

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

FEBRUARY 13, 2018

The Planning and Zoning Commission of the City of McKinney, Texas met in regular session in the Council Chambers, 222 N. Tennessee Street, McKinney, Texas, on Tuesday, February 13, 2018 at 6:00 p.m.

City Council Present: Mayor George Fuller and Charlie Philips

Commission Members Present: Chairman Bill Cox, Vice-Chairman Brian Mantzey, Janet Cobbel, Deanna Kuykendall, Cam McCall, and Pamela Smith

Commission Members Absent: Eric Zepp and Mark McReynolds - Alternate

Staff Present: Director of Planning Brian Lockley; Planning Managers Jennifer Arnold, Matt Robinson, and Samantha Pickett; Planner II Aaron Bloxham; Planners Danielle Quintanilla, Melissa Spriegel, and David Soto; and Administrative Assistant Terri Ramey

There were approximately 20 guests present.

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

Chairman Cox stated that item # 17-0013SP would be pulled down from the Consent agenda to be considered separately.

The Commission approved the motion by Commission Member Cobbel, seconded by Commission Member McCall, to approve the following three Consent items, with a vote of 5-0-1. Vice-Chairman Mantzey abstained from the vote.

18-150 Minutes of the Planning and Zoning Commission Regular Meeting of January 23, 2018

18-0062PF Consider/Discuss/Act on a Preliminary-Final Plat for Lot 6R, Block A, of Lake Forest Crossing Addition, Located at the Southeast Corner of Highlands Drive and South Lake Forest Drive

17-176PF Consider/Discuss/Act on a Preliminary Final Plat for Lots 1-11, Block A of the 380 Commons at Headington Heights Addition, Located at the Southwest Corner of Hardin Boulevard and U.S. Highway 380 (University Drive)

END OF CONSENT

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

Vice-Chairman Mantzey stepped down on the following item # 17-0013SP due to a possible conflict of interest.

17-0013SP Consider/Discuss/Act on a Site Plan for an Auto Repair Facility (Service First), Located Approximately 250 Feet West of North Jordan Road and on the North Side of Virginia Parkway

Mr. David Soto, Planner I for the City of McKinney, briefly explained the proposed site plan request. He stated that the applicant is proposing to construct an 11,348 square foot auto repair facility (Service First) on 1.43 acres site, located approximately 250 feet west of North Jordan Road and on the north side of Virginia Parkway. Mr. Soto stated that the current zoning of the property is "BG" – General Business District, which allows the use for auto repair by right. He stated that site plans could typically be approved by Staff; however, the governing ordinance requires that site plan to be reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission and acted upon by City Council. Mr. Soto stated that the applicant had met all of the requirements, such as parking, loading spaces, solid waste, landscaping, screening, and all other requirements within in the Zoning Ordinance. He stated that Staff recommends approval of the proposed site plan as conditioned in the Staff Report and offered to answer questions.

Commission Member Cobbel stated that Ms. Julia Brady with Imagine International Academy of North Texas had sent an email yesterday. She asked Mr. Soto if he received a copy of it. Mr. Soto said no.

Commission Member Cobbel stated that there was traffic issues in the area during school hours. She asked Staff how traffic might be impacted once the auto repair facility was built. Ms. Samantha Pickett, AICP, Planning Manager for the City of McKinney, stated that once a site plan is submitted and the civil plans are reviewed by the City Staff it will be looked at for any traffic impact. She stated that if the traffic counts warrant, then a traffic impact analysis could be completed by the Engineering Department.

Commission Member Cobbel stated that the school was located directly behind the subject property. She asked Staff to discuss what type of screening and landscaping might be proposed at the site. Mr. Soto stated that the applicant has proposed to build a six foot wrought iron fencing with masonry columns and a living screen on the eastern, western, and northern sides of the property. Commission Member Cobbel asked if that was required by the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Soto said yes.

Commission Member Cobbel asked about the access the subject property would have to the student population during school hours from the proposed gate on the northwest corner. She asked Staff about the purpose of the gate. Mr. Soto stated that he was unsure why they needed a gate. He suggested the applicant might be able to answer that question.

Commission Member Kuykendall stated that she had not seen the letter that Commission Member Cobbel referenced. Ms. Pickett stated that she did not believe that Staff was included on the e-mail. She stated that it appeared that a couple of the Commission Members received a copy of it. Ms. Pickett stated that Staff could make it part of the record before it goes to City Council.

Chairman Cox asked how long the current zoning had been in place. Mr. Soto stated that the current zoning was approved in 1994.

Chairman Cox asked if the auto repair facility was an allowed use at that time. Mr. Soto state that it was allowed by right under the "BG" – General Business District. Ms. Pickett stated that Staff could look to see if there was any significant changes to the allowed uses in this zoning classification. She stated that if anything the allowed uses would have lighted up over time. Ms. Pickett stated that you would likely have seen more intense allowed uses in 1994 compared to today. She believed that this use was allowed during that time.

Chairman Cox asked if the applicant was requesting anything outside the scope of the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Soto said no and that they were not requesting any variances. He stated that there were some conditions listed in the Staff Report.

Mr. Mac McCloud, Cross Development, 905 Rush Creek Drive, Allen, TX, concurred with the Staff Report and offered to answer questions.

Commission Member Cobbel asked Mr. McCloud if they had spoken with the staff at the school and if he felt their concerns had been addressed. Mr. McCloud stated that he spoke with Ms. Julia Brady and members of her staff this afternoon. He stated that their primary concern was the safety of the children. Mr. McCloud stated that they had come to an agreement that they would have a construction fence around the project and require all of the workers to wear vests to properly identify them. He stated that they were going to meet again on February 23rd. Mr. McCloud stated that the contractor was also

going to attend this meeting. Commission Member Cobbel felt the school staff appreciated Mr. McCloud meeting with them today. Mr. McCloud stated that they were very understanding and accommodating. He stated that he requested that they will limit the delivery of construction materials between 7:00 a.m. – 9:00 a.m. and suspend the delivery of construction materials between 2:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. each day to allow the school traffic to get in and out. Mr. McCloud stated that they were going to ask the City for latitude to allow them to pour concrete around 3:00 a.m. or earlier to avoid all of the traffic and make things smoother. Commission Member Cobbel stated that she felt it was great that they were going to limit these things during the school's major ins and outs.

Commission Member Cobbel asked if the construction would be going in and out of the property. Mr. McCloud stated that he did not see them bringing construction traffic off of Jordan Road, since that would take them through a parking lot. He stated that the most desirable route would be on Virginia Parkway. Mr. McCloud stated that they would be willing to put in a sign with an arrow pointing towards Virginia Parkway to help direct traffic exiting the facility. He briefly explained that customers would drop off their vehicles and one of the auto repair facility staff members will drive it to the back area of the property. Mr. McCloud stated that one of the employees will take the vehicle from its service location up to the customer when the vehicle was finished being serviced. He stated that a request was made that the employees parking the vehicles pointing towards the bank to encourage the customers to exit out on Jordan Road. Mr. McCloud stated that they were willing to trying it.

Commission Member Cobbel thanked Mr. McCloud for answer questions about the project. She stated that she understood that the site plan was in conformance with the Zoning Ordinance.

Chairman Cox explained that this item was not a public hearing item; therefore, no public comments would be requested at this time. He explained that there should be an opportunity to speak on this item at the City Council meeting being held on Tuesday, March 6, 2018.

On a motion by Commission Member Smith, seconded by Commission Member McCall, the Commission voted to recommend approval of the proposed site plan as recommended by Staff, with a vote of 5-0-1. Vice-Chairman Mantzey abstained.

Vice-Chairman Mantzey returned to the meeting.

17-275Z Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on a Request to Rezone the Subject Property from "PD" - Planned Development District and "REC" - Regional Employment Center Overlay District to "PD" - Planned Development District, Generally to Allow for Retail, Office, and Multi-family Residential Uses, Located Approximately 200 Feet South of Chisholm Trail and on the East Side of Ridge Road

Ms. Melissa Spriegel, Planner I for the City of McKinney, explained the proposed rezoning request. She stated that the applicant is requesting to rezone approximately 5.33 acres to "PD" – Planned Development District, generally for retail, office, restaurant, and multi-family residential uses. Ms. Spriegel stated that the property is currently zoned for office uses; however, the applicant has indicated the desire to rezone the property in order to develop a vertical, mixed-use product, with non-residential uses on the first floor and multi-family residential uses above. She stated that the subject property is surrounded by multi-family residential uses to the south and west, single family residential uses to the east, and a daycare to the north. Ms. Spriegel stated that while the applicant has indicated their intent to create a vertical, mixed-use development, Staff's professional opinion is that a development of this nature would not be viable in this setting. She stated that vertical, mixed-use is intended to be urban in design, creating a walkable, pedestrian-friendly development that relies heavily on visibility and foot traffic to thrive. Ms. Spriegel stated that given the limited size of the property, mid-block location, isolation from similar developments, and lack of urban-style space limits, it is unlikely that this type of development would be able to thrive in this location without similar developments nearby that work in conjunction to create a destination environment. She stated that the scale of the development could potentially overwhelm the adjacent single family development and would increase the multi-family residential land uses in the area. Ms. Spriegel stated that currently there are just under 2,000 multi-family units spread among six existing or proposed developments in the immediate area. She stated that Staff has concerns given the unique and narrow shape of the property and adjacency to existing single family residential uses. Ms. Spriegel stated that the proposed development standards include provisions that may increase the difficulty of developing on the property, including, but not limited to, restrictions on the location of

loading spaces, open space requirements, suburban-style setbacks, and decreased setback of windows from single family residential uses from what the Zoning Ordinance typically requires. She stated that the property's narrow depth and mid-block location is best suited for low-intensity uses that do not require a large amount of parking, such as neighborhood offices. Ms. Spriegel stated that the proposed standards do not provide for a transition between existing uses and the subject property, and could result in a development that is not compatible with the surrounding and adjacent properties. She stated that Staff recommends denial of the proposed rezoning request and offered to answer questions. There were none.

Mr. Glen Kistenmacher, Kistenmacher Engineering, 8350 Meadow Road, Dallas, TX, stated that he did not agree with Staff's recommendation. He gave a short video presentation and then a PowerPoint presentation regarding the proposed development. Mr. Kistenmacher stated that there would be office buildings in the front along Ridge Road and mixed-use building in the back of the subject property. He stated that under the current zoning four-story office buildings with a 55' setback from the existing residential was allowed. Mr. Kistenmacher stated that was a very intense use allowed there by right. Mr. Kistenmacher stated that they intend to build a three story building with the height limited to 35'. He stated that this height was the same height restriction allowed by the adjacent residential development. Mr. Kistenmacher stated that they intend to limit the maximum lot coverage to 50% from the allowed 75% lot coverage under the current zoning. He stated that they propose to increase the rear setback to 80' and 100' to the nearest window. Mr. Kistenmacher stated that they propose a 20' landscape buffer, which is required per the City's ordinance. He stated that, based on the concept plan shown for informational purposes only, they are proposing 29% open space on the property. Mr. Kistenmacher stated that they were proposing non-residential uses on the first floor and would be permitting retail and restaurant uses. He stated that they were trying to provide a transition from the nearby multi-family uses to the single family uses. Mr. Kistenmacher stated that they were not intending this to be a destination-style center. He stated that they were trying to introduce a live/work concept for users such as architects, lawyers, engineers, insurance sales, travel agents, and bakers. Mr. Kistenmacher stated that they were proposing neighborhood commercial

uses, not intense commercial uses. He did not feel that they would generate a lot of traffic. Mr. Kistenmacher stated that it would be to serve the neighborhood. He stated that the proposed rezoning request reduced the building height and maximum lot coverage and increased the setbacks, perimeter landscape buffer, masonry percentage on the facades, and open/green space percentage. Mr. Kistenmacher stated that the adjacent residential property owners were not aware of what was currently allowed under the zoning for the subject property. He offered to answer questions.

Chairman Cox stated that this request had been tabled at the December 12, 2017 and January 9, 2018 Planning and Zoning Commission meetings. He asked the applicant what had changed from that time to today. Mr. Kistenmacher stated that they were working with Staff and fine tuning the wording for the "PD" – Planned Development District standards. He stated that they finally realized that they were never going to be in agreement on the proposed rezoning request.

Chairman Cox asked about the meeting with the applicant and adjacent homeowners. Mr. Kistenmacher stated that it was relatively positive. Mr. Kistenmacher stated that others would like to see the subject property remain undeveloped; however, that was not under the developer's purview. He stated that they were trying to put together something that was attractive, usable, and create a tax base for the City. Mr. Kistenmacher stated that initially they considered developing townhomes on the property. He stated that it was his understanding that City Council did not want to take properties zoned for commercial uses and down zone them to residential uses. Mr. Kistenmacher stated that this was a compromise between the two.

Vice-Chairman Mantzey asked if the residential portion of the proposed project would be for rent. Mr. Kistenmacher stated that the property owner was intending these to be condominium units and not apartments.

Vice-Chairman Mantzey asked if Mr. Kistenmacher had experience with this type of product somewhere else. Mr. Kistenmacher said no; however, he believed that the property owner had some experience with a similar product.

Commission Member Cobbel asked if the development standards would restrict the residential units to be listed for sale only and not for lease. Mr. Kistenmacher stated that should not be an issue. He stated that there were some other things that were

brought up at the neighborhood meeting that they would like to also include, like lighting and hours of operation. Mr. Kistenmacher stated that he approached Staff about them and was told that these were not conditions of zoning.

Chairman Cox opened the public hearing and called for comments.

The following four residents spoke in opposition to the proposed rezoning request.

Mr. Greg DiNovis, 6004 Silverton Avenue, McKinney, TX, stated that he lives in a different homeowners' association than the one the applicant met with to discuss the proposed project, and therefore was not included in their meeting. He stated that he lives about 50' away from the subject property. Mr. DiNovis stated that a two-story development, with a higher elevation, is located to the south of the subject property. He stated that development had an approximately 40' setback and would have a great view into his backyard. Mr. DiNovis felt that the property owners adjacent to the subject property could have the same issue. He asked if there were going to be lease restrictions for the commercial portion of the development. Mr. DiNovis asked if the commercial uses would be paper-pushing businesses and no production businesses. He gave the example of a donut shop going in there and felt it would be a terrible issue. Mr. DiNovis asked where the garbage units were being proposed. He stated that the egress on the east side of the property, as shown on the informational-only Concept Plan, did not go anywhere due to the property next door being undeveloped. Mr. DiNovis stated that Ridge Road had two lanes going both directions and did not have turn lanes. He stated that Collin McKinney Parkway currently did not have a lot of traffic on it; however, it already had turn lanes to anticipate future traffic. Mr. DiNovis asked how we could make this fit into the community.

Mr. David Geise, 4800 Lasso Lane, McKinney, TX, concurred with Mr. DiNovis's comments. He expressed concerns about decrease in property values, impact on privacy, increase in noise levels, excessive lighting, increase in traffic congestion, garbage fumes and collection times, vandalism, plans for a retention pond for the water runoff, safety of the children standing at the bus stop with increased traffic, and the possible turnover of businesses. Mr. Geise stated that the bus stop needs to be moved to another location. He stated that when the daycare center went in there was soil tamping that caused a lot of vibrations; therefore, he had concerns about foundation

damages. Chairman Cox acknowledged Mr. Geise's e-mails that were included in the Staff Report.

Ms. Katherine Calhoun, 4816 Lasso Lane, McKinney, TX, stated that their single-story home backed up to the subject property. She stated that she was an attorney. Ms. Calhoun expressed concerns about their children, increased traffic, property values, and the invasiveness of multi-story buildings that would have a view into their backyard. She stated that when you purchase a home you expect a certain level of privacy. Ms. Calhoun questioned how much it would cost to rent one of the proposed condominium units. She stated that they were probably going to sell these units for more than an average wage worker could afford. Ms. Calhoun questioned whether the proposed live/work scenario would actually occur here. She stated that there are seven apartment complexes that were already built or development had just started in the area. Ms. Calhoun stated that she spoke with a real estate professional and was told that her property value had already decreased \$5,000 in the past 30 days due to the surrounding apartments. She stated that she understands that the subject property was currently zoned for commercial uses. Ms. Calhoun preferred to see a single story office building developed on the property. She stated that she would have issues with a multi-story office space on the subject property due to privacy concerns.

Mr. Luke Calhoun, 4816 Lasso Lane, McKinney, TX, stated that he was also an attorney; however, was here in the capacity as a homeowner. He stated that he concurred with the previous concerns mentioned. Mr. Calhoun stated that he understood that the current zoning on the subject property would allow a multi-story office building; however, there are differences in privacy between an office building and condominium units. He asked the Commission to consider their concerns.

Mr. Bhujang Karakavalasa, EDW Architectonics, LLC, 2770 Main Street, Frisco, TX, spoke in favor of the request. He stated that he was the developer of the proposed project. Mr. Karakavalasa stated that the original 380 acres in this area was zoned "REC" – Regional Employment Center Overlay District and designed for the creation of jobs. He stated that unfortunately some single family homes were built in this area. Mr. Karakavalasa stated that the proposed development would be appropriate in the "REC" – Regional Employment Center Overlay District and according to the Comprehensive

Plan. He stated that they had been working with Staff to try to meet the City's requirements and build the best product. Mr. Karakavalasa stated that they increased the open space over what was required. He stated that he was proposing loft-style residential units. Mr. Karakavalasa stated that they would not be for lease. He stated that he has already lined up 27 customers interested in the proposed development. Mr. Karakavalasa stated that they were excited to see a live/work development that would be a unique product. He stated that he sacrificed many things to make this project viable due to the height restriction. Mr. Karakavalasa stated that the first floor would be commercial or retail uses. He stated that the proposed 27 residential units were approximately 2,500 square feet.

On a motion by Vice-Chairman Mantzey, seconded by Commission Member McCall, the Commission unanimously voted to close the public hearing, with a vote of 6-0-0.

Commission Member McCall asked Staff for some examples of what could be built on the property under the current zoning. Ms. Spriegel stated that the current zoning requires that the property develop according to the "O-1" – Neighborhood Office District, which is fairly restricted in uses. She stated that basically only office uses could develop there. Ms. Spriegel stated that the Zoning Ordinance does permit the maximum height to be four stories; however, you have to consider the narrow depth of the lot and the City's parking requirements. She stated that based on the size of the lot and how large of a building is being proposed, they may not be able to get four stories and still be able to meet the parking requirement. Ms. Spriegel stated that there were several different factors to consider as far as looking at the height of an office building that could be on the subject property.

Commission Member McCall asked how many multi-family units were located in the area. Ms. Spriegel stated that there were 1,993 units total among Raleigh House, Millennium, Soho, Aspire, Mansions of McKinney, and Springs of McKinney multi-family developments. Commission Member McCall asked if there was a good percentage of multi-family compared to single family in the area. Ms. Spriegel said yes. She stated that a large majority of the area to the east was single family residential developments.

Commission Member Cobbel wanted to clarify that Mr. Karakavalasa stated that the condominium units would be approximately 2,500 square feet. Chairman Cox stated that was correct.

Commission Member Cobbel asked if there were any other condominium type units in the area. She also asked if the other multi-family developments were all apartments. Ms. Samantha Pickett, AICP, Planning Manager for the City of McKinney, stated if it is more than four units on a single lot then the City considers it multi-family. She stated that the City does not differentiate between whether the units are for rent or sale. Ms. Pickett stated that the multi-family units in this area are typically for rent. She stated that there could be some for sale units in there.

Commission Member Cobbel asked about the size of the first floor retail units. Ms. Spriegel stated that the proposed development regulations limit each individual use to be 5,000 square feet.

Commission Member Cobbel asked if there was a limit on medical type use. Ms. Spriegel said no.

Commission Member Kuykendall asked if the developer was not able to fill the bottom retail units if those units could be transitioned into more multi-family units. Ms. Spriegel stated that the bottom floor units must remain non-residential, except for the leasing office and amenities, based upon the proposed zoning.

Commission Member Kuykendall asked Mr. Kistenmacher what was discussed in the meetings with the adjacent property owners. Mr. Kistenmacher stated that it was an open meeting to discuss just about anything and everything related to the proposed development. He stated that they really did not discuss privacy issues. Mr. Kistenmacher stated that they did not add the multi-story construction to the zoning and that it was already a permitted use. He stated that they created a larger setback, by increasing the rear setback to a minimum of 80'. Mr. Kistenmacher stated that the draft concept plan they prepared has a rear setback of 116'. He stated that the current zoning has a 55' rear setback for a four-story office building. Mr. Kistenmacher stated that they had written in a 100' minimum separation between windows and a 20' landscape setback. He stated that the distance between the windows in the proposed development to the adjacent residential backyards was a greater than the distance between the

houses in the subdivision going across the street. Mr. Kistenmacher stated that he understands the concern about privacy; however, that concern was not something that they created. He stated that the four story office building could have underground parking, so that there would be enough parking available under the earlier example.

Chairman Cox asked Mr. Kistenmacher if they were far enough along in the process to know where a dumpster pad might be located on the subject property. Mr. Kistenmacher stated that they had considered placing it in the southeast portion of the property. He stated that the connection to Silverton was not something that they designed; however, Staff requested it. Mr. Kistenmacher stated that they have no interest in having connection to Silverton.

Vice-Chairman Mantzey stated that he did not believe that a four story office building would be built at this location, even though it was an option. He stated that the proposed rezoning request was skirting two issues that the City does not want to happen, by getting rid of commercial land for residential uses and calling the proposed residential units condominium, instead of multi-family, by stacking them a different way. Vice-Chairman Mantzey stated that he would be in support of Staff's recommendation of denial of this proposed rezoning request.

Commission Member McCall concurred with Vice-Chairman Mantzey's comments. He stated that he would also be in favor of Staff's recommendation of denial for this proposed rezoning request.

Commission Member Smith stated that she also supported Staff's recommendation of denial for this proposed rezoning request. She stated that Staff had done an exceptional job on their assessment and arguments for denial of the request. Commission Member Smith felt Staff's arguments were sound, logical, and relevant. She stated that there is an excess of multi-family in the area, so she could not see rezoning this parcel to multi-family. Commission Member Smith stated that the proposed development could potentially overwhelm the adjacent single family development. She stated that she did not feel that this was an appropriate site for a mixed-use development. Commission Member Smith thanked Staff and stated that this was a very thoroughly thought-out assessment.

Commission Member Cobbel stated that she disagreed. She stated that for the most part this looked like an outstanding place to have a live/work/play area, especially with the retail on the bottom and the other multi-family units and single-family developments in the area. Commission Member Cobbel stated that it was a neat, modern, contemporary design for the area. She stated that it would also be useful, with the area needing retail of this size. Commission Member Cobbel stated the proposed residential units being 2,500 square feet and for sale, was a completely different concept than apartments. She stated that this is an area where you would see professionals having an office downstairs and then living upstairs. Commission Member Cobbel stated that McKinney needs live/work/play development and this fits in.

On a motion by Commission Member Kuykendall, seconded by Commission Member Smith, the Commission voted to recommend denial of the proposed rezoning request as recommended by Staff, with a vote of 5-1-0. Commission Member Cobbel voted against the motion.

Chairman Cox stated that the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission will be forwarded to the City Council meeting on March 6, 2018.

17-002Z 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 Allow for Commercial, Office, Warehouse and Agricultural Uses, Located Approximately 750 Feet West of State Highway 5 (McDonald Street) and on the South Side of Eldorado Parkway

Mr. Matt Robinson, AICP, Planning Manager for the City of McKinney, explained the proposed rezoning request. He stated that the applicant is requesting to rezone approximately 16.7 acres of land from "PD" – Planned Development District to "PD" – Planned Development District generally for commercial, office, warehouse, and agricultural uses. Mr. Robinson stated that the proposed development regulations are designed to break the property into two tracts. He stated that Tract 1 was on the northeast corner of the subject property and Tract 2 was the larger portion to the west of Tract 1 as shown on the Zoning Exhibit. Mr. Robinson stated that Tract 1 was proposed to consist of a mix of commercial, office, and warehouse uses and Tract 2 was almost exclusively floodplain and that it was intended to be used for agricultural purposes. He stated that

as part of the proposed regulations for Tract 1 the development includes a warehouse with caretaker's quarters and six horse stalls to be developed. Mr. Robinson stated increased masonry percentages were proposed in the development regulations to have 85% masonry on each elevation, where only 50% is currently required. He stated that development will generally be in accordance with the proposed concept plan with defined building square footage and uses established within the development regulations. Mr. Robinson stated that under the current "PD" – Planned Development District regulations all of the proposed uses are allowed, with the exception for the proposed warehouse with caretaker's quarters and six horse stalls. He stated that given the location of the property and the proximity of commercial, office, and industrial/storage uses to the north, south, and east, Staff was of the opinion that the rezoning request is appropriate for the subject property. Mr. Robinson stated that Staff recommends approval of the proposed rezoning request and offered to answer questions. There were none.

Mr. Don Day, 110 E. Louisiana Street, McKinney, TX, concurred with the Staff Report and asked for a recommendation of approval for the proposed rezoning request.

Chairman Cox opened the public hearing and called for comments. There were none.

Commission Member Smith commended Mr. Day for the proposed project. She stated that this was one of the most unique diversity of uses that she had seen during her 17 years of public service. Commission Member Smith stated that she loved that he was willing to utilize the floodplain for orchards and gardens, have a pub would be located on the City's Hike and Bike trail that abuts the subject property, and have horse stalls with caregiver quarters. She stated that it will bring such a unique livelihood to this area and would be a quality development. Commission Member Smith stated that she was looking forward to seeing this developed.

Chairman Cox concurred with Commission Member Smith's comments. He stated that he appreciated what Mr. Day was proposing.

On a motion by Vice-Chairman Mantzey, seconded by Commission Member McCall, the Commission unanimously voted to close the public hearing and 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 March 6, 2018.

18-0084MRP Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on a Minor Replat for Lots 5 and 6, Block E, of Eldorado Park Addition, Located at the Northwest Corner of Bush Drive and Laura Lane

Mr. David Soto, Planner I for the City of McKinney, explained the proposed minor replat. He stated that the applicant was proposing to subdivide one lot into two lots, one lot being approximately 0.43 acres and the other lot being approximately 0.566 acres. Mr. Soto stated that the applicant had indicated that the site will be developed for two medical offices. He stated that the applicant had met all of the requirements of the Subdivision Ordinance. Mr. Soto stated that Staff recommended approval of the proposed minor replat and offered to answer questions. There were none.

Mr. Driss Bouaazzi, BBX Technologies, LLC, 2150 S. Central Expressway, McKinney, TX, briefly explained the proposed minor replat. He stated that the subject property was approximately a one acre tract. Mr. Bouaazzi stated that they were proposing to build two identical 5,000 square foot office buildings. He stated that they intend the office buildings to be used for general office or medical office uses. Mr. Bouaazzi stated that their banker and real estate professional had suggested that they subdivide the property, so that each building is on its own piece of property and could later be sold individually should the need arise.

Chairman Cox opened the public hearing and called for comments. There being none, on a motion by Commission Member Kuykendall, seconded by Vice-Chairman Mantzey, the Commission unanimously voted to close the public hearing and approve the proposed minor replat as recommended by Staff, with a vote of 6-0-0.

END OF REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS AND PUBLIC HEARINGS

Chairman Cox continued the meeting with the Discussion Items on the agenda.

18-0002M Update on ONE McKinney 2040 Comprehensive Plan Initiative

Mr. Aaron Bloxham, Planner II for the City of McKinney, gave a presentation on the ONE McKinney 2040 Comprehensive Plan Initiative. He briefly discussed the phases completed, the various outreach events, timeline, general approach, policy direction, and strategy components of the ONE McKinney 2040 Comprehensive Plan Initiative. Mr.

Bloxham stated that during the process there was a regional discussion taking place regarding transportation with the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG), Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT), Collin County, and the City of McKinney. He stated that Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) launched the U.S. Highway 380 Feasibility Study last year and that the City has been awaiting progress on that Feasibility Study before finalizing the ONE McKinney 2040 Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Bloxham stated that TxDOT plans to hold outreach meetings in Spring 2018 and that the City of McKinney will re-engage stakeholders on the ONE McKinney 2040 process soon and will begin moving forward with the initiative again following those Spring TxDOT meetings. He offered to answer questions.

Commission Member Smith asked if the re-engagement phase was just to share information about where the plan currently is or is it to gather additional input from stakeholders. Mr. Bloxham stated that it would be a combination of both. Commission Member Cobbel asked what the possibilities were that after all of the feedback there could be some major changes to the plan. Ms. Jennifer Arnold, Planning Manager for the City of McKinney, stated that changes to the plan should only be to incorporate applicable considerations for U.S. Highway 380 based on the progress of the TxDOT study and to account for any major changes in existing development that have occurred over the last year.

Vice-Chairman Mantzey asked what happens if U.S. Highway 380 stays as it is and if traffic is considered in the development of the plan. Ms. Arnold stated that part of the Comprehensive Plan process is considering travel demand modeling, so Staff should be able to project what the traffic flow would look like. She stated that TxDOT was also looking at it as well.

Vice-Chairman Mantzey asked if TxDOT does not propose any changes to U.S. Highway 380 if Staff would look at making change changes to land uses in the area to help with traffic congestion. Ms. Arnold stated that was a possibility and gave some examples.

Commission Member Cobbel asked how Staff foresaw U.S. Highway 380 in the current version of the ONE McKinney 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update. Ms. Arnold stated that the draft plan currently considers U.S. Highway 380 as-is.

Commission Member Smith asked if TxDOT plans to expand U.S. Highway 75 south of McKinney. Ms. Arnold stated that they are planning to expand U.S. Highway 75 between Interstate 635 and State Highway 121; however, she was unsure of the details.

Chairman Cox stated that it was good that the citizens have another opportunity to have input and be involved in the ONE McKinney 2040 Comprehensive Plan Initiative process. Ms. Arnold stated that Staff hopes to get the Comprehensive Plan Update completed by the end of the year. Chairman Cox thanked Staff for the update.

END OF DISCUSSION ITEMS

Vice-Chairman Mantzey congratulated Chairman Cox on receiving the 2017 Stemmons Service Award given by North Texas Commercial Association of Realtors and Real Estate Professionals (NTCAR). He stated that it is given to someone who best exemplifies the highest standards of a commercial broker, along with a demonstrated commitment to professional and community involvement. Vice-Chairman Mantzey stated Chairman Cox was followed in his father's footsteps, who also won the award in 2001. The Commission Members and Staff congratulated Chairman Cox on receiving this huge accomplishment.

There being no further business, Chairman Cox declared the meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

BILL COX
Chairman