
**MINUTES
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
Meeting of June 2, 2009**

The Planning and Zoning Commission of the City of Cedar Hill, Texas met on TUESDAY, June 2, 2009 at 6:00 p.m. in the T.W. "Turk" Cannady/Cedar Hill Room, 285 Uptown Blvd. Building 100, Cedar Hill, Texas.

Present: Chairman Bill Strother and Commissioners Theresa Brooks, Todd Hinton, Steve Mason, Tim Hamilton and Gehrig Saldaña.

Absent: None.

I. Call the meeting to order

Chairman Strother called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m. declaring it an open meeting in which a quorum was present and the meeting notice was duly posted.

II. Approve the minutes of the May 19 2009 meeting

A motion was made by Commissioner Hamilton to approve the minutes of the May 19, 2009 meeting, as presented. The motion was seconded by Commission Brooks. The vote was as follows:

Ayes: 4 – Chairman Strother and Commissioners Brooks, Hamilton and Saldana.

Nays: 0

Abstention: 2- Hinton and Mason.

Chairman Strother declared the motion carried.

III. Citizens Forum

No one spoke

IV. Case No. 09-10 – Review and consider the revised Site Plan of Chase Bank for a proposed drive-thru automated teller machine (ATM) on Lot 2, Block A, Cedar Hill Village Addition, more commonly known as 225 North Highway 67. *Requested by Pablo Chavez of Security Vault Works, Inc.*

Bobby Huskins of Security Vault Works, Inc., 8904 North Royal Lane, Irving, TX. 75063, stepped forth to present this request and answer any questions from the Commission.

Mr. Huskins stated that this item was considered last night by the Architectural Review Board (ARB). The ARB recommended that the vertical panels be wrapped in brick or stone to match the exterior of the bank. When he reported this [recommendation] to his client, they proposed an alternative design of a half height masonry finish, with irrigated landscaping in the approach island. He stated one of his client's primary concerns was keeping their branding visible on the canopy. Mr. Huskins stated that his office is currently working on two sets of revised plans, one set as per ARB's recommendation and the other set being the alternative design proposed by his client. At this point he was unclear as to the next step in the approval process, whether or not they needed to go back to the ARB for consideration of their alternative design or can the Planning & Zoning Commission (P&Z) act upon this request; therefore, Mr. Huskins asked Rod Tyler, Director of Planning for guidance.

Mr. Tyler stated that the P&Z had the option of considering this item with or without the ARB's recommendation due to the fact that the P&Z reviews different elements [of a site plan] than the ARB.

Referring to the changes the applicant is proposing, Mr. Tyler stated that there are two ways of handling this. The first option would be to go back before the ARB for consideration of the alternative design and then be placed on the next available City Council agenda. He advised the applicant that the ARB only meets once a month and so it may be several weeks before this item would be considered by City Council. The second option would be to go before the City Council as currently scheduled; however, since this item will be placed on the consent agenda, it will be *approved as per* the recommendations of the ARB and the P&Z. In order for the applicant to present an alternative plan to City Council, he must request that this item be removed from the consent agenda and placed on the regular agenda. Mr. Tyler asked the applicant to submit drawings of the proposed alternative design and a letter requesting this item be removed from the consent agenda and placed on the regular agenda.

Mr. Huskins stated that going back before the ARB would push their project well into July or later and he would rather go as scheduled to City Council on June 9, 2009. He stated that he would get a letter and revised drawings to Mr. Tyler in the morning.

Mr. Tyler advised the Commission that it would be acceptable for them to act upon this item since the changes proposed did not affect other site plan elements such as the location of the ATM.

Commissioner Mason asked the applicant if he was aware of staff's comment regarding any new lighting being Dark Sky compliant.

Mr. Huskins stated he was unaware of this comment, but any new lighting being proposed will be Dark Sky compliant.

Speaking to the Chairman and seeking to clarify what the Commission is actually considering, Commissioner Hinton asked if a motion should include the following: staff recommendations that all lighting be Dark Sky compliant, revision of the site plan to include street names and a location map as well as the alternative design proposed by the applicant.

Chairman Strother confirmed Commissioner Hinton's account of the items under consideration by the Commission.

A motion was made by Commissioner Hinton to approve Case No. 09-10, subject to the following staff recommendations: all lighting is Dark Sky compliant, revision of the site plan to include street names and a location map, as well as the alternative design proposed by the applicant that was discussed at tonight's meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Mason. The vote was as follows:

Ayes: 6 – Chairman Strother and Commissioners Brooks, Mason, Hinton, Hamilton and Saldana.

Nays: 0

Chairman Strother declared the motion carried.

V. Reports

1. Discussion on 2008 Comprehensive Plan Implementation

Don Gore, City Planner, reviewed with the Commission the [Comprehensive] implementation work plan.

Commissioner Hinton expressed concerns over a reference to cluster housing. He stated he was unable to find a reference for that type of housing in the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Brooks stated that she requested cluster housing be mentioned as one of the options for varied housing types.

Again, Commissioner Hinton expressed his concerns over the reference to cluster housing and seeing that it is not mentioned in the Comprehensive Plan, then it should not be discussed as an option [for housing types].

Chairman Strother commented to the Commission as a whole and stated that at this point nothing [with the Comprehensive Plan] is proposed to be amended; at this point all new ideas and strategies are open for discussion.

In the interest of moving forward, Mr. Gore stated that staff will investigate alternative housing options and report back to the Commission.

Commissioner Brooks stated it was her intent for Staff and the Commission to examine *all* types of housing options. She further stated that in some areas of the City such as the downtown/uptown area, more intense residential may be a better fit.

Chairman Strother stated that the City should begin working on a Transit Oriented Development (TOD) plan now, even though the state's legislators haven't approved funding.

Commissioner Hamilton asked if the City has a funding mechanism in place to purchase land for the purpose of a rail station and/or public parking lot.

Mr. Tyler stated that the City has options at their disposal to purchase land if and when the time comes; however he stressed at this point, the Commission should be focusing on developing the framework for a [TOD] plan.

In preparation for the next P&Z meeting, Mr. Gore asked the Commissioners to study the work plan. In reviewing the plan, he asked them to think in terms of the “big picture”, how they would like to see development occurring in the future and what plans or procedures they should focus on to bring their vision to fruition.

Chairman Strother asked Staff if they attended the Economic Development Corporation’s (EDC) meetings and how closely did we work with them.

Mr. Tyler stated that generally Staff does not attend the EDC’s board meetings; however they do work fairly closely with staff.

2. Recent Submittals

Mr. Tyler reviewed with the Commission recent submittals.

VI. Adjourn

A motion was made, followed by a second for adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 7:16 p.m.

Bill Strother
Chairman

Belinda L. Huff
Planning Secretary
