



**REGULAR PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES  
MAY 7, 2018**

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chairperson Lynn Motley, Vice-Chairperson Joshua Spare, Secretary John Lopez, Commissioners Cheryl Smith, Janie Adhikari, Eduardo Carranza, Shawn Connor, Clayton Fisher, Max Coleman, Eduardo Carranza.

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: None

CITY STAFF PRESENT: Steve Norwood, Director of Development Services, David Jones, Chief City Planner, Charles Lee, Senior Planner, Savannah Ware, Senior Planner, Colby Collins, Planner, Planner, Daon Stephens, Transportation Planner, Walter Shumac, Transportation Director, Mark Dempsey, Deputy City Attorney, Chris Hartmann, Executive Assistant.

Chairperson Motley called the meeting to order in the Council Chambers in the City Hall Building at 6:30 p.m. Chairperson Motley gave the invocation, Commissioner Spare led the pledge of allegiance to the US Flag, and the pledge of allegiance to the Texas Flag.

PUBLIC HEARING AGENDA Item #15– S180502 - Site Plan - Retail at Victory at Lakeridge, Lot 3 (City Council District 6). Senior Planner Savannah Ware presented the case report and gave a Power Point presentation to approve a Site Plan for a 7,613 sq. ft. retail building on 1.035 acres. Lot 3, Block 1, Victory at Lakeridge, City of Grand Prairie, Tarrant County, Texas, zoned PD-283, within the Lake Ridge Overlay District, and addressed as 5150 Lake Ridge Pkwy. The applicant is Patrick Filson and the owner is Kris Ramji, Victory at Lake Ridge.

Ms. Ware stated the proposed use is retail; however, the names of prospective tenants are not available at this time. The initial application indicated that an urgent care facility intended to locate here, but this user is no longer a prospective tenant. The site is accessible from a drive off of Lake Ridge and an access easement across Lot 4. The applicant must extend the drive across Lot 4 before any building permits will be approved. The applicant must also construct a temporary turnaround for the fire lane on Lot 4 immediately east of the site. The proposal meets the density and dimensional requirements. The proposal meets the landscape and screening requirements.

Ms. Ware noted since the site is adjacent to single family residential use, the applicant must provide a screening wall and a 15 ft. landscape buffer with trees along the common property line. The proposal meets these requirements. A screening wall is depicted on the property line; the applicant must coordinate with the High Hawk PID and homeowners to ensure that there is not a gap between the screening wall and single family fences. Once the wall has been constructed, individual homeowners may keep their fence or tear it down and tie into the screening wall. The building

elevations consist primarily of brick and stone with stucco and metal accents. The proposed elevations appear to meet the building materials requirements. However, due to technical inconsistencies in the materials calculation table, Staff is unable to verify that the elevations meet the stone accent requirement. The proposed building elevations are in substantial compliance with Appendix F. The proposed elevations include a fin feature that is 41 ft. tall and extends above the highest parapet by 15 ft. The UDC makes height allowances for certain architectural features. Elements such as ornamental cupolas, domes, spires, and parapet walls are not taken into account when determining the height of a building. Additionally, Appendix F states that a customer entrance feature is permitted to extend up to a maximum of 30 ft. above the highest parapet wall elevation. However, the applicant intends to use the feature for signage. Given the intended function, Staff has made the determination to evaluate this feature as a sign instead of an architectural feature.

Ms. Ware stated the applicant is requesting a variance to allow signage that exceeds the maximum allowable height and area. The fin feature exceeds the height allowed for roof signs by 15 ft. and the area intended to be used for signage exceeds 50 sq. ft. When unique use, site conditions, or other unusual factors exist, applicants may request a variance to the sign ordinance through a Unified Signage Plan. The Unified Signage Plan should encourage unique treatments, materials, and maintenance, and take precedent over the signage requirements addressed in UDC. Staff does not support the applicant's request for a variance. The specific user is unknown at this time and there does not appear to be unique site conditions or other unusual factors. Additionally, the site is adjacent to single family residential use. Given this close proximity, Staff has concerns about the requested variance.

Ms. Ware stated the Development Review Committee recommends approval with the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall submit revised building elevations with the corrected materials calculations and projecting cornice prior to City Council;
2. The applicant shall coordinate with the High Hawk PID and adjacent single family property owners to coordinate the installation of the screening wall. This coordination shall take place before the applicant submits building permit applications for the screening wall;
3. The applicant shall extend the drive across Lot 4 consistent with the access easement established with the Final Plat for Lot 4 and construct the temporary turnaround before beginning construction on the building; and
4. The applicant shall revise the building elevations to comply with the UDC. This can be done by
  - Reducing the height of the fin feature,
  - Removing the fin, or
  - Replacing the fin with an architectural feature or customer entrance feature that is consistent with the intent of Appendix F.

Chairperson Motley noted there were no questions for staff, opened the public hearing, and called for individuals wishing to speak on this item.

Eleana Tuley with Kirkman Engineering, 4821 Merlot Avenue, Suite 210, Grapevine, TX stepped forward representing the case and to answer questions from the commission.

There being no discussion on the case Commissioner Smith moved to close the public hearing and approve case S180502 as presented by staff. The action and vote being recorded as follows:

Motion: Smith

Second: Spare

Ayes: Adhikari, Carranza, Coleman, Connor, Fisher, Lopez, Motley, Smith, Spare

Nays: None

**Approved: 9-0**

Motion: carried.