

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

OCTOBER 24, 2017

The Planning and Zoning Commission of the City of McKinney, Texas met in regular session in the Jack Hatchell Collin County Administration Building – Commissioners Court – 4th Floor at 2300 Bloomdale Road on Tuesday, October 24, 2017 at 6:00 p.m.

City Council Present: Charlie Philips

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

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

There were approximately 45 guests present.

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

Chairman Cox continued the meeting with the Consent Items.

The Commission unanimously approved the motion by Commission Member McCall, seconded by Commission Member Cobbel, to approve the following two Consent items, with a vote of 7-0-0.

17-1069 Minutes of the Planning and Zoning Commission Regular Meeting of October 10, 2017

17-243CVP Consider/Discuss/Act on a Conveyance Plat for Lots 1, 2, 3R, 6, 7, and 8, Block B of the Parkside at Craig Ranch Addition, Located on the Northwest Corner of State Highway 121 (Sam Rayburn Tollway) and Alma Road

END OF CONSENT

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

17-281Z Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on a Request to Rezone the Subject Property from "BN" - Neighborhood Business District to "DR" - Duplex Residential District, Located at the Northeast Corner of

**White Avenue and Kentucky Street (REQUEST TO BE
TABLED)**

Mr. Brian Lockley, Director of Planning for the City of McKinney, explained that Staff recommends that the public hearing be continued and the item be tabled to the November 14, 2017 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting due to public notification signs not being posted on the subject property within the timeframe required by the Zoning Ordinance. He offered to answer questions. There were none.

Chairman Cox opened the public hearing and called for comments. There being none, on a motion by Commission Member McCall, seconded by Commission Member Smith, the Commission voted unanimously to continue the public hearing and table the proposed rezoning request to the November 13, 2017 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting as recommended by Staff, with a vote of 7-0-0.

**17-125SUP Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on a
Specific Use Permit and Site Plan for a Pump Station
(Redbud Pump Station), Located Approximately 980
Feet South of Bloomdale Road and on the West Side of
Redbud Boulevard**

Ms. Danielle Quintanilla, Planner I for the City of McKinney, explained the proposed specific use permit. She stated that the City of McKinney's Engineering Department is requesting approval of a specific use permit and site plan to allow for an 11,533 square foot utility substation (Redbud Pump Station) and four water storage tanks. Ms. Quintanilla stated that the zoning on the property is "AG" – Agricultural District which allows for a utility substation and water storage tanks with the approval of a specific use permit. She stated that given that the area is industrial in nature, the Future Land Use Plan (FLUP) calls for this area to be industrial and the future, adjacent developments are proposed to be industrial uses, it is Staff's professional opinion that the utility substation and water storage tanks will be compatible with the surrounding land uses. Ms. Quintanilla stated that in addition to the specific use permit request, the Engineering Department is requesting approval of a variance. She stated that typically variances are requested during the site plan review process. Ms. Quintanilla stated that Staff combined the specific use permit and the site plan as one request since a site layout exhibit is required for the specific use permit request. She stated that approval of the specific use permit shall also constitute approval of the site plan, landscape plan, and associated variance request. Ms. Quintanilla stated that the Engineering Department is requesting

a variance for an alternate screening device to screen the bay door located on the north side of the building from public right-of-way (McLarry Drive). She stated that the alternate screening consists of an 8' tall chain link fence, Cedar Elm trees, Dwarf Wax Myrtle shrubs, and existing trees on the northwest portion of the property, which will remain until the future phases are constructed. Ms. Quintanilla stated that the chemical building just southwest of the bay door will also provide partial screening. She stated that the Engineering Department has indicated that traditional screening materials with piers and a foundation could interfere with the existing, buried infrastructure located north of the proposed building. Ms. Quintanilla stated that although a chain link fence is not an ideal screening material, it has been indicated as a temporary structure. She stated that it will also be enhanced by the existing trees as well as the proposed Cedar Elm trees and Wax Myrtle shrubs. Ms. Quintanilla stated that during a future phase of construction, an 8' tall wrought iron decorative fence with masonry columns and evergreen shrubs will be constructed along McLarry Drive, satisfying the screening requirement per the ordinance. She stated that once the future water tanks have been constructed, they will also serve as screening. Ms. Quintanilla stated that given the proposed chain link fence, row of shade trees, and shrubs to be planted along a portion of the chain link fence and existing trees to remain in place, it is Staff's professional opinion that the Engineering Department has met the intent of the Zoning Ordinance. She stated that Staff has no objections to the variance request to utilize an alternate screening device. Ms. Quintanilla stated that Staff recommends approval of the specific use permit and site plan variance request. She offer to answer questions.

Commission Member McCall asked where this would be located from the future college training academy. Ms. Quintanilla stated that it would be located to the west of it.

Vice-Chairman Mantzey asked about the construction timeline for the second two tanks. Ms. Quintanilla stated that she would allow the applicant to speak to the timeline for them.

Alternate Commission Member McReynolds asked about the location of the cemetery to the subject property. Ms. Quintanilla stated that it was located just north of the proposed utility substation.

Mr. Sam Meisner, Freese and Nichols, Inc., 2211 N. Haskell Avenue, Dallas, TX, stated that they were the engineering consultant for the City of McKinney on this project. He explained the proposed specific use permit. Mr. Meisner gave examples of when the future tanks might be built on the subject property. He stated that these expansions would be driven by growth and water demand.

Chairman Cox asked for clarification on what areas of the City these tanks would serve. Mr. Meisner stated that the pressure plane # 794 would be for the east side of Highway 75 (Central Expressway) and pressure plane # 850 would be Highway 75 (Central Expressway) to the west. Chairman Cox asked for clarification on a pressure plane. Mr. Meisner explained that was the elevation of the water towers.

Chairman Cox opened the public hearing and called for comments. There being none, on a motion by Commission Member Cobbel, seconded by Alternate Commission Member McReynolds, the Commission unanimously voted to recommend approval of the proposed specific use permit and site plan to allow for a utility substation and four water storage tanks 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 December 5, 2017.

17-085Z Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on a Request to Rezone the Subject Property from "AG" - Agricultural District to "SF5" - Single Family Residential District, Located at the Southeast Corner of Greenville Road and Enloe 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 0.38 acres of land from "AG" – Agricultural District to "SF5" – Single Family Residential District, generally for single family residential uses. Ms. Spriegel stated that the current zoning district allows for primarily agricultural uses; however, the applicant has indicated the potential for the property to develop for single family residential uses. She stated that the Future Land Use Plan (FLUP) designates the property for residential uses. Ms. Spriegel stated that the adjacent properties to the north, south, east, and west, are currently used or zoned for single family residential uses. She stated that given the adjacent similar single family residential uses, it is Staff's professional opinion the rezoning request is appropriate for the subject property and will remain compatible with

the existing and future land uses. Ms. Spriegel stated that Staff recommends approval of the proposed rezoning request. She offered to answer questions.

Alternate Commission Member McReynolds asked if the property boundaries were drawn correctly. Ms. Spriegel said yes, the property boundaries are drawn correctly and do cross over Enloe Road. She stated that Enloe Road was not formally a dedicated right-of-way and would be dedicated as part of the platting of this property.

Alternate Commission Member McReynolds asked how the setbacks would be affected with the right-of-way dedication for Enloe Road. Ms. Spriegel stated that they would be able to meet their setbacks with the required right-of-way.

Commission Member Cobbel asked if that would be addressed during the platting process. Ms. Spriegel said yes.

Mr. Mike Ripperger, 6951 Virginia Parkway, McKinney, TX, explained the proposed rezoning request. He concurred with the Staff Report.

Chairman Cox opened the public hearing and called for comments. There being none, on a motion by Commission Member Cobbel, 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 7-0-0.

Chairman Cox stated that the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission will be forwarded to the City Council meeting on December 5, 2017.

17-256Z Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on a Request to Rezone the Subject Property from "RS 60" - Single Family Residential District to "PD" - Planned Development District, Generally to Allow Single Family Attached Residential Uses, Located approximately 440 feet South of Standifer Street and on the East Side of Bumpas Street

Mr. Brian Lockley, Director of Planning for the City of McKinney, explained the proposed rezoning request. He stated that revised development standards were distributed to the Commission prior to the meeting. Mr. Lockley explained the document did not have an additional standards for the proposed development. He stated that it was primarily removing some redundant items and changing the order of some of the items that were listed in the Staff Report. Mr. Lockley stated that Staff and the applicant were discussing this project up until late Friday. He stated that the applicant is requesting to

rezone from "RS 60" – Single Family Residential District to "PD" – Planned Development District. Mr. Lockley stated that the property would essentially follow the "TH" - Townhome Residential District with certain exemptions built in the "PD" – Planned Development District. He stated that they were proposing 35 single family attached residential units with an attached club house and amenity center. Mr. Lockley stated that this development proposes to use stacked shipping containers and would be the first of its kind in the City of McKinney. He stated that the shipping containers were made with corrugated metal. Mr. Lockley stated that they would have a masonry and/or stone finish along the front, cement siding that would take on the appearance of wood, and wood. He stated that they were proposing to have open space along the front of the property. Mr. Lockley stated that there would be breaks between the properties to allow for fire access. He stated that the rear yard setbacks would be 10'. Mr. Lockley stated that no alleys would be required for lots less than 50' wide. He stated that Staff recommends approval of the proposed rezoning request with the special ordinance provisions listed in the Staff Report and offered to answer questions.

Commission Member Cobbel asked if this would be a Habitat project. Mr. Lockley said yes.

Commission Member Cobbel asked where they would be obtaining the storage containers to be used in this development. She also asked if they would be new or used. Mr. Lockley deferred those questions to the applicant.

Commission Member McCall stated that he thought that they had already done something like this north of Highway 380 (University Drive). Mr. Lockley stated that he was unaware of it.

Vice-Chairman Mantzey asked if someone could take the proposed "PD" – Planned Development District and use it in other parts of McKinney. Mr. Lockley stated that this "PD" – Planned Development District was specific to this property and proposed development. He stated that if someone wanted to do a similar development that it would be evaluated on its own merits.

Commission Member Kuykendall asked how old the neighborhood was to the north of the subject property. Mr. Lockley stated that he thought that neighborhood was developed within the last 10 years or so.

Commission Member Kuykendall asked if those neighbors had been alerted to this proposed development. Mr. Lockley stated that the residents within 200' were noticed as part of this public hearing. He stated that Staff requested that the applicant hold a neighborhood meeting to discuss the project with them. Mr. Lockley stated that he was told that the applicant did reach out to them by going door to door to discuss the proposed development.

Commission Member Kuykendall asked if the City had received any correspondence from the surrounding neighbors. Mr. Lockley stated that Staff had not received any comments regarding this proposal.

Mr. JD Lee, 8300 Olympia Drive, McKinney, TX, explained the proposed rezoning request and gave a presentation. He stated that they were proposing 35 single family residential units on approximately 2.75 acres of vacant property at the corner of Bumpas Street and Fitzhugh Street. Mr. Lee stated that it would be a Habitat for Humanity project. He discussed some of the proposed elevations for the proposed development. Mr. Lee stated that this project would be the first of its kind in McKinney. He stated that upon completion it would probably be one of the largest residential developments of its kind in the country. Mr. Lee stated that it would be a unique opportunity to bring an eco-friendly, family-friendly, and community-friendly environment with a new twist for our community. He stated that the proposed amenity center would have a combination of stone, glass, reclaimed wood, and cement siding on the exterior. Mr. Lee stated that it would have a slight pitched roof that was flat in nature. He stated that the residential units would be connected and have a zero side lot lines. Mr. Lee stated that they would have 20' front yard setbacks with sidewalks. He stated that there would be a 40' right-of-way for street access. Mr. Lee stated that the proposed two-vehicle carports would also serve as a walkout balcony for the second floor of the units. He stated that the street would be lined with trees. Mr. Lee stated that it would be a very walkable, friendly, connected, and dense environment. He stated that it would allow families to get to know one another. Mr. Lee stated that on some of the carports there would be exposed metals that would be treated with marine grade paint that would be reflective to maintain heat in the winter and reflect heat in the summer. He showed photographs and briefly discussed some residential and commercial developments that used shipping containers. Mr. Lee stated that he had

visited some of these developments. He stated that they were amazing, modern, and forward-thinking developments. Mr. Lee stated that Habitat for Humanity has made an impact on affordable housing over the years. He stated that they had worked tirelessly to bring a new, exciting product to McKinney's affordable housing options. Mr. Lee offered to answer questions.

Alternate Commission Member McReynolds asked for the proposed unit sizes. Mr. Lee stated that each shipping container would be a 40' in depth, 8' wide, and 9 1/2' high. He stated that there would be two containers side by side and two stacked on top for a total of four containers per unit. Mr. Lee stated that there would be a total of 1,280 square foot of livable space. He stated that one of the floor plans would have three bedrooms and two bathrooms. Mr. Lee stated that another plan might have four bedrooms and 2 1/2 bathrooms. He stated that these would rival any market rate units that you would see in McKinney. Mr. Lee stated that their goal was not to make it look like traditional affordable housing. He gave examples of hardworking people who were being priced out of their own cities where they work due to cost of living not reflecting the escalation of increasing land prices, so they end up moving in affordable housing units.

Commission Member Smith asked about the affordability of these units. Mr. Lee stated that Habitat for Humanity has an equation that they use to determine the price to be paid. He thought that it was not more than 30% net of the homeowner's income after expenses. Mr. Lee stated that prices would vary. He stated that sweat equity was also a big part of the process. Mr. Lee stated that homeowners work a minimum of 300 hours towards the asset value of their home.

Commission Member Cobbel asked if this would be homeownership and not rental units. Mr. Lee stated that this was not a for rent neighborhood. He stated that this same piece of land was once cotton fields. Mr. Lee stated that it was worked by migrants and slaves, in many cases. He stated that today their descendants could own the land that their relatives once worked. Mr. Lee stated that was a very important milestone.

Commission Member Kuykendall asked about the turnover rate for these types of units. Ms. Celeste Cox, Chief Executive Officer for the North Collin County Habitat for Humanity, 2060 Couch Drive, McKinney, TX, stated that they had built 110 single family residents to-date in North Collin County. She stated that of those 110 houses they had

sold four. Ms. Cox stated that two of the four have been foreclosed upon and two had been sold back to them. She stated that Habitat for Humanity finances the houses and maintains the mortgages for 20 – 30 years.

Commission Member Kuykendall asked if the corrugated metal of the containers would be visible on the sides of the units. Mr. Lee stated that they would be completely covered. He felt that these structures would be ten times sounder than any stick building built in McKinney. Mr. Lockley offered to clarify that Mr. Lee's statement stated that within the standards the remaining facade on the sides can be no more than the corrugated metal. He stated that the sides might not be covered with some other type of material like masonry or wood. Mr. Lockley stated that some of the sides might be painted with the marine grade paint.

Commission Member Kuykendall asked if this development could impact the property values of the surrounding neighborhood to the north. Mr. Lee stated that it would enhance the property values.

Commission Member Kuykendall asked if they had communicated to the surrounding property owners to the north that the proposed development was going to be affordable housing using shipping containers. Ms. Cox stated that they had talked to every property owner surrounding the subject property. She stated that they were very excited about it. Ms. Cox stated that they were also excited about the proposed community center, since they have no amenities in their neighborhood. She stated that they were excited to bring up the values in that neighborhood. Ms. Cox stated that there were a lot of current homes in the neighborhood to the north that need repairs that Habitat for Humanity was currently helping repair some of them. She stated that they not only did new construction, they also repair existing houses.

Commission Member Kuykendall stated that she had concerns about this project being new and very different. She stated that she had concerns about the quality of the project. Commission Member Kuykendall stated that she did not want to see it negatively impact the surrounding homeowners.

Commission Member Kuykendall asked how quickly the upkeep and changes would be made. Mr. Lee stated that there would be a homeowners association (HOA) for the development. He stated that they would be responsible for the upkeep of the open

spaces in the development. Mr. Lee stated that the homeowners association would encourage the residents to keep a high standard of homeownership maintenance. He stated that would help the community stay at a certain level and not grow into a poorly kept neighborhood.

Alternate Commission Member McReynolds asked if they already had a ratio in place for the market rate units compared to affordable housing units. Mr. Lee stated that currently they thought there would probably be about four or five market rate units built out of the proposed 35 units. He stated that they did not want to turn it into just a market rate neighborhood. Mr. Lee stated that the main theme of the proposed development was an affordable housing project. He stated that what is considered affordable housing was widening. Mr. Lee stated that it would not just be for low or no income individuals. He stated that you would be surprised at how many people are living in houses that they really cannot afford. Mr. Lee stated that they want to create a product that meets the needs of what people can actually afford.

Alternate Commission Member McReynolds felt that the homeowners in this development would maintain their properties just like any other property owner would maintain their property.

Commission Member Cobbel stated that it would have a homeowners association (HOA) just like any other development in McKinney. Mr. Lee said yes.

Commission Member Cobbel asked if the shipping containers would be recycled and where they were obtaining them. Mr. Lee stated that in some cases they would have been used several times; however, would be water tight. He stated that they might use a brand new container when they need to use a clean exterior facade. Mr. Lee stated that they would make sure that the exterior quality was intact. He stated that they plan to procure the shipping containers with local companies.

Commission Member Cobbel asked if the neighborhood to the north had a homeowners association (HOA). Ms. Cox said yes.

Commission Member Smith asked if the proposed amenity center would only be available to the residents of the proposed development. Ms. Cox stated that their goal was to make the amenity center available to the entire community. Mr. Lockley stated that typically an amenity center within subdivisions were developed for that subdivision

only. He stated that to open it up to others would make it another use and would require different standards and requirements. Mr. Lockley stated that right now the proposed amenity center would be for this development and used by these residents of this development.

Commission Member Kuykendall asked if the property owners to the north would still be as excited about the project after learning that they were not able to have access to the proposed amenity center. Mr. Lee said absolutely. He stated that they personally went house to house speaking to those residents about the project. Mr. Lee stated that the overwhelming response was that they loved the idea and were waiting for something to happen to spruce up the neighborhood. He stated that there was a lack of quality and care that exists on that side of town. Mr. Lee stated that they hope this development helps catch fire in the hearts of the existing residents to see a positive movement in upgrading properties. Ms. Cox stated that the subject property was presently a brownfields with a condemned house. She stated that they were working with the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to abate. Ms. Cox stated that the surrounding property owners were very excited about getting rid of this house on the subject property. She stated that they were excited that the property was being developed.

Commission Member Smith asked where other similar communities had been created. Mr. Lee gave examples of single family and multi-family developments made with shipping containers in Houston and San Antonio, TX. He stated that it was happening in and around Texas. Mr. Lee stated that it was an emerging trend in America. He stated that the land availability was shrinking. Mr. Lee stated that Habitat for Humanity tried to create more with less. He stated that was an opportunity to bring something unique and with a high quality to the equitation.

Commission Member Kuykendall asked if Habitat for Humanity was looking at doing this in any other city in Collin County. Ms. Cox stated that they hoped so, after this development was complete.

Alternate Commission Member McReynolds asked about the examples shown during Mr. Lee's presentation. Mr. Lee stated that those were examples of what was going on in America and not something that Habitat for Humanity developed. He stated

that no one company has a long resume of these types of developments using shipping containers, since it is a fairly new trend. Mr. Lee stated that he and Ms. Cox had toured and visited with many of these developers around the country to help address any unforeseen problems of doing it for the first time. He stated that they were staying on board as connected parties to the project to ensure that what is being done in McKinney goes off without a hitch.

Commission Member Kuykendall what to clarify that they had never done this type of project before. Mr. Lee said no.

Commission Member Kuykendall asked about the unforeseen problems that happened in the other communities. Mr. Lee gave an example of the total cost of the units once developed possibly being an issue where the price becomes too high that it could no longer be an affordable housing development. He also gave an example of Adriatica in McKinney being an excellent example of a very dense, mixed-use environment. Mr. Lee stated that he had been involved with that development for the past six years in several capacities. He stated that some of the leading advisors on this project have done some amazing work. Mr. Lee stated that the proposed development would not be managed by novices.

Commission Member Kuykendall asked if they might want to bring this type of development to other parts of McKinney. Mr. Lee stated that they would need the blessing of the Planning Department and City of McKinney to do so. He stated that they had done their homework as best as they could for this project. Mr. Lee stated that if it was done again then it would need to meet the same or greater criteria.

Chairman Cox opened the public hearing and called for comments.

The following people turned in speakers cards in support of the request; however, did not wish to speak during the meeting.

- Matt Hilton, 2150 S. Central Expressway, McKinney, TX
- Rache Barnette, 450 Sloan Creek Pkwy., Fairview, TX
- Kimberly Kimmons, 1500 Preston Road, Plano, TX
- Bryant Knepp, 3412 Ruidoso Lane, McKinney, TX
- JR Russell, 2603 Sunny Meadows, McKinney, TX

- Yvette C. Powers, 1723 N. McDonald Street, McKinney, TX

On a motion by Vice-Chairman Mantzey, seconded by Alternate Commission Member McReynolds, the Commission unanimously voted to close the public hearing, with a vote of 7-0-0.

Commission Member Cobbel stated that the proposed development was exciting. She stated that this was definitely unique by nature. Commission Member Cobbel stated that it was moving forward to helping McKinney's affordable housing crisis. She stated that she felt it was a cool looking project for McKinney.

Vice-Chairman Mantzey stated that workforce housing was becoming a bigger and bigger issue for McKinney. He stated that pricing continues to go up. Vice-Chairman Mantzey stated that this was a unique project. He stated that Habitat for Humanity has put a lot into this project and has plans to grow this into other communities. Vice-Chairman Mantzey stated that he has faith that they will put in a full effort to make sure that it is a show community and one that is better for the neighborhood. He stated that there is no doubt that our employers are seeing a deficient of employment due to the housing shortage. Vice-Chairman Mantzey stated that he was excited that Habitat for Humanity was leading it.

On a motion by Commission Member Cobbel, seconded by Commission Member McCall, the Commission voted to recommend approval of the proposed rezoning request as recommended by Staff, with a vote of 6-1-0. Commission Member 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 December 5, 2017.

- 17-250Z Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on a Request by the City of McKinney to Zone Approximately 3,821 Acres of Land to "AG" - Agricultural District, Generally Located in Areas Described as Being: Along and extending to the north and the south from the east-west section of FM 1461 from FM 2478 to East of CR 166 and extending to the north, south and east from and about Geren Trail; at and Around Stover Creek and the north-south section of CR 161 between US Highway 380 (University Drive) and CR 123 and extending along and from a portion of CR 124; at and Around the North side of US Highway 380 (University Drive) between Ridge Road and Lake Forest Drive; at and Around the Northeast Quadrant of Lake Forest Drive and Wilmeth Road Extending to the Western Boundary of Erwin Park**

and Extending as far North as CR 1006; at and Around the Northwest Quadrant of Hardin Boulevard and Wilmeth Road Extending to the North and West; at and Around CR 164 South and East of Erwin Park and at and Around CR 201 Extending to the Eastern Boundary of Erwin Park and Extending North to CR 1006; and Extending to the South from the Southern Boundary of the McKinney Municipal Utility District No. 1 of Collin County (Trinity Falls M.U.D.) and FM 543 and Along and Around Both the North-South Section and the East-West Section of CR 202 in a Southerly Direction to the City's Current Northern Corporate Boundary Extending in an Easterly Direction from CR 201 and CR 1200 and Extending to the East and West Along and Around Both Sides of Trinity Falls Parkway

Mr. Aaron Bloxham, Planner II for the City of McKinney, explained the proposed zoning request. He stated that Staff received an e-mail and letter in opposition to the zoning request was received after the agenda had been posted and that he placed a copy of those letters, a map of the locations where zoning signs had posted for this zoning request, and the section of the Zoning Ordinance regarding the posting of zoning signs on the table for each Commission Member prior to the meeting. Mr. Bloxham stated that the City of McKinney is proposing to zone approximately 3,821 acres of land to "AG" – Agricultural District in association with a proposed annexation case (17-249A). He stated that the subject properties were generally located in the northwest sector of McKinney's ETJ. Mr. Bloxham stated that, per City ordinances, properties that are annexed into the City's corporate limits are required to be zoned. He stated that in order for the zoning request to be considered concurrently with the annexation request, a recommendation was needed by the Planning and Zoning Commission at this time. Mr. Bloxham stated that the intent of the proposed zoning was to match the existing uses on the properties. He stated that Staff recommends approval of the proposed zoning request. Mr. Bloxham stated that the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission will be forwarded to City Council at the November 7th meeting for their consideration. He stated that there had been a lot of discussion regarding the proposed annexation; however, this request is only regarding the zoning of the properties. He offered to answer questions.

Commission Member McCall asked if the proposed properties were currently zoned. Mr. Bloxham stated that no properties in the Extraterritorial Jurisdiction (ETJ) are zoned.

Alternate Commission Member McReynolds asked why these parcels were being considered for annexations and why now. Mr. Bloxham stated that there were a number of Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) currently underway by the city that deal with extending roadways, sewer, and facilities being planned for that area. He stated that it relates to those areas having access to these types of infrastructure and facilities. Mr. Bloxham stated that the City was trying to get ahead of it to protect the land uses and areas to be developed in conformance with the City's Comprehensive Plan over the long term.

Alternate Commission Member McReynolds asked if the properties need to be annexed prior to being zoned. Mr. Bloxham said yes, the properties would be annexed prior to be zoned.

Commission Member Kuykendall asked if this was traditionally how it was handled. Mr. Bloxham stated yes, and reiterated that the properties would not be zoned prior to being annexed. He stated that the annexation case would be presented to City Council prior to the zoning case.

Commission Member Kuykendall wanted to clarify that the Planning and Zoning Commission was considering a zoning case on property that is currently not part of the city limits. Mr. Bloxham stated that was correct.

Commission Member Kuykendall asked if City Council could alter the properties being annexed into the city. Mr. Bloxham said yes. He stated that only the properties that are annexed would be zoned to "AG" – Agricultural District. Ms. Jennifer Arnold, Planning Manager for the City of McKinney, stated that City Council could determine to annex less acreage than what is proposed. She stated that the proposed zoning would still be "AG" – Agricultural District regardless of if the area annexed was reduced in size. Ms. Arnold stated that if City Council decided to zone to another classification, then a new zoning case would be required.

Alternate Commission Member McReynolds asked if the Planning and Zoning Commission's recommendation on this zoning case could influence the City Council regarding the annexation case. Ms. Arnold said no, the recommendation on the zoning request would not influence City Council's decision on whether or annex or not annex. She stated that zoning is required for any property within the city limits.

Commission Member Kuykendall asked if a zoning case typically comes to the Planning and Zoning Commission prior to the annexation of a property or if this was a special case. Ms. Arnold stated that this is how the City typically handles annexations, whether it is voluntary or involuntary. She stated that Staff tries to lineup the Planning and Zoning Commission recommendation regarding the zoning to allow for the annexation and zoning requests to go before City Council at the same meeting. Ms. Arnold reiterated that this was not an abnormal process.

Commission Member Cobbel stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission does not typically hear annexation cases. Ms. Arnold stated that was correct.

Vice-Chairman Mantzey stated that City Council will decide whether or not to annex the properties and whether or not to accept the Planning and Zoning Commission's recommendation to zone the properties. Ms. Arnold stated that was correct.

Commission Member McCall asked if this case could be tabled. Ms. Arnold stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission could take whatever action they feel is necessary; however, Staff does not recommend tabling the proposed zoning case.

Commission Member Cobbel asked if the property owners being considered for annexation had been offered development agreements. Mr. Bloxham said yes, in association with the annexation case. He stated that the property owners who have an agricultural (AG) exemption on their properties were offered an agreement. Mr. Bloxham stated that City Council offered a three year tax reimbursement agreement to the property owners that did not have an agricultural (AG) exemption.

Commission Member Cobbel asked for the percentage of property owners that had signed the agreements. Mr. Bloxham stated that to date the number of executed agreements is not high. He stated that Staff had been talking with quite a bit of property owners in association with the development agreements.

Commission Member Cobbel asked if certain City services would be provided to property owners once they were annexed into the city limits. She also asked about the timeframe for the City to provide those services. Mr. Bloxham stated that is more related to the annexation case. He stated that we are only talking about zoning case before you tonight.

Commission Member Kuykendall stated that there was a meeting scheduled tomorrow regarding the annexation case. She expressed concerns about talking about something that City Council had not decided on yet and gave an example of putting the cart before the horse.

Commission Member Cobbel wanted to clarify that "AG" – Agricultural District was the only zoning district being proposed on these properties, which is a continuation of the current uses on the properties. Mr. Bloxham stated that was correct.

Commission Member Kuykendall stated that was with the assumption that they will be involuntarily annexed into the city limits. Mr. Bloxham said yes.

Commission Member Cobbel stated that City Council will make the final determination on the annexation and zoning cases. Mr. Bloxham stated that was correct.

Chairman Cox asked if there was language in the ordinance that allows certain leeway to the way that zoning signs could be posted on the property. Chairman Cox stated that the Commission has received several letters referring to the zoning signs not being posted appropriately. Mr. Bloxham stated that there is language in the ordinance that gives the Director of Planning discretion to see what is proposed meets the intent of the noticing requirements.

Chairman Cox asked if based upon the language in the ordinance if City was in compliance with the requirements of the ordinance. Mr. Bloxham said yes. Mr. Brian Lockley, Director of Planning for the City of McKinney, stated that Section 146-164 of the Zoning Ordinance outlines the posting requirements, size of the signs, location of the signs, distance between the signs, and when the signs should be posted prior to the public meeting. He stated that that section also gives the Director of Planning the authority to determine if the notice posted on the subject property met the intent of the ordinance requirements. Mr. Lockley stated that the signs that were posted for this zoning case did meet that section of the ordinance. He stated that this was not the first time that the City had used that provision to notice very large tracts of land, due to the number of signs and cost associated with them. Mr. Lockley stated that the City would continue to do so as larger properties were rezoned or annexed in the future.

Commission Member Cobbel asked if the map that was distributed earlier shows where the zoning signs were posted. Mr. Lockley said yes.

Commission Member Smith asked if Staff could point to where the property owners who wrote in complaints about the locations of the posted zoning signs were located. Mr. Bloxham stated that they were located in areas 17-C and 17-K on the map and they pointed them out on the map displayed on the overhead projector at the meeting.

Commission Member Cobbel asked for clarification on the three year tax reimbursement. Mr. Bloxham stated that the property owners would pay the tax upfront and then they get reimbursed within the three year period.

Commission Member Smith asked for clarification of the posting of the zoning signs for this large area. Mr. Lockley stated that the Zoning Ordinance gives discretion to the Director of Planning to make the determination, in instances where there is very large tract of land that are being zoned, that instead of the notices being placed every 200', they could be spaced accordingly to the size of the property or area. He gave examples where the signs could be spaced every 500' or 1,000' apart.

Chairman Cox opened the public hearing and called for comments.

The following people turning in speaker cards in opposition to the zoning request; however, did not wish to speak.

- Mr. Don Bourland, 7729 County Road 202, McKinney, TX
- Ms. Lynn Cooper, 4692 County Road 164, McKinney, TX
- Ms. Brenda Bourland, 7720 County Road 202, McKinney, TX
- Mr. Billy Barbo, 4496 County Road 1006, McKinney, TX
- Mr. Joe Covington, 7532 County Road 202, McKinney, TX
- Ms. Shannon Blake, 800 County Road 1200, McKinney, TX

The following people spoke in opposition to the zoning request.

Ms. Beth Douglas, 15206 King of Spain, Dallas TX, stated that she was speaking on behalf of Mr. Charles Patmore who lives at 5000 County Road 164, McKinney, TX. She stated that this zoning case should be tabled. Ms. Douglas stated that she read on the City's website that all zoning changes require zoning notification signs to be placed on the property within the specified timeframe per the Zoning Ordinance. She stated that failure to post the notification signs on the property by the close of business by the Tuesday prior to the Planning and Zoning Commission public hearing on that case shall

result in the postponement of consideration if the applicant has not attempted to replace damaged or missing signs upon notification by Staff. Ms. Douglas stated that it later goes on to say that incomplete submittals could not be accepted. She stated that if a developer is required to properly notify the area being rezoned, then the City should also be held by the same standards. She stated that every property is required to have a notification sign placed on the property. Ms. Douglas stated that the signs were required to be 200' apart. She stated that property owners within 200' of the subject property have to be noticed at least 10 days prior to the meeting. Ms. Douglas stated that to her knowledge some properties do not meet this requirement. She requested that the proposed zoning case be tabled until proper notification has been placed on the properties. Ms. Douglas stated that the citizens of McKinney and the property owners being zoned deserve to be properly notified. She stated that properties in the county cannot be zoned by a city. Ms. Douglas stated that during the September 12, 2017 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting the Director of Planning recommended tabling an item due to proper notices had not been placed on the subject property. She stated that Planning and Zoning Commission unanimously agreed. Ms. Douglas stated that they expect the City to be held to the same standard.

Mr. Charles Patmore, 5000 County Road 164, McKinney, TX, stated that he believed that the property owners had been improperly notified of the zoning change. He stated that it was very confusing to him why the zoning was being discussed at the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting when the property has yet to be annexed into the city limits. Mr. Patmore stated that the City seems to be scrambling to correct a mistake made during their haste to annex the properties. He stated that it was his understanding that the City could not zone properties that were outside of their city limits.

Mr. Chris Cooper, 4692 County Road 164, McKinney, TX, stated that he concurred with Ms. Douglas's comments. He stated that if a developer was required to properly notify the area being rezoned, then the City should also be held to the same standard. Mr. Cooper stated that every property was required to have a notification sign placed on the property. He stated that the signs were required to be 200' apart. Mr. Cooper stated that property owners within 200' of the subject property have to be notified at least 10 days prior to the meeting for that case. He stated that he had one sign at the edge of his

property by a tree line. Mr. Cooper stated that there was over 600' of frontage on his property, so he felt there were some missing signs on his property. He stated that the signs were not visible from public right-of-way. Mr. Cooper stated that the signs on his property were approximately 50' from the edge of the road. He requested that the proposed zoning request be tabled until the property notification signs be placed on his property. Mr. Cooper stated that the citizens of McKinney deserve to be properly notified as well as the property owners being zoned. He stated that property in the county could not be zoned by a City. Mr. Cooper stated that he expects the City to be held to the same standard.

Mr. Bernd Fitzau, 6551 County Road 161, McKinney, TX, stated that the proposed zoning request was for the 3,821 acres being considered for annexation. He stated that he did not have a notification sign on his property. Mr. Fitzau stated that he did not think that his neighbor had a notification sign on their property either. He stated that on County Road 164 and County Road 201 there were stretches where there were no notification signs posted. Mr. Fitzau stated that he read on-line that tracts of land with frontage right-of-way greater than 250' that an additional sign should be posted so that no sign is greater than 200' apart. He stated that he did not find any leeway for the Director of Planning to change that requirement. Mr. Fitzau stated that he thought the only leeway the Director of Planning had was to change the verbiage on the signs.

Ms. Beverly Covington, 9532 County Road 202, McKinney, TX, stated that she and her family have lived on this property for 46 years. She stated that they have an agricultural (AG) exemption as well as a homestead exemption on the property. Ms. Covington stated that she opposed the forced annexation of their five acres that is coming before City Council in November. She stated that their property only qualifies to be taken into the city limits as part of the isolated section in the extraterritorial jurisdiction (ETJ). Ms. Covington stated that she understands the difference between the agricultural use exemption on their property from the County and the "AG" – Agricultural District zoning by the City. She stated that the Commissions service is appreciated. She stated that she felt the zoning request should be scheduled after the annexation ordinance was approved, since you cannot legally zone property outside of the city limits. Ms. Covington stated that they had been told that the annexation would not occur until the November

15th City Council meeting, not on November 7th as they were originally notified. She requested that the Commission make a motion that this zoning request not be scheduled until the November 15th City Council meeting allowing Staff additional time to make sure that all legalities and procedures for public notices, notifications to surrounding property owners, correct descriptions of the properties with metes and bounds, county road descriptions on both sides of the road, and legal zoning signs were placed on the properties. Ms. Covington stated that no sign was posted on the property that has a frontage of 466.7'. She stated that she was proud of the attitude and words spoken by the property owners in the extraterritorial jurisdiction (ETJ). Ms. Covington stated that they speak passionately on this item, since the annexation threatens the lifestyle that they have chosen. She stated that it would mean the loss of control in the way they live their lives. Ms. Covington requested more time to allow them to work with Staff and the City Council to resolve this issue. She stated that she did not object to the suggested zoning for the property. Ms. Covington stated that she was opposed to the forced and rushed annexation of their property before SB6 takes effect on December 1, 2017.

Ms. Tamlynn Clyde, 6919 County Road 123, McKinney, TX, stated that she received notice that the City of McKinney intends to annex her property. She stated that she understands that the property anticipated to be annexed has to receive a zoning designation and that there were laws and procedures regarding zoning and rezoning of properties. Ms. Clyde stated that according to the City of McKinney's Code of Ordinances Section 146-164 zoning change signs must be posted on the affected property no later than seven days before a Planning and Zoning Commission meeting for the case. She stated that as of today no zoning signs had been posted on her property. Ms. Clyde requested that the proposed zoning request be tabled due to failure to post signs at least seven days prior to this public hearing. She stated that she sent an e-mail pointing out these facts to some of the Commission Members. Ms. Clyde stated that she appreciated receiving a response from Mr. Lockley today acknowledging the sign ordinance and pointing out that the Director of Planning has the authority to determine if the notice posting on the subject property met the intent of the requirements contained in the ordinance. She stated that he explained that in cases with several widely spaced, large tracts of land are being zoned or rezoned it was not uncommon for the City of McKinney's

Director of Planning to approve signs posted sporadically through a zoning area rather than on each individual property. Ms. Clyde stated that large tracts of land was highly subjective and relative. She stated that her property has approximately 400' of frontage on a public right-of-way. Ms. Clyde stated that according to the City's ordinances it should have two signs posted on it instead on none. She stated that she disagreed that the City could post a zoning sign on her neighbor's property and assume that sign applies to her property. Ms. Clyde gave an example that nobody would see a for sale sign on a property and assume that the property next door was also for sale. She asked the Commission Members to consider the precedent that could be setting for developers and others that have an interest in rezoning. Ms. Clyde asked what the point was in having signage laws if the City was not obliged to follow them. She stated that according to the City of McKinney Comprehensive Plan for Future Land Use most of this area was designated as suburban mix, including some commercial uses. Ms. Clyde requested that the proposed zoning request be tabled. Chairman Cox stated that Staff distributed Ms. Clyde's e-mail to the Commission prior to the meeting.

Mr. Jason Blake, 800 County Road 1200, McKinney, TX, stated that there were numerous properties that did not have zoning signs on their properties and he mentioned several of them, including his property. He stated that the nearest sign to his property was more than 200' away. Mr. Blake gave examples of where signs had been posted and the distance between them. He requested that the proposed zoning request be tabled until the property notification signs have been placed on all properties. Mr. Blake stated that the citizens of McKinney deserve to be properly notified and well as the property owners who are being rezoned.

Mr. Rhett Preston, 5702 Four Seasons Lane, McKinney, TX, stated that the proposed annexation covers a wide amount of area and other school districts. He stated that there are 14 houses in his neighborhood and none of them have zoning signs on them. Mr. Preston stated that their neighborhood fronts Farmer Market 1461 and there were no notices in front of their entire neighborhood. He stated that the City claims that they can do the annexation since the law allows them to do it up to 99 houses. Mr. Preston stated that if the Commission tabled an item at a meeting last month due to improper notification signs, then he feels that the proposed rezoning request should also

be tabled. He asked if every property was required to have a zoning sign posted on it. Mr. Preston asked if the property owners have to be notified. He stated that he was not notified of this meeting.

Ms. Dalana Squires, 6762 County Road 202, McKinney, TX, stated that she did not have a sign in front of her property, nor did her neighbor. She requested that the proposed zoning be tabled. Ms. Squires stated that she was opposed to the forced annexation. She stated that they were not ready to sign away their rights.

Chairman Cox stated that the letter distributed to the Commission Members prior to the meeting was from Katherine Lynn and Christopher B. Cooper. He stated that they requested that the proposed zoning case be tabled due to public notification signs not being properly posted on their property.

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.

Commission Members Cobbel and Kuykendall asked about the noticing for the proposed rezoning request. Commission Member Cobbel asked if any notices were returned in the mail undeliverable. Ms. Arnold stated that she was not sure if any notices were returned in the mail. She stated that per City ordinance the City was not required to notify the property owners of a zoning change, since typically a property owner that was requesting a zoning change already knows about it. Ms. Arnold stated that Staff notified the property owners affected by the zoning and the property owners within 200' of these properties for this case. Ms. Arnold stated that the postcards were mailed on Friday, October 13th.

Commission Member Kuykendall asked for clarification on the posting of the zoning signs on properties. Mr. Lockley stated that there were two sections of the Zoning Ordinance being cited for the posting of the zoning signs. He stated that Section 146-164 2c1 states that the Director of Planning has the authority to determine if the notice posted on the subject property met the intent of the requirements contained therein. Mr. Lockley stated that it is not unusual for the Director of Planning to use discretion when considering the posting of zoning signs for projects that extend across an extremely large area. He stated that this discretion has been used in the past on voluntary and involuntary

requests. He stated that in order to meet the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, any company posting and maintaining the signs must submit an affidavit that they posted the requested signs by the timeframe required. Mr. Lockley stated that Staff did verify that the requested signs had been posted at the locations determined by Staff. He stated that the map that was distributed prior to the meeting shows where each sign was posted. Mr. Lockley stated that Staff did receive confirmation that the signs were posted within the seven day period. He stated that Staff had gone out twice to verify that the signs were posted and had taken photographs of them to ensure that the signs were still up. Ms. Arnold stated that no zoning signs were required on private streets by any applicant. She stated that the signs were only required on public streets.

Alternate Commission Member McReynolds stated that he was not in favor of annexation in general. Alternate Commission Member McReynolds stated that he did not think that the City had to annex the properties to do whatever infrastructure changes that they need to make to it. He stated that was not what was being considered at this meeting. Alternate Commission Member McReynolds stated that given that City Council had not even voted on annexing the properties, he did not see it necessary for the Planning and Zoning Commission to make a recommendation on the proposed zoning request just in case they do vote to annex the properties. He felt that City Council should annex the properties first and then have the zoning request come before the Planning and Zoning Commission for a recommendation. Alternate Commission Member McReynolds suggested that City Council hammer out all of the details of the annexation first. He stated that he understood that this was the normal way to do it; however, he just heard of a dozen people that were not thrilled with the normal way of doing it. Alternate Commission Member McReynolds stated that he would be in favor of tabling the proposed zoning request until after City Council makes a decision on the annexation of the properties. Ms. Arnold stated that it was not just a standard practice for Staff to run these item concurrently, it was also a requirement in the City's ordinance. She stated that Chapter 146 of the Zoning Ordinance does state that all property in the process of being annexed into the city limits shall be concurrently considered for a permanent zoning classification. Ms. Arnold stated that concurrent consideration was one of the reasons

that Staff came before the Planning and Zoning Commission for that recommendation in advance of the properties actually being considered for annexation into the city.

Commission Member Kuykendall stated that she had a jurisdictional issue with the process. She stated that she felt she was being asked something that was out of her jurisdiction, since it was not currently in McKinney's city limits. Commission Member Kuykendall stated that she understood that City Council would be deciding one way or the other. She stated that there were still annexation meetings happening, so there was a lot of things that could happen between now and when it is ultimately decided upon by City Council. Commission Member Kuykendall stated that City Council would be looking at the Planning and Zoning Commission's recommendation on this zoning request. Ms. Arnold stated that the only changes that would be made on the final determination of annexation would be the area and not necessarily the proposed zoning district. Commission Member Kuykendall stated that she understood that it was unlikely that the Commission would want to make a different decision. She stated that there was a slight possibility. Commission Member Kuykendall stated that she has concerns. She stated that the Commission was being asked to make decisions outside of their jurisdiction. Commission Member Kuykendall stated that things could still change and the Commission would not be able to make a new recommendation based upon those changes. Mr. Lockley read Section 146-37 A of the Zoning Ordinance. He stated that all property in the process of annexation into the City shall be concurrently considered for a permanent zoning classification. Planning and Zoning Commission shall be advised by City Staff regarding the proposed annexation and may at the same time hold a hearing upon the permanent zoning that is to be given to the area or tract of land to be annexed and make a recommendation to the City Council, so that the City Council may act on the matter of annexation and permanent zoning at the same time. Mr. Lockley stated that the Commission would be acting consistently, by the Commission taking action, with the annexation process that is currently underway. He stated that he did not want the Commission to feel that they were stepping out of bounds or acting in a manner that is contrary to the Zoning Ordinance or the direction of City Council.

Commission Member Kuykendall stated that since it says "may" and not "shall", she feels that the Commission has an option as to when they can consider and make a

recommendation on the zoning for the property. She asked if City Council decides to move forward with the annexation if there was a grace period for the property to be zoned at a later date. Ms. Arnold stated that her interruption was no. She stated that if the Commission made a decision to table the proposed rezoning request at this meeting then it would need to come back before the Commission for a recommendation prior to going to City Council. Ms. Arnold stated that City Council could approve the annexation and not be able to act upon the zoning that is related to it. Mr. Lockley stated that if City Council chooses to not to act upon the annexation at their meeting then the zoning request would also not be acted upon.

Alternate Commission Member McReynolds stated that there was an opportunity for this item to come back before the Commission prior to the City Council meeting. He stated that he would be more comfortable with the properties being annexed prior to making a recommendation for the associated zoning.

Commission Member McCall stated that the Commission could also recommend denial of the proposed zoning request. He stated that the City Council would then vote on the request as they see fit. Commission Member McCall stated that the City was growing in that direction. He stated that he did not like the forced, rushed annexation. Commission Member McCall questioned who really wanted zoning signs in their front yard. He stated that the property owners have heard about the proposed zoning request coming to this meeting, since they are present at the meeting. Commission Member McCall stated that he cannot vote for this request. Ms. Arnold stated that whatever recommendation that comes for the Commission it would be forwarded to City Council.

Alternate Commission Member McReynolds stated that everyone is for growth. He stated that the Commission meets about every two weeks. Alternate Commission Member asked why the request could not be tabled indefinitely until after City Council decides exactly what is being annexed into the city. Ms. Arnold stated that City Council would not be able to act upon the zoning at the same time as they consider the annexation request.

Commission Member Smith stated that she had followed the annexation proceedings, so she had not heard anything new at this meeting. She stated that she understood the resident's concerns over minimalist postings, but that there were some

discretion allowed there. Commission Member Smith stated that she was not aware of the discretion allowed there either. She stated that she understands about the rushed annexation. Commission Member Smith stated that she had served on other governing bodies and this was not her first exposure to annexation. She stated that she was generally not favorable to a forced annexation. Commission Member Smith stated that she was not in favor of the proposed zoning request. She stated that the Commission was not zoning anything at this meeting that they were just offering up a recommendation.

Chairman Cox stated that he agreed with the recommendation by Staff. He stated that the notification was within the City's rights. Chairman Cox stated that a zoning case before the Commission and while there were other issues related to this. He reiterated that the question before the Commission was the zoning of the properties. Chairman Cox stated that he appreciated the public comments.

On a motion by Alternate Commission Member McReynolds, seconded by Commission Member Kuykendall, the Commission voted to table the item indefinitely, with a vote of 3-4-0. The motion failed. Chairman Cox, Vice-Chairman Mantzey, Commission Member Cobbel, and Commission Member McCall voted against the motion.

On a motion by Vice-Chairman Mantzey, seconded by Chairman Cox, the Commission voted to recommend approval of the proposed zoning request as recommended by Staff, with a vote of 3-4-0. The motion failed. Commission Members Kuykendall, Smith, McCall, and McReynolds – Alternate voted against the motion.

On a motion by Commission Member McCall, seconded by Commission Member Smith, the Commission voted to recommend denial of the proposed zoning request, with a vote of 4-3-0. The motion passed. Chairman Cox, Vice-Chairman Mantzey, and 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 November 7, 2017; however, Staff would be requesting that the item be tabled to the November 15, 2017 City Council meeting.

END OF REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS AND PUBLIC HEARINGS

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

17-1070 October 2017 Recap

Ms. Samantha Pickett, Planning Manager for the City of McKinney, briefly discussed the October 2017 Recap that was included in the Staff Report.

END OF DISCUSSION ITEM

Mr. Charlie Philips, City Council Member for the City of McKinney, thanked the Commission for their dedication and hard work.

Chairman Cox thanked Mr. Philips and Staff for their hard work.

There being no further business, Chairman Cox declared the meeting adjourned at 8:07 p.m.

BILL COX
Chairman