CITY OF RICHARDSON CITY PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES – MARCH 20, 2012

The Richardson City Plan Commission met March 20, 2012, at 7:00 p.m. at City Hall in the Council Chambers, 411 W. Arapaho Road, Richardson, Texas.

MEMBERS PRESENT: David Gantt, Chairman

Gerald Bright, Commissioner
Janet DePuy, Commissioner
Marilyn Frederick, Commissioner

Barry Hand, Commissioner

Thomas Maxwell, Commissioner

Eron Linn, Alternate

MEMBERS ABSENT: Bill Hammond, Vice Chair

Don Bouvier, Alternate

CITY STAFF PRESENT: Michael Spicer, Director of Dev. Svcs.

Don Magner, Director of Community Services

Sam Chavez, Asst. Director of Dev. Svcs. – Planning Susan Smith, Asst. Director of Dev. Svcs – Dev. & Eng.

Israel Roberts, Development Review Manager

Chris Shacklett, Planner

Kevin Laughlin, City Attorney Kathy Welp, Executive Secretary

BRIEFING SESSION

Prior to the regular business meeting, the City Plan Commission met with staff to receive a briefing on agenda items and staff reports. No action was taken.

MINUTES

1. Approval of the minutes of the regular business meeting of March 6, 2012.

Motion: Commissioner Maxwell made a motion to approve the minutes as presented;

second by Commissioner Bright. Motion passed 7-0.

CONSENT AGENDA

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.

2. **Preliminary Plat of the Savoy Trace Addition:** A request for approval of a preliminary plat for a 5.87-acre tract into 42 single-family lots. The site is located at 1250 Jonsson Boulevard, at the northwest corner of Lake Park Way and Jonsson Boulevard.

Motion: Commissioner Bright made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as presented; second by Commissioner DePuy. Motion passed 7-0.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

3. Variance 12-02 Brick Row Townhome Development: Consider and take necessary action on a request by Scot Witwer, representing CB JENI Homes, for approval of variances from Section 11, Signs, of the Spring Valley Station District Development Regulations. The applicant is requesting variances for three (3) freestanding signs for marketing purposes. The request allows two (2) of the three (3) signs to be located off-site; allows all three (3) signs to remain until the end of construction of the Brick Row townhomes; and, allows the sum of the three (3) signs to exceed the maximum 200 square feet. The townhome subdivision is located north of Spring Valley Road, on the west side of Greenville Avenue.

Ms. Smith stated she would brief both Variance 12-02 and 12-03 at one time, and Chairman Gantt noted there would be separate public hearings and separate votes.

Ms. Smith reported that Variance 12-02 was a request for three variances for three free-standing signs for marketing purposes:

- Locate two (2) of the three (3) signs off site (intersection of Spring Valley Road and Centennial, and the intersection of Spring Valley Road and Greenville Avenue);
- Allow all three (3) signs to remain until the end of the construction phase for the townhomes in lieu of the first initial sign permits being valid for thirty (30) days, then additional permits allowed for 21 days with a limit of four permit renewals. In addition, in between those renewals, the signs would have to be removed for seven (7) days; and
- To allow all signs to exceed the maximum allowed area of 200 square feet by 202 square feet. (Sign 1 at the intersection of Spring Valley Road and Centennial Boulevard would have 100.5 square feet; Sign 2 at the intersection of Spring Valley Road and Greenville Avenue would have 201 square feet. The third sign would be the same as Sign 1 with 100.5 square feet.)

Regarding Variance 12-03, Ms. Smith noted that the request was for the Brick Row Apartments located at the intersection of Spring Valley Road and the DART Light Rail line and they were asking for two variances for a free-standing sign for marketing purposes:

• Locate the sign off site at the intersection of Spring Valley Road and Centennial Boulevard; and

• Allow the sign to remain for six months (October 9, 2012).

Commissioner DePuy asked if the townhome and apartment signs would both be located on the pie-shaped lot at Centennial Boulevard and Spring Valley Road and about the sign placement on the lot.

Ms. Smith replied that both signs would be located on the pie-shaped, and there would be sufficient room with the signs located further back on the site.

Commissioner Linn asked if the variance was approved by the Commission, would it preclude future commercial development of the site (he referenced a previous development request for a 7-11 and gas station).

Ms. Smith replied to her knowledge it would not preclude future development.

With no further questions for staff, Chairman Gantt opened the public hearing for Variance 12-02.

Mr. Bruno Pasquinelli, owner of CB JENI Homes, 107 Suncreek Drive, Allen, Texas, noted that his company was coming into the area to finish construction on the townhome development and had met with the local Homeowners Association (HOA) in an effort to involve them in the process. He added that the best way to finish the development was to get people into the sales office and that it would be accomplished through the use of signs.

Mr. Pasquinelli stated his plan was originally to reface the three signs used by the previous home builder, but when the builder left they took the signs with them. He added that whatever signs his company was allowed to erect, they would be correctly permitted and located in the same location as those of the previous builder.

Commissioner DePuy asked the applicant to respond to her earlier question about placement of the signs on the pie-shaped lot.

Mr. Scott Whitwer, CB JENI Homes, 107 Suncreek Drive, Allen, Texas, replied he was working with staff on the specifics of the sign location, but it was his understanding that they would be offset – one in front of the other, to allow for visibility for both directions of traffic.

Commissioner Maxwell asked if the applicant had reviewed the signs and the location of the signs with the local HOA.

Mr. Pasquinelli replied that during the first meeting with the HOA the signs were not discussed, but at a subsequent meeting it was discussed and, even though the attendance was limited, the attendees did not have a problem with the signs.

Commissioner Frederick noted there was also a commercial leasing sign at Centennial Boulevard and Spring Valley Road and wanted to know how all the signs would fit on the lot.

Mr. Pasquinelli replied that he was not sure, but noted that the previous builder had placed a sign at that same location, but he was open to any suggestions about sign placement.

Commissioner Linn asked why the applicant was requesting such large signs and suggested a smaller sign with a directional arrow.

Mr. Pasquinelli replied that the bigger the sign the easier it was to see for traffic moving by the location. He added that the signs also needed to have the phone number, web address, and a picture of the development.

Commissioner Hand stated that he had a concern about the proposed indefinite construction timeline and that he would not want to burden the applicant with having to return every six months to reapply. He suggested that an automatic six month extension be built into the requirements, but after one year the applicant should be required to return to re-permit the signs.

Mr. Pasquinelli replied that David Weekley Homes built and closed on 20 townhomes in a little over two years and there are over 100 lots remaining. A conservative estimate would be approximately 5 years to complete the development unless the housing market improved dramatically.

Commissioner Hand asked if it was fair to say that David Weekley Homes accomplished those 20 sales in what was probably the worse real estate economy in the last 100 years.

Mr. Pasquinelli replied that was correct, and confirmed that his company was in it for the long haul and asked if the Commission was going to set a time limit on the permits to make it longer than one year.

Commissioner Hand acknowledged that it could take a little longer if the housing market did not improve and added that the "open-endedness" of the request was causing him some concern.

No other comments were made in favor or opposition and Chairman Gantt closed the public hearing.

Chairman Gantt asked staff if the signs from the previous builder were approximately the same size, and had the City received any complaints from the public.

Mr. Magner replied that the previous builder did have signs on the site and thought they were about the same size, but was not aware of any complaints from the public.

Commissioner Bright asked to confirm that if the Commission approved the variances, and the lot was developed in the future, the development would be subject to the signs as approved. He also wanted to know if the David Weekley Homes signs were under a six month renewal.

Ms. Smith replied that was correct and it would also be subject to whatever arrangements the new property owner made with the current owner.

Regarding the term of renewal for David Weekley Homes, Ms. Smith stated that the builder had never permitted the signs.

Chairman Gantt stated that he concurred with Mr. Hand about putting a time limitation on the permit and felt an older sign would not be beneficial to either the City or the developer.

Mr. Magner replied that requiring a six month renewal would be consistent with Chapter 18 of the City's Code of Ordinances and would enable the Community Services Department to inspect the condition of the sign and intervene if necessary. However, a different period of time would be appropriate if required by the Commission.

Ms. Smith added that approval of a Chapter 18 permit request would be handled by staff and would not have to come back before the Commission.

Chairman Gantt asked if the renewal of the permit would have a cost associated with it.

Mr. Magner replied that under the ordinance for Class 4 Signs the applicant would pay a permit fee.

Commissioner Frederick stated she understood the need to have a large, informative sign on site to provide all of the pertinent information, but the directional signs (Signs 1 and 2) should be a little smaller. She added that the design of the signs was very attractive and the price point for the townhomes was very reasonable.

Chairman Gantt noted the applicant had stated he was amenable to changing the size of the signs and suggested that the signs from Variance 12-02 and 12-03 might be combined into one size, which would alleviate some of the sign congestion on that corner with the other commercial sign.

Ms. Smith concurred with the suggestion, but thought the question should be posed to both applicants.

Mr. Pasquinelli replied that sharing a sign was not, in his opinion, as attractive as one sign and was not in favor of sharing, but he was in favor of having smaller directional signs.

Chairman Gantt stated that he could live with the two smaller directional signs, but would prefer that they be smaller in size. He did not have an issue with Sign Location 2 because it was on the corner of an undeveloped tract of land, but felt if the Commission could address the sign size for Sign Location 1, and the time frame for the permit, he would be in favor of the request.

Commissioner Hand stated whether it was once a year, or once every two years he liked the idea of having staff handle the sign approval process.

Commissioner DePuy concurred with the suggestion of limiting the time of the permit to one year and stated it was important to get the signs up quickly so the development could be a vital part of Richardson.

Mr. Magner confirmed that the Commission could set whatever time limit they were comfortable with for renewing the sign permit.

Commissioner Maxwell suggested keeping the time limit at the same duration as any other developer in the City – six months.

Chairman Gantt stated that he did not have a problem with a longer duration, but he definitely thought the City should have some level of control.

Commissioner Linn suggested that 4 feet by 8 feet was a large enough for the signs, but Ms. DePuy disagreed and thought an 8 by 8-foot sign would be better.

Commissioner Bright concurred that an 8 by 8-foot sign would be fine, and with respect to the time frame, he thought it should be no longer than one year. He added that renewing the permit at six months made it consistent with the City's ordinance.

Commissioner Frederick clarified that the commercial sign she was speaking of earlier was where Sign 2 would be located and not Sign 1; therefore, if the request was approved, there would be an "L" shaped sign on the site along with the commercial sign.

Chairman Gantt stated he thought there was room for those signs at Sign Location 2, but was concerned there was not enough room if the signs were to be erected at Location 1. He suggested the motion would have to specify any changes to the size of the signs, and asked the staff if the applicant's request to allow the three signs exceeded the maximum 200 square feet limit.

Ms. Smith replied that more than likely the signs would exceed the maximum area and suggested that the Commission could specify the size they were comfortable with along with the time limit.

Motion: Commissioner Hand made a motion to approve Variance 12-02 with the following qualifications: off-site Sign 1 and 2 would be limited to 8 feet by 8 feet in size; the applicant would be required to renew their permit each year; and the applicant would be allowed to exceed the maximum 200 square feet; second by

Commissioner Frederick. Motion passed 6-1 with Commissioner Linn opposed.

4. Variance 12-03: Consider and take necessary action on a request by Chris Ray, representing Centennial Park Richardson, LTD., for approval of variances from Section 11, Signs, of the Spring Valley Station District Development Regulations. The applicant is requesting two (2) variances for a single free-standing sign for marketing purposes. The request allows the sign to be located off-site; and, allows the sign to remain throughout the summer leasing season for a period of six (6) months. The development is located north of Spring Valley Road, directly east of the DART light rail line.

Ms. Smith stated that she had no comments to add to the information already presented, therefore, Chairman Gantt opened the public hearing.

Mr. Chris Ray, representing Centennial Park Richardson, 744 Brick Row, Richardson, Texas advised that when David Weekley Homes had their sign at Location 1, it was set to the southeast and staggered so there was ample visibility for the townhome and apartment signs.

Mr. Ray admitted that his sign was already up and in place and the 8 feet by 12 feet size was the best size for the area because it provided greater visibility with the fast flow of the traffic. He added that the pie-shaped lot where the apartment and townhome signs would be placed was approximately 2.5 acres so there would be sufficient room for all the signs.

In closing his presentation, Mr. Ray noted that the spring and summer months were the peak sales season and he was requesting at least a six month period for the sign permit.

Commissioner Linn asked if there were any additional signs advertising apartments for lease.

Mr. Ray replied there are permanent signs directly above the leasing office door, and a belayed sign on the rotunda listing the development's name.

Chairman Gantt asked if the picture presented to the Commission was a correct representation of the current sign.

Mr. Ray replied that it was the existing sign with a white fabric covering that can be interchanged with a red covering. He admitted that it was not the most attractive sign, but they had received a lot of traffic in their sales office because of the sign and they were planning to construct a monument sign in the future at that same location.

Chairman Gantt asked if the townhome signs being on the site for quite some time would affect the plans for their monument sign.

Mr. Ray replied that where CB JENNI Homes wanted to locate their sign, east and little bit south, would be fine.

Commissioner Bright asked which direction the sign was facing.

Mr. Ray replied the one-sided sign faces west and captures the attention of the traffic going east at the Spring Valley/Centennial split.

No other comments were made in favor or opposition and Chairman Gantt closed the public hearing.

Chairman Gantt asked if the existing sign had a permit and Mr. Magner replied that it did not.

Commissioner Maxwell stated that he did not have an issue with the request, especially since the request was only for six months.

Commissioner Hand stated that it was to the City's benefit that the development reached capacity and the Commission should do whatever it could to help accomplish that goal.

Motion: Commissioner Hand made a motion to approve Variance 12-03 as presented; second by Commissioner Maxwell. Motion passed 6-1 with Commissioner Linn opposed.

5. Zoning File 11-24 Bowser Self Service Warehouse: Consider and take necessary action on a request by Kenneth R. Smith, representing Heath Asset Management, LP, for approval of a Special Permit for a self-service warehouse with modified development standards. The 1.6 acre site is currently zoned I-FP(2) Industrial and is located at the southeast corner of Bowser Road and Alpha Drive

Mr. Chavez reported that the request was for a Special Permit for a self-service warehouse located the southeast corner of Bowser Road and Alpha Drive and that the request was previously considered by the Commission in December of 2011, but had been continued indefinitely to allow staff and the applicant to revise the site plan to try and bring it closer into compliance. He added that there is currently a 40,000 square foot, nonconforming structure on the site, and that the nonconforming issues related to the landscaping, driveway locations, and driveway widths.

Mr. Chavez noted that the site would be developed in two phases: Phase 1 involved the western half of the building with the construction of 150 self-storage units, landscaping along Bowser Road and Alpha Road, a 2,000 square foot office store front, filling in the existing

loading ramp located on the west side of the building, and adding a double wide dumpster screen at the southwest corner of the building.

Regarding Phase 2, Mr. Chavez stated that the development of this phase would depend on tenant in the eastern portion of the building vacating the premises. The improvements for this phase would include cutting asphalt along Alpha Road and Industrial Drive to provide landscaping, and modifying the existing driveway widths to bring them into conformance with City requirements. In addition, once the eastern portion of the building was converted into a self-service warehouse, there will be a total of 300 storage units, 1.9 percent on-site landscaping, and 43 parking spaces.

Mr. Chavez closed his presentation by presenting the elevations for the office, site photos including one showing a moving truck and the limited space available, and noting that staff was recommending two possible motions for the Commission to consider:

- First, if the application was approved as presented, the Concept Site Plan which allows the applicant to utilize the site for the proposed use with a few minor modifications would be submitted to the City Council for consideration, but the site would still remain nonconforming.
- Second, if the Commission considered recommending approval of the applicant's request with additional modifications, a motion for a continuance should be made to allow staff and the applicant to further refine any conditions related to any of the proposed site improvements.

Commissioner Bright read from a paragraph in the staff report stating "...without any modifications to address the nonconforming elements of the site, the functionality of the site is not appropriate for the intended use" and asked if the functionality of the site would be appropriate for the intended use if only the driveway modifications were completed.

Mr. Chavez replied that the issue that hampers how the property is used is the maneuverability of vehicles, especially novice drivers with larger vehicles. He added that as far as completing the driveway modifications, those would improve the safety aspect of the location of the driveways, but there would still be problems with maneuvering deficiencies on the site because of the lack of depth in the parking/driving area.

Commissioner Linn asked if the angled parking spaces recommended in Exhibit D would address the specific concern regarding the parking area.

Mr. Chavez replied yes.

Commissioner Maxwell asked staff to review the three staff proposed driveway modifications with the Commission.

Mr. Chavez replied that the driveway at Bowser and Alpha Roads was located 26 feet from the intersection, which is less than the City's driveway standard requirement of 50 feet so the applicant would need to relocate the driveway. The second modification pertained to the width of the center drive along Alpha Road that is used for the loading dock. Staff recommendation would keep that driveway for the sole use of the loading dock, but would create driveways on each side of the loading dock driveway to allow for ease of access. Lastly, the staff was recommending that the driveway on Industrial Drive be widened to 24 feet.

Mr. Chavez added that even with the three modifications, the driveways would still be nonconforming because the driveway throat (measured from the face of the curb to the first turning movement) measurement is 12 to 14 feet when the City requirement is 28 feet, which highlights how much the site is hampered by lack of lot depth from Alpha Road.

Commissioner Maxwell asked if there was a minimum distance requirement between driveways, and wanted to know if a driveway could be added along Bowser Road to line up with the existing overhead door.

Mr. Chavez replied that the distance requirement was 80 feet, but that the applicant would have to seek relief or a variance for the distance between the drives on each side of the loading dock driveway on Alpha Road.

Regarding adding a driveway along Bowser Road, Mr. Chavez replied there was a grade change from Bowser Road to the building that would make it very difficult to overcome.

Chairman Gantt asked if the earlier statement about filling in the ramp on the west end of the property meant the applicant would trim the borders of the ramp and then pave over the area.

Mr. Chavez replied that the applicant would fill it in to the existing grade.

Commissioner Hand asked what the requirements were to revoke a Special Permit.

Mr. Laughlin, City Attorney, replied that when a Special Permit was granted it becomes a zoning change so it can not be revoked because, as a general premise, if it was revoked a nonconforming use would be created.

With no further questions for staff, Chairman Gantt opened the public hearing.

Mr. Ken Smith, 4925 Greenville Avenue, Dallas, Texas, stated that after his request for a Special Permit was tabled in December 2011, he met with staff regarding concerns over the landscaping, traffic flow, and location of trash receptacles. He said that he felt they had addressed all of the issues by adding a landscape buffer around the property, provided a different location for the dumpster on the west side of the property, added a customer friendly

store front, and added bollards and guardrails in the area of the grade change and along the loading dock ramp.

Mr. Smith pointed out that the loading dock ramp on Alpha Road would be a common area ramp and one of two major points of access to the facility for the customers. In addition, if anyone brought a moving truck to move goods into the facility they would use the driveway and ramp, and the picture presented by staff was not a fair representation of the parking area because that vehicle would have had to jump the curb to be parked there.

Commissioner DePuy complimented the applicant on the proposed design for the store front, but asked why the landscaping was going to be installed in two phases. She also wanted to know if Verizon was going to vacate the east side of the building.

Mr. Smith replied that he would have no problem with combing the landscaping into one phase, but he did not know if Verizon was planning on leaving in three years at the end of their lease.

Commissioner DePuy stated that the non-existent landscaping was one of her concerns and the little that was proposed should be completed in one phase unless there were extenuating circumstances.

Commissioner Maxwell asked why the applicant had chosen not to implement the three driveway and the dumpster recommendations suggested by staff.

Mr. Smith replied that the proposed landscape buffer was substantially more than what is currently on site and he was not sure if it would constrict the traffic flow, which was a factor in addition to the cost of adding the driveways. He added that he felt there were adequate driveways for the facility and pointed out that after Phase 1 traffic would not be able to flow from one side of the property to the other.

Regarding the dumpster location, Mr. Smith replied that by putting the dumpster on the east side it would cut off access to the loading dock used by Verizon so he suggested leaving it on the west side. He added that there were not a lot of other changes that could be made to site because it was originally developed before many of the City's ordinances and codes were initiated and the property did not have the depth to make the changes.

Chairman Gantt asked if the over-head door located next to the proposed store front would be opened by an employee or would it be an automatic door.

Mr. Smith replied that the door will go up at 7:00 a.m. and down at 7:00 p.m. every day and behind the door there would be glass doors that would allow entry via an access code whether or not an employee was present.

Chairman Gantt expressed concern that if the automatic over-head door came down without an employee in attendance it could possibly trap someone inside the building. He also wanted to know about the ramp on the west side of the building that was going to be filled in and if a vehicle would be able to drive over that space to get to the dumpsters.

Mr. Smith replied that he would have to look into the concern about locking someone in the building, and stated that he was planning on filling in the ramp, paving over it and putting guardrails and bollards where the grade change is located to prevent anyone from driving over the grade change.

Commissioner Maxwell asked if the overhead door on the west side of building would remain after the modifications.

Mr. Smith replied that it would stay and be another access point to the facility.

Commissioner Linn asked if the previous tenant for the western portion of the building was Verizon and if they approached the applicant to re-lease that area would he lease it to them again.

Mr. Smith replied that the previous tenant had been Verizon, but re-leasing it to them would depend on if that portion of the facility had been converted to a self-storage warehouse.

Mr. Laughlin stated that he wanted to expand on his previous comments regarding the revocation of a Special Permit and noted that there was a provision in the City's ordinances that allows the Commission, at the direction of the City Council, to initiate proceedings to reconsider an existing Special Permit provided the conditions or circumstances surrounding the Special Permit call into question issues of public health, safety, morals, general welfare and other issues. He added that if the Commission granted a Special Permit with existing issues, then the City would be obligated to keep the Special Permit unless conditions changed.

With no other comments in favor or opposition, Chairman Gantt closed the public hearing.

Commissioner DePuy expressed concerns that the applicant's plan was not solidified and hinged on whether or not the tenant on the east side of the building remained. She also stated that enough items were not changing to make the request palatable and that it was as if the applicant was applying a band-aid to the situation while waiting for something else to happen.

Commissioner Hand pointed out that the applicant's property was located in the Arapaho/Collins Redevelopment and Enhancement area listed in the City's 2009 Land Use Plan, and even though the Commission had entertained a few self-storage warehouse requests in the past, he felt the study on the Arapaho/Collins area should be finished before any

changes were made in the area. He added that another item that should be considered was the value of the property and how it could be diminished if the Special Permit was approved and again suggested that any changes wait until the study of the area was finished.

Commissioner Bright stated that even with the suggested changes, he felt it would be difficult to modify the property for the intended use.

Commissioner Frederick said she disagreed with Mr. Hand's assertion that the modifications on the property should wait because many of the challenging sites in the City fell within one of the study areas. She added that putting off modifying properties to a future time was not beneficial and suggested the applicant continue to work with staff to refine the modifications.

Commission Linn stated he appreciated the fact that the applicant was trying to find a solution to make the vacant portion of the warehouse profitable; however, he felt the plan was incomplete and questioned the commitment level to the plan.

Commissioner Maxwell felt there were still functionality issues with the plan and it needed additional work, but that he was inclined to agree with Ms. Frederick about locking the landowners in until the study was completed. He added as a proposed use it was okay, but there were still a lot of problems to address to make the plan work.

Commissioner DePuy acknowledged that she was usually the one bringing up the fact that a property was in a study area, but she did not have a problem with the property becoming a self-storage warehouse. She also had a concern over the level of commitment to the proposed plan, suggested the applicant follow the recommendations of the staff, and the landscaping should be combined and completed in Phase 1.

Chairman Gantt noted that in December 2011, the Commission made a motion to deny the request, which subsequently failed and a motion was made and passed to continue the item, but in his opinion the current proposal still has a lot of challenges to overcome and he could not support the plan as presented. He understood how difficult the site was to modify, and as for waiting for a redevelopment/enhancement study to be completed, the Commission could put a time limit on the Special Permit.

Commissioner Bright asked what other changes could be made, other than the existing recommendations, to make the site functional for the intended use.

Mr. Chavez replied that it would fall closer in line to the previous exhibit provided as a staff recommendation, but the changes would truly be a major modification to the site. Also, as the Commission is aware, the applicant wants to maintain the functionality of both a self-storage warehouse as well as the Verizon lease, which makes it difficult to do both on the site.

Commissioner Maxwell commented that continuing the request without giving the applicant some direction would leave the item in a stalemate.

Chairman Gantt replied that if the request was denied, the applicant could appeal their request to the City Council, or if the request was continued it would have to come back before the Commission before going to the Council. He added that he was not sure if continuing the request was a viable option because the applicant and staff had already met regarding the changes needed to make the site functional for the intended use.

Commissioner Maxwell stated that it seemed that the Commission could recommend a continuation prior to taking final action on the request based on staff's recommended motion regarding revision of the Concept Plan in accordance with the Commission's direction.

Chairman Gantt explained that a motion could be made for a continuance and the applicant would come back before the Commission, or the motion could be made to recommend approval and direct the applicant to make changes before going to the City Council. He asked staff if a motion was made to recommended approval with modifications, would the applicant have to come back before the Commission.

Mr. Chavez replied no, but the Commission should only consider making that motion if the Commission was comfortable with the applicant making the suggested modifications, and suggested asking the applicant how far he was willing to go on the modifications.

Mr. Smith stated that the request had been discussed many times and he asked the Commission to tell him exactly what they would approve; would the Commission approve the request if all the modifications suggested by staff were made.

Commissioner Linn asked if the applicant could confirm they would complete all the recommendations presented by staff in Exhibit D.

Mr. Smith replied that he had a tenant in half the space and could not remove any of the parking or ramps that are available under their lease.

Commissioner Linn stated that he understood the constraints the applicant was facing and that was why he made the motion to recommend denial of the request at the December 2011 meeting.

Chairman Gantt suggested there may have been a miscommunication regarding the expansion of the center driveway and the addition of two additional driveways on either side, but there was still the problem of the circulation in terms of the dock on the eastern side that is used by Verizon and widening and reconfiguring the driveways along Alpha Road. He added that the placement of the dumpster was also a concern, but if a driveway could be added along

Bowser Road that would allow the trash trucks to pull in and back out that it might be acceptable.

Chairman Gantt asked if the applicant would add the landscaping in one phase and was he flexible with aligning the driveways along Alpha Road.

Mr. Smith said he could do all the landscaping changes in Phase 1, but was concerned about making any changes to the centrally located driveway on Alpha Road because it was a common area that was used by the existing tenant.

Chairman Gantt stated that the staff was recommending adding driveways on either side of the main driveway to the ramp and suggested the applicant could work with the staff to reconfigure that area.

Mr. Smith said that it would be a better traffic flow if the driveways were put at each end of the lot, and along with angled parking, that would make it easier to go in one end of the lot and out the other.

Chairman Gantt noted that Exhibit D would probably not be feasible because of the commitments to the existing tenant, but thought there might be an opportunity if the driveways were reconfigured and the location of the dumpster could be determined. He added that if the applicant was willing to work with staff and implement some of their recommendations, the Commission would be willing to continue the item.

Mr. Smith replied that he would like to work on the recommendations, but did not want to waste anyone's time if an agreement could not be reached with what he wanted to do with the property.

Chairman Gantt stated he understood and the applicant could choose to withdraw the application even if the Commission voted to continue the item. He added that the Commission was looking for a commitment level from the applicant to work on the recommendations and possibly make more changes to the plan.

Mr. Smith replied that his sole purpose in submitting the request again was to get it approved. He added that the property was an important asset and thought it might be time for it to transition into another use, but again asked what the Commission would approve because he felt the current discussion was similar to that of the December 2011 meeting.

Chairman Gantt stated that if the applicant was willing to work with staff regarding their concerns, the Commission would most likely take a more favorable view of the request.

Commissioner Maxwell stated that based on the comments from the Commission, he did not think the item was going to be approved, or could guarantee the applicant that it would be passed if and when the item was brought back before the Commission. He added that he would like to make a motion, but would not be including the dumpster location because the staff's minimum recommendation might impede the usefulness of the overhead door, which would help get the larger trucks out of the driving aisles.

Motion:

Commissioner Maxwell made a motion to continue Zoning File 11-24 indefinitely with recommendations that the applicant work with staff to incorporate the three driveways, add the additional five feet of landscape, and that all landscaping be incorporated into Phase 1; second by Commissioner DePuy.

Chairman Gantt pointed out that staff had stated there would be a safety issue with the trash trucks backing up around a blind corner if the dumpster was left in its current location, and that the motion with no change in the dumpster location was a concern. He suggested that the motion could be changed to say "the applicant and staff could work together to find a more suitable agreed upon location."

Mr. Chavez noted that Sanitation would have to approve the dumpster location, confirmed that the site was difficult from a design stand point, and that staff was looking at moving the dumpster to the east side of the building, but with the existing tenant on that side it would serve no purpose.

Commissioner Maxwell stated that he would amend his motion to include the verbiage suggested by Chairman Gantt. Ms. DePuy concurred.

Motion passed 5-2 with Commissioners Bright and Hand opposed.

6. Zoning File 12-03 Methodist Richardson Medical Center PD: Consider and take necessary action on a request by Ken Hutchenrider, representing Methodist Richardson Medical Center, to rezone a 20.45-acre lot from I-M(1) Industrial with a Special Permit for a hospital to PD Planned Development for the I-M(1) Industrial District with a Special Permit with modified development standards for the expansion of the existing hospital campus located at the southeast corner of President George Bush Turnpike and Renner Road.

Mr. Shacklett Mr. Shacklett reported that the applicant was requesting to rezone the property to a PD Planned Development (PD) for the I-M (1) Industrial District with a Special Permit for a hospital with special conditions for expansion of the existing hospital campus located at the southeast corner of President George Bush Turnpike (PGBT) and Renner Road.

Mr. Shacklett noted that in 2007 a portion of the site was rezoned to industrial and a concept plan was attached showing a general layout of where buildings would be located; however, now that the applicant had developed a more detailed plan for the campus they were presenting a revised Concept Plan and a request for an increase in the floor area ratio over what was previously granted. In addition, the applicant was presenting two separate zoning

concept site plans depicting a Phase 1 expansion to the hospital, and a Phase 2 expansion that represented a full build-out of the campus including additions to the hospital and cancer center, as well as another medical office building and parking structures.

Mr. Shacklett reported that under Phase 1, the hospital would be increased in size to 457,250 square feet which included the existing 191,000 square foot building and the newly proposed four-story, 266,250 square foot hospital. He added that an additional 381 parking spaces would be required, and that a trip generation study was conducted by the applicant for both phases to analyze traffic needs and demands. The study highlighted that in Phase 1 a deceleration lane would be needed along the PGBT frontage road and another into the southern most proposed Shiloh Road driveway.

Regarding landscaping requirements, Mr. Shacklett noted that the PGBT design guidelines contained landscape buffering requirements along the frontage road and intersecting streets located within 300 feet of the turnpike; however, under the site's current zoning district it was required to have a 30-foot landscape buffer along the Turnpike and Renner Road, which is what exists today. Under the proposed PD, the PGBT guidelines called for a 40-foot landscape buffer, but the applicant is requesting to maintain the existing 30-foot landscape buffer along Renner Road and PGBT.

Chairman Gantt asked if the whole site met the 30-foot landscape buffer requirement and could the landscape buffer width request be handled through a variance request.

Mr. Shacklett replied that staff was recommending that the buffer width be included in the PD conditions since the majority of the frontage along PGBT and Renner Road met the 40-foot landscape buffer width, with the exception of a few small areas that would lie within that buffer, but would be located outside the 30-foot landscape buffer along the frontage road and along Renner Road.

Mr. Shacklett stated that as part of the PD request, the applicant submitted building elevations for approval that would be attached to the ordinance for the first phase of construction. He added that the current ordinance required building elevations to be approved at the time development plans were approved; however, the applicant is requesting that Phase 1 building elevations be approved as part of their current zoning request and they be required to come back for approval of full build-out building elevations at a later date.

Mr. Shacklett explained the floor area ratio at full build-out, the location of the building and parking structures, and the traffic mitigation plans.

In closing his presentation, Mr. Shacklett reviewed some of the items listed in the staff report that were not normally allowed by right or items that needed to be considered as part of the PD.

Commissioner Linn asked about the proposed fabric shade covered parking and did the Commission need to approve all the details.

Mr. Chavez replied that based on recommended conditions in the PD; condition 2.h., the cable tension structure would allow a larger expansion of the shade structure without the need for many support structures and that the proposed fabric had a minimum 10 year warranty.

With no further questions, Chairman Gantt opened the public hearing.

Mr. Ken Hutchenrider, President of Methodist Richardson Medical Center, 401 W. Campbell Road, Richardson, Texas, presented renderings of the new campus that took the features of the existing site and built upon those to accomplish their expansion goals.

Chairman Gantt asked if the renderings that were shown represented Phase 1 development.

Mr. Hutchenrider replied yes and added that as the site went through the construction phases, additional medical office buildings and parking garages would be added on the campus.

Commissioner DePuy asked what would happen to the existing facility on Campbell Road.

Mr. Hutchenrider replied that all of the acute care services would be moved to the new campus with the sub-acute care, in-patient psychiatric, rehabilitation and hospice services, along with a full-service emergency room remaining at the Campbell Road facility.

Commissioner Hand stated from a land use perspective that he was disappointed with the planning of the project and felt the main building would be better placed along the frontage road and visible from the turnpike.

Mr. Hutchenrider replied that one of his main concerns is security and safety of the patients and staff at the facility and the layout of the site provides the utmost from a security point of view. In addition, the design provides two front entrances and allows the maximum amount of space in the facility while making it convenient for the staff.

Commissioner Hand stated that he felt the design was missing the opportunity to do something very vertical on the site, somewhat similar to the iconic Methodist Hospital in downtown Dallas.

Chairman Gantt stated that he liked the choice of materials and thought the design was well done.

With no further comments in favor or opposition, Chairman Gantt closed the public hearing.

Motion: Commissioner DePuy made a motion to approve Zoning File 12-03 as presented.

Mr. Shacklett asked if the motion could contain language regarding staff's recommendation to allow a six-foot parapet to the building height.

Ms. DePuy amended her motion to include the request for adding a six-foot parapet; second by Commissioner Linn. Motion passed 7-0.

ADJOURN

With no further business before the Commission, Chairman Gantt adjourned the regular business meeting at 9:52 p.m.

David Gantt, Chairman City Plan Commission