

# City of Richardson City Plan Commission Agenda Packet Tuesday, August 19, 2025

To advance to the background material for each item in the agenda, click on the item title in the agenda or click on Bookmarks in the tool bar on the side of your screen.

22  
3709

118.28'  
S89°12'16\"E

**AGENDA**  
**CITY OF RICHARDSON – CITY PLAN COMMISSION**  
**TUESDAY, AUGUST 19, 2025, AT 7:00 P.M.**  
**RICHARDSON CITY HALL**  
**2360 CAMPBELL CREEK BOULEVARD, SUITE 525**  
**RICHARDSON, TX 75082**

---

**Closed Executive Session Authorized**

As authorized by Section 551.071 (2) of the Texas Government Code, this meeting may be convened into closed Executive Session to seek confidential legal advice from the City Attorney on any listed agenda item.

---

**Meeting Information**

- Public hearing information: <https://www.cor.net/PublicHearing>
  - Public Comment Cards for comments or public hearings can be found at [www.cor.net/PublicCommentForm](http://www.cor.net/PublicCommentForm) and submitted online by 5:00 p.m. on the date of the meeting or in person before the meeting begins to be included in the public record.
  - City Planning Commission meetings are available for viewing via live-stream online and on-demand at <https://www.cor.net/city>.
- 

The City Plan Commission meeting will be held in the Multipurpose Room #CH 157, of the Richardson City Hall located at 2360 Campbell Creek Boulevard, Richardson, TX 75082.

---

**BRIEFING SESSION: 6:00 P.M.** Prior to the regular business meeting, the City Plan Commission will meet with staff in Multipurpose Room #CH 157 at the above listed address to receive a briefing on:

- A. **Legislative Update – State of Texas 89<sup>th</sup> Legislative Session**
  - B. **Discussion of regular agenda items**
  - C. **Staff report on pending development, zoning permits, and planning matters**
- 

**REGULAR BUSINESS MEETING 7:00 P.M. – MULTIPURPOSE ROOM #CH 157**

**MINUTES**

1. **Approval of the minutes of the regular business meetings of July 1 and July 15, 2025.**

**PUBLIC HEARING**

2. **Zoning File 25-15 – Special Permit – Senior Activity Center:** Consider and act on a request for a Special Permit for a Senior Activity Center within an 11,500-square-foot suite space in a 52,668-square-foot existing building on a 4.8-acre lot located at 1750 E. Belt Line Road, Suite 100, on the south side of Belt Line Road, west of Yale Boulevard, and currently zoned Local Retail LR-M(2). Owner: Michael Kottwitz, Richardson Consolidated, LLC. Staff: Derica Peters.

**ADJOURN**

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE ABOVE AGENDA WAS POSTED ON THE BULLETIN BOARD AT RICHARDSON CITY HALL ON OR BEFORE 5:30 P.M., FRIDAY, AUGUST 15, 2025.

\_\_\_\_\_  
A.J. CASTANEDA, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY  
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

ACCOMMODATION REQUESTS FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES SHOULD BE MADE AT LEAST 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING BY CONTACTING THE ADA COORDINATOR, LOCATED AT 2360 CAMPBELL CREEK BLVD., SUITE 550, RICHARDSON, TX 75082. VIA PHONE AT (972) 744-4168 OR VIA EMAIL AT [ADACOORDINATOR@COR.GOV](mailto:ADACOORDINATOR@COR.GOV).

PURSUANT TO SECTION 46.03. PENAL CODE (PLACES WEAPONS PROHIBITED). A PERSON MAY NOT CARRY A FIREARM OR OTHER WEAPON ON THIS PROPERTY. \*

FOR THE PURPOSE OF THIS NOTICE “PROPERTY” SHALL MEAN THE RICHARDSON ROOM AND OR COUNCIL CHAMBERS OF ANY OTHER ROOM WHERE A MEETING SUBJECT TO AN OPEN MEETING UNDER GOVERNMENT CODE CHAPTER 551 OF THE RICHARDSON CITY PLAN COMMISSION IS HELD.

# Briefing Item A

Legislative Update:  
State of Texas 89th Legislative Session

# Agenda Item 1

Approval of the minutes of the regular business meetings of July 1 and July 15, 2025

**CITY OF RICHARDSON  
CITY PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES – JULY 1, 2025**

The Richardson City Plan Commission met on July 1, 2025, at 6:00 p.m. in the Multipurpose Room #CH157 of the Richardson City Hall, 2360 Campbell Creek Boulevard, Suite 525, Richardson, TX.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Bryan Marsh, Chairman  
Jeremy Thomason, Vice Chairman  
Nate Roberts, Commissioner  
Michael Keller, Commissioner  
Gary Beach, Commissioner  
Kristen Schascheck, Commissioner  
Rebecca Poynter, Commissioner  
Joe Quirk, Commissioner

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Byron Purdy, Commissioner

**CITY STAFF PRESENT:** Charles Goff, Assistant City Manager  
Andrew Bogda, Assistant Director of DS – Planning  
Derica Peters, Senior Planner  
Aaron Zilz, Planner II  
Anna Jo Castaneda, Executive Secretary

**BRIEFING SESSION**

Prior to the start of the regular business meeting, the City Plan Commission met with Staff at 6:00 p.m. regarding staff reports and agenda items. No action was taken.

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Marsh called the regular business meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**REGULAR BUSINESS MEETING**

**1. Approval of minutes of the regular business meetings of June 17, 2025.**

**Motion:** Chairman Marsh made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Commissioner Schascheck seconded the motion. 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 upon 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. Replat – 190 Corporate Center, Lot 1D, Block A:** Consider and act on a request for a replat of Lot 1C, Block A, of the 190 Corporate Center to dedicate water easements and abandon certain easements. The 3.174-acre tract of land is located south of Breckinridge

Boulevard, east of N. President George Bush Highway, and west of Shiloh Road. *Owner: Jeff Anderson, HHRE Richardson MOB, LLC Staff: Aaron Zilz.*

**Motion:** Chairman Marsh made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. Vice Chairman Thomason seconded the motion. Motion passed 7-0.

### **PUBLIC HEARING**

#### **3. Zoning File 25-10 – Special Permit & Special Development Plan – Ayat Restaurant:**

Consider and act on a request for a Special Development Plan and a Special Permit for a Drive-Through Restaurant within an existing building on a 0.7-acre lot located at the northwest corner of Sherman Road and Spring Valley Road and currently zoned Main Street/Central Expressway PD Planned Development (Railside Sub-District). *Owner: The Jibrins LLC. Staff: Derica Peters.*

Derica Peters stated the request is for a Special Permit and Special Development Plan for the property located at 200 W. Spring Valley Road, at the northwest corner of S. Sherman Street and W. Spring Valley Road, to allow a drive-through Mediterranean restaurant. The Comprehensive Plan designates the future land use of the property as part of the Transit Village Place Type, which is characterized by a higher density mix of residential and commercial development within walking distance of transit.

Ms. Peters advised the site was previously a Wendy's restaurant that received a Special Permit in 1994 and operated until 2023. The applicant purchased the property with the intent of reestablishing a drive-through, however, rights to operate a drive-through were abandoned after a six-month period of inactivity; therefore, a new Special Permit is required to reestablish the use.

Ms. Peters stated but the applicant plans to add a 300-square-foot covered patio to the east side of the building for outdoor seating. They will use the existing drive-through lane that can stack 10 vehicles and two pickup windows. There are 45 parking spaces located on-site.

Ms. Peters explained the applicant is modifying the site, so a Special Development Plan is required to address the existing nonconformities, such as the location of the building in relation to the required build-to zone and the required streetscape standards in the PD that include an 8-foot sidewalk along Sherman Street and a 12-foot-wide sidewalk with a landscaped amenity zone along Spring Valley Road. The applicant is requesting to keep the streetscapes as-is.

Ms. Peters advised the site shall be developed in conformance with the Special Development Plan. Furthermore, if the Special Permit is approved, it would be limited to Ayat Restaurant as the operator, a building permit shall be obtained in accordance with the CZO, and hours of operation would be limited to 9 am to 10 pm. She reported five public comments were received in support of the request.

Chairman Marsh asked where the retaining wall was located.

Ms. Peters said the retaining wall is located between the sidewalk and landscape buffer along W. Spring Valley Road.

Commissioner Keller asked what the requirement was in terms of the build-to zone.

Ms. Peters said on Sherman St., it goes back 15 feet from the property line and 75% of the front of the building is required to be located here, with the intent of bringing buildings closer to the street edge.

Commissioner Keller asked how far from the edge of the street is the existing building.

Ms. Peters responded 40 feet.

Commissioner Keller asked how the Special Development Plan is related to the request.

Ms. Peters explained the Special Development Plan comes into play when there is development on a site, whether it is redevelopment or a new development. If it is a new development and they cannot meet the standards of the form-based code for the building and site design, the project would need a Special Development Plan to address the exceptions.

Commissioner Keller asked if the patio was the addition in this case.

Ms. Peters confirmed yes, it is.

Andrew Bogda advised the Special Permit is limited to Ayat Restaurant, but the Special Development Plan will run with the land.

Chairman Marsh asked if there were any other questions for Staff, and seeing none, the public hearing was opened, and the applicant was asked to come forward.

Mr. John Martini, real estate broker representing The Jibrins LLC, 1057 S. Sherman Street, Suite 300, stated he was available to answer any questions from the Commission.

Chairman Marsh asked about the specifics of Ayat Restaurant.

Mr. Martini said after Wendy's vacated, the corporate office put a deed restriction on the site that a business could have no more than 15% of sales from hamburgers, therefore it was difficult to lease the space. The applicant convinced Wendy's corporate they could get a different type of restaurant in the space, and when they agreed, the applicant purchased the property. A lease was secured with a group in New York that has many Mediterranean-style restaurants that wanted to come to Texas with an express version of their typical sit-down restaurant.

Chairman Marsh asked the applicant to expand on their drive-through plans.

Mr. Martini stated one of their New York restaurants has a successful drive-through and they wanted to have that option when they expanded to this location.

Chairman Marsh asked about the need for a patio.

Mr. Martini stated there is a lot of pedestrian activity in the area and the patio provides another option for their clientele to either sit inside or outside.

Chairman Marsh asked him to address the other exceptions like the streetscape and sidewalks.

Mr. Martini stated in order to adhere to the streetscape requirements along Spring Valley, there are things in this area that would need to be relocated: City utilities, a telephone pole, and the retaining wall.

Chairman Marsh asked if the patio would be enclosed.

Mr. Martini said yes, it would be enclosed with glass

Chairman Marsh asked if the applicant provided any specs for the patio build out.

Ms. Peters said no.

Vice Chairman Thomason asked if the restaurant would be serving breakfast and what were the hours of operation.

Mr. Martini advised breakfast would be coffee and pastries with hours of operation from 9:00 am to 10:00 pm.

Commissioner Poynter asked if the Ayat Restaurant has a specific appearance and branding.

Mr. Martini said no, but they do have a logo.

Commissioner Poynter asked what the occupancy was for the patio.

Mr. Martini advised there would be 40 seats.

Chairman Marsh asked if this request was denied, would the plan be to operate as a sit-down restaurant or are they relying on having both a patio and a drive-through.

Mr. Martini said they want both for financial reasons.

Chairman Marsh said this is a prominent corner in an area the City is trying to redevelop to create a walkable pedestrian environment; there is a concern that none of the requirements of the existing zoning have been met.

Mr. Martini said the existing sidewalk on Sherman could potentially be expanded, but they could not expand the sidewalk on Spring Valley to 12 feet due to the utilities at the corner of the property.

Mr. Bogda stated only an 8-foot sidewalk would be required along Sherman Street where they currently have a 5-foot sidewalk, and W. Spring Valley is encumbered by a retaining wall where the 5-foot sidewalk would be required to be 12-feet-wide.

Chairman Marsh asked the applicant to explain the west side of the building, which looked to be back of house, but there is a requirement that all public-facing building facades be designated and designed as building fronts.

Mr. Martini stated there is a walk-in cooler in the back on the west side.

Chairman Marsh asked if there were plans to add any windows, other than on the patio.

Mr. Martini said no.

Chairman Marsh asked if they plan to make modifications to the façade.

Mr. Martini indicated they will screen the rooftop HVAC units.

Chairman Marsh asked if there is a requirement for parking spaces.

Ms. Peters explained that parking standards in this code are 1 space per 300 square feet, and the lot provides 45 existing spaces.

Chairman Marsh asked what the occupancy limit was for the restaurant.

Mr. Martini replied there is seating for 91 occupants. He also commented on the landscaping saying new shrubbery will be added to the area beside the retaining wall.

Ms. Peters clarified that there were previously shrubs in that area, but they died over time and the applicant indicated they will replace the shrubs.

Vice Chairman Thomason asked about the Wendy's deed restriction.

Mr. Martini said Wendy's corporate had to close this location because it was impacting sales at a nearby Wendy's. They also deed restricted it for 10 years so another operator could not have hamburger sales greater than 15%. Additionally, Mr. Martini advised the Commission that the applicant is an experienced developer who has been successfully redeveloping this area for many years in an effort to meet the vision the city has for this area.

With no further questions for the applicant, Chairman Marsh asked if anyone would like to come forward and speak in favor or opposition to the request.

Seeing no more speakers, Chairman Marsh made a motion to close the public hearing. Commissioner Beach seconded the motion. Motion passed 7-0.

Chairman Marsh stated the subject site is on a key corner of Sherman Street which serves as an entry point to the City and would represent what the City has envisioned for the area. If the Special Development Plan is approved, it runs with the land and could remain that way forever. This corner could have a sit-down restaurant with a patio and not a drive-through to go with the overall vision of the Railside subdistrict.

Commissioner Keller said he would favor a sit-down restaurant in the area, but a drive-through is neither a primary or secondary use in the Comprehensive Plan, and not envisioned for the area.

Commissioner Beach commented that being able to have a place to pick up food on the way home when getting off of the train would be a desirable option.

Vice Chairman Thomason commented that by not approving the request, they would risk the property remaining vacant indefinitely, so he is in favor of giving the restaurant a chance to be successful.

Commissioner Roberts and Commissioner Quirk agreed to give the operator a chance.

Commissioner Schascheck sits in opposition of the Special Permit and asked if the Special Development Plan and Special Permit could be considered separately.

Mr. Bogda advised that the items could be considered separately and that the Commission could also put in an additional condition related to the drive-through limiting it to mobile pickup orders only and that they not have the menu board and speaker box.

**Motion:** Vice Chairman Thomason made a motion to recommend approval of the Special Development Plan and Special Permit with modifications that the drive-through be only for mobile order pick-up only. Commissioner Roberts seconded the motion. Motion passed 4-3 (Chairman Marsh, Commissioner Keller, Commissioner Schascheck opposed).

- 4. Zoning File 25-11 – PD Planned Development – Telecom Warehouse:** Consider and act on a request to change the zoning on 66.56 acres located at the southwest corner of Breckinridge Blvd and Telecom Pkwy from I-M(1) Industrial District to PD Planned Development for the I-M(1) Industrial District with modified development standards for an office/warehouse building. *Owner: Michael Schack, HIG/DSP Richardson Owner LLC. Staff: Derica Peters.*

Derica Peters stated the request is to rezone the property located at 2801 Telecom Parkway from I-M(1) Industrial District to PD Planned Development for the I-M(1) Industrial District with modified development standards for an office/warehouse building. The site allows the proposed use of warehouse, distribution, and office by right; however, the applicant is seeking an exception to the zoning rule that restricts a single-story building to 25-feet. The Comprehensive Plan designates this area as part of the Innovation and Industrial PlaceType, which calls for light industrial, manufacturing, distribution, and office as primary uses. Therefore, the proposed use is consistent with the zoning and the future land use plan. The applicant proposes a new 343,624-square-foot single-story flex warehouse building. The site will continue to operate as one singular platted lot with no proposed modifications to the north half of the campus or to the existing driveways. They propose to provide 22.6% of landscaped area which exceeds the minimum requirement of 10%. The proposed warehouse needs additional clearance height for storage of materials, merchandise, and other warehouse uses; therefore, they have proposed a height of 50-feet to the top of the parapet. The elevations provide for an aesthetic that mimics the appearance of a two-story office building with floor-to-ceiling vertical storefront windows spaced along the

front and sides of the building. The truck court will have 74 loading dock doors located on the rear of the building. The building will be constructed of concrete tilt wall and have aluminum windows and canopy awnings.

Ms. Peters advised a trip generation memo was provided, which indicated total vehicle trips were reduced by 160 in the morning, 146 in the evening, and 910 per day, as compared to the existing development. The applicant provided both an on-site circulation plan and a truck traffic circulation plan that outlines designated truck routes, limiting trucks to entering and exiting the site from Telecom Parkway and Research Drive, and then proceeding southwest to the President George Bush Turnpike. The applicant has proposed a reduction in the parking ratio for assembly, manufacturing, and laboratory from 1 space per 400 square feet to 1 space per 1,000 square feet and a reduction in the parking ratio for warehouse and distribution from 1 space per 1,000 square feet to 1 space per 1,250 square feet. Based on the proposal, the applicant would be required to have 1,444 spaces with the proposed mix of office, manufacturing, and warehouse uses, and they will be providing 1,998 spaces with the redevelopment. The site plan shows approximately 250 parking spaces immediately adjacent to the new building. They have outlined areas in the green spaces where they could expand parking in the future. They have proposed enhanced landscape screening comprised of evergreen trees and shrubs, ornamental trees, and canopy trees on the west and east sides of the truck dock area.

Ms. Peters concluded by reviewing the correspondence Staff had received, which were two neutral comments, one comment in favor of the request, and five comments in opposition of the request.

Chairman Marsh asked to confirm the property will provide 1,998 parking spaces and that the applicant is asking for a parking ratio that would require 1,444 spaces.

Ms. Peters confirmed yes.

Commissioner Poynter asked if trees will be removed.

Ms. Peters answered a tree survey is not required as part of the zoning, but it will be required during the development plan review where they will also assess which trees need to be mitigated.

Commissioner Poynter asked what is the plan for the oak trees along the sidewalk.

Ms. Peters stated the City has street tree requirements and she will need to confirm if these trees will remain.

Commissioner Poynter asked if the trees located in the parking lot and in front of the buildings would be removed.

Ms. Peters said she did not know, but if they are considered protected, they would have to be mitigated for if they are removed.

Commissioner Roberts asked if market conditions are driving the increase in zoning cases where they have had to consider allowing a single-story building height increase to 40 or 50 feet.

Andrew Bogda confirmed the market has evolved since the original zoning went into effect. Most warehouse tenants are requesting a building height that is measured to the top of the parapet to allow for the screening of rooftop equipment. He reminded the Commission that a 25-foot-tall industrial or warehouse building can be built at this location by-right, but some tenants want flexibility in the height to meet their needs.

Vice Chairman Thomason asked how tall the existing structures are.

Ms. Peters answered that some of the buildings are approximately 40 feet tall and single-story, however they were permitted before the single-story limitation was adopted in 1998.

Aaron Zilz confirmed the buildings on the north side are both 43-foot-tall and the office building that will be torn down is 46-foot-tall.

Commissioner Poynter asked if the site will be changing from a campus to a distribution center.

Ms. Peters responded they do not have a definition for campus or distribution center.

Commissioner Poynter asked if there is anything that indicates there is office space on this property because it appears to be predominantly distribution.

Ms. Peters replied yes, there is a mix of office, distribution, and manufacturing uses proposed for the site.

Commissioner Poynter asked about the location of the current office area.

Ms. Peters indicated there is office space within the northeast corner of the site and additional office space in the manufacturing buildings.

Commissioner Poynter asked if the same tenant occupied all the buildings.

Ms. Peters advised there is a mix of tenants.

Chairman Marsh asked if there were any other questions for Staff, and seeing none, the public hearing was opened, and the applicant was asked to come forward.

Michael Schack, HIG/DSP Richardson Owner, LLC, 350 W. Hubbard, Chicago stated they are available to answer any questions.

Commissioner Roberts asked what the vision is for tenancy in the building.

Mr. Schack said it is a speculative development; however, they have been talking to the existing major tenant, Celestica, and they are interested in making this site their North American headquarters. They conduct light assembly of high-reliability design manufacturing and supply chain solutions, but it is not guaranteed they will remain as tenants. Other high-tech companies that are similar in nature have also expressed interested in the site.

Commissioner Schascheck asked why they told the homeowners' association it was not feasible to make the building smaller.

Mr. Schack stated the reason is the economies of scale; when a smaller building is built, the cost per square foot gets much higher, and if their costs get too high, they will not be able to charge a market rate to entice tenants to locate here.

Commissioner Schascheck mentioned that the neighboring homeowners had a concern about noise and asked what the hours of operation would be for Celestica or tenants of a similar nature.

Mr. Schack said no hours have been set because they don't know who will occupy the space. They have tried to mitigate the potential noise as much as possible by facing the truck docks toward the existing buildings and installing landscape screening that will deaden the sound.

Chairman Marsh stated there is an abundance of parking on the site since 2,042 spaces are typically required and 1,998 are provided. He asked the applicant to explain the necessity to lower the required parking amount to 1,444 spaces.

Mr. Schack responded they need a building that is competitive in the market that includes enough parking for the tenants, and although there are many parking spaces unused, there is potential for further parking if needed. They prefer to keep the additional future parking areas as green space until a tenant requires more parking.

Chairman Marsh asked how many parking spaces are around the proposed new building.

Mathew Gardner, Civil Engineer, Halff Associates, 1201 N. Bowser Road, Richardson stated there are 250 parking spaces for the new building, which he says is adequate and there is room to add more. If they build all the parking spaces required by code, many of the spaces will sit vacant, however if the need arises, then they can add more parking in the expansion areas.

Chairman Marsh asked how much office space they expect to provide in this building.

Mr. Gardner replied 3.5% office space.

Mr. Schack commented that having enough parking is important, otherwise they cannot lease the space.

Chairman Marsh asked if they were going to expand into the green space to meet the required parking spaces, or will they be using the existing lots to fulfill the requirement.

Mr. Schack said the existing lots have excess parking so their intent is to maintain the green space, but if they require future parking, they will use the green space.

Commissioner Poynter asked if the trees at the entrance of the property will be removed.

Mr. Gardner said the driveway trees will be removed.

Commissioner Poynter asked how many feet the building set is back from the sidewalk.

Mr. Gardner stated the building will be setback 70 feet from the sidewalk and there is a required 40-foot building setback.

Commissioner Poynter asked if traffic would come in and out of the south driveway and will the trees located there remain.

Mr. Gardner indicated traffic would come in that way and the landscape features like the pond and trees will be removed.

Commissioner Poynter asked about the height, material, and setback of the existing building.

Mr. Zilz answered the existing building is approximately 315 feet setback from Research Blvd.

Chairman Marsh asked about the clear height and why did the building height need to be 50 feet.

Mr. Schack emphasized the market demand and need for taller buildings has grown; they need more clear height inside.

Chairman Marsh asked if the market for office space was obsolete today, and if it is better financially to tear the existing building down instead of re-leasing it for office.

Mr. Schack stated there is no market for office space; offices are being repurposed across the country.

Chairman Marsh asked how long the building had been vacant.

Mr. Schack advised the tenant, Fujitsu, is currently in the building but will vacate soon.

Chairman Marsh asked if the building on the northeast corner was vacant and what the occupancy is for the two warehouse buildings.

Mr. Schack advised the northeast building is 60% vacant with 40% leased to a technology company and the two warehouse buildings are 100% leased to Celestica.

Chairman Marsh asked if Celestica's truck loading was all on the north side of the site.

Mr. Schack said yes.

Chairman Marsh asked if they would be open to restricting the amount of additional parking that could be built in the green space.

Mr. Schack stated they need to remain competitive in the market and while they would like to keep it green, they need the flexibility to build parking on it if needed.

Chairman Marsh asked why they need more flexibility for parking.

Mr. Schack replied that flexibility helps to bring new businesses and new jobs to the market.

Chairman Marsh asked if they would be willing to shrink the area for the future expansion parking.

Mr. Shack stated no, they would prefer not to shrink it.

Chairman Marsh clarified that although they are asking for a reduction in the required parking ratio, they are also designating expansion areas for more parking in the future.

Mr. Shack said correct.

Chairman Marsh asked if they had enough room for trucks accessing the site and the truck court.

Mr. Schack said they have adequate room, and the truck court is 130 feet deep, with an extra 55-foot trailer parking room in some areas.

Chairman Marsh asked what the average length of a trailer was.

Mr. Schack said the trailer itself is 53 feet and, with the cab, it is 75 feet.

Tom Maxwell, Alliance Architects, 1600 N. Collins, Richardson stated the parking reduction is to add flexibility because of the different uses that may occupy the building have different requirements. However, the existing parking is underutilized.

Chairman Marsh asked what the reasoning was behind the request for the required parking ratio for assembly, manufacturing, and laboratory uses going from 1 per 400 square feet to 1 per 1000 square feet.

Mike Magee, Director of Construction, Dayton Street Partners (DSP) Richardson, advised that research & development, light assembly, manufacturing, and laboratory space will have larger pieces of equipment that will use more floor space which reduces the number of people in that space. On a national average, they are seeing needed parking ratios of 1 space per 1,500 square feet.

Chairman Marsh said he did the math, and he found they would have a deficit of 50 spaces. He also mentioned it would be better if the parking spaces for this new building were adjacent. He is looking to preserve the green space rather than have parking in those areas. If they received a reduced ratio, and they have surplus parking, then they should not need to build in the green space.

Mr. Magee said the parking count was off because of the significant amount of parking to the north.

Mr. Schack said they will try to reserve the green space but can't guarantee it. They are okay with dropping the request to reduce the parking.

Commissioner Poynter asked if there was a rendering of the front façade.

Mr. Schack responded no, but it will look the same as the building that is shown on the renderings.

Vice Chairman Thomason asked what they were doing to mitigate noise pollution.

Mr. Schack presented the circulation plan where they have oriented the truck docks to the north and interior to the existing buildings, which should block some of the noise, and they are adding tree buffers that will absorb the sound. In addition, they will include the truck circulation plan in the new tenant leases which requires truck traffic to use the proposed routes that stay away from residential areas.

With no further questions for the applicant, Chairman Marsh asked if anyone would like to come forward and speak in favor or opposition to the request.

Albert Smith, 3062 Blackfield Drive, indicated he is against the request. He stated this seems like a trucking terminal, truck noise was not being taken seriously, they did not have renderings of the truck bays, and there is nothing restricting them from adding more bays in the future. He wanted to know why the City would allow such a beautiful campus to be torn down, and why can't they work to find a better way to keep the existing buildings. He stated there seems to be a lack of vision.

Angela Smith, 3062 Blackfield Drive, asked why the applicant did not provide the hours of operation. She is concerned about the air pollution when the building gets demolished, and the health issues it may cause. She works from home and is distracted by the noise from trucks in construction operations in the area. Trucks can be seen outside her front door and a buffer will not prevent the noise.

Eric Scott, 4144 Bentley, commented he does not live as close as some of the other residents, but he hears beeping from trucks operating in the industrial area to the south and east, and 74 bays could create a lot of extra noise.

Terri Masters, 2988 Marlow Lane, commented that warehouses are not what the area needs; they do not blend with the neighborhood, so the request should be denied. 74 bays shouldn't be considered light industrial. She was concerned why the City would let them take away the big trees and pond from such a beautiful area. They should try to bring in tech companies to occupy the space instead. She is worried about the traffic and noise.

Petra Goins, 2982 Marlow Lane, had concerns about the pollution in the area, the traffic, the noise, and 74 bays seems extensive when it backs up to houses right across the street at Telecom Parkway. The neighborhood has families and kids, and they are hoping truck traffic will not drive through the residential area. She thought there should be a restriction on how much green space is removed, and if removed, it could affect property values. Richardson has always been known for green space and planting of trees; therefore, she is against the request.

Chairman Marsh asked the applicant if they had a response to the comments.

Mr. Schack expressed they want to be good corporate citizens and have tried to mitigate issues by how they have designed the building. The truck circulation plan avoids residential areas. The zoning of this area allows them to build an industrial building, however, the only reason for the zoning request is for the 50-foot building height. They will follow all requirements to make sure dust from demolition is mitigated. They want to bring in high-tech jobs which aren't in office

anymore but are in lab space and light assembly. The building is not designed like a truck terminal; 74 bay doors provides flexibility, and they do not anticipate every truck dock being occupied all the time. Trip generation will go down.

Commissioner Schascheck inquired if they would be willing to put limited hours of operation into the leases.

Mr. Schack said it would be difficult since they do not know who the tenants will be.

Commissioner Quirk asked if they could partition off portions of the building for different tenants.

Mr. Schack said they designed the interior of the building for to provide for partitioning.

Commissioner Quirk asked if there is capability to have a mezzanine level.

Mr. Schack said they prefer not to have a mezzanine; however, the clear height would allow for it.

Commissioner Roberts asked if the reduction of traffic in the traffic memo represents counts for personal automobiles or trucks.

Mr. Schack stated, overall, the trip generation will be a reduction in automobiles, but because they are converting from office to warehouse, there will be more truck traffic.

Commissioner Roberts asked what is the traffic memo and reduction based on.

Mr. Gardner advised the traffic memo is based on the inputs of the square footage and the warehouse use of the building. This site will not have high-turnover truck traffic.

Commissioner Roberts asked to confirm there is nothing prohibiting 74 trucks turning over every 4 hours, for example.

Mr. Gardner indicated they had no control over that, and it will be up to the end user.

Chairman Marsh asked where the extra parking would be located, and he may request specific areas. He prefers parking closer to the building. He is trying to find middle ground between finding parking and losing green space. He asked if they needed more relief on the warehouse or assembly ratio.

Mr. Schack indicated on the plan where it may change. They have 25% landscape coverage, and they currently exceed the requirement of 10%, so if they do have to pave some green area, they will still exceed the code requirements.

Mr. Gardner said expanding parking into the green space is a last resort.

Commissioner Quirk and agreed it is hard to believe that they will not have enough parking in that area and they should leave the green space.

Commissioner Schascheck agreed and said there appears to be ample parking in the aerial photo.

Commissioner Roberts agreed, and said he was sympathetic to the comments in opposition; however, there is already industrial in this area, and proper use of the area is light industrial.

Commissioner Schascheck reiterated that they would be allowed 74 truck bays if they built a 25-foot-tall building by right, so the green space may not be relevant at this time.

Commissioner Poynter asked if parking areas are designated for specific tenants.

Mr. Schack answered it will all be shared parking and there is no reserved parking.

Mr. Thomason commented that there is a buffer of buildings and adequate distance between this site and the residential areas. This is not a use case, but a consideration for the taller building height.

Chairman Marsh commented that this area has become like an industrial park, so it is compatible, he just asked they preserve as much green space and trees as possible along the frontages.

Commissioner Quirk commented that since the market is moving to taller buildings, he supports it.

Seeing no more speakers, Commissioner Roberts made a motion to close the public hearing. Commissioner Beach seconded the motion. Motion passed 7-0.

**Motion:** Commissioner Roberts made a motion to recommend approval of the of the request as presented. Commissioner Beach seconded the motion. Motion passed 7-0.

The Commission recessed at 9:29 p.m. and resumed the meeting at 9:36 p.m.

5. **Zoning File 25-12 – Major Modification – The Leaves:** Consider and act on a request for a major modification to the development standards of the West Spring Valley PD Planned Development District on approximately 8.5 acres located at 1230 W. Spring Valley Road to accommodate the development of 5 new residential buildings containing a total of 11 units on an existing site developed for nursing home, an independent living facility and supporting residential uses. *Owner: The Leaves Inc. Staff: Derica Peters.*

Derica Peters stated the request is for a major modification to the development standards of the West Spring Valley PD Planned Development for the property at 1230 W. Spring Valley Road. In 1967, the Christian Science Church originally developed the site with a nursing facility at the northeast corner of the property, and the property continued to develop over time with an 8-unit multi-family building, as well as a lodge and training facilities. Today, there is 24,750 square feet of buildings on-site.

Ms. Peters indicated the proposed uses are consistent with the Future Land Use Plan, which designates this area as part of the Compact Residential PlaceType. In addition, Ms. Peters stated that the property is part of Sub-District E of the West Spring Valley Corridor and

explained how the sub-district is intended to create opportunities for high-quality housing in a variety of styles and types, including senior-oriented housing, but that independent living facilities and nursing/convalescent homes are not allowed by-right in the sub-district. Ms. Peters provided photos of the entrance of the site from West Spring Valley where a drainage culvert was improved, and as part of that improvement, a 12-foot-wide sidewalk was installed along a portion of the property's frontage. She also showed photos of the development from the cul-de-sac that dead ends near the north property line that includes an emergency access gate near the existing nursing home.

Ms. Peters advised the applicant is proposing to add 4 buildings providing 8 dwelling units that will support the on-site independent living care patients. Some staff live in the existing 8-unit multi-family building that is also on the property. The number of parking spaces will be reduced from 115 to 81 spaces, which the applicant has indicated are sufficient for the staff, nurses, residents, and visitors, particularly as many of the residents do not drive.

Ms. Peters presented the proposed building elevations that depict the façade of all sides of the new buildings, which are single-story and incorporate design elements such as a low-pitched gabled roof as well as clerestory and transom windows. The units will be 18-foot-tall and constructed with building materials consisting of stucco, shiplap siding accents, and windows on front-facing and rear-facing elevations. The PD requires all buildings, including duplexes, to be a minimum of two (2) stories; however, in accordance with the PD, a minor modification may be granted to permit the duplexes as single-story buildings. This is a major modification where most of the existing structures and site elements are considered non-conforming as it was developed before the current zoning was adopted in 2011; therefore, changes to the structure and site elements are prohibited unless the site is brought into compliance with the PD, or the major modifications are approved.

Ms. Peters explained the uses currently on-site are considered legal non-conforming and the code requires those uses to obtain a major modification. In addition, they are requesting a major modification on the requirements for several of the site elements. The code requires duplexes to be a minimum of 3,000 square feet, with 1,500 square feet for each unit; they are requesting duplexes be a minimum 2,200 square feet, with each unit being a minimum of 1,100 square feet. that the code also requires special streetscape improvements that have specific building design standards, including a build-to zone where building facades are required to be built closer to the front property line; however, most of the buildings are set back well into the property in a campus-like setting and the new buildings will be as well. In addition, the code requires a 12-foot-wide sidewalk and a 10-foot-wide landscape amenity zone along West Spring Valley Road; there is a 12-foot-wide sidewalk for about 33% of the frontage and the applicant does not intend to continue this treatment due to utility encumbrances, allowing the existing 5-foot sidewalk to remain in its current condition.. The on-site circulation and fire lane will not be modified by the proposal, but major modifications will be required to allow the existing and new parking to be located in front of the buildings rather than behind the buildings, and to allow residential parking to be surface parking rather than in a garage. The applicant also does not intend to provide parking lot trees as required by code, as the campus is already heavily landscaped with large trees and the new parking areas will generally be provided in smaller increments of less than 8 spaces. Also, while the code prohibits fencing from extending past the front wall of a building, the applicant is requesting to reconstruct the 6-foot-tall fence with an 8-foot-tall fence to provide a secure

campus for the residents. Ms. Peters reported that no correspondence has been received for this request.

Vice Chairman Thomason asked if this type of request would typically need to come to CPC and would it be allowed in other zoning districts.

Ms. Peters stated that it is a unique development and is hard to compare to any other zoning code.

Vice Chairman Thomason stated he was in favor of Council revisiting the master overlay created by this Planned Development.

Ms. Peters stated the PD allows duplexes by right; however, it does not allow the nursing home and independent living uses by right, so there is a difference in some elements.

Andrew Bogda pointed out there is the requirement for building development standards; new development is generally required to be built close to the street and abide by all the other requirements.

Commissioner Roberts commented that he is in support of the request because, aside from the requested exceptions, the proposal is consistent with the PD and the Comprehensive Plan. Chairman Marsh asked if independent living facility and nursing/convalescent home were defined uses in the code.

Aaron Zilz confirmed that nursing/convalescent homes are defined in the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance.

Chairman Marsh asked if independent living facility or senior housing are also included.

Mr. Bogda advised that independent living facility is also defined in the Zoning Ordinance; the principal use is the nursing/convalescent center, while the independent living duplex units are accessory

Chairman Marsh commented that the applicant is not seeking a specific parking ratio but instead will provide a blanket number of spaces to support the campus

Ms. Peters said there is no required parking ratio for nursing homes. The applicant is seeking an acceptance of the proposed parking count, as well as an exception to the requirement for enclosed garages for the duplexes.

Chairman Marsh asked Staff to show the photo of where the sidewalk conforms to the PD.

Ms. Peters presented the slide showing the sidewalk and bridge.

Mr. Bogda stated several utility easements encumber this area and make it difficult to build a full 12-foot-wide sidewalk with the amenity zone, as required.

Chairman Marsh asked if Staff felt it acceptable to leave as-is.

Mr. Bogda advised the decision is ultimately for the Commission to consider; he wanted to point out that because of the utility encumbrance, it would be difficult for them to achieve the required sidewalk width. He stated there will be more opportunity to build out the full sidewalk, as required, if the property to the east redevelops, but at this time, it would be a hinderance to the current property owner.

Chairman Marsh asked about the height and material of the fence.

Ms. Peters reported it is currently a 6-foot wrought iron or tubular aluminum fence, but they are planning to replace it with an 8-foot-tall fence of approved fence material such as wrought iron, tubular aluminum, or composite material with privacy slats.

Vice Chairman Thomason asked for confirmation regarding the number of new buildings and units since that the public notice states they will have 5 new buildings and 11 units.

Ms. Peters explained the applicant has revised their proposal to reduce the number of buildings from 5 to 4 and the number of units from 11 to 8.

Chairman Marsh asked if there were any other questions for Staff, and seeing none, the public hearing was opened, and the applicant was asked to come forward.

Chance LeBlanc, Senior Planner, Dunaway Associates, 550 Bailey Avenue, Fort Worth, provided a presentation on The Leaves, a non-profit Christian Science campus serving the city of Richardson since 1966. The campus provides nursing services for inpatients and outpatients with a nursing training facility and independent and supervised residential living. As an 8-acre campus, it is one of the largest private open space developments in the city.

Mr. LeBlanc reported some modifications they are requesting are a reduction in the parking requirement and to allow surface parking to meet those requirements. He said they plan to replace the existing fence with an 8-foot composite fence and emphasized that a few small trees in that area may need to be mitigated. The buildings are roughly 207 feet from the property line. There is an encumbrance along Spring Valley Road including a pole, conduit, and a manhole, which he advised would be expensive to relocate in order to widen the sidewalk. Also, the existing monument sign would also need to be pushed back, and a retaining wall installed. In addition, there is a 60-foot utility easement that limits a portion of the property.

Chairman Marsh asked if the facility was open to the public and what is the admittance process.

Susan West, Manager, The Leaves, 1230 W. Spring Valley Road, Richardson, indicated the facility is for those who are practicing Christian Science, and to be admitted, one would need to enlist the services of a Christian Science practitioner located in the Christian Science Journal to pray for you for healing. While they do not practice medicine, the facility is licensed with Medicare as a religious non-medical healthcare institution.

Chairman Marsh asked if there is sufficient property to meet the demand of this type of facility.

Ms. West answered yes.

Chairman Marsh asked how many of the staff live on-site

Mr. LeBlanc answered 15.

Vice Chairman Thomason asked if they were owned by the Christian Science denomination.

Ms. West stated they are affiliated with the Christian Science Church, but the The Leaves is designated as a non-profit institution.

Chairman Marsh asked what the total occupancy would be with the planned improvements and how many of the staff were permanent residents.

Mr. LeBlanc reported occupancy would be 25-30 and roughly half are staff residing on the property.

Chairman Marsh asked if more staff than residents were living there, would it change the interpretation of the allowed use.

Mr. Bogda advised that given how the use is set up and with the campus format, the multi-family residential would still be considered as accessory to the principal nursing and independent living facility use.

Commissioner Roberts asked if the non-profit is a 501(c)(3) and if they are a church.

Ms. West said yes, they are a 501(c)(3) because of the religious portion of their work and they are affiliated because the Christian Science Church is a recognized church. The First Church of Christian Scientists, located in Boston, is the mother church and there are branches and societies all over the world.

Commissioner Schascheck asked if the new units will be ADA accessible.

Mr. LeBlanc replied yes.

Chairman Marsh asked staff if the ADA accessibility is a building code requirement.

Ms. Peters said yes.

With no further questions for the applicant, Chairman Marsh asked if anyone would like to come forward and speak in favor or opposition to the request.

Seeing no more speakers, Vice Chairman Thomason made a motion to close the public hearing. Commissioner Quirk seconded the motion. Motion passed 7-0.

**Motion:** Commissioner Schascheck made a motion to recommend approval of the of the request as presented. Commissioner Beach seconded the motion. Motion Passed 7-0.

**ADJOURN**

With no further business before the Commission, Chairman Marsh adjourned the regular business meeting at 10:12 p.m.

---

Bryan Marsh, Chairman

**DRAFT**

**CITY OF RICHARDSON**  
**CITY PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES – JULY 15, 2025**

The Richardson City Plan Commission met on July 15, 2025, at 6:30 p.m. in the Multipurpose Room #CH157 of the Richardson City Hall, 2360 Campbell Creek Boulevard, Suite 525, Richardson, TX.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Jeremy Thomason, Vice Chairman  
Nate Roberts, Commissioner  
Michael Keller, Commissioner  
Gary Beach, Commissioner  
Joe Quirk, Commissioner

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Bryan Marsh, Chairman  
Kristen Schascheck, Commissioner  
Byron Purdy, Commissioner  
Rebecca Poynter, Commissioner

**CITY STAFF PRESENT:** Andrew Bogda, Assistant Director of DS – Planning  
Derica Peters, Senior Planner  
Anna Jo Castaneda, Executive Secretary

**BRIEFING SESSION**

Prior to the start of the regular business meeting, the City Plan Commission met with Staff at 6:30 p.m. regarding staff reports and agenda items. No action was taken.

**CALL TO ORDER**

Vice Chairman Thomason called the regular business meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

- 1. Zoning File 25-14 – Special Permit – Nay Hookah Cafe:** Consider and act on a request for a Special Permit for a smoking establishment on an outdoor patio in conjunction with a restaurant within an existing building on a 0.7-acre lot located at 2100 Alamo Road, on the east side of Alamo Road, north of Campbell Road and currently zoned PD Planned Development for Local Retail LR-M(2). Owner: Keith E. Koop, Bravo Central LLC. Staff: Derica Peters

Derica Peters stated the applicant is requesting a Special Permit for a smoking establishment at 2100 Alamo Road, currently zoned PD Planned Development for the Local Retail LR-M(2) District. The future land use designates this area as part of the Community Commercial PlaceType which identifies restaurants as a primary use, however it doesn't address smoking establishments. The suite space was previously occupied by the restaurant Palapas but has since been vacated. The applicant applied for a Certificate of Occupancy in February 2025 with the intent of opening a restaurant concept and hookah lounge.

Ms. Peters advised the applicant proceeded with opening the restaurant and upgraded the interior and exterior patio. The subject lease space is 3,026 square feet located in the northern portion of the 24,840-square-foot building. A 1,300-square-foot patio located on the north side of the building

has been dedicated with 650 to 850 square feet of area that would accommodate smoking. In addition, the site provides 143 parking spaces in total, the required ratio of a restaurant use is 1 space per 100 square feet of building area, which comes to 27 required parking spaces.

Ms. Peters stated that, in 2011, the City adopted a definition for smoking establishments and amended the zoning code to require a Special Permit for any new smoking establishments. She presented a floor plan with the patio areas that are within a 10-foot radius of doors and windows where smoking is prohibited. A smoking area would be provided beyond that 10-foot buffer, and a proposed condition of the Special Permit is that smoking would be limited to the patio, which is a common condition for Special Permits for smoking establishments.

Ms. Peters said that, since the zoning code was amended, six (6) legal non-conforming hookah lounges or smoking establishments remain open and two (2) previously established smoking establishments relocated and thus needed a Special Permit. If approved with the conditions that Staff recommends, the Special Permit would be limited to the applicant Ahmed Allami, the Special Permit shall expire and terminate in accordance with the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance, the hours of operation for a smoking establishment on an outdoor patio in conjunction with a restaurant shall be limited to 10:00 a.m. to midnight Sunday through Thursday, and from 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 a.m. on Friday and Saturday, and the patio area may not be enclosed. No responses have been received to the public hearing notice for this case.

Vice Chairman Thomason asked if there were any other questions for Staff, and seeing none, the public hearing was opened, and the applicant was asked to come forward.

Ahmed Allami, 2100 Alamo Road, restaurant owner, introduced himself as the applicant.

Hayi Anon, 325 Blackthorn Drive, Plano, introduced herself as Mr. Allami's translator.

Vice Chairman Thomason asked if applicant had a presentation.

Ms. Anon said no, but they are available to answer any questions.

Commissioner Roberts asked if they are planning to have any kind of visual barrier on the east side.

Ms. Anon advised there would not be a barrier.

Commissioner Roberts asked if the restaurant would have a line of site right to the back of Café Brazil.

Ms. Anon said no.

Commissioner Roberts asked why 4.6% landscaping was allowed instead of the required 7%.

Andrew Bogda said the landscaping provided is consistent with what was previously approved with the PD in 2023.

Commissioner Roberts asked how they would manage to keep people outside of the required 10-foot radius.

Ms. Anon answered they plan to have a sectioned off area for hookah that will be 10 feet away from any doors.

Vice Chairman Thomason asked if they had conducted any neighborhood outreach.

Ms. Anon said they reached out to the Canyon Creek HOA, who responded to ask about hours of operation.

Vice Chairman Thomason asked how long the restaurant has been open.

Ms. Anon said a few months.

Vice Chairman Thomason asked if their business is dependent on having hookah as an offering.

Ms. Anon answered no, the restaurant is viable without hookah.

Commissioner Quirk asked why they decided to stay open so late.

Ms. Anon said it is an appropriate time for their business, and they would not be serving alcohol.

Commissioner Quirk said he felt the late hours would attract the wrong crowd for the neighborhood and asked if patrons are allowed to bring their own tobacco products.

Ms. Anon replied no.

Commissioner Keller asked if the 2:00 a.m. time is exclusively tied to the Special Permit for hookah.

Ms. Anon said the restaurant is also open until 2:00 a.m.

Commissioner Keller asked if they had much of a crowd at 2:00 a.m.

Ms. Anon said no.

Commissioner Keller asked how many tables would be on the patio in the smoking area.

Ms. Anon said there would be 4 tables.

With no further questions for the applicant, Vice Chairman Thomason asked if anyone would like to come forward and speak in favor or opposition to the request.

Seeing no more speakers, Commissioner Roberts made a motion to close the public hearing. Commissioner Beach seconded the motion. Motion passed 5-0.

Commissioner Roberts said, in the absence of any neighborhood resistance, this use would fit with the cultural aspect of Richardson, and he is in favor of the proposed request.

Commissioner Beach commented Richardson is a very diverse and multicultural city and he approved of the request.

Commissioner Keller said the restaurant owners have successfully operated solely as a restaurant, therefore having hookah would be a secondary use, and he is in favor of the request.

Commissioner Quirk said his only concern are the operating hours.

Vice Chairman Thomason said they need to make sure the HOA approved of the hours of operation. He said this is a viable restaurant that is not dependent on the hookah and is far enough away from any neighborhood, so he does not see there being a concern with the 4-table limitation. This restaurant is clearly not designed to be a hookah lounge, and with the eclectic feeling of the area, it fits in. He stated there seems to be a fear of hookah based on some prior things that have happened, but also cultural differences, as well as how the Texas Legislature is aiming to address THC which may cause concerns regarding what is in the hookah tobacco. He stated this particular case should not warrant any fear beyond the typical stigmas associated with hookah by those not familiar with hookah or the culture; as a result, he is inclined to favor the request.

**Motion:** Commissioner Roberts made a motion to recommend approval of the request as presented. Commissioner Beach seconded the motion. Motion passed 5-0.

### **ADJOURN**

With no further business before the Commission, Vice Chairman Thomason adjourned the regular business meeting at 7:26 p.m.

---

Jeremy Thomason, Vice Chairman

# Agenda Item 2

Zoning File 25-15:  
Senior Activity Center