

Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes of June 28, 2016:

14-068FR Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on a Facade Plan Appeal for a Multi-Family Residential Development (McKinney Urban Village), Located Approximately 850 Feet North of Frisco Road and on the West Side of State Highway 5 (McDonald Street)

Ms. Eleana Galicia, Planner I for the City of McKinney, explained the proposed facade plan appeal. She stated that the applicant was requesting a facade plan appeal for the covered parking structures for McKinney Urban Village. Ms. Galicia stated that the proposed covered parking structures feature exposed steel and metal roofing as shown in the proposed elevations. She stated that the architectural and site standards of the Zoning ordinance require all covered parking and enclosed parking for multifamily residential uses to be finished with similar materials as the main multifamily structures. Ms. Galicia stated that the standards specifically stated that exposed steel or timber supporting columns for covered parking structures shall be prohibited. She stated that the main building consists of brick masonry with a combination of stucco and fiber cement finishing materials. Ms. Galicia stated that a meritorious exception (14-269ME) was approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on October 14, 2014 to allow for covered parking structures to be designed with the appearance of wood trellises; however, they would be constructed of fiberglass material. She stated that the architectural standards are intended to serve as a baseline for the minimum design expectations of the City and to provide for development of enduring quality that provides visual character and interest. Ms. Galicia stated that Staff was in the opinion that a similar design could be accomplished through the use of masonry columns and the use of steel columns does not meet the requirements nor the intent of the architectural standards.

She stated that Staff recommends denial of the proposed façade plan appeal due to the proposed elevations for the covered parking structure columns not being finished with masonry materials. She offered to answer questions.

Ms. Lauren Partovi, Catalyst Urban Development, 7001 Preston Rd., Dallas, TX, explained the proposed facade plan appeal and gave a brief history of the meritorious exception (14-268ME) that was approved on October 14, 2014. She stated that they had submitted a trellises inspired design made of wood; however, in the final approval there was a stipulation that the parking structures be made of fiber glass material. Ms. Partovi stated that they did not catch that at the time. She stated that they had not been able to find a manufacturer that makes a commercial grade fiber glass carport. Ms. Partovi stated that they had selected a company for the carport installation for this project that they feel like is proposing a quality design that is consistent with the architectural components used in the main multifamily structure. She gave a presentation showing the current status of the overall development and level of quality. Ms. Partovi stated that all of the proposed parking structures would not be visible from the public street. She stated that they proposed covered parking in this area. Ms. Partovi showed the approved covered parking structure design compared to the proposed design. She explained that they were advised that the approved design would have some maintenance issues, whereas the proposed metal design would be more durable. Ms. Partovi stated that they were proposing a metal open gabled roof with double metal columns. She stated that the posts would match the color of the roof. Ms. Partovi discussed the various upper story view looking onto the parking area if there was not covered parking, flat roof carports, and gabled roof carports. She stated that the proposed gabled roof carports would look similar to small buildings

within the courtyard and was the best treatment option. Ms. Partovi stated that the mail kiosk would have the same metal material on its roof that was being proposed for the covered carports. She offered to answer questions.

Commission Member McCall asked if the multifamily structure would have the same metal roofing material. Ms. Partovi stated that the multifamily structure would have a shingle roof. She stated that there were metal accents and the mail kiosk would have a metal roof.

Vice-Chairman Zepp asked if the proposed 4"x4" covered parking posts would be square and not round. Ms. Partovi stated that they would be square.

Vice-Chairman Zepp asked if the proposed metal would be powder coated instead of being painted. Ms. Partovi stated that they would be painted onsite by the same crew that paints the building.

Vice-Chairman Zepp asked what the width of the columns would be if they added the required masonry. Ms. Partovi stated that they would take up approximately 12" in diameter, which their current plan does not accommodate.

Commission Member Smith asked if they expected to build the masonry columns at the beginning of the project. Ms. Partovi stated that they initially expected to build a wood structure with a trellis appearance that had a column that fit within the striping zone that divided each parking space.

Commission Member Smith asked how using the masonry columns would affect their ability to meet the City's parking requirements. Ms. Partovi stated that they would have to modify their layout for the development. She stated that the proposed design would allow for two to four extra parking spaces and would be cutting the parking spaces

pretty close to what was required. Ms. Partovi stated that they increased the number of covered parking spaces with the proposed design, which she felt helped the aesthetic of the courtyard. She stated that she proposed to plant more trees in that zone than what was required by the City. Ms. Partovi stated that they felt it was a good balance and was also consistent with the architecture of the building.

Vice-Chairman Zepp asked if the proposed changes would cause there to be less trees planted in the courtyard. Ms. Partovi said no, they were proposing to plant the same number of trees in that area. She explained that they propose to build additional carports so that there would not be as many cars visible from the upper residential view. Ms. Partovi stated that the planting would not be affected.

Commission Member Mantzey asked how many spaces they proposed to cover with the requested changes. Ms. Partovi said 24 parking spaces. She stated that they were showing the entire courtyard so that they could address the market response.

Commission Member Mantzey asked if the current approved columns were 4" x 4" like what they were currently requesting. Ms. Partovi said yes. She stated that the only difference would be the material used to construct it.

Chairman Cox asked how many columns were in question. Ms. Partovi stated that they currently have approval to build the trellis design made out of fiber glass. She stated that the challenge was meeting the parking requirement, which she felt was more important than the structure themselves. Ms. Partovi stated that they might consider not providing covered parking. She stated that would be unfortunate for the residents of the development that would like a covered space and not a whole garage. Ms. Partovi stated that if the Planning and Zoning Commission was uncomfortable with the proposed

material for the covered parking then she would prefer to table the project to allow them to come up with another alternative.

Ms. Galicia stated that the applicant was proposing to have supporting columns every two parking spaces. She stated that it was shown on the proposed site plan in the Staff report.

Commission Member Mantzey asked if Staff had reviewed the parking requirements of the proposed design versus the masonry requirement. Ms. Galicia stated that the applicant would need to let Staff know how wide the columns would be with the masonry finishing materials. She stated that the masonry columns would probably take up more room than what was currently approved to be built, which would cause them to lose some parking spaces. Ms. Galicia stated that the proposed development only had two extra parking spaces. She stated that parking spaces were required to be a minimum of 9' wide.

Commission Member Smith asked Staff to comment on the durability issue of the masonry columns. Ms. Galicia stated that all of the multifamily developments in McKinney have provided masonry around the columns and not exposed steel. She stated that Staff would like to carryover that consistency.

Commission Member Smith asked if there were steel parking garages at any apartment complexes in McKinney. Ms. Galicia stated that she was not aware of any in McKinney; however, there could be some that were built prior to the architectural standards being passed or if they received a facade plan appeal approval.

Commission Member Smith asked if Staff spoke with the applicant about not being able to supply the approved material for the parking structures. Ms. Galicia said

yes. She stated that if the applicant was not able to provide the approved material then they could have reverted back to the City's standard requirements.

Commission Member Smith asked if the applicant discussed any alternative designs with Staff. Ms. Galicia said no.

Commission Member Smith wanted to clarify that the applicant could revert back to the original design. Ms. Galicia said yes. She stated that the applicant was having an issue finding something composed of fiber glass material to build the parking structures. Ms. Galicia stated that she could not speak as to why the fiber glass material was requested.

Commission Member Smith stated that she was ready to support Staff recommendation to deny the request.

Commission Member McCall asked why the City did not recommend exposed metal to be used for the columns. Ms. Galicia stated that Staff felt that masonry was a higher quality material than exposed steel.

Commission Member Smith stated that the City's architectural standards were in place to maintain aesthetic appeal. She stated that they all understood the value of having architectural standards for the City.

Commission Member Kuykendall stated that she was not comfortable for approving what had been presented for this request. She stated that she was not opposed to allowing the applicant to submit another alternative.

Commission Member McCall asked if Staff's main concern about the request was the exposed metal columns and not the metal roof. Ms. Galicia said yes.

Ms. Partovi stated that there would not be much of a visual difference between the proposed steel columns and the approved fiber glass columns, since both would be painted. She stated that the difference would be that the steel was a commercial grade material that was more commonly used in this type of application and would hold up better over time. Ms. Partovi stated that the approved fiber glass material is proving to be very challenging to accomplish on the site to be durable and to the quality they expect on the project. She stated that she was happy to work with Staff to work on a compromise. Ms. Partovi asked if the Commission was comfortable with the original trellis design made out of metal.

Chairman Cox stated that the metal surface was still not allowed. Ms. Partovi stated that fiber glass was technically not allowed and had been approved. She stated that while going through the first process she believed it was more about the proposed design than the material being used. Ms. Partovi stated that if the Commission and Staff feel that the current design falls short of the intent, then she would prefer to revisit it, and see how close they can come to the approved design made out of steel. She stated that the contractors that she had spoken with did not recommend using fiber glass on the carport structures. Ms. Partovi stated that they explained that metal would be more durable. Mr. Brian Lockley, Director of Planning for the City of McKinney, stated that he believed that the direction that the Commission and Staff would like for her to go back to research into an alternative material that was not metal that she would find acceptable that also fit within the City's code. Ms. Partovi requested that the item be tabled to give them an opportunity to have further discussions with Staff and the groups that fabricate this type of structure to see what else they can come up with. She asked if they were

not able to come up with a new material and decided to go ahead with the approved design and material if they would need to come back before the Commission. Ms. Galicia stated that if they decide to go forward with the approved design and material or decided to use masonry, then they would not need to come back before the Commission. She stated that if they decide to use steel or some other material not permitted by the architectural standards, then they would need to come back before the Commission for approval. Ms. Galicia stated that Staff would work diligently with the applicant to come up with a material to be used on the carports.

Vice-Chairman Zepp asked if masonry was the only approved material for use on the carport columns. Ms. Galicia stated that it was for multifamily development. She stated that commercial development were not required to have masonry columns on their carports.

Vice-Chairman Zepp wanted to clarify that the previous approved material was for fiber glass columns. Ms. Galicia said yes.

Chairman Cox stated that someone must have thought that there were fiber glass columns produced and available.

Vice-Chairman Zepp stated that approving this request would not set a precedent, since the carports were not visible from a public right-of-way. He stated that the City had approved different variances from the Code in the past.

Commission Member Cobble stated that she enjoyed the difference in materials presented.

On a motion by Commission Member Smith, seconded by Commission Member Mantzey, the Commission voted to close the public hearing and deny the request per

Staff's recommendation failed, with a vote of 3-4-0. Chairman Cox, Vice-Chairman Zepp, Commission Member Cobbel, and Commission Member McCall voted against the motion.

During the discussion of the above motion, Vice-Chairman Zepp requested that the motion be denied, so that the item could be tabled to allow the applicant and Staff to come up with a compromise. He stated that fiber glass was not a desired material for the use on carport structures and questioned how it got approved.

On a motion by Vice-Chairman Zepp, seconded by Commission Member McCall, the Commission voted to close the public hearing and table the item indefinitely per the applicant's request, with a vote of 6-1-0. Commission Member Smith voted against the motion.