering on the project. Mr. Cabré stated that the civil and landscaping for the project had already been approved by Staff. He offered to answer questions. There were none.

Chairman Cox opened the public hearing and called for comments. There being none, on a motion by Alternate Commission Member McReynolds, seconded by Commission Member McCall, the Commission unanimously voted to close the public hearing and approve the proposed site plan as recommended by Staff with the conditions listed in the Staff Report, with a vote of 6-0-0.

**17-127SUP Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on a Specific Use Permit Request for Indoor Commercial Amusement (Exit Plan), Located at 218 East Louisiana Street**

Mr. Brian Lockley, Director of Planning for the City of McKinney, explained the proposed specific use permit. He stated that the applicant is requesting a specific use permit in order to operate an escape room adventure business (Exit Plan) as an indoor commercial amusement at 218 E. Louisiana Street. Mr. Lockley stated that the zoning of the property was "MTC" – McKinney Town Center Zoning District that requires that a specific use permit be granted in order for an indoor commercial amusement to be operated on the subject property. He stated that the "MTC" – McKinney Town Center Zoning District was intended to implement the Town Center Master Plan, which calls for

pedestrian oriented, mixed-use, urban infill redevelopment, providing shopping, employment, housing, and business and personal services. Mr. Lockley stated that this is achieved by promoting an efficient, compact and walkable development pattern. He stated that the proposed indoor commercial amusement use would not affect the exterior of the building. Mr. Lockley stated that Staff recommended approval of the proposed specific use permit and offered to answer questions. There were none.

Mr. Elliott Collins, 2825 Summer Tree Lane, McKinney, TX, explained he was eager to get started on this proposed use and offered to answer questions.

Chairman Cox asked for clarification on an escape room. Mr. Collins stated that the participants go into a room, figure out riddles and clues that leads them into another room, and they do this until they make it through the whole course. He stated that they were not actually locked in where they could not exit if needed. Mr. Collins stated that it was a fun experience. He stated that his friend runs a similar business in Virginia that has been very successful.

Chairman Cox opened the public hearing and called for comments. There being none, on a motion by Commission Member Mantzey, seconded by Commission Member McCall, the Commission unanimously voted to close the public hearing and recommend approval of the proposed specific use permit as recommended by Staff, with a vote of 6-0-0.

Chairman Cox stated that the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission will be forwarded to the City Council meeting on June 6, 2017.

Chairman Cox stepped down on the following item # 17-092Z due to a possible conflict of interest.

Vice-Chairman Zepp continued the meeting.

**17-092Z      Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on a Request to Rezone the Subject Property from "RG 18" - General Residence District to "PD" - Planned Development District, for Multi-Family Residential Uses and Generally to Modify the Development Standards, Located at the Southeast Corner of Rockhill Road and North Brook Drive**

Mr. Brian Lockley, Director of Planning for the City of McKinney, stated that this was discussed during the Planning and Zoning Commission Work Session held prior to this meeting and that the applicant was present for that presentation. He requested that

the applicant make their presentation and the public hearing be held prior to Staff giving their recommendation.

Mr. Shea Kirkman, Kirkman Engineering, 4821 Merlot Avenue, Grapevine, TX, thanked Mr. Lockley and the Planning Staff for their assistance with this request. He stated that Staff stated in the Work Session earlier that they request the item be tabled to the next Planning and Zoning Commission meeting; however, they would like the request to move forward. Mr. Kirkman stated that the errors in the Staff Report were easily explained. He explained the proposed rezoning request and gave a presentation. Mr. Kirkman stated that this property was zoned for "RG-18" – General Residence District in 1984. He stated that it was currently entitled to 60 multi-family units on the property. Mr. Kirkman stated that due to its zoning from the 1980's, he felt that the 10% Multi-Family Policy requirement did not apply. He discussed the surrounding developments. Mr. Kirkman stated that they were asking for four items due to the constraints on the property. He stated that they were asking for a density increase from 60 units up to 72 units, a 6' wrought iron fence with masonry columns and landscaping on the eastern and southern property lines, the exterior windows to be oriented towards adjacent single family residential use and/or zoning, reduced setback requirements, and a waiver on the covered parking. Mr. Kirkman stated that they plan to take the traffic west out of the property and that they were not proposing any driveways to the north side of the property near the single family residential neighborhood. He stated that they had added some amenities. Mr. Kirkman stated that the site was only 280' deep. He stated that the proposed screening was less impactful to the site. Mr. Kirkman stated that the current vegetation on the property line was a wonderful screen. He stated that 150' setbacks would not allow them to develop on over half of the property. Mr. Kirkman stated that they were limited to a two-story structure. He stated that there was 36 required covered parking spaces; however, they were proposing to construct 55 covered parking spaces. Mr. Kirkman stated that in addition to the required standards, they proposed some site enhancements. He stated that there was a 50% masonry requirement; however, they propose to provide 100% masonry. Mr. Kirkman stated that two amenities were required; however, they proposed to provide three (business center, fitness center, and basketball court). He stated that they also plan to provide three minor architectural enhancements.

Mr. Kirkman stated that they were asking for four variances. He stated that he understood there was some surrounding neighborhood concerns. Mr. Kirkman offered to answer questions.

Alternate Commission Member McReynolds wanted to clarify that the proposed units would not be taller than two-story structure. Mr. Kirkman stated that was correct.

Vice-Chairman Zepp wanted to clarify that they were proposing to build at least the required amount of parking spaces for the development. Mr. Kirkman said yes; however, they did not have the room to build the garage or tandem concept. He stated that they proposed to construct extra covered parking spaces instead.

Commission Member Smith asked how many parking spaces per unit they proposed to build. Mr. Kirkman stated that 124 parking spaces were required and they proposed to build 128 parking spaces.

Commission Member Mantzey stated that they were talking about not having enough space on the property; however, they were asking for more units to be allowed under the current zoning. Mr. Kirkman stated that the current zoning allowed for 60 total units. He stated that when they designed the three pads that it came to 72 units. Commission Member Mantzey restated that there was a space limitation and they want to add more units. Mr. Kirkman stated that it was a density restriction that triggered the variance request.

Alternate Commission Member McReynolds wanted to clarify how many extra units that they were requesting for the project. Mr. Kirkman stated that they were 12 units over what was currently allowed on the property.

Commission Member McCall wanted to clarify that they were proposing four parking spaces over the requirement. Mr. Kirkman said yes.

Commission Member Mantzey asked how many parking units were required per unit. Mr. Kirkman stated that one parking space per unit and a half parking space per bedroom was required.

Mr. Lockley stated that then requirement was for a garage parking; however, the applicant was requesting covered parking spaces in lieu of garages.

Commission Member Smith asked if there would be adequate parking spaces for the proposed number of units. Mr. Lockley stated that there would be an adequate number of parking spaces.

Vice-Chairman Zepp opened the public hearing and called for comments.

The following residents spoke in opposition to the rezoning request.

Mr. Jeff Ellis, 2802 Rockhill Road, McKinney, TX, stated that he had lived there for 22 years. He stated that the applicant was asking for four variances, which seemed to state to him that the project did not fit on the property. Mr. Ellis asked where overflow parking would occur, if needed. He questioned if they would be parking in front of the residents houses. Mr. Ellis stated that no parking was permitted on North Brook Drive. He stated that Rockhill Road was a 1 ½ lane road. Mr. Ellis stated that he was the lessor to the property to the east of the subject property, which was currently a horse pasture. He stated that he had concerns about what happens during the construction process if his fence was damaged where his livestock would be free to roam. Mr. Ellis stated that this was a quiet, sleepy neighborhood. He stated that they understand that the property is zoned for multi-family uses; however, he did not feel that high density multi-family was the correct use for the property.

Mr. Gary Davis, 5121 Forest Lawn Drive, McKinney, TX, stated that his 81 year old mother lives at 2900 Rockhill Road and his sister lives at 2904 Rockhill Road. He stated that they were the only two houses that face the subject property. Mr. Davis stated that nobody wants to look out their front door to see dense multi-family housing. He stated that Rockhill Road is a lane and a half until you get to the top of the hill. Mr. Davis stated that the portion of Rockhill Road from Dogwood to Hwy. 75 (Central Expressway) is coming completely apart and cannot handle any more traffic. He expressed concerns about the proposed density, whether or not adequate parking was being provided, and possible parking on the streets. Mr. Davis stated that there was a lot of congestion on Rockhill Road already.

Mr. Michael Hann, 2720 Rockhill Road, McKinney, TX, stated that he had lived there for 21 years. He felt that they were proposing too dense of a plan. Mr. Hann stated that there was already a large apartment complex around the corner. He felt that the

residents of that apartment complex put a lot of pressure on the parks and streets. Mr. Hann stated that the proposed development would add more pressure.

Ms. Julie Chapin Ellis, 2802 Rockhill Road, McKinney, TX, stated that they built their house in 1996 and had lived there ever since then. She expressed concerns about the horses they have on the property to the east of the subject property. Ms. Ellis stated that they had previously kept their horses on another property where construction took place next to it and they had issues with the fence being taken down which caused them to round up their horses when they got out. She stated that there were some apartments approximately ¼ mile up the road. Ms. Ellis stated that she did not want to live by apartments. She stated that they have traffic issues and that her child could not ride a bike on their street. Ms. Ellis stated that was ridiculous for a suburban area. She stated that she appreciated the applicant proposing the driveway off the east side of the property and not directly across from their residential properties. Ms. Ellis stated that Rockhill Road was a very badly maintained road. She expressed concerns about the additional traffic this development would create. Ms. Ellis questioned whether or not there would be adequate parking available at the site. She stated that they already have issues with people using the park that also park in front of their houses. Ms. Ellis stated that they also have a problem with abandon vehicles in the area. She stated that there was nothing positive about the proposed development that will help her neighborhood. Ms. Ellis offered to answer questions. There were none.

Ms. Pamela Davis, 2900 Rockhill Road, McKinney, TX, turned in a speaker's card in opposition to the rezoning request and noted that she did not wish to speak during the meeting.

On a motion by Commission Member Mantzey, seconded by Commission Member Smith, the Commission voted to close the public hearing, with a vote of 5-0-1. Chairman Cox abstained.

Alternate Commission Member McReynolds asked for clarification on the 10% Multi-Family Policy requirement. Mr. Lockley stated that at the time the Multi-Family Policy was adopted in 2001, all of the sectors of the City were above the allotted 10%. He stated that the City recognizes the need for multi-family developments and that they serve a purpose. Mr. Lockley stated that the 10% in each sector was to create some



balance of multi-family developments in the City. He stated that this takes into account the amount of land that can be developed for multi-family uses. Mr. Lockley stated that the applicant can already develop multi-family to a certain density; however, they were requesting a higher density multi-family development that what is currently allowed on the subject property. He stated the addition units are what exceeds the Multi-Family Policy.

Commission Member Smith asked if the intent of the Multi-Family Policy was to make sure that the City was not overrun with multi-family at buildout. Mr. Lockley stated that was correct.

Vice-Chairman Zepp stated that the Comprehensive Plan and Future Land Use Plan (FLUP) were meant to be a guides and were not Zoning Ordinances. Mr. Lockley agreed.

Commission Member Smith wanted to clarify that what was being discussed was the Multi-Family Policy and not the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Lockley stated that was correct. He stated that the Comprehensive Plan is a vision for the City.

Commission Member McCall asked if the roads being affected by the proposed development would be improved. Mr. Lockley stated that it was based on the Thoroughfare Plan, which is a part of the Comprehensive Plan. He stated that if any improvements needed to take place during this development that would be part of the platting process.

Commission Member Mantzey stated that the site has challenges due to its size. He stated that he did not feel that he could recommend approval of the rezoning request for a site with size challenges and where they want to increase the density, which would create a bigger issue. Commission Member Mantzey stated that the property owners to the north would be the ones suffering if all of the variances were granted.

Alternate Commission Member McReynolds concurred with Commission Member Mantzey's comments. He stated that he was not in favor of increasing the density on the property. Alternate Commission Member McReynolds stated that if the 150' setback was enforced then it would render the property useless, so he did not have an issue with that variance. He stated that they should stick to the 6' masonry wall around the property line as required. Alternate Commission Member McReynolds stated that he was okay

with the proposed covered parking in lieu of garage parking. He stated that the property was zoned for multi-family uses; however, he did not feel that we should allow an increase in density there. Alternate Commission Member McReynolds stated that it was an extremely busy road.

Commission Member McCall concurred with Alternate Commission Member McReynolds's comments. He stated that it would be overcrowding this area. Commission Member McCall stated that Rockhill Road was a smaller road than average. He stated that is why he asked earlier when Staff would be looking into any street improvements necessary. Commission Member McCall questioned that there would be adequate parking provided. He stated that it just seems overcrowded to him and that he could not support the rezoning request at this time.

Commission Member Smith concurred with the previous three Commission Member's comments. She stated that she was not as concerned with the Comprehensive Plan, since it was a guide. Commission Member Smith stated that she understood about the Multi-Family Policy and recalled when it was created and its intent. She stated that the surrounding residential property owners were aware that the property is currently zoned for multi-family uses. Commission Member Smith stated that the residents have a reasonable expectation that this property would develop within the Multi-Family Policy.

Vice-Chairman Zepp asked Mr. Kirkman if the density was the main issue with this rezoning request. Mr. Kirkman said yes.

Vice-Chairman Zepp asked Mr. Kirkman about tabling the request. Mr. Kirkman stated that they wished to proceed if Staff's reasoning behind requesting the item be tabled was the errors in the Staff Report. He stated that they wanted to receive feedback from the public to hear their concerns. Mr. Kirkman stated that the feedback from the Commission was also helpful. He suggested tabling the item to allow them to review the comments on this request

On a motion by Commission Member Mantzey, seconded by Commission Member Smith, the Commission voted to table the item to the June 13, 2017 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting, with a vote of 5-0-1. Chairman Cox abstained.

Mr. Lockley stated that Staff will renote for the next meeting.

Chairman Cox returned to the meeting.

**17-039Z Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on a Request to Rezone the Subject Property from "RG 18" - General Residence District to "PD" - Planned Development District, for Multi-Family Residential Uses and Generally to Modify the Development Standards, Located at 1200 N. Tennessee Street**

Mr. Brian Lockley, Director of Planning for the City of McKinney, explained the proposed rezoning request. He stated that the property extends back to Hwy. 5 (McDonald Street). Mr. Lockley stated that the subject property was an existing McKinney Housing Authority development that they want to redevelop. He stated that they would follow the "MF-1" – Multiple Family Residential – Low Density District requirements with several special ordinance provisions that would define the property. He stated that they were proposing a maximum of 140 dwelling units, a maximum building height of three stories, modified building setbacks, and parking requirements. He stated that the Zoning Ordinance requires a level of exceptional quality or innovative design or development. Mr. Lockley stated that the applicant was proposing to increase the number of required amenities from three to five. He stated that among the proposed amenities is a centralized internal open space that is a minimum of one acre in size. Mr. Lockley stated that while Staff recognizes that the proposed rezoning is not in compliance with the City's Multi-Family Policy in regards to the number of new multi-family units, the rezoning request is intended to help redevelop an existing multi-family public housing development. He stated that in addition the rezoning request is in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan, which calls for medium density residential uses. Mr. Lockley stated that the proposed redevelopment would provide a lot more housing options and opportunities for people on the east side of McKinney. He stated that Staff has no objections and recommends approval of the proposed rezoning request. He offered to answer questions.

Alternate Commission Member McReynolds asked if the redevelopment would be for public housing. Mr. Lockley said yes.

Alternate Commission Member McReynolds asked about the difference in unit numbers between what is currently there and what is proposed. Mr. Lockley stated that they were proposing to build a maximum of 140 dwelling units. He suggested that the applicant state the current unit count during their presentation.

Commission Member McCall asked if this was under the 10% multi-family percentage requirement. Mr. Lockley stated that it exceeds 10% citywide.

Mr. Martin Sanchez, 2000 N. McDonald Street # 100, McKinney, TX, explained the proposed rezoning request. He gave a brief history of the Newson and Merit developments and discussed why they needed to be redeveloped. Mr. Sanchez stated that there were currently 86 units on the subject property. He stated that they were looking at developing approximately 136 units; however, that number could change a little. Mr. Sanchez stated that they were capping the unit number at 140. He stated that this would be considered urban redevelopment. Mr. Sanchez stated that they were proposing to build mostly two-story building and a few three-story buildings. He stated that enclosed parking did not make sense. Mr. Sanchez stated that the McKinney Housing Authority had a limited budget and there were on-site constraints. He stated that this would be a strong community that serves a need in McKinney. Mr. Sanchez stated that the use would not change; however, the living conditions and quality of life were certainly going to improve. He asked for a recommendation for approval and offered to answer questions.

Commission Member Smith asked if currently all units were occupied. Mr. Sanchez said yes.

Commission Member Smith asked where the current residents were going to live while the subject property was being redeveloped. Mr. Sanchez stated that they were relocated to other residential properties in McKinney until their unit was ready for them to move into and then they were relocated back into their community.

Commission Member Mantzey asked if there was a waiting list to move into these communities. Mr. Sanchez said yes.

Alternate Commission Member McReynolds asked for additional clarification on where the residents were relocated to during the transition. Mr. Sanchez stated that they were relocated all over the community in other multi-family facilities and for rent properties. Then they were relocated back after the new units were ready. He stated that they try to make it as seamless as possible. Mr. Sanchez stated that this is their neighborhood and they do not really want to go somewhere else; however, they are willing to do it for an improvement in the quality of life of improving the housing.

Commission Member McCall asked if the residents were aware that they will have to move out and then move back in. Mr. Sanchez said yes.

Commission Member Smith asked about the current amenities on the property. Mr. Sanchez stated that there was a community room; however, he did not consider it very much of an amenity. He stated that the McKinney Housing Authority Board meets there and the residents hold some social and teaching activities there.

Alternate Commission Member McReynolds asked about the new amenities for the proposed redevelopment. Mr. Sanchez stated that they plan to build playgrounds, outdoor park space, business center, and a fitness center inside the main structure.

Commission Member McCall asked about the fence currently around the property. Mr. Sanchez stated that there was currently a wrought iron fence with columns. He stated that screening would be addressed during the site plan phase of the project. Mr. Sanchez stated that it would be screened.

Commission Member Mantzey asked if most of the surrounding properties were light industrial. Mr. Sanchez said yes.

Vice-Chairman Zepp stated that if they were not able to increase the density on this property then they would probably have to purchase another property to address to need for affordable housing. Mr. Sanchez agreed.

Alternate Commission Member McReynolds asked about the Newsome project. Mr. Sanchez stated that they were very proud of the success of that community. He stated that Newsome originally had 64 units and the new development has 180 units. Mr. Sanchez stated that the same architect would be working on the proposed Merit redevelopment. Alternate Commission Member McReynolds stated that the Newsome development looks a lot nicer than before.

Chairman Cox opened the public hearing and called for comments.

Ms. Karen Burnside, 817 Inwood Drive, McKinney, TX, stated that they own a property to the south of the subject property. She stated that they were not against the request at all. Ms. Burnside expressed concerns about drainage and erosion issues at the creek. She stated that the creek area was eroding away. Ms. Burnside questioned whether or not the new taller buildings would cause addition drainage issues.

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 6-0-0.

Commission Member McCall asked Staff for their position on this request. Mr. Lockley stated that Staff was in favor of the request. He stated that if this is an urban development then the 10% requirement in the Multi-Family Policy would not apply. Mr. Lockley stated that this project can exceed 10% for this sector, since there needs to be a higher density in an urban area.

Commission Member Smith stated that she commends the work of the McKinney Housing Authority. She stated that there was definitely a need for more affordable housing. Commission Member Smith stated that this is an established neighborhood. She was in favor of increasing the opportunity for the demographic that this project would provide. Commission Member Smith stated that it would be a win-win all around. She stated that the residents would be proud of the new development. Commission Member Smith stated that the Newsome project was a benefit to the aesthetic appeal down Hwy. 5 (McDonald Street).

Vice-Chairman Zepp asked Mr. Sanchez to address Ms. Burnside's comments about drainage issues. Mr. Sanchez stated that the creek would be studied during the site plan process. He stated that they might have to detain water on-site to lessen the pressure on the creek. Mr. Sanchez stated that the City did reconstruct part of the failing creek, especially on the southern side of the creek. He stated that more needs to be done to the creek and that would be part of the civil engineering review of the project.

Commission Member Mantzey asked if their intent was not to push more water down the creek. Mr. Sanchez stated that they would try to lessen the pressure as much as they could.

Alternate Commission Member McReynolds stated that he was in favor of this project. He stated that he hoped the McKinney Housing Authority did everything that they could to maintain the new buildings and not allow the buildings get to a point later on where they need to be torn down due to disrepair. Alternate Commission Member McReynolds stated that he would like to see them maintain the structures to the same high quality for the life of the structures. He stated that Hwy. 5 (McDonald Street) needs

to get as much help as it can get aesthetically. Alternate Commission Member McReynolds stated that this would be a nice addition to the northern end of Hwy. 5 (McDonald Street) in McKinney.

Chairman Cox concurred with Alternate Commission Member McReynolds comments. He stated that Newsome and Merit have been an important part of this section of the City for a long time. Chairman Cox stated that he was excited about the proposed project that was very much needed in the community.

On a motion by Alternate Commission Member McReynolds, seconded by Vice-Chairman Zepp, the Commission unanimously voted to recommend approval of the proposed rezoning request as recommended by Staff, with a vote of 6-0-0.

Chairman Cox stated that the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission will be forwarded to the City Council meeting on June 20, 2017.

**17-107M     Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on  
the Semiannual Report with Respect to the Progress of  
the Capital Improvements Plan for Roadway and Utility  
Impact Fees**

Mr. Steven Doss, Planner II for the City of McKinney, explained the Semiannual Report with respect to the progress of the Capital Improvements Plan for Roadway and Utility Impact Fees as required by Chapter 395 of the Texas Local Government Code. He stated that Staff recommends filing of the Semiannual Report with respect to the progress of the Capital Improvements Plan for Roadway and Utility Impact Fees and offered to answer questions.

Vice-Chairman Zepp asked why the Roadway Impact Fees Fund Activity (FY 16-17) table included in the Staff Report had a large amount of available funds and did not show committed funds for future projects that were planned. Ms. Jennifer Arnold, Planning Manager for the City of McKinney, stated that the Engineering Department appropriates all of the Capital Improvement Plan project funding. She stated that roadway projects have to meet certain criteria to use those funds, so it is likely that the Engineering Department doesn't commit funds until they know if a future project is eligible. Ms. Arnold stated that the Engineering Department utilizes various sources of funding for roadway projects, not just impact fee revenues.

Vice-Chairman Zepp stated that we have the Northwest Sector that we are trying to develop that it might be advantageous to do some infrastructure improvements prior to development if we want to direct the way development goes. He briefly mentioned that State Highway 5 (McDonald Street) was an eyesore and the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) would probably love some money to help develop part of the road. Ms. Arnold stated that impact fee funds could only be used to add capacity and that aesthetic improvements or sidewalks were not impact fee eligible. She stated that roadway impact fees must be used on projects within the city limits.

Vice-Chairman Zepp asked if the roadway impact fee funds could be used within the Extraterritorial Jurisdiction (ETJ). Ms. Arnold said no. She stated that the utility impact fee only had one large service area and could be used in the Extraterritorial Jurisdiction (ETJ).

Commission Member Smith asked about projects listed for future years. Ms. Arnold briefly discussed the Stonebridge Lift Station project (# WW4359).

Commission Member Smith asked if future bond money was being earmarked for some of these projects. Ms. Arnold did not think so.

Commission Member Smith asked about the unused capacity of the last Capital Improvement Bond Program. Ms. Arnold suggested that the Engineering Department give a presentation at a future work session to discuss some of these items.

Alternate Commission Member McReynolds asked about the funds allocated towards the improvements of State Highway 5 (McDonald Street). He gave an example of something that Mr. Michael Quint, Executive Director of Development Services for the City of McKinney, had discussed with him where tax dollars were being put aside for the future improvements of State Highway 5 (McDonald Street). Ms. Arnold stated that what she thought Mr. Quint was referring to was the Tax Increment Reinvestment Zone (TIRZ). She stated that a lot of people call it a Tax Increment Financing (TIF) District. Ms. Arnold stated that in 2010 the City approved two Tax Increment Financing (TIF) Districts and briefly discussed how they work. She stated that the Engineering Department was working with Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) on the environmental assessment for the entire stretch of State Highway 5 (McDonald Street). Ms. Arnold stated that these funds were separate from the impact fee funds. She stated that she



was unsure that impact fee funds could ever be used on the reconstruction of State Highway 5 (McDonald Street).

Commission Member Smith asked about properties that were annexed in to the City if impact fees could be used at that time. Ms. Arnold stated that when properties are annexed into the City they pay proportionality fees in lieu of roadway impact fees. She stated that these fees are not impact fees.

Chairman Cox asked about the roadway project near the southern end of Airport Drive and if it was a connector for the future southern loop. Mr. Doss stated that section was punching Airport Drive through to the future FM 546. He stated that it would be a short stretch of road. Chairman Cox asked if Staff knew the timing of FM 546. Ms. Arnold said no. She stated that it would be a good idea to have Mr. Gary Graham from the Engineering Department give a presentation to go over the Capital Improvement Program and the status of current and planned infrastructure projects.

Chairman Cox opened the public hearing and called for comments. There being none, the Commission unanimously approved the motion by Commission Member McCall, seconded by Alternate Commission Member McReynolds, to close the public hearing and recommend filing of the Semiannual Report with respect to the progress of the Capital Improvements Plan for Roadway and Utility Impact Fees, with a vote of 6-0-0.

Chairman Cox stated that the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission will be forwarded to the City Council meeting of June 20, 2017.

**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 7:40 p.m.

---

BILL COX  
Chairman