

## **PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**APRIL 28, 2015**

The Planning and Zoning Commission of the City of McKinney, Texas met in regular session in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Building on April 28, 2015 at 6:00 p.m.

City Council Present: Mayor Pro Tem Travis Ussery and Don Day

Commission Members Present: Chairman Rick Franklin, Jim Gilmore, Deanna Kuykendall, Mark McReynolds, Dick Stevens, and Eric Zepp

Commission Members Absent: Vice-Chairman Matt Hilton and Alternate Cameron McCall

Staff Present: Assistant Director of Development Services Rick Leisner; Director of Planning Michael Quint; Planning Managers Brandon Opiela and Matt Robinson; Planner II Samantha Pickett; Planners Eleana Galicia and Aaron Bloxham; and Administrative Assistant Terri Ramey

There were approximately 45 guests present.

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

Chairperson Franklin explained the format and procedures of the meeting, as well as the role of the Commission. He announced that some of the items considered by the Commission on this date would be only heard by the Planning and Zoning Commission and others would be forwarded on to City Council. Chairperson Franklin stated that he would advise the audience if the case will go on to City Council or be heard only by the Planning and Zoning Commission. He stated that guests would need to limit their remarks to three minutes and speak only once. Chairperson Franklin explained that there is a timer located on the podium, and when one minute of the speaker's time is remaining, the light will switch from yellow to red and a buzzer will sound. He asked that everyone treat others with respect, be concise in all comments, and avoid over talking the issues.

Chairman Franklin continued the meeting with the Consent Items.

The Commission unanimously approved the motion by Commission Member Gilmore, seconded by Commission Member Zepp, to approve the following three Consent items with a vote of 6-0-0.

**15-411 Minutes of the Planning and Zoning Commission Regular Meeting of April 14, 2015**

**15-076CVP Consider/Discuss/Act on a Conveyance Plat for Lots 2R, 4, and 5, Block A, of The Heights at Westridge, Planning Area 12, Parcel 1209 Addition, Located on the Southwest Corner of Westridge Boulevard and Independence Parkway**

**15-063PF Consider/Discuss/Act on a Preliminary-Final Plat for 859 Single Family Residential Lots and 48 Common Areas (Auburn Hills), Located on the North Side of U.S. Highway 380 (University Drive), South of Wilmeth Road and on the East and West Sides of County Road 166**

**END OF CONSENT**

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

Chairman Franklin stepped down during the consideration of item # 15-060Z, due to a possible conflict of interest. Commission Member Stevens continued the meeting.

**15-060Z Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on a Request to Rezone the Subject Property from "PD" - Planned Development District to "PD" - Planned Development District, Generally to Modify the Development Standards, Generally Located at the Northern Terminus of Tremont Boulevard and along the Northern Side of Darrow Drive (REQUEST TO BE TABLED)**

Mr. Aaron Bloxham, Planner I for the City of McKinney, explained that Staff recommends that the public hearing be continued and the item be tabled to the May 12, 2015 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting per the applicant's request.

Commission Member Stevens opened the public hearing and called for comments. There being none, on a motion by Commission Member Zepp, seconded by Commission Member McReynolds, the Commission voted to continue the public hearing and table the proposed rezoning request to the May 12, 2015 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting as recommended by Staff, with a vote of 5-0-1. Chairman Franklin abstained.

Chairman Franklin returned to the meeting.

**15-065MRP Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on a Minor Replat for Lots 1 and 2, Block A, of the Winteg-Douglas Addition, Located Approximately 100 Feet North of Christian Street and on the West Side of Kentucky Street (REQUEST TO BE TABLED)**

Mr. Aaron Bloxham, Planner I for the City of McKinney, explained that Staff recommends that the public hearing be closed and the item be tabled indefinitely per the applicant's request.

Chairman Franklin opened the public hearing and called for comments. There being none, on a motion by Commission Member Gilmore, seconded by Commission Member Kuykendall, the Commission voted unanimously to close the public hearing and table the proposed rezoning request indefinitely as recommended by Staff, with a vote of 6-0-0.

**14-347Z Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on a Request to Rezone the Subject Property from "AG" - Agricultural District, "REC" - Regional Employment Center Overlay District and "CC" - Corridor Commercial Overlay District to "PD" - Planned Development District, "REC" - Regional Employment Center Overlay District and "CC" - Corridor Commercial Overlay District, Generally to Allow for Single Family Residential Uses, Located Approximately 325 Feet East of Stacy Road and on the South Side of Future Collin McKinney Parkway**

Ms. Samantha Pickett, Planner II for the City of McKinney, explained the proposed rezoning request. She stated that Staff recommended approval of the proposed rezoning request.

Commission Member Stevens asked if the applicant was in agreement to the special ordinance provisions listed in the Staff report. Ms. Pickett said yes.

Commission Member Gilmore asked if this request included the hard corner at Stacy Road and Collin McKinney Parkway. Ms. Pickett said no.

Commission Member Zepp asked if this request was in the Tollway Commercial area on the proposed FLUP changes. Mr. Brandon Opiela, Planning Manager for the City of McKinney, said yes. Commission Member Zepp asked what percentage of the acreage that would represent. Mr. Opiela stated that it would be about 2.5%.

Mr. Levi Wild, Sanchez and Associates, 402 N. Tennessee Street, McKinney, TX, concurred with the Staff report and offered to answer questions.

Chairman Franklin opened the public hearing and called for comments. There being none, on a motion by Commission Member Stevens, seconded by Commission

Member McReynolds, the Commission voted unanimously to close the public hearing and recommend approval of the proposed rezoning request as recommended in the Staff report, with a vote of 6-0-0.

Chairman Franklin stated that the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission will be forwarded to the City Council meeting on May 19, 2015.

**15-066Z      Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on a Request to Rezone the Subject Property from "AG" - Agricultural District to "PD" - Planned Development District, to Allow for Commercial, Single Family Detached Residential, Single Family Attached Residential and Industrial Uses, Located on the Southwest Corner of Bloomdale Road and State Highway 5 (McDonald Street)**

Ms. Eleana Galicia, Planner I for the City of McKinney, explained the proposed rezoning request. She stated that the applicant was requesting to rezone approximately 112.91 acres from "AG" Agricultural District to "PD" Planned Development District generally to allow for commercial uses (approximately 11.22 acres), single family attached residential uses (approximately 9.66 acres), single family detached residential uses (approximately 80.33 acres), and industrial uses (approximately 11.32 acres). Ms. Galicia stated that more specifically the applicant was requesting that the property develop according to the rules and regulations of Section 146-106 "SF5" - Single Family Residential District, Section 146-112 "C2" - Local Commercial District, Section 146-108 "TH" - Townhome Residential District, and Section 146-114 "LI" - Light Industrial District of the Zoning Ordinance and as amended. She stated that the applicant had provided a zoning exhibit indicating where each of the proposed land uses will be situated on the property and had also provided architectural standards for the "SF5" - Single Family Residential District portion of the property that the applicant believed would ensure that an exceptional quality residential product would be built. Ms. Galicia stated that Staff was not opposed to the request of the architectural standards, so that was not a determining factor in Staff's recommendation. She stated that the Future Land Use Plan (FLUP) designates the subject property for industrial use. Ms. Galicia stated that the applicant had proposed approximately 11.32 acres for industrial uses directly south to the proposed single family detached residential uses. She stated that Staff does not feel that these two designations are compatible with one another and was of the opinion

that the industrial uses, in such close proximity to the residential uses, would negatively impact the quality of life for future residents within the subdivision. Ms. Galicia stated that Staff was not in support of the industrial uses in such close proximity to residential uses and vice versa. She stated that if the proposed rezoning request was approved and the subject property was rezoned to allow single family residential uses, the land located in close proximity to the property would likely no longer be ideal for industrial uses, as it was currently designated on the Future Land Use Plan (FLUP). Ms. Galicia stated that the subject property was served by a number of major arterial roadways which would be ideal for industrial uses. She stated that Staff recommended denial of the proposed rezoning request due to a lack of conformance with the Comprehensive Plan.

Chairman Franklin questioned if the property was shown for heavy industrial uses on the Future Land Use Plan (FLUP) as mentioned by Ms. Galicia. Mr. Quint stated that the Future Land Use Plan (FLUP) did not specify it would be heavy or light industrial uses.

Commission Member Stevens asked Staff where the Fire Administration Training Facilities would be located. Mr. Quint was not sure that the location had been confirmed yet.

Mr. Robert Roeder; Abernathy, Roeder, Boyd & Joplin, P.C.; 1700 Redbud, McKinney, TX, explained the proposed rezoning request. He stated that the property was currently zoned "AG" – Agricultural District. Mr. Roeder stated that this property was not being proposed to be zoned down to a lower zoning category. He briefly discussed some of the uses and zoning on the surround properties. Mr. Roeder stated that there were some residential properties adjacent to this location. He stated that this location was shown for industrial uses on the Future Land Use Plan (FLUP); however, he did not feel that was the best use for the property. He did not feel that every use in the purple area of the Future Land Use Plan (FLUP) needed to be industrial. Mr. Roeder stated that there was room within this area for a bunch of different uses and that perhaps industrial uses in this location was not the highest and best use of the property. He stated that industrial uses require a major road system. He stated that US Highway 75 (Central Expressway) was a major north-south road system and he felt that Wilmeth

Road would be a major east-west road system in McKinney. Mr. Roeder stated that there were already heavy commercial and industrial uses along both sides of Wilmeth Road. He stated that there was an underpass, protected turns, and a fueling station located at the intersection at US Highway 75 (Central Expressway) and Wilmeth Road. Mr. Roeder felt that Bloomdale Road would not be a major transportation artery. He stated that there was residential on the north side of Bloomdale Road and an elementary school, which needed to be protected. Mr. Roeder stated that the intersection at US Highway 75 (Central Expressway) and Bloomdale Road was congested with traffic from the Collin Council Courthouse and would not be appropriate for large truck traffic. He felt that a commercial corner at the intersection at State Highway 5 (McDonald Street), Bloomdale Road, and the spill in of Farm-to-Market (FM) 543 was appropriate and was included in this request. Mr. Roeder felt that most of the customers for this commercial corner would come from the surround residents. He felt that residential uses were appropriate in the northeast corner of McKinney as long as it was done correctly. Mr. Roeder stated that the economic return to the City would be better with residential uses verses industrial uses on the property. He stated that Collin County was one of the largest employers in the City of McKinney; therefore, it made sense to have residential properties located near it. Mr. Roeder felt that McKinney had already developed a lot of industrial properties. He stated that Bray Central still had about 40% of its property that had not been developed yet and was in the better location than the property along Bloomdale. Mr. Roeder also gave the example of the Headington tract, located near Raython, not being used. He stated that the City's desire to protect this proposed area for industrial uses was overreaching, since there was plenty of industrial properties not being used in McKinney. Mr. Roeder briefly discussed the retail corner planned at the intersection of Bloomdale Road, Farm-to-Market (FM) 543, and State Highway 5 (McDonald Street); about 10 acres of townhomes planned behind the retail area to act as a buffer between the retail and single family residential uses; single family residential; and light industrial uses on the southern end of the property. He felt that with the light industrial planned on this property that the future single family residential property owners would not be able to block any additional industrial uses from going in on the property to the south of this location. Mr. Roeder

stated that there was a tree mass along the property line and an easement to protect these 30 – 40 feet tall trees.

Mr. Scott Polikov, Gateway Planning Group, 3100 McKinnon Street, Dallas, TX, briefly discussed the proposed land plan for the development and how they came up with this layout. He briefly explained what they plan to build for the residential portions and open spaces on the property. Mr. Polikov stated that they thought quality was more important than quantity. He stated that a lot of what was going on State Highway 5 (McDonald Street) was over zoned. Mr. Polikov stated that the proposed development would be a very substantial mixed-use retail center at Farm-to-Market (FM) 543 and US Highway 75 (Central Expressway). He stated that the residential portion of the development would be an extension of the 543 corridor. Mr. Polikov reiterated Mr. Roeder's earlier comments about the proposed mixed-use development creating a better tax base for the City versus an industrial use on the property. He briefly discussed the Northwest Sector Study and felt this project was a continuation of these goals.

Commission Member Stevens asked how the McKinney Independent School District (MISD) felt about this proposed residential development. Mr. Thad Helsley, AM Scott Insurance, 1650 W. Virginia Street, McKinney, TX, felt that Press Elementary School could handle the additional school children that would come from this development. He briefly discussed the future school planned for Timber Creek. Mr. Helsley stated that he had spoken with the McKinney Independent School District (MISD) about this proposed development and they preferred to have residential uses near the school.

Commission Member Gilmore stated that similar requests had been presented twice before and had been denied each time of City Council. He asked what was different with this request. Mr. Roeder stated in the previous cases developers requested to building straight residential houses on the property without regard to buffering the property to the surrounding properties and did not include a commercial corner at the intersection. He stated that the City had an excess of similar properties that were not being used. Mr. Roeder felt that they would receive a different response from City Council with this request.

Chairman Franklin opened the public hearing and called for comments.

Mr. Jamal Talukder, 600 W. McDermott Drive, Allen, TX, stated that he owned the property adjacent to the proposed property. He stated that he planned to build a residential development on this property. Mr. Talukder stated that he was in favor of the request.

Chairperson Franklin read the following name and address that turned in a Speaker's card; however, did not wish to speak during the meeting:

- Mr. Rob Parsons, 1700 McKinnon Drive, Dallas, TX, was in support of this request.

On a motion by Commission Member Stevens, seconded by Commission Member McReynolds, the Commission voted unanimously to close the public hearing, with a vote of 6-0-0.

Commission Member Stevens stated that he saw this development as a real advantage for the McKinney Independent School District (MISD) and the school children. He felt that we needed more residential development in this area and the retail corner at that intersection. Commission Member Stevens stated that he usually was not in favor of losing commercial property for residential uses unless there were circumstances that outweigh it and he felt that this request did that. Commission Member Stevens stated that he was in favor of this request.

Chairman Franklin stated that he was in favor of the two previous requests and this request was a much better plan. He stated that this request had been well thought out. Chairman Franklin stated that most of the industrial in that area of McKinney was for distribution and would not be good next to residential uses. He felt having large trucks driving down Bloomdale Road near the elementary school would be a dangerous situation. Chairman Franklin stated that providing the light industrial on the southern portion of the property created a natural buffer.

Commission Member McReynolds also expressed traffic concerns with possibly having large trucks driving down Bloomdale Road and near Press Elementary school. He stated that he had two children that had attended Press Elementary. Commission Member McReynolds spoke in favor of the request and having mixed-uses on the property.



Commission Member Kuykendall asked Staff if rezoning this property could cause a domino effect. Mr. Quint stated that some of the surrounding properties that are currently used for residential uses are actually zoned for commercial uses. He stated that Staff's concern was the surrounding properties would then request to be rezoned for residential uses. Mr. Quint stated that Staff wished to preserve these non-residential areas. He stated that the recent Northwest Sector Study showed the general area for future business park areas.

Commission Member Steven asked to clarify where the potential location for the business park was called for in the Northwest Sector Study. Mr. Quint stated that the Northwest Sector Study Phase I Report called for a business park to be located east of US Highway 75 (Central Expressway) and south of Bloomdale Road as an ideal location to capitalize on the surrounding large employment centers.

Commission Member Gilmore stated that it appeared to be a great development; however, he felt it was located in the wrong area of McKinney. He did not feel that this property should be rezoned for residential uses, since it could kill the development of commercial properties around it called for in the Future Land Use Plan (FLUP). Commission Member Gilmore stated that similar residential developments for this property had failed twice before.

Commission Member Stevens stated that he did not feel that this rezoning request would affect the commercial development around it. He stated that the City controlled the property to the west. Commission Member Stevens stated that the applicant proposed a light industrial development on the south edge of the property. He stated that it was slim to none that the property to the south would then be developed as residential. Commission Member Stevens stated that this development would help the area.

Commission Member Gilmore stated that when you bring in a large residential development that it took a lot of the future commercial uses away for that area. Commission Member Stevens stated that this was just approximately 68 acres of residential uses in about 1,000 acres of commercial and industrial uses around it.

Commission Member McReynolds stated that on a recent case that the Commission Members noted that you hardly ever see commercial uses located near

schools. He stated that it made sense to add some residential units to this area of McKinney. Mr. Quint stated that City Council actually denied the case that Commission Member McReynolds was referring to in order to preserve the non-residential property. Commission Member McReynolds stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission was in support of that request.

Commission Member Zepp asked about the size of the parcel of land to the west of this property. Mr. Quint stated that the City owned approximately 100 acres of land to the west of this location. He stated that the entire area in purple of the Future Land Use Map (FLUP) was approximately 300 acres.

Commission Member Zepp asked if the City planned to development an office park on the property owned by the City. Mr. Quint was not aware of the City having plans to build an office park at this location. He stated that the City had considered a number of options for the property they own to the west of this location. Mr. Quint gave examples of a pump station, burn tower, Fire Administration Building, and various economic development opportunities. He stated that it was still up in the air to what would be building on the City's property there.

Commission Member Zepp felt that the school needed residential developments nearby.

Chairman Franklin stated that there was enough land remaining in this area where a decent business park could still be built.

On a motion by Commission Member Stevens, seconded by Commission Member McReynolds, the Commission voted to recommend approval of this proposed rezoning request per the applicant's request with the special ordinance provisions listed in the Staff report, with a vote of 4-2-0. Commission Members Gilmore and Kuykendall voted again the motion.

**15-078SP Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on a Site Plan for Hunt Street Office Building, Located on the Southwest Corner of Hunt Street and Chestnut Street**

Mr. Matt Robinson, Planning Manager for the City of McKinney, explained the proposed site plan. He stated that the applicant was proposing to construct a 17,550 square foot office building on approximately 0.46 acres. Mr. Robinson stated that the site plans within the McKinney Town Center could be approved administratively;

however, the applicant had requested a number of design exceptions related to the site layout and architectural design. He stated that the design exceptions were to allow for an additional driveway to be located off a Pedestrian Priority B Street (Chestnut Street); to reduce the required building frontage along a Pedestrian Priority B Street (Chestnut Street) from 50% to 0%; maintaining the traditional façade rhythm of 20-foot to 30-foot along a Pedestrian Priority B Street (Hunt Street and Chestnut Street); the requirement for commercial ready buildings to have ground floor retail storefront that include a transom, display window area, and bulkhead at the base; to the requirement of 65% transparent storefront windows on ground floor facades along a Pedestrian Priority B Street (Hunt Street and Chestnut Street); the requirement that commercial and mixed-use buildings have flat or low pitched roofs with parapets; the requirement of 80% masonry percentage for facades facing a Pedestrian Priority B Street (Hunt Street and Chestnut Street); and to vary from the requirement that on roofs visible from a public street that they consist of copper, architectural metal, slate, synthetic slate, or similar materials. Mr. Robinson stated that the applicant had requested to use asphalt shingles. He stated that Staff supports the requested design exceptions related to the site layout, specifically to allow for an additional driveway to be located off of Chestnut Street, and to not meet the required building frontage along Chestnut Street. Mr. Robinson stated that Staff felt that these design exceptions allow for better circulation and accessibility for on-site parking while still meeting the intent of having the building built up to the street. He stated that Staff recommends approval of the proposed site plan. Mr. Robinson stated that in regards to the building elevations, Staff had significant concerns with the design exceptions related to the building design and materials. He stated that in Staff's opinion the requested exceptions allow a suburban building character to be developed that does not align with the prescribed vision established in the Town Center Study and that was called for in the McKinney Town Center (MTC) Zoning District. Mr. Robinson stated that Staff felt that the design of the proposed office building was more in line with the character of a suburban office building and did not deliver the character desired for McKinney's Historic Town Center. He stated that Staff recommends denial of all requested design exceptions related to the building design and material standards. An architectural rendering of the proposed building and an

example of a Downtown McKinney building that generally meets the Urban Design Standards of the McKinney Town Center (MTC) Zoning District were displayed on the overhead.

Mr. Matthew King, 1212 Cabernet, Allen, TX, explained the proposed site plan and design exceptions. He thanked City Staff for helping them to make this a workable site. Mr. King felt that this location was outside of the retail area of Downtown McKinney. He felt that the design exceptions were better suited for this project since the building was proposed for office uses. Mr. King stated that the site currently had a bank located on it. He felt this site was outside of the Downtown McKinney retail district. Mr. King felt there was some separation from the Downtown Square, with having City Hall and the Roy and Helen Hall Library near this location. He stated that there were warehouses to the east of this property, so he felt this would be a transitional space between the retail of the Downtown Square and the area to the north. Mr. King felt the proposed architectural rendering showed the building had rhythm. He did not feel that the 65% transparent storefront windows on the ground floor would be conducive to an office building, since most offices have office furniture against the walls. Mr. King stated that they currently proposed 75% masonry materials for the facade of the building, which was close to the 80% requirement. He stated that they proposed a shallow, low pitched roof that would be using asphalt shingles. Mr. King did not feel a parapet would be appropriate for this building. He offered to answer questions.

Commission Member Gilmore asked what roofing material could be used in lieu of asphalt shingles. Mr. King stated that it would depend on what the owner wanted to invest in roofing materials. He stated that he was asked to match elements used for the old Collin County Prison located on Kentucky Street, which he thought used asphalt shingles on the roof. Mr. King stated that there were other buildings in Downtown McKinney that used asphalt shingles.

Commission Member McReynolds felt that the old McKinney City Hospital and Nurses Home located on College Street had brick exteriors that felt more historic in nature and fit into the surrounding neighborhood. He felt that the stone and concrete finish on the proposed building had a suburban feel and would not fit into the

surrounding Historic Districts. Commission Member McReynolds did not have any issues with the proposed windows.

Commission Member Zepp asked what roofing material was used on the Roy and Helen Hall Library and the Wysong Central Fire Station. Mr. King thought that they both had metal roofs. Commission Member McReynolds stated that the Fire Station had a Spanish tile roof. Mr. King stated that he was correct.

Commission Member Stevens asked if the applicant might want to table the request. Mr. Michael Quint, Director of Planning for the City of McKinney, stated that Staff recommends approval of the proposed site plan; however, Staff does not recommend approval of the six of the eight requested design exceptions. He stated that if the request was approved per Staff's recommendation, then the proposed use would still be allowed on the property. Mr. Quint stated that the applicant would be required to modify the elevations to conform to the McKinney Town Center requirements.

Commission Member Stevens asked if the request was approved per Staff's recommendation if it would deny the applicant the opportunity to come back with a different design. Mr. Quint stated that it was hard to give a clear answer to this question. He stated that there could be some inference that could be made from denying all of the requested design exceptions that the Planning and Zoning Commission wanted the building to conform to the McKinney Town Center requirements. Mr. Quint was not aware of anything in the McKinney Town Center that would prohibit the applicant from asking for the same design exceptions at a later time. He stated that he did not know how the applicant could ask for the same design exceptions when they had already been denied though.

Commission Member Stevens was in favor of the building being built close to Downtown McKinney, creating more jobs, and increasing spending at the various restaurants and stores located on the Downtown Square.

Mr. King was willing to scratch some of the design exception requests. He stated that he could revise the elevation by making some reductions to the proposed Concrete Masonry Units (CMU), so that they could meet the 80% masonry requirement. Mr. King stated that he could make the windows 65% transparency on the first floor. He stated that he would need to discuss changing the roofing material with the owner.

Chairman Franklin stated that he preferred to see the 80% masonry on the exterior of the building. Mr. King stated that currently they were at 75% masonry and that he felt they could get there with some modifications to the elevations. Chairman Franklin felt the proposed building was away from the retail area of Downtown McKinney and would be an office building; therefore, he did not have any issues with the proposed windows.

Chairman Franklin asked if the only other design request issue was the roof. Mr. King stated that the requirement was that they have a parapet or a low pitched roof on the building. Chairman Franklin stated that he preferred to see the low pitched roof on the proposed building. Mr. Robinson stated that the actual requirement called for a flat or low pitched roof with parapet. Chairman Franklin felt the parapet worked well in Downtown McKinney and fit in with that architecture; however, he felt that the low pitched roof would look better on Hunt Street. Chairman Franklin stated that he really liked the look of the proposed building and felt it would be an asset for that area. He stated that it might set a tone for other development down there. Chairman Franklin stated that he was in favor of the building.

Commission Member Zepp asked if they were proposing Austin stone on the exterior of the building. Mr. King said yes.

Commission Member Stevens asked what type of roofing material was used on the old Post Office Building located on Virginia Street. Commission Member McReynolds stated that it had Spanish tile. Commission Member Stevens asked if it was a flat roof. Commission Member McReynolds stated that it had a hip roof.

Chairman Franklin opened the public hearing. There being none, on a motion by Commission Member McReynolds, seconded by Commission Member Zepp, the Commission voted unanimously to close the public hearing.

Commission Member Stevens stated that he would like to see the applicant come back in a couple of weeks with some design changes. He suggested that the applicant table the request to allow additional time to work with Staff on the design exception issues.

Mr. King stated that they were willing to install a standing seam metal roof on the proposed building in lieu of the asphalt shingles. He stated that it would be similar to the roof on the Roy and Helen Hall Library.

Mr. Quint recommended that the item be tabled to allow Staff additional time to work with the applicant on addressing the design exceptions. He stated that the applicant had offered to cross off the design exception requests for the asphalt shingles and not meeting the 80% masonry on the exterior of the building. Mr. Quint stated that it sounded like the Planning and Zoning Commission did not have concerns about the proposed building having parapets, ground floor retail storefront, or 65% transparent storefront windows on the ground floor. He stated that left the following design exceptions: additional driveway located off of a Pedestrian Priority B Street (Chestnut Street), reducing the required building frontage along a Pedestrian Priority B Street (Chestnut Street), and maintaining the traditional façade rhythm of 20-foot to 30-foot along a Pedestrian Priority B Street (Hunt Street and Chestnut Street). Mr. Quint expressed concerns about making adjustments to the request during the meeting, since it might allow items to be missed or not fully addressed. He stated that could put the Planning and Zoning Commission or the applicant in a position where they were not getting what they wanted. Mr. King stated that he took exception to the proposed building not showing rhythm. He did not feel that making the building look like multiple buildings on a street corner that was away from the Downtown Square would be appropriate. Mr. Quint stated that Staff did not see this as a transitional area. He stated that it was Staff's goal for Downtown McKinney to grow and expand. Mr. Quint stated that in the future Staff would like to see this area be an extension of the retail destination that we currently have on the Square proper. He stated that was what the Town Center Study and McKinney Town Center was trying to achieve.

Chairman Franklin stated that he did not want to hold up the applicant on this request.

Commission Member McReynolds stated that he agreed with Staff and would prefer to see the exterior of the proposed building be brick instead of stone with the close proximity to the Downtown Square. Commission Member McReynolds stated that he was fine with the shape and size of the building. He stated that the proposed

building reminded him of one located at Eldorado Parkway and Country Club Drive that looked fine at that location; however, he did not feel that it would look appropriate off the Downtown Square.

Commission Member Stevens stated that he had been in McKinney for about 15 years and he would love to have an office in Downtown McKinney; however, they were not available. He stated that office uses help support nearby restaurants and retail stores.

Mr. King commented that Hunt Street had less traffic than Louisiana Street. He stated that a lot of the surround area was City parking. Mr. King stated that he would love to see the request recommended for approval at this meeting, so they could move forward with the project. He asked if the request was denied by the Planning and Zoning Commission, if it would need to receive a supermajority vote to be approved the next time it was presented. Commission Member Stevens stated that Staff was recommending approval of the site plan, just not the design exception requests. Mr. Quint stated that if the request was approved per Staff's recommendation then the site plan would be approved; however, the look of the building would need to be reworked. Mr. King questioned what design exceptions still needed to be addressed. Mr. Quint felt that the façade rhythm and parapet around the roof had not been addressed yet.

Commission Member Gilmore asked if the exterior of the building needed to be brick. Mr. Quint stated that the façade did not necessarily need to be brick and that it just had to be an approved masonry product. Mr. King stated that stone was an approved masonry façade material.

Chairman Franklin stated that Staff and the applicant had done an admirable job getting the design exceptions down to these two issues. He stated that the proposed building was a good looking building. Chairman Franklin stated that three years ago there would not have been any questions on whether or not this could be built on the property. He stated that Downtown McKinney was built on diversity. Chairman Franklin did not feel that we should be arguing about the last two issues.

Commission Member Gilmore asked about the remaining issues. Mr. Quint stated that the parapet around the roofline and the traditional façade rhythm of 20-foot



to 30-foot still remained. He stated that there was various ways to address the façade rhythm and gave a few examples.

Commission Member McReynolds stated that the massing at the cornice gives the effect of a parapet.

Commission Member Gilmore stated that he liked the design of the building.

Chairman Franklin called for a motion. On a motion by Commission Member Stevens, seconded by Commission Member Gilmore, the Commission unanimously voted to approve the proposed site plan as recommended by Staff; approved the following design exceptions: allow for an additional driveway to be located off a Pedestrian Priority B Street (Chestnut Street); reduce the required building frontage along a Pedestrian Priority B Street (Chestnut Street) from 50% to 0%; to not maintain the traditional façade rhythm of 20-foot to 30-foot along a Pedestrian Priority B Street (Hunt Street and Chestnut Street); to not require the ground floor retail storefront that include a transom, display window area, and bulkhead at the base; to not provide 65% transparent storefront windows on the ground floor facades; and to not provide a parapet at the roof; and noted that the applicant agreed to install a standing seam metal roof instead of an asphalt material roof and that they would meet the 80% masonry percentage for facades requirement; with a vote of 6-0-0.

**15-069MRP Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on a Minor Replat for Lots 1 and 2, Block A of the Wiles Addition, Located on the South Side of West Louisiana Street and Approximately 220 Feet West of Bradley Street**

Ms. Eleana Galicia, Planner I for the City of McKinney, explained the proposed minor replat. She stated that the applicant was proposing to subdivide one existing lot into two lots, Lot 1 (approximately 0.15 acres) and Lot 2 (approximately 0.15 acres) for residential uses. Ms. Galicia stated that the subject property previously had a single family residence on the lot that had recently been taken down. She stated that the applicant had met all requirements of the Subdivision Ordinance. Ms. Galicia stated that Staff recommends approval of the minor replat as conditioned in the Staff report.

Mr. Wayne Goodall, The British Builder, 210 Oak Street, McKinney, TX, concurred with the Staff report and offered to answer questions. There were none.

Chairman Franklin opened the public hearing and called for comments.

Ms. Betty Petkovsek, 1101 W. Louisiana Street, McKinney, TX, spoke in opposition to this minor replat request. She wanted to keep consistency on Louisiana Street and in the Historic District. Ms. Petkovsek stated that she did not want a duplex built and realized that the applicant was not proposing to build a duplex; however, stated that a duplex could be allowed under the current zoning on the property. She stated that she was trying to envision what two houses at that location would look like. Ms. Petkovsek stated that the Historic Preservation Overlay District's purpose says that it will protect and enhance the district and landmarks which represent distinctive elements of the City's historic architectural and cultural heritage; foster civic pride in the accomplishments of the past; protect and enhance the City's attractiveness; ensure the harmonious, orderly, and efficient growth and development of the City; and stabilize and improve the values of such properties. She asked that the Historic District's purpose be applied to what was proposed to be built on the two lots. Ms. Petkovsek expressed concerns about having two houses close together. She stated that it was difficult backing out of driveways on Louisiana Street due to traffic. Ms. Petkovsek stated that having two houses close together might cause even more issues with trying to back out of the driveways. She complimented the applicant on some of his previous developments. Ms. Petkovsek reiterated her concerns on how the two houses located on smaller lots would look compared to other properties along Louisiana Street and questioned if the new houses would be consistent with the surrounding houses.

Mr. Thomas Matley, 1001 W. Louisiana Street, McKinney, TX, stated that he lives directly west of this property. He stated that the applicant told him they plan to sell each home for around \$400,000 – \$500,000. Mr. Matley stated that the applicant assured him that the windows on the homes would not be directly over looking his property. He felt that the houses that the applicant had previously built were good looking. Mr. Matley talked about how much he enjoyed the Historic District. He stated that many of the Downtown McKinney restaurants serve the produce that he grows. Mr. Matley asked what the City wanted people to see when they drive down Louisiana Street heading to Downtown McKinney. He stated that he preferred to see one house per lot and not duplexes. Mr. Matley stated that if duplexes were good for the Historic

District then he felt they should be good enough for the west side of McKinney. He expressed concerns regarding the value of the property with the proposed changes.

Mr. Keith McElwain, 801 W. Louisiana Street, McKinney, TX, stated that he lives on the east side of this property. He stated that he would prefer the property to just have one house on it. Mr. McElwain stated that he feels very strongly about the Historic District and how valuable Louisiana Street and Virginia Street are to the City. He stated that he was not aware of what the applicant had planned for the two lots, if the property was subdivided. Mr. McElwain stated that he had a hard time imaging houses valued around \$500,000 on such narrow lots. He stated that he would like to learn more about what was planned for the property. Mr. McElwain expressed concerns on whether this would be consistent with the rest of the Historic District.

Ms. Jacque Weinberg, 1207 W. Louisiana Street, McKinney, TX, stated that she had lived in the Historic District for about 35 years. She spoke against the request. Ms. Weinberg stated that she would like to see one house built on the lot and not subdivided into two lots for two houses. She expressed concerns about additional lots on Louisiana Street being subdivided into smaller lots so that more houses could be built and that it might set a precedent. Ms. Weinberg stated that she did not understand \$500,000 houses being built on small lots. She asked what happened to being unique and not looking like all of the other neighborhoods.

Ms. Rebecca Motley, 1001 W. Louisiana Street, McKinney, TX, briefly discussed the raised bed garden located directly behind the proposed property and history of the property. She questioned who allows a house in the Historic District to be torn down and what determines that it must be torn down versus restoring it. Ms. Motley stated that the applicant had approached them about purchasing some of their land at a sum of money that she felt was insulting. She stated that the applicant does excellent work; however, she felt that he cared very little for the Historic District. Ms. Motley asked the Planning and Zoning Commission to think carefully about approving this request.

Ms. Billie Pitts, 1003 Louisiana Street, McKinney, TX, expressed concerns for the safety for the school children having these two driveways close together and near the busy school. Mr. Goodall stated that the property was zoned for duplexes, which

allowed two driveways. He did not feel it would make a difference if there was a duplex with two driveways versus two houses with two driveways.

On a motion by Commission Member Stevens, seconded by Commission Member McReynolds, the Commission unanimously approved to close the public hearing, with a vote of 6-0-0.

Chairman Franklin asked Staff to discuss the zoning uses allowed on the property. Mr. Michael Quint, Director of Planning for the City of McKinney, explained that the applicant wants to develop under the "RD 30" – Duplex Residence District, which allowed detached single family residential development on a minimum 50' x 100' lot size with a minimum 5,000 square foot lot size. He stated that these two lots met these minimum thresholds. Mr. Quint stated that the applicant was currently allowed to build a duplex with two driveways under the current zoning on the property. He explained that the applicant was trying to subdivide the oversized lot into two smaller lots to build two single family residential houses. Mr. Quint stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission was obligated, per State Law, to approve the request since the request met the City's minimum zoning requirements and regulations.

Commission Members Gilmore and Stevens had questions regarding the current zoning and subdividing of the property. Mr. Quint stated that this request was regarding the subdividing of the property. He stated that the zoning was already established and allowed for a number of things to be built on the property.

Chairman Franklin asked if the applicant could still build duplexes on the two properties after it was subdivided. Mr. Quint said possible; however, it might be hard to do with the setback requirements.

Commission Member McReynolds stated that he was a home designer and was familiar with the various home builders that typically build in the Historic District. He stated that The British Builder was a Southern Living builder and had to meet certain standards to be associated with them. Commission Member McReynolds felt that The British Builder builds houses that were historic in appearance and fit into the surrounding neighborhood. He felt that building historic looking houses on these two lots would not be much different from the smaller bungalow houses located directly across the street.

On a motion by Commission Member Kuykendall, seconded by Commission Member McReynolds, the Commission voted unanimously to approve the minor replat as conditioned in the Staff report, with a vote of 6-0-0.

Commission Member Gilmore left the meeting during the consideration of the following item.

**15-080SP Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on a Site Plan for the McKinney Aquatic and Fitness Center, Located on the Southeast Corner of Alma Road and Eldorado Parkway**

Ms. Samantha Pickett, Planner II for the City of McKinney, explained the proposed site plan. She stated that Staff recommends approval of the proposed site plan.

Chairperson Franklin opened the public hearing and called for comments. There being none, on a motion by Commission Member Stevens, seconded by Commission Member Kuykendall, the Commission voted to close the public hearing and recommend approval of the proposed site plan as conditioned in the Staff report, with a vote of 5-0-0.

Chairman Franklin stated that the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission will be forwarded to the City Council meeting on May 19, 2015.

Commission Member Gilmore returned to the meeting.

**15-075M Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on a Request by the City of McKinney to Amend Sections 146-99 (REC Regional Employment Center Overlay District), 146-132 (Fences, Walls, and Screening Requirements), and 146-139 (Architectural and Site Standards) of the Zoning Ordinance (Chapter 146 of the Code of Ordinances); and to Amend Sections 1 (Introduction), 7 (Land Use Element), 8 (Transportation), 11 (Urban Design), and Appendix E (An Informal Guide to the Multi-Family Policy in the City of McKinney) of the Comprehensive Plan**

Mr. Brandon Opiela, Planning Manager for the City of McKinney, briefly discussed the proposed amendments to Sections 146-99 (REC Regional Employment Center Overlay District), 146-132 (Fences, Walls, and Screening Requirements), and 146-139 (Architectural and Site Standards) of the Zoning Ordinance (Chapter 146 of the Code of Ordinances); and to Sections 1 (Introduction), 7 (Land Use Element), 8 (Transportation), 11 (Urban Design), and Appendix E (An Informal Guide to the Multi-Family Policy in the City of McKinney) of the Comprehensive Plan pertaining to the

Regional Employment Center (REC) Overlay, which establishes a new approach and vision for future development within this area of the City. He briefly discussed a timeline regarding the amendments and an overview of the proposed changes to multiple sections of the Zoning Ordinance and Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Opiela stated that subsequent to the April 6, 2015 City Council Work Session, Staff added verbiage to Sections 7 and 11 stating that residential uses within the Tollway Commercial module should generally be located no closer than 1,000 feet from State Highway 121. He briefly discussed the proposed Future Land Use Plan (FLUP), Future Land Use Plan Module Diagram (FLUP MD), and changes to the Multi-family Policy. Mr. Opiela asked for additional feedback from the Planning and Zoning Commission on the proposed amendments.

Commission Member Stevens stated that he would like more time to review all of the proposed amendments, since there were so many attachments to review in the packet for this item. Mr. Michael Quint, Director of Planning for the City of McKinney, stated that Staff was trying to address a series of development issues as quickly as possible and also stated that the proposed amendments had been posted on the City's website for the past month for the Planning and Zoning Commission and Public to review. Mr. Quint stated that there had been various stakeholder meetings and joint meetings with City Council and the Planning and Zoning Commission which also discussed the proposed amendments.

Commission Member Gilmore asked if this was the same material that was discussed in the previous joint meeting held with City Council and the Planning and Zoning Commission. Mr. Quint explained that the only changes made were to address the City Council's feedback to preserve the first 1,000 feet of depth along State Highway 121 for commercial uses.

Chairman Franklin stated that he would like the City Council to consider allowing higher maximum single family detached residential densities (4.5-4.7 dwelling units per acre) within the REC area. Chairman Franklin suggested changing the maximum densities allowed in the ordinance.

Commission Member Zepp asked if the zoning had been changed for the two parcels of land that had submitted letters of opposition. Mr. Quint said the zoning on

those properties will not be changed with the amendments, and felt that the property owners had concerns about potential future entitlements that were not currently on the property.

Commission Member Stevens asked how this zoning would compare to what Allen had zoned on the other side of the highway. Mr. Quint did not know what the City of Allen had planned for their area.

Commission Member Stevens asked if Staff met with other municipalities to discuss developing areas like this. Mr. Quint stated that there have been opportunities for this type of coordination but the proposed amendments did not take into account the zoning south of State Highway 121.

Chairman Franklin opened the public hearing and called for comments. There being none, on a motion by Commission Member Zepp, seconded by Commission Member McReynolds, the Commission unanimously voted to close the public hearing and recommend approval of the proposed amendments to multiple sections of Chapter 146 (Zoning Regulations) of the Code of Ordinances and multiple sections of the Comprehensive Plan as listed in the Staff report, with a vote of 6-0-0.

Chairman Franklin stated that the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission will be forwarded to the City Council meeting on May 5, 2015.

There being no further business, Chairman Franklin declared the meeting adjourned at 8:08 p.m.

---

RICK FRANKLIN  
Chairman