

## PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MAY 26, 2020

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, May 26, 2020, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.

City Council Present: Charlie Philips

Commission Members Present: Chairman Bill Cox, Vice-Chairman Brian Mantzey, Christopher Haeckler, Deanna Kuykendall, Cam McCall, Bry Taylor, and Scott Woodruff  
– Alternate

Commission Members absent: Hamilton Doak,

Staff Present: Assistant City Manager Kim Flom, Director of Planning Jennifer Arnold, Planner II Danielle Mathews, Planners Kaitlin Gibbon and Joseph Moss, and Administrative Assistant Terri Ramey

There were nine guests present.

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

Chairman Cox Called for public comments on non-public hearing agenda items. There were none.

The Commission unanimously approved the motion by Commission Member Haeckler, seconded by Commission Member McCall, to approve the following Consent item as recommended by Staff, with a vote of 7-0-0.

**20-0438** Minutes of the Planning and Zoning Commission Regular Meeting of May 12, 2020.

END OF CONSENT

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

**20-0031Z** Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on a Request to Rezone the Subject Property from "RS 60" - Single Family Residence District to "C1" - Neighborhood Commercial District, Located on the Northwest Corner of U.S. Highway 380 (University Drive) and West Way.

Ms. Danielle Mathews, Planner II for the City of McKinney, explained the proposed rezoning request. She stated that the intent is to convert the existing single-family dwelling units into office uses on the subject property. Ms. Mathews discussed the surrounding zoning, then explained that the Comprehensive Plan stated that the intensity and historic form/character will likely transition to more traditional development patterns in areas near U.S. Highway 75 (Central Expressway) and U.S. Highway 380 (University Drive) and Redbud Boulevard areas. She stated that the office and commercial uses along this section of U.S. Highway 380 (University Drive) suggested this area was in transition. Ms. Mathews stated that given the site's location along a business highway, Staff feels the proposal will complement the surrounding area. She stated that a letter of opposition was distributed to the Commission prior to the meeting. Ms. Mathews stated that Staff recommends approval of the proposed rezoning request and offered to answer questions. Vice-Chairman Mantzey asked if there would be parking and screening requirements in regard to the residential development to the north. Ms. Mathews stated that there would be parking and screening requirements that must meet. Mr. Bruce Chen, John & Vincent Investment, LLC, 14134 Susana Lane, Frisco, TX, explained the proposed rezoning request and offered to answer questions. There were none. Chairman Cox opened the public hearing and called for comments. There being none, on a motion by Vice-Chairman Mantzey, seconded by Alternate Commission Member Woodruff, 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 7-0-0. Chairman Cox stated that the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission will be forwarded to the City Council meeting on June 16, 2020.

**20-0003SUP** Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on a Specific Use Permit to Allow for Automobile Sales, Repair, or Storage (Brandon Tomes Subaru), Located Approximately 870 Feet East of Hardin Boulevard and on the North Side of State Highway 121 (Sam Rayburn Tollway). Ms. Danielle Mathews, Planner II for the City of McKinney, explained the proposed specific use permit. She discussed the surrounding zoning and developments. Ms. Mathews stated that the applicant was requesting a specific use permit to allow for automobile sales, repair, or storage (Brandon Tomes Subaru) because the current zoning for the subject property required that a specific use permit be granted for a car dealership at this site. Ms. Mathews stated that the applicant has submitted an exhibit, detailing building location, parking areas, and ingress/egress points. She stated that Staff must consider not only the specific use permit criteria in the Ordinance, but the Comprehensive Plan, which identified the preferred scenario as the Collin McKinney Commercial District and designated the placetype as Entertainment Center. Ms. Mathews stated that Staff felt the site should be preserved in an effort towards diversifying entertainment mix in the City, as well as to provide cultural and community amenities. Ms. Mathews stated that, amongst other reasons, in 2018 City Council approved a resolution that required specific use permits for auto related uses, in an effort to preserve U.S. Highway 75 (Central Expressway) and State Highway 121 (Sam Rayburn Tollway) for uses that enhanced McKinney's presence along these major corridors. She stated that Staff had not received any letters of support or opposition to the request, and that Staff recommended denial of the proposed specific use permit. She added that if the Commission decided to recommend approval of the request that the special ordinance provisions listed in the Staff Report shall apply. Ms. Mathews offered to answer questions. There were none. Mr. Bob Roeder; Abernathy, Roeder, Boyd, & Hullett, P.C.; 1700 Redbud Blvd.; McKinney, TX; explained the proposed specific use permit.

He stated that the proposed use would be compatible with the surrounding uses, and that there should be appropriate access at this location. He stated that, while the Comprehensive Land Use Plan designates the area from Highway 75 (Central Expressway) to Custer Road as Entertainment Center, it was highly unlikely the subject property would ever develop for Entertainment Center type uses. He stated that an automotive use would be the highest and best use at this location. Mr. Roeder then explained that we are in a unique situation with the COVID-19 lockdown, and life might not be the same afterwards. He stated that this project would put \$12 million ad valorem tax value on the ground, would almost double the number of employees compared to the current location, and that these jobs have an average annual salary of \$68,000 plus benefits. Mr. Roeder stated that the Tomes family has been a vital and important citizen of McKinney for a number of years, and that this would be a first-class development. Mr. Roeder offered to answer questions. There were none. Chairman Cox opened the public hearing and called for comments. There being none, on a motion by Vice-Chairman Mantzey, seconded by Commission Member Haeckler, the Commission unanimously voted to close the public hearing, with a vote of 7-0-0. Vice-Chairman Mantzey stated that the Tomes family has been a good citizen of McKinney, business owners for a long time, and do quality projects. He stated that automobile dealerships provided valuable jobs to the community and people will continue to purchase vehicles. Vice-Chairman Mantzey stated that he felt this request deserved to be recommended for approval and let City Council make the final decision. Chairman Cox concurred with Mr. Roeder's comments regarding having a business ready to develop on the property now. He stated that it was important the City continue to grow, so that the citizens could afford to do the things they liked to do. Chairman Cox stated that adding \$12 million to the tax rolls was a big deal, and that the subject property was suited for the proposed development. Chairman

Cox stated he would support the proposed specific use permit. Alternate Commission Member Woodruff asked if the \$12 million would include the difference in what the current site is worth or not. Mr. Roeder explained that the construction costs for this site was approximately \$12 million. Alternate Commission Member Woodruff stated that he was in favor of trying to preserve the property along Highway 121 (Sam Rayburn Tollway) for corporate campuses and getting large companies to come to McKinney in the future. He stated that on the flip side, this property is located in between an automotive dealership and an Oncor station. Chairman Cox stated that was a valid point. Chairman Cox stated that this site has some unique features that might make it difficult to develop an office building. He felt there were other sites further west more appropriate for office uses. Commission Member Kuykendall stated that limitations sometimes spark some of the best innovations, and that after all of this is over development might come back even stronger than before. Commission Member Kuykendall stated that she tended to lean towards Staff's recommendation for denial due to City Council's stance on the issue. Alternate Commission Member Woodruff asked if the City collected tax on the available automobile inventory for sale. Ms. Jennifer Arnold, Director of Planning for the City of McKinney, stated that she believed the City collected tax on the available inventory based off what was still available at the end of the year. Mr. Roeder explained that dealerships pay an inventory sales tax based upon the previous year's sales for new vehicle sales and sales tax on all of the parts they sell and automotive work performed. Commission Member McCall stated that he might agree with the City's recommendation at another location in the City, but that he liked this location due to the surrounding uses. Commission Member Haeckler stated that a lot of thought went into the ONE McKinney 2040 Comprehensive Plan and the vision for this area of McKinney, and that the City Council decisions were fairly recent. He stated that he agreed with Staff's recommendation of

denial. On a motion by Vice-Chairman Mantzey, seconded by Commission Member McCall, the Commission voted to recommend approval of the proposed specific use permit with the special ordinance provisions listed in the Staff report, with a vote of 5-2-0. Commission Members Haeckler and Kuykendall voted against the motion. Chairman Cox stated that the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission will be forwarded to the City Council meeting on June 16, 2020.

**19-055Z** 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 and to Allow Commercial Uses and a Telecommunication Tower, Located on the South Side of Virginia Parkway and on the East Side of Dogwood Trail. Ms. Kaitlin Gibbon, Planner I for the City of McKinney, explained the proposed rezoning request. She stated that she distributed two letters of opposition to the Commission prior to the meeting. Ms. Gibbon stated that there was one letter of opposition included in the meeting packet as well. She stated that the applicant has also provided a binder with supportive information. Ms. Gibbon stated that the applicant is proposing to rezone the subject property to a "PD" – Planned Development District with a base zoning of "C1" – Neighborhood Commercial District, with an allowed use of a telecommunications tower. She stated that the tower would be a stealth, unipole design, and would be a maximum height of 95' with a 4' lighting rod. Ms. Gibbon stated that commercial antennas and antenna support structures are allowed by specific use permit in most non-residential zoning districts, if the proposed tower complies with certain requirements set forth in the Zoning Ordinance. She stated that the proposed telecommunications tower does not meet all of the requirements and therefore the applicant has requested a rezoning of the subject property. Ms. Gibbon stated that under the existing zoning the northern half of the property has a maximum building height of 50' and on the southern half of the property has a maximum building height of 35'. She

stated that the applicant is proposing to maintain these maximum height provisions and requesting a maximum height of 95' for the telecommunications tower with a 4' lighting rod. Ms. Gibbon stated that Staff does not have any objections to maintaining the building height maximums currently allowed on the subject property; however, Staff does have concerns regarding the proposed height of the proposed communications tower in an area that has largely developed for residential and neighborhood-scaled commercial uses. She stated that part of that criteria in the existing ordinance allows for the increased height of the tower beyond the maximum zoning district, if the tower is located at least a minimum setback distance of equal to three times the height of the structure. Ms. Gibbon stated that with this requirement the proposed telecommunications tower typically would be required to be approximately 285' away from the adjacent property. She stated that the proposed telecommunications tower would be located approximately 75' from the nearest adjacent property line. Ms. Gibbon stated that commercial antenna support structures in non-residential zoning districts are required to maintain minimum setback requirements from any residential zoning district boundary line equal to twice the height of the support structure. She stated that based upon the proposed height of the telecommunications tower of 95', the minimum distance that would typically be required between the tower and residential property line is approximately 190'. Ms. Gibbon stated that the applicant is proposing a minimum setback of the proposed telecommunications tower and the adjacent single-family development to be 145'. She stated that with "PD" – Planned Development District requests, the applicant is proposing to increase the required height of the masonry screening wall from 6' to 8'. Ms. Gibbon stated that the applicant is also proposing to provide Texas Shade shrubs on the north and south side of the screening device. She stated that Staff appreciates the applicant's proposal and enhancements for the screening device, concerns remain about the request. Ms. Gibbon stated that Staff feels as

though the proposed telecommunications tower is not compatible with the surrounding areas. She stated that Staff has safety concerns with the potential collapse of tower in a parking lot and within such close proximity to neighborhood-scaled uses and residences could pose a risk. Ms. Gibbon stated that given these factors and concerns, Staff was unable to support the proposed rezoning request. She offered to answer questions. Commission Member Haeckler asked if the proposed telecommunication tower was unique to McKinney. Ms. Gibbon stated that they were proposing a stealth, unipole tower design. Ms. Jennifer Arnold, Director of Planning for the City of McKinney, stated that there is a similar tower near Highway 75 (Central Expressway) and Eldorado Parkway. Commission Member Haeckler asked if the other tower met the minimum setback requirements at that location. Ms. Arnold stated that Staff's concern was the proximity to the neighborhood-scaled uses. She stated that Staff might be able to get comfortable with some reductions to the distance from property line to tower setbacks and gave some examples. Alternate Commission Member Woodruff asked if the church owns the property to the east. Ms. Gibbon stated that the subject property and adjacent property have two separate owners. Commission Member McCall asked about the distance between the proposed tower and the adjacent residential properties. Ms. Gibbon stated that that the distance between the tower and the closest residential property line was approximately 160'; however, the applicant was tying down a minimum distance of 145' in the proposed zoning ordinance. She stated that the distance between the tower and the property to the east is approximately 75'. Alternate Commission Member Woodruff asked about the entrance to the tower enclosure. Ms. Gibbon stated that the entrance gate would be positioned towards the east property line. Mr. Bebb Francis, The Francis Law Firm, PC, 112 E. Pecan, San Antonio, TX, explained the proposed rezoning request and gave a presentation. He stated that he was the attorney for Skyway Towers. Mr. Francis thanked Ms. Arnold and Ms. Gibbon for the



great collaborative effort over the past 18 months on this project. He stated that the proposed tower was critical to the area due to T-Mobile experiencing a gap in its wireless service in this area of McKinney. He discussed the increase in cell phone usage due to the spread of COVID-19. Mr. Francis gave various examples of E911, telehealth, various alerts, and staying connected with the schools and teachers using cell phones. He stated that the proposed masonry screening wall around the tower would be painted to match the church and would have a wrought iron gate. Mr. Francis stated that they were asked to reduce four parking spaces to allow for landscaping hubs to plant four trees and additional landscaping to soften the look. He stated that they were proposing a unipole with the wires and antennas concealed on the inside. Mr. Francis stated that the proposed tower would accommodate T-Mobile and two additional carriers. Mr. Francis stated that the proposed unipole was designed to bend upon itself in an unlikely event as described in the Engineer's letter. He stated that the bend point is set at 71'. Mr. Francis gave examples of where similar tower have withstood various destructive events. He showed photo simulations of how the tower might appear on the church property. Mr. Francis discussed the justification letter regarding the wireless signal gap for residential and commercial service for this area. He stated that they searched for other towers or structures in this area to collocate, however were unsuccessful. Mr. Francis explained why they chose this site. Mr. Francis stated that Skyway did an outreach to the community by writing a letter to 33 nearby residents asking them to call with questions and allow them to explain why this is a critical site for the proposed tower. He stated that they only received one call. Mr. Francis stated that they believe they meet the intent of the City's code. He offered to answer questions. Commission Member Haeckler asked for clarification on the distance from the proposed tower to the closest residential property. Mr. Francis stated that the distance from the center of the tower to the closest residential property would be 160'. He stated that while speaking with Ms. Gibbon

regarding the language for the ordinance, she suggested included the minimum setback should be 145' in the proposed zoning ordinance. Ms. Gibbon stated that would allow a little flexibility if for some reason they would need to move the tower closer. She stated that the tower was currently proposed to be located 160' away from the closest residential property line. Alternate Commission Member Woodruff asked if the property to the east would be affected by the tower being located by requiring additional setbacks once that property is developed. Ms. Gibbon stated that no, the adjacent property would follow their own setback requirements. Ms. Arnold stated that the development on the adjacent property would not be affected due to the tower on the subject property. Commission Member Haeckler asked if Staff participated in the search for a location for the proposed tower. Ms. Arnold stated that Staff typically does not direct applicants to other locations. Commission Member Kuykendall stated that she sees the need for the proposed tower to keep up with the demands. She asked if they were not allowed to build at this location if there was a way to see what other locations were available to be able to fill the service gaps. Ms. Arnold stated that many times the companies lease a space on commercial properties to place the telecommunication tower. She stated that Staff would prefer to see the towers located in major commercial areas and as far away from residential as possible. Ms. Arnold stated that Staff has concerns regarding the height of the proposed tower and not necessarily the location. She stated that sometimes there were tower enclosed in structures like steeples, so that they were not as visible. Alternate Commission Member Woodruff asked if there was a way to build the proposed tower at a lower height. Mr. Francis stated that the T-Mobile engineer stated that the antenna needs to be located at a 95' height to be able to provide service to the current gaps in this area. He stated that would cause the additional carriers to be at a lower height, which might not meet their needs. Mr. Francis felt that if they try to build the tower at a lower height, they would be back within two years

with a new request. Commission Member Haeckler asked what the minimum diameter was at the base of the proposed tower. Mr. Francis stated that the diameter would be approximately 54". Alternate Commission Member Woodruff asked if they considered locating the entrance to the tower towards the church instead of the undeveloped property to the east. Mr. Francis stated that he was not part of the lease agreement for the site. He stated that the Commission could condition that as a requirement, and he could get that clarified prior to the City Council meeting. Vice-Chairman Mantzey stated that there is a dumpster located near the proposed tower location. Commission Member Haeckler asked for the distance between the proposed tower and the closest church structure due to safety concerns. Mr. Francis stated that he was unaware of that being measured. He guessed that it would be approximately 160'. Ms. Gibbon reiterated that the setbacks were to the property line and not existing structures on the property. Ms. Arnold stated that the safety of the church was a good point. She estimated the distance to be between 150' – 160'. Chairman Cox opened the public hearing and called for comments. Mr. Larry Robinson, 2504 Peachtree Lane, McKinney, TX, stated that he lives near the church's parking lot. He stated that he opposes the proposed location for the tower. Mr. Robinson did not feel the site was large enough for a 95' pole. Mr. Robinson expressed safety concerns and gave various bad weather examples that could affect the tower. He expressed concerns about possible unauthorized climbing of the tower. He also felt it would decrease the value of the adjacent properties. Mr. Robinson requested the proposed rezoning request be denied. Mr. Richard Weaver, 2419 Peachtree Lane, McKinney, TX, turned in a Speakers Card in opposition to the proposed rezoning request; however, he did not wish to speak during the meeting. On a motion by Vice-Chairman Mantzey, seconded by Commission Member McCall, the Commission unanimously voted to close the public hearing, with a vote of 7-0-0. Vice-Chairman Mantzey stated that he understands the demand and need for wireless service. He felt the

telecommunication towers should be located near commercial developments. Vice-Chairman Mantzey expressed concerns about locating wireless close to residential properties and how it would affect their property values. He stated that it comes down to whether we want to set a precedent on how close we were willing to allow telecommunication tower near residential properties. Vice-Chairman Mantzey stated that he would support Staff's recommendation for denial of the request. Commission Member Haeckler stated that he understands there is a need for wireless service in the area. He expressed concerns about the 75' setback to the property to the east and the tower being an eyesore. Commission Member Haeckler stated that he also agreed with Staff's recommendation for denial of the request. Commission Member Kuykendall stated that during this challenging time we need to make sure we have the infrastructure in place to meet the need. Commission Member Kuykendall stated that there were a lot of different components to this request. Commission Member Kuykendall reiterated that it was a difficult decision. Commission Member McCall concurred with the previous Commission's comments. Alternate Commission Member Woodruff stated that there were pros and cons to the request. Chairman Cox stated that the question seemed to not be the need, but the location. Commission Member Kuykendall questioned that, if this truly is the only location in this area for the tower, would not approving it negatively impact the need of service in this area. She questioned if there were other location options. Commission Member Haeckler concurred and stated that he was not sure this was the only possible location for the tower. Chairman Cox asked Mr. Francis if there were other locations to place the tower. Mr. Francis said no sir. Commission Member Haeckler questioned if this is the only possible location if we would be doing a disservice to the community by not approving it. Commission Member Kuykendall asked if Staff was in agreement that there was not another location where a tower like this could be placed for service to this area. Ms. Arnold stated that Staff has not

spoken with property owners and businesses along US Highway 75 (Central Expressway) and Virginia Parkway to know if a tower in that location could be viable. She stated that Staff looks at what the applicant provides and if Staff feels that they have provided enough justification to warrant bringing forward a zoning case based upon the propagation map provided. Ms. Arnold stated that the applicant can speak to whether or not they have approached other possible property owners or locations. Ms. Arnold stated that Staff does not know if other options fell through or what. Commission Member Haeckler stated that he does not want to compromise safety. He asked what the setback requirement was for the adjacent property to the east. Ms. Gibbon stated that it was 15'. On a motion by Vice-Chairman Mantzey, seconded by Commission Member Haeckler, the Commission recommended denial of the proposed rezoning request as recommended by Staff, with a vote of 7-0-0. Commission Member Kuykendall stated that she did not feel that she had enough information to go against Staff's recommendation for denial. She felt that there was more information that could be gathered to make a more informed decision. Chairman Cox stated that the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission will be forwarded to the City Council meeting on June 16, 2020.

**20-0014Z** 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 Use and Development Standards, Located on the South Side of Rockhill Road and Approximately 200 Feet West of Dogwood Trail. Mr. Joe Moss, Planner I for the City of McKinney, explained the proposed rezoning request. He stated that he distributed five letters of opposition to the Commission that were received today. Mr. Moss stated that the packet included three letters of opposition and one letter of support. He discussed the surrounding uses. Mr. Moss stated that the proposed zoning would tie down the

proposed layout exhibit included in the Staff report. He discussed the proposed layout, parking, landscaping, and screening for the development. Mr. Moss stated that given the scale and density, Staff feels the proposed zoning would provide an appropriate transition between the existing multi-family and the single-family homes in the vicinity. He stated that Staff recommends approval of the proposed rezoning request and offered to answer questions. Vice-Chairman Mantzey asked for the current density. Mr. Moss stated that the current zoning has a patio home across Rockhill Road and multi-family zoning on the remainder of the property that would cap out at 17 units per acre. Commission Member Haeckler asked if the density would be increasing or decreasing with the proposed rezoning request. Mr. Moss stated that the overall density would be decreasing. He stated that they were proposing a cap of 10 units per acre. Commission Member Haeckler asked about the access points. Mr. Moss stated that there were two proposed entrances. He stated that one entrance would align with an existing street and the other would be further to the east. Vice-Chairman Mantzey asked about the possibility of widening Rockhill Road. Mr. Moss stated that the Engineering Department Staff told him that any development at this location would be required to develop their half of Rockhill Road. Ms. Lisa Gage, Gage Planning Associates, LLC, 5911 S., Banning Street, Gilbert, AZ, concurred with the Staff report and offered to answer questions. There were none. She also stated that Staff was great to work with on this request. Chairman Cox opened the public hearing and called for comments. Ms. Jules Ellis, 2802 Rockhill Road, McKinney, TX, stated that they have lived at this location for 24 years. She spoke in opposition to the request. Ms. Ellis expressed concerns over a masonry screening wall that would be located across from their property. She questioned if the proposed entrance to the west was actually lined up with the existing street. Ms. Ellis express concerns about headlights from vehicles leaving the development shining into adjacent property owner's

windows at night. She expressed concerns regarding the number of apartments being built in the area. Ms. Ellis stated that the nearby Rustic Apartments having emergency vehicles and the police there all of the time. She stated that she has been told there are drug problems there. Ms. Ellis stated that they did not want more of these issues near their house. She stated that the Fiscal Analysis shows the property would have a \$13 million reduction in taxable property value compared to what could be developed on the property under the current zoning. Ms. Ellis requested that the developer install an 8' masonry screening wall instead of a 6' masonry screening wall. She requested that they move the proposed pool location to boarder the Rustic Apartments and away from Rockhill Road, to help with the noise issues. Ms. Ellis stated that they can hear people at the Rustic Apartments' pool at night. Mr. Neil Mays, 2710 Rockhill Road, McKinney, TX, asked about the future enhancement of Rockhill Road. He expressed concerns about having a continued construction zone on Rockhill Road with all of the development occurring for the next few years. Mr. Mays asked when the construction on this property would begin, if approved. He stated that when he moved here 21 years ago, he was told that garden style homes were planned for the subject property. Mr. Mays stated that there was a difference in purchased property verses rental property. On a motion by Vice-Chairman Mantzey, seconded by Alternate Commission Member Woodruff, the Commission unanimously voted to close the public hearing, with a vote of 7-0-0. Commission Member Kuykendall asked Staff to discuss the current zoning and density verses the proposed density. Mr. Moss stated that the current zoning has a minimum 4,500 square foot lot size garden style houses across Rockhill Road in the first 100 feet and behind that based off of the "RG-18" – General Residence District, which is an older multi-family district that has a modified density cap of 17 units per acre. Commission Member Haeckler asked if they were proposing a change in the height allowance. Mr. Moss

stated that the proposed zoning would keep the same height allowance currently allowed and in line with the adjacent zoning at 35'. Commission Member Haeckler asked Staff to discuss the steps of when traffic and street improvement studies would be completed during the submittal process. Ms. Moss stated that at the time of site planning, Engineering Staff would evaluate the need for any studies deemed necessary and any improvements that would be required. He stated that after speaking with Engineering Staff recently, the developer would be required to build half of Rockhill Road that is currently substandard. Chairman Cox asked if the developer would be required to build their portion of Rockhill Road before construction began or afterwards. Mr. Moss stated that they would be required to improve the road with the construction on the site. He stated that before they could get their certificate of occupancy and plat filed, they would be required to have the improvements accepted by the Engineering Department. Chairman Cox asked if there was a way for citizens to track the progress of the project. Ms. Moss stated that the City has an online dash board that tracks what submittals have been received. Ms. Jennifer Arnold, Director of Planning for the City of McKinney, stated that there is also a Notify Me email option on the City's website where citizens can sign up to be notified when specific agendas are published. For example: City Council and Planning and Zoning Commission agendas. Chairman Cox asked Ms. Gage when they plat to begin construction on the site. Ms. Gage stated that the hope to break ground during the fourth quarter of 2020. Chairman Cox asked if she knew the estimated length of construction time for the project. Ms. Gage stated that it would be approximately 12 months. Vice-Chairman Mantzey asked if Ms. Gage could relay the neighbor's concerns to the developer. Ms. Gage stated that she would share their concerns to the developer for consideration. Commission Member Haeckler stated that the proposed rezoning request would reduce the density and they were not requesting any height



variances. On a motion by Commission Member Haeckler, seconded by Commission Member Taylor, the Commission Unanimously voted to recommend approval of the proposed rezoning request as recommended by Staff, with a vote of 7-0-0. Chairman Cox stated that the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission will be forwarded to the City Council meeting on June 16, 2020.

END OF THE REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS AND PUBLIC HEARINGS

On a motion by Commission Member Haeckler, seconded by Commission Member McCall, the Commission unanimously voted to adjourn the meeting, with a vote of 7-0-0. There being no further business, Chairman Cox declared the meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

---

BILL COX  
Chairman