

**CITY OF RICHARDSON
CITY PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES – APRIL 17, 2018**

The Richardson City Plan Commission met on April 17, 2018, at 7:00 p.m. at City Hall in the Council Chambers, 411 W. Arapaho Road, Richardson, Texas.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Janet DePuy, Vice Chair
Marilyn Frederick, Commissioner
Tom Maxwell, Commissioner
Randy Roland, Commissioner
Stephen Springs, Commissioner
Bill Ferrell, Commissioner
Dorothy McKearin, Alternate
Ken Southard, Alternate

MEMBERS ABSENT: Ron Taylor, Chairman

CITY STAFF PRESENT: Sam Chavez, Assistant Director – Dev. Svcs. – Planning
Amy Mathews, Sr. Planner
Dan Tracy, Development Engineer
Chris Shacklett, Senior Planner
Daniel Harper, Planner
Connie Ellwood, 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 rezoning initiatives. No action was taken.

REGULAR BUSINESS MEETING

MINUTES

1. Approval of minutes of the regular business meeting of April 3, 2018.

Motion: Commissioner Maxwell made a motion to approve the minutes as submitted; second by Commissioner Frederick. Motion approved 7-0.

PUBLIC HEARING

- 2. Replat – Fujitsu Campus Addition, Lots 1B & 2, Block 1:** Consider and take the necessary action on a request for approval of a replat of a 99.92-acre lot to subdivide one (1) lot into two (2) lots. The site is located at 2801 Telecom Parkway, at the southwest corner of Telecom Parkway and Breckinridge Boulevard. Applicant: B. David Littleton, Halff Associates, Inc., representing Fujitsu Network Communications. *Staff: Daniel Harper.*

Mr. Harper stated the request was for a replat of the Fitjitsu Campus Addition Lot 1A, Block 1, to subdivide it into Lot 1B and 2, Block 1. Lot 1B will be the remaining portion of the Fitjitsu campus consisting of 66.56 acres with Lot 2 being the newly created lot consisting of 33.36 acres earmarked for the new Edgecore site that was approved by the City Planning Commission on April 3, 2018.

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

David Littleton with Halff Associates, Inc. 1201 N. Bowser Road, came forward to answer any questions on the replat.

No further questions were asked of the staff and no further comments, in favor or opposed, were received; therefore, Vice Chair DePuy closed the public hearing.

Motion: Commissioner Roland made a motion to approve Replat as presented; second by Commissioner McKearin. Motion approved 7-0.

3. **Zoning File 18-08 – The Cottages on Mimosa (continued from the April 3, 2018, CPC meeting):** Consider and take the necessary action on a request for approval of a zoning change from LR-M (1) Local Retail to PD Planned Development to accommodate the development of a maximum 77-unit apartment community on approximately 4.61 acres located at 1900 Mimosa Drive, south of W. Campbell Road, on the east side of Mimosa Drive. The property is zoned LR-M (1) Local Retail. Applicant: Jason Leeds, Leeds Real Estate Services, Inc., representing Pavillion Mimosa Holdings, Ltd. *Staff: Amy Mathews.*

Ms. Mathews advised the applicant requested this case be continued to the May 1, 2018, City Plan Commission meeting.

The following is a list of those who submitted appearance cards in opposition of Zoning File 18-08:

- Mrs. Judi Girolamo, 1214 Chesterton Dr., Richardson, Texas 75080
- Mr. Vince Girolamo, 1214 Chesterton Dr., Richardson, Texas 75080
- Mr. James Walsh, 12190 Chesterton Dr., Richardson, Texas 75080
- Mrs. Marcia Walsh, 12190 Chesterton Dr., Richardson, Texas 75080
- Ms. Kristy Goodwin, 1218 Huntington Dr., Richardson, Texas 75080
- Ms. Elizabeth Alewine, 1213 Huntington Dr., Richardson, Texas 75080
- Ms. Lisa Hanes, 1125 Huntington Dr., Richardson, Texas 75080
- Ms. Sue Hineman, 1331 Melrose Dr., Richardson, Texas 75080
- Ms. Vicky Campos, 1403 Melrose Dr., Richardson, Texas 75080
- Mr. & Mrs. Clark Serrilie, 1404 Navaho Tr., Richardson, Texas 75080
- Mrs. Kay Severence, 1324 Apache Dr., Richardson, Texas, 75080
- Mrs. Sissy Marcone, 1311 Cherokee Dr., Richardson, Texas 75080
- Mr. Darrell Dave, 1303 Chickasaw Dr., Richardson, Texas 75080

Summary of the comments and concerns:

- Traffic congestion;

- Overcrowding in schools;
- Transient population of multi-family usually brings crime;
- Length of construction time;
- Concerned that current retail space will be torn down and additional multi-living units will be built in the area;
- Negative impact on the sense of community;
- Too much multi-family density in northern portion of the City;
- Traffic safety and neighborhood children.

Commissioner Ferrell recommended Zoning File 18-08 be ‘continued indefinitely’ and Commissioner Roland concurred.

With no further comments in favor or opposed, Vice Chair DePuy closed the public hearing and asked for a motion.

Motion: Commissioner Roland made a motion to continue indefinitely Zoning File 18-08 – The Cottages on Mimosa, second by Commissioner Ferrell. Motion approved 7-0.

4. **Zoning File 18-04 – DFW Hospitality Hotels:** Consider and take the necessary action on a request for approval of a zoning change from TO-M Technical Office to PD Planned Development for the TO-M Technical Office District with modified development standards to allow for two (2) Limited Service Hotels on approximately 3.10 acres located northwest of Frankford Road and Waterview Parkway. Applicant: Pann Sribhen, PE, PSA Engineering, representing Granite Properties, Inc. *Staff: Amy Mathews.*

Ms. Mathews advised the subject property was a 3.1 acre site and the applicant was requesting a zoning change to Planned Development for the Technical Office District for 2 proposed Limited Service hotels. The TO-M district allowed a limited services hotel with a special permit, but it had to be located on 5 contiguous acres, therefore the applicant was requesting the Planned Development District.

She explained the proposed limited service hotel brands would consist of AVID Hotel (Intercontinental Hotels) with 87 rooms and would be located on the western side of property with elevation plan materials that included brick, stone, rock, stucco and cast stone base for a more modern look, and the Comfort Inn & Suites (Choice Hotels) brand with 85 rooms and would be located on the eastern side of property with elevation plan materials that included brick, stone and stucco. Both hotels would be 4-stories in height and approximately 46,000 square feet in size. There would be a shared swimming pool, located on the Comfort Inn & Suites site.

Ms. Mathews concluded her presentation by summarizing the proposed special conditions which included reducing the masonry percentage for the north building elevation of the AVID hotel to 67% masonry and the west building elevation for the Comfort Suites hotel to 79%. Additionally, the applicant was requesting the ability to plat a lot without street frontage in the future so that each hotel site could be located on their own lot, on the condition that a shared access easement and a shared fire lane were provided.

Vice Chair DePuy asked what would happen in regards to the pool if the current lot was re-platted into two lots, and one of them was sold.

Ms. Mathews stated that there is a shared access easement in place as part of the development.

Mr. Pann Sribhen, PSA Engineering, consultant for the owners to develop the two hotels on this site gave a brief presentation about the hotel brand and concept.

Dr. Bora, Bora Properties, Rockwall, Texas the owner/franchisee made himself available to answer questions from the Commission. Dr. Bora explained that the reason for the two brands side by side was the attractiveness it presents to business travelers and frequency program members.

Mr. Steve Waggispeck, Rockville MD, a representative for Choice Hotels made himself available for questions from the Commission. He explained that the Choice Hotel brand is an upscale brand of various suite rooms. He stated that the Choice Hotel brand is slanted more to the corporate traveler as they are looking for the additional space.

Commissioner Southard asked if the Choice Hotel brand was primarily targeting 'extended-stay' consumers.

Mr. Waggispeck responded no.

Ms. Cooper Gant, San Diego CA, a representative of IHG/AVID made herself available for questions of staff and public.

Commissioner Frederick inquired about AVID's 35+ franchise licenses sold in Texas and how many of those hotels were completed.

Ms. Gant responded that ground was broken on one site in December 2017, with an expected opening date of August 2018. The remaining locations have 2 years to open from date of purchasing the license.

Commissioner Southard asked if there would be coordinated marketing between the two hotel brands.

Ms. Gant responded no, materials are kept separate.

Dr. Bora responded that the marketing would be completed separately between IHG and Choice hotels, along with regional teams. The sales marketing team can market for both brands if necessary.

Mr. Thurston Witt, CRVE, 8080 Park Lane, Dallas, representing Granite Properties came forward to speak in favor of DFW Hospitality Hotels.

Mr. Jewel Palmer, 3004 Durango Court, Richardson, Texas asked about clarity on a family suite hotel next to a millennial hotel specifically regarding the shared pool.

Ms. Gant responded that the IHG/AVID brands were not ‘millennial’ focused brands. The brand was created for individuals wanting a very simple and easy booking process, a comfortable sleep, a grab and go breakfast, etc. which encompassed travelers of all ages.

Mr. Waggispeck responded that the Comfort Suites brand was geared primarily towards business travelers and found that 60% of business travelers do not utilize the pool, but it is offered as an amenity.

Commissioner Springs commented that he felt it was an appropriate use for the challenging parcel of land and was not as concerned about the acreage.

No questions were asked of the staff and no further comments, in favor or opposed were received; therefore, Vice Chair DePuy closed the public hearing and asked for a motion.

Motion: Commissioner Maxwell made a motion to recommend approval of Zoning File 18-04 with conditions specified; second by Commissioner McKearin. Motion approved 6-1 (Commissioner Roland opposed).

5. **Zoning File 18-09 – Richardson Industrial:** Consider and take the necessary action on a request for approval of a zoning change from I-M(1) Industrial to PD Planned Development for the I-M(1) Industrial District with modified development standards on approximately 38.39 acres located on the east side of Telecom Parkway, between Breckinridge Boulevard and Research Drive. The property is currently zoned I-M(1) Industrial. Applicant: Jason Nunley, Jackson-Shaw Co., representing Panhandle Breckinridge Holdings. *Staff: Amy Mathews.*

Ms. Mathews advised the applicant was requesting a zoning change to PD Planned Development under the I-M(1) Industrial district to accommodate the construction of four (4) office/warehouse buildings totaling approximately 447,000 square feet. Each building, limited to one story, would vary in size from 92,000 square feet to 140,000 feet and would be comprised of approximately 85-90% warehouse with the remaining space utilized as office space.

An (8) foot masonry screen wall will be provided along the western property line. In addition, a minimum twelve (12) foot wide landscape buffer extending from the southern easement line of the existing 60-foot wide water line easement located north of the Building 4 to the south property line along the west side of the existing 15-foot wide sanitary sewer easement would be provided. Landscaping would consist of one (1) evergreen canopy tree planted every fifty (50) feet on center with a minimum of three (3) inches in caliper size, fourteen (14) feet in height at the time of planting. All lighting would be directed downward, and up lighting will only be at building entrances. A living landscape screen would also be planted the entire length of all truck loading dock areas that are facing externally to reduce noise and light and the landscape requirements for this project exceeded what was required.

A Traffic Impact Analysis was completed per staff's request. The results showed there would not be a big impact to existing traffic. One of the outcomes was all truck traffic would be required to enter and exit from the south.

Commissioners Springs and Maxwell asked what entitlements would be allowed on the site as currently zoned.

Ms. Mathews responded the applicant could build the same development, but buildings would be limited to (25) feet maximum height, and the site could not be subdivided into "flag lots" without first obtaining a variance.

Mr. Jason Nunley, 621 Summerset, Flower Mound, Texas - VP of Development with Jackson-Shaw Co., explained their goal for the site design was to build a premier urban industrial park which blended in and was additive to the existing neighborhood, and to create a campus atmosphere to attract businesses.

Mr. Nunley stated the requests complied with most of the current zoning requirements with exception of building height, and a flag-lot. Current landscaping requirements are 10% green space, while 28.8% were proposed; tree count required for this site was 87 trees, while 168 new trees were proposed and were working diligently to maintain any pockets of existing trees.

The exterior façade of the buildings would consist of a combination of concrete tilt wall, metal accents, and Nichiha panels (a type of fiber-cement exterior cladding and siding system). Regulations for building materials and elevations have been met. Mr. Nunley went on to describe similar projects that were completed in the DFW and DC areas.

Commissioner Southard asked for clarity on the types of tenants that would occupy the buildings and traffic expectations.

Mr. Nunley responded the proposed industrial warehouses were very small in size compared to bulk heavy-distribution warehouses that require 18-wheeler traffic. The proposed project was specifically designed to house smaller tenants utilizing sprinter vans and or box trucks, with low truck traffic.

Commissioner Roland made commented to the building being spec space and asked why there were so many docks doors, etc.

Mr. Nunley responded that because these were spec buildings and the tenants were unknown, the dock doors would be evenly dispersed to allow for division of the buildings when leased. Many of the doors would never be used, but were proposed nonetheless.

Commissioner Ferrell asked about the "flag lots" and if the intent was to sell the lots at a later date.

Mr. Nunley responded that it was not their investment strategy to sell single buildings, only entire developments; however, they'd like to be able to offer that opportunity.

Commissioner Maxwell posed a question to both staff and the applicant about what the masonry screen walls would be constructed of.

Ms. Mathews responded brick or stone, no precast concrete walls.

Mr. Nunley responded their intent was to comply.

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

The following is a list of those who submitted appearance cards in opposition of Zoning File 18-09:

- Mr. Scott Bratcher, 3505 Deerwood Dr., Richardson, Texas 75082
- Mr. Michael Battista, 3512 Hollowridge Ct., Richardson, Texas 75082
- Mr. Abdellatif Bellaouar, 2917 Anndor Dr., Richardson, Texas 75082
- Ms. Nancy Humphrey, 3009 Cotters Cr., Richardson, Texas 75082
- Mr. David Blasingame, 3907 Marlow Ln., Richardson, Texas 75082
- Ms. Martita Short, 3902 Marlow Ln., Richardson, Texas 75082
- Mr. Ron Nag, 3910 Compton Dr., Richardson, Texas 75082
- Mrs. Dhilan Nag, 3901 Compton Dr., Richardson, Texas 75082
- Ms. Li Shi, 4129 Silverthorne Dr., Richardson, Texas 75082
- Ms. Zhiyuan Hu, 4129 Elk Springs Tr., Richardson, Texas 75082
- Mr. Tsuihud Wei, 4105 Elk Springs Tr., Richardson, Texas 75082
- Mr. Chris McCracken, 3605 Blackwood Ct., Richardson, Texas 75082
- Mr. Edward Lam, 3903 Compton Dr., Richardson, Texas 75082
- Mr. Steve Cozart, 3905 Chainhurst Dr., Richardson, Texas 75082
- Mr. Mike Haer, 3021 Cotters Cr., Richardson, Texas 75082
- Ms. Sofia Short, 3902 Marlow Ln., Richardson, Texas 75082
- Mr. Robert Short, 3902 Marlow Ln., Richardson, Texas 75082
- Mr. Joe Dao, 3024 Cotters Cr., Richardson, Texas 75082
- Ms. Pauline Hales, 3082 Greenfield Dr., Richardson, Texas 75082
- Ms. Kelley Thomas, 4168 Tabermash Ln., Richardson, Texas 75082
- Ms. Bertha Marconi, 1311 Cherokee Dr., Richardson, Texas 75082
- Mr. Ret K. Little, 1204 Pawnee Dr., Richardson, Texas 75082
- Mr. Craig Didntcatchit, 3066 Blackfield Dr., Richardson, Texas 75082
- Shafar Krahrime, 3602 Pinecrest Cr., Richardson, Texas 75082
- Albert Smith 3062 Blackfield Drive., Richardson, Texas 75082

Summary of the comments and concerns:

- If this is approved, there is no control over the type of tenants;
- Increased & congested traffic on Telecom (e.g. 18-wheeler traffic)
- Pollution: Noise, light, air;
- Road rehabilitation – repaving pot holes from 18-wheeler traffic
- Plans to cover a natural creek;

- Length of construction time;
- Concerned about the water drainage into the Crystal Creek subdivision;
- No insight into the different product line and services the tenants might bring into the neighborhood;
- Detrimental to the safety and peace of the surrounding neighborhoods;
- School safety, there is a day-care and an elementary school nearby;
- Concerned with buildings towering over residential property;
- Undetermined hours of operations;
- Undetermined tenants, multiple tenants made it difficult for neighbors to negotiate with the industrial owners if issues arose.

Commissioner Maxwell made comment that by right in view of the current standards, the applicant could build the proposed spec buildings with exception of the building height and were granted by right under the current zoning the trucks, dock doors, lighting, etc.

The following is a list of those who submitted appearance cards (contingent) in favor of Zoning File 18-09:

- Mr. Riaz Uddin, 2245 Amy Ln., Richardson Texas, 75082
- Mr. Doug Huey, 8214 Westchester Dr., Dallas Texas

Summary of the comments:

- Would like the wall separating the property from the subdivision to be aesthetically pleasing;
- Pleased to see that the dock for Building 4 was rotated facing inward;
- Would like to see the building height reduced, but understood that industry standards required taller buildings;
- Would request that during the phases of construction that the surrounding residential streets were not utilized for construction access;
- Would request the fence be built before actual building construction began;
- Water drainage be re-directed out of the neighborhood;
- Assurance that the traffic on Telecom will not increase;
- Opportunity for Richardson to get a quality urban industrial development, one that was lacking;
- This was a quality development and a quality developer

With no further comments in favor or opposed, Vice Chair DePuy closed the public hearing and asked the applicant if he had any comments in rebuttal.

Mr. Jason Nunley, in summary stated:

- Willingness to talk through all concerns presented;
- Having a proven track record of placing this product directly adjacent to residential property;
- Light pollution concerns having been addressed with specific language recommended by staff that were accepted as recommend;

- Tried to meet requests from a screening, landscaping and lighting perspective to address all concerns. Not sure of how to address concerns of pollution;
- Requirement by the city to do a Traffic Impact Analysis of 19 intersections. The study showed that the existing infrastructure is sufficient as is for the traffic this site would generate and there were no additional requirements from a traffic impact scenario that would need to be addressed on city infrastructure.

Commissioner Southard made a clarification concerning the drainage and that fencing could not be continued across the areas as part of the requirements of the easements.

Vice Chair DePuy asked if the applicant had met with the HOA's.

Mr. Nunley stated they met with Crystal Creek HOA and attempted to reach out to the other HOA to set a time for their next meeting on April, 28.

Commissioner Maxwell asked staff if the applicant was required to address the drainage issue and if there was anything in the proposed site layout hindering addressing the issue.

Mr. Dan Tracy responded that the layout is not hindering addressing the drainage issue. There were items that could be changed with the site development should it move forward that could address the issue.

Commissioner Maxwell asked the applicant about city's recommendation to move the screening wall on the east side of the property line, inbound and up the hill so all living material would be on the resident side instead of on the property line, and if they had issue with doing so.

Mr. Nunley responded no.

Mr. Chavez provided clarification on the suggested screening wall which would be moved to the west easement line of the 15-foot sanitary sewer easement, followed by trees and then the fire lane. The trees would be located on the west side of the screen wall.

Commissioner Maxwell asked the applicant for clarity regarding the canopy trees. Staff's recommendation was to plant trees on 20-foot intervals instead of 50-foot intervals and was that acceptable to the applicant.

Mr. Nunley responded yes.

Commissioner Roland summarized and asked for confirmation of the proposed changes recommended by staff:

- Limit the hours of operation to typical business hours
- Offset the screen wall off the property line to staff recommendations
- Canopy trees would be planted every 20-feet on center

Mr. Nunley responded yes.

Mr. Chavez recommended that the canopy trees be planted every 40-foot minimum to allow room for proper growth.

Commissioner Springs asked if the hours of operation can be limited to specific hours to limit noise and traffic and coincide with the city's noise ordinance.

Mr. Chavez recommended the following verbiage: "No loading shall occur between the hours of 6:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. or on Saturday and Sunday" which corresponded to the allowed hours of construction throughout the city.

Mr. Nunley responded it was something that could be added as a special condition.

Commissioner Southard stated that the vote by the Commission would be a recommendation not an approval. It would go before City Council for consideration allowing another opportunity for the public to raise questions.

Commissioner Springs inquired on the special condition of "flag-lots" and the potential challenges they pose.

Mr. Chavez responded that this could be addressed in two ways. One was to allow a flag-lot configuration requiring access easements so each property owner had access to a common drive. Staff's concern with flag-lots is primarily access and signage. The Sign Code mandated specific spacing requirements between signs on lots and property lines. The second was to utilize lots without frontage with a caveat that each lot had access to a roadway.

Mr. Nunley responded they would have mutual access easements in the event a replat of the property went forward.

Commissioners Maxwell and Roland asked the applicant for clarity on the request for a sub-lot and if it was not approved, would it be a deal breaker.

Mr. Nunley responded they would like to have the flexibility of the sub-lot, but would drop the request if the sub-lot that was the only item impeding movement forward to City Council.

Commissioner Ferrell commented on Special Condition No. 5 regarding the flag-lots suggesting it be modified to allow for two flag-lots instead of abandoning the entire special condition.

Mr. Chavez explained the applicant had the option to re-plat the property in the future to seek a variance process. It was staff's recommendation to delete special condition 5 in its entirety.

Commissioner Frederick asked staff about steps the developer would need to take to address the drainage issue.

Mr. Tracy responded that it would go through the normal Development Review Process. Staff would review the set of civil plans, look at the existing flow coming to the site; going through the site; and different creeks and the streams it is draining to.

Commissioner Southard asked staff for clarity on the height of the structures on this property by right under existing zoning allowing for a total height of 40-feet.

Mr. Chavez confirmed that the buildings of greater height could be achieved upon meeting the increase setbacks; however, single story buildings were still limited to a maximum height of 25 feet regardless of the setback. The applicant was proposing all single story buildings at a height of 36-feet for the building and a maximum of 6-feet for the parapet walls used to screen roof mounted equipment.

With no further comments in favor or opposed, Vice Chair DePuy asked for a motion.

Motion: Commissioner Maxwell made a motion to recommend approval of Zoning File 18-09 with the conditions including: removal of Condition No. 5 entirely; limiting the hours of operation to ‘no loading between the hours of 6:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. M-F or weekends; relocation of the screening wall to the west side of the drainage easement located along the east property line with spacing of canopy trees every 40-feet; second by Commissioner Roland. Motion approved 6-1 (Commissioner Frederick opposed).

ADJOURN

With no further business before the Commission, Vice Chair DePuy adjourned the regular business meeting at 10:22 p.m.

Janet DePuy, Vice Chairman
City Plan Commission