

EXCERPTS
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
March 19, 2019

Case Number 63-2020

A request by A Civil Group (agent) on behalf of McRob Investments, LLC (owner) for a Planned Development Plan (PD Plan) and a revised statement of intent (SOI) for lots 29, 30, 50, 51 and 52 of Mikel's Subdivision. The "Jackson-Sexton Artisan Industries PD Plan" includes the entirety of the approximately 1.17-acre property, which is split-zoned PD (Planned Development) and M-C (Mixed-Use Corridor). The property has frontage on both Sexton Road and Jackson Street, to the north of Mikel Street and south of the Business Loop and is addressed 715 and 713 West Sexton Road and 610 Jackson Street.

MR. TOOHEY: Mr. Zenner, can we have a staff report?

Staff report was given by Mr. Pat Zenner of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the Jackson-Sexton Artisan Industries PD and Landscaping Plan and the associated revised Statement of Intent.

MR. TOOHEY: Thank you, Mr. Zenner. Before we continue, I would like to ask any Commissioner who has had ex parte communications prior to this meeting related to Case Number 63-2020, please disclose that now so that all Commissioners have the same information to consider on behalf of this case before us. Anyone? Perfect. Anyone have any questions for staff? Ms. Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: The 46 parking spaces, is that the minimum parking spaces that would be required by UDC?

MR. ZENNER: That is slightly over what the minimum is. However, given the nature of the site and the potential mix of uses, because we cannot control that it would just be artisan industry that would occupy the buildings, we wanted to error on the side of greatest caution, so the 46 is the maximum amount that would be permitted, but the likelihood of them being possibly used if the building were to be -- both buildings were to be completely artisan industry is unknown. M-C zoning does allow for a whole gamut of other commercial uses; therefore, we had to plan for the worst. A portion of the easternmost building, as we understand it, is -- two of the four bays are going to be allocated out to a landscaping company. They have parking areas that are identified on the plan if you have looked at it in detail that actually are shown as being potentially fenced in in order to secure their equipment. The remaining six bays then may be used for other retail purposes, other than artisan industry. And if we had a brew pub or we had something else which would be considered artisan industry, that could generate a significant amount of traffic in our mind, though the site right now as parked would not be creating a neighborhood parking problem. So reductions of parking could spill that off into the neighborhood, which is what we would like to avoid, as well.

MR. TOOHEY: Any other questions? Okay. At this point, we'll go ahead and open the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MR. TOOHEY: If anyone would like to come forward to give any relevant information in this case, please come forward. Apparently, we have none, so we'll go ahead and close the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MR. TOOHEY: Commissioners? Ms. Russell?

MS. RUSSELL: I have a motion. In the case of 63-2020 regarding Jackson-Sexton Artisan Industry PD Plan and SOI revision, I move to approve the PD Plan and SOI revision.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MR. TOOHEY: Thank you, Mr. Stanton, for your second. Any discussion? Seeing none, Ms. Burns -- oh, sorry.

MS. CARROLL: I was raising my hand. Did you have discussion, Anthony?

MR. STANTON: No. I was looking at Ms. Russell, wondering why she didn't let me get the motion in.

MS. BURNS: Got your name down.

MS. CARROLL: Okay.

MR. TOOHEY: Ms. Carroll, do you have any --

MS. CARROLL: Yeah. I'm just -- I'm not sold on the plan in light of the cap I think that we want less surface parking. I think that the trends have been not to plan for peak level parking, not to plan for the most parking, but to not -- but to plan for regular intensity of parking demands, and I'd -- I'd like to see that reflected in the future. I do like this plan, so it -- it's kind of a tough sell. That -- that's the choice that I'm weighing now.

MR. TOOHEY: Any other discussion? Ms. Burns?

MS. BURNS: And, Ms. Carroll, I appreciate your comment. I think working in an artist industry, there are times when you need additional parking if you have a show or an opening or an installation, and I know we don't know exactly what's going to be going into these businesses and the landscape company. I don't think 46 parking spaces -- I know where I work, we don't have enough parking and it's a consideration when we have an event or an opening or an installation. So I think since it fits within the parameters of the UDC, I'm willing to support this.

MR. TOOHEY: Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Plus it prevents that parking from spilling into the neighborhood, which would probably cause a big hoopla if they had to have a big event, so I'll support it.

MR. TOOHEY: Anyone else? All right. If no further discussion, Ms. Burns, will you please call the role.

MS. BURNS: Yes.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodman, Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohey, Ms. Burns, Ms. Carroll. Motion carries 7-0.

MS. BURNS: Seven to zero, motion carries.

MR. TOOHEY: Thank you, Ms. Burns. Our recommendation for approval will be forwarded to the City Council for their consideration.