# CITY OF RICHARDSON CITY PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES – MAY 6, 2014

The Richardson City Plan Commission met on May 6, 2014, at 7:00 p.m. at City Hall in the Council Chambers, 411 W. Arapaho Road, Richardson, Texas.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Gerald Bright, Vice Chair

Marilyn Frederick, Commissioner Janet DePuy, Commissioner Eron Linn, Commissioner Randy Roland, Commissioner Stephen Springs, Alternate Thomas Maxwell, Commissioner

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Barry Hand, Chairman

Bill Ferrell, Alternate

**CITY STAFF PRESENT:** Sam Chavez, Assistant Director – Dev. Svcs – Planning

Tina Firgens, Planning Project Manager

Israel Roberts, Development Review Manager

Mohamed Bireima, Planning Tech Kathy Welp, Executive Secretary

#### **BRIEFING SESSION**

Prior to the start of the regular business meeting, the City Plan Commission met with staff regarding staff reports, agenda items and a work session. No action was taken.

#### **MINUTES**

1. Approval of the minutes of the regular business meeting of April 11, 2014.

**Motion:** Commissioner Frederick made a motion to approve the minutes of April 11, 2014, as presented; second by Commissioner Roland. Motion passed 7-0.

2. Approval of the minutes of the regular business meeting of April 15, 2014.

Ms. Welp notified the Commission that a scrivener's error had been found and corrected between the time the minutes were posted and the regular business meeting.

**Motion:** Commissioner DePuy made a motion to approve the minutes as corrected; second by Commissioner Linn. Motion passed 7-0.

#### **CONSENT ITEMS**

All items listed under the Consent Agenda are considered to be routine by the City Plan Commission and will be enacted by one motion in the form listed below. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless desired, in which case any item(s) may be removed from the Consent Agenda for separate consideration.

3. **Amending Plat – PREI-KP No. 3 Addition:** A request for approval of an amending plat of Lots 2D, 2E, 2F, 2G, 2H, 2J and 2K, Block A of the PREI-KP Addition with right-of-way dedication for Spring Valley Road. The 16.64-acre site is located at the southwest corner of Spring Valley Road and St. Paul Drive.

- 4. **Site, Landscape and Building Elevation Plans West Campbell Office Park:** A request for approval of revised site and landscape plans with building elevations for the development of a one-story, 4,992 square foot office building. The 3.18-acre site is located at 1050 1090 W. Campbell Road, on the north side of Campbell Road, west of Waterview Parkway.
- 5. **Building Elevations McDonald's:** A request for approval of revised building elevations for an existing one-story, 3,900 square foot McDonald's restaurant. The 0.88-acre site is located at 105 S. Coit Road, at the southeast corner of Coit Road and Belt Line Road.

**Motion:** Commissioner Roland made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as presented; second by Commissioner Maxwell. Motion approved 7-0.

## **VARIANCE**

6. **VAR 14-04** – **Camelot Shopping Center:** Consider and take necessary action on a request for a variance to Chapter 21, Article III, Section 21-52(i) of the Subdivision and Development Code to allow a reduction in required parking. The property is located at 580 W. Arapaho Road, at the northeast corner of W. Arapaho Road and Hampshire Lane.

Mr. Roberts stated the applicant was requesting a 73 parking space reduction from the required number of parking spaces to accommodate a martial arts studio and to allow the flexibility for a possible future restaurant. In addition to the current request, he noted that two previous requests had been made and granted for a reduction in parking of 98 spaces. Those two previous requests, in addition to the current request, would reduce the required parking by 171 spaces, or 28% of the parking spaces required by the City.

Mr. Robert pointed out that the applicant had completed a parking study over several weeks and at most there were 177 parking spaces occupied. He added that staff had visited the site on a number of occasions and conducted their own study which concurred with the results of the applicant's parking study.

Commissioner Roland asked what the parking requirements were for a martial arts studio and a restaurant.

Mr. Roberts replied the parking requirement for both is 1:100 square feet.

Commissioner Maxwell asked if the two spaces shaded in red on the site plan were the only spaces vacant in the shopping center.

Mr. Roberts said that according to the tenant roster provided by the applicant those were the only vacant spaces in the center.

Mr. Amos Waranch, representing Hoppenstein Properties, 5601 Gaston Avenue, Dallas, Texas, stated that even with the current and proposed tenants, there would be 270 available parking spaces and requested the Commission grant the variance.

Commissioner Maxwell asked if the proposed variance would be the largest granted in the City and, if so, did the staff have any concerns. He said he did not necessarily have an issue with the proposed variance, but was concerned the City might be setting precedence.

Mr. Roberts replied that if the variance was approved, it would be the largest and directed the Commission to a list of recent parking variances granted by the City Council.

Regarding setting precedence, Mr. Roberts said that each request for a variance was reviewed on its own merits based on the tenant roster, adjacent uses, and the appropriateness of granting a variance.

**Motion:** Commissioner Roland made a motion to recommend approval of Variance 14-04 as presented; second by Commissioner DePuy. Motion approved 7-0.

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

7. **Replat – Canyon Park Estates Addition, Second Section, Lots 17A, 34 and 35, Block E:** Consider and take necessary action on a request for approval of a replat for three (3) residential lots totaling 1.65-acres, located at 1 Ridgeview Circle, and 316 and 318 Ridgeview Drive.

Mr. Bireima reported the purpose of the replat was to create two (2) lots on 1.27 acres, to accurately reflect the ownership boundaries of Lot 17A, Block E of the Canyon Park Estates, Second Section, and dedicate new easements. He added that in March the subject property received a variance allowing side lot lines that were not configured at a right angle to the street line.

Mr. Bireima stated the replat complied with City regulations and no correspondence had been received.

With no questions for staff, Vice Chair Bright opened the public hearing.

Mr. Hugh Simpson, 316 Ridgeview Drive, Richardson, Texas, said he and his wife were ready to downsize and leave the large home for the next family to enjoy. He asked the Commission to approve the replat.

No other comments in favor or opposed were received and Vice Chair Bright closed the public hearing.

**Motion:** Commissioner Maxwell made a motion approve Item 7 as presented; second by Commissioner Frederick. Motion approved 7-0.

8. **ZF 14-12 – Villas of Nantucket:** Consider and take necessary action on a request for approval of a change in zoning from LR-M(2) Local Retail and O-M Office to PD Planned Development for the development of thirteen (13) patio-home residential lots on approximately 1.8 acres. The property is located at the northeast corner of Old Campbell Road and Nantucket Drive.

Mr. Bireima stated the applicant was requesting to rezone 1.8 acres from local retail and office districts to Planned Development (PD) with base regulations of RP-1500-M Residential/Patio Homes and modified development standards for the purpose of developing thirteen (13) patio home lots. He added that the subject property was undeveloped and located at the northeast corner of Old Campbell Road and Nantucket Drive.

Mr. Bireima pointed out that the property was designated for Neighborhood Services on the City's Future Land Use plan; however, the property was behind an already developed retail center and surrounded by an elder day care, office, and a junior high school. In addition, the character of the site (lack of depth and visibility) would not accommodate most uses allowed under the current zoning.

Mr. Bireima reviewed the proposed layout of the 3,600 square foot lots as well as the proposed design of the patio homes. He added that the layout planned a 6-foot screening wall for the north and east boundaries of the district and a shared common drive connected to the public street via multiple points of access.

Mr. Bireima noted that Old Campbell Road was currently a substandard street, but the applicant would be improving the section of street adjacent to the project during development of the site. He also presented a rendering of the proposed homes showing two stories, front entry driveways, and shaker style garage door with glass panels.

Mr. Bireima reported that one piece of correspondence in support of the request had been received from the adjacent elder day care facility.

Vice Chair Bright asked where the junior high school was located in relation to the property.

Mr. Bireima indicated the junior high school was west of subject property.

Commissioner Frederick asked for the location of the easement mentioned in the correspondence.

Mr. Bireima replied the easement was along the north property line and currently served the existing elder day care center, but was owned by the developer of the subject property.

Commissioner DePuy pointed out that because of the lack of frontage on a main road, the property would not be conducive for Neighborhood Services as listed under the current zoning. She also wanted to know if the property had been for sale for a long time.

Mr. Bireima stated the applicant agreed and thought the property was not favorable for commercial/retail development, which was most likely the reason it sat vacant for so many years. He did not know how long it had been for sale.

Mr. Chavez added that there had been several conversations over the last few years with individuals interested in developing the property for non-residential use, but the problem of the property not being deep enough to accommodate a building pad and the required parking prevented that type of development.

Commissioner Linn asked why the rezoning request was a PD as opposed to a straight rezoning request.

Mr. Bireima said that if the regular zoning was applied, it would affect the number of lots allowed under the base patio home zoning.

Mr. Chavez pointed out that a PD would provide the relief needed by the applicant in regard to setbacks and lot area through development regulations designed specifically for the site.

Commissioner Roland asked if the City would improve the portion of Old Campbell Road that was not adjacent to the proposed development.

Mr. Bireima replied that as far as he knew there were no plans for further improvement along that road.

Commissioner Springs asked about the rationale for on-street parking on Old Campbell Road as opposed to including that in the common driveway.

Mr. Bireima said the applicant felt the area within the common drive was limited and would not accommodate visitor parking, therefore, visitors would have to park on Old Campbell Road.

With no further questions for staff, Vice Chair Bright opened the public hearing.

Ms. Cheryl Williams, Williams Consulting Group, 2611 Forrest Grove Drive, Richardson, Texas, stated there was a significant demand for new housing in the City, particularly as Richardson continues to add jobs to the local economy. Williams acknowledged that although the development would be small, it would help meet the growing demand for detached housing with limited yard maintenance.

Ms. Williams pointed out that the cities of Carrollton, Plano and Richardson commissioned a retail study of under-performing and vacant retail area that showed there was an excess of retail zoning with many of the properties in the wrong location. She added that most retailers were moving way from neighborhood centers to larger retail centers located on major corridors and the proposed site did not meet this demand.

Ms. Williams concluded her presentation stating that it was her understanding after discussions with executives from the City that Old Campbell Road was slated to be repaired and the portion adjacent to the proposed development would be done in conjunction with that effort.

Commissioner Frederick asked if the common drive would be maintained by the homeowners association.

Ms. Williams replied the common drive was a separate lot owned by the homeowners association and would be maintained by the association.

Commissioner DePuy asked if the developer had plans to bury the overhead utility lines. She also wanted to know where the 6-foot fence would be located.

Mr. Harry Purdom, H Purdom, Inc., 309 Meadowcrest, Richardson, Texas, said that only the service lines to the homes will be buried, and the fence would be along the northern and eastern boundaries. He added that the fence would actually be a 6 to 8-foot masonry wall with intricate iron railing details along the top.

Commissioner Springs asked if the applicant had been provided with a copy of the correspondence and did he have any objections to the statements in the letter.

Mr. Purdom replied that the piece of land did not fit into the proposed development plans for the homes, and it was originally part of elder day care property and used as part of their entrance, so it was decided to deed the property over to the day care.

Commissioner DePuy asked about the spacing between the proposed homes, and for additional information on the glass panel garage doors.

Mr. Purdom said the homes would be six feet apart, which was typical for zero lot line/patio homes, and the garage doors would be more of a commercial grade with the option of having metal panels along the bottom and opaque glass on the upper panels.

Commissioner Linn noted that it was common practice to have conversations with neighboring homeowners associations and asked if there had been any with the association to the south of the subject property.

Mr. Purdom said they had not spoken with that association and Ms. Williams pointed out that no correspondence had been received from that group.

Commissioner Frederick asked what the setback was for the start of the garage.

Mr. Purdom replied the common drive would be 20 feet wide and the individual driveways would be 7 feet, which would be 27 feet to the start of the garage.

Commissioner Maxwell asked if the applicant had any concerns about the viability of the project especially with the retail center located directly behind the proposed development.

Mr. Purdom said he felt the product would be successful because the masters would all be on the first floor making the homes more appealing to individuals who were looking to downsize from their larger homes and at the same time stay in Richardson. He also thought the influx of new resident would be beneficial for the retail center. Commissioner Maxwell said he did not think it was the applicant's intent to build 100 percent stucco, but the way the PD was written it appeared to allow that percentage. He suggested rewriting the percentage of stucco allowed in the PD.

Mr. Purdom replied that they were asking for the stucco to be counted as masonry, but they were not planning on doing a 100 percent stucco home.

Commissioner Maxwell suggested the applicant change the PD to allow a certain percentage of stucco on the homes.

Commissioner DePuy asked for the price point on the homes and the square footage.

Mr. Purdom stated the price point would be \$350,000.00 and the homes would be 2,400 square feet.

Commissioner Springs asked the applicant to clarify their statement of rebuilding Old Campbell Road in concert with the City, and if the project would be done in phases.

Mr. Purdom replied they were involved in discussions with the City Manager's Office regarding the rebuilding of the road, but as far as the phasing, construction would most likely taking place from the east to west with the common drive built to a certain point during the first phase of construction.

Commissioner Roland asked if the common drive would be one-way.

Mr. Purdom said that was correct and Mr. Chavez added that the common driveway would be poured at the same time a section of the lots was being developed to allow access.

No other comments were made in favor and Vice Chair Bright called for any comments in opposition.

Mr. Michael Moreno, 6901 Northwood Road, Richardson, Texas, owner of the car wash at 1962 Nantucket Drive, had three concerns: 1) impact of residential community coming into a commercial community; 2) property values for commercial property owners; 3) future objections to any redevelopment of the commercial property by the residents. He asked the Commission to deny the rezoning request.

No other comments in opposition were received and Vice Chair Bright asked if the applicant had any comments in rebuttal.

Ms. Williams stated that residential properties were never used for comps for commercial property, and far as introducing residential into a commercial area, the proposed development was on the periphery and it was outlined in the performance standards that the development would not be considered a residential zoning district, which would hold harmless the adjacent commercial property owners from light or noise performance standards.

Ms. Williams concluded her comments by saying that she felt almost any future redevelopment would be more welcome and less objectionable to the residents then a car wash.

Commissioner Roland asked about the hold harmless comment and if the residents would have any say in changes to the commercial businesses.

Ms. Williams confirmed residences inside a commercial district would not have any ground to stand to object to any changes to the commercial area.

Mr. Greg Cooney, H Purdom, Inc., 319 Overcreek Drive, Richardson, Texas, asked to add to Ms. Williams' statement by noting the planned 8-foot masonry wall would add definition and be an additional buffer between the residential and commercial properties. In addition, the current property owner was maintaining another property adjacent to the proposed development and viewed the project in a positive light.

With no other comments in favor or opposed, Vice Chair Bright closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Maxwell asked staff to further expound on the hold harmless section of the performance standards.

Mr. Bireima replied the development would be held to non-residential performance standards as opposed to residential standards.

Mr. Chavez added that a similar situation occurred when the GreenVue multi-family project was being developed. Due to the close proximity of commercial/industrial businesses the standards for both were treated as non-residential.

Vice Chair Bright asked if staff knew the status of the discussions for repairing Old Campbell Road and Mr. Chavez said they were still in the preliminary discussion stage.

Commissioner Roland asked for an example of wording for the development standards that would allow the use of stucco, but only as an accent to brick and/or stone.

Mr. Chavez replied the language could be very specific as to the percentage allowed; possibly only on the second story. He added that the applicant wanted to have the ability to mix stucco with stone or brick, but felt the applicant might be better able to provide a level or percentage that would work for their product.

Vice Chair Bright asked if the design standards, as worded, would allow the applicant to construct the homes of 100 percent stucco.

Mr. Chavez replied the design standards would allow 75 to 100 percent as currently written.

Commissioner Springs stated that using the rendering as a guide, it appeared the applicant was proposing to use either stone or brick on the first floor and stucco on the second. He suggested using the term "traditional masonry" for products to be used on the first floor.

Mr. Purdom suggested removing stucco as masonry in the design standards, using the City's current definition of a masonry wall, and making the requirement 70 percent.

Commissioner Maxwell asked if the applicant was proposing a 6-foot or an 8-foot fence.

Mr. Bireima replied the design standards called for a wall that was from 6 to 8 feet, but if the Commission wanted to require an 8-foot fence, the applicant was open to that change.

Commissioner Maxwell said he understood the applicant's proposed changes, but still felt the development was strange and asked the two real estate professionals on the Commission for their thoughts on the proposed development.

Commissioner Frederick said she appreciated the concerns expressed in opposition, and the placement of residential on the border of a commercial area may seem awkward, but the Commission has positively reviewed many cases of mixed-use developments in the last 18 months.

Commissioner DePuy concurred with Ms. Frederick and noted that the property in question was not visible from the main thoroughfare in the area – Campbell Road, making it highly unlikely retail businesses would be successful in the area. She added that if the project had master bedrooms on the first floor, an 8-foot fence, and was priced right it would work well.

Commissioner Linn concurred with Ms. Frederick's comments and felt the residential would help the commercial properties to north and enhance the existing neighborhood to the south.

Vice Chair Bright also acknowledged the concerns presented in opposition, but was in favor of the proposed development and suggested the motion contain conditions to insure the masonry would be at 70 percent and the fence at 8-foot. He also wanted to know if staff had any concerns about the piece of property to be deeded to the elder day care center.

Mr. Cooney responded that the piece of property being deeded to the elder day care was of no value to their development plans, plus it was part of the day care's entrance, so it made sense to deed it to them.

Ms. Williams asked if the motion could contain 70 percent traditional masonry and remove stucco from the definition.

**Motion:** Commissioner DePuy made a motion to recommend approval of Zoning File 14-12 with the additional conditions to require an 8-foot fence in-lieu-of a 6-foot fence; the reference to stucco would be deleted; and the masonry requirement would be reduced from 75 percent to 70 percent; second by Commissioner Springs.

Commissioner Maxwell said he still had some reservations about the project and stated he would not be voting in favor.

Motion approved 6-1 with Maxwell opposed.

# **ADJOURN**

With no further business before the Commission, Vice Chair Bright adjourned the regular business meeting at 8:21 p.m.

Gerald Bright, Vice Chair City Plan Commission