MINUTES PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING City Hall, 385 South Goliad, Rockwall, Texas Council Chambers February 12, 2019 6:00 P.M.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Lyons called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. The Commissioners present at the meeting were, Jerry Welch, Eric Chodun, Mark Moeller, Tracey Logan, John Womble, and Annie Fishman. Staff members present were Planning Director, Ryan Miller, Planning Manager, David Gonzales, Senior Planer Korey Brooks, Planning Coordinator, Laura Morales, City Engineer, Amy Williams, Civil Engineers, Jeremy White and Sarah Hager.

II. CONSENT AGENDA

1. Approval of Minutes for the January 2, 2018 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.

2. SP2019-001

Discuss and consider a request by Reese Baez of Triton General Contractors on behalf of Kevin Lefere for the approval of a site plan for a medical office building on a 0.26-acre portion of a larger one (1) acre tract of land identified as Block 26 of the Garner Addition, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Planned Development District 50 (PD-50) for Residential-Office (RO) District land uses, situated within the North Goliad Corridor Overlay (NGC OV) District, located north of the northwest corner of the intersection of W. Heath Street and S. Goliad Street [SH-205], and take any action necessary.

Commissioner Welch made a motion to approve the consent agenda. Commissioner Chodun seconded the motion which passed by a vote of 7-0.

III. APPOINTMENTS

3. Appointment with Architectural Review Board representative to receive the Board's recommendations and comments for items on the agenda requiring architectural review.

Architectural Review representative gave a brief explanation concerning agenda items that were discussed at the Architectural Review Board meeting.

Chairman Lyons indicated that agenda item #5 would be moved up.

IV. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

4. Z2019-001

Hold a public hearing to discuss and consider approval of a text amendment to Article IV, *Permissible Uses*, and Article V, *District Development Standards*, of the Unified Development Code [Ordinance No. 04-38] for the purpose of incorporating standards for a *Barn or Agricultural Accessory Building* and to amend the land use conditions for the *Guest Quarters/Secondary Living Unit* land use, and take any action necessary.

Planning Director, Ryan Miller, provided a brief explanation and background pertaining to agenda item. On January 7, 2019 the City Council directed staff to amend the Land Use Standards contained in Article IV, Permissible Uses, of the UDC to allow guest quarters/secondary living units not meeting the requirements stated in the Land Use Standards the ability to request a Specific Use Permit. In addition, the City Council also directed staff to create a land use for Barns or Agricultural Accessory Buildings. This direction came in response to a request by a citizen to amend the code to allow an 4,950 square feet, metal barn that would contain a storage area for eight vehicles and a guest quarters/secondary living facility, the facility includes all components of a residential living unit kitchen, bathroom, on a property zoned Agricultural District.

Mr. Miller advised the Commission staff was available for questions.

Chairman Lyons opened up the public hearing and asked if there was anyone wished to speak to come forward and do so; there being no one indicating such Chairman Lyons closed the public hearing and brought the item back to the Commission for discussion or a motion.

Following brief discussion Commissioner Welch made a motion to approve the text amendment with Barn or Agricultural Accessory Buildings being allowed through a Specific Use Permit in the Agricultural District. Chairman Lyons seconded the motion which passed by a vote of 7-0.

5. Z2019-002

Hold a public hearing to discuss and consider a request by Mark W. Pross of Pross Design Group, Inc. on behalf of Carolina Molina of Alvaplast US (SPR Packaging) for the approval of a Specific Use Permit (SUP) for a structure that exceeds 60-feet in a Light Industrial (LI) District on a 42.61-acre tract of land identified as Tract 7 of the N. Butler Survey, Abstract No. 20 (*11.3736-acres*); Tract 31 of the R. Ballard Survey, Abstract No. 29 (*8.197-acres*); and, Lot 1-01, Block 1, Indalloy Addition (*14.53-acres*), City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Light Industrial (LI) District, situated at the terminus of Aluminum Plant Road, and take any action necessary.

Planning Manager, David Gonzales, indicated that the applicant has requested to withdraw the case at this time and action will be required to be taken.

Commissioner Moeller made a motion to accept the withdrawal. Commissioner Fishman seconded the vote which passed by a vote of 7-0

V. ACTION ITEMS

6. SP2019-002

Discuss and consider a request by Chuck Vickers of T & C Main Street Holdings, LLC for the approval of a site plan for an office building on a 0.50-acre parcel of land identified as Block 80B of the B. F. Boydston Addition, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Residential-Office (RO) District, addressed as 108 St. Mary's Street, and take any action necessary.

Senior Planner, Korey Brooks, provided a brief background and explanation of the request. On April 2 2018, the City Council approved a request to rezone the subject property from a Single-Family 7 District to a Residential-Office (RO) District. The request included a second property, 106 St. Mary's Street). At the time of the rezoning request, the property owners stated that the intent was to convert two single-family homes into two residential-office buildings. The Residential-Office District is a unique district that allows live/work arrangements with the intention of extending the life of older homes by allowing them to be converted into low-intensity office buildings. These areas usually serve as a transition between high-intensity, nonresidential land uses to low-intensity residential land uses. The flexibility of live/work arrangements in a Residential-Office District allows a residential-office structure to be utilized as a single-family home, an office, or both. The applicant is requesting approval of a site plan to convert an existing single-family home to an office building. The home is approximately 1,423 SF including the garage. The applicant is proposing to demolish the existing garage, which reduces the size of the structure to approximately 1,221 square feet. The exterior of the existing structure is clad with hardie board or a similar cementitious material and the applicant is proposing to add an approximately three foot stone wainscot to each façade. Since the structure is being converted from a single-family home to an office building, it will require a parking lot to be constructed. The applicant is proposing to locate the parking lot behind the main structure and provide landscape screening in conjunction with an existing six foot tall wooden fence to screen the property from the adjacent residential properties.

118Mr. Brooks further noted that the Future Land Use Plan shows the subject property being119located in the Downtown District and designated for Live/Work land uses. The Downtown120District contains some of the City's oldest structures and maintains its small town atmosphere121by utilizing strategies such as live/work arrangements, historic preservation, and the adaptive122reuse of existing buildings. Given the proximity of the subject property to S. Goliad Street and123the surrounding Commercial/Retail land uses, the proposed office building appears to be a124natural transition from the high-intensity, non-residential land uses west of the subject property

125 to the lower intensity land uses east of the subject property. Since the subject property is 126 designated for Live/Work land uses, the existing structure utilized as a single-family home, an 127 office, or both. The applicant's request to convert a single-family home into an office building 128 conforms to the Future Land Use Plan and the strategies implemented in the Downtown District. 129 According to the Unified Development Code, Residential-Office Districts "...recognize the 130 existence of older residential areas where older homes can be converted into low-intensity office 131 uses..." Additionally, the Residential-Office District "...provides low-intensity services such as 132 offices, medical and professional services, and some limited retail businesses to residents in the 133 adjacent neighborhoods ... " Residential-Office Districts serve as a transition between high-134 intensity, non-residential uses or busy arterial roadways to lower intensity residential uses and 135 should have access to major or secondary thoroughfares. With that being said, the applicant's request for approval of a site plan to convert an existing single-family home to an office building 136 137 appears to be in conformance with the intent of the Residential-Office District. Currently, there 138 is residential adjacency to the east, and the proposed office would serve as a transition between 139 the higher intensity General Retail District land uses to the west of the subject property and the 140 lower intensity residential uses to the east. The Unified Development Code requires a six foot 141 masonry-screening wall be constructed for all non-residential property adjacent to residentially 142 zoned or used property; however, the code does give the Planning and Zoning Commission the 143 discretion to approve alternative landscape screening plans when warranted. In this case, the 144 adjacent residential subdivision has an existing six foot wood fence that extends along the 145 entire adjacency. Based on this, the applicant has indicated a preference to use a thick 146 vegetative screen utilizing trees and bushes in lieu of the required masonry-screening wall and 147 staff has requested an updated landscape plan reflecting these changes; however, the applicant 148 has failed to provide the plan prior to the resubmission date. As a result, staff has added a 149 condition of approval requiring that the applicant resubmit a landscape plan showing canopy 150 trees planted on 20-foot centers and mature bushes planted in a staggered pattern along the 151 eastern property line along the entire residential adjacency. If the Planning and Zoning 152 Commission chooses to approve this alternative screening method the applicant would be 153 required to submit a landscape plan showing conformance to this requirement prior to 154 submitting civil plans and/or a building permit. 155

> Mr. Brooks went on to share that the Architectural Review Board reviewed the building elevations and passed a motion to recommend approval of the site plan. He then advised the Commission that the applicant was present and available for questions.

> Commissioner Womble asked if the screening was only required on the one side. Mr. Brooks indicated it is only required on the residential adjacency which in this case is only on the one side. South of the property is the Post Office and west of the property is General Retail District. Commissioner Womble asked if they are removing part of the structure. Mr. Brooks indicated that they are removing the garage.

> Commissioner Fishman asked if they require a masonry wall, would they be required to also do the landscape buffer. Mr. Brooks indicated it was discretionary to the Commission. Discussion took place between the Commission in regards to what would be a better fit for the property the landscape buffer or the masonry wall.

Chairman Lyons asked the applicant to come forward.

Jeff Carol 750 E. IH-30 Rockwall, TX

156 157

158

159 160

161

162

163

164

165 166

167

168

169

170 171

172 173

174

175

176 177

178

179

180

181

183

184

185

Mr. Carol came forward and provided additional comments in regards to the case. He shared that they feel the living screen makes the most sense in this situation. With the mixture of the bushes and the trees it provides a good buffer to the residential adjacency. He indicated he was available for questions.

182 Chairman Lyons brought the item back to the Commission for further discussion or action. Chairman Lyons generally shared being in favor of the landscape buffer as it offers a better transition as opposed to the masonry wall. Commissioner Fishman expressed the same opinion.

Chairman Lyons made a motion to approve SP2019-002 with staff recommendations and the condition that a thick vegetative screen be planted and maintained adjacent to the residential properties to the east. Commissioner Chodun seconded the motion which passed by a vote of 7-0.

7. SP2019-003

186

187

188

189

190 191

192

193

194

195

196

197

Discuss and consider a request by Matt Moore of ClayMoore Engineering, Inc. for the approval of a site plan for a multi-tenant office/warehouse complex on a 7.52-acre portion of a larger 9.76-acre tract of land identified as Lot 18 and the south portion of Lot 19, Rainbow Acres Addition, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Commercial (C) District, addressed as 407 Ranch Trail, and take any action necessary.

198 Senior Planner, Korey Brooks, provided a brief explanation and background pertaining to the 199 request. The applicant is requesting approval of a site plan for a multi-tenant office/warehouse 200 complex on the subject property. The proposed facility consists of 11 office buildings on 201 approximately seven acres. The proposed buildings will be approximately 4,999 square feet. 202 constructed of metal, utilize roll-up doors, and have a pitched roof design. The applicant is 203 proposing to incorporate a seven foot stone and brick wainscot on all building façades that are 204 visible from the street. The remaining buildings will be internal to the complex, be constructed 205 of metal, and will not be visible from the street. In order to provide some variation in the 206 building facades, the applicant is proposing to utilize a contrasting roof and trim color, and utilize metal awnings on the façades visible from the street. Additionally, the applicant is 207 208 proposing to provide landscape screening adjacent to the northern property line to screen the 209 property from the adjacent residential land uses. According to the applicant, the intent of the 210 development is to provide offices for multiple tenants such as plumbers, contractors, or other 211 similar uses. Additionally the applicant has submitted a treescape plan showing that 38.5 212 caliper-inches of primary protected trees and 493 caliper-inches of secondary protected trees 213 will be required to be removed to develop the subject property. According to the Unified 214 Development Code, primary protected trees require mitigation calculated on an inch-for-inch 215 basis and secondary protected trees require mitigation of 1/2 the total caliper inches being 216 removed. Based on the submitted treescape plan, the total mitigation balance for both primary 217 and secondary protected trees is 285 caliper-inches. Since the applicant is planting 150 caliper-218 inches within the proposed development, the remaining balance will be 135 caliper-inches. The 219 Unified Development Code allows up to 20% of the total tree mitigation to be paid to the City's 220 tree fund. The Unified Development Code gives the City Council the ability to approve 221 alternative tree mitigation agreements, pending a recommendation from the Planning and 222 Zoning Commission. Since the applicant is proposing to exceed the 20% maximum allowable 223 tree mitigation paid to the City's tree fund by proposing 47% of total mitigation balance, an 224 alternative tree mitigation plan will need to be approved by the City Council, pending a 225 recommendation by the Planning and Zoning Commission. 226

227 Mr. Brooks further noted that the Future Land Use Plan indicates that the subject property is 228 located in the Southwest Residential District and is situated within an area that is identified as a 229 Transitional Area. According to the district, the Transitional Area is defined as, "...currently 230 transitioning from interim land uses and building types to more permanent structures with 231 conforming land uses. These areas should be given special consideration with regard to requests that further the establishment of uses and structures that will improve the property 232 values of the adjacent properties ... " In this case, the applicant is proposing a multi-tenant office 233 234 facility that is composed of metal buildings. This use and the proposed metal buildings are 235 similar to the existing buildings in the area, and the proposed improvements are similar to other 236 buildings that have been approved along Ranch Trail since this area was annexed by the City in 237 2004. The Unified Development Code states that the Commercial District is a district intended to 238 provide commercial land uses such as retail, large shopping centers, and restaurants. 239 Commercial Districts are generally situated in close proximity to an arterial or major collector 240 that is capable of carrying the traffic generated by the land uses in the district. In addition, these 241 areas may require increased water, fire protection, and wastewater and drainage capacity. Since 242 the Commercial District is general in nature, development standards are less stringent as lower 243 intensity districts such as Residential-Office, Neighborhood Services, and General Retail 244 Districts. In this case, the applicant's proposal is adjacent to County Line Road identified as a 245 Minor Collector on the City's Master Thoroughfare Plan, and the office land use is not typically a 246 high volume water/wastewater user. With regard to the land use, an office complex is permitted 247 by-right in a Commercial District. Additionally according to the Unified Development Code, nonresidential developments that are directly across the street from a residential development should incorporate a minimum ten foot landscape buffer that incorporates trees on 50-foot centers. In this case, the applicant's plan does appear to meet the minimum requirements.

Mr. Brooks then went over the details of the variances and exceptions that are being requested by the applicant to the construction materials and building articulation. He then advised the Commission the applicant was present and available for questions as well as staff.

- Chairman Lyons asked the applicant to come forward.
- Robert LaCroix Scenic Drive Rowlett, TX

 Mr. LaCroix provided a power point presentation and shared a brief explanation of the request. The presentation included pictures of surrounding metal buildings to the subject property. He provided a picture of the site plan and shared the project will be done in two phases with the complete infrastructure being done in the first phase. He added that they feel this building will be an improvement to the area and owner operated which will allow the owner to maintain the integrity of the site.

Following brief discussion Commissioner Welch made a motion to approve to approve SP2019-003 with staff recommendations and recommended approval of the alternative tree mitigation plan. Commissioner Moeller seconded the vote which passed by a vote of 6-0 with Commissioner Logan dissenting.

VI. DISCUSSION ITEMS

Planning Manager, David Gonzales, provided a brief update about the outcome of the above referenced case at the City Council meeting.

- 8. Director's report of post City Council meeting outcomes for development cases.
- ✓ P2019-002: Lot 2, Block A, Houser Addition [Approved]
- ✓ P2019-003: Lot 2, Block B, R. W. Marketcenter Addition [Approved]
- ✓ P2019-004: Lot 7, Block A, Temunovic Addition [Approved]
- ✓ Z2018-056: Zoning Change (AG to LI) for Friendship Baptist Church (1st Reading) [Approved]
- ✓ Z2018-057: Amendment to Planned Development District 57 (PD-57) (2nd Reading) [Approved]
- ✓ Z2018-058: SUP for a Craft Winery and Commercial/Amusement Outdoors (1st Reading) [Approved]
- ✓ Z2018-059: Zoning Change (SFE-2.0 to SFE-1.5) for 1085 Dalton Road (2nd Reading) [Approved]
- VII. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Lyons adjourned the meeting at 6:54 p.m.

296	
297	PASSED AND APPROVED BY THE PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF ROCKWALL,
298	Texas, this day of, 2019.
299	
300	$\sqrt{0}$
301	Ali
302	Johnny Lyons, Chairman
303	
304	Attest:
305	Galling Un all all all all all all all all all al
306	Juna Turalka
307	Laura Morales, Planning Coordinator
308	