



# CITY OF MCKINNEY, TEXAS

## Legislation Text

---

**File #:** 21-0007M2, **Version:** 1

---

Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on a Request by the City of McKinney to Amend Chapter 146 (Zoning Regulations), Section 146-135 (Landscape Requirements) of the Code of Ordinances, and Accompanying Ordinance

**COUNCIL GOAL:** Operational Excellence  
(2E: Continuously provide a high level of customer service to our citizens)

**MEETING DATE:** September 21, 2021

**DEPARTMENT:** Development Services - Planning Department

**CONTACT:** Jennifer Arnold, AICP, Director of Planning  
Adam Engelskirchen, Arborist

**RECOMMENDED CITY COUNCIL ACTION:**

- Staff recommends approval of the proposed amendments.

**ITEM SUMMARY:**

- Staff is proposing amendments to Section 146-135 (Landscape Requirements) of the Zoning Ordinance to better identify landscaping requirements for parking lots in non-residential and multi-family developments and to add new language that allows for alternate compliance for parking lot landscape designs that do not meet the strict requirements of the ordinance.
- Staff is also proposing an amendment to clarify where necessary driveways may be allowed within a required landscape area.

**PROPOSED AMENDMENTS**

- Parking Lot Landscaping for Non-Residential and Multi-Family Uses.  
Staff proposes to reorganize the existing provisions pertaining to required landscaping for non-residential and multi-family parking lots into a new sub-section, 146-135(f)(7) titled "Parking Lot Landscaping for Non-Residential and Multi-Family Uses Required." The proposed reorganization should make it easier to identify these requirements within the ordinance.

Staff is also proposing to add a new "Alternate Compliance" section for parking lot landscaping which would give Staff the ability to consider approval of alternative parking lot landscape designs under certain circumstances. The proposed amendment should allow for some modest flexibility when an alternate design is proposed that meets the spirit and intent of the

ordinance but doesn't meet the specific requirements for parking lot landscaping.

As proposed, the amendments to parking lot landscaping requirements for non-residential and multi-family developments would read as follows:

*"146-135(f)(7) Parking Lot Landscaping for Non-Residential and Multi-Family Uses Required.*

- a. Parking lot landscape areas shall be provided as follows:*
  - 1. terminus islands with a minimum of one canopy tree shall be provided at the end of each parking row; and*
  - 2. landscape islands with a minimum of one tree shall be provided within 65 feet of every parking space.*
- b. Parking lot landscape areas shall:*
  - 1. be at least one parking space in size (minimum 162 square feet);*
  - 2. include a minimum of 50 percent of its area dedicated to living plant material;*
  - 3. not have more than 50 percent of its area covered with bark mulch or decomposed granite material; and*
  - 4. include vertical curbs and gutters to define parking areas and assist in clarifying appropriate circulation patterns;*
- c. In parking lots with more than 20 spaces, a minimum of one tree shall be planted in the parking area for every 10 parking spaces within the parking lot.*
- d. At least 75 percent of the frontage of parking lots, adjacent to a public right-of-way, within the street yard shall be screened from public streets with evergreen shrubs attaining a minimum height of three feet, an earthen berm of a minimum height of three feet, a low masonry wall of a minimum height of three feet, or a combination of the above with a minimum combined height of three feet. A wall used for parking lot screening should be accompanied with landscape planting in the form of low shrubs and groundcover to soften the appearance of the wall.*
- e. Alternate Compliance. When strict compliance with the requirements of this section cannot be met, the Director of Planning or their designee may approve an alternate parking lot landscape design, so long as:*
  - 1. the total number of trees otherwise required per this section are still provided on the*

site;

2. *no more than 10% of the trees otherwise required per this section are relocated outside of the limits of the parking lot;*
3. *the alternate design meets the spirit and intent of this section regarding tree coverage, living landscape, and impervious surfaces*
4. *the alternate design does not have an adverse impact on adjacent existing or future developments;*
5. *the alternate design does not have an adverse impact on public health, safety and general welfare; and*
6. *the alternate design is not only serving to reduce the financial obligations of the minimum landscape requirements.*

*The decision of the Director of Planning or their designee may be appealed to the planning and zoning commission for action according to the procedures in Section 146-45 (a)(2)c.*

- Necessary Driveways and Landscape Areas.

Staff also proposes to clarify where necessary driveways may be allowed within a required landscape area. The updated ordinance provision would read as follows:

*“(11) Necessary driveways from the public right-of-way and shared drives shall be allowed to intersect perpendicularly with required landscaping areas in accordance with city regulations, so long as it does not overly degrade the function of the required landscape area.”*

## **BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

- In order to maintain high quality development that is in line with the market and development community, Staff recognizes the importance of reviewing the city’s Zoning Ordinance from time to time to ensure that it is still performing optimally.
- Based on a recent review of Section 146-135 (Landscape Requirements) of the City’s Zoning Ordinance, Staff has identified an opportunity to improve the clarity, flexibility, usability, and implementation of this section of the ordinance.

## **OPPOSITION TO OR SUPPORT OF REQUEST:**

- Staff has received no emails or phone calls in support of or opposition to the proposed amendment.

## **BOARD OR COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION:**

- On August 24, 2021, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted 7-0-0 to recommend

approval of the proposed amendment.