2 3		MINUTES PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION PUBLIC
4		HEARING
5		City Hall, 385 South Goliad,
6		Rockwall, Texas Council Chambers
7		March 10, 2015
8		6:00 P.M.
9		
10	1.	CALL TO ORDER
11		
12		The meeting was called to order by Chairman Craig Renfro at 6:02 p.m. with the following
13		Commissioners present: Jonathan Lyons, Annie Fishman, Tracey Logan, Mike Jusko, John
14		McCutcheon with Commissioner Conley absent.
15		
16	11.	CONSENT AGENDA
17		L (M' L Gulles Estructure 10, 2014 Dispring and Zaping Commission meeting
18		1. Approval of Minutes for the February 10, 2014 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.
19		2. Approval of Minutes for the February 24, 2014 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.
20		2. Approval of Minutes for the February 24, 2014 Hanning and 20ming Commission meeting.
21		3. P2015-007
22		Discuss and consider a request by Dub Douphrate of Douphrate & Associates, Inc. on behalf of
23 24		D. R. Horton Homes for the approval of a replat of Lakeview Summit, Phase IV for the purpose of
24		reducing the number of single-family residential lots from 97 to 93 for a 38.056-acre subdivision
26		currently composed of 97 single-family residential lots situated within the J. H. B. Jones Survey,
27		Abstract No. 124 and the Nathan Butler Survey, Abstract No. 21, City of Rockwall, Rockwall
28		County, Texas, zoned Planned Development District 29 (PD-29) for Single-Family 10 (SF-10)
29		District land uses, located north of the intersection of Petaluma Drive and N. Lakeshore Drive,
30		and take any action necessary.
31		
32		Commissioner Jusko made a motion to approve all of the Consent Agenda (#1, 2, and 3).
33		Commissioner Lyons seconded the motion, which passed unanimously 6-0
34		(Commissioner Conley absent).
35		· 00 0
36		
37	111.	PUBLIC HEARINGS
38		8 Bertopek koor Devoorse
39		4. Z2015-003
40		Hold a public hearing to discuss and consider a request by Cole Franklin of the Skorburg
41		Company on behalf of the owner Larry Hance for the approval of a zoning change from an
42		Agricultural (AG) District to a Planned Development District for Single Family 7 (SF-7) and
43		General Retail (GR) District land uses for a 44.56-acre tract of land identified as Tract 3 of the T.
44		R. Bailey Survey, Abstract No. 30, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Agricultural (AG) District, situated within the SH-205 By-Pass Overlay (SH-205 BY-OV) District, located at the
45		northwest corner of FM-552 and John King Boulevard, and take any action necessary [<i>Requested</i>
46		Postponement to the March 31, 2015 Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting].
47		Posiponement to the march 31, 2013 Flamming and 20ming commission meeting.
48		Chairman Renfro announced that the applicant has requested this case to be postponed
49		until the March 31st P&Z meeting. No action was taken.
50 51		
51 52		
52 53		5. Z2015-007
55		Hold a public hearing to discuss and consider a request by Kevin Carr of GearHeads Hot Rod
55		Garage for the approval of a Specific Use Permit (SUP) to allow truck rental in conjunction with
56		an existing minor automotive repair garage on a two (2) acre tract of land identified as Tract 23-

57 01 of the R. Irvine Survey, Abstract No. 120, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned
58 Light Industrial (LI) District, situated within the IH-30 Overlay (IH-30 OV) District, addressed as
59 3920 E. IH-30, and take any action necessary .

Senior Planner, David Gonzales, provided information related to this agenda item explaining that U-Haul Co. of North East Dallas is proposing a Neighborhood Dealer location for the GearHeads Hot Rod Garage facility. U-Haul will provide the rental of no more than five (5) U-Haul trucks and five (5) trailers for this location at any given time. The applicant has indicated that the trucks and trailers will be parked at the rear of the facility where there is less visibility from IH-30. The purpose of the rental trucks and trailers is to provide their customers with an additional service associated with the existing automotive repair garage.

GearHeads Hot Rod Garage is located at 3920 E. IH-30, is within the IH-30 Overly district and is zoned Light Industrial (LI) District. This particular location is adjacent to the eastern City Limits boundary line and is the last property seen as you travel east bound along IH-30 and/or the frontage road.

Mr. Gonzales stated that should the SUP be approved, staff would offer the following conditions of approval:

- 1. Adherence to all Engineering and Fire Department standards.
- 2. That the specific use permit (SUP) shall be valid for a period of three years from the date of passage of the SUP ordinance. If an extension to the 3-year time limit is desired, the owner shall petition the City Council for such extension at least 90 days prior the expiration of the SUP. The City Council shall review the SUP and determine if an extension of time is warranted.
 - 3. That the commercial operation of a truck rental facility shall be limited to no more than five (5) U-Haul trucks and five (5) U-Haul trailers on the premises at any one time.
 - 4. That the rental trucks and trailers be parked/stored on the premises, to the rear of the building, behind the fenced area as indicated on the conceptual site plan submitted so as to not be visible from the adjacent street rights-of-way (i.e. IH-30).

Chairman Renfro opened the public hearing and asked the applicant to come forth and speak.

Kevin Carr (No address given)

 Applicant explained the number of vehicles he would be storing would not exceed combined total of ten (*i.e. a maximum of five trucks and five trailers*), and that he had cleared that with the U-Haul representative.

Chairman Renfro opened the floor for anyone wishing to come forward to speak for or against this with no one coming forth Chairman Renfro closed the public hearing and asked for questions or comments from the Board. Commissioner Lyons asked the applicant if the trailers and trucks would be screened from IH-30. The applicant explained he would be storing them outside, and stated that he was considering purchasing a tennis court style mesh that could serve as screening. Planning and Zoning Director, Robert LaCroix, explained it is the last property within the city limits, and is heavily treed providing a natural screening. Chairman Renfro asked if there were any additional questions from the Commissioners. With no further questions or discussion taking place Chairman Renfro called for motions.

113 Commissioner McCutcheon made a motion to approve Z2015-007 including any staff 114 recommendations. Commissioner Lyons seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 115 6-0 (Commissioner Conley absent).

6. Z2015-008

116 117 118

119

120

121

122

123 124

125

149 150

151

152 153

154

155 156

161

165 166 Hold a public hearing to discuss and consider a request by Herman Douglas Utley for the approval of a zoning change from an Agricultural (AG) District to a Single Family Estate 2.0 (SFE-2.0) District for a 4.502-acre tract of land identified as Tract 1 of the S. R. Barnes Survey, Abstract No. 13, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Agricultural (AG) District, situated within the SH-205 By-Pass (SH-205 BY OV) District, addressed as 1815 E. Quail Road, and take any action necessary.

126 Planning Manager, Ryan Miller, explained that the applicant is requesting a zoning change on 4.502-acre tract of land identified as Tract 1 of the S. R. Barnes Survey, Abstract No. 127 13. Specifically, the applicant, Herman Douglas Utley, is requesting to rezone the property 128 from an Agricultural (AG) District to a Single-Family Estate (SFE 2.0) District for the 129 130 purpose of subdividing the property into two (2) acre parcels of land (i.e. Lot 1: 2.172-acres and Lot 2: 2.33-acres). Currently, the subject property has an existing single-family home 131 constructed in the southeast corner. According to the applicant's letter, the existing 132 house will remain on one lot and a new single-family home will be constructed on the 133 remainder lot. Mr. Miller also stated that staff mailed seven (7) notices to property owners 134 and residents within 500-feet of the subject property and emailed notices to the Stoney 135 136 Hollow and Caruth Lakes Homeowner's Associations (HOA's), which are the only HOA's 137 located within 1,500-feet of the subject property. Additionally, staff posted a sign along E. Old Quail Run Road, and advertised the public hearings in the Rockwall Harold Banner. At 138 the time the case memo was prepared staff had not received any responses in favor or 139 opposed to the request. Mr. Miller stated the applicant was present to answer any 140 141 questions. 142

143 Chairman Renfro opened the floor for questions and discussion for the Commission. 144 Commissioner Logan asked about the remaining two acres. Mr. Miller stated that the 145 whole property would be rezoned Single Family Estate (SFE 2.0) District and then be 146 required to go through the platting process. 147

- 148 Chairman Renfro asked the applicant to come forth and speak.
 - Herman Utley 1815 E. Quail Run Rockwall, Tx 75087

Chairman Renfro asked applicant if he had any additional comments, the applicant stated Mr. Miller covered it all. Chairman Renfro asked if there were any additional questions from the Board and asked for anyone to come forth and speak.

 157

 158
 Tim Turner

 159
 1691 E. Quail Run

 160
 Rockwall, Tx 75087

162Mr. Turner came forward and stated that he owned the property to the south of Mr. Utley163and was in favor of the zoning change. Furthermore, that the change would have minimal164if no impact on the area. No further questions or discussion took place.

167Commissioner Lyons made a motion to approve Z2015-008 with staff recommendations.168Commissioner McCutheons seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 6-0

169	(Commissioner Conley absent).
170	
171	
172	7. Z2015-009
173	Hold a public hearing to discuss and consider a request by Chris and Jill Blasé for the approval of
174	a Specific Use Permit (SUP) for a detached garage that does not conform to the requirements as
175	stipulated by Section 2.1.2, Residential and Lodging Use Conditions, of Article IV, Permissible
176	Uses, of the Unified Development Code for a 4.05-acre parcel of land identified as Lot 1, Block 1,
177	Blasé Addition, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Single Family 10 (SF-10)
178	District, addressed as 1220 East Fork Drive, and take any action necessary.
179	
180	Senior Planner, David Gonzales, gave explanation of item stating that the applicants are
181	requesting a Specific Use Permit (SUP) to allow for a 2-story detached garage that exceeds
182	the area and height requirements of the Residential and Lodging Use Conditions for an
183	accessory building within a residential district. The proposed structure will have a
184	building footprint of 1,235 sq. ft. which exceeds the maximum area of 900 sq. ft. The
185	overall height of the structure is 24ft - 10 7/8", exceeding the 15ft height requirement. The
186	applicant stated it should be noted that the proposed structure has a gabled roof deign
187	that is measured at the mid-point of the roof for height purposes. When measured at the
188	mid-point, the roof is approximately 17 ½-ft in height, exceeding the 15ft maximum.
189	
190	Furthermore, the detached garage does not meet the exterior material requirements of the
191	Residential and Lodging Use Conditions for the detached garage. Rather, the applicants
192	are proposing the structure to incorporate metal siding with a metal roof and metal roof
193	elements (dormers) that will have stone matching the primary structure and appearing on
194	the front façade.
195	
196	The applicants have provided a site plan indicating the location of the detached garage to
197	be directly behind the existing home and building elevations for the proposed 2-story
198	structure. The applicants have proposed to use the structure for parking of vehicles,
199	storage, and as a workshop. A request for a Specific Use Permit is a discretionary act
200	upon the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council
201	
202	Mr. Gonzales also stated staff mailed sixty-six (66) notices to property owners and
203	residents within 500 feet of the subject property as well as the Shores/Ray Hubbard, Lake
204	View Summit and Hillcrest at the Shores Homeowner's Associations (HOA) via e-mail,
205	which are located within 1,500 feet of the subject property. Additionally, staff posted a
206	sign adjacent to the subject property on East Fork Dr. A public notice was published in the
207	Rockwall Harold Banner and was posted on the City's web-site. Staff received two (2)
208	notices "opposed" to the zoning change request.
209	
210	Should the request for an SUP be approved, staff offers the following conditions:
211	
212	1. Any construction or building allowed by this request must conform to the
213	requirements set forth by the Unified Development Code, the 2009 International
214	Building Code, the Rockwall Municipal Code of Ordinances, city adopted
215	engineering and fire codes and with all other applicable regulatory requirements
216	administered and/or enforced by the state and federal government.
217	O That submitted and support of the first states of
218	2. That submittal and approval of a building permit is required prior to the
219	construction of the detached garage.
220	0 That the detected wave a little little is the second second
221	3. That the detached garage shall generally conform to the site plan as submitted.
222	4 That the detected service shall as the 14 core of the
223	4. That the detached garage shall not exceed 1,235 sq. ft. in area or an overall height
224	of 25 ft.

225		
226		5. That the detached garage shall generally conform to the building elevations as
227		submitted, including the use of metal siding, a metal roof, and metal roof elements
228		(dormers) as depicted.
229		
230		6 That the detected menors in the second second
		6. That the detached garage is subject to administrative review in the event that the
231		subject property is sold to another party, conveyed in any manner to another party,
232		subdivided, or re-platted.
233		
234		7. The City Council reserves the right to review the Specific Use Permit within one (1)
235		year from the date approval.
236		· THE IN TRANSPORT PROPERTY OF THE
237		Chairman Renfro asked the representative for the applicant to come forth.
238		ensument reline desced the representative for the applicant to come form.
239		lim Touler
		Jim Taylor
240		1287 Mission Dr.
241		Rockwall, Tx 75087
242		
243		Mr. Taylor gave brief reason for request. Chairman Renfro asked if he Commission had
244		any questions. Commissioner Logan asked if the use was associated with the adjacent
245		business. Mr. Taylor explained that it will be used for storage of farm equipment and that
246		the business will be relegated to the adjacent property.
247		the submess will be relegated to the adjacent property.
248		Dovid Compeles elevitied that the second states to the states of the
		David Gonzales clarified that the property is zoned residential and the garage will be for
249		residential uses.
250		
251		Chairman Renfro opened the public hearing and asked if anyone would like to come
252		forward and speak. There being no one coming forth, Chairman Renfro closed the public
253		hearing.
254		-
255		Commissioner McCutcheon made a motion to pass Z2015-009 with staff
256		recommendations. Commissioner Fishman seconded the motion, which passed by a vote
257		of 6-0 (Commissioner Conley absent).
		or o-o (commissioner comey absent).
258		
259		
260		8. Z2015-010
261		Hold a public hearing to discuss and consider a request by Noah Flabiano of the Skorburg
262		Company for the approval of a zoning change from Planned Development District 70 (PD-70) for
263		limited commercial/retail land uses to a Planned Development District for townhomes on a
264		10.142-acre tract of land being identified as a portion of a larger 164.812-acre tract of land
265		identified as Tract 3 of the S. King Survey, Abstract No. 131, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County,
266		Texas being zoned Plane of Plane of District 70 (D 70) struct will, Rockwall County,
267		Texas, being zoned Planned Development District 70 (PD-70), situated within the North SH-205
		Overlay (N-SH205 OV) District, generally located at the northeast corner of the intersection of E.
268		Quail Run Road and N. Goliad Street [N. SH-205], and take any action necessary [Requested
269		Postponement to the March 31, 2015 Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting].
270		
271		Chairman Renfro announced that the applicant has requested this case be postponed until
272		the
273		March 31st P&Z meeting.
274		
275	IV.	ACTION ITEMS
276		
		0 602016 002
277		9. SP2015-003
278		Discuss and consider a request by Jimmy Strohmeyer of Strohmeyer Architects on behalf of the
279		owner Dr. Umar Burney of the North Dallas Rockwall Land Investors, LLC for the approval of a
280		site plan for a medical office building on a 1.6121-acre tract of land identified as Lot 2, Block A,

- Ridge/Summer Lee Addition, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Planned
 Development District 9 (PD-9), situated within the Scenic Overlay (SOV) District, located east of
 the intersection Ridge Road and Summer Lee Drive, and take any action necessary.
 - Senior Planner, David Gonzales, discussed the action item Jimmy Strohmeyer of Strohmeyer Architects, LLC has submitted an application on behalf of the owner Dr. Umar Burney of the North Dallas Land Investors, LLC for site plan approval of a 14,200 sq. ft. medical office building.
- 290The proposed facility will be situated on a 1.6121-acre tract of land that is adjacent to and291east of the Aldi Grocery store and is generally located at the S.E. quadrant of Summer Lee292and Ridge Road. The property is zoned Planned Development No. 9 (PD-9) District and is293located within the Scenic Overlay (SOV) district.
- The proposed site will house a 14,200 sq. ft. single story medical office. The sites' design 295 is to allow for two points of access (along Summer Lee Drive and Oak Drive) and will share 296 a drive with the Aldi location for better circulation and additional access. The parking ratio 297 298 for a medical office is one (1) space per 200 sq. ft. This site requires seventy-one (71) 299 parking spaces and the applicant is proposing to meet the City standards by providing the 300 seventy-one (71) parking spaces required. The building footprint meets the four sided horizontal articulation requirements of the SOV districts standards. The site plan meets (or 301 exceeds) the intent of the SOV and UDC as submitted. 302 303
- 304 The applicant has submitted a landscape plan indicating 13,220 sq. ft. of landscaping for the site which equates to an approximate total of 18.8% landscaping coverage. The 305 proposed landscape plan exceeds the 15% minimum required by the UDC for a 306 commercial development; however, since the site does not front Ridge Road, it is not 307 required to meet the landscape buffering standards of the SOV district. Rather the general 308 landscape standards for a commercial development will apply. However, there are parking 309 spaces located within the 10-ft landscape buffer that requires a variance from City Council 310 to allow for this design. With the exception to the requested variance, the landscape plan 311 312 meets (or exceeds) the intent of the UDC as submitted.
- The UDC requires all lighting to be contained on site at a maximum intensity of 20-FC and that lighting at the property lines are not to exceed 0.2-FC in order to control glare and spillover lighting. Also, the SOV districts require light poles not to exceed 20-ft in height (including the base) and that all light sources are to be shielded with a full cut-off source and directed down with a maximum one inch reveal.
- The photometric plan meets (or exceeds) the intent of the SOV and UDC as submitted. 320 The overall building design represents an urban modern look and will be comprised 321 primarily of brick and Eldorado Stone European Ledge that provides for an image of 322 tightly stacked ledge pieces. The building incorporates canopies in select locations at 323 varying heights to create interest while the windows are trimmed to provide relief to the 324 elevations. Wood is being used as an architectural accent on all elevations; however, 325 wood is considered a secondary material and the north elevation exceeds the 10% 326 maximum allowed by the SOV. This will require a variance by the City Council. The 327 proposed elevations for the medical office indicates an overall building height of 22-ft. 328 with a parapet roof design that incorporates varied heights meeting the articulation 329 standards of the UDC. The building also has a portico supported by stone columns and is 330 331 articulated by wood accents at the main entrance. 332
- The SOV district requires a minimum of four (4) architectural elements to be incorporated in the design of the building. The color elevations depict several elements that meet this requirement such as the portico at the entrance, decorative metal awnings, varied roof heights, and recesses and projections that provide additional relief for the elevations.

285

286

287

288

289

- With the exception of the requested variances, the building elevations meet (or exceeds) the intent of the SOV and UDC as submitted.
 - Mr. Gonzales explained the applicant is requesting the following variances to various sections of the Unified Development Code: Article V, District Development Standards and Article VIII, Landscape Standards as indicated below.
 - 1. To allow for not meeting the 10-ft. landscape buffer requirements by allowing parking spaces to be located within the buffer as established in Art. VIII, Sec. 5.7, A. as depicted in the landscape plan submitted.
 - 2. To allow for not meeting the 20 percent natural or quarried stone requirements established in Art. V, Sec. 6.8 of the Scenic Overlay (SOV) District standards, as depicted in the building elevations submitted.
 - 3. To allow for not meeting the requirements for secondary materials and allowing an exterior wood product to exceed 10% as a secondary material as established in Art. V,
 - Chairman Renfro asked if the Commission had any questions of staff. General discussion took place concerning the landscaping buffer between staff and Commissioners. Mr. Gonzales explained that the applicant met the minimum requirements for parking and landscaping with the exception of 10-foot landscape buffer requirement.
 - Chairman Renfro asked the applicant to come forth and answer questions from the Commission.
 - Jimmy Strohmeyer 1620 Fair lakes Pointe Rockwall, Tx 75087

- Applicant came forward and stated his name and address. General discussion took place concerning the proposed materials. Specifically the kind of wood that will be utilized. Staff stated the applicant had met all recommendations by the Architectural Review Board.
- Commissioner McCutcheon made a motion to pass Z2015-003 with staff recommendations. Commissioner Jusko seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 6-0 (Commissioner Conley absent).
- 376 10. SP2015-004
- Discuss and consider a request by Jimmy Strohmeyer of Stohmeyer Architects on behalf of the owner Russell Phillips for the approval of a site plan for a 265 unit, condo development situated on a 7.58-acre tract of land identified as Lots 6A, 7A & 8A, Isaac Brown Addition, and a portion of Lots 3 & 4, Block 16 and Lot 4, Block 18, Moton Addition, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Planned Development District 32 (PD-32), situated within the Interior Subdistrict of PD-32, located south of the intersection of Summer Lee Drive and Sunset Ridge Drive, and take any action necessary.
- Planning manager, Ryan Miller, explained the site plan submitted by the applicant shows the 7.58-acre tract of land being subdivided into two (2) lots, with Lot 1 being 5.32-acres and Lot 2 being 1.92-acres. The proposed 265-unit condominium facility will be situated on Lot 1 adjacent to Summer Lee Drive, and have a building footprint of 88,140 SF. According to Planned Development District 32 (PD-32) a condominium development requires 1.5 parking spaces per unit with a total of 10% of the required parking being permitted to be surface parking. Additionally, the Unified Development Code (UDC) requires one (1) parking space per 300 SF of office area. For the proposed development this translates to

- 393408 parking spaces (i.e. 265-Units @ 1.5 Parking Spaces/Unit = 398; 3,000 SF of Office394Space @ 1 Parking Space/300 SF of Office Area = 10). The site plan indicates that they will395exceed the required number of parking spaces by providing 419; with only 18 surface396parking spaces available (~4% surface parking).
- 398With respect to the density and dimensional requirements contained in Planned399Development District 32 (PD-32) [Ordinance 10-21] and the UDC the applicant's plan, with400the adoption of the conditions of approval, is in conformance with all applicable401requirements.
- Mr. Miller went on to explain that the Landscape Plan submitted by the applicant indicates 403 that a total of 26 canopy trees (i.e. three [3] Live Oaks, 13 Bald Cypress and ten [10] 404 Chinese Pistache) and 59 accent trees (i.e. 14 Redbud, ten [10] Mexican Plum, 24 405 406 Crapemyrtle and 11 Yaupon Holly) will be planted around the development. Additionally, several landscaping beds containing shrubs, ground cover and perennials will be planted 407 adjacent to the surface parking areas. With the exception of a few minor corrections, the 408 Landscape Plan submitted by the applicant is in conformance with all applicable 409 landscaping requirements as stipulated by Planned Development District 32 (PD-32) and 410 by Article VIII, Landscape Standards, of the UDC. Additionally, no variances will be 411 required to be approved with regard to landscaping. 412
- The applicant has been unable to submit a Treescape Plan, and has agreed to submit a plan prior to the issuance of a grading permit. Additionally, the applicant has stated that they intend to meet the current mitigation requirements prior to the issuance of a building permit. These items have been added to the Conditions of Approval section of this case memo.
- Mr. Miller further explained that the Photometric Plan submitted by the applicant generally 420 demonstrates conformance to the requirements of Article VII, Environmental Performance, 421 of the UDC. Staff has identified a few areas of concern where the lighting values drop off 422 dramatically (e.g. 1.0-FC to 0.1-FC), and has asked the applicant to review the plan. The 423 applicant has stated that he intends to meet all the ordinance requirements, and will 424 review staff's concerns and resubmit a revised lighting plan if necessary. With the 425 exception of the areas pointed out by staff, the plan indicates conformance to the 426 requirements and guidelines stipulated by Planned Development District 32 (PD-32) 427 [Ordinance No. 10-21]. The lighting cut sheets submitted by the applicant show that they 428 will be utilizing the Ameriux Exterior D154-TS20, which was approved for use within 429 Planned Development District 32 (PD-32) by Case No. MIS2013-010 (approved by City 430 Council on December 2, 2013). 431
- Mr. Miller proceeded to explain that the proposed building elevation submitted by the 433 applicant depicts a five (5) to six (6) story condominium complex that will range in height 434 from 72-feet to 86-feet, with the majority of the building height being between 62-feet and 435 436 77-feet (for the purposes of this ordinance the building height is calculated at 72-feet. 437 which is the height of the building from grade at the point closest to Summer Lee Drive -this is in compliance with the height requirements of Ordinance No. 10-21). The structure 438 will incorporate a two (2) story-parking garage, with the first floor being located below 439 grade. The remaining four (4) stories of the building will house the proposed 265-condo 440 units. The exterior of the building will utilize a mix of three (3) part stucco and cultured 441 stone (Mountain Ledge by Eldorado Stone) that are similar to the materials used on the 442 Trend Tower and Harbor Heights Retail developments (i.e. Eldorado Stone and Dryvit 443 Stucco). In addition, the roof will be clad in a clay tile roofing (Boral Tejas Espana-Brazos 444 Blend) that is similar to the tile used on other buildings within the district. The building 445 elevations submitted by the applicant will require variances to the stone and 446 cementaceous material requirements as stipulated by Section 4.1, General Commercial 447 District Standards, of Article V, District Development Standards, of the UDC. 448

397

402

413

419

449 Mr. Miller also explained the City Council Waivers which according to Ordinance No. 10-21, 450 "(i)n order to provide flexibility and create high quality projects, an applicant for 451 development within the PD District [PD-32] may request a waiver of the following District or Subdistrict standards: (1) Building Placement Requirements, (2) Landscape Standards, 452 (3) Parking Requirements, (4) Parking Garage Design Standards, and (5) Increased 453 Building Height in any Subdistrict." In this case, the applicant is requesting a waiver to 454 the building height requirements for the first floor of a building as stipulated for the 455 subdistrict. According to the Interior Subdistrict the maximum building height is five (5) 456 457 stories at 75-feet, with the first floor being constructed to a commercial standard of 15feet. In this case, the building elevations submitted by the applicant show a ten (10) foot 458 459 first floor -- as measured from grade at the point closest to Summer Lee Drive --, and will require a waiver. The overall building height is in conformance with the requirements of 460 461 Ordinance No. 10-21; being a five (5) story condominium complex that ranges in height from 72-feet to 86-feet, with the majority of the building height being at 62-feet to 77-feet 462 (72-feet for the purposes of the height requirements established in Ordinance No. 10-21 463 [PD-32] -- height is measured from grade at the point closest to the Summer Lee Drive and 464 is maintain throughout the development). 465

467 With regard to granting waivers, Ordinance No. 10-21 states that "... (w)aivers may only be 468 approved by the City Council following a recommendation by the Planning and Zoning 469 Commission ... [and] (i)n order to approve a waiver, the City Council must find that the 470 waiver: Meets the general intent of the PD District or Subdistrict in which the property is 471 located; and, Will result in an improved project which will be an attractive contribution to 472 the PD District or Subdistrict; and, Will not prevent the implementation of the intent of this 473 PD District."

Mr. Miller also noted that the applicant's original submittal could have met the ordinance 475 requirements; however, the building was required to be lowered so that no "...floors used 476 for human occupancy [were] located more than 55-feet above the lowest level of fire 477 department vehicle access ... " (Section 18-33, Article II; Code of Ordinances). If the 478 applicant did not lower the building the structure would have been classified as a High-479 Rise Building, which would require different and more costly construction standards. This 480 became an issue due to the grade of the subject property, which falls 12-feet from the 481 grade adjacent to Summer Lee Drive extending southward. As a compensatory measure, 482 the applicant has incorporated a 12-foot floor height on the garage, which is visibly the 483 first floor on ~75% of the building (i.e. all areas not adjacent to Summer Lee Drive): 484 485 however, it is below grade at the point of the building closest to Summer Lee Drive.

- 486 Mr. Miller explained that the purpose of requiring first floors to be constructed to a 487 commercial standard of 15-feet was intended to add to the pedestrian nature of Planned 488 Development District 32 (PD-32). This requirement would create the appearance of 489 commercial storefronts for non-commercial buildings that were directly adjacent to a 490 sidewalk or street. In addition, the Interior District requires that buildings fronting onto 491 Summer Lee Drive be setback a minimum of 20-feet from the right-of-way. Furthermore, 492 taking the property's grade differential into consideration and understanding that the 493 intent of the Interior Sub-district is "to provide an area that can function as either office. 494 residential, or senior living ... ", the proposed development does not appear to change the 495 general objective of Planned Development District 32 (PD-32). Nor would it prevent the 496 implementation of the remaining Interior Subdistrict plan. 497
- 499 Mr. Miller briefed the Commission concerning variances; based on the applicant's 500 submittal staff has identified the following variances:
- 501502Stone Requirements. According to Section 4.1, General Commercial District Standards, of503the UDC each exterior wall should incorporate a minimum of 20% stone (e.g. natural,504quarried or cultured). The building elevations submitted by the applicant show stone

466

474

505 percentages on each building façade ranging from five (5) percent to 16.07% (i.e. East: 506 14%; North: 16.07%; South: 5%; West: 10.4%).

Masonry Material Requirements. According to Section 4.1, General Commercial District Standards, of the UDC exterior walls should be constructed utilizing a minimum of 90% masonry materials, with a minimum of 50% of the masonry requirement permitted to be a cementaceous product (e.g. stucco, Hardy Plan or similar material). The building elevations submitted by the applicant indicate that each building façade will be 83.93% to 95% stucco (i.e. East: 86%; North: 83.93%; South: 95%; West: 89.6%).

515It should be noted that variances similar to the ones requested by the applicant have been516approved throughout the Harbor District. The applicant has stated that the purpose of517requesting these variances is to maintain consistency with the development scheme518established within Ordinance No. 10-21 [PD-32] and established with the Trend Tower519development; however, approval of variances to the building material requirements is a520discretionary decision for the City Council pending a recommendation by the Planning521and Zoning Commission.

Mr. Miller also advised the Commission that on February 24, 2015, the Architectural Review Board (ARB) reviewed the proposed site plan and building elevations. The ARB, having no issues with the proposed building elevations or site plan, recommended approval of the applicant's request. In addition, the board stated that they had no issues with the proposed variances, and that the increased stucco and cultured stone would match other projects within Planned Development District 32 (PD-32).

Mr. Miller also explained that if the Planning & Zoning Commission chooses to approve the applicant's request, the following conditions of approval should be adopted with this case:

Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a Treescape Plan shall be submitted and approved by City staff. Additionally, any mitigation requirements shall be satisfied prior to the issuance of a building permit;

A facilities agreement addressing the construction of Summer Lee Drive (situated on Lot 538 2) will need to be approved by City Council at the time of final plat and signed by the 539 applicant prior to final plat approval; and, Any construction or building necessary to 540 complete this Site Plan request must conform to the requirements set forth by the UDC, 541 the 2009 International Building Code, the Rockwall Municipal Code of Ordinances, city 542 adopted engineering and fire codes and with all other applicable regulatory requirements 543 administered and/or enforced by the state and federal government. Mr. Miller advised the 544 Commission that the applicant was present and available for any questions. 545

Chairman Renfro asked if there were any question from staff. Commissioner Logan asked 547 questions about the current zoning and general discussion took place of the proposed 548 549 use. Mr. LaCroix explained that PD32 is broken into sub-districts and residential uses are included. Additionally this is a flexible sub-district planning district. The master concept 550 plan showed a building very similar to this, and the variance is due to the height of the 551 first floor. Commissioner Lyons questioned what the percentage of stone being used was. 552 Mr. Miller stated that stone percentage ranges from 5 to 16 percent and that the UDC 553 requires a minimum of 20 percent, however in this district several buildings had received 554 similar variances with respect to the stone requirements. Specifically Trend Towers and 555 Harbor Heights have received variances to the stone percentage requirement and to use 556 cultured stone in lieu of natural stone. McCutcheon guestioned, concerning the proposed 557 lot line being divided. Staff explained the proposed lot line was being put in adjacent to 558 summer lee and there's artificial lot line where the property will be subdivided in the 559 future. If approved the property would need to be subdivided and the remainder property 560

507

508

509

510 511

512

513 514

522

523

524

525

526

527 528

529

530

531 532

533

534

535

536 537

561 would need to go through the same site planning process. A possible use for this 562 remainder property could be residential or possibly medical offices. It was explained that property could not be subdivided until the roadway goes through because street frontage 563 564 must be established. No further questions were asked of staff. 565 Chairman Renfro asked applicant to come forward to speak. 566 567 568 Jimmy Strohmeyer 569 (No address given) 570 571 General discussion with the applicant took place. 572 **Russell Phillips** 573 574 **Sterling One Properties** 575 Russell Phillips advised that at some point the condos could be sold, a requirement in 576 PD32 is for each individual unit to be constructed with separate utilities to allow them to 577 be sold separately. However at this time due to financing a condominium project is 578 579 difficult to get built unless they lease all the units. They may consider selling the units in 580 the future. Commissioner Fishman questioned size and price points. Mr. Phillips advised the condos range from 700 to 1500 square feet and will be 1, 2, and 3 bedrooms. Price 581 range will be from \$200,000 to \$325,000. Chairman Renfro asked the applicant to explain 582 unit mix between the bedrooms. Mr. Phillips also explained 45% would be one bedroom, 583 50% two bedrooms and 5% one bedrooms and that was done through a market analysis of 584 demand of market place. Commissioner Logan questioned sale price/rental fees. Mr. 585 Phillips explained they wanted to go above what the average market is currently and 586 587 believes it will be around the \$1.65 ft. for rental fee. Mr. Phillips explained they had the opportunity to review three different concept plans, and the proposed Tuscan style is the 588 most costly to build. Also the plan is to blend the aesthetics of existing building from the 589 Harbor. Mr. Phillips indicated that the plan is to sell it to one owner who can maintain it by 590 a strong group, as opposed to each individual unit being sold; he believes this would help 591 with the overall maintenance and at a good value. 592 593 It was discussed by staff that the ARB's findings established that the Tuscan style 594 matches other buildings in the district and that the variance were not causing it to have 595 596 any additional disparities in the district. 597 598 Chairman Renfro asked the applicant to discuss the possibility of boat and RV storage on the site as he has received numerous phone calls and emails pertaining to that. Mr. 599 Russell stated that outside storage would not be allowed due to space concerns. 600 601 Chairman Renfro asked if the applicant intended to establish an HOA. Mr. Russell 602 indicated that PD32 requires an HOA be established and that it will be implemented from 603 day one. 604 605 606 Commissioner Lyons asked questions concerning where the HVAC condenser units would be located. Mr. Russell stated HVAC units would be on the roof and be screened from all 607 sides. This is also a requirement of the UDC. 608 609 Chairman Renfro asked the Commission for any additional questions or comments. Mr. 610 LaCroix brought to the Commissions attention that Chief Point Dexter wanted to put on 611 the record there are still additional steps that need to be taken to meet fire requirements. 612 Chief Pointdexter stated they were still working through some issues and the applicant is 613 aware of them, such as location of fire lanes not meeting the requirements fire hydrants 614 not in the correct locations and additional information that needs to be submitted 615 concerning cross slope and slope of the fire lanes and information concerning hose 616

- 617 coverage. Chief Poindexter pointed out those issues needed to be addressed before 618 building permits can be obtained.
 - Chairman Renfro brought the agenda item back to discussion, and pointed out that his residence was in a close proximity to the subject property and would abstain from the vote.

Commissioner Lyons made a motion to approve the site plan with staff recommendations and Chief Pointdexters comments regarding the Fire Department's concerns. Commissioner Fishman seconded the motion. A vote was taken, and the motion passed 4-1, with Commissioner Jusko dissenting and Chairman Renfro abstaining (Commissioner Conley absent).

- V. DISCUSSION ITEMS
 - 11. Z2015-011

619

620

621 622

623

624

625

626

627

628 629 630

631 632

633

634

635

636

637 638

665

Hold a public hearing to discuss and consider a City initiated zoning request for the approval of a text amendment to Article IX, Tree Preservation, Section 11.1, Tree fund administration, of the Unified Development Code [Ordinance No. 04-38] for the purpose of modifying this section of the code, and take any action necessary.

Planning Manager Ryan Miller gave a brief explanation of the item explaining that in the 639 last month, the City Council has voted to accept two (2) alternative tree mitigation plans 640 that allowed the applicants to pay the remaining tree credits in cash to the Tree Fund. The 641 additional revenue added to the fund as a result of these actions totals \$234,136.00. With 642 the current drought situation, it is not opportune to use this money to plant trees without 643 the irrigation and equipment (e.g. a large auger, etc.) necessary to properly install and 644 sustain the trees. In response to this situation staff has prepared an amendment to 645 Section 11.1, Tree Fund Administration, of Article IX, Tree Preservation, of the Unified 646 Development Code (UDC) that would expand how the funds could be allocated while 647 continuing to allow the City Council the flexibility of considering and approving an 648 alternative tree mitigation plan. Specifically, this amendment would allow for the funds 649 collected to be used for labor, equipment, and irrigation associated with installing and 650 sustaining landscaping. The proposal further defines the types of landscaping that 651 qualifies to be purchased with these funds. Mr. Miller stated he was available for any 652 questions. 653

654655Commissioner Fishman asked what percentage of the tree mitigation was going into the656fund. Mr. Miller explained there are several ways to satisfy tree mitigation requirements657per the current ordinance and that a cash payment was one way.

658659Commissioner Logan asked how much percentage of the money would go to trees versus660irrigation and equipment. Mr. Miller explained that as the ordinance is written now money661could be used for equipment for planting trees, and noted that at a certain point only so662much equipment will actually be needed.

- 663 664 No further discussion or comments concerning this item took place.
- 666 12. Director's Report of post Council meeting outcomes of Planning & Zoning cases.
- 667 668 P2015-005: Lot 1, Block A, Hoardstroms Addition [Approved]
- 669 P2015-006: Lot 3, Block A, Blasé Addition [Approved]
- 670 Z2015-001: SUP for Jackson Automotive (2nd Reading) [Approved]
- 671 Z2015-002: SUP for Avis Rental Car (2nd Reading) [Approved]
- 672 Z2015-003: Hance Property Rezoning [AG to PD] [Postponed]

673 674 675		Z2015-004: SUP for New Car Dealership (2nd Reading) [Approved] Z2015-005: Landmarking of the Downtown Courthouse (1st Reading) [Approved] Z2014-040: SUP for a Hotel in PD-32 (2nd Reading) [Approved]
676		SP2014-034: Variance/Waivers for a Hotel in PD-32 [Approved]
677		
678		Planning Director Robert LaCroix provided brief update to the Commissioners concerning
679		the outcomes of the above referenced cases at the City Council level. The Commission
680		neither discussed nor took action concerning this agenda item.
681		
682	VI.	ADJOURNMENT
683 684	VI.	ADJOORNMENT
685		The meeting adjourned at 7:37 p.m.
686		The meeting adjourned at the pinn
687	PASSE	ED AND APPROVED BY THE PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF
688	ROCK	WALL, Texas, this 12 day of May , 2015.
689		
690		MAAn II In the
691		
692		Craig Renfrø, Chairman
693		
694		Attest:
695		Haus a M Ore Ore
696		Van a II a and
697		Laura Morales, Planning Coordinator