

From: Charlotte Nelson
Sent: Tuesday, March 3, 2026 2:35 PM
To: Jacob Bennett
Cc: Contact-Planning
Subject: FW: Formal Objection – Residential Adjacency Screening, Noise, and Compatibility Concerns (Cannon Beach Project)



From: Lakbir Singh <laakhbiir1@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 3, 2026 2:31 PM
To: Contact-Planning <Contact-Planning@mckinneytexas.org>
Subject: Re: Formal Objection – Residential Adjacency Screening, Noise, and Compatibility Concerns (Cannon Beach Project)

EXTERNAL MESSAGE ALERT: This message originated from outside of the city. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you are unsure, use the Phish Alert button.

Dear McKinney Planning Department,

I am the homeowner at **5717 Demi Sec Dr, McKinney, TX 75070** , and my property directly abuts the proposed **Cannon Beach** development. I am submitting this correspondence as a **formal objection** to the current site plan approach and respectfully request that specific conditions be applied to ensure compliance with the McKinney Unified Development Code (UDC) and the protection of adjacent residential properties.

Based on the information currently available, the proposed reliance on **natural landscaping and existing residential fencing** is insufficient to meet the intent and requirements of the UDC for a **high-intensity destination use** located immediately adjacent to single-family residences.

1. Screening and Buffering – UDC Section 206C & Section 402 (Compatibility)

When a high-intensity commercial or entertainment use directly abuts low-density residential zoning, the UDC requires **effective screening and buffering** to ensure compatibility with existing neighborhoods.

The current proposal appears to rely primarily on **trees and existing residential fencing**. This approach does not provide a **durable, continuous, year-round visual and physical screen**, nor does it meet the standard typically applied to commercial developments of this scale.

Landscaping alone does not provide consistent opacity, particularly during seasonal leaf loss. Existing residential wooden fencing is not a commercial-grade screening device and was not designed to mitigate impacts from a destination entertainment venue.

To meet the intent of **UDC Section 206C (Screening)** and **Section 402 (Compatibility)**, a **continuous masonry screening wall** along the shared residential boundary is necessary. This is consistent with mitigation measures required for other non-residential developments adjacent to single-family neighborhoods.

2. Noise Impacts – Code of Ordinances Chapter 70

McKinney's Noise Ordinance limits sound levels at residential property lines to:

- **65 dB(A)** during daytime hours
- **58 dB(A)** during nighttime hours

The Cannon Beach project includes features that are inherently noise-generating, including mechanical systems, surf and water-feature equipment, and the potential use of amplified sound. Landscaping alone does not provide a reliable or measurable method of noise mitigation.

Without a structural barrier and a project-specific acoustical analysis, the developer cannot reasonably demonstrate compliance with **Chapter 70** at the residential property line during peak operations.

3. Compatibility and Reflected Sound – UDC Section 402

While some project elements may be described as “subterranean,” this does not account for **reflected and elevated sound propagation** from vertical building surfaces and water features. Sound and light impacts can project over standard residential fencing and into adjacent backyards.

A **structural masonry wall** is necessary to break line-of-sight and reduce both direct and reflected impacts, consistent with standard compatibility practices for large-scale developments along the SH-121 corridor.

4. Safety, Security, and Trespass Concerns

A destination resort projected to attract a large volume of visitors annually presents a predictable **trespass and safety risk** to immediately adjacent residential properties.

Existing residential fencing is easily scalable and not intended to serve as a security barrier for a commercial attraction. For resident safety, privacy, and long-term compatibility, a reinforced masonry wall and an appropriate security strategy are required along the residential interface.

Formal Requests

I respectfully request that the Planning Department:

1. **Condition site plan and/or SUP approval** to require a **continuous masonry screening wall** along the shared residential boundary, with height sufficient to mitigate visual, noise, and safety impacts.
2. Require a **developer-funded professional acoustical study** demonstrating compliance with Chapter 70 noise limits at the residential property line, including worst-case operational scenarios.
3. Require a **photometric lighting plan** demonstrating no spillover or glare impacts on adjacent residential properties.

4. Require a **security and trespass-prevention plan** appropriate for a high-traffic destination use adjacent to single-family homes.
5. Place this objection into the official record and **forward it to the Planning & Zoning Commission** for consideration at the next scheduled hearing.

I look forward to your written response outlining how these residential compatibility concerns will be addressed.

Sincerely,

Lakhbir Singh

5717 Demi Sec Dr, McKinney, TX 75070

469-919-1385

laakhbiir1@gmail.com