## (I) CALL TO ORDER

(II) OPEN FORUM

This is a time for anyone to address the Planning and Zoning Commission on any topic that is not already listed on the agenda for a public hearing. Per the policies of the City of Rockwall, public comments are limited to three (3) minutes out of respect for the time of other citizens. On topics raised during the OPEN FORUM, please know that the Planning and Zoning Commission is not permitted to respond to your comments during the meeting per the Texas Open Meetings Act.

## (III) CONSENT AGENDA

These agenda items are administrative in nature or include cases that meet all of the technical requirements stipulated by the Unified Development Code (UDC) and Chapter 38, Subdivisions, of the Municipal Code of Ordinances, and do not involve discretionary approvals.
(1) Approval of minutes for the November 14, 2023 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.
(2) Approval of minutes for the November 28, 2023 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.
(3) SP2023-046 (HENRY LEE)

Discuss and consider a request by Cody Johnson of Johnson Volk Consulting on behalf of Stephen Pepper of SH Dev Klutts Rockwall, LLC for the approval of a Site Plan for Phase 1 of the Homestead Subdivision being a 196.009-acre tract of land identified as Tract 6 of the J. A. Ramsey Survey, Abstract No. 186, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Planned Development District 92 (PD-92), generally located at the northeast corner of the intersection of FM-549 and FM-1139, and take any action necessary.

## (IV) PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

This is a time for anyone to speak concerning their issues with a public hearing case. If you would like to speak regarding an item listed in this section, please submit a Request to Address the Planning and Zoning Commission (i.e. the yellow forms available at the podium or from staff). The Planning and Zoning Commission Chairman will call upon you to come forward at the proper time or will ask if anyone in the audience would like to speak. Please limit all comments to three (3) minutes out of respect for the time of other citizens.
(4) Z2023-052 (HENRY LEE)

Hold a public hearing to discuss and consider a request by Matt Wavering of the Rockwall Economic Development Corporation (REDC) on behalf of Paul Liechty of 36 Wagon Road, LLC and Shailesha Vora of Akshar 10, LLC for the approval of a Specific Use Permit (SUP) for an Office Building that will exceed 36 -feet in the Scenic Overlay (SOV) District on a 9.9406 -acre tract of land identified as Lots 22 \& 23, Block A, La Jolla Pointe Addition, Phase 2, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Commercial (C) District, situated within the Scenic Overlay (SOV) District and the $\mathrm{IH}-30$ Overlay (IH-30 OV) District, generally located west of the intersection of La Jolla Pointe Drive and Ridge Road [FM-740], and take any action necessary.
(5) Z2023-053 (HENRY LEE)

Hold a public hearing to discuss and consider a request by Matt Wavering of the Rockwall Economic Development Corporation (REDC) on behalf of Richard Chandler of HFS Management, Inc. for the approval of a Zoning Change amending Planned Development District 4 (PD-4) [Ordinance No. $72-03$ \& 01-26] being a 12.1462-acre tract of land identified as Tract 2 of the D. Atkins Survey, Abstract No. 1, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Planned Development District 4 (PD-4) for General Retail (GR) District land uses, situated within the Scenic Overlay (SOV) District, generally located in between Lakedale Drive and Becky Lane on the eastside of Ridge Road [FM-740], and take any action necessary.

## ACTION ITEMS

These items are not advertised public hearings and deal with discretionary approvals for the Planning and Zoning Commission related to variances and special exceptions to the technical requirements of the Unified Development Code (UDC) or Chapter 38, Subdivisions, of the Municipal Code of Ordinances.
(6) SP2023-034 (HENRY LEE)

Discuss and consider a request by Trenton Jones and Ben Sanchez of Parkhill on behalf of Frank New of Rockwall County for the approval of a Site Plan for a Government Building on a 1.90-acre portion of a larger 12.79-acre parcel of land identified as Lot 1, Block A, Rockwall County Courthouse Addition, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Commercial (C) District, situated within the IH-30 Overlay (IH-30) District, addressed as 963 E. Yellow Jacket Lane, and take any action necessary.
(7) SP2023-038 (ANGELICA GUEVARA)

Discuss and consider a request by Clay Cristy of ClayMoore Engineering on behalf of Staci Bowen of Metroplex Acquisition Fund, LP for the approval of a Site Plan for Restaurant with Less Than 2,000 SF with a Drive-Through or Drive-In (i.e. HTeaO) on a 0.93acre portion of a larger 5.16-acre parcel of land identified as Lot 13, Block A, Stone Creek Retail Addition, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Planned Development District 70 (PD-70) for General Retail (GR) District land uses, situated within North SH-205 Overlay (N. SH-205 OV) District, generally located at the northeast corner of the intersection of N. Goliad Street [SH-205] and Bordeaux Drive, and take any action necessary.
(8) SP2023-042 (ANGELICA GUEVARA)

Discuss and consider a request by Kamran Khan for the approval of an Amended Site Plan for an existing general retail building on a 0.55 -acre parcel of land identified as Lot 1, Block A, Burgamy Addition, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Commercial (C) District, situated within the Scenic Overlay (SOV) District, addressed as 1007 Ridge Road, and take any action necessary.
(9) SP2023-044 (HENRY LEE)

Discuss and consider a request by Hind Saad of RSG Engineering on behalf of Roy Bhavi of FlexSpace Business Parks, LLC for the approval of a Site Plan for a warehouse/office development on a 6.17-acre tract of land identified as Tract 2-01 of the D. Harr. Survey, Abstract No. 102, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Light Industrial (LI) District, situated within the Airport Overlay (AP OV) District, addressed as 1760 Airport Road, and take any action necessary.
(VI) DISCUSSION ITEMS
(10) Director's Report of post City Council meeting outcomes for development cases (RYAN MILLER).

- P2023-038: Final Plat for Lot 1, Block A, Tri-Tex Addition (APPROVED)
- Z2023-049: Specific Use Permit (SUP) for Heavy Manufacturing (2ND READING; APPROVED)
- Z2023-050: Specific Use Permit (SUP) for Guest Quarters/Secondary Living Unit for 605 E. Washington Street (2ND READING; APPROVED)
- Z2023-051: Zoning Change from AG to LI for 1775 Airport Road (2ND READING; APPROVED)


## (VII) ADJOURNMENT

The City of Rockwall Planning and Zoning Commission reserves the right to adjourn into executive session at any time to discuss any matters listed on the agenda above, as authorized by Texas Local Government Code $\$ 55.071$ (Consultation with City Attorney) or any other exception allowed under Chapter 551 of the Texas Local Government Code.

This facility is wheelchair accessible and accessible parking spaces are available. Request for accommodations or interpretive services must be made 48 hours prior to this meeting. Please contact the City Secretary's Office at (972) 772-6406 for further information.

I, Melanie Zavala, Planning and Zoning Coordinator for the City of Rockwall, Texas, do hereby certify that this Agenda was posted at City Hall, in a place readily accessible to the general public at all times, on December 8, 2023 at 5:00 PM, and remained so posted for at least 72 continuous hours preceding the scheduled time of said meeting.

NOTES: [1] ADDITIONAL CASE INFORMATION CAN BE FOUND AT HTTPS://SITES.GOOGLE.COM/SITE/ROCKWALLPLANNING/DEVELOPMENT/DEVELOPMENT-CASES, AND [2] TO PROVIDE INPUT ON A ZONING OR SPEICIFIC USE PERMIT CASE PLEASE CLICK HERE OR CLICK ON THE LINK ABOVE AND USE THE ZONING AND SPECIFIC USE PERMIT INPUT FORM ON THE CITY'S WEBSITE.

## I.CALL TO ORDER


#### Abstract

Chairman Deckard called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM. Commissioners present were Kyle Thompson, Jean Conway, Jay Odom, Ross Hustings and Brian Llewelyn. Staff members present were Director of Planning and Zoning Ryan Miller, Senior Planner Henry Lee, Planning Technician Angelica Guevara, Planning Coordinator Melanie Zavala, City Engineer Amy Williams, Assistant City Engineer Jonathan Browning and Civil Engineer Madelyn Price. Absent from the meeting was Planner Bethany Ross.


II.OPEN FORUM

This is a time for anyone to address the Planning and Zoning Commission on any topic that is not already listed on the agenda for a public hearing. Per the policies of the City of Rockwall, public comments are limited to three (3) minutes out of respect for the time of other citizens. On topics raised during the OPEN FORUM, please know that the Planning and Zoning Commission is not permitted to respond to your comments during the meeting per the Texas Open Meetings Act.

Chairman Deckard explained how the open forum is conducted and asked if anyone who wished to speak to come forward at this time; there being no one indicating such, Chairman Deckard closed the open forum.
III.CONSENT AGENDA

These agenda items are administrative in nature or include cases that meet all of the technical requirements stipulated by the Unified Development Code (UDC) and Chapter 38, Subdivisions, of the Municipal Code of Ordinances, and do not involve discretionary approvals.

1. Approval of minutes for the November 1, 2023 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.
2. P2023-034 (ANGELICA GUEVARA)

Consider a request by Billy Duckworth of A\&W Surveyors, Inc. on behalf of David Gamez for the approval of a Replat for Lots 2 \& 3, Block A, Gamez Addition being a 0.369 -acre parcel of land identified as Lot 1 , Block A, Gamez Addition, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Single-Family 7 (SF-7) District, situated within the Southside Neighborhood Residential Overlay (SRO) District, addressed as 614 E, Boydston Avenue, and take any action necessary.

Vice-Chairman Womble made a motion to approve Consent Agenda. Commissioner Conway seconded the motion which passed by a vote of 7-0.
IV.PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

This is a time for anyone to speak concerning their issues with a public hearing case. If you would like to speak regarding an item listed in this section, please submit a Request to Address the Planning and Zoning Commission (i.e. the yellow forms available at the podium or from staff). The Planning and Zoning Commission Chairman will call upon you to come forward at the proper time or will ask if anyone in the audience would like to speak. Please limit all comments to three (3) minutes out of respect for the time of other citizens.

## 3. Z2023-049 (RYAN MILLER)

Hold a public hearing to discuss and consider a request by Phil Wagner of the Rockwall Economic Development Corporation (REDC) for the approval of a Specific Use Permit (SUP) for Heavy Manufacturing on a 32.00 -acre portion of a larger 77.148 -acre tract of land identified as Tract 6 of the J. H. B. Jones Survey, Abstract No. 125, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Light Industrial (LI) District, located at the southwest corner of the intersection of Data Drive and Discovery Boulevard, and take any action necessary.

Director of Planning and Zoning Ryan Miller provided a brief summary in regard to the request. The applicant is requesting approval of a specific use permit (SUP) for a heavy manufacturing facility that will produce hydrogen fuel cells. The reason this is being presented to the commission is for the reason that they produce a large durable good. The proposed business does appear to be consistent with other businesses in the technology park area. A SUP is discretionary to the Planning and Zoning Commission and the City Council. Staff did mail out notices to property owners and occupants within 500 -feet of the subject property. This included 16 notices and as of now staff has not received any notices in return. Since this is a large facility with multiple phases the applicant has requested that the SUP be extended to a four (4) year.

Phil Wagner
2610 Observation Trail
Suite 104, Rockwall, TX 75087
Mr. Wagner came forward and provided additional details in regard to the request.

Chairman Deckard opened the public hearing and asked anyone who wished to speak to come forward at this time. There being no one indicating such, Chairman Deckard closed the public hearing and brought the item back to Commission for discussion or action.

Commissioner Llewelyn made a motion to approve Z2023-049. Vice-Chairman Womble seconded the motion which passed by a vote of 7-0.
Chairman Deckard advised this item will go before City Council on November 20, 2023.

## 4. Z2023-050 (ANGELICA GUEVARA)

Hold a public hearing to discuss and consider a request by Keith Green for the approval of a Specific Use Permit (SUP) for Guest Quarters/Secondary Living Unit on a 0.22 -acre parcel of land identified as Block 43A of the B. F. Boydston Addition, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Single-Family 7 (SF-7) District, situated within the Old Town Rockwall (OTR) Historic District, addressed as 605 E. Washington Street, and take any action necessary.

Planning Technician Angelica Guevara provided a brief summary in regard to the request. The applicant is requesting approval of a Specific Use Permit (SUP) for the purpose of constructing a 350 SF guest quarters/ secondary living unit on the subject property. The applicant has indicated that the proposed structure will match the existing single-family home and it'll have a half bath making it a guest quarters/ secondary living unit. Staff should note that there is an existing $8^{\prime} \times 14^{\prime}$ foot or 112 SF accessory building and a separate playhouse on the subject property, however if the proposed structure is approved it will be taking place of the playhouse on the property. According to the Unified Development Code (UDC) guest quarters are permitted to be $30 \%$ of the square footage of the primary structure. In this case the applicant is permitted by right in 862 SF guest quarters, the applicant is only requesting a 350 square foot guest quarters that represents approximately $8 \%$ of the primary structure. Based on this the proposed site plan and building elevations the proposed building does meet all the requirements for a guest quarters/ secondary living unit. Staff should also note that this did have to go before the Historic Preservation Advisory Board (HPAB) and they did approve the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA). This being a zoning case staff did mail out 82 notices to property owners and occupants within 500 - feet of the subject property. At this time staff has received one (1) notice in regard to the applicant's request.

Chairman Deckard opened the public hearing and asked anyone who wished to speak to come forward at this time. There being no one indicating such, Chairman Deckard closed the public hearing and brought the item back to Commission for discussion or action.

Commissioner Conway made a motion to approve Z2023-050. Commissioner Hustings seconded the motion which passed by a vote of 7-0.
Chairman Deckard advised this item will go before City Council on November 20, 2023.

## 5. Z2023-051 (ANGELICA GUEVARA)

Hold a public hearing to discuss and consider a request by Jeff Carroll of Carroll Architects, Inc. on behalf of Frank Conselman of Conselman Equities for the approval of a Zoning Change from an Agricultural (AG) District to a Light Industrial (LI) District for a 6.60-acre tract of land identified as Tracts 21 \& 21-01 of the D. Harr Survey, Abstract No. 102, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Agricultural (AG) District, situated in the Airport Overlay (AP OV) District, addressed as 1775 Airport Road, and take any action necessary.

Planning Technician Angelica Guevara provided a brief summary in regard to the request. The applicant is requesting to rezone the property from an Agricultural (AG) District to a Light Industrial (LI) District. The request is in conformance with the comprehensive plan and the future land use map. Staff should note that the properties adjacent to the subject property are zoned Light Industrial (LI) District and Agricultural (AG) District. Based on this the requesting zoning change does appear to conform to the surrounding area. This being a zoning case staff mailed out 14 notices to property owners and occupants within 500 -feet of the subject property. Currently staff has not received any notices in return to the applicant's request.

Jeff Carroll
750 E Interstate 30
Rockwall, TX 75087
Mr. Carroll came forward and provided additional details regarding the request.
Chairman Deckard explained how the open forum is conducted and asked if anyone who wished to speak to come forward at this time; there being no one indicating such, Chairman Deckard closed the open forum.

Commissioner Hustings made a motion to approve Z2023-051. Commissioner Llewelyn seconded the motion which passed by a vote of 7-0.
Chairman Deckard advised this item will go before City Council on November 20, 2023.
V.ACTION ITEMS

These items are not advertised public hearings and deal with discretionary approvals for the Planning and Zoning Commission related to variances and special exceptions to the technical requirements of the Unified Development Code (UDC) or Chapter 38, Subdivisions, of the Municipal Code of Ordinances.

## 6. SP2023-032 (HENRY LEE)

Discuss and consider a request by Salvador Salcedo for the approval of a Site Plan for an Office/Warehouse Building on a 0.45 -acre parcel of land identified as Lot 10, Block A, Municipal Industrial Park Addition, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, being zoned Light Industrial (LI) District, addressed as 855 Whitmore Drive, and take any action necessary.

Senior Planner Henry Lee provided a brief summary in regard to the request. The applicant is requesting approval of a site plan. They do generally meet the requirements for property located in the Light Industrial (LI) District, however they do have variances to their building. The primary issue is the primary and secondary articulation, essentially, they do not have articulation on the building. The Architectural Review Board (ARB) did look at this and they did recommend denial based that there was no articulation on the building. Staff did request a variance letter for the applicant indicating that they would be requesting this variance they did not provide us this letter and because they didn't, they also didn't provide compensatory measures for the requested variances.

Chairman Deckard asked about the material selection.
Director of Planning and Zoning Ryan Miller mentioned that this case was previously tabled after ARB asked them to re-design the building and add articulation meeting the ordinance. This was ultimately what they brought back, and this was not in line with what ARB had recommended therefore ARB moved to deny.

After some discussion, Chairman Deckard made a motion to deny SP2023-032. Commissioner Hustings seconded the motion to deny which passed by a vote of 7-0.
7. SP2023-034 (HENRY LEE)

Discuss and consider a request by Trenton Jones and Ben Sanchez of Parkhill on behalf of Frank New of Rockwall County for the approval of a Site Plan for a Government Building on a 1.90-acre portion of a larger 12.79-acre parcel of land identified as Lot 1, Block A, Rockwall County Courthouse Addition, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Commercial (C) District, situated within the IH-30 Overlay (IH-30) District, addressed as 963 E. Yellow Jacket Lane, and take any action necessary.

Senior Planner Henry Lee. Provided a brief summary in regard to the request. The applicant is requesting approval of a site plan. The building does generally meet all the requirements. They do have several variances associated with this request. ARB did look at this and did make a recommendation of approval based on these changes. The applicant is requesting a variance to the four (4) side architecture. Less than 20\% stone, less than $90 \%$ masonry, tilt-wall construction, roof pitch, landscape buffer and driveway spacing. The first few are related to the building, which are the ones ARB said they were okay with after they had made the changes they requested. In regard to the landscape buffer trees they currently have overhead power lines along yellowjacket and in lieu of doing canopy trees they requested on doing all accent trees. In addition to their compensatory measures, they are providing a 15 -foot landscape buffer in lieu of a 10 -foot buffer along yellowjacket. For their landscape percentage for the site the required is $20 \%$ and they're providing $31.40 \%$.

Chairman Deckard asked about the zoning in that area.
Salvador Sanchez \& Trenton Jones
3000 Internet Blvd
Suite 550
Frisco, TX 75034
Mr. Sanchez and Mr. Jones came forward and provided additional details in regards to the request.
Commissioner Odom Made a motion to table this item to the next P\&Z Meeting on December 12, 2023. Chairman Deckard seconded the motion which passed by a vote of 7-0.

## 8. SP2023-035 (HENRY LEE)

Discuss and consider a request by Leslie Ford of Ofi Chito on behalf of Michael Hampton of Creekside Commons Crossing, LP for the approval of a Site Plan for a Restaurant, Greater than 2,000 SF, with Drive-Through or Drive-In (i.e. McDonald's) on a 1.251 -acre tract of land identified as a portion of Lot 3 and all of Lot 2, Block A, Creekside Commons Addition, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Commercial (C) District, situated within the SH-205 Overlay (SH-205 OV) District, generally located north of the northeast corner of the intersection of S. Goliad Street [SH-205] and FM-549, and take any action necessary.

Senior Planner Henry lee provided a brief summary in regard to the request. The applicant is proposing to build a drive-through restaurant greater than $\mathbf{2 , 0 0 0}$ SF. The applicant is generally meeting the requirements for the Unified Development Code (UDC). They are meeting the conditional land use standards for having the stacking requirements. ARB did look at this tonight because they do have variances to the articulation requirements and they had made changes in the first meeting, however the ARB did not feel there was enough articulation coming out from the building. They referenced the applicant to the other McDonald's in town that have more variation in terms of articulation to the building. They also have the variance of the roof design standards which we've seen on many of these drive-through restaurants because the overlay states that anything less than 6,000 square feet is supposed to have pitched roof but like many other restaurants, they're requesting the parapet which the ARB didn't seem to have any issues with. For compensatory measures they are mentioning increase masonry percentages, and they have stone percentages that are $14 \%$ to $21 \%$ over the required $20 \%$ they are using up to $100 \%$ masonry on some of the facades. They are mentioning that increased architectural elements such as spandrel grass, awnings and cornices but staff should note that those aren't necessarily truly compensatory measures because it's required by the overlay district already to have architectural elements on the building. They have quoted increased landscape percentage which was $1.3 \%$ more than what was required. Lastly, they had a bench and planters as their 4th compensatory measure.

```
Leslie Ford
3224 Collinsworth Street
Fort Worth, TX }7610
```

Mrs. Ford came forward and provided additional details regarding the request.

Commissioner Llewelyn made a motion to table this item to the next P\&Z Meeting on December 12, 2023. Vice-Chairman Womble seconded the motion which passed by a vote of 7-0.
9. SP2023-036 (HENRY LEE)

Discuss and consider a request by Juan J. Vasquez of Vasquez Engineering, LLC on behalf of Shae Shoulders of Kennor Rockwall Retail, LLC for the approval of a Site Plan for two (2) commercial/retail buildings on a 1.93 -acre parcel of land identified as Lots 8 \& 9, Block A, Dalton-Goliad Addition, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned -General Retail (GR) District, situated within the North SH-205 Overlay (N. SH-205 OV) District, addressed as 3611 \& 3775 N. Goliad Street [SH-205], and take any action necessary.

Senior Planner Henry Lee provided a brief summary in regard to the request. This property may look familiar since a couple months ago they applied for a SUP for a drive-through restaurant, now coming back to request approval of their site plan. In their SUP they did have requirements for the three-tiered screening, additional landscaping on the property and headlight screening. They are meeting all the operational conditions of the SUP as well as the current standards for the UDC. ARB did look at it tonight and they did make a recommendation of approval as they had addressed their comments from the previous meeting, and they don't have any variances.

Commissioner Llewelyn made a motion to approve SP2023-036. Commissioner Conway seconded the motion which passed by a vote of 7-0.

## 10. SP2023-037 (HENRY LEE)

Discuss and consider a request by Bart Gardner and James Belt of Gardner Construction on behalf of Corey Fleck of C2LA, LLC for the approval of a Site Plan for a Light Industrial Building on a 6.50-acre tract of land identified as Tracts 3-1, 3-2, 3-3 \& 3-4 of the J. Lockhart Survey, Abstract No. 134 and Lots 1 \& 2, Block A, Eastplex Inc. Park \#2 Addition, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Light Industrial (LI) District and Commercial (C) District, situated within the $\mathrm{IH}-30$ Overlay (IH-30 OV) District and the SH-205 By-Pass Overlay (SH-205 BY-OV) District, generally located at the northwest corner of the intersection of the $\mathrm{IH}-30$ Frontage Road and Enterprise Drive, and take any action necessary.

Senior Planner Henry Lee provided a summary regarding the request. The applicant is requesting approval of a site plan. This building will be located within the Light Industrial (LI) District. Based on the site plan and the landscape plan they are requesting approval for the light industrial building on the subject property. They are generally meeting the requirements to unified development code. They are providing screening for loading docks that will face east towards John king. They are providing screening there for the loading docks which they then continued around the property to the north or to the right per staff recommendation to continue that landscaping scheme. In addition, they do have variances to the property for the material requirements and for the articulation. They are proposing a row of shrubs along the building and then along the side of the building to help screen and provide some relief on that side of the building. The building is primarily metal, they have dressed up the entrance adding stone there as well and then per ARB's recommendations from last meeting they requested the stone to continue along the east side of the building. As indicated specifically their variances are to the four-sided architecture the less than $20 \%$ stone, greater than $10 \%$ secondary materials and to the roof design standards. The roof design standards require 612 roof pitch, but they are requesting the 312 , they felt that the scaling would be an issue not only given that the building is a metal building the 312 is easier to work with. ARB didn't seem to have an issue with that since they recommended approval tonight. As staff states the compensatory measures were the shrub row along the west and north side of the building as well as the stone wainscot they continued which was ARB's recommendation.

## Bart Gardner

1066 Candice Circle
Rockwall, TX 75032
Mr. Gardner came forward and provided additional details regarding the request.
Commissioner Conway made a motion to approve SP2023-037. Vice-Chairman Womble seconded the motion which passed by a vote of 7-0.
11. SP2023-038 (ANGELICA GUEVARA)

Discuss and consider a request by Clay Cristy of ClayMoore Engineering on behalf of Staci Bowen of Metroplex Acquisition Fund, LP for the approval of a Site Plan for Restaurant with Less Than 2,000 SF with a Drive-Through or Drive-In (i.e. HTeaO) on a 0.93 -acre portion of a larger 5.16 -acre parcel of land identified as Lot 13, Block A, Stone Creek Retail Addition, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Planned Development District 70 (PD-70) for General Retail (GR) District land uses, situated within North SH-205 Overlay (N. SH-205 OV) District, generally located at the northeast corner of the intersection of N. Goliad Street [SH-205] and Bordeaux Drive, and take any action necessary.

Planning Technician Angelica Guevara provided a summary regarding the request. The applicant is requesting approval of a site plan for the purpose of constructing a drive through restaurant on the subject property. The landscape plan that was provided by the applicant does not match what was approved during their SUP process. They are still missing some shrubbery along 205 and the built-up berm. Staff should point out that the site plan does indicate that they are over parked by about 12 parking spaces, that would potentially provide the extra area for their needed landscaping. Aside from that their site plan does generally conform to the standards of the general overlay district and the general commercial district. Besides the variances requested which are the $20 \%$ stone requirement $90 \%$ masonry the roof design standards of four-sided architecture and the landscape buffers. In lieu of the variances the applicant is proposing increased landscaping, additional coverings and increased horizontal articulation. Staff should point out that all these compensatory measures are requirements and they do not meet the ordinances definition for a compensatory measure. For one of the conditions of approval staff did want to add that the applicant shall provide an updated landscape plan that shows conformance with the operational requirements that were approved during the SUP process, and they shall also update the photometric plan to be in conformance with the UDC. The elevations were shown to ARB tonight and they did recommend denial of all variances regarding the building design.

Director of Planning and Zoning Ryan Miller stated that the reason ARB recommended denial was because they felt that this was not articulated in the same manner that other HTeaO are. The material variations weren't the same the front facade wasn't the same.

Vice-Chairman Womble asked if it meets the articulation requirements.
Commissioner Odom asked what was different regarding the other HTeaO's?
Commissioner Conway stated that she was concerned that there was no attempt to provide berms.
Lynn Rowland
1903 Central Drive
Bedford, TX 76021
Mr. Rowland came forward and provided additional details regarding the request.
Cole Harris
211 Renfrow Street,
Rockwall, TX 75087
Mr. Harris came forward and provided additional details regarding the request.
Commissioner Llewelyn made a motion to table this item to the next P\&Z Meeting on December 12, 2023. Chairman Deckard seconded the motion which passed by a vote of 7-0.

## 12. SP2023-039 (HENRY LEE)

Discuss and consider a request by Ronny Klingbeil of RLK Engineering, Inc. on behalf of Tim Lyssy of the Rockwall Independent School District (RISD) for the approval of a Site Plan for existing Public Secondary School (i.e. J. W. Williams Middle School) on a 26.25 -acre parcel of land identified as Lot 1 , Block 1, Rockwall Middle School \#4 Addition, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Single-Family 16 (SF-16) District, North SH-205 Overlay (N. SH205 OV) District, addressed as 625 FM-552, and take any action necessary.

Senior Planner Henry Lee provided a summary regarding the request. The applicant is requesting approval of a site plan. on their site plan you can see they're doing an addition to the school. Its split into three separate pieces they have a piece on the north side and internal piece on the southwest side and then a small addition on the east side adjacent to that parking lot. That being said in the elevations they're showing they're trying to match the existing materials so that each phase of this building looks the same so there's not any odd breaks and material that can date either phase. With this they do have one variance and that's the landscape buffer requirements. The main reason they must request this is that the old building was built under a different code standard and now with the new code standards because they're increasing the existing floor area by $30 \%$ supposed to bring the property to conformance that would be the landscape buffer along 552. They are planting six (6) more canopy trees that landscape buffer to try to bring it closer into conformance and they're also providing a shrub row in front of the parking. They're also adding shrubbery to screen for the headlights, so they are trying to bring it closer to conformance. ARB had already approved recommendations during previous meeting.

Tim Lyssy
1050 Williams Street
Rockwall, TX 75087
Mr. Lyssy came forward and provided additional details in regards to the request.
Commissioner Conway made a motion to approve SP2023-039. Commissioner Odom seconded the motion which passed by a vote of 7-0.
VI. DISCUSSION ITEMS
13. Director's Report of post City Council meeting outcomes for development cases (RYAN MILLER).

- P2023-031: Final Plat for Lot 1, Block A, Hunter Addition (APPROVED)
- P2023-032: Final Plat for Lots 1 \& 2, Block A, Interstate Classic Cars Addition (APPROVED)
- P2023-033: Final Plat for Lot 1, Block A, John King Office Park Addition (APPROVED)
- P2023-035: Replat for Lot 3, Block 1, Rockwall Recreation Addition (APPROVED)
- P2023-036: Final Plat for Lot 1, Block A, Helping Hands Addition (APPROVED)
- P2023-037: Replat for Lots 17-24, Block 1, Alliance Addition (APPROVED)
- Z2023-045: Zoning Amendment to Planned Development District 50 (PD-50) for General Personal Services (2ND READING; APPROVED)
- Z2023-046: Specific Use Permit (SUP) for Residential Infill Adjacent to an Established Subdivision for 715 Sherman Street Lane (2ND READING; APPROVED)
- Z2023-048: Specific Use Permit (SUP) for a Restaurant, with 2,000 SF of More, with Drive-Through or Drive-In at 3060 N. Goliad Street [SH-205] (2ND READING; APPROVED)

Director of Planning and Zoning Ryan Miller provided a brief update about the outcome of the above referenced cases at the City Council meeting.
VII. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Deckard adjourned the meeting at 7:24PM.
$\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ , 2023.

Derek Deckard, Chairman
Attest:

Melanie Zavala, Planning Coordinator

NOTES: [1] ADDITIONAL CASE INFORMATION CAN BE FOUND AT HTTPS://SITES.GOOGLE.COM/SITE/ROCKWALLPLANNING/DEVELOPMENT/DEVELOPMENT-CASES, AND [2] TO PROVIDE INPUT ON A ZONING OR SPECIFIC USE PERMIT CASE PLEASE CLICK HERE OR CLICK ON THE LINK ABOVE AND USE THE ZONING AND SPECIFIC USE PERMIT INPUT FORM ON THE CITY'S WEBSITE.

## I.CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Deckard called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM. Commissioners present were John, Womble, Kyle Thompson, Jean Conway, Jay Odom, Ross Hustings and Brian Llewelyn. Staff members present were Director of Planning and Zoning Ryan Miller, Senior Planner Henry Lee, Planning Technician Angelica Guevara, Planning Coordinator Melanie Zavala, City Engineer Amy Williams, Assistant City Engineer Jonathan Browning and Civil Engineer Madelyn Price. Absent from the meeting was Planner Bethany Ross.

## II.APPOINTMENTS

1. Appointment with the Architectural Review Board (ARB) Chairman to receive the Architectural Review Board's recommendations and comments for items on the agenda requiring architectural review.

## III.OPEN FORUM

This is a time for anyone to address the Planning and Zoning Commission on any topic that is not already listed on the agenda for a public hearing. Per the policies of the City of Rockwall, public comments are limited to three (3) minutes out of respect for the time of other citizens. On topics raised during the OPEN FORUM, please know that the Planning and Zoning Commission is not permitted to respond to your comments during the meeting per the Texas Open Meetings Act.

Chairman Deckard explained how the open forum is conducted and asked if anyone who wished to speak to come forward at this time; there being no one indicating such, Chairman Deckard closed the open forum.
IV.CONSENT AGENDA

These agenda items are administrative in nature or include cases that meet all of the technical requirements stipulated by the Unified Development Code (UDC) and Chapter 38, Subdivisions, of the Municipal Code of Ordinances, and do not involve discretionary approvals.

## 2. P2023-038 (ANGELICA GUEVARA)

Consider a request by Erick Nolasco of Eagle Surveying, LLC on behalf of David Lindsay of Tri-Tex Construction, Inc. for the approval of a Final Plat for Lot 1 , Block A, Tri-Tex Addition being a 1.50-acre tract of land identified as Tract 8-3 of the J. D. McFarland Survey, Abstract No. 145, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Heavy Commercial (HC) District, addressed as 955 Sids Road, and take any action necessary.

Commissioner Llewelyn made a motion to approve Consent Agenda. Vice-Chairman Womble seconded the motion which passed by a vote of 7-0.

## V.ACTION ITEMS

These items are not advertised public hearings and deal with discretionary approvals for the Planning and Zoning Commission related to variances and special exceptions to the technical requirements of the Unified Development Code (UDC) or Chapter 38, Subdivisions, of the Municipal Code of Ordinances.

## 3. SP2023-033 (ANGELICA GUEVARA)

Discuss and consider a request by Dillon Stokes of Stoked Out Services on behalf of Michael Hendricks of Chaparral Partners for the approval of an Amended Site Plan for the remodel of an existing amenity center for the Eastbank Apartments (i.e. Pebblebrook Apartments) being a 11.579-acre parcel of land identified as Lot 1, Block A, Pebblebrook Addition, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Multi-Family 14 (MF-14) District, situated within the SH-205 Overlay (SH-205 OV) District, addressed as 1410 S. Goliad Street, and take any action necessary.

Planning Technician Angelica Guevara provided a brief summary in regard to the request. The applicant is requesting approval of an amended site plan to change the exterior of the existing leasing office and to add the change structures to the basketball courts. This request was originally brought before you on November 1, 2023 however ARB requested colored building elevations and a material sample board to better explain what the applicant was changing, the applicant then requested an extension to allow them more time to bring these items before you and today the applicants proposing the change part of the exterior facade of the existing leasing center to either a Hardy board siding or metal siding and to raise that one part to about 18 feet in height. The applicant is also proposing shade structures near the basketball courts that will consist of metal posts with cedar elements. Based on the proposed elevations the building does not meet the following standards and will require a variance to the $90 \%$ masonry requirement the cementitious and their roof design standards. Although the applicant is not providing any compensatory measures staff should note that the proposed changes to the leasing center and the addition of this shade structures are a reinvestment into an older property and should warrant consideration without compensatory measures. Approval of variances is a discretionary decision for the Planning and Zoning Commission and do require a super majority vote the minimum of four votes in the affirmative. ARB did look at this tonight and they did recommend a motion to approve by a vote of 3-1.

Michael Hendricks
4825 Greenville Avenue
Dallas, TX 75206
Mr. Hendricks came forward and provided additional details regarding the request.
Chairman Deckard asked what kind of metal they would be using.
Commissioner Llewelyn made a motion to approve SP2023-033 based upon ARB recommendations. Commissioner Conway seconded the motion which passed by a vote of 7-0.

## 4. SP2023-041 (ANGELICA GUEVARA)

Discuss and consider a request by Alejandro Orfanos of POP Restaurants, LLC for the approval of an Amended Site Plan for an existing restaurant with drivethrough on a 0.64-acre parcel of land identified as Lot 1, Block A, Popeye's Addition, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Commercial (C) District, situated within the $\mathrm{IH}-30$ Overlay ( $\mathrm{IH}-30 \mathrm{OV}$ ) District and the Scenic Overlay (SOV) District, addressed as 2535 Ridge Road, and take any action necessary.

Planning Technician Angelica Guevara provided a brief summary in regard to the request. Staff was notified by the building inspections department that work had commenced for a remodel on the subject property. The applicants were told to stop working until appropriate permits were approved by staff which then prompted the applicant to apply for an amended site plan. The finished work on the building consisted of painting the entire existing building white and removing the canopies and shutters. On November 13, 2023, they submitted new building elevations indicating the addition of a mural and the addition of metal flat canopies to the building. Based on the general overlay district standards the proposed mural on the building will require a variance for corporate branding on the subject property. Staff will point out that this variance for murals associated with branding elements have been approved for other restaurants in the IH30 corridor which most recently being Velvet Taco however the approval of the requested variance is a discretionary decision for the Planning and Zoning Commission and will also require a supermajority vote. ARB also recommended approval for this case by a vote of 3-0.

Chairman Deckard asked what the definition of murals would be.
Commissioner Odom asked what side the mural would be facing.
Commissioner Conway is concerned about murals setting a precedent.
Commissioner Llewelyn made a motion to approve SP2023-041. Vice-Chairman Womble seconded the motion which passed by a vote of 6-1. Commissioner Conway dissenting.

## 5. SP2023-043 (ANGELICA GUEVARA)

Discuss and consider a request by Brent Northington of MJDII Architects, Inc. on behalf of Carolina Molina of Alvaplast US Development, LLC for the approval of an Amended Site Plan for an existing warehouse/manufacturing facility on a 42.6034-acre parcel of land identified as a portion of Lot 2, Block 1, Indalloy Addition, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Light Industrial (LI) District, addressed as 501 Industrial Boulevard, and take any action necessary.

Planning Technician Angelica Guevara provided a summary regarding the request. Earlier this year the applicant had received approval of an amended site plan to allow for the expansion of the existing warehouse. The applicants are now requesting approval of a site plan to add a pump house to the subject property. Based on the building elevations provided the applicant has made changes to the building materials for the proposed pump house so these went from being a fiberglass full brick exterior to a metal paneling exterior. Based on this the proposed building does not meet the requirements of the general industrial district standards and will require exceptions to the roof design standards the building articulation requirements and the building materials. Staff should note that the proposed building will be internal to the site and the applicant will be providing additional landscaping as a compensatory measure specifically the applicant will be adding a row of trees along the private drive for screening. Exceptions are also discretionary decisions for the Planning and Zoning commission and require a minimum of four votes in the affirmative. ARB also looked at this tonight and they did recommend approval by a vote of 3-0.

Brent Northington
16775 Addison Road
Addison, TX 75001
Mr. Northington came forward and provided additional details in regard to the request.
Commissioner Conway made a motion to approve SP2023-043.Commissioner Hustings seconded the motion which passed by a vote of 7-0.

## 6. SP2023-045 (ANGELICA GUEVARA)

Discuss and consider a request by Steven Huffman of Huffman Communications Sales, Inc. on behalf of David Naylor of Rayburn Country Electric Cooperative for the approval of an Amended Site Plan for an Industrial Campus on a 99.849-acre tract of land identified as Lots 6, 7, 8 \& 9, Block A, Rayburn Country Addition and Tract 3 of the W. H. Barnes Survey, Abstract No. 26, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Heavy Commercial (HC) District, situated within the SH-205 Overlay (SH-205 OV) District, addressed as 950 \& 980 Sids Road, and take any action necessary.

Planning Technician Angelica Guevara provided a summary in regard to the request. Staff received an application for a commercial building permit for a new communications utility building on the subject property and based on the building elevations provided in the building permit the applicant added a new communications utility building that was to be constructed out of prefabricated aggregate concrete panels, staff then requested that
the applicant submit an amended site plan due to the building not meeting the architectural requirements of the general commercial district. Based on the provided building elevations that proposed communications building will require exceptions to the roof design standards and the building articulation requirements. Staff should note that the proposed building will be internal to the site and will not be visible from the right of way.

Steven Huffman
2829 W $7^{\text {th }}$ Ave
Corsicana, TX 75110
Mr. Huffman came forward and provided additional details regarding the request.
Commissioner Hustings made a motion to approve SP2023-045. Commissioner Thompson seconded the motion which passed by a vote of 7-0.

## 7. MIS2023-018 (HENRY LEE)

Discuss and consider a request by Jean-Paul Aube III for the approval of a Miscellaneous Case for the approval of artificial or synthetic plant materials on a 0.207-acre parcel of land identified as Lot 12 of the Dawson Addition, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Single-Family 7 (SF-7) District, situated within the Old Town Rockwall Historic (OTR) District, addressed as 509 Munson Street, and take any action necessary.

Senior Planner Henry Lee provided a summary in regard to the request. The applicant is requesting a variance to the landscape material standards. The request is to put artificial turf in the front yard of the property. They would want to replace that with artificial turf. The applicants indicated that this request is being made due to thick grass has not been able to be established previously on this property which is why they're making this request. Staff did send out the city arborist to look and see if there were any issues with the site that would prevent grass from being grow. They did not find anything that would prevent grass from going there based on their inspection. This is also located within the historic district; however, the historic district does not have a purview over landscape materials which is why it's coming directly to the Planning and Zoning Commission. Staff has not approved any artificial turf in the front yard or anywhere else in Rockwall. There has been some in the rear yards but that's due to not being visible from public right away.

Paul Aube II
509 Munson Street
Rockwall, TX 75087
Mr. Aube came forward and provided additional details regarding the request.
Commissioner Conway asked if son knows why grass has not been growing.
Commissioner Husting asked if they read the letter Director of Parks recommended.
Commissioner Conway made a motion to deny MIS2023-018. Chairman Deckard seconded the motion to deny which passed by a vote of 7-0.

## VI.DISCUSSION ITEMS

These items are for discussion between staff and the Planning and Zoning Commission and relate to administrative information and/or cases that will come forward for action or public hearing at a future Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. Public comment on these cases can take place when these items are considered for action by the Planning and Zoning Commission. The anticipated Planning and Zoning Commission public hearing and/or action date for the following cases is December 12, 2023.

## 8. Z2023-052 (HENRY LEE)

Hold a public hearing to discuss and consider a request by Matt Wavering of the Rockwall Economic Development Corporation (REDC) on behalf of Paul Liechty of 36 Wagon Road, LLC and Shailesha Vora of Akshar 10, LLC for the approval of a Specific Use Permit (SUP) for an Office Building that will exceed 36 -feet in the Scenic Overlay (SOV) District on a 9.9406 -acre tract of land identified as Lots 22 \& 23, Block A, La Jolla Pointe Addition, Phase 2, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Commercial (C) District, situated within the Scenic Overlay (SOV) District and the IH-30 Overlay (IH-30 OV) District, generally located west of the intersection of La Jolla Pointe Drive and Ridge Road [FM-740], and take any action necessary.

Senior Planner Henry Lee provided a summary regarding the request. The SUP being requested due to increase the maximum height of 220 feet. This was worthy of putting into a planned development district since the commercial district already allows the uses regarding what the applicant will be targeting for future development. The height limitation is what is getting them in. Addition to that the applicant also requested that a time frame of 10 years be allotted to this specific use permit just as they're searching for potential businesses to come into this property and staff felt like that shouldn't be an issue given also that this is the Economic Development Corporation.

## Mathew Wavering

2610 Observation Trail
Rockwall, TX 75032
Mr. Wavering came forward and provided additional details regarding the request.
Commissioner Llewelyn asked if the parking garage would be for office buildings.
Chairman Deckard advised that this item will go before the Commission for discussion or action on December 12, 2023.

## 9. Z2023-053 (HENRY LEE)

Hold a public hearing to discuss and consider a request by Matt Wavering of the Rockwall Economic Development Corporation (REDC) on behalf of Richard Chandler of HFS Management, Inc. for the approval of a Zoning Change amending Planned Development District 4 (PD-4) [Ordinance No. 72-03 \& 01-26] being a 12.1462 -acre tract of land identified as Tract 2 of the D. Atkins Survey, Abstract No. 1, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Planned Development District 4 (PD-4) for General Retail (GR) District land uses, situated within the Scenic Overlay (SOV) District, generally located in between Lakedale Drive and Becky Lane on the eastside of Ridge Road [FM-740], and take any action necessary.

Senior Planner Henry Lee provided a summary in regard to the request. They are requesting a height increase of 90 feet that will be more in line with the existing buildings that are there. This request is a little different since it is already within a planned development district it has the same height limitations. Instead of doing a SUP staff felt that updating the plan development district with those standards and then tailoring it more to the Economic Development Corporation is targeting for their clientele updating the PD would facilitate them better.

Chairman Deckard advised that this item will go before the Commission for discussion or action on December 12, 2023.

## 10. SP2023-042 (ANGELICA GUEVARA)

Discuss and consider a request by Kamran Khan for the approval of an Amended Site Plan for an existing general retail building on a 0.55 -acre parcel of land identified as Lot 1, Block A, Burgamy Addition, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Commercial (C) District, situated within the Scenic Overlay (SOV) District, addressed as 1007 Ridge Road, and take any action necessary.

Planning Technician Angelica Guevara provided a brief summary in regard to the request. The applicant is requesting approval of an amended site plan. Based on what was submitted the applicant will be making changes to the building facade and adding a dumpster to the subject property. Staff will be working with the applicant through the project comments. ARB did have a recommendation that they go ahead and screen the AC units by bringing the brick up on the sides.

## Abel Cisneros <br> 805 Green Pond Drive <br> Garland, TX 75040

Mr. Cisneros came forward and provided additional details in regards to the request.
Chairman Deckard advised that this item will go before the Commission for discussion or action on December 12, 2023.
11. SP2023-044 (HENRY LEE)

Discuss and consider a request by Hind Saad of RSG Engineering on behalf of Roy Bhavi of FlexSpace Business Parks, LLC for the approval of a Site Plan for a warehouse/office development on a 6.17 -acre tract of land identified as Tract 2-01 of the D. Harr. Survey, Abstract No. 102, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Light Industrial (LI) District, situated within the Airport Overlay (AP OV) District, addressed as 1760 Airport Road, and take any action necessary.

Senior Planner Henry Lee provided a brief summary in regards to the request. The applicant has resubmitted for the same request they have before. They had to get approval from the FAA to make sure the buildings would be okay in terms of the overlay zone that they have near the airport. The ARB did look at this and on buildings 2 and 3 the comments they had were to raise the stone on the rear of the property which will face directly the east adjacent property. They also requested for a row of canopy trees behind those buildings to screen the metal facade.

Commissioner Thompson said buildings 2 and 3 have not been improved.
Commissioner Conway said articulation would make it better.
Roy Bhavi
835 Tillman Drive
Allen, TX 75013
Mr. Bhavi came forward and provided additional details in regards to the request.
Chairman Deckard advised that this item will go before the Commission for discussion or action on December 12, 2023.
12. SP2023-046 (HENRY LEE)

Discuss and consider a request by Cody Johnson of Johnson Volk Consulting on behalf of Stephen Pepper of SH Dev Klutts Rockwall, LLC for the approval of a Site Plan for Phase 1 of the Homestead Subdivision being a 196.009-acre tract of land identified as Tract 6 of the J. A. Ramsey Survey, Abstract No. 186, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Planned Development District 92 (PD-92), generally located at the northeast corner of the intersection of FM-549 and FM-1139, and take any action necessary.

Senior Planner Henry Lee provided a brief summary in regards to the request. The applicant is proposing a site plan for the amenity center. The elevations do meet all the requirements for that Planned Development ordinance.

```
Meredith Joyce
767 Justin Road
Rockwall, TX 75087
    Mrs. Joyce came forward and provided additional details in regards to the request.
    Chairman Deckard advised that this item will go before the Commission for discussion or action on December 12, 2023.
13. Director's Report of post City Council meeting outcomes for development cases (RYAN MILLER).
    - P2023-034: Replat for Lots 2 & 3, Block A, Gamez Addition (APPROVED)
    - Z2023-049: Specific Use Permit (SUP) for Heavy Manufacturing (15T READING; APPROVED)
    - Z2023-050: Specific Use Permit (SUP) for Guest Quarters/Secondary Living Unit for 605 E. Washington Street (15T READING; APPROVED)
    - Z2023-051: Zoning Change from AG to LI for 1775 Airport Road (15T READING; APPROVED)
```

    Director of Planning and Zoning Ryan Miller provided a brief update about the outcome of the above referenced cases at the City Council meeting.
    VII.ADJOURNMENT
Chairman Deckard adjourned the meeting at 7:21PM.
PASSED AND APPROVED BY THE PLANNING \& ZONING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF ROCKWALL, Texas, this
$\qquad$ day of $\qquad$
$\qquad$ 2023.

Derek Deckard, Chairman
Attest:
Melanie Zavala, Planning Coordinator

TO:<br>FROM:<br>DATE:<br>SUBJECT:<br>Planning and Zoning Commission<br>Henry Lee, Senior Planner<br>December 12, 2023<br>SP2023-046; PD Site Plan for the Homestead Subdivision Amenity Center

The applicant, Cody Johnson of Johnson Volk Consulting, is requesting the approval of a site plan for the amenity center within the Homestead Subdivision. The Homestead Subdivision is situated on a 196.009 -acre tract of land (i.e. Tract 6 of the J. A. Ramsey Survey, Abstract No. 186) that is generally located at the northeast corner of the intersection of FM-549 and FM1139. Phase 1 of the Homestead Subdivision was approved for a Final Plat [Case No. P2022-055] and a PD Site Plan [Case No. SP2022-048] in accordance with the submittal schedule contained in the Planned Development District ordinance. As part of this site plan application, the applicant has submitted a site plan, landscape plan, hardscape plan, photometric plan, and building elevations for the proposed amenity center.

The site plan submitted by the applicant indicates that a pavilion with restrooms, swimming pool, and parking lot will be constructed on the subject property. The landscape plan shows that all of the required landscaping as stipulated by the Planned Development District ordinance will be provided, and that the pool equipment will be screened in accordance with the requirements of Article 08, Landscape and Fence Standards, of the Unified Development Code (UDC). The hardscape plan details the location of all sidewalks and trails, the pool, and each fence types associated with the development. The submitted site plan, landscape plan, hardscape plan, photometric plan, and building elevations all conform to the applicable technical requirements contained in Planned Development District 92 (PD-92) and the Unified Development Code (UDC). Since the proposed site plan conforms to the technical requirements, this case is being placed on the consent agenda. Should the Planning and Zoning Commission have any questions concerning the applicant's request, staff and the applicant will be available at the December 12, 2023 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.

City of Rockwall Planning and Zoning Department 385 S. Goliad Street Rockwall, Texas 75087

## STAFF USE ONLY

PLANNING \& ZONING CASE NO.
NOTE: THE APPLICATION IS NOT CONSIDERED ACCEPTED BY THE CITY UNTL THE PLANNING DIRECTOR AND CITY ENGINEER HAVE SIGNED BELOW.

DIRECTOR OF PLANNING:
CITY ENGINEER:

PLEASE CHECK THE APPROPRIATE BOX BELOW TO INDICATE THE TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT REQUEST [SELECT ONLY ONE BOX]:

| PLATTING APPLICATION FEES: | ZONING APPLICATION FEES: |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\square$ MASTER PLAT ( $\$ 100.00+\$ 15.00$ ACRE $)^{1}$ | $\square$ ZONING CHANGE ( $\$ 200.00+\$ 15.00$ ACRE) ${ }^{1}$ |
| $\square$ PRELIMINARY PLAT $(\$ 200.00+\$ 15.00 \text { ACRE })^{1}$ | $\square$ SPECIFIC USE PERMIT ( $\$ 200.00+\$ 15.00$ ACRE $)^{182}$ |
| $\square$ FINAL PLAT ( $\$ 300.00+\$ 20.00$ ACRE) ${ }^{1}$ | $\square \mathrm{PD}$ DEVELOPMENT PLANS ( $\$ 200.00+\$ 15.00$ ACRE) ${ }^{1}$ |
| $\square$ REPLAT ( $\$ 300.00+\$ 20.00$ ACRE) ${ }^{1}$ | OTHER APPLICATION FEES: |
| $\square$ AMENDING OR MINOR PLAT (\$150.00) | $\square$ TREE REMOVAL (\$75.00) |
| $\square$ PLAT REINSTATEMENT REQUEST (\$100.00) | $\square$ VARIANCE REQUEST/SPECIAL EXCEPTIONS $(\$ 100.00)^{2}$ |
| SITE PLAN APPLICATION FEES: | $\frac{\text { NOTES: }}{\text { I }}$ IN DETERMINNG THE FEE, PLEASE USE THE EXACT ACREAGE WHEN MULTIPLYING BY THE |
| $\square$ SITE PLAN (\$250.00 + \$20.00 ACRE) ${ }^{1}$ | PER ACRE AMOUNT. FOR REQUESTS ON LESS THAN ONE ACRE, ROUND UP TO ONE (1) ACRE |
| $\square$ AMENDED SITE PLAN/ELEVATIONS/LANDSCAPING PLAN (\$100.00) | 2: A S1,000.00 FEE WIL BE ADDED TO THE APPLICAION FEE FOR ANY REQUEST THAT INvoLVES CONSTRUCTION WTTHOUT OR NOT IN COMPLIANCE TO AN APPROVED BUILDING PERMT |

PROPERTY INFORMATION [PLEASE PRINT]
ADDRESS Amenity Center within Homestead
SUBDIVISION
Homestead
LOT
9 BLOCK
F

## general location Corner of Fisher Road and Hardin Boulevard

| ZONING, SITE PLAN AND PLATTING INFORMATION [PLEASE PRINT] |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CURRENT ZONING | Sin | ntial | CURRENT USE | Private Recreation Center |
| PROPOSED ZONING | Sing | ntial | PROPOSED USE | Private Recreation Center |
| ACREAGE | 1.60 | LOTS | 1 | LOTS [PROPOSED] |

S SITE PLANS AND PLATS: BY CHECKING THIS BOX YOU ACKNOWLEDGE THAT DUE TO THE PASSAGE OF HB3167 THE CITY NO LONGER HAS FLEXIBILITY WITH REGARD TO ITS APPROVAL PROCESS, AND FAILURE TO ADDRESS ANY OF STAFF'S COMMENTS BY THE DATE PROVIDED ON THE DEVELOPMENT CALENDAR WILL RESULTIN THE DENIAL OF YOUR CASE.
OWNER/APPLICANT/AGENT INFORMATION [PLEASE PRINT/CHECK THE PRIMARY CONTACTIORIGINAL SIGNATURES ARE REQUIRED]

| - OWNER | SH DEV KLUTTS ROCKWALL LLC | $\square$ APPLICANT | Johnson Volk Consulting |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CONTACT PERSON | Stephen Pepper | CONTACT PERSON | Cody Johnson |
| ADDRESS | 2400 Dallas Parkway | ADDRESS | 704 Central Parkway East |
|  | Suite 460 |  | Suite 1200 |
| CITY, STATE \& ZIP | Plano, Texas 75093 | CITY, STATE \& ZIP | Plano, Texas 75074 |
| PHONE | 972-526-7700 | PHoNe | 972-201-3100 |
| E-MALL | stephen.pepper@shaddockhomes.com | E-MAIL | cody.johnson@johnsonvolk.com |

NOTARY VERIFICATION [REQUIRED] STATED THE INFORMATION ON THIS APPLICATION TO BE TRUE AND CERTIFIED THE FOLLOWING:
"I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT I AM THE OWNER FOR THE PURPOSE OF THIS APPLICATION; ALL INFORMATION SUBMITTED HEREIN IS TRUE AND CORRECT; AND THE APPLICATION FEE OF \$ 382.00

TO COVER THE COST OF THIS APPLICATION, HAS BEEN PAID TO THE CITY OF ROCKWALL ON THIS THE 13 th
Nowember 2023 BY SIGNING THIS APPLICATION, I AGREE THAT THE CITY OF ROCKWALL (I.E. 'CITY') IS AUTHORIZED AND PERMITTED TO PROVIDE INFORMATION CONTAINED WITHIN THIS APPLICATION TO THE PUBLIC. THE CITY IS ALSO AUTHORIZED AND PERMITTED TR PEPRQDUGEAANK CPDVR SUBMITTED IN CONUUNCTION WITH THIS APPLICATION, IF SUCH REPRODUCTION IS ASSOCIATED OR IN RESPONSE TO A REQUE


City of Rockwall
Planning \& Zoning Department
385 S. Goliad Street
Rockwall, Texas 75087
(P): (972) 771-7745
(W): www.rockwall.com

The City of Rockwall GIS maps are continually under development and therefore subject to change without notice. While we endeavor to provide timely and accurate information, we make no guarantees. The City of Rockwall makes no warranty, express or implied, including warranties of merchantability and fitness for a particular purpose. Use of the information is the sole responsibility of the user.




ACME BRICK
ASHE BRICK


MUELLER, INC. DARK CHARCOAL


SHERWIN WILLIAMS

SHERWIN WILLIAMS WEB GRAY SW 7075


SHERWIN WILLIAMS KINGS CANYON (WOOD STAIN) SW 3026


DALTILE DARK GREY (TILE) 12 X 24


GLASS WINDOW WITH FROSTED GLAZING

OWNER/DEVELOPER:



LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT:
JoHnson Volk Consulting
TOH CENTRAL PARKwA EAST, sUITE 1200


SUbmittal date: November 13, 2023


| PLANT LIST |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| KEY | ESTIMATED QUANTITY | COMMON NAME | SCIENTIFIC NAME | SIZE | SPACING | REMARKS |
| เо | , | оак | Qubrcus virginana | 4 Caniper | mown |  |
| во | 7 | ви ояк | Qubrcus macrocirea | $4{ }^{4}$ Caliper | as shown |  |
| ${ }^{\text {LE }}$ | 10 | Іасввлке еім | Uinus Privifoui | 4 Caniper | as shown |  |
| ${ }^{\text {ce }}$ | 6 | cmar mim | Uumus crassfolia | caliper | ssho |  |
| -gM | 3 | Lutire gen magnolia | Mmigoil | aliper | asshown |  |
| dw | 4 | Desert wiliow | Chluopsi Linexils |  | As shown |  |
| ун | 8 | yatpon holix | Hex vomitora | Lup | asshown | (e) |
| ${ }^{\text {кв }}$ | 6 | texas repbud |  | ${ }^{\text {2 }}$ Canliper | as shown | (ex |
|  | 21 |  | (ioropralum cinesis | 7 gallog | $48^{8} \mathrm{oc}$. | Contaner grown fulli plant. |
|  | ${ }^{74}$ | texastage | Leucoophyilum rrutescens | 7 gallon | $48^{8} \mathrm{OC}$ | contaner grown: fulut plant. |
|  | ${ }^{67}$ | gioss abela | LINNAEA Grandiflora | ${ }_{\text {t allon }}$ | о., | Contaner grown full Plant |
|  | 42 | Dware burford houl |  | ${ }^{\text {Gamlon }}$ |  | Contaner grown: fulil plant. |
|  | 6 | UPright rosemary | Rosharius offcinalis | 3 balloon | ${ }_{86}{ }^{\text {a }}$. c. | Contaner grown: fuli plant. |
|  | 6 | dwarf madin grass | miscanthus sinensis adagio | ${ }^{\text {3 Gallon }}$ | ${ }_{36}{ }^{\text {rac.e. }}$ | contaner grownt fuli. plant. |
|  | 10 |  | (MICCNTHHUSSIENSIS | Hov | ${ }^{6 \times 0.0 .6}$ | Contaner grown: fuli. plant. |
|  | 21 | Red yucca | hesprraloe pravifora | ${ }^{\text {banlog }}$ | $3^{65}{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{Oc}$ | Contaner grown f ful plant |
|  | ${ }^{70}$ | plumyew frostrata |  | ${ }^{3}$ Gallov |  | Contaner grown: full plant. |
|  | ${ }_{825}$ | Lriope grass | Lriope мuscarl | 1 gallon |  | Contaner growns fuli plant |
|  | 85 | nexican feathrigrass | Nasselia tenussila | 1 gallon | ${ }^{18}{ }^{\text {s }}$ Oc. | contaner growns fuli. plant. |
|  | ${ }_{825}$ | andual color | To be shectre by owner | от | s"o.c. | contaner grown fuli plant |
|  | 50, 35 | conmon bernuda grass | crnodon dactilion |  | solid sod | minnum low coverage ali. Areas shown |
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TO:
DATE:
APPLICANT:
CASE NUMBER:

Planning and Zoning Commission
December 12, 2023
Matt Wavering; Rockwall Economic Development Corporation (REDC)
Z2023-052; Specific Use Permit (SUP) for La Jolla Pointe Drive

## SUMMARY

Hold a public hearing to discuss and consider a request by Matt Wavering of the Rockwall Economic Development Corporation (REDC) on behalf of Paul Liechty of 36 Wagon Road, LLC and Shailesha Vora of Akshar 10, LLC for the approval of a Specific Use Permit (SUP) for an Office Building that will exceed 36 -feet in the Scenic Overlay (SOV) District on a 9.9406 -acre tract of land identified as Lots 22 \& 23, Block A, La Jolla Pointe Addition, Phase 2, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Commercial (C) District, situated within the Scenic Overlay (SOV) District and the $\mathrm{IH}-30$ Overlay (IH-30 OV) District, generally located west of the intersection of La Jolla Pointe Drive and Ridge Road [FM-740], and take any action necessary.

## BACKGROUND

The subject property was annexed by the City Council on September 5, 1960 by Ordinance No. 60-02 [Case No. A1960-002]. At the time of annexation, the subject property was zoned Agricultural (AG) District. At some point between the time of annexation and January 3, 1972, the subject property was zoned from an Agricultural (AG) District to a Commercial (C) District. On November 17, 2003, the City Council approved a final plat [Case No. P2003-024] that establish the subject property as Lot 1, Block A, La Jolla Pointe, Phase 2 Addition. On February 7, 2005 the City Council approved a replat [Case No. P2004-068] that reestablished the subject property as a Lots 4-6, Block A, La Jolla Pointe, Phase 2 Addition. On August 21, 2006, the City Council approved another replat [Case No. P2006-019] that change the subject property to Lots 6, 7, and a portion of Lot 8, Block A, La Jolla Pointe, Phase 2 Addition. On April 2, 2018, the City Council approved a Specific Use Permit (SUP) [Ordinance No. 18-20; S-187] allowing a Limited Service Hotel on a portion of the subject property. This Specific Use Permit (SUP) expired on October 1, 2020. On August 20, 2018 the City Council approved two (2) site plans [Case No. SP2018-024 \& SP2018-025] to allow the construction of an Office Building and a Medical Office Building on the subject property. These site plans expired on August 20, 2020. On October 1, 2018 the City Council approved a site plan [Case No. SP2018-023] to allow the construction of a Hotel. This site plan expired on October 1, 2020. On March 2, 2020, the City Council approved a replat [Case No. P2020009] that reestablished the subject property as Lots 22 \& 23, Block A, La Jolla Pointe, Phase 2 Addition. The property has remained vacant since the time of annexation.

## PURPOSE

On November 13, 2023, the applicant -- Matt Wavering of the Rockwall Economic Development Corporation (REDC) -- submitted an application requesting a Specific Use Permit (SUP) for an Office Building that will exceed 36 -feet in height on the subject property.

## ADJACENT LAND USES AND ACCESS

The subject property is generally located west of the intersection of La Jolla Pointe Drive and Ridge Road [FM-740]. The land uses adjacent to the subject property are as follows:

North: Directly north of the subject property is La Jolla Pointe Drive, which is identified as a Minor Collector on Master Thoroughfare Plan contained in the OURHometown Vision 2040 Comprehensive Plan. Beyond this is a 100 -foot right-of-way owned by the Union Pacific/Dallas Garland NE Railroad. Beyond this is Phase 3 of the Turtle Cove

Subdivision, which consists of 102 single-family residential lots. This subdivision was established on April 11, 2000 and is zoned Planned Development District 2 (PD2) for single-family residential land uses.

South: Directly south of the subject property are several parcels developed with restaurants (i.e. Steak N Shake, IHOP, Waffle House, Velvet Taco, and Snuffers) that are zoned Commercial (C) District. Beyond this is the westbound frontage road of $\mathrm{IH}-30$, followed by the main lanes of $\mathrm{IH}-30$, and the eastbound frontage road for $\mathrm{IH}-30$.

East: Directly east of the subject property are three (3) parcels of land developed with Office Buildings (i.e. Ebby Halliday, Allstate, Epstein \& Kolacz) and zoned Commercial (C) District. Beyond this is Ridge Road, which is identified as a A4D (i.e. major arterial, four [4] lane, divided roadway) on the Master Thoroughfare Plan contained in the OURHometown Vision 2040 Comprehensive Plan. Following this are several parcels of land developed with commercial/retail land uses that are zoned Commercial (C) District.

West: Directly west of the subject property is the intersection of Carmel Circle and La Jolla Pointe Drive. Carmel Circle is identified as a R2 (i.e. residential, two [2] lane, undivided roadway) and La Jolla Pointe Drive is identified as a Minor Collector on the Master Thoroughfare Plan contained in the OURHometown Vision 2040 Comprehensive Plan. Beyond this is a 100 -foot right-of-way owned by the Union Pacific/Dallas Garland NE Railroad. Following this is Phase 3 of the Lakeside Village Subdivision, which consists of 122 single-family residential lots. This subdivision was established in 1972 and is zoned Planned Development District 2 (PD-2) for single-family residential land uses

## MAP 1: LOCATION MAP

YELLOW: SUBJECT PROPERTY


## CHARACTERISTICS OF THE REQUEST

The applicant has submitted a concept plan and a conceptual building height exhibit indicating that the proposed development scheme will be multi-story Office Buildings. Based on the conceptual building height exhibit, the intent of the requested Specific Use Permit (SUP) is to develop the subject property with Office Buildings that exceed the height requirement of 36 -feet stipulated by the Scenic Overlay (SOV) District. According to the applicant's letter, the increased height is being requested in order to attract "high-quality employment opportunities" that are of "superior quality than the standard one or two-story garden-style office buildings." The applicant has also indicated that development of the property will be highly selective. Given this, the applicant is also requesting that the Specific Use Permit (SUP) remain effective for ten (10) years in lieu of the standard one (1) year per Article 11, Development Applications and Review Procedures, of the Unified Development Code (UDC).

## CONFORMANCE WITH THE CITY'S CODES

According to Article 13, Definitions, of the Unified Development Code (UDC), an Office Building is defined as "(a) facility that provides executive, management, administrative, or professional services... not involving the sale of merchandise except as incidental to a permitted use. Typical examples include real estate, insurance, property management, investment, employment, travel, advertising, law, architecture, design, engineering, accounting, call centers, and similar offices." In this case, the proposed concept plan indicates the development of Office Buildings on the subject property, which is in conformance with this definition. In addition, according to Subsection 06.02, General Overlay District Standards, Article 05, District Development Standards, of the Unified Development Code (UDC), any building over 36-feet in height requires a Specific Use Permit (SUP). This requirement prompted the applicant to submit for the proposed Specific Use Permit (SUP).

## OURHOMETOWN VISION 2040 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

According to the Future Land Use Plan contained in the OURHometown Vision 2040 Comprehensive Plan, the subject property is situated within the $I H-30$ Corridor District. All of the property located within the $I H-30$ Corridor District is designated for the Special Commercial (SC) Corridor land use. The OURHometown Vision 2040 Comprehensive Plan describes the Special Commercial (SC) Corridor as being reserved for Regional Centers, which are described as being one (1) of the following four (4) models: Strip Retail Center, Mixed-Use Center, Town Center, or Regional Designation Center, however, the Primary Land Uses identified for this land use designation include Corporate Office. Based on this, the applicant's request is in conformance with the Future Land Use Plan. Staff should also note that the IH-30 Corridor District is divided into three (3) Corridor Zones (i.e. the Preservation, Opportunity, and Transitional Zones). In this case, the subject property is located within a Transitional Zone, which is defined as "(a) segment of the existing corridor that is currently underutilized due to incompatible land uses, building design, commercial densities, and/or land uses that do not maximize tax potential." The subject property is currently vacant and is surrounded by single-story, single-tenant Office Buildings and Restaurants. Based on this, the proposed future development would appear to maximize the subject property's tax potential and conform to the IH-30 Corridor Plan contained in Appendix 'B', Corridor Plans, of the OURHometown Vision 2040 Comprehensive Plan.

According to the Vision Statement within Chapter 06, Economic Development, of the OURHometown Vision 2040 Comprehensive Plan, "(t)he City of Rockwall should continue to build a diversified local economy by attracting and retaining businesses that can utilize the City's existing highly skilled workforce and aid in the creation of a stable and resilient tax base." In this case, the applicant's letter states that they intend to attract Class-A corporate office developments occupied by tenants that can provide high-quality employment opportunities for the citizens of Rockwall." Given this, the applicant's request appears to conform to goals and policies laid out for Economic Development within the OURHometown Vision 2040 Comprehensive Plan.

## STAFF ANALYSIS

In this case, the proposed concept plan and conceptual building height exhibit appear to conform with all of the density and dimensional requirements for a property in a Commercial (C) District, with the exception of maximum height requirement. The applicant's proposal also appears to conform with the intent of the OURHometown Vision 2040 Comprehensive Plan. Staff has included provisions in the Specific Use Permit (SUP) ordinance that will require general conformance with the concept plan at the time of site plan approval, and that the proposed buildings cannot exceed 120 -feet as depicted in the conceptual building height exhibit. At the request of the applicant, staff has also included a ten (10) year term for the Specific Use Permit (SUP). This appears to be warranted due to the scale of the proposed development and the amount of time that may be necessary for
the Rockwall Economic Development Corporation (REDC) to attract high-quality corporate office users. With this being said, a request for a Specific Use Permit (SUP) is a discretionary decision for the City Council pending a recommendation from the Planning and Zoning Commission.

## NOTIFICATIONS

On November 15, 2023, staff mailed 85 notices to property owners and occupants within 500 -feet of the subject property. Staff also notified the Lakeside Village and Turtle Cove Homeowner's Association (HOA), which are the only Homeowners' Associations (HOAs) and/or Neighborhood Organizations within 1,500 -feet of the subject property participating in the Neighborhood Notification Program. Additionally, staff posted a sign on the subject property, and advertised the public hearings in the Rockwall Herald Banner as required by the Unified Development Code (UDC). At the time this report was drafted, staff has received two (2) notices in opposition and one (1) notice in favor of the applicant's request.

## CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

If the Planning and Zoning Commission chooses to recommend approval of the applicant's request for a Specific Use Permit (SUP) for an Office Building that exceeds 36 -feet in height on the subject property, then staff would propose the following conditions of approval:
(1) The applicant shall be responsible for maintaining compliance with the operational conditions contained in the Specific Use Permit (SUP) ordinance and which are detailed as follows:
(a) The development of the Subject Property shall generally conform to the Concept Plan as depicted in Exhibit ' $B$ ' of this ordinance.
(b) Buildings on the Subject Property shall not exceed 120-feet or as depicted on the building elevations/cross sections contained in the Conceptual Building Heights in Exhibit ' $C$ ' of this ordinance.
(c) The Specific Use Permit (SUP) shall be valid for a period of ten (10) years from the approval date of this ordinance (i.e. valid until January 2, 2034). If an extension of the Specific Use Permit (SUP) is necessary, the property owner shall submit a request in writing to the Director of Planning and Zoning no less than 90 -days prior to the expiration date of this ordinance (i.e. October 4, 2033). Upon receipt of a request for an extension, the Director of Planning and Zoning shall bring the request forward to the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council for review. The Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council shall be charged with determining if an extension of the Specific Use Permit (SUP) is warranted. This shall be conducted in accordance with the process and procedures outlined in Subsection 02.03, Procedures for Zoning Applications, of Article 11, Development Applications and Review Procedures, of the Unified Development Code (UDC), and with which this ordinance was originally adopted.
(2) Any construction resulting from the approval of this Specific Use Permit (SUP) shall conform to the requirements set forth by the Unified Development Code (UDC), the International Building Code (IBC), the Rockwall Municipal Code of Ordinances, city adopted engineering and fire codes and with all other applicable regulatory requirements administered and/or enforced by the state and federal government.

DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION
City of Rockwall
Planning and Zoning Department
385 S. Goliad Street
Rockwall, Texas 75087

## STAFF USE ONLY <br> PLANNING \& ZONING CASE NO.

NOTE: THE APPLICATION IS NOT CONSIDERED ACCEPTED BY THE CITY UNTLL THE PLANNING DIRECTOR AND CITY ENGINEER HAVE SIGNED BELOW.
DIRECTOR OF PLANNING:
CITY ENGINEER:

PLEASE CHECK THE APPROPRIATE BOX BELOW TO INDICATE THE TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT REQUEST ISELECT ONLY ONE BOX]:

## PLATTING APPLICATION FEES:

$\square$ MASTER PLAT $\left(\$ 100.00+\$ 15.00\right.$ ACRE) ${ }^{1}$
$\square$ PRELIMINARY PLAT ( $\$ 200.00+\$ 15.00$ ACRE $)^{1}$
$\square$ FINAL PLAT $\left(\$ 300.00+\$ 20.00\right.$ ACRE) ${ }^{1}$
$\square$ REPLAT $(\$ 300.00+\$ 20.00 \text { ACRE })^{1}$
$\square$ AMENDING OR MINOR PLAT (\$150.00)
$\square$ PLAT REINSTATEMENT REQUEST ( $\$ 100.00$ )
SITE PLAN APPLICATION FEES:
$\square$ SITE PLAN ( $8250.00+\$ 20.00$ ACRE $)$
$\square$ AMENDED SITE PLAN/ELEVATIONS/LANDSCAPING PLAN ( 8100.00 )

## ZONING APPLICATION FEES:

$\square$ ZONING CHANGE ( $\$ 200.00+\$ 15.00$ ACRE)
区 SPECIFIC USE PERMIT $(\$ 200.00+\$ 15.00 \text { ACRE })^{1 \$ 2}$
$\square$ PD DEVELOPMENT PLANS $(\$ 200.00+\$ 15.00 \text { ACRE })^{~}{ }^{1}$
OTHER APPLICATION FEES:

- TREE REMOVAL ( $\$ 75.00$ )
$\square$ VARIANCE REQUEST/SPECIAL EXCEPTIONS $(\$ 100.00)^{2}$


## NOTES:

! IN DETERMINING THE FEE, PLEASE USE THE EXACT ACREAGE WHEN MULTIPLYING BY THE PER ACRE AMOUNT. FOR REQUESTS ON LESS THAN ONE ACRE, ROUND UP TO ONE (1) ACRE. \%: A $\$ 1.000 .00$ FEE WILL BE ADDED TO THE APPLICATION FEE FOR ANY REQUEST THAT INVOLVES CONSTRUCTION WITHOUT OR NOT IN COMPLIANCE TO AN APPROVED BUILDING PERMIT.

PROPERTY INFORMATION [PLEASE PRINT]
adDress La Jolla Pointe Drive
SUBdIVISION La Jolla Pointe Addition LOT 22 BLOCK A
general location Corner of La Jolla Pointe Drive \& Carmel Circle
ZONING, SITE PLAN AND PLATTING INFORMATION [PLEASE PRNT]

CURRENT ZONING Commercial (C)
PROPOSED ZONING Specific Use Permit (SUP)
ACREAGE 4.2837
LOTS [CURRENT]

PROPOSED USE office
LOTS [PROPOSED]
$\square$ SITE PLANS AND PLATS: BY CHECKING THIS BOX YOU ACKNOWLEDGE THAT DUE TO THE PASSAGE OF HB3167 THE CITY NO LONGER HAS FLEXIBILITY WITH REGARD TO ITS APPROVAL PROCESS, AND FAILURE TO ADDRESS ANY OF STAFF'S COMMENTS BY THE DATE PROVIDED ON THE DEVELOPMENT CALENDAR WILL RESULT IN THE DENIAL OF YOUR CASE.
OWNER/APPLICANT/AGENT INFORMATION [PLEASE PRINT/CHECK THE PRIMARY CONTACT/ORIGINAL SIGNATURES ARE REQUIRED]

| $\square$ |  |  |  |
| ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| CONTACT PERSON | 36 Wagon Road, LLC | Paul Liechty | CONTACT PERSON Mant Wavering | Rockwall Economic Development Corporation

CITY, STATE \& ZIP Heath, TX 75032
PHONE
E-MAIL drpliechty@gmail.com

## CITY, STATE \& ZIP Rockwall, TX 75032

PHONE 972-772-0025
E-MAIL mwavering@rockwalledc.com

NOTARY VERIFICATION [REQUIREd]
BEFORE ME, THE UNDERSIGNED AUTHORITY, ON THIS DAY PERSONALLY APPEARED $\qquad$ Paul Liechty, Manager [OWNER] THE UNDERSIGNED, WHO STATED THE INFORMATION ON THIS APPLICATION TO BE TRUE AND CERTIFIED THE FOLLOWING:

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT I AM THE OWNER FOR THE PURPOSE OF THIS APPLICATION; ALL INFORMATION SUBMITTED HEREIN IS TRUE AND CORRECT; AND THE APPLICATION FEE OF $\$ 264.26$ TO COVER THE COST OF THIS APPLICATION, HAS BEEN PAID TO THE CITY OF ROCKWALL ON THIS THE 13th DAY OF November 2023. BY SIGNING THIS APPLICATION, I AGREE THAT THE CITY OF ROCKWALL (I.E. "CITY") IS AUTHORIZED AND PERMITTED TO PROVIDE INFORMATION CONTAINED WITHIN THIS APPLICATION TO THE PUBLIC. THE CITY IS ALSO AUTHORIZED AND PERMITTED TO REPRODUCE ANY COPYRIGHTED INFORMATION SUBMITTED IN CONUUNCTION WITH THIS APPLICATION, IF SUCH REPRODUCTION IS ASSOCIATED OR IN RESPONSE TO A REQUEST FOR PUBLIC INFORMATION."


# DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION 

 City of Rockwall Planning and Zoning Department 385 S. Goliad Street Rockwall, Texas 75087
## STAFF USE ONLY

## PLANNING \& ZONING CASE NO.

NOTE: THE APPLICATION IS NOT CONSIDERED ACCEPTED BY THE CITY UNTLL THE PLANNING DIRECTOR AND CITY ENGINEER HAVE SIGNED BELOW.

## DIRECTOR OF PLANNING:

CITY ENGINEER:

## PLATTING APPLICATION FEES

$\square$ MASTER PLAT ( $\$ 100.00+\$ 15.00$ ACRE) ${ }^{1}$
$\square$ PRELIMINARY PLAT ( $\$ 200.00+\$ 15.00$ ACRE $)^{1}$
FINAL PLAT $(\$ 300.00+\$ 20.00 \text { ACRE })^{1}$
REPLAT ( $\$ 300.00+\$ 20.00$ ACRE) ${ }^{1}$AMENDING OR MINOR PLAT (\$150.00)
$\square$ PLAT REINSTATEMENT REQUEST ( $\$ 100.00$ )
SITE PLAN APPLICATION FEES:
$\square$ SITE PLAN $\left(\$ 250.00+\$ 20.00\right.$ ACRE) ${ }^{1}$
$\square$ AMENDED SITE PLAN/ELEVATIONS/LANDSCAPING PLAN (\$100.00)

## ZONING APPLICATION FEES:

$\square$ ZONING CHANGE $\left(\$ 200.00+\$ 15.00\right.$ ACRE) ${ }^{1}$
区 SPECIFIC USE PERMIT $(\$ 200.00+\$ 15.00$ ACRE) 182
$\square$ PD DEVELOPMENT PLANS $\left(\$ 200.00+\$ 15.00\right.$ ACRE) ${ }^{1}$
OTHER APPLICATION FEES:
$\square$ TREE REMOVAL (\$75.00) ,
$\square$ VARIANCE REQUEST/SPECIAL EXCEPTIONS $(\$ 100.00){ }^{2}$

## NOTES:

::IN DETERMINING THE FEE, PLEASE USE THE EXACT ACREAGE WHEN MULTIPLYING BY THE 2: A s1,000.00 FEE WILL BE ADTS ON LESS THAN ONE ACRE, ROUND UP TO ONE (1) ACRE. INVOLVES CONSTRUCTION WITHOUT OR THET APPLICATION FEE FOR ANY REQUEST THAT PERMIT.

## PROPERTY INFORMATION [PLEASE PRNTiT]

ADDRESs La Jolla Pointe Drive
subdivision La Jolla Pointe Addition
general location La Jolla Pointe Drive, west of Ridge Rd
LOT 23 BLOCK A

## ZONING, SITE PLAN AND PLATTING INFORMATION [PLEASE PRINT]

Current zoning Commercial (C)
PROPOSED ZONING
Specific Use Permit (SUP)
ACREAGE
5.6569

LOTS [CURRENT]
CURRENT USE vacant
PROPOSED USE office
LOTS [PROPOSED]
$\square$ SITE PLANS AND PLATS: BY CHECKING THIS BOX YOU ACKNOWLEDGE THAT DUE TO THE PASSAGE OF HB3167 THE CITY NO LONGER HAS FLEXIBILITY WITH REGARD TO ITS APPROVAL PROCESS, AND FAILURE TO ADDRESS ANY OF STAFF'S COMMENTS BY THE DATE PROVIDED ON THE DEVELOPMENT CALENDAR WILL
RESULTIN THE DENIAL OF YOUR CASE.
OWNER/APPLICANT/AGENT INFORMATION [PLEASE PRINTCHECK THE PRIMARY CONTACT/ORIGINAL SIGNATURES ARE REQUIRED]

\author{

- OWNER <br> CONTACT PERSON <br> ADDRESS
}

CITY, STATE \& ZIP
PHONE
E-MAIL
scvora@sbcglobal.net

## NOTARY VERIFICATION [REQured]

BEFORE ME, THE UNDERSIGNED AUTHORITY, ON THIS DAY PERSONALLY APPEARED Shaitesh voRA
STATED THE INFORMATION ON THIS APPLICATION TO BE TRUE AND CERTIFIED THE FOLLOWING:
$\triangle$ APPLICANT Rockwall Econ
TACT PERSON Matt Wavering
ADDRESS 2610 Observation Trl, Suite 104

CITY, STATE \& ZIP Rockwall, TX 75032
PHONE 972-772-0025
E-MAIL mwavering@rockwalledc.com

## ${ }^{\text {II }}$ HEREBY CERTIFY THAT I A

 $\$ 284.85$$\qquad$ TO COVER THE COST OF THIS APPLICATION, HAS BEEN PATION SUBMITTED HEREIN IS TRUE AND CORRECT; AND THE APPLICATION FEE OF INFORMATION November 2023. BY SIGNING THIS APPLICATION, I AGREE THAT THE TO THE CITY OF ROCKWALL ON THIS THE



City of Rockwall
The City of Rockwall GIS maps are continually under development and therefore subject to change without notice. While we endeavor to provide timely and accurate information, we make no guarantees. The City of Rockwall makes no warranty, express or implied, including warranties of merchantability and fitness for a particular purpose. Use of the information is the sole responsibility of the user.
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385 S. Goliad Street
Rockwall, Texas 75087 (P): (972) 771-7745
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| From: | Zavala, Melanie |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Thursday, November 16, 2023 3:19 PM |
| Cc: | Miller, Ryan; Ross, Bethany; Guevara, Angelica; Lee, Henry |
| Subject: | Neighborhood Notification Program [Z2023-052] |
| Attachments: | Public Notice (P\&Z) (11.15.2023).pdf; HOA Notification Map (11.13.2023).pdf |

HOA/Neighborhood Association Representative:
Per your participation in the Neighborhood Notification Program, you are receiving this notice to inform your organization that a zoning case has been filed with the City of Rockwall that is located within 1,500 -feet of the boundaries of your neighborhood. As the contact listed for your organization, you are encouraged to share this information with the residents of your subdivision. Please find the attached map detailing the property requesting to be rezoned in relation to your subdivision boundaries. Additionally, below is the summary of the zoning case that will be published in the Rockwall Herald Banner on November 17, 2023. The Planning and Zoning Commission will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, December 12, 2023 at 6:00 PM, and the City Council will hold a public hearing on Monday, December 18, 2023 at 6:00 PM. Both hearings will take place at 6:00 PM at City Hall, 385 S . Goliad, Rockwall, TX 75087.

All interested parties are encouraged to submit public comments via email to Planning@rockwall.com at least 30 minutes in advance of the meeting. Please include your name, address, and the case number your comments are referring to. These comments will be read into the record during each of the public hearings. Additional information on all current development cases can be found on the City's website: https://sites.google.com/site/rockwallplanning/development/development-cases.

## Z2023-052: SUP for La Jolla Pointe Drive

Hold a public hearing to discuss and consider a request by Matt Wavering of the Rockwall Economic Development Corporation (REDC) on behalf of Paul Liechty of 36 Wagon Road, LLC and Shailesha Vora of Akshar 10, LLC for the approval of a Specific Use Permit (SUP) for an Office Building that will exceed 36 -feet in the Scenic Overlay (SOV) District on a 9.9406 -acre tract of land identified as Lots 22 \& 23, Block A, La Jolla Pointe Addition, Phase 2, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Commercial (C) District, situated within the Scenic Overlay (SOV) District and the $\mathrm{IH}-30$ Overlay ( $\mathrm{IH}-30 \mathrm{OV}$ ) District, generally located west of the intersection of La Jolla Pointe Drive and Ridge Road [FM-740], and take any action necessary.

Thank You,

## Melanie Zavala

Planning \& Zoning Coordinator | Planning Dept.| City of Rockwall
385 S. Goliad Street \| Rockwall, TX 75087
http://www.rockwall.com/
972-771-7745 Ext. 6568

City of Rockwall
Planning \& Zoning Department
385 S. Goliad Street
Rockwall, Texas 75087
(P): (972) 771-7745
(W): www.rockwall.com

The City of Rockwall GIS maps are continually under development and therefore subject to change without notice. While we endeavor to provide timely and accurate information, we make no guarantees. The City of Rockwall makes no warranty, express or implied, including warranties of merchantability and fitness for a particular purpose. Use of the information is the sole responsibility of the user.


Case Number:
Case Name: Case Type:
Zoning:
Case Address:

Z2023-052
SUP for La Jolla Pointe Drive Zoning Commercial (C) District La Jolla Pointe Drive


SPARKS TANA J
1000 SPARKS DR
FATE, TX 75087

SHIPMAN FIRE GROUP INC 1020 LA JOLLA POINTE DRIVE ROCKWALL, TX 75087

TURTLE COVE RESIDENTIAL ASSOC INC C/O NEIGHBORHOOD MANAGEMENT 1024 S GREENVILLE AVE SUITE 230 ALLEN, TX 75002

STEAK N SHAKE OPERATIONS, INC C/O THE STEAK N SHAKE COMPANY 107 S PENNSYLVANIA ST SUITE 400 INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46204

RESIDENT
1600 LA JOLLA POINTE DR ROCKWALL, TX 75087

2424 MTA REALTY LLC
2424 RIDGE ROAD
ROCKWALL, TX 75087

ESTATE OF DR RICHARD L BROOKS 2504 RIDGE RD STE 107 ROCKWALL, TX 75087

RESIDENT 2510 RIDGE RD ROCKWALL, TX 75087

RESIDENT
2555 RIDGE RD
ROCKWALL, TX 75087

> RESIDENT
> 2604 RIDGE RD
> ROCKWALL, TX 75087

RESIDENT
2616 RIDGE RD
ROCKWALL, TX 75087

MARLEY KELLEE AND CLAYTON D
2904 PRESTON TRAIL
ROCKWALL, TX 75087

```
TOLKACHJOV HOLDINGS ROCKWALL LLC 1105 LADY DE VANCE LN LEWISVILLE, TX 75056
```

TRITON I-30 ROCKWALL LLC
1845 WOODALL ROGERS FREEWAY, SUITE 1100 DALLAS, TX 75201

RESIDENT
2455 RIDGE RD ROCKWALL, TX 75087

## BROOKS RICHARD L MD <br> 2504 RIDGE RD STE 101 ROCKWALL, TX 75087

> RESIDENT
> 2535 RIDGE RD ROCKWALL, TX 75087

BELAC PROPERTIES LLC
2600 RIDGE RD STE 102 ROCKWALL, TX 75087

> RESIDENT
> 2608 RIDGE RD ROCKWALL, TX 75087

2455 RIDGE LLC 2701 CUSTER PARKWAY SUITE 706 RICHARDSON, TX 75080

BOLD LLC
121 WYLER DR DAKOTA, IL 61018

RICHARD HARRIS AND JUDY HARRIS FAMILY TRUST RICHARD AND JUDY HARRIS- TRUSTEES 210 GLENN AVENUE ROCKWALL, TX 75087
RESIDENT
2475 RIDGE RD
ROCKWALL, TX 75087

AKSHAR 10 LLC 2508 SAM SCHOOL ROAD SOUTHLAKE, TX 76092

RESIDENT 2545 RIDGE RD ROCKWALL, TX 75087

BROOKS TIM
2602 RIDGE ROAD SUITE 1 ROCKWALL, TX 75087
RESIDENT
2610 RIDGE RD
ROCKWALL, TX 75087

HALL JUSTIN KIMBELL
2902 PRESTON TRAIL ROCKWALL, TX 75087

LEE GREGORY P AND LAUREN W 2908 PRESTON TRAIL ROCKWALL, TX 75087

KESTER SEAN AND MISTI 2910 PRESTON TRAIL
ROCKWALL, TX 75087

TURNER CECE 3002 PRESTON CT ROCKWALL, TX 75087

RESIDENT 3004 PRESTON TR ROCKWALL, TX 75087

RESIDENT 3006 PRESTON TR ROCKWALL, TX 75087

BURK CATHERINE \& HOWARD T 3007 PRESTON CT ROCKWALL, TX 75087

GANCI GLENN
305 DREW LN HEATH, TX 75032

ROBERTS JAMES F 4112 VILLAGE DR ROCKWALL, TX 75087

36 WAGON ROAD, LLC
502 TERRY LANE
HEATH, TX 75032

RESIDENT
550 VIGOR WAY
ROCKWALL, TX 75087
RESIDENT
568 E I30
ROCKWALL, TX 75087

RESIDENT

ROCKWALL, TX 75087

EHLERT GORDON W \& LINDA K
3001 PRESTON CT
ROCKWALL, TX 75087

SANCHEZ ENEIDA
3003 LAKESIDE DR ROCKWALL, TX 75087

MILLER KATHLEEN PALMER 3004 PRESTON CT<br>ROCKWALL, TX 75087

HAMBLEY DAVID L JR \& CAROL A
3006 PRESTON COURT
ROCKWALL, TX 75087

RESIDENT
3008 PRESTON TR
ROCKWALL, TX 75087

LOTL HOLDINGS LLC 320 PORTVIEW PLACE ROCKWALL, TX 75032

QSR 30 LAND LLC
4515 LBJ FREEWAY
DALLAS, TX 75224

36 WAGON ROAD, LLC 502 TERRY LANE HEATH, TX 75032

RESIDENT 550 E I30
ROCKWALL, TX 75087

RESIDENT
578 E I30
ROCKWALL, TX 75087

ROGERS GENTRY 3003 PRESTON COURT ROCKWALL, TX 75087

RESIDENT 3005 PRESTON CT ROCKWALL, TX 75087

## CHILDRESS DENNIS K JR \& HILARY

 3007 LAKESIDE DR ROCKWALL, TX 75087
## ZUMWALT HAROLD J \& VICKY

3009 PRESTON CT
ROCKWALL, TX 75087

RESIDENT 4100 VILLAGE DR ROCKWALL, TX 75087

CBAX PROPERTIES LLC 465 W PRESIDENT GEORGE BUSH HWY RICHARDSON, TX 75080

RESIDENT 550 LA JOLLA DR ROCKWALL, TX 75087

RESIDENT
560 E I30 ROCKWALL, TX 75087

ROCKWALL CORNER CORPORATION 600 E I-30 ROCKWALL, TX 75087

RESIDENT
610 I30
ROCKWALL, TX 75087

RESIDENT 630 I 30
ROCKWALL, TX 75087

SVRCEK JOSEPH T 649 CHANNEL RIDGE DR ROCKWALL, TX 75087

RESIDENT 657 CHANNEL RIDGE DR ROCKWALL, TX 75087

SANDERS JOLINDA 950 BRIAR OAKS DRIVE ROCKWALL, TX 75087

WILLIAMS KYLIE J
958 BRIAR OAK DR ROCKWALL, TX 75087

LAKESIDE VILLAGE HOMEOWNERS
P.O. BOX 650255

DALLAS, TX 75265

LAKESIDE VILLAGE H O ASSOC
P.O. BOX 650255

DALLAS, TX 75265

WAFFLE HOUSE INC
ATTN: TAX DEPT
PO BOX 6450
NORCROSS, GA 30091

ROCKWALL INNKEEPERS I LTD 6176 FM 2011
LONGVIEW, TX 75603

## ZASTROW BRADLEY L \& SANDRA D 641 CHANNEL RIDGE DR ROCKWALL, TX 75087

PAUL'S KWIK KAR INC 650 E INTERSTATE 30 ROCKWALL, TX 75087

ALLEN TEXAS WHITE TIGER CORPORATION 853 BEAR CROSSING DRIVE ALLEN, TX 75013

FIELDS TODD H AND NANCY E 954 BRIAR OAKS DR ROCKWALL, TX 75087

JAGH HOSPITALITY LP
996 E I-30
ROCKWALL, TX 75087

LAKESIDE VILLAGE HOMEOWNERS
P.O. BOX 650255

DALLAS, TX 75265

B\&M ALPHA INC
PO BOX 171754
ARLINGTON, TX 76003

ROCKWALL INNKEEPERS I LTD<br>6176 FM 2011<br>LONGVIEW, TX 75603

COGDELL CHELSEA ANNE 645 CHANNEL RIDGE DRIVE ROCKWALL, TX 75087

MCCOY RAYMOND \& BELVA 653 CHANNEL RIDGE DR ROCKWALL, TX 75087

MCDONALDS CORP (398/42) C/O KEVA CHILDRESS 935 W RALPH HALL PKWY \#101 ROCKWALL, TX 75032

GERRALD SCOTT W \& JUDY A 955 BRIAR OAK DR ROCKWALL, TX 75087

ROBERT H FAMILY TRUST AND BMK FIN CORP AND
SHERRI LANE HEWETT AND SUSAN LYNNE HEWETT LUCAS
C/O IHOP ATTN HAKIM REMA P. O. BOX 12168
DALLAS, TX 75225

LAKESIDE VILLAGE HOMEOWNERS
P.O. BOX 650255

DALLAS, TX 75265

ROCKWALL II PROPERTIES LLC PO BOX 630768
HOUSTON, TX 77263

Property Owner and/or Resident of the City of Rockwall:
You are hereby notified that the City of Rockwall Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council will consider the following application:

## Z2023-052: SUP for La Jolla Pointe Drive

Hold a public hearing to discuss and consider a request by Matt Wavering of the Rockwall Economic Development Corporation (REDC) on behalf of Paul Liechty of 36 Wagon Road, LLC and Shailesha Vora of Akshar 10, LLC for the approval of a Specific Use Permit (SUP) for an Office Building that will exceed 36 -feet in the Scenic Overlay (SOV) District on a 9.9406-acre tract of land identified as Lots 22 \& 23, Block A, La Jolla Pointe Addition, Phase 2, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Commercial (C) District, situated within the Scenic Overlay (SOV) District and the IH-30 Overlay (IH-30 OV) District, generally located west of the intersection of La Jolla Pointe Drive and Ridge Road [FM-740], and take any action necessary.

For the purpose of considering the effects of such a request, the Planning and Zoning Commission will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, December 12, 2023 at 6:00 PM, and the City Council will hold a public hearing on Monday, December 18, 2023 at 6:00 PM. These hearings will be held in the City Council Chambers at City Hall, 385 S. Goliad Street.

As an interested property owner, you are invited to attend these meetings. If you prefer to express your thoughts in writing please return the form to:

Henry Lee<br>Rockwall Planning and Zoning Dept.<br>385 S. Goliad Street<br>Rockwall, TX 75087

You may also email your comments to the Planning Department at planning@rockwall.com. If you choose to email the Planning Department please include your name and address for identification purposes.

Your comments must be received by Monday, December 18, 2023 at 4:00 PM to ensure they are included in the information provided to the City Council.
Sincerely,
Ryan Miller, AICP
Director of Planning \& Zoning
MORE INFORMATION ON THIS CASE CAN BE FOUND AT: https:///sites. google.com/site/rockwallplanning/development/development-cases

## - - - PLEASE RETURN THE BELOW FORM

## Case No. Z2023-052: SUP for La Jolla Pointe Drive

## Please place a check mark on the appropriate line below:

$\square \mathrm{I}$ am in favor of the request for the reasons listed below.
$\square$ I am opposed to the request for the reasons listed below.

## Name:

## Address:

Tex. Loc. Gov. Code, Sec. 211.006 (d) If a proposed change to a regulation or boundary is protested in accordance with this subsection, the proposed change must receive, in order to take effect, the affirmative vote of at least three-fourths of all members of the governing body. The protest must be written and signed by the owners of at least 20 percent of either: (1) the area of the lots or land covered by the proposed change; or (2) the area of the lots or land immediately adjoining the area covered by the proposed change and extending 200 feet from that area.

> PLEASE SEE LOCATION MAP OF SUBJECT PROPERTY ON THE BACK OF THIS NOTICE

November 13, 2023
Ryan Miller
Director of Planning
City of Rockwall
385 S. Goliad Street,
Rockwall, TX 75087
Re: La Jolla Pointe Drive
Mr. Miller:
Enclosed you will find an application and supporting documents requesting that the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council grant a Specific Use Permit (SUP) on the 9.9406-acre tract of land located on La Jolla Pointe Drive in Rockwall. The Rockwall Economic Development Corporation (REDC) has contracts to purchase the two parcels of land and has been performing due diligence and planning exercises over the past several months.

The REDC intends to utilize the property to attract "Class-A" corporate office developments occupied by tenants that can provide high-quality employment opportunities for the citizens of Rockwall. In order to attract the tenants and the significant tax value investment desired by the REDC, we are proposing office projects that will be vertical in nature, which we feel will be of superior quality than the standard one or two-story garden-style office buildings that are more commonly seen without public involvement.

The provided cross-sections show a potential maximum building height of 120 feet above grade. Therefore, the zoning requires an amendment to allow for building heights up to 120 feet, as well as the FAR (floor area ratio) to accommodate office buildings of this scale. Please note that the property grade is approximately 12 feet below the elevation of Ridge Road and 13 feet below the elevation or Carmel Circle. Furthermore, the site's elevation is 20 feet or more below the Ridge Road elevation.

It is worth noting that the REDC is strictly governed by state statute as well as oversight provided by a Board of Directors of Rockwall residents appointed by the Rockwall City Council. You may rest-assured that the future development of this property will be of the highest-quality, will adhere to City of Rockwall development standards, and will support business enterprise and local employment alike. Furthermore, the REDC is highly selective in its recruiting efforts and therefore will be patient in the development of this property, not wishing to compromise on quality for an expedient development. Due to this fact, the REDC requests that the SUP remains effective for a period of no less than 10 years in order to provide ample time for marketing and attraction efforts.

The REDC kindly requests this SUP to facilitate the development of this property for the purposes of high-quality corporate office development.

Respectfully,


Matt Wavering
Vice President
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ALTAINSPS LAND TITLE SURVEY
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WILLIAM BLEVINS SURVEY
ABSTRACT NO. 9
ABSTRACT SURVE ABSTRACT NO. 200 ROCKWALL COUNTY, TEXAS

## ORDINANCE NO. 24-XX

SPECIFIC USE PERMIT NO. S-2XX


#### Abstract

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCKWALL, TEXAS, AMENDING THE UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT CODE (UDC) [ORDINANCE NO. 20-02] OF THE CITY OF ROCKWALL, ROCKWALL COUNTY, TEXAS, AS PREVIOUSLY AMENDED, SO AS TO GRANT A SPECIFIC USE PERMIT (SUP) FOR BUILDINGS THAT EXCEED 36-FEET IN HEIGHT ON A 9.9406-ACRE TRACT OF LAND IDENTIFIED AS LOTS 22 \& 23, BLOCK A, LA JOLLA POINTE ADDITION, PHASE 2, CITY OF ROCKWALL, ROCKWALL COUNTY, TEXAS; AND MORE SPECIFICALLY DESCRIBED AND DEPICTED IN EXHIBIT 'A' OF THIS ORDINANCE; PROVIDING FOR SPECIAL CONDITIONS; PROVIDING FOR A PENALTY OF FINE NOT TO EXCEED THE SUM OF TWO THOUSAND DOLLARS ( $\$ 2,000.00$ ) FOR EACH OFFENSE; PROVIDING FOR A SEVERABILITY CLAUSE; PROVIDING FOR A REPEALER CLAUSE; PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.


WHEREAS, the City has received a request from Matt Wavering of the Rockwall Economic Development Corporation (REDC) for the approval of a Specific Use Permit (SUP) for Buildings that Exceed 36-Feet in Height on a 9.9406-acre tract of land identified as Lots 22 \& 23, Block A, La Jolla Pointe Addition, Phase 2, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Commercial (C) District, situated within the IH-30 Overlay (IH-30 OV) District and the Scenic Overlay (SOV) District, generally located west of the intersection of La Jolla Pointe Drive and Ridge Road [FM740], and being more specifically described and depicted in Exhibit ' $A$ ' of this ordinance, which herein after shall be referred to as the Subject Property and incorporated by reference herein; and

WHEREAS, the Planning and Zoning Commission of the City of Rockwall and the governing body of the City of Rockwall, in compliance with the laws of the State of Texas and the ordinances of the City of Rockwall, have given the requisite notices by publication and otherwise, and have held public hearings and afforded a full and fair hearing to all property owners generally, and to all persons interested in and situated in the affected area and in the vicinity thereof, the governing body in the exercise of its legislative discretion has concluded that the Unified Development Code (UDC) [Ordinance No. 20-02] of the City of Rockwall should be amended as follows:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Rockwall, Texas;
SECTION 1. The Unified Development Code (UDC) [Ordinance No. 20-02] of the City of Rockwall, as heretofore amended, be and the same is hereby amended so as to grant a Specific Use Permit (SUP) for Buildings that Exceed 36-Feet in Height in accordance with Article 04, Permissible Uses, of the Unified Development Code (UDC) [Ordinance No. 20-02] on the Subject Property; and,

SECTION 2. That the Specific Use Permit (SUP) shall be subject to the requirements set forth in Subsection 04.05, Commercial (C) District; Subsection 06.02, General Overlay District Standards; Subsection 06.06, IH-30 Overlay (IH-30 OV) District; and Subsection 06.08, Scenic Overlay (SOV) District, of Article 05, District Development Standards, of the Unified Development Code (UDC) [Ordinance No. 20-02] -- as heretofore amended and as may be amended in the future --
and with the following conditions:

### 2.1 OPERATIONAL CONDITIONS

The following conditions pertain to the operation of Buildings that Exceed 36-Feet in Height on the Subject Property and conformance to these conditions is required for continued operation:

1) The development of the Subject Property shall generally conform to the Concept Plan as depicted in Exhibit ' $B$ ' of this ordinance.
2) Buildings on the Subject Property shall not exceed 120 -feet or as depicted on the building elevations/cross sections contained in the Conceptual Building Heights in Exhibit 'C' of this ordinance.
3) The Specific Use Permit (SUP) shall be valid for a period of ten (10) years from the approval date of this ordinance (i.e. valid until January 2, 2034). If an extension of the Specific Use Permit (SUP) is necessary, the property owner shall submit a request in writing to the Director of Planning and Zoning no less than 90 -days prior to the expiration date of this ordinance (i.e. October 4, 2033). Upon receipt of a request for an extension, the Director of Planning and Zoning shall bring the request forward to the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council for review. The Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council shall be charged with determining if an extension of the Specific Use Permit (SUP) is warranted. This shall be conducted in accordance with the process and procedures outlined in Subsection 02.03, Procedures for Zoning Applications, of Article 11, Development Applications and Review Procedures, of the Unified Development Code (UDC), and with which this ordinance was originally adopted.

### 2.2 COMPLIANCE

Approval of this ordinance in accordance with Subsection 02.02, Specific Use Permits (SUP) of Article 11, Development Applications and Review Procedures, of the Unified Development Code (UDC) will require the Subject Property to comply with the following:

1) Upon obtaining a Building Permit, should the business owner operating under the guidelines of this ordinance fail to meet the minimum operational requirements set forth herein and outlined in the Unified Development Code (UDC), the City may (after proper notice) initiate proceedings to revoke the Specific Use Permit (SUP) in accordance with Subsection 02.02(F), Revocation, of Article 11, Development Applications and Revision Procedures, of the Unified Development Code (UDC) [Ordinance No. 20-02].

SECTION 3. That the official zoning map of the City be corrected to reflect the changes in zoning described herein.

SECTION 4. That all ordinances of the City of Rockwall in conflict with the provisions of this ordinance be, and the same are hereby repealed to the extent of that conflict.

SECTION 5. Any person, firm, or corporation violating any of the provisions of this ordinance shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be punished by a penalty of fine not to exceed the sum of TWO THOUSAND DOLLARS $(\$ 2,000.00)$ for each offence and each and every day such offense shall continue shall be deemed to constitute a separate offense.

SECTION 6. If any section or provision of this ordinance or the application of that section or provision to any person, firm, corporation, situation or circumstance is for any reason judged invalid, the
adjudication shall not affect any other section or provision of this ordinance or the application of any other section or provision to any other person, firm, corporation, situation or circumstance, and the City Council declares that it would have adopted the valid portions and applications of the ordinance without the invalid parts and to this end the provisions of this ordinance shall remain in full force and effect.

SECTION 7. That this ordinance shall take effect immediately from and after its passage.

## PASSED AND APPROVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCKWALL, TEXAS,

 THIS THE $2^{\text {ND }}$ DAY OF JANUARY, 2024.
## ATTEST:

Kristy Teague, City Secretary

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

## Frank J. Garza, City Attorney

$1^{\text {st }}$ Reading: December 18, 2023
$2^{\text {nd }}$ Reading: January 2, 2024

Exhibit 'A'


Exhibit 'B'
Concept Plan


Exhibit ' C '
Conceptual Building Heights


TO:
DATE:
APPLICANT:
CASE NUMBER:

Planning and Zoning Commission
December 12, 2023
Matt Wavering; Rockwall Economic Development Corporation (REDC)
Z2023-053; Amendment to Planned Development District 4 (PD-4)

## SUMMARY

Hold a public hearing to discuss and consider a request by Matt Wavering of the Rockwall Economic Development Corporation (REDC) on behalf of Richard Chandler of HFS Management, Inc. for the approval of a Zoning Change amending Planned Development District 4 (PD-4) [Ordinance No. 72-03 \& 01-26] being a 12.1462-acre tract of land identified as Tract 2 of the D . Atkins Survey, Abstract No. 1, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Planned Development District 4 (PD-4) for General Retail (GR) District land uses, situated within the Scenic Overlay (SOV) District, generally located in between Lakedale Drive and Becky Lane on the eastside of Ridge Road [FM-740], and take any action necessary.

## BACKGROUND

The City Council approved Ordinance No. 60-02 [Case No. A1960-002], annexing the subject property into the City of Rockwall on September 5, 1960. On January 27, 1972, the City Council approved Planned Development District 4 (PD-4) [Ordinance No. 72-03] allowing Neighborhood Services (NS) District and General Retail (GR) District land uses. In addition, the Planned Development District allowed Shopping Center land uses on the subject property. On June 18, 2001, the City Council approved a City initiated amendment to Planned Development District 4 (PD-4) [Case No. PZ2001-053-01] removing Neighborhood Services (NS) District land uses from the base zoning. This changed the Planned Development District to only allow General Retail (GR) District land uses. The subject property has remained vacant since the time of annexation.

## PURPOSE

On November 13, 2023, the applicant -- Matt Wavering of the Rockwall Economic Development Corporation (REDC) -- submitted an application requesting a Zoning Change to amend Planned Development District 4 (PD-4) to facilitate the development of multi-story Office Buildings on the subject property.

## ADJACENT LAND USES AND ACCESS

The subject property is generally located between Lakedale Drive and Becky Lane on the eastside of Ridge Road [FM-740]. The land uses adjacent to the subject property are as follows:

North: Directly north of the subject property is a mixed-use development consisting of 202 urban residential units and several office/retail land uses. This property is better known as Rockwall Commons, and is zoned Planned Development District 1 (PD-1) for General Retail (GR) District and Multi-Family 14 (MF-14) District land uses. North of this mixed-use development, is another mixed-use development consisting of 140 urban residential units and several office/retail land uses. This property is known as the Lakeview Apartments, and is zoned Planned Development District 1 (PD-1) for General Retail (GR) District land uses.

South: Directly south of the subject property is Ridge Road, which is identified as a M4D (i.e. minor collector, four [4] lane, divided roadway) on the City's Master Thoroughfare Plan contained in the OURHometown Vision 2040 Comprehensive Plan. South of this thoroughfare is an 8.583 -acre tract of vacant land (i.e. Lot 1, Block A, Sky Ridge Addition) zoned Commercial (C) District.

East: Directly east of the subject property is a 100 -foot right-of-way owned by the Union Pacific/Dallas Garland NE Railroad. Beyond this are two (2) vacant tracts of land (i.e. Tract 9 [9.24-acres] \& Tract 9-1 [7-acres], of the D. Atkins Survey, Abstract No. 1), which are situated within the 100 -year floodplain and zoned Commercial (C) District. East of the two (2) vacant tracts is the Waterstone Estates Subdivision, which was platted on November 30, 1994 and consists of 123 single-family residential lots. This subdivision is zoned Single-Family 7 (SF-7) District.

West: $\quad$ Directly west of the subject property is Ridge Road [FM-740], which is identified as a M4D (i.e. major collector, four [4] lane, divided roadway) on the City's Master Thoroughfare Plan contained in the OURHometown Vision 2040 Comprehensive Plan. Continuing west are several single-family residential subdivisions (i.e. Lake Ray Hubbard Estates [65 lots], The Estates of Coast Royal 1 [four [4\} lots], The Estates of Coast Royal 2 [13 lots], and Lakeridge Park [87 lots]), which are zoned for Single-Family 10 (SF-10) District land uses.

## MAP 1: LOCATION MAP

YELLOW: SUBJECT PROPERTY


## CHARACTERISTICS OF THE REQUEST

The applicant has submitted a concept plan and a conceptual building height exhibit indicating that the proposed development scheme will be multi-story Office Buildings. Based on the concept plan and conceptual building height exhibit, the intent of the requested zoning change is to develop the subject property with Office Buildings that exceeds the $25,000 \mathrm{SF}$ maximum building size required by the General Retail (GR) District standards, and exceed the height requirement of 36 -feet stipulated by the General Retail (GR) District and the Scenic Overlay (SOV) District standards. According to the applicant's letter, the increased building size and height is being requested in order to attract "high-quality employment opportunities" that are of "superior quality than the standard one or two-story garden-style office buildings." More specifically, the applicant is requesting a maximum permissible height of 90 -feet. Based on the applicant's letter this height will be in consistent with the adjacent developments along the east side of Ridge Road [FM-740] (i.e. the Commons and Lakeview Apartments).

## CONFORMANCE WITH THE CITY'S CODES

According to Article 13, Definitions, of the Unified Development Code (UDC), an Office Building is defined as "(a) facility that provides executive, management, administrative, or professional services... not involving the sale of merchandise except as incidental to a permitted use. Typical examples include real estate, insurance, property management, investment, employment, travel, advertising, law, architecture, design, engineering, accounting, call centers, and similar offices." In this case, the proposed concept plan indicates the development of Office Buildings on the subject property, which is in conformance with this definition. In addition, according to Subsection 06.02, General Overlay District Standards, and Subsection 04.04, General Retail (GR) District, Article 05, District Development Standards, of the Unified Development Code (UDC), buildings are limited to 25,000 SF and cannot exceed over 36 -feet in height. Given that the subject property is within a Planned Development District, these requirements prompted the applicant to submit for the proposed zoning change and amend Planned Development District 4 (PD-4).

## OURHOMETOWN VISION 2040 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

According to the OURHometown Vision 2040 Comprehensive Plan, the subject property is designated for Commercial/Retail land uses and is situated within the Scenic District. According to the Land Use Plan, the Commercial/Retail land use is "...characterized by single to multi-tenant commercial retail centers along major arterials at key intersections." The Land Use Plan goes on to state that Office is a Secondary Land Use within the Commercial/Retail land use. That being said, the Scenic District description specifically states that "...vacant areas -- designated for Commercial land uses -- adjacent to Ridge Road [FM-740] ..." should eventually developed with office or neighborhood/convenience centers. In this case, the applicant's development scheme for Office Buildings [1] satisfies the Secondary Land Use description for Commercial/Retail land uses, and [2] meets the intent for vacant land development within the Scenic District adjacent to Ridge Road [FM-740]. Based on this, the proposed future development appears to conform to the Future Land Use Plan contained within the OURHometown Vision 2040 Comprehensive Plan.

According to the Vision Statement within Chapter 06, Economic Development, of the OURHometown Vision 2040 Comprehensive Plan, "(t)he City of Rockwall should continue to build a diversified local economy by attracting and retaining businesses that can utilize the City's existing highly skilled workforce and aid in the creation of a stable and resilient tax base." In this case, the applicant's letter states that they intend to attract Class-A corporate office developments occupied by tenants that can provide high-quality employment opportunities for the citizens of Rockwall." Given this, the applicant's request appears to conform to goals and policies laid out for Economic Development within the OURHometown Vision 2040 Comprehensive Plan.

## STAFF ANALYSIS

In this case, the proposed concept plan and conceptual building height exhibit appear to conform with all of the density and dimensional requirements for a property in a General Retail (GR) District, with the exception of maximum building size and maximum building height requirements. The applicant's proposal also appears to conform with intent of the OURHometown Vision 2040 Comprehensive Plan. Staff has included a Purpose Statement within the Planned Development District ordinance that states, the purpose of the "... Planned Development District is to provide Class 'A' corporate offices that will be occupied by tenants that can provide high-quality employment opportunities for the citizens of Rockwall." If the applicant deviates from this stated intent, the Planned Development District ordinance provides flexibility through a PD Development Plan. In the same spirit of the Purpose Statement, staff has provided a list of prohibited land uses that did not appear to align with the applicant's letter or the adjacent/existing residential land uses.

In addition to the Purpose Statement, staff has included changes to the Permitted Uses and Lot Dimensional Requirements sections of the ordinance in order to facilitate the applicant's request in a manner that is consistent with development in the area. As discussed in the Characteristics of the Request and the Conformance with the City Codes sections of this case memo, the General Retail (GR) District does not allow buildings over 25,000 SF. Given this, the Permitted Uses section of the ordinance lists Office Buildings Greater than 25,000 SF as a permitted by-right land use. Staff also updated the Lot Dimensional Requirements for the ordinance to allow a maximum lot coverage of $60 \%$ (as opposed to the $40 \%$ called out in the UDC), and a floor area ratio of 4:1 (opposed to the 2:1 called out in the UDC). In addition, the following notes were included, [1] a maximum of one (1) row of parking may be located between the front façade and the property line, and [2] the front yard setback (i.e. 25-
feet) shall create a uniform building frontage along Ridge Road [FM-740]. Staff included these notes to reaffirm the requirements of the General Overlay District Standards contained in the Unified Development Code (UDC), and maintain a consistent frontage along the east side of Ridge Road [FM-740]. With this being said, a request for a Zoning Change is a discretionary decision for the City Council pending a recommendation from the Planning and Zoning Commission.

## NOTIFICATIONS

On November 15, 2023, staff mailed 80 notices to property owners and occupants within 500 -feet of the subject property. Staff also notified the Waterstone and Turtle Cove Homeowner's Association (HOA), which are the only Homeowners' Associations (HOAs) and/or Neighborhood Organizations within 1,500-feet of the subject property participating in the Neighborhood Notification Program. Additionally, staff posted a sign on the subject property, and advertised the public hearings in the Rockwall Herald Banner as required by the Unified Development Code (UDC). At the time this report was drafted, staff has received one (1) notice in opposition of the applicant's request.

## CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

If the Planning and Zoning Commission chooses to recommend approval of the applicant's request for a Zoning Change to amend Planned Development District 4 (PD-4), then staff would propose the following conditions of approval:
(1) The applicant shall be responsible for maintaining compliance with the PD Development Standards outlined within the Planned Development District 4 (PD-4) Ordinance.
(2) Any construction resulting from the approval of this Specific Use Permit (SUP) shall conform to the requirements set forth by the Unified Development Code (UDC), the International Building Code (IBC), the Rockwall Municipal Code of Ordinances, city adopted engineering and fire codes and with all other applicable regulatory requirements administered and/or enforced by the state and federal government.

# DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION 

City of Rockwall
Planning and Zoning Department
385 S. Goliad Street
Rockwall, Texas 75087

STAFF USE ONLY
PLANNING \& ZONING CASE NO.
NOTE: THE APPLICATION IS NOT CONSIDERED ACCEPTED BY THE CITY UNTIL THE PLANNING DIRECTOR AND CITY ENGINEER HAVE SIGNED BELOW.

DIRECTOR OF PLANNING:
CITY ENGINEER:

PLEASE CHECK THE APPROPRIATE BOX BELOW TO INDICATE THE TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT REQUEST [SELECT ONLY ONE BOX]:

## PLATTING APPLICATION FEES:

$\square$ MASTER PLAT $\left(\$ 100.00+\$ 15.00\right.$ ACRE) ${ }^{1}$
$\square$ PRELIMINARY PLAT $(\$ 200.00+\$ 15.00 \text { ACRE })^{1}$
$\square$ FINAL PLAT $\left(\$ 300.00+\$ 20.00\right.$ ACRE) ${ }^{1}$
$\square$ REPLAT ( $\$ 300.00+\$ 20.00$ ACRE) ${ }^{1}$
$\square$ AMENDING OR MINOR PLAT ( $\$ 150.00$ )
$\square$ PLAT REINSTATEMENT REQUEST ( $\$ 100.00$ )
SITE PLAN APPLICATION FEES:
$\square$ SITE PLAN $(\$ 250.00+\$ 20.00 \text { ACRE })^{1}$
$\square$ AMENDED SITE PLAN/ELEVATIONS/LANDSCAPING PLAN (\$100.00)

## ZONING APPLICATION FEES:

$\square$ ZONING CHANGE ( $\$ 200.00+\$ 15.00$ ACRE) ${ }^{1}$
$\square$ SPECIFIC USE PERMIT $\left(\$ 200.00+\$ 15.00\right.$ ACRE) ${ }^{1 \& 2}$
$\boxed{\square}$ PD DEVELOPMENT PLANS ( $\$ 200.00+\$ 15.00$ ACRE) ${ }^{1}$
OTHER APPLICATION FEES:
$\square$ TREE REMOVAL (\$75.00)
VARIANCE REQUEST/SPECIAL EXCEPTIONS $(\$ 100.00)^{2}$

## notes:

$\because: I N$ DETERMINING THE FEE, PLEASE USE THE EXACT ACREAGE WHEN MULTIPLYING BY THE PER ACRE AMOUNT. FOR REQUESTS ON LESS THAN ONE ACRE, ROUND UP TO ONE (1) ACRE. 2: A $81,000.00$ FEE WIL BE ADDED TO THE APPLICATION FEE FOR ANY REQUEST THAT INVOLVES CONSTRUCTION WTHOUT OR NOT IN COMPLIANCE TO AN APPROVED BUILDING PERMIT.

PROPERTY INFORMATION [PLEASE PRINT]
ADDRESS 1661 Ridge Road, Rockwall, TX 75087
SUBDIVISION
LOT
BLOCK
general location Northeast Corner of Ridge Rd \& Dallas Garland N.E. Railroad
ZONING, SITE PLAN AND PLATTING INFORMATION [PLEASE PRINT]

| CURRENT ZONING | PD-4 | CURRENT USE | vacant |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PROPOSED ZONING | PD-4 (amended) | PROPOSED USE | office |
| ACREAGE | 12.1462 LOTS [CURRENT] |  | LOTS [PROPOSED] |
| SITE PLANS AND PLATS: BY CHECKING THIS BOX YOU ACKNOWLEDGE THAT DUE TO THE PASSAGE OF HB3167 THE CITY NO LONGER HAS FLEXIBILITY WITH REGARD TO ITS APPROVAL PROCESS, AND FAILURE TO ADDRESS ANY OF STAFF'S COMMENTS BY THE DATE PROVIDED ON THE DEVELOPMENT CALENDAR WILL RESULT IN THE DENIAL OF YOUR CASE. |  |  |  |
| OWNER/APPLICANT/AGENT INFORMATION [PLEASE PRINT/CHECK THE PRIMARY CONTACT/ORIGINAL SIGNATURES ARE REQUIRED] |  |  |  |
| $\square$ OWNER | HFS Management, Inc | 凹 APPLICANT | Rockwall Economic Development Corporation |
| CONTACT PERSON | Richard Chandler | CONTACT PERSON | Matt Wavering |
| ADDRESS | 122 W. John Carpenter Fwy, Ste 400 | ADDRESS | 2610 Observation Trl, Suite 104 |
| CITY, STATE \& ZIP | Irving, TX 75039 | CITY, STATE \& ZIP | Rockwall, TX 75032 |
| PHONE |  | PHONE | 972-772-0025 |
| E-MAIL | rchandler@sei-mi.com | E-MAIL | mwavering@rockwalledc.com |

NOTARY VERIFICATION [REQUIRED]
BEFORE ME, THE UNDERSIGNED AUTHORITY, ON THIS DAY PERSONALLY APPEARED Richard $P$ Chand e Pre_ [OWNER] THE UNDERSIGNED, WHO STATED THE INFORMATION ON THIS APPLICATION TO BE TRUE AND CERTIFIED THE FOLLOWING:
"I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT I AM THE OWNER FOR THE PURPOSE OF THIS APPLICATION; ALL INFORMATION SUBMITTED HEREIN IS TRUE AND CORRECT; AND THE APPLICATION FEE OF $\$ 382.19$ TO COVER THE COST OF THIS APPLICATION, HAS BEEN PAID TO THE CITY OF ROCKWALL ON THIS THE $\qquad$ 13th

DAY OF November 2023. BY SIGNING THIS APPLICATION, I AGREE THAT THE CITY OF ROCKWALL (I.E. "CITY") IS AUTHORIZED AND PERMITTED TO PROVIDE INFORMATION CONTAINED WITHIN THIS APPLICATION TO THE PUBLIC. THE CITY IS ALSO AUTHORIZED AND PERMITTER TO REPRODUCE ANY COPYRIGHTED INEORMATION SUBMITTED IN CONJUNCTION WITH THIS APPLICATION, IF SUCH REPRODUCTION IS ASSOCIATED OR IN RESPONSE TO A REQUE STFORPUBLICINFORMATIUN.


NOTARY PUBLIC IN AND FOR THE STATE OF TEXAS


## City of Rockwall

Planning \& Zoning Department
385 S. Goliad Street
Rockwall, Texas 75087 (P): (972) 771-7745
(W): www.rockwall.com

The City of Rockwall GIS maps are continually under development and therefore subject to change without notice. While we endeavor to provide timely and accurate information, we make no guarantees. The City of Rockwall makes no warranty, express or implied, including warranties of merchantability and fitness for a particular purpose. Use of the information is the sole responsibility of the user.


| From: | Zavala, Melanie |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Thursday, November 16, 2023 3:24 PM |
| Cc: | Miller, Ryan; Ross, Bethany; Guevara, Angelica; Lee, Henry |
| Subject: | Neighborhood Notification Program [Z2023-053] |
| Attachments: | Public Notice (P\&Z) (11.15.2023).pdf; HOA Map (11.10.2023).pdf |

HOA/Neighborhood Association Representative:
Per your participation in the Neighborhood Notification Program, you are receiving this notice to inform your organization that a zoning case has been filed with the City of Rockwall that is located within 1,500 -feet of the boundaries of your neighborhood. As the contact listed for your organization, you are encouraged to share this information with the residents of your subdivision. Please find the attached map detailing the property requesting to be rezoned in relation to your subdivision boundaries. Additionally, below is the summary of the zoning case that will be published in the Rockwall Herald Banner on November 17, 2023. The Planning and Zoning Commission will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, December 12, 2023 at 6:00 PM, and the City Council will hold a public hearing on Monday, December 18, 2023 at 6:00 PM. Both hearings will take place at 6:00 PM at City Hall, 385 S . Goliad, Rockwall, TX 75087.

All interested parties are encouraged to submit public comments via email to Planning@rockwall.com at least 30 minutes in advance of the meeting. Please include your name, address, and the case number your comments are referring to. These comments will be read into the record during each of the public hearings. Additional information on all current development cases can be found on the City's website: https://sites.google.com/site/rockwallplanning/development/development-cases.

## Z2023-053: Amendment to PD-4

Hold a public hearing to discuss and consider a request by Matt Wavering of the Rockwall Economic Development Corporation (REDC) on behalf of Richard Chandler of HFS Management, Inc. for the approval of a Zoning Change amending Planned Development District 4 (PD-4) [Ordinance No. 72-03 \& 01-26] being a 12.1462 -acre tract of land identified as Tract 2 of the D. Atkins Survey, Abstract No. 1, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Planned Development District 4 (PD-4) for General Retail (GR) District land uses, situated within the Scenic Overlay (SOV) District, generally located in between Lakedale Drive and Becky Lane on the eastside of Ridge Road [FM-740], and take any action necessary.

Thank You,

## Melanie Zavala

Planning \& Zoning Coordinator | Planning Dept. | City of Rockwall
385 S. Goliad Street | Rockwall, TX 75087
http://www.rockwall.com/
972-771-7745 Ext. 6568

City of Rockwall
Planning \& Zoning Department
385 S. Goliad Street
Rockwall, Texas 75087
(P): (972) 771-7745
(W): www.rockwall.com

The City of Rockwall GIS maps are continually under development and therefore subject to change without notice. While we endeavor to provide timely and accurate information, we make no guarantees. The City of Rockwall makes no warranty, express or implied, including warranties of merchantability and fitness for a particular purpose. Use of the information is the sole responsibility of the user.


Case Number: Z2023-053
Case Name: Amendment to PD-4

Case Type:
Zoning:
Case Address: Ridge Rd.

NEUFELL JAMES V AND FRANCINE M
101 BECKY LN
ROCKWALL, TX 75087

STAVINOHA JIM L \& MITZIE J
103 JULIAN DR ROCKWALL, TX 75087

COX MARCUS D<br>105 BECKY LANE<br>ROCKWALL, TX 75087

MARTINEZ GRACE \& JESSE LEE III 106 LAKEDALE DR ROCKWALL, TX 75087

PECK RUTH H 108 LAKEDALE DR ROCKWALL, TX 75087

HPA TEXAS SUB 2017-1 LLC 120 S RIVERSIDE PLZ STE 2000 CHICAGO, IL 60606

```
HALL STEPHANIE MCGARRY 130 PELICAN COVE DR ROCKWALL, TX 75087
```

ANDERSON JERRY C AND MELVA J 138 PELICAN COVE DR ROCKWALL, TX 75087

ROGERS FAMILY LIVING TRUST
MICHAEL WAYNE ROGERS AND RELLA
VILLASANA ROGERS, TRUSTEES
1404 RIDGE RD
ROCKWALL, TX 75087

NORMAN LINDA
1406-B RIDGE RD ROCKWALL, TX 75087

HAMILTON JAMES MARK AND STEVEN TORRES 104 BECKY LN ROCKWALL, TX 75087

AZULAY TJ AND MELINDA<br>105 EMERALD COVE<br>HEATH, TX 75032

VILLASENOR GRACIELA R 106 PELICAN COVE DR ROCKWALL, TX 75087

ECKERT TRUST
DAVID W \& BONNIE L ECKERT 112 PELICAN COVE DRIVE ROCKWALL, TX 75087

HFS MANAGEMENT INC
C/O HANNA SAHLIYEH
122 W JOHN CARPENTER FWY STE 400
IRVING, TX 75039

RESIDENT
1309 RIDGE RD ROCKWALL, TX 75087

HIDALGO RAFAEL
1400 RIDGE RD
ROCKWALL, TX 75087

RESIDENT
1405 RIDGE RD ROCKWALL, TX 75087
PADILLA OSCAR GAMALIEL AND MELISSA
AZUSENA
1408 RIDGE ROAD
ROCKWALL, TX 75087

MARSHALL RICHARD A AND KENNETH F WILSON 103 BECKY LN ROCKWALL, TX 75087

WEST KENDRA LYNN AND JOHN HENRY LEWIS 104 LAKEDALE DRIVE ROCKWALL, TX 75087
7.1 RIDGE LLC

106 E RUSK SUITE 200
ROCKWALL, TX 75087

RESIDENT 107 BECKY LN ROCKWALL, TX 75087

## HAMPTON MATTHEW \& CORINA

118 PELICAN COVE DR ROCKWALL, TX 75087

SHUGART WILLIAM E \& MERIDITH JUNE 124 PELICAN COVE DR ROCKWALL, TX 75087

RESIDENT 134 PELICAN COVE DR ROCKWALL, TX 75087

MASON RONALD E \& GLORIA M 1402 RIDGE RD ROCKWALL, TX 75087

RESIDENT 1406 RIDGE RD ROCKWALL, TX 75087

RESIDENT 1410 RIDGE RD ROCKWALL, TX 75087

NAJMABADI NATHAN R \& JENNIFER N
1412 RIDGE ROAD
ROCKWALL, TX 75087

KROPKE JAMES \& MARY 142 PELICAN COVE DR ROCKWALL, TX 75087

TEBBUTT BRIAN \& MYLA 150 PELICAN COVE DRIVE ROCKWALL, TX 75087

RESIDENT
156 PELICAN COVE DR ROCKWALL, TX 75087

T ROCKWALL APARTMENTS TX LLC 16600 DALLAS PARKWAY SUITE 300

DALLAS, TX 75248

RESIDENT
1722 RIDGE RD ROCKWALL, TX 75087

HATCHER JASON \&
NATASHA HATCHER
1728 RIDGE RD ROCKWALL, TX 75087

## PETTIGREW TERESA VIOLA <br> 1901 LAKEVIEW DR ROCKWALL, TX 75087

PADILLA KRIS AND JOE 2005 LAKESHORE DRIVE ROCKWALL, TX 75087

CHARLES JACOB
2008 S LAKESHORE DR
ROCKWALL, TX 75087

RESIDENT
2011 LAKESHORE DR ROCKWALL, TX 75087

CRANE ADAM T 146 PELICAN COVE DR ROCKWALL, TX 75087

## WELLS RACHEL MARY

 1502 RIDGE ROAD ROCKWALL, TX 75087
## MCANALLY JOHN L \& CINDY N 1600 RIDGE RD ROCKWALL, TX 75087

HARRIS FAMILY LAKE HOUSE, LLC 1663 MISSOURI ST SAN DIEGO, CA 92109

GREEN STEVEN T
1724 RIDGE RD ROCKWALL, TX 75087

RESIDENT 174 MURPHY CT ROCKWALL, TX 75087

BALL DEREK AND AMANDA 1903 LAKEVIEW DR ROCKWALL, TX 75087

RUSSELL CURTIS J \& JENNIFER J 2006 S LAKESHORE DR ROCKWALL, TX 75087

HIGGINS BYRON STEPHEN AND KIMBERLY LEE PETRIELLO 2009 S LAKESHORE DRIVE ROCKWALL, TX 75087

SALAZAR AARON AND OLGA 2012 LAKESHORE DR ROCKWALL, TX 75087

## RESTORATION PROPERTIES GROUP LLC 2013 S LAKESHORE DRIVE

 ROCKWALL, TX 75087SIMS CHRISTOPHER P AND KRISTEN
206 LAKEVIEW DR
ROCKWALL, TX 75087

MFR PROPERTIES LLC AND YELLOW JACKET PLAZA LLC 28632 ROADSIDE DR SUITE 270 AGOURA HILLS, CA 91301

SOLENA GROUP, LLC 321 PRAIRIE VIEW RD ROCKWALL, TX 75087

THAMES HOLDING LLC 514 WILDEWOOD DR CHANDLER, TX 75758

RESIDENT 900 W YELLOWJACKET LN ROCKWALL, TX 75087

KJT FLYING PROPERTIES LLC PO BOX 1476 ROCKWALL, TX 75087

RESIDENT
2014 LAKESHORE DR
ROCKWALL, TX 75087

HAYNES PETER \& JANNA 208 LAKEVIEW DRIVE ROCKWALL, TX 75087

## JAMES \& MARY SYVRUD REVOCABLE TRUST JAMES P SYVRUD AND MARY J SYVRUD 301 MCKINNEY ST FARMERSVILLE, TX 75442

WILLCOXEN R GENE \& MARY F 4820 SUTCLIFF AVE SAN JOSE, CA 95118

HENDRICKS JAMES \& BARBARA 5903 VOLUNTEER PL ROCKWALL, TX 75032

HUDSON SFR PROPERTY HOLDINGS LLC C/O HUDSON HOMES MANAGEMENT LLC ATTN: HEATHER HAWKINS 2711 N HASKELL STE 1800
DALLAS, TX 75204

BURKE CASEY JOE AND ANDREA GAYDEN PO BOX 2514
ROCKWALL, TX 75087

RIIS RICKI LEE 203 LAKEVIEW DR ROCKWALL, TX 75087 2135 RIDGE RD ROCKWALL, TX 75087

## RPSC ROCKWALL PROPERTIES LLC 3201 E PRESIDENT GEORGE BUSH HIGHWAY SUITE 101 <br> RICHARDSON, TX 75082

SHERI POWERS REVOCABLE TRUST SHERI POWERS- TRUSTEE 4872 CORONADO AVE SAN DIEGO, CA 92107

ROCKWALLISD 801 E WASHINGTON ST ROCKWALL, TX 75087

AMERICAN RESIDENTIAL LEASING COMPANY LLC ATTN: PROPERTY TAX DEPARTMENT 23975 PARK SORRENTO, SUITE 300 CALABASAS, CA 91302

Property Owner and/or Resident of the City of Rockwall:
You are hereby notified that the City of Rockwall Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council will consider the following application:

## Z2023-053: Amendment to PD-4

Hold a public hearing to discuss and consider a request by Matt Wavering of the Rockwall Economic Development Corporation (REDC) on behalf of Richard Chandler of HFS Management, Inc. for the approval of a Zoning Change amending Planned Development District 4 (PD-4) [Ordinance No. 72-03 \& 01-26] being a 12.1462-acre tract of land identified as Tract 2 of the D. Atkins Survey, Abstract No. 1, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Planned Development District 4 (PD-4) for General Retail (GR) District land uses, situated within the Scenic Overlay (SOV) District, generally located in between Lakedale Drive and Becky Lane on the eastside of Ridge Road [FM-740], and take any action necessary.

For the purpose of considering the effects of such a request, the Planning and Zoning Commission will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, December 12, 2023 at 6:00 PM, and the City Council will hold a public hearing on Monday, December 18, 2023 at 6:00 PM. These hearings will be held in the City Council Chambers at City Hall, 385 S. Goliad Street.

As an interested property owner, you are invited to attend these meetings. If you prefer to express your thoughts in writing please return the form to:

Henry Lee<br>Rockwall Planning and Zoning Dept.<br>385 S. Goliad Street

Rockwall, TX 75087
You may also email your comments to the Planning Department at planning@rockwall.com. If you choose to email the Planning Department please include your name and address for identification purposes.

Your comments must be received by Monday, December 18, 2023 at 4:00 PM to ensure they are included in the information provided to the City Council.
Sincerely,
Ryan Miller, AICP
Director of Planning \& Zoning

MORE INFORMATION ON THIS CASE CAN BE FOUND AT: https://sites.google.com/site/rockwallplanning/development/development-cases

## - - - PLEASE RETURN THE BELOW FORM

## Case No. Z2023-053: Amendment to PD-4

## Please place a check mark on the appropriate line below:

$\square \mathrm{I}$ am in favor of the request for the reasons listed below.
$\square$ I am opposed to the request for the reasons listed below.

## Name:

## Address:

Tex. Loc. Gov. Code, Sec. 211.006 (d) If a proposed change to a regulation or boundary is protested in accordance with this subsection, the proposed change must receive, in order to take effect, the affirmative vote of at least three-fourths of all members of the governing body. The protest must be written and signed by the owners of at least 20 percent of either: (1) the area of the lots or land covered by the proposed change; or (2) the area of the lots or land immediately adjoining the area covered by the proposed change and extending 200 feet from that area.

> PLEASE SEE LOCATION MAP OF SUBJECT PROPERTY ON THE BACK OF THIS NOTICE

November 13, 2023
Ryan Miller
Director of Planning
City of Rockwall
385 S. Goliad Street, Rockwall, TX 75087

Re: 1661 Ridge Rd
Mr. Miller:
Enclosed you will find an application and supporting documents requesting that the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council grant an amendment to the PD-4 zoning on the 12.1462-acre tract of land located at 1661 Ridge Rd in Rockwall. The Rockwall Economic Development Corporation (REDC) has a contract to purchase the property and has been performing due diligence and planning exercises over the past several months.

The REDC intends to utilize the property to attract "Class-A" corporate office developments occupied by tenants that can provide high-quality employment opportunities for the citizens of Rockwall. In order to attract the tenants and the significant tax value investment desired by the REDC, we are proposing office projects that will be vertical in nature, which we feel will be of superior quality than the standard one or two-story garden-style office buildings that are more commonly seen without public involvement.

The provided cross-sections show a potential maximum building height of 90 feet above grade. Therefore, the zoning requires an amendment to allow for building heights up to 90 feet, as well as the FAR (floor area ratio) to accommodate office buildings of this scale. Please note that the property grade is approximately 12 to 13 feet below the elevation of Ridge Road. The REDC does not anticipate that a future office building will exceed the existing heights of the Lakeview Apartments building located to the north of the adjacent Rockwall Commons.

It is worth noting that the REDC is strictly governed by state statute as well as oversight provided by a Board of Directors of Rockwall residents appointed by the Rockwall City Council. You may rest-assured that the future development of this property will be of the highest-quality, will adhere to City of Rockwall development standards, and will support business enterprise and local employment alike. Furthermore, the REDC is highly selective in its recruiting efforts and therefore will be patient in the development of this property, not wishing to compromise on quality for an expedient development.

The REDC kindly requests this amendment to PD-4 to facilitate the development of this property for the purposes of high-quality corporate office development.

Respectfully,


Matt Wavering
Vice President

## CONCEPT SITE PLAN




## CONCEPT SITE SECTION
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DAVID ATKINS SURVEY, ABSTRACT NO. 1 CITY OF ROCKWALL
Kimley»)Horn
$0=1$

## CITY OF ROCKWALL

ORDINANCE NO. 24-XX


#### Abstract

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCKWALL, TEXAS AMENDING PLANNED DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT 4 (PD-4) [ORDINANCE NO. 72-03 \& 01-26] AND THE UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT CODE [ORDINANCE NO. 20-02] OF THE CITY OF ROCKWALL, AS HERETOFORE AMENDED, FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING PLANNED DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT 4 (PD-4) BEING 12.1148-ACRE TRACT OF LAND IDENTIFIED AS TRACT 2 OF THE D. ATKINS SURVEY, ABSTRACT NO. 1, CITY OF ROCKWALL, ROCKWALL COUNTY, TEXAS AND MORE FULLY DESCRIBED AND DEPICTED HEREIN BY EXHIBIT 'A' OF THIS ORDINANCE; PROVIDING FOR SPECIAL CONDITIONS; PROVIDING FOR A PENALTY OF A FINE NOT TO EXCEED THE SUM OF TWO THOUSAND DOLLARS $(\$ 2,000.00)$ FOR EACH OFFENSE; PROVIDING FOR A SEVERABILITY CLAUSE; PROVIDING FOR A REPEALER CLAUSE; PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.


WHEREAS, the City of Rockwall has received a request from Matt Wavering of the Rockwall Economic Development Corporation (REDC) for the approval of an amendment to Planned Development District 4 (PD-4) [Ordinance No. 72-03 \& 01-26] being a 12.1148-acre tract of land identified as Tract 2 of the D. Atkins Survey, Abstract No. 1, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, which is more fully described in Exhibit ' $A$ ' and depicted in Exhibit ' $B$ ' of this ordinance, and hereinafter shall be referred to as the Subject Property and incorporated by reference herein; and,

WHEREAS, the Planning and Zoning Commission of the City of Rockwall and the governing body of the City of Rockwall in compliance with the laws of the State of Texas and the ordinances of the City of Rockwall have given the requisite notices by publication and otherwise, and have held public hearings and afforded a full and fair hearing to all property owners generally and to all persons interested in and situated in the affected area, and in the vicinity thereof, and the governing body in the exercise of its legislative discretion, has concluded that Planned Development District 4 (PD-4) [Ordinance No.'s 72-03 \& 01-26] and the Unified Development Code [Ordinance No. 20-02] should be amended as follows:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCKWALL, TEXAS:
SECTION 1. That the approval of this ordinance shall supersede all requirements stipulated in Ordinance No.'s 72-03 \& 01-26;

SECTION 2. That the Subject Property shall be used only in the manner and for the purposes authorized by this Planned Development District Ordinance and the Unified Development Code [Ordinance No. 20-02] of the City of Rockwall as heretofore amended, as amended herein by granting this zoning change, and as maybe amended in the future;

SECTION 3. That development of the Subject Property shall generally be in accordance with the Concept Plan, depicted in Exhibit 'C' of this ordinance, attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference as Exhibit ' $C$ ', which is deemed hereby to be a condition of approval of the amended zoning classification for the Subject Property;

SECTION 4. That development of the Subject Property shall generally be in accordance with the Concept Building Elevations, depicted in Exhibit ' $D$ ' of this ordinance, attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference as Exhibit ' $D$ ', which is deemed hereby to be a condition of approval of the amended zoning classification for the Subject Property;

SECTION 5. That development of the Subject Property shall generally be in accordance with the $P D$ Development Standards, described in Exhibit ' $E$ ' of this ordinance, attached hereto and incorporated herein
by reference as Exhibit ' $E$ ', which is deemed hereby to be a condition of approval of the amended zoning classification for the Subject Property;

SECTION 6. That the official zoning map of the City of Rockwall, Texas be corrected to reflect the change in zoning described here in.

SECTION 7. That any person, firm, or corporation violating any of the provisions of this ordinance shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be punished by a penalty of fine not to exceed the sum of two thousand dollars $(\$ 2,000.00)$ for each offense and each and every day such offense shall continue shall be deemed to constitute a separate offense;

SECTION 8. That if any section, paragraph, or provision of this ordinance or the application of that section, paragraph, or provision to any person, firm, corporation or situation is for any reason judged invalid, the adjudication shall not affect any other section, paragraph, or provision of this ordinance or the application of any other section, paragraph or provision to any other person, firm, corporation or situation, nor shall adjudication affect any other section, paragraph, or provision of the Unified Development Code [Ordinance No. 04-38], and the City Council declares that it would have adopted the valid portions and applications of the ordinance without the invalid parts and to this end the provisions for this ordinance are declared to be severable;

SECTION 9. The standards in this ordinance shall control in the event of a conflict between this ordinance and any provision of the Unified Development Code [Ordinance No. 04-38] of any provision of the City Code, ordinance, resolution, rule, regulation, or procedure that provides a specific standard that is different from and inconsistent with this ordinance. References to zoning district regulations or other standards in the Unified Development Code [Ordinance No. 04-38] (including references to the Unified Development Code), and references to overlay districts, in this ordinance or any of the Exhibits hereto are those in effect on the date this ordinance was passed and approved by the City Council of the City of Rockwall, Texas;

SECTION 10. That this ordinance shall take effect immediately from and after its passage;
PASSED AND APPROVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCKWALL, TEXAS, THIS THE $2^{\text {TH }}$ DAY OF JANUARY, 2024.


Frank J. Garza, City Attorney
${ }^{1 s t}$ Reading: December 18, 2023
$2^{\text {nd }}$ Reading: January 2, 2024


BEING a tract of land situated in the David Atkins Survey, Abstract No. 1, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, and being a portion of a tract of land described in the Special Warranty Deed to HFS Management Inc., recorded in Volume 1194, Page 256, Deed Records, Rockwall County, Texas, and being more particularly described as follows:

BEGINNING at $3 / 8$-inch iron rod found in the east right-of-way line of Ridge Road (also known as Farm to Market Highway No. 740, a variable width right-of-way), same being the northeast corner of a called 40,736 square foot tract of land described in the Right-of-Way Deed to the City of Rockwall, recorded in Volume 1617, Page 25, Deed Records, Rockwall County, Texas, and being the southwest corner of Lot 3, Block A of Rockwall Commons Replat, an Addition to the City of Rockwall according to the plat thereof recorded in Instrument No. 20100000443217, Official Public Records, Rockwall County, Texas, and being in the north line of said HFS Management Inc., tract;

THENCE with the north line of said HFS Management Inc., tract, South $72^{\circ} 24^{\prime}{ }^{\prime 2} 5^{\prime \prime}$ East, a distance of 378.20 feet to a $1 / 2$-inch iron rod found in the west right-of-way line of MKT Railroad (a 100 -foot right-of-way), same being the southeast corner of Lot 4, Block A of the aforementioned Rockwall Commons Replat;

THENCE with the west right-of-way line of said MKT Railroad, the following courses and distances:
South $17^{\circ} 43^{\prime} 18^{\prime \prime}$ West, a distance of 701.65 feet to a $5 / 8$-inch iron rod with red plastic cap stamped "KHA" set at the beginning of a non-tangent curve to the right with a radius of $3,476.10$ feet, a central angle of $06^{\circ} 28^{\prime} 33^{\prime \prime}$, and a chord bearing and distance of South $20^{\circ} 06^{\prime} 12^{\prime \prime}$ West, 392.68 feet;

In a southerly direction, with said non-tangent curve to the right, an arc distance of 392.89 feet to a $5 / 8$-inch iron rod with red plastic cap stamped "KHA" set at the beginning of a non-tangent curve to the right with a radius of $2,716.45$ feet, a central angle of $05^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime}$, and a chord bearing and distance of South $26^{\circ} 34^{\prime} 50^{\prime \prime}$ West, 267.77 feet;

In a southerly direction, with said non-tangent curve to the right, an arc distance of 267.88 feet to a $5 / 8$-inch iron rod with red plastic cap stamped "KHA" set at the beginning of a non-tangent curve to the right with a radius of $4,855.10$ feet, a central angle of $06^{\circ} 43^{\prime} 18^{\prime \prime \prime}$, and a chord bearing and distance of South $33^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 38^{\prime \prime}$ West, 569.25 feet;

In a southerly direction, with said non-tangent curve to the right, an arc distance of 569.58 feet to a $5 / 8$-inch iron rod with red plastic cap stamped "KHA" set at the intersection of the west right-of-way line of said MKT Railroad and the east right-of-way line of said Ridge Road;

THENCE with said east right-of-way line of Ridge Road and the east line of the aforementioned 40,736 square foot tract, the following courses and distances:

North $09^{\circ} 42^{\prime} 12$ " West, a distance of 60.60 feet to a 4 -inch bronze disk stamped "Texas Department of Transportation" found (hereinafter called bronze disk);

North $06^{\circ} 34^{\prime} 38$ " West, a distance of 94.51 feet to a bronze disk found;
North $00^{\circ} 38^{\prime} 06^{\prime \prime}$ East, a distance of 94.67 feet to a bronze disk found;
North $07^{\circ} 14^{\prime} 21^{\prime \prime}$ East, a distance of 94.72 feet to a $5 / 8$-inch iron rod with red plastic cap stamped "KHA" set;

North $13^{\circ} 14^{\prime} 21^{\prime \prime}$ East, a distance of 94.72 feet to a bronze disk found;
North $19^{\circ} 07^{\prime} 43^{\prime \prime}$ East, a distance of 91.23 feet to a bronze disk found;
North $23^{\circ} 07^{\prime 2} 22^{\prime \prime}$ East, a distance of 103.71 feet to a bronze disk found;
North $27^{\circ} 43^{\prime} 42$ " East, a distance of 100.50 feet to a bronze disk found;

## EXHIBIT 'A':

Legal Description

North $20^{\circ} 05^{\prime} 18^{\prime \prime}$ East, a distance of 105.14 feet to a bronze disk found; North $15^{\circ} 02^{\prime} 32$ " East, a distance of 103.16 feet to a bronze disk found; North $08^{\circ} 35^{\prime 2} 28^{\prime \prime}$ East, a distance of 100.50 feet to a bronze disk found;

North $14^{\circ} 18^{\prime} 06$ " East, a distance of 200.00 feet to a bronze disk found;
North $20^{\circ} 00^{\prime} 44$ " East, a distance of 100.50 feet to a bronze disk found;
North $14^{\circ} 18^{\prime} 06^{\prime \prime}$ East, a distance of 100.00 feet to a bronze disk found;
North $10^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 51$ " East, a distance of 100.24 feet to a bronze disk found;
North $12^{\circ} 34^{\prime} 477^{\prime \prime}$ East, a distance of 100.14 feet to a bronze disk found;
North $13^{\circ} 26^{\prime} 55$ " East, a distance of 151.36 feet to a $5 / 8$-inch iron rod with red plastic cap stamped "KHA" set;

North $11^{\circ} 41^{\prime} 22$ " East, a distance of 138.13 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING and containing a calculated area of 529,088 square feet or 12.1462 acres of land.



EXHIBIT 'C':
Concept Plan


EXHIBIT 'D':
Conceptual Cross Sections

(A) Purpose Statement. The purpose of this Planned Development District is to provide Class 'A' corporate offices that will be occupied by tenants that can provide high-quality employment opportunities for the citizens of Rockwall. In addition, this Planned Development District aims at attracting offices that can provide significant tax value and investment for the community. This type of development could include one (1) or two (2) large office buildings -- and potentially some accessory or supporting land uses (e.g. retail, restaurant, etc.) -- as depicted in the Concept Plan in Exhibit ' $A$ '.
(B) Permitted Uses. The Subject Property shall be subject to the land uses permitted in the General Retail (GR) District contained in Article 04, Permissible Uses, of the Unified Development Code (UDC) [Ordinance No. 20-02] as heretofore amended, as amended herein by granting this zoning change, and as maybe amended in the future, with the following additional land uses and restrictions:

## Land Uses Permitted By-Right:

■ Office Buildings Greater Than 25,000 SF
Prohibited Land Uses:
Animal Clinic for Small Animals without Outdoor Pens
Animal Boarding/Kennel without Outside Pens
Animal Hospital, Clinic
Convent, Monastery, or Temple
Hotel or Motel (i.e. Limited Service, Full Service, Residence)
Hotel, Residence
Caretakers Quarters/Domestic or Security Unit
Convalescent Care Facility/Nursing Home
■ Daycare with Seven (7) or More Children
Emergency Ground Ambulance Service
■ Group or Community Home

## Hospice

$\square$ Hospital

- Public Library, Art Gallery or Museum
- Local Post Office
$\square$ Public or Private Primary School
■ Public or Private Secondary Schoo
■ Cemetery/Mausoleum
■ Mortuary of Funeral Chapel
■ Temporary Carnival, Circus, or Amusement Ride
- Outdoor Commercial Amusement/Recreation

Indoor Gun Club with Skeet or Target
Antique/Collectible Store
Astrologer, Hypnotist, or Psychic
■ Garden Supply/Plant Nursery
v Night Club, Discotheque, or Dance Hall

- Secondhand Dealer
- Pawn Shop

■ Laundromat with Dropoff/Pickup Services
■ Self Service Laundromat
$\square$ Social Service Provider
■ Restaurant with Less Than 2,000 SF with Drive-Through or Drive-In
$\square$ Restaurant with 2,000 SF or More with Drive-Through or Drive-In
■ Full Service Car Wash and Auto Detail
■ Self Service Car Wash
$\square$ Service Station
$\square$ Mining and Extraction of (Sand, Gravel, Oil and/or Other Materials)
V Helipad
■ Railroad Yard or Shop
■ Transit Passenger Facility

City of Rockwall, Texas
(C) Density and Dimensional Requirements. The Subject Property shall generally be developed in accordance with the Concept Plan depicted in Exhibit ' $C$ ' of this ordinance; however, deviations in the number of buildings and building locations may be approved through the site plan process, as long as, the proposed development conforms to the spirit and intent of the stated purpose of this Planned Development District ordinance. In addition, unless specifically provided by this Planned Development District ordinance, any development of the Subject Property shall conform to the requirements stipulated for the General Retail (GR) District and the Scenic Overlay (SOV) District as specified by Article 05, District Development Standards, of the Unified Development Code (UDC). In addition, the subject property shall conform to the following standards:

TABLE 1: LOT DIMENSIONAL REQUIREMENTS

| MINIMUM LOT WIDTH | $60-\mathrm{FEET}$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| MINIMUM LOT DEPTH | $100-\mathrm{FEET}$ |
| MINIMUM LOT AREA | 6,000 SF |
| MINIMUM FRONT YARD SETBACK ${ }^{1 \& 2}$ | $25-\mathrm{FEET}$ |
| MINIMUM SIDE YARD SETBACK | $10-\mathrm{FEET}$ |
| MINIMUM REAR YARD SETBACK | $10-\mathrm{FEET}$ |
| BETWEEN BUILDINGS | $15-F E E T$ |
| MAXIMUM HEIGHT | $90-F E E T$ |
| MAXIMUM LOT COVERAGE | $60 \%$ |
| FLOOR AREA RATIO | $4: 1$ |

## NOTES:

${ }^{1}$ : A MAXIMUM OF ONE (1) ROW OF PARKING MAY BE LOCATED BETWEEN THE FRONT FAÇADE AND THE PROPERTY LINE.
2: THE FRONT YARD SETBACK SHALL CREATE A UNIFORM BUILDING FRONTAGE ALONG RIDGE ROAD [FM-740].
(D) PD Development Plan. A PD Development Plan shall be required if a proposed development within Planned Development District 4 (PD-4) does not meet the stated purpose described in Subsection (A) of Exhibit ' $E$ of this ordinance, and/or does not meet the intent of the Concept Plan depicted in Exhibit ' $C$ ' of this ordinance. If a PD Development Plan is required it shall be submitted and approved in accordance with requirements of Article 10, Planned Development Regulations, of the Unified Development Code (UDC).
(E) Variances. The variance procedures and standards for approval that are set forth in the Unified Development Code shall apply to any application for variances to this ordinance.


TO:
DATE:
APPLICANT:
CASE NUMBER:

Planning and Zoning Commission
December 12, 2023
Trenton Jones \& Ben Sanchez; Parkhill
SP2023-034; Site Plan for Rockwall County Courthouse Annex

## SUMMARY

Consider a request by Trenton Jones and Ben Sanchez of Parkhill on behalf of Frank New of Rockwall County for the approval of a Site Plan for a Government Building on a 1.90-acre portion of a larger 12.79-acre parcel of land identified as Lot 1, Block A, Rockwall County Courthouse Addition, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Commercial (C) District, situated within the $\mathrm{IH}-30$ Overlay (IH-30) District, addressed as 963 E . Yellow Jacket Lane, and take any action necessary.

## BACKGROUND

The subject property was originally annexed into the City of Rockwall on September 5,1960 by Ordinance No. 60-02. At the time of annexation, the subject property was zoned Agricultural (AG) District. According to the 1983 historic zoning map, at some point between January 3, 1972 and May 16, 1983 the property was zoned from Agricultural (AG) District to Commercial (C) District. On May 17, 2010, the City Council approved a final plat that established the subject property as Lot 1, Block A, Rockwall County Courthouse Addition. According to the Rockwall Central Appraisal District (RCAD), a 121,208 SF Government Facility (i.e. Rockwall County Courthouse) was constructed in 2011.

On November 14, 2023, the Planning and Zoning Commission approved a motion to table the applicants request, to allow the applicant time to better address recommendations made by the Architectural Review Board (ARB).

## PURPOSE

On October 20, 2023, the applicants -- Trenton Jones and Ben Sanchez of Parkhill -- submitted an application requesting the approval of a Site Plan for the purpose of constructing a Government Building on the subject property.

## ADJACENT LAND USES AND ACCESS

The subject property is generally located south of the intersection of T. L. Townsend Drive and E. Yellow Jacket Lane. The land uses adjacent to the subject property are as follows:

North: Directly north of the subject property is E. Yellow Jacket Lane, which is classified as a A4D (i.e. major arterial, four [4] lane, divided roadway) on the City's Master Thoroughfare Plan contained in the OURHometown Vision 2040 Comprehensive Plan. Beyond this is an 8.485 -acre parcel of land (i.e. Lot 10, Block A, First United Methodist Church Addition) developed with a Church/House of Worship. Beyond this is a vacant 9.001 -acre parcel of land (i.e. Lot 11, Block A, First United Methodist Church Addition). Both of these properties are zoned Commercial (C) District.

South: Directly south of the subject property are several parcels of land developed with commercial land uses (i.e. Office, Retail, General Personal Service, Animal Hospital, Car Wash, \& Car Dealership), and zoned Commercial (C) District. Beyond this is the intersection of S. Goliad Street [SH-205] and E. Interstate 30 [IH-30], where S. Goliad Street [SH-205] is classified as a P6D (i.e. principal arterial, six [6] lane, divided roadway) on the City's Master Thoroughfare Plan contained in the OURHometown Vision 2040 Comprehensive Plan.

East: $\quad$ Directly east of the subject property is a 5.909 -acre parcel of land (i.e. Lot 5 , Block A, Rockwall Library Addition) developed with a Public Library and zoned Commercial (C) District. Beyond this is T. L. Townsend Drive, which is classified as a A4D (i.e. major arterial, four [4] lane, divided roadway) on the City's Master Thoroughfare Plan contained in the OURHometown Vision 2040 Comprehensive Plan. Following this is a 4.194-acre parcel of land (i.e. Lot 1, Block A, Emerus Emergency Hospital) developed with a Hospital and zoned Light Industrial (LI) District.

West: Directly west of the subject property is E. Yellow Jacket Lane, which is classified as a A4D (i.e. major arterial, four [4] lane, divided roadway) on the City's Master Thoroughfare Plan contained in the OURHometown Vision 2040 Comprehensive Plan. Beyond this are two (2) vacant parcels of land (i.e. Lot 11, Block A, First United Methodist Church Addition and Lot 6, Block 1, First United Methodist Church Addition). Following this are three (3) parcels of land developed with commercial land uses (i.e. Minor Automotive Repair, Restaurant with Drive-Through, and Convenience Store with Gasoline Sales). All of these properties are zoned Commercial (C) District. After this is S . Goliad Street [SH-205], which is classified as a P6D (i.e. principal arterial, six [6] lane, divided roadway) on the City's Master Thoroughfare Plan contained in the OURHometown Vision 2040 Comprehensive Plan.

## DENSITY AND DIMENSIONAL REQUIREMENTS

According to Section 01, Land Use Schedule, of Article 04, Permissible Uses, of the Unified Development Code (UDC), a Government Facility is permitted by-right in a Commercial (C) District. The submitted site plan, landscape plan, photometric plan, and building elevations generally conform to the technical requirements contained within the Unified Development Code (UDC) for a property located within a Commercial (C) District with the exception of the item(s) noted in the Variances and Exceptions Requested by the Applicant section of this case memo. A summary of the density and dimensional requirements for the subject property are as follows:

| Ordinance Provisions | Zoning District Standards | Conformance to the Standards |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Minimum Lot Area | $10,000 \mathrm{SF}$ | $X=12.79$-acres; In Conformance |
| Minimum Lot Frontage | $60-$ Feet | $X=673.84$-feet; In Conformance |
| Minimum Lot Depth | 100 -Feet | $X=563.21$-feet; In Conformance |
| Minimum Front Yard Setback | $15-$ Feet | $X=15$-feet; In Conformance |
| Minimum Rear Yard Setback | 10 -Feet | $X>10-$ feet; In Conformance |
| Minimum Side Yard Setback | $10-$ Feet | $X>10-$ feet; In Conformance |
| Maximum Building Height | $60-F e e t$ | $X=23.5$-feet; In Conformance |
| Max Building/Lot Coverage | $60 \%$ | $X=9.1 \%$; In Conformance |
| Minimum Number of Parking Spaces | 1 Parking Space/300 SF (Office) | $X=43 ;$ In Conformance |
| Minimum Landscaping Percentage | 39 Required Parking Spaces | $X=31.42 \%$; In Conformance |
| Maximum Impervious Coverage | $20 \%$ | $X=68.58 \%$; In Conformance |

## CONFORMANCE WITH THE CITY'S CODES

The applicant is requesting to construct a Government Facility on the subject property. According to Subsection 02.02(C)(12), Government Facility, of Article 13, Definitions, of the Unified Development Code (UDC), a Government Facility is defined as "(a)n office of a governmental agency that provides administrative and/or direct services to the public..." In this case, the applicant's proposed use falls under this classification, which is permitted by-right within a Commercial (C) District. When reviewing the proposed site plan against these standards, it appears to generally conform with the exception of the variance(s) and exception(s) being requested as outlined in the Variances and Exceptions Requested by the Applicant section of this case memo.

## VARIANCES AND EXCEPTIONS BY THE APPLICANT

As stated above, the applicant's request conforms to the majority of the City's codes; however, staff has identified the following variance(s) and exception(s):
(1) Four-Sided Architecture. According to Subsection 06.02(C)(5), of Article 05, of the General Overlay District Development Standards of the Unified Development Code (UDC), "(a)ll buildings shall be architecturally finished on all four (4) sides utilizing the same materials, detailing, articulation and features." In this case, the proposed building exceeds the wall length requirement, "...the maximum wall length shall not exceed three (3) times the wall height." This will require a variance from the Planning and Zoning Commission pending a recommendation from the Architectural Review Board (ARB).
(1) Landscape Buffer. According to Subsection 05.01, Landscape Buffers, of Article 08, Landscape and Fence Standards, of the Unified Development Code (UDC), a landscape buffer shall have a "...minimum of one (1) canopy tree and one (1) accent tree...per 50 -linear feet..." Given this, the applicant is required to have eight (8) canopy and eight (8) accent trees. That being said, the applicant is requesting not to plant the canopy trees and have 16 accent trees due to overhead power lines. This will require an exception from the Planning and Zoning Commission.
(2) Driveway Spacing. According to Figure 2.4: Minimum Driveway Spacing and Corner Clearance, of Chapter 2, Streets, of the Engineering Department's Standards of Design and Construction Manual, driveways must be 100 -feet apart. In this case, the applicant is adding an additional drive along E. Yellow Jacket Lane that is less than 100 -feet to another existing drive. This will require a variance from the Planning and Zoning Commission.

According to Subsection 09, Exceptions and Variances, of Article 11, Development Applications and Review Procedures, of the Unified Development Code (UDC), "...an applicant may request the Planning and Zoning Commission grant variances and exceptions to the provisions contained in the Unified Development Code (UDC), where unique or extraordinary conditions exist or where strict adherence to the technical requirements of the Unified Development Code (UDC) would create an undue hardship." In addition, the code requires that the applicant provide compensatory measures that directly offset the requested variances and exceptions. The applicant has indicated the following as compensatory measures: [1] providing a 15 -foot landscape buffer in lieu of a ten (10) foot, and [2] providing $31.40 \%$ landscaping in lieu of the required $20.00 \%$. Requests for exceptions and variances to the Unified Development Code (UDC) are discretionary decisions for the Planning and Zoning Commission. Staff should note that a supermajority vote (e.g. six [6] out of the seven [7] commissioners) -- with a minimum of four (4) votes in the affirmative -- is required for the approval of a variance or exception.

## CONFORMANCE WITH OURHOMETOWN VISION 2040 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

According to the Future Land Use Plan contained in the OURHometown Vision 2040 Comprehensive Plan, the subject property is situated within the Central District and is designated for Public land uses. According to the District Strategies this land use designation should "... support the existing and proposed residential developments and should be compatible in scale with the adjacent residential structures." That being said, the subject property is located within a cluster of Public and Quasi-Public land uses. Given this, the proposed request is in conformance with the Future Land Use Map contained in the OURHometown Vision 2040 Comprehensive Plan.

## ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD (ARB) RECOMMENDATION

On November 1, 2023 the Architecture Review Board (ARB) reviewed the building elevations provided by the applicant. The ARB requested the applicant provide a material sample board and provide material variation on the north and west facades. The applicant has made to the building elevation, which will be reviewed by the ARB prior to the December 12, 2023 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.

## CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

If the Planning and Zoning Commission chooses to approve the applicant's Site Plan for the construction of a Government Facility on the subject property, then staff would propose the following conditions of approval:
(1) All staff comments provided by the Planning, Engineering and Fire Department must be addressed prior to the submittal of engineering plans.
(2) Any construction resulting from the approval of this Site Plan shall conform to the requirements set forth by the Unified Development Code (UDC), the International Building Code (IBC), the Rockwall Municipal Code of Ordinances, city
adopted engineering and fire codes and with all other applicable regulatory requirements administered and/or enforced by the state and federal government.

City of Rockwall
Planning and Zoning Department
385 S. Goliad Street
Rockwall, Texas 75087

NOTE: THE APPLICATION IS NOT CONSIDERED ACCEPTED BY THE CITY UNTIL THE PLANNING DIRECTOR AND CITY ENGINEER HAVE SIGNED BELOW.

DIRECTOR OF PLANNING:
CITY ENGINEER:

PLEASE CHECK THE APPROPRIATE BOX BELOW TO INDICATE THE TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT REQUEST [SELECT ONLY ONE BOX]:

| PLATTING APPLICATION FEES: <br> $\square$ MASTER PLAT $(\$ 100.00+\$ 15.00 \text { ACRE) })^{1}$ <br> $\square$ PRELIMINARY PLAT $(\$ 200.00+\$ 15.00 \text { ACRE })^{1}$ <br> $\square$ FINAL PLAT $\left(\$ 300.00+\$ 20.00\right.$ ACRE) ${ }^{1}$ <br> $\square$ REPLAT $\left(\$ 300.00+\$ 20.00\right.$ ACRE) ${ }^{1}$ <br> $\square$ AMENDING OR MINOR PLAT (\$150.00) <br> $\square$ PLAT REINSTATEMENT REQUEST (\$100.00) <br> SITE PLAN APPLICATION FEES: <br> $\square$ SITE PLAN $\left(\$ 250.00+\$ 20.00\right.$ ACRE) ${ }^{1}$ <br> $\square$ AMENDED SITE PLAN/ELEVATIONS/LANDSCAPING PLAN (\$100.00) |
| :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

```
ZONING APPLICATION FEES:
\square ZONING CHANGE ($200.00 + $15.00 ACRE) }\mp@subsup{}{}{1
\square SPECIFIC USE PERMIT ($200.00 + $15.00 ACRE) $ & 2
\square PD DEVELOPMENT PLANS ($200.00 + $15.00 ACRE) }\mp@subsup{}{}{1
OTHER APPLICATION FEES:
\square TREE REMOVAL ($75.00)
\square VARIANCE REQUEST/SPECIAL EXCEPTIONS ($100.00) 2
NOTES:
1: IN DETERMINING THE FEE, PLEASE USE THE EXACT ACREAGE WHEN MULTIPLYING BY THE
PER ACRE AMOUNT. FOR REQUESTS ON LESS THAN ONE ACRE, ROUND UP TO ONE (1) ACRE. z: A \(\$ 1,000.00\) FEE WILL BE ADDED TO THE APPLICATION FEE FOR ANY REQUEST THAT INVOLVES CONSTRUCTION WITHOUT OR NOT IN COMPLIANCE TO AN APPROVED BUILDING PERMIT.
```

PROPERTY INFORMATION [PLEASE PRINT]

## ADDRESS 1111 E Yellow Jacket Ln, Rockwall, TX 75037

## subdivision Rockwall County Courthouse Addition <br> LOT 1 BLOCK A

general location Grass area 300 ft NW of County Clerk Building

| ZONING, SITE PLAN AND PLATTING INFORMATION [PLEASE PRINT] |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| CURRENT ZONING | Commercial | CURRENT USE | Commercial |
| PROPOSED ZONING | Commercial | PROPOSED USE | Commercial |

ACREAGE 1.9 acres (Total Distrubed LOTS [CURRENT] $1 \quad$ LOTS [PROPOSED] 1 area)
$\square$ SITE PLANS AND PLATS: BY CHECKING THIS BOX YOU ACKNOWLEDGE THAT DUE TO THE PASSAGE OF HB3167 THE CITY NO LONGER HAS FLEXIBILITY WITH REGARD TO ITS APPROVAL PROCESS, AND FAILURE TO ADDRESS ANY OF STAFF'S COMMENTS BY THE DATE PROVIDED ON THE DEVELOPMENT CALENDAR WILL RESULT IN THE DENIAL OF YOUR CASE.
OWNER/APPLICANT/AGENT INFORMATION [PLEASE PRINT/CHECK THE PRIMARY CONTACT/ORIGINAL SIGNATURES ARE REQUIRED]

| ם OWNER | Rockwall County |
| ---: | :--- |
| CONTACT PERSON | Frank New |
| ADDRESS | 101 East Rusk St |
|  |  |
| CITY, STATE \& ZIP | Rockwall, TX 75087 |
| PHONE | $972-204-6000$ |
| E-MAIL | fnew@rockwallcountytexas.com |

## $\square$ APplicant Parkhill <br> CONTACT PERSON Trenton Jones, Ben Sanchez

| ADDRESS | 3000 Internet Blvd |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Suite 550 |

CITY, sTATE \& ZIP Frisco, TX 75034
PHONE 972-987-1670
E-MAIL tjones@parkhill.com, bsanchez@parkhill.com

NOTARY VERIFICATION [REQUIRED]
BEFORE ME, THE UNDERSIGNED AUTHORITY, ON THIS DAY PERSONALLY APPEARED $\qquad$ [OWNER] THE UNDERSIGNED, WHO STATED THE INFORMATION ON THIS APPLICATION TO BE TRUE AND CERTIFIED THE FOLLOWING:
"I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT I AM THE OWNER FOR THE PURPOSE OF THIS APPLICATION; ALL INFORMATION SUBMITTED HEREIN IS TRUE AND CORRECT; AND THE APPLICATION FEE OF $\$$ $\qquad$ TO COVER THE COST OF THIS APPLICATION, HAS BEEN PAID TO THE CITY OF ROCKWALL ON THIS THE DAY OF INFORUATION CONTAINED WITHIN THIS APPI BY SIGNING THIS APPLICATION, I AGREE THAT THE CITY OF ROCKWAL. (I.E. "CITY') IS AUTHORIZED AND PERMITTED TO PROVIDE SUBMITIED IN CONUUNCTION WITH THIS APPLICATION, IF SUCH REPRODUCTION IS ASSOCIATED OR IN RESPONSE TO A REQUEST FOR PUBLIC INFORMATION."

GIVEN UNDER MY HAND AND SEAL OF OFFICE ON THIS THE $\qquad$ DAY OF $\qquad$ 20 OWNER'S SIGNATURE

NOTARY PUBLIC IN AND FOR THE STATE OF TEXAS
$\square$


## City of Rockwall

Planning \& Zoning Department
385 S. Goliad Street
Rockwall, Texas 75087
(P): (972) 771-7745
(W): www.rockwall.com

The City of Rockwall GIS maps are continually under development and therefore subject to change without notice. While we endeavor to provide timely and accurate information, we make no guarantees. The City of Rockwall makes no warranty, express or implied, including warranties of merchantability and fitness for a particular purpose. Use of the information is the sole responsibility of the user
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| City of Rockwall Landscape Requirements |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| оro. .eg. | Discriprow | Require | Provoso |
| Ste 5 S0. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Required landssaped Area |  | 31.4\% (24,711 5F Frovided) |
| SEC05.0.1. | Jental landsape | 10' wide buffer along entire length of non residential lot w/ 1 canopy and 1 accent trees per 50' along Yellowjacket Lane: ( 377 ' frontage $/ 50$ ) $=8$ canopy trees \& 8 accent trees, 30 " tall shrubbery. | 15 ' wide landscape buffer w/ 30" height <br> shrubbery. 16 Accent Trees. Exception <br> requested to substitute 8 Canopy Trees for 8$\frac{\text { Accent Trees in Buffer due to overhead power }}{\text { line along Yellowjacket Lane. }}$ |
| SECO5,03, [1 |  |  |  |
| SEC0.503, [2 2 |  |  |  |
| SECO5.00101. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Impenius Area evesus the andscaped Area |  |  |




| $\theta^{3}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | 5 |  |
| 6 | 2 | Yaupontour |
| 4 | 6 |  |
| canopr tress | ary |  |
| $\theta$ | ${ }^{3}$ |  |
| $\frac{\text { Shevess }}{\text { * }}$ | ar | COMMON / BOTANICAL NAME RED YUCCA |
| * | 11 |  |
| 3 | ${ }^{13}$ |  |
| $\bigcirc$ | ${ }^{26}$ |  |
| \% | " | Mexcan saiem |
| ORNMENTAL Consses | arv | Common forancal NamE |
| O | ${ }_{71}$ | deremuly |
| $\bigcirc$ | ${ }^{14}$ |  |
| \% | ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Lithe ile siem fass |
|  | orv | COMMON / BOTANICAL NAME EXAS LANTANA |
| ¢ | ${ }_{66}$ |  |
| ornamental crass area | orv | commov/ Botancal NamE |
| Ery | ${ }_{46} 8$ |  |
| grouno covers | orv | common/botancal Name |
|  | 45.1 sF |  |
| $0$ | ${ }^{52558}$ |  |
| 準 | 5.414 5 F |  |
| soosseo | or | comoon/ Botancal Name |
|  | 6.065 5F |  |
| 约 | ${ }^{3} 38085$ |  |
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| Plot |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| symbol | Lobel | Image | Quantiv | Mantuaturer | Catalog Mumber | Description | Number | ${ }_{\text {Lerl }}^{\text {Lemens }}$ | ${ }_{\text {Liolt Loss }}^{\text {Facor }}$ | Wattage |
| $\square$ | W1 |  | 1 | nia Lighting | WST LED P3 40 K VF MVOLT | WST LE, Pefformane parkge 3 30000 K. | 1 | 6609 | 0.8 | 50 |
| $\square$ | w2 |  | 2 | Lithonia Lighting | WSt Leo pr 40 K Mvolt | WPX1 LED wallpack 15001 m 4000 K color ure 120-277 Volts | 1 | 1568 | ${ }^{0.8}$ | ${ }^{11.47}$ |
| $\bigcirc$ | C/CE |  | 10 | Lithonia Lighting | Low 40/07 Lotar Lo | Sid Low, 4000, 750M, Clear, Matte | 1 | 679 | ${ }^{0.8}$ | 8.91 |
| $\square$ | AA |  | 1 | Lithonia Lighting | E5x1 Lep p3 40k RS |  | 1 | 21680 | ${ }^{0.8}$ | 146.35 |
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Site Plan

City of Rockwall
Planning Department
385 S. Goliad Street
Rockwall, Texas 75069
RE: Letter of Intent - Design Exceptions Request

Dear Mr. Lee:
Parkhill, as the representative for Rockwall County, previously submitted an application for site plan approval for the Rockwall County Courthouse Annex. The property is located at 1101 E . Yellow Jacket Lane Rockwall Texas, 75087. The application has been identified as case number SP2023-034.

The project consists of adding a Courthouse Annex Building, parking, utilities, and connection to the existing Rockwall County complex. As discussed previously with the city of Rockwall Planning Department, Parkhill was aware that multiple design exceptions would be necessary as part of this Site Plan Submission. Per our previous discussions with the city of Rockwall Planning Department, we would like to submit the following design exception requests:

- Articulation Standards (Subsection 04.01. C. of Article 05, UDC)
- Building footprint is nearly at maximum building size allowed. There is no primary building entrance along East Yellow Jacket, our main façade faces in toward the existing parking.
- Exterior Walls consist of 90\% Masonry (Subsection 06.02. C. of Article 05, UDC)
- Total of $60 \%$ Masonry provided. Design intent is to closely relate to the adjacent County courthouse and library
- At least 20\% Natural quarried stone on each façade (Subsection 06.02. C. of Article 05, UDC)
- Providing $18.8 \%, 33 \%, 41.5 \%$, and $6.4 \%$ to the façades, and a total percentage of $25.4 \%$
- The minimum roof pitch for this zoning district is 6:12. (Subsection 04.01, of Article 05, UDC)
- Mansard roof pitch to be 6:12, front overhangs to be 4:12.
- Landscape Exception requested to substitute 8 Accent Trees for the 8 Canopy Trees required along East Yellow Jacket Lane due to the existing overhead power line in right of way
(Subsection 05.01.B of Article 8, UDC). The two proposed compensatory measures include:
- 15-foot wide landscape buffer provided along East Yellow Jacket Lane instead of the ordinance required 10-foot wide buffer.
- 31.4\% (24,711 SF) of landscape area provided instead of the ordinance required 20\% (15,729 SF).
- Driveway Spacing (Section 02.06, Standards of Design and Construction)
- Seeking an exception from the driveway spacing requirement of 200 feet along Yellow Jacket Lane, to a spacing of 85 ft .
- $20 f t$ minimum depth for all parking
- Seeking an exception to the 20ft depth requirement for the parking lot area south of the proposed building, to 18 feet. The existing parking spaces in this area are $18 \mathrm{ft} x 9 \mathrm{ft}$.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions regarding the applications for the Site Plan of the Rockwall County Courthouse Annex.

Sincerely,
PARKHILL


Civil Engineer
Authorized Representative/Applicant for Rockwall County
Enclosures
Cc: Files

CITY OF ROCKWALL
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION CASE MEMO
PLANNING AND ZONING DEPARTMENT
385 S. GOLIAD STREET • ROCKWALL, TX 75087
PHONE: (972) 771-7745•EMAIL: PLANNING@ROCKWALL.COM

TO:
DATE:
APPLICANT:
CASE NUMBER:

Planning and Zoning Commission
December 12, 2023
Clay Cristy; ClayMoore Engineering
SP2023-038; Site Plan for HTeaO

## SUMMARY

Discuss and consider a request by Clay Cristy of ClayMoore Engineering on behalf of Staci Bowen of Metroplex Acquisition Fund, LP for the approval of a Site Plan for Restaurant with Less Than 2,000 SF with a Drive-Through or Drive-In (i.e. HTeaO) on a 0.93 -acre portion of a larger 5.16 -acre parcel of land identified as Lot 13 , Block A, Stone Creek Retail Addition, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Planned Development District 70 (PD-70) for General Retail (GR) District land uses, situated within North SH-205 Overlay (N. SH-205 OV) District, generally located at the northeast corner of the intersection of N. Goliad Street [SH-205] and Bordeaux Drive, and take any action necessary.

## BACKGROUND

The subject property was annexed into the City of Rockwall on May 19, 1986 by Ordinance No. 86-37. On December 7, 1993, the City's historic zoning map indicates the subject property was zoned Agricultural (AG) District. On April 2, 2007, the City Council approved a zoning change for the subject property changing the zoning designation from an Agricultural (AG) District to Planned Development District 70 (PD-70) [i.e. Ordinance No. 07-13] for limited General Retail (GR) District land uses. On October 5, 2020, the City Council approved a replat [i.e. Case No. P2020-038] that replatted the subject property as Lot 11, Block A, Stone Creek Retail Addition. On May 2, 2022, the City Council approved a replat [i.e. Case No. P2022-013] that established the subject property as a portion of Lot 13, Block A, Stone Creek Retail Addition. On November 6, 2023, the City Council approved a Specific Use Permit (SUP) [i.e. Case No. Z2023-048; Ordinance No. 23-62, S-319] to allow a Restaurant with less than 2,000 SF with Drive-Through or Drive-In on the subject property. The subject property is currently vacant.

## PURPOSE

On October 20, 2023, the applicant -- Clay Cristy of ClayMoore Engineering -- submitted an application requesting the approval of a site plan for the purpose of constructing a Restaurant Less Than 2,000 SF with a Drive-Through or Drive-In (i.e. HTeaO) on the subject property.

## ADJACENT LAND USES AND ACCESS

The subject property is generally located northeast of the intersection of N. Goliad Street [SH-205] and Bordeaux Drive. The land uses adjacent to the subject property are as follows:

North: Directly north of the subject is a Restaurant with less than 2,000 SF with a Drive-Through (i.e. Salad-n-Go). North of this is a Restaurant with more than 2,000 SF with a Drive-Through (i.e. McDonald's). Beyond this is a Retail Store with Gasoline Sales (i.e. Tom Thumb Gas Station). All of these properties are zoned Planned Development District 70 (PD-70) for limited General Retail (GR) District land uses.

South: Directly south of the subject property is Bordeaux Drive, which is identified as a A4D (i.e. major arterial, four [4] lane, divided roadway) on the City's Master Thoroughfare Plan contained in the OURHometown Vision 2040 Comprehensive Plan. Beyond this is Phase 1 of the Stone Creek Subdivision, which is an 83.57 -acre residential subdivision, zoned Planned Development District 70 (PD-70) for Single-Family 10 (SF-10) District land uses.

East: $\quad$ Directly east of the subject property is the remainder of a 5.16 -acre parcel of land (i.e. Lot 13, Block A, Stone Creek Retail Addition) -- that includes the subject property --, which is currently vacant. East of this is Stone Creek Drive, which is identified as a Minor Collector on the City's Master Thoroughfare Plan contained in the OURHometown Vision 2040 Comprehensive Plan. Beyond this is Phases 2B \& 6 of the Stone Creek Subdivision, which are zoned Planned Development District 70 (PD-70) for Single-Family 10 (SF-10) District land uses.

West: $\quad$ Directly west of the subject property is N . Goliad Street [SH-205], which is identified as a A4D (i.e. major arterial, four [4] lane, divided roadway) on the City's Master Thoroughfare Plan contained in the OURHometown Vision 2040 Comprehensive Plan. Beyond this are two (2) parcels of land (i.e. 3069 and 3073 N. Goliad Street), zoned Single-Family 16 (SF-16) District. Beyond this is Phase 6 of the Shores Subdivision, which consists of 70 lots and is zoned Planned Development District 3 (PD-3) for single-family land uses.

## DENSITY AND DIMENSIONAL REQUIREMENTS

According to Section 01, Land Use Schedule, of Article 04, Permissible Uses, of the Unified Development Code (UDC), a Restaurant with Less Than 2,000 SF with a Drive-Through or Drive-In is permitted by Specific Use Permit (SUP) in a General Retail (GR) District. A Specific Use Permit (SUP) [i.e. Case No. Z2023-048; Ordinance No. 23-62, S-319] was granted for this land use by the City Council on November 6, 2023. The submitted site plan, landscape plan, photometric plan, and building elevations generally conform to the technical requirements contained within the Unified Development Code (UDC) for a property located within a General Retail (GR) District. A summary of the density and dimensional requirements for the subject property are as follows:

| Ordinance Provisions | Zoning District Standards | Conformance to the Standards |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Minimum Lot Area | 6,000 SF | $X=0.81$-acres; In Conformance |
| Minimum Lot frontage | 60 -Feet | $X=137$-feet; In Conformance |
| Minimum Lot Depth | 100 -Feet | $X=249.46$-feet; In Conformance |
| Minimum Front Yard Setback | $15-$ Feet | $x>15$-feet; In Conformance |
| Minimum Rear Yard Setback | 10 -Feet | $x>10$-feet; In Conformance |
| Minimum Side Yard Setback | $10-$ Feet | $x=10$-feet; In Conformance |
| Maximum Building Height | 36 -Feet | $X<60-$-feet; In Conformance |
| Max Building/Lot Coverage | $40 \%$ | $X=2.22 \%$; In Conformance |
| Minimum Number of Parking Spaces | 1 Parking Space/100 SF (8 Required) | $x=8$; In Conformance |
| Minimum Landscaping Percentage | $20 \%$ | In Conformance |
| Maximum Impervious Coverage | $85-90 \%$ | $x<85 \%$; In Conformance |

## TREESCAPE PLAN

There are no trees being removed from the property, therefore no treescape plan is required.

## CONFORMANCE WITH THE CITY'S CODES

According to Subsection 02.02(F)(27), Restaurant with Drive Through or Drive-In, of Article 13, Definitions, of the Unified Development Code (UDC) defines Restaurants with Drive Through or Drive-In as "(a) place of business whose primary source of revenue is derived from the sale of prepared food to the general public for consumption on-premise or off-premises and/or in a personal vehicle or where facilities are provided on the premises that encourages the serving and consumption of food in a personal vehicle on or near the restaurant premises." In this case the applicant is requesting a Restaurant with Less Than 2,000 SF with Drive-Through or Drive-In, which conforms to the land use listed in Section 01, Land Use Schedule, of Article 04, Permissible Uses, of the Unified Development Code (UDC).

The proposed site plan generally conforms to the standards of the General Overlay District Standards and the General Commercial District Standards as stipulated by Article 05, District Development Standards, of the Unified Development Code (UDC), with the exception of the variances being requested as outlined in the Variances and Exceptions Requested by the Applicant section of this case memo.

## VARIANCES AND EXCEPTIONS BY THE APPLICANT

As stated above, the applicant's request conforms to the majority of the City's codes; however, staff has identified the following exceptions:
(1) Architectural Standards.
(a) $20 \%$ Stone Requirement. According to Subsection 06.02(C)(1)(A)(1), Stone, of Article 05, District Dovelopment Standards, of the Unified Development Code (UDC), "...a minimum of $20 \%$ natural or quarried stone is required on all building facades." In this case, the applicant meots this requirement on three (3) of four (4) sides of the building. A variance is requested for the building façade that does not meet this requirement,
(b) 90\% Masonry Requirement. According to Subsection 06.02(C)(1), Materials and Masonry Composition, of Article 05, District Development Standards, of the Unified Development Code (UDC), "...each exterior wall of a building's façade shall consist of a minimum of $90 \%$ Primary Materials..." In this case, the applicant meets this requirement on one (1) of the four (4) sides of the building. A variance is requested on three (3) of the four (4) sides of the building.
(c) Roof Design Standards. According to Subsection 06.02 (C)(3), Roof Design Standards, of Article 05, District Development Standards, of the Unified Development Code (UDC), states that "(a)ll structures that have a building footprint of less than $6,000 \mathrm{SF}$ shall be constructed with a pitched roof'. In this case, the applicant is requesting that this requirement be waived in order to meet their brand standards and match the surrounding buildings. Staff should note that this variance has been granted before for the adjacent restaurant (i.e. Salad and Go).
(d) Four-Sided Architecture. According to Article 05, General Overlay District Development Standards, of the Unified Development Code (UDC), "(a)ll buildings shall be architecturally finished on all four (4) sides utilizing the same materials, detailing, articulation and features. In addition, a minimum of one (1) row of troes (i.e. four [4] or more accent or canopy trees) shall be planted along perimeter of the subject property to the rear of the building." In this case, the building elevations did not meet the articulation standards or projection standards for all four (4) facades of all buildings proposed and there is not an additional row of trees proposed at the back of the property.
(e) Landscape Buffers. According to Article 08, Landscape and Fonce Requirements, of the Unified Development Code (UDC) "(a) minimum of a ten (10) foot wide landscape buffer shall be required along the entire length of any non-residential lot that abuts public right-of-way ... all landscape buffers adjacent to a public right-of-way shall incorporate ground cover, a built-up berm and shrubbery ..." In addition, the Genoral Overlay District Standards require a built-up berm along the entire frontage of the required 20 -foot landscape buffer. In this case, the applicant has not provided any berms in the landscape buffers. This will require an exception and a variance to the standards.

According to Subsection 09.01, Exceptions to the General Standards, of Article 11, Development Applications and Review Procedures, of the Unified Development Code (UDC), "...an applicant may request the Planning and Zoning Commission grant an exception to the provisions contained in the Unified Development Code (UDC), where unique or extraordinary conditions exist or where strict adherence to the technical requirements of the Unified Development Code would create an undue hardship." In addition, the code requires that applicant's provide compensatory measures that directly offset the requested exception. In this case, as compensatory measures the applicant is proposing to [1] increased landscaping (i.e. six (6) canopy treos around the building and incroasod landscaping at oast and southwost cornors of the lot), [2] additional coverings (i.e. portico around the front ontrance and squared arch openings on eithor side of portico), and [3] increased horizontal articulation (i.e. added cornice design using two-stop cornice crowning the top of the walls finishod in stucco). Staff should point out that all of the identified compensatory measures are requirements and do not meet the ordinances definition of compensatory measures. With this being said, requests for exceptions to the general standards are discretionary decisions for the Planning and Zoning Commission. Staff should also note that a supermajority vote (e.g. six [6] out of the seven [7] commissioners) -- with a minimum of four (4) votes in the affirmative -- is required for the approval of an exception.

Addendum (December 07, 2023): On December 6, 2023, the applicant submitted revisions to staff that included an updated Site Plan, Building Elevations, Landscape Plan, and Photometric Plan. Based on what was submitted, the applicant is requesting exceptions to the $90 \%$ masonry requirements, roof design standards, and four-sided architecture requirements (i.e. primary and secondary articulation). Staff should note that a Variance Letter was requested by staff, but was not provided by the applicant. As of now, there are no compensatory measures being proposed to off-set the requested exceptions; however, the applicant has changed the building elevations to be in conformance with the $20 \%$ stone requirement and provided increased landscaping as required by the General Overlay District Standards.

## CONFORMANCE WITH OURHOMETOWN VISION 2040 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The Future Land Use Plan adopted with the OURHometown Vision 2040 Comprehensive Plan identifies the subject property as being situated in the Northwest Residential District. The Northwest Residential District is an established district that is significantly developed with medium-density, suburban housing and many of the subdivisions are not anticipated to change. As a result, the majority of commercial development in the area is anticipated to consist of neighborhood/convenience centers that are compatible in scale with the adjacent residential properties. Strategy \#2 in the Northwest Residential District states that "...commercial in this district is intended to support the existing residential subdivisions and should be compatible in scale with the adjacent residential structures." In this case, the applicant's proposal appears to conform with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan.

## ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD (ARB) RECOMMENDATION

The Architectural Review Board (ARB) reviewed the building elevations provided by the applicant on November 1, 2023. The ARB recommended that the applicant revise the elevations to be more consistent with the surrounding buildings (i.e. Salad and Go ) in terms of projections and building materials. They also asked that the applicants meet the articulation requirements. Before action is taken on the elevations, the ARB wants to see the revised elevations at the November 14, 2023 meeting.

## CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

If the Planning and Zoning Commission chooses to approve the applicant's Site Plan for HTeaO on the subject property, then staff would propose the following conditions of approval:
(1) All staff comments provided by the Planning, Engineering and Fire Department must be addressed prior to the submittal of engineering plans.
(2) The applicant shall provide an updated Landscape Plan that shows conformance with the Landscape Plan and operational requirements approved with the Specific Use Permit (SUP) ordinance (i.e. Ordinance No. 23-62].
(3) The applicant shall update the Photometric Plan to be in conformance with the Unified Development Code (UDC) before the engineering process.
(4) Any construction resulting from the approval of this Site Plan shall conform to the requirements set forth by the Unified Development Code (UDC), the International Building Code (IBC), the Rockwall Municipal Code of Ordinances, city adopted engineering and fire codes and with all other applicable regulatory requirements administered and/or enforced by the state and federal government.

DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION

City of Rockwall<br>Planning and Zoning Department<br>385 S. Goliad Street<br>Rockwall, Texas 75087

## STAFF USE ONLY <br> PLANNING \& ZONING CASE NO.

NOTE: THE APPLICATION IS NOT CONSIDERED ACCEPTED BY THE CITY UNTIL THE PLANNING DIRECTOR AND CITY ENGINEER HAVE SIGNED BELOW.

DIRECTOR OF PLANNING:
City engineer:

Please check the appropriate box below to indicate the type of development request [SELECT ONLY ONE BOX]:

## Platting Application Fees:

[ ] Master Plat ( $\$ 100.00+\$ 15.00$ Acre) ${ }^{1}$
[ ] Preliminary Plat $\left(\$ 200.00+\$ 15.00\right.$ Acre) ${ }^{1}$
[ ] Final Plat $(\$ 300.00+\$ 20.00 \text { Acre })^{1}$
[ ] Replat ( $\$ 300.00+\$ 20.00$ Acre) ${ }^{1}$
[ ] Amending or Minor Plat (\$150.00)
[ ] Plat Reinstatement Request ( $\$ 100.00$ )
Site Plan Application Fees:
[ ${ }^{\prime}$ ] Site Plan ( $\$ 250.00+\$ 20.00$ Acre) ${ }^{1}$
[ ] Amended Site Plan/Elevations/Landscaping Plan (\$100.00)

## Zoning Application Fees:

[ ] Zoning Change ( $\$ 200.00+\$ 15.00$ Acre) ${ }^{1}$
[ ] Specific Use Permit $\left(\$ 200.00+\$ 15.00\right.$ Acre) ${ }^{1}$
[ ] PD Development Plans ( $\$ 200.00+\$ 15.00$ Acre) ${ }^{1}$
Other Application Fees:
[ ] Tree Removal (\$75.00)
[ ] Variance Request (\$100.00)
Notes:
${ }^{1}$ : In determining the fee, please use the exact acreage when multiplying by the per acre amount. For requests on less than one acre, round up to one (1) acre.

## PROPERTY INFORMATION [PLEASE PRINT]



## General Location North East Corner of N. Goliad St and Bordeaux Dr.

## ZONING, SITE PLAN AND PLATTING INFORMATION [PLEASE PRINT]

Current Zoning PD-070
Proposed Zoning PD-070
Acreage 0.93
$\checkmark$ ] SITE PLANS AND PLATS: By checking this box you acknowledge that due to the passage of HB3167 the City no longer has flexibility with regard to its approval process, and failure to address any of staff's comments by the date provided on the Development Calendar will result in the denial of your case.

OWNER/APPLICANT/AGENT INFORMATION [PLEASE PRINT/CHECK THE PRIMARY CONTACT/ORIGINAL SIGNATURES ARE REQUIRED]

NOTARY VERIFICATION [REQUIRED]
Before me, the undersigned authority, on this day personally appeared this application to be true and certified the following: "I hereby certify that I am the owner for the purpose of this application; all information submitted herein is true and correct; and the application fee of $\$ 268.60$

Billy J. Brice III, President of Metroplex Acquisition Fund, LP
$\qquad$
$\qquad$ [Owner] the undersigned, who stated the information on , $20 \underline{23}$

By signing this application, I agree tho $\ddagger$ WhltitlldfiRppkwall (ie. "City") is authorized and permitted to provide information contained within this application to the public. The City is also authorized and Rate li tiokragiag any copyrighted information submitted in conjunction with this application, if such reproduction is associated or in response to a request for public
 day of Septembers. 23
 My Commission Expires /-27-2025




| BUILDING EXTERIOR WALL MATERIAL PERCENTAGES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TOTAL FAÇADE AREAS: <br> 4424 S.F. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL FAÇADE AREAS EXCLUDING OPENINGS, WINDOWS AND DOORS: 4424 S.F. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAX. BUILDING HEIGHT ALLOWED BY CODE: $40^{\prime}-0{ }^{\prime \prime}$ S.F. PROPOSED BUILDING HEIGHT: $22^{\prime}$-0" S.E. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BLDG MATERIAL | NORTH |  | SOUTH |  | EAST |  | WEST |  | TOTALS |  |
|  | S.F. | \% | S.F. | \% | S.F. | \% | S.F. | \% | S.F. | \% |
| Stucco | 848 | 59\% | 703 | 48\% | 353 | 46\% | 226 | 30\% | 2130 | 48\% |
| Stone | 536 | 37\% | 446 | 31\% | 227 | 29\% | 155 | 21\% | 1364 | 31\% |
| Wood/Composite | 0 | 0\% | 250 | 17\% | 171 | 22\% | 351 | 47\% | 772 | 17\% |
| EIFS | 64 | 4\% | 54 | 4\% | 23 | 3\% | 17 | 2\% | 158 | 4\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTALS | 1448 | 100\% | 1453 | 100\% | 774 | 100\% | 749 | 100\% | 4424 | 100\% |

GENERAL NOTES



 Colleliconraio



|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TOTAL FAÇADE AREAS: <br> 4424 S.F. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL FAÇADE AREAS EXCLUDING OPENINGS, WINDOWS AND DOORS: 4424 S.F. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAX. BUILDING HEIGHT ALLOWED BY CODE: $40^{\prime}-0{ }^{\prime \prime}$ S.F. PROPOSED BUILDING HEIGHT: $22^{\prime}$--0" S.E. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BLDG MATERIAL | NORTH |  | SOUTH |  | EAST |  | WEST |  | totals |  |
|  | S.F. | \% | S.F. | \% | S.F. | \% | S.F. | \% | S.F. | \% |
| Stucco | 848 | 59\% | 703 | 48\% | 353 | 46\% | 226 | 30\% | 2130 | 48\% |
| Stone | 536 | 37\% | 446 | 31\% | 227 | 29\% | 155 | 21\% | 1364 | 31\% |
| Wood/Composite | 0 | 0\% | 250 | 17\% | 171 | 22\% | 351 | 47\% | 772 | 17\% |
| EIFS | 64 | 4\% | 54 | 4\% | 23 | 3\% | 17 | 2\% | 158 | 4\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTALS | 1448 | 100\% | 1453 | 100\% | 774 | 100\% | 749 | 100\% | 4424 | 100\% |

GENERAL NOTES

 3. H . BNo





LANDSCAPE PLANTING SPECIFICATIONS 1) Guarantee - All labor, materials and plants will be guaranteed for a period of twelve
(12) months afte the final acceptance of work by Owner. All plants that have died or are unhealthy shall be replaced no later than 30 days from the anniversary ate of the
final acceptance. This guarantee does not apply to plant material that dies due to bnormal freezes, hail, abnormal high winds, or other acts of God, vandalism or lac of normal
plantings.
2) Contractor is to verify all site dimensions and layout prio to the commencement of andscape construction. Any discreatancies between he rawings and the actual site
conditions shal be brought to the attention of the owner's representative immediately. Contractor is responsitle for verification of the ocacaion of all underground utilites, epair to said utilities as a result of the work of the contractor shall be the responsibi 4) Contractor is responsible for maintaining positive drainage in all shrub and turf lanting areas.
Tree pits are
e tree pit should be filled with depth as the root ball and $24^{\prime \prime}$ wider. Prior to planting Hain the Contractor should dheck with the Landscapape Archinitect to to felocater toes thot tree 6) Trees should be positioned in the center of the tree pits, back filled with soil that
 dia.). Water untilil planting piti is soaked and sioil has settled. Add soin hecessary to dia). Water until lanting pit is soaked and soil has settled. Add soil necessary to
bring soil level flush with surrounding ground. Fill the basin with three (3) inches of All plant Al plant material shall conform to the standards of the latest edition of "American
Standard for Nursery Stock" by The American Association of Nurserymen and Grades and Standards" bb The Texas Association of Nunservmen. A plant shall be
imensioned as it stands in its natural oosition. All plants shall be a t least the dimensioned as it stands in its natural position. All plants shall be at least the
minimum size indicated. Larger stock is aceeptable at no additional cost, an providint that the largee peantst will not be cut back ko sise ind indicated.
B)
It st
${ }^{\text {pests. }}$ 9) Space specified quantity of plant materials to evenly fill designated areas, owner to have final approval of locations of all trees, shrubs and groundcover beds C) Contractor is responsible for removing aliclocs, rocks, concrete, trash and any
 depth of six $(6)$ inches. A three (3) inch layer of shredded hardwood bark mulch
should be appied to all beds after planting is completed. Four (4) inch pots and ground cover may be planted throup panting in incon.
12) Contractor is responsible for removal of trash and repair of hazardous
conditions (tools, open holes, et.) on a daily basis by the end of the work day 13) Water all plantings in bed areas thoroughly on a daily basis until final acceptance.

To prepare turf areas treat them with a selective herbicide two weeks prior Add two (2) inche of tesoil to the tuf area. Rake area to a finish grade ( 1 " below walks and curbs).
15) If sodding is to take
48 hour period. Lay the sod to to form a solid mess with thed tight fiting plonted witts. Buth a ends and sides of sod and offset joints in adiacent courses. Roll sod to ensure contours and secure sod with pins if neecessary. Site preparation and maintenance will be the same for hydromulchang.
16) Water sod daily so as to not allow turf blades to wilt. If necessary wate
twice per day.
47) Apply slow release fer
to all turf or planted areas.

## REFERENCE NOTE SPECIFICATIONS


 lot

MULCHES / GRAVELS/ RIVER ROCK / BOULDERS
3. Mulch, Native Hardwood. 3 d deep with d dip irigation.


TREE PLANTING MULTI-STAKE
 shall thoroughly clean the site of all trash, spilled soil, and liter, etc. that has resulted from landscape construction operations. Repair all damage to finish grade including
tailings from excavations, wheel ruts, etc. caused from construction. All debbis, trash a


## LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS

## The owner shall be responsible for:

1) Regular maintenanco of all required landscape areas and plant materials in a vigorous
and healthy condition, free from diseases, pests, weeds and and liter This mine and eathy condition, free from diseases, pests, weeds, and liter. This maintenance
shall include eveeding, watering, ererilization, pruning, mowing, edging, mulching or othe
heeded mainenand
 structurally sound condition. screening or buffering. 4) All open space areas that are to be preserved as natural plant communities shal be timmed, at least once a year, of all exotic vegetation, lawn grasses, trash, or other are vigorous.
IRRIGATION SPECIFICATIONS
2) Irigation contractor will provide pipes for seoves 1) lrigation contractor will provide pipes for sleeves and specify locations for placement
of sileeves by general contractor prio to oporing concrete or laying asphat
3) lrigation contractor will install all backflow prevention devices and all piping between 2) lrigation contractor will install all backlow prevention devices and all piping between
the point of connection and the backlow preventer as per local governing authorities. the pint of connection and the beckflow preventer as per local governing autho
4) Find locotion of focklifow preventer and autumatic controler location shall be approved by the owner's authorized representative


$\square$
(2)
hers. Th elicerical power source at controler location shall be provided by source to the controll ${ }^{\text {specified. }}$
) The irigation contractor shall flush and adiust all sprinkler heads and valves for potimum coverage with minimal overspray onto walk, streets, walls, etc. understanding that all landscape areas will receive adequate water to provide for vigorous growth of vegetation.
5) lrigation contractor will replace or repair all items damaged by his work. 9) All work shall be installed in accordance with applicabbe eocdes and ordinances
for the City of Rockwall, Texas (UDC) and the National Electrical Code and all governing authorties.
6) The iririgation contractor is responsible for reporting any deficiency in water
pressure that would affect the operation of the irigation system pressure that would afiect the operation of the inirigation System.
11 TTe irigation contractor shall be a Registered ticensed lrigator in the State of
Texas Water Codre and TNRCC.
7) All remote control valves, gate valves, quick couplers and control wire and
computer cable pull pints shall beinstalled
computer cable pull pints shall be installed in approved valve boxes.
8) lrigation Contractor shall procure all permits licenses, and pay all charges and 13) Ilrigation Contractor shall procure all permits, licenses, and pay all charges and
ees and give all necessany notices for the completion of work.
9) Contractor shall not disturb roots of existing trees. There shall be no machine trenching below the dripline of existing trees.
$155)$ Etreme care shall be exerciseds in excavating and working near utitities.
Contractor shall verify the location and condition of all utilities and be responsib) Contractor shall verify the
for damage to any utilites.
10) Contractor shall llearly mark all exposed excavations, materials, and equipment. Cover or barricade trenchess when the contractor is int on on the site. Take
all necessary precautions to proctect and prevent iniury to any persons on the site 17) All automatic irifgation systems shall be equipped with a controller of dual of multiple programming. Controllers shall have multipee wyile cy startronorepacity and a fiexive calendar rrogram inclucing the capacity of being set to water every five
dayss All automatic ririgation systems shall be equipeed with a rain sensor shutoff device.
11) lrigatio
12) Irigation in Texas is regulated by the Texas
Quality, www.tceq.texas.gov, (512) 239-1000

TO:
DATE:
APPLICANT:
CASE NUMBER:

Planning and Zoning Commission
December 12, 2023
Kamran Khan
SP2023-042; Amended Site Plan for an Existing General Retail Building

On July 6, 1959, the subject property was annexed into the City of Rockwall by Ordinance No. 59-02 [i.e. Case No. A1959002]. At the time of annexation, the subject property was zoned Commercial (C) District and has remained zoned Commercial (C) District since annexation. In June 1977, the subject property was established as Lot 1, Block A, Burgamy Addition. According to Rockwall Central Appraisal District (RCAD), there is a $2,585 \mathrm{SF}$ retail building currently situated on the subject property that was constructed in 1983. On November 13, 2023, the applicant -- Kamran Khan -- submitted an application for an Amended Site Plan proposing to make changes to the existing retail building. Based on the building elevations provided in the Amended Site Plan, the applicant is proposing changes to the existing building façade and adding a dumpster on the subject property. Based on the General Overlay District Standards, the proposed changes will require a variance to the following:
(1) Roof Design Standards. According to Subsection 06.02(C)(2), of Article 05, District Development Standards, of the Unified Development Code (UDC), "(a)ll structures that have a building footprint less than $6,000 \mathrm{SF}$ shall be constructed with a pitched roof." In this case, the existing building has a partial mansard roof on the front of the structure. By removing this roof element, the applicant is bringing the existing building further out of conformance with the General Overlay District Standards. This will require a variance to be granted by the Planning and Zoning Commission.

According to Subsection 09.02 of Article 11, Variances to the General Overlay District Standards, of the Unified Development Code (UDC), "(i)n cases where a variance or variances is/are being requested, the applicant shall provide compensatory measures that directly offset the requested exception." Based on the provided building elevations, the proposed changes to the existing general retail store will require a variance to the roof design standards. Staff should note that even though there are no compensatory measures provided, the applicant is proposing improvements to the property that will bring the building closer in to conformance with the General Overlay District Standards. Specifically, when the existing retail store closed, new RTU's were placed on the roof that were not permitted. The applicant has indicated that they will be raising the parapet on three (3) sides of the building and finishing the parapet on the back side of the building. This will meet the HVAC screening requirements and will screen the RTU's reducing the visibility from the adjacent public rights-of-way. Based on this, staff feels the applicant's variance request warrants consideration without compensatory measures. With this being said, approval of variances are discretionary decisions for the Planning and Zoning Commission and do require a supermajority vote with a minimum of four (4) affirmative votes. Should the Planning and Zoning Commission have any questions concerning the applicant's request, staff and the applicant will be available at the December 12, 2023 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.

## DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION

City of Rockwall
Planning and Zoning Department
385 S. Goliad Street
Rockwall, Texas 75087

## STAFF USE ONLY

PLANNING \& ZONING CASE NO.
NOTE: THE APPLICATION IS NOT CONSIDERED ACCEPTED BY THE CITY UNTIL THE PLANNING DIRECTOR AND CITY ENGINEER HAVE SIGNED BELOW.
DIRECTOR OF PLANNING:
CITY ENGINEER:

PLEASE CHECK THE APPROPRIATE BOX BELOW TO INDICATE THE TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT REQUEST [SELECT ONLY ONE BOX]:


PROPERTY INFORMATION [PLEASE PRINT]
adDress 1007 Ridge Rd
SUBDIVISION
LOT
BLOCK
GENERAL LOCATION
ZONING, SITE PLAN AND PLATTING INFORMATION [PLEASE PRINT]

$\square$ SITE PLANS AND PLATS: BY CHECKING THIS BOX YOU ACKNOWLEDGE THAT DUE TO THE PASSAGE OF HB3167 THE CITY NO LONGER HAS FLEXIBILITY WITH REGARD TO ITS APPROVAL PROCESS, AND FAILURE TO ADDRESS ANY OF STAFF'S COMMENTS BY THE DATE PROVIDED ON THE DEVELOPMENT CALENDAR WILL RESULT IN THE DENIAL OF YOUR CASE.

OWNERIAPPHCANT/AGENT INFORMATION [PLEASE PRINT/CHECK THE PRIMARY CONTACTIORIGINAL SIGNATURES ARE REQUIRED]


NOTARY VERIFICATION [REQUIRED]
beFore me, the undersigned authority, on this day personally appeared haman ahmed than [owner] the undersigned, who STATED THE INFORMATION ON THIS APPLICATION TO BE TRUE AND CERTIFIED THE FOLLOWING:
"HEREBY CERTIFY THAT I AM THE OWNER FOR THE PURPOSE OF THIS APPLICATION: ALL INFORMATION SUBMITTED HEREIN IS TRUE AND CORRECT; AND THE APPLICATION FEE OF \$ $\$$


City of Rockwall
Planning \& Zoning Department
385 S. Goliad Street
Rockwall, Texas 75087
(P): (972) 771-7745
(W): www.rockwall.com



EXISTING REAR ELEVATION


EXISTING RIGHT SIDE ELEVATION
SCAE: $1 / 8^{\circ}=1^{-1} 0^{\circ}$




NEW RIGHT SIDE ELEVATION

NEW LEFT SIDE ELEVATION
SCALE: $1 / 8^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ SCALE: $1 / 8^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime \prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$


## TYPICAL FLOORPLAN NOTES

. DOWEL CONC. WALK INTO FOUNDATION WALL AT EXTERIOR DOORS AND STOREFRONT DOORS, AND AT STORERENT SYSTEM
REFERENCE STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS FOR COLUMN DESIGNATIONS AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.
REFERENCE MEP DRAWINGS FOR UTILITIES RUN UNDE SLAB. PROVIDE 2' SQ. LEAVE OUT AT
OUTS, UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE.
. SITE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR UTILITIES BEYOND 5'-0" OF BUILDING PERIMETER.
REFERENCE ELEVATIONS FOR TRANSOM WINDOW LOCATIONS AND R RTOREFRONT WORK. STOREFRONT WORK.

trpical side ellevation
DUMPSTER ENCLOSURE SIDE ELEVATION
SCALE: N.T.S.


DUMPSTER ENCLOSURE FRONT ELEVATION ScALE: N.TS.



ISSUE LOG | ISSUE LOG |
| :--- |
| DATE DESCRIPTION |

## GENERAL NOTES

1. CONSTRUCTION: COMPLY WITH APPLICABLE CODES AND RELATED AMENDMENTS.
2. THESE DRAWINGS DO NOT CONTAIN COMPLETE SPECIFICATIONS, DETAILS, OR FUL INFORMATION NECESSARY FOR THE COMPLETE CONSTRUCTION OF THE
PROJECT. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION SHALL EE OBTANED PRODECC. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION SHALL EE OBTAINED
FROM THE OWNER.
3. NOTIFY ARCHITECT AND OWNER OF ERRORS, OMISIIONS, AND DISCREPANCIES IN CONTRACT DOCLMENTS, OR CONSTRUCTION CONDITIONS. ERRORS, OMISSIONS, AND
DISCREPANCIES MUST BE RESOVED AND DOCUMENTED IISCREPANCIES MUST BE RESOVVED AND DOCUMENTED QUESTION. FAILURE TO NOTIFY THE OWNER AND ARCHITECT IN SUCH AN EVENT SHALL CONSTITUTE ACCEPTANCE OF ANY RESULTTING OLLIGATIONS OR CODE COMPLIANCE, AND LEGAL REMEDIES RESULTING FROM THIS OR RELATED WORK.
4. CIVLL, LANDSCAPE, STRUCTURAL, MECHANICAL, PLUMBING, 4.1. ARCHITCCT'S ELECTRICAL, MECHANICAL, AND PLUMMBING PLANS ARE DIAGRAMMATTIC ONLY, ACTUAL DESIGN BY OWNER'S CONSULTANT.
4.2. REFER TO CMIL AND LANDSCAPE DRAWINGS FOR
5. GRADING AND RRANAGE REQUIREMENTS,
4.3. REFER TO STRUCTURAL ENGINEER FOR STRUCTURAL
 4.4. COORCDINATE SOIL COMPACTION REQUIREMENTS .4. COORDINATE SOIL COMMACHIN REQUIREMENT BENIINEER.
ENGIER
6. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY ALL MEASUREMENTS AT THE SITE AND BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACCURACY AND CORRECTNESS OF SAME.
7. VERIFY TYPE AND LOCATION OF UTLLTTIES SERVING STTE.
8. REFER TO ELEVATTONS FOR ROOFS TO BE GUTTERED.
SUBMIT PROPOSED LOCATIONS OF GUITERS AND DOWMSPOUTS TO OWNER AND ARCHITECT FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL.
9. ALL FLLOOR FINISH HEIGHTS TO MATCH. FLOOR ELEVATIONS AT SECOND FLOOR ARE GIVEN TO TOP OF -
10. install studs at closet side wall rod locations, MEASURED 10" FROM BaCK WALL
11. EXTERIOR MATERIALS AND FINISHES ARE TO BE INSTALLED ACCORDANCE WITHANS instructions and details.
12. FIRE SPRINKLERS SYSTEMS: REERR TO LOCAL

SHOP DRAWINGS SHALL BE SUEMITTED TO OWNER AN ARCHITECT FOR APPROVAL PRIOR TO ORDERING AND INSTALLING ANY EQUIPMENT. I.E. WINDOWS, STEEL, CAST 13. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PAY ALL RINES, GIVE AL

ALL PERMITS AND CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL REQUIRED IN CONNECTION WITH ALL WORK UNDER THE CONTRACT

AL GARAGE DOORS SHALL HAVE REMOTE ACCESS. MATERTALL ON GARAGE WILL EE ALUMINUM WTH A LIGHT RONZE FINISH.
15. ALL CONCRETE AREAS SHALL FORMED WTTH git tinst with matierial and shall have à RUSH FINISH WITH A STONE BOARD.
16. EXISTING BACK YARD TREE SHALL BE USED TO MEET AND D SHALL COMPLY ITH CITY OF DESOTO TREE SURVEY.

## FOR DIMENSICN PURPOSES:

1. DO NOT SCALE DRAWINGS.
2. VERIFY DIMENSIONS: NOTIFY ARCHITECT OF ANY
DISCREPANCIES.
3. WOOD STUD WALLS: $2 \times 4^{\prime} \mathrm{S}$ @ 16" O.C. TO A MAXIMUM HEIGHT OF $10^{-}-0^{\prime \prime}$, SUPPORTING ONE FLOOR, ROOF, AND ELLING. STORY CONDITOLL HEIGHTS EXCEEDING $10^{\prime}-0^{0 \prime}$ AND 3 STORY CONDITONS REQUIRE STRUCT
4. EXTERIOR WOOD STUD/MASONRY ASSEMBLLES:

5. Interior wood studs dimensioned to centerline o WALL, EXCEPTION: FLAT STUDS DIMENSIONED 2" THICK AND OVER G" THICK STUD WALLS DIMENSIONED OUT-TO-OUT.
6. Wall plate heights: cross reference exterior ELLEVATIONS,
DETERMINE.

| CODE INFORMATION | REQUIRED | PROVIDED |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE (IBC) | 2021 | 2021 |
| INTERNATIONAL ENERGY CONSERVATION CODE (IECC) | 2021 | 2021 |
| INTERNATIONAL MECHANICAL CODE (IMC) | 2021 | 2021 |
| NFPA 70 NATIONAL ELECTRICAL CODE (NEC) | 2020 | 2020 |
| INTERNATIONAL PLUMBING CODE (IPC) | 2021 | 2021 |
| INTERNATIONAL. FIRE CODE (IFC) | 2021 | 2021 |



EXISTING FLOOR PLAN
SCALE $1 / 8^{\circ}=0^{-0^{\circ}}$

TO:<br>DATE:<br>APPLICANT:<br>CASE NUMBER:<br>Planning and Zoning Commission<br>December 12, 2023<br>Hind Saad; RSG Engineering<br>SP2023-044; Site Plan for 1760 Airport Road

## SUMMARY

Discuss and consider a request by Hind Saad of RSG Engineering on behalf of Roy Bhavi of FlexSpace Business Parks, LLC for the approval of a Site Plan for a warehouse/office development on a 6.17-acre tract of land identified as Tract 2-01 of the D. Harr. Survey, Abstract No. 102, City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas, zoned Light Industrial (LI) District, situated within the Airport Overlay (AP OV) District, addressed as 1760 Airport Road, and take any action necessary.

## BACKGROUND

The subject property was annexed by the City Council on March 16, 1998 by Ordinance No. 98-10 [Case No. A1998-001]. The subject property has been vacant since annexation. On April 3, 2023, the City Council approved a Zoning Change [Case No. Z2023-010] from Agriculture (AG) District to Light Industrial (LI) District for the subject property.

Prior to the current submittal, the Planning and Zoning Commission has reviewed this request twice. The first site plan [Case No. SP2023-022] was submitted by the applicant on July 14, 2023, and was denied without prejudice by the Planning and Zoning Commission on August 15, 2023 by a vote of 5-0 (with Commissioner Hustings absent and one [1] vacant seat). The reason the case was denied by the Planning and Zoning Commission was due to the exceptions that were being requested (i.e. exceptions to the building articulation requirements -- both primary and secondary --, building material requirements, stone requirements, and residential adjacency standards). Following this denial, the applicant resubmitted a new development application on August 18, 2023 [Case No SP2023-028]. This case was withdrawn by the applicant on October 4, 2023, after the applicant was unable to secure letters from the FAA regarding the required Part 77 Form (i.e. approval from the FAA concerning the location of the proposed buildings). The applicant has since provided staff with the required FAA approvals.

## PURPOSE

On November 13, 2023, the applicant -- Hind Saad -- submitted an application requesting the approval of a Site Plan for seven (7) office/warehouse buildings on the subject property.

## ADJACENT LAND USES AND ACCESS

The subject property is generally located on the south side of Airport Road, east of the intersection of Airport Road and John King Boulevard. The land uses adjacent to the subject property are as follows:

North: Directly north of the subject property is Airport Road, which is identified as a M4U (i.e. major collector, four [4] lane, undivided roadway) on the City's Master Thoroughfare Plan contained in the OURHometown Vision 2040 Comprehensive Plan. North of Airport Road is: [1] a 5.68-acre tract of vacant land (i.e. Tract 21 of the D. Harr Survey, Abstract No. 102); [2] a one (1) acre tract of land (i.e. Tract 21-01 of the D. Harr Survey, Abstract No. 102) with a single-family home situated on it; [3] a 12.00-acre tract of vacant land; and [4] a 43.66 -acre tract of land with a single-family home situated on it. All of these properties are zoned Agricultural (AG) District. Beyond this is SH-66, which is identified as a TXDOT4D (i.e. a Texas Department of Transportation [TXDOT], four [4]
lane, divided roadway) on the City's Master Thoroughfare Plan contained in the OURHometown Vision 2040 Comprehensive Plan.

South: Directly south of the subject property is the right-of-way for the Union Pacific Dallas/Garland Northeast Railroad. Beyond this is a vacant 4.114-acre tract of land (i.e. which is part of a larger 10.291-acre tract of land and is identified as Tract 2-9, of the D Harr. Survey, Abstract No. 102). Beyond this is a vacant two (2) acre tract of land (i.e. Tract 2-5, of the D. Harr Survey, Abstract 102). Both of these properties are zoned Agricultural (AG) District. Beyond that is an 18.5175-acre vacant tract of land (i.e. Tract 3-5, of the J Lockhart Survey, Abstract 134) zoned Light Industrial (LI) District and Commercial (C) District.

East: Directly east of the subject property is a 5.477 -acre vacant tract of land (i.e. Tract 2 of the D. Harr Survey, Abstract No. 102), zoned Agricultural (AG) District. East of this is a 16.89-acre tract of land (i.e. Tract 4 of the D.Harr Survey, Abstract No. 102), which was rezoned to Light Industrial (LI) District in 2021. A site plan was approved for this property in 2021 allowing a warehouse/distribution center to be constructed on it.

West: Directly west of the subject property is a 5.784 -acre tract of vacant land (i.e. Tract 2-03 of the D. Harr Survey, Abstract No. 102), which is zoned Agriculture (AG) District. West of this is a vacant 5.07 -acre tract of vacant land (i.e. Tract 2-06 of the D. Harr Survey, Abstract No. 34) also zoned Agricultural (AG) District. Beyond this is S . John King Boulevard, which is identified as a P6D (i.e. a principal arterial, six [6] lane, divided roadway) on the City's Master Thoroughfare Plan contained in the OURHometown Vision 2040 Comprehensive Plan.

## DENSITY AND DIMENSIONAL REQUIREMENTS

According to Section 01, Land Use Schedule, of Article 04, Permissible Uses, of the Unified Development Code (UDC), a Warehouse/Distribution Center and an Office Building 5,000 SF or Greater are permitted by-right land uses in a Light Industrial (LI) District. The submitted site plan, landscape plan, photometric plan, building elevations, and phasing plan generally conform to the technical requirements contained within the Unified Development Code (UDC) for a property located within a Light Industrial (LI) District with the exception of the items noted in the Variances and Exceptions Requested by the Applicant section of this case memo. A summary of the density and dimensional requirements for the subject property are as follows:

| Ordinance Provisions | Zoning District Standards | Conformance to the Standards |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minimum Lot Area | 12,500 SF | X=6.18-Acres; In Conformance |
| Minimum Lot Frontage | 100-Feet | X $=332$-Feet; In Conformance |
| Minimum Lot Depth | 125-Feet | $X=729-F e e t ;$ In Conformance |
| Minimum Front Yard Setback | 25-Feet | X>25-Feet; In Conformance |
| Minimum Rear Yard Setback | 10-Feet | $x>10$-Feet; In Conformance |
| Minimum Side Yard Setback | 10-Feet | X>10-Feet; In Conformance |
| Maximum Building Height | 60-Feet | $X=27-$ Feet; In Conformance |
| Max Building/Lot Coverage | 60\% | $X=31.6 \%$; In Conformance |
| Minimum Number of Parking Spaces | 1 Parking Space per 300 SF for Office and 1 Parking Space per 1,000 SF for Warehouse (109 Total Required) | $X=110$; In Conformance |
| Minimum Landscaping Percentage | 15\% | $X=15.3 \%$; In Conformance |
| Maximum Impervious Coverage | 90-95\% | X=76.46\%; In Conformance |

## TREESCAPE PLAN

No trees are being removed from the subject property. Based on this, no Treescape Plan is required.

## CONFORMANCE WITH THE CITY'S CODES

The applicant is requesting to construct seven (7) office/warehouse buildings on the subject property. According to Subsection 02.02(J)(7), Wholesale, Distribution and Storage Land Uses, of Article 13, Definitions, of the Unified Development Code (UDC), a Warehouse/Distribution Center is defined as a "... building used primarily for the storage and distribution of goods,
merchandise, supplies, and equipment including wholesalers which display, sell, and distribute merchandise to business representatives for resale ..." In addition, Subsection 02.02(D)(2), Office and Professional Uses, of Article 13, Definitions, of the Unified Development Code (UDC), an Office Building is defined as a "...(a) facility that provides executive, management, administrative, or professional services ... but not involving the sale of merchandise except as incidental to a permitted use. Typical examples include real estate, insurance, property management, investment, employment, travel, advertising, law, architecture, design, engineering, accounting, call centers, and similar offices." In this case, the applicant's request for seven (7) office/warehouse buildings is permitted by-right in a Light Industrial (LI) District as stipulated by Section 01, Land Use Schedule, of Article 04, Permissible Uses, of the Unified Development Code (UDC).

The proposed site plan generally conforms to the requirements of the General Industrial District Standards as stipulated by Article 05, District Development Standards, of the Unified Development Code (UDC), with the exception of the exceptions being requested as outlined in the Variances and Exceptions Requested by the Applicant section of this case memo.

## VARIANCES AND EXCEPTIONS BY THE APPLICANT

Staff has identified the following exceptions:

## (1) Building Materials.

(a) Primary Materials. According to Subsection 05.01 (A)(1), Materials and Masonry Composition, of Article 05, District Development Standards, of the Unified Development Code (UDC), "(e)ach exterior wall of a building's façade shall consist of a minimum of $90 \%$ Primary Materials..." or masonry material. The applicant is proposing $18 \%-80 \%$ secondary materials (i.e. $18 \%$ on the front elevation, $28 \%$ on the left and right elevations, and $80 \%$ on the rear elevation) on Buildings $4-7$ and $18 \%-48 \%$ secondary materials (i.e. $18 \%$ on the front elevation, $28 \%$ on the left and right elevations, and $48 \%$ on the rear elevation) on Buildings $2 \& 3$. This will require an exception from the Planning and Zoning Commission.
(2) Building Articulation.
(a) Primary Building Facades. According to Subsection 05.01 (C), Building Articulation, of Article 05, District Development Standards, of the Unified Development Code (UDC), the minimum wall length shall not exceed four (4) times the wall height. In this case, the proposed buildings do not meet the projection requirements for primary building facades on all buildings. This will require an exception from the Planning and Zoning Commission pending a recommendation from the Architectural Review Board (ARB).
(b) Secondary Building Facades. According to Subsection 05.01 (C), Building Articulation, of Article 05, District Development Standards, of the Unified Development Code (UDC), the minimum wall length shall not exceed three (3) times the wall height. In this case, the proposed buildings do not meet the projection requirements for secondary building facades on all buildings. This will require an exception from the Planning and Zoning Commission pending a recommendation from the Architectural Review Board (ARB).
(3) Loading Dock Screening. According to Subsection 01.05, Screening Standards, of Article 05, District Development Standards, of the Unified Development Code (UDC), "(0)ff-street loading docks must be screened from all public streets, any residential zoning district or residentially used property, and any parks and open space that abuts or is directly across a public street or alley from the subject property." In this case, the applicant is providing three (3) tiered landscaping along the adjacency except for the area within the FAA restricted area. While this does not meet the requirements, the code does allow the Planning and Zoning Commission to grant an exception to the screening requirements.
(4) Driveway Spacing. According to Figure 2.4, Minimum Driveway Spacing and Corner Clearance, of Chapter 02, Streets, of the Engineering Department's Standards of Design and Construction Manual, the minimum spacing for driveways on Airport Road is 100 -feet. In this case, the eastern driveway is within 100 -feet of an adjacent driveway on the adjacent property. This will require a variance from the Planning and Zoning Commission.

According to Subsection 09, Exceptions and Variances, of Article 11, Development Applications and Review Procedures, of the Unified Development Code (UDC), "...an applicant may request the Planning and Zoning Commission grant variances and exceptions to the provisions contained in the Unified Development Code (UDC), where unique or extraordinary conditions exist or where strict adherence to the technical requirements of the Unified Development Code (UDC) would create an undue hardship." In addition, the code requires that the applicant provide compensatory measures that directly offset the requested variances and exceptions. The applicant has indicated the following as compensatory measures: [1] plant two (2) additional canopy trees along the east property line behind Buildings 2 \& 3, [2] provide three (3) tiered screening along the west property line [this is already a requirement and cannot be considered a compensatory measure], [3] increase the canopy trees caliper inch from four (4) caliper inches to five (5) caliper inches for the three (3) tiered screening areas, [4] add two (2) benches on the west side of Building 1 along the landscape detention pond, [5] provide more than the required landscaping [i.e. they are required $15.00 \%$ and are providing $15.36 \%$ or $0.36 \%$ more than required], and [6] provide canopy trees on 40 -foot centers along the south property line. Staff should point out that they are not providing the required number of compensatory measures, the additional landscaping being provided is nominal compared to the required landscaping percentage, and the three (3) tiered landscaping is already required. In addition, the benches do not appear to directly off-set any of the requested variances; however, requests for exceptions and variances to the Unified Development Code (UDC) are discretionary decisions for the Planning and Zoning Commission. Staff should note that a supermajority vote (e.g. six [6] out of the seven [7] commissioners) -- with a minimum of four (4) votes in the affirmative -- is required for the approval of a variance or exception.

## CONFORMANCE WITH OURHOMETOWN VISION 2040 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The Future Land Use Plan adopted with the OURHometown Vision 2040 Comprehensive Plan identifies the subject property as being situated in the Central District. The Central District "... is composed of a wide range of land uses that vary from single-family to industrial." In addition, the Central District "... incorporates a high volume of industrial land uses adjacent to the Union Pacific/Dallas Garland and Northeastern Rail Road line that bisects the district -- and City -- in an east/west direction." The Future Land Use Map contained in the OURHometown Vision 2040 Comprehensive Plan, indicates that the subject property should be developed with industrial land uses. In this case, the applicant is proposing a Warehouse/Distribution Center and Offices. Based on this, the applicant's land uses appear to conform with the Comprehensive Plan; however, Chapter 9, Non-Residential, of the OURHometown Vision 2040 Comprehensive Plan states as one of the goals of commercial building design, buildings should be "... designed and constructed in unity with the community's existing commercial and residential buildings, and should incorporate high quality materials that will minimize the need for maintenance over time." The polices to implement this goal are "... [1] (n)on-residential buildings should be constructed of masonry materials and contain a minimum of $20 \%$ stone on every façade that faces a street, public open space, trail or park. [and] [2] Non-residential buildings should be architecturally finished on all four (4) sides with the same materials, detailing and features." In this case, the applicant is requesting exceptions to building materials and building articulation requirements. These exceptions appear to conflict with the goals for non-residential buildings contained in the Comprehensive Plan. Staff should point out that a similar land use was approved on a property directly east of the subject property, which was required to meet the material requirements of the Light Industrial (LI) District, and which are called for in the Comprehensive Plan. Furthermore, the John King Boulevard Corridor Plan contained in the OURHometown Vision 2040 Comprehensive Plan, states that one of the guiding concepts of the plan is Quality and Timelessness. The plan goes on to state that "(t)he design forms for John King Boulevard should be rooted in Rockwall's strong landscape and heritage, while coexisting comfortably with new development, never looking 'dated.' High quality of materials and construction should be a defining characteristic of new enhancement projects." In this case, the applicant is requesting exceptions to the building materials due to the use of metal. These buildings will be highly visible from John King Boulevard, and do not appear to meet the intent of this corridor plan. Based on this the applicant's proposal does not appear to meet the vision of the Comprehensive Plan.

## STAFF ANALYSIS

The phasing plan provided by the applicant shows Building 1 being built in the first phase, Buildings 2 \& 3 in the second phase, and Buildings $4-7$ in the final and third phase. Staff should note that the phasing plan only lays out the phasing of the buildings, and all other site plan elements must be constructed with the first phase. This means that with the construction of the first phase all landscaping will be required to be installed. Given this, Building 1 will be screened from John King Boulevard by the three (3) tiered screening located along the west property line; however, Buildings 6 \& 7 -- included in phase 3 -- will not be screened from John King Boulevard. These buildings along with their loading docks will have direct visibility from John King Boulevard due to the Runway Protection Zone of the Ralph Hall Municipal Airport, which does not allow any trees. This
prompted the applicant's request for the exception to the loading dock screening described in the Variances and Exceptions Requested by the Applicant section of this case memo. As stated above, the applicant's request appears to be deficient when comparing it to the requirements of the Unified Development Code (UDC) and the policies and goals of the OURHometown Vision 2040 Comprehensive Plan. Staff should also note that the compensatory measures offered with the development do not seem to off-set the requested variances; however, requests for exceptions and variances to the Unified Development Code (UDC) are discretionary decisions for the Planning and Zoning Commission.

## ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD (ARB) RECOMMENDATION

On November 28, 2023, the Architecture Review Board reviewed the proposed building elevations provided by the applicant and recommended that the applicant [1] raise the stone wainscot on the rear elevations of Buildings $2 \& 3$ to the top of the door frame, [2] add awnings to the doors on the rear elevations of Buildings 2 \& 3, [3] provide a row of canopy trees behind Buildings $2 \& 3$, and [4] finish the back side of the parapets in the same material as the exterior facing façade. The applicant has provided updated elevations that will be reviewed by the Architectural Review Board (ARB) prior to the December 12, 2023 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.

## CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

If the Planning and Zoning Commission chooses to approve the applicant's Site Plan for the establishment of seven (7) warehouse/office buildings on the subject property, then staff would propose the following conditions of approval:
(1) All staff comments provided by the Planning, Engineering and Fire Department must be addressed prior to the submittal of engineering plans.
(2) All landscaping shall be installed with Phase 1 of the proposed development.
(3) Any construction resulting from the approval of this Site Plan shall conform to the requirements set forth by the Unified Development Code (UDC), the International Building Code (IBC), the Rockwall Municipal Code of Ordinances, city adopted engineering and fire codes and with all other applicable regulatory requirements administered and/or enforced by the state and federal government

City of Rockwall
Planning and Zoning Department 385 S. Goliad Street
Rockwall, Texas 75087

## STAFF USE ONLY <br> PLANNING \& ZONING CASE NO.

NOTE: THE APPLICATION IS NOT CONSIDERED ACCEPTED BY THE CITY UNTLL THE PLANNING DIRECTOR AND CITY ENGINEER HAVE SIGNED BELOW.
DIRECTOR OF PLANNING:
CITY ENGINEER:

PLEASE CHECK THE APPROPRIATE BOX BELOW TO INDICATE THE TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT REQUEST [SELECT ONLY ONE BOX]:

## PLATTING APPLICATION FEES:

$\square$ MASTER PLAT ( $\$ 100.00+\$ 15.00$ ACRE) ${ }^{1}$
$\square$ PRELIMINARY PLAT ( $\$ 200.00+\$ 15.00$ ACRE)
$\square$ FINAL PLAT $(\$ 300.00+\$ 20.00 \text { ACRE })^{1}$
REPLAT $\left(\$ 300.00+\$ 20.00\right.$ ACRE) ${ }^{1}$
$\square$ AMENDING OR MINOR PLAT (\$150.00)
$\square$ PLAT REINSTATEMENT REQUEST ( $\$ 100.00$ )

## SITE PLAN APPLICATION FEES:

Q SITE PLAN $(\$ 250.00+\$ 20.00 \text { ACRE })^{1}$
$\square$ AMENDED SITE PLAN/ELEVATIONS/LANDSCAPING PLAN (\$100.00)

## ZONING APPLICATION FEES:

$\square$ ZONING CHANGE $(\$ 200.00+\$ 15.00 \text { ACRE })^{1}$
$\square$ SPECIFIC USE PERMIT $(\$ 200.00+\$ 15.00 \text { ACRE })^{1 \& 2}$
$\square$ PD DEVELOPMENT PLANS $(\$ 200.00+\$ 15.00 \text { ACRE })^{1}$
OTHER APPLICATION FEES:

- TREE REMOVAL (\$75.00)
$\square$ VARIANCE REQUESTISPECIAL EXCEPTIONS $(\$ 100.00)^{2}$


## NOTES:

$\frac{1}{5}$ : IN DETERMINING THE FEE, PLEASE USE THE EXACT ACREAGE WHEN MULTIPLYING BY THE PER ACRE AMOUNT. FOR REQUESIS ON LESS THAN ONE ACRE, ROUND UP TO ONE (1) ACRE. 3: A $\$ 1,000.00$ FEE WILL BE ADDED TO THE APPLICATION FEE FOR ANY REQUEST THAT INVOLVES CONSTRUCTION WITHOUT OR NOT IN COMPLIANCE TO AN APPROVED BUULDING PERMIT.

PROPERTY INFORMATION [PLEASE PRINT]
ADDRESS 1760 Airport rd, Rockwall, TX 75087
SUBDIVISION A102, D Harr: Tract 2-01 LOT BLOCK
GENERAL LOCATION
ZONING, SITE PLAN AND PLATTING INFORMATION [PLEASE PRINT]

CURRENT ZONING
Light Industrial
PROPOSED ZONING
ACREAGE
6.18

LOTS [CURRENT]

CURRENTUSE Vacant PROPOSED USE Light industrial

1

LOTS [PROPOSED]
$\star$ SITE PLANS AND PLATS: BY CHECKING THIS BOX YOU ACKNOWLEDGE THAT DUE TO THE PASSAGE OF HB3167 THE CITY NO LONGER HAS FLEXIBILITY WITH REGARD TO ITS APPROVAL PROCESS, AND FAILURE TO ADDRESS ANY OF STAFF'S COMMENTS BY THE DATE PROVIDED ON THE DEVELOPMENT CALENDAR WILL RESULTIN THE DENIAL OF YOUR CASE.
OWNER/APPLICANT/AGENT INFORMATION [PLEASE PRINT/CHECK THE PRIMARY CONTACT/ORIGINAL SIGNATURES ARE REQUIRED]

| ELOWNER | FlexSpace Business Parks LLC | APPLICANT | RSG ENGINEERING |
| ---: | :--- | ---: | :---: |
| CONTACT PERSON | Roy Bhavi | CONTACT PERSON | HIND SAAD |
| ADDRESS | 835 Tillman Dr, | ADDRESS | 13501 KATY FREEWAY, STE. 3180 |

CITY, STATE \& ZIP Allen TX75013
PHONE 972.674.8933
E-MAIL roy.bhavi@flexspacebusinessparks.co

CITY, STATE \& ZIP Houston, TX 77041
PHONE 281-248-6785
E-MAlL hind@rsgcompanies.com

NOTARY VERIFICATION [REQUIRED]
BEFORE ME, THE UNDERSIGNED AUTHORITY, ON THIS DAY PERSONALLY APPEARED STATED THE INFORMATION ON THIS APPLICATION TO BE TRUE AND CERTIFIED THE FOLLOWING:
"I HEREBY CERTIFY THATI AM THE OWNER FOR THE PURPOSE OF THIS APPLCATION; ALL INFORMATION SUBMITED HEREN IS TRUE AND CORRECT; AND THE APPLICATION FEE OF



## City of Rockwall

Planning \& Zoning Department
385 S. Goliad Street
Rockwall, Texas 75087
(P): (972) 771-7745
(W): www.rockwall.com

The City of Rockwall GIS maps are continually under development and therefore subject to change without notice. While we endeavor to provide timely and accurate information, we make no guarantees. The City of Rockwall makes no warranty, express or implied, including warranties of merchantability and fitness for a particular purpose. Use of the information is the sole responsibility of the user.

## ** DETERMINATION OF NO HAZARD TO AIR NAVIGATION **

The Federal Aviation Administration has conducted an aeronautical study under the provisions of 49 U.S.C., Section 44718 and if applicable Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations, part 77, concerning:

| Structure: | Commercial Use Building Flex Space Business Park |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location: | Rockwall, TX |
| Latitude: | 32-55-32.00N NAD 83 |
| Longitude: | 96-25-59.20W |
| Heights: | 573 feet site elevation (SE) |
|  | 23 feet above ground level (AGL) |
|  | 596 feet above mean sea level (AMSL) |

This aeronautical study revealed that the structure would have no substantial adverse effect on the safe and efficient utilization of the navigable airspace by aircraft or on the operation of air navigation facilities. Therefore, pursuant to the authority delegated to me, it is hereby determined that the structure would not be a hazard to air navigation provided the following condition(s) is(are) met:

As a condition to this Determination, the structure is to be marked/lighted in accordance with FAA Advisory circular 70/7460-1 M, Obstruction Marking and Lighting, red lights-Chapters 4,5(Red),\&15.

Any failure or malfunction that lasts more than thirty (30) minutes and affects a top light or flashing obstruction light, regardless of its position, should be reported immediately to (877) 487-6867 so a Notice to Air Missions (NOTAM) can be issued. As soon as the normal operation is restored, notify the same number.

It is required that FAA Form 7460-2, Notice of Actual Construction or Alteration, be e-filed any time the project is abandoned or:
__X_ At least 10 days prior to start of construction (7460-2, Part 1)
__X_ Within 5 days after the construction reaches its greatest height (7460-2, Part 2)
See attachment for additional condition(s) or information.
The structure considered under this study lies in proximity to an airport and occupants may be subjected to noise from aircraft operating to and from the airport.

This determination expires on 03/27/2025 unless:
(a) the construction is started (not necessarily completed) and FAA Form 7460-2, Notice of Actual Construction or Alteration, is received by this office.
(b) extended, revised, or terminated by the issuing office.
(c) the construction is subject to the licensing authority of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and an application for a construction permit has been filed, as required by the FCC, within 6 months of the date of this determination. In such case, the determination expires on the date prescribed by the FCC for completion of construction, or the date the FCC denies the application.

## NOTE: REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF THE EFFECTIVE PERIOD OF THIS DETERMINATION MUST BE E-FILED AT LEAST 15 DAYS PRIOR TO THE EXPIRATION DATE. AFTER RE-EVALUATION OF CURRENT OPERATIONS IN THE AREA OF THE STRUCTURE TO DETERMINE THAT NO SIGNIFICANT AERONAUTICAL CHANGES HAVE OCCURRED, YOUR DETERMINATION MAY BE ELIGIBLE FOR ONE EXTENSION OF THE EFFECTIVE PERIOD.

This determination is subject to review if an interested party files a petition that is received by the FAA on or before October 27, 2023. In the event an interested party files a petition for review, it must contain a full statement of the basis upon which the petition is made. Petitions can be submitted to the Manager of the Rules and Regulations Group via e-mail at OEPetitions@faa.gov, via mail to Federal Aviation Administration, Air Traffic Organization, Rules and Regulations Group, Room 425, 800 Independence Ave, SW, Washington, DC 20591, or via facsimile (202) 267-9328. FAA encourages the use of email to ensure timely processing.

This determination becomes final on November 06, 2023 unless a petition is timely filed. In which case, this determination will not become final pending disposition of the petition. Interested parties will be notified of the grant of any review. For any questions regarding your petition, please contact Rules and Regulations Group via telephone-202-267-8783.

This determination is based, in part, on the foregoing description which includes specific coordinates, heights, frequency(ies) and power. Any changes in coordinates, heights and frequencies or use of greater power, except those frequencies specified in the Colo Void Clause Coalition; Antenna System Co-Location; Voluntary Best Practices, will void this determination. Any future construction or alteration, including increase to heights, power or the addition of other transmitters, requires separate notice to the FAA. This determination includes all previously filed frequencies and power for this structure.

If construction or alteration is dismantled or destroyed, you must submit notice to the FAA within 5 days after the construction or alteration is dismantled or destroyed.

This determination does include temporary construction equipment such as cranes, derricks, etc., which may be used during actual construction of the structure. However, this equipment shall not exceed the overall heights as indicated above. Equipment which has a height greater than the studied structure requires separate notice to the FAA.

This determination concerns the effect of this structure on the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace by aircraft and does not relieve the sponsor of compliance responsibilities relating to any law, ordinance, or regulation of any Federal, State, or local government body.

This aeronautical study considered and analyzed the impact on existing and proposed arrival, departure, and en route procedures for aircraft operating under both visual flight rules and instrument flight rules; the impact
on all existing and planned public-use airports, military airports and aeronautical facilities; and the cumulative impact resulting from the studied structure when combined with the impact of other existing or proposed structures. The study disclosed that the described structure would have no substantial adverse effect on air navigation.

An account of the study findings, aeronautical objections received by the FAA during the study (if any), and the basis for the FAA's decision in this matter can be found on the following page(s).

If we can be of further assistance, please contact Andrew Hollie, at (817) 222-5933, or andrew.hollie@faa.gov. On any future correspondence concerning this matter, please refer to Aeronautical Study Number 2023-ASW-13750-OE.

Signature Control No: 598974876-600361930
Manager, Obstruction Evaluation Group
Attachment(s)
Additional Information
Case Description
Map(s)

Issued Date: 09/27/2023
Deepak Bhavi
Deepak Bhavi
835 Tillman Drive
Allen, TX 75013

## ** DETERMINATION OF NO HAZARD TO AIR NAVIGATION **

The Federal Aviation Administration has conducted an aeronautical study under the provisions of 49 U.S.C., Section 44718 and if applicable Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations, part 77, concerning:

| Structure: | Commercial Use Building Flex Space Business Park Bldg 2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location: | Rockwall, TX |
| Latitude: | $32-55-30.70 \mathrm{~N}$ NAD 83 |
| Longitude: | 96-25-57.70W |
| Heights: | 577 feet site elevation (SE) <br>  |
|  | 23 feet above ground level (AGL) |
|  | 600 feet above mean sea level (AMSL) |

This aeronautical study revealed that the structure would have no substantial adverse effect on the safe and efficient utilization of the navigable airspace by aircraft or on the operation of air navigation facilities. Therefore, pursuant to the authority delegated to me, it is hereby determined that the structure would not be a hazard to air navigation provided the following condition(s) is(are) met:

As a condition to this Determination, the structure is to be marked/lighted in accordance with FAA Advisory circular 70/7460-1 M, Obstruction Marking and Lighting, red lights-Chapters 4,5(Red),\&15.

Any failure or malfunction that lasts more than thirty (30) minutes and affects a top light or flashing obstruction light, regardless of its position, should be reported immediately to (877) 487-6867 so a Notice to Air Missions (NOTAM) can be issued. As soon as the normal operation is restored, notify the same number.

It is required that FAA Form 7460-2, Notice of Actual Construction or Alteration, be e-filed any time the project is abandoned or:
_ X __ At least 10 days prior to start of construction (7460-2, Part 1)
__X__ Within 5 days after the construction reaches its greatest height (7460-2, Part 2)
See attachment for additional condition(s) or information.
The structure considered under this study lies in proximity to an airport and occupants may be subjected to noise from aircraft operating to and from the airport.

This determination expires on 03/27/2025 unless:
(a) the construction is started (not necessarily completed) and FAA Form 7460-2, Notice of Actual Construction or Alteration, is received by this office.
(b) extended, revised, or terminated by the issuing office.
(c) the construction is subject to the licensing authority of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and an application for a construction permit has been filed, as required by the FCC, within 6 months of the date of this determination. In such case, the determination expires on the date prescribed by the FCC for completion of construction, or the date the FCC denies the application.

## NOTE: REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF THE EFFECTIVE PERIOD OF THIS DETERMINATION MUST BE E-FILED AT LEAST 15 DAYS PRIOR TO THE EXPIRATION DATE. AFTER RE-EVALUATION OF CURRENT OPERATIONS IN THE AREA OF THE STRUCTURE TO DETERMINE THAT NO SIGNIFICANT AERONAUTICAL CHANGES HAVE OCCURRED, YOUR DETERMINATION MAY BE ELIGIBLE FOR ONE EXTENSION OF THE EFFECTIVE PERIOD.

This determination is subject to review if an interested party files a petition that is received by the FAA on or before October 27,2023. In the event an interested party files a petition for review, it must contain a full statement of the basis upon which the petition is made. Petitions can be submitted to the Manager of the Rules and Regulations Group via e-mail at OEPetitions@faa.gov, via mail to Federal Aviation Administration, Air Traffic Organization, Rules and Regulations Group, Room 425, 800 Independence Ave, SW, Washington, DC 20591, or via facsimile (202) 267-9328. FAA encourages the use of email to ensure timely processing.

This determination becomes final on November 06,2023 unless a petition is timely filed. In which case, this determination will not become final pending disposition of the petition. Interested parties will be notified of the grant of any review. For any questions regarding your petition, please contact Rules and Regulations Group via telephone-202-267-8783.

This determination is based, in part, on the foregoing description which includes specific coordinates, heights, frequency(ies) and power. Any changes in coordinates, heights and frequencies or use of greater power, except those frequencies specified in the Colo Void Clause Coalition; Antenna System Co-Location; Voluntary Best Practices, will void this determination. Any future construction or alteration, including increase to heights, power or the addition of other transmitters, requires separate notice to the FAA. This determination includes all previously filed frequencies and power for this structure.

If construction or alteration is dismantled or destroyed, you must submit notice to the FAA within 5 days after the construction or alteration is dismantled or destroyed.

This determination does include temporary construction equipment such as cranes, derricks, etc., which may be used during actual construction of the structure. However, this equipment shall not exceed the overall heights as indicated above. Equipment which has a height greater than the studied structure requires separate notice to the FAA.

This determination concerns the effect of this structure on the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace by aircraft and does not relieve the sponsor of compliance responsibilities relating to any law, ordinance, or regulation of any Federal, State, or local government body.

This aeronautical study considered and analyzed the impact on existing and proposed arrival, departure, and en route procedures for aircraft operating under both visual flight rules and instrument flight rules; the impact
on all existing and planned public-use airports, military airports and aeronautical facilities; and the cumulative impact resulting from the studied structure when combined with the impact of other existing or proposed structures. The study disclosed that the described structure would have no substantial adverse effect on air navigation.

An account of the study findings, aeronautical objections received by the FAA during the study (if any), and the basis for the FAA's decision in this matter can be found on the following page(s).

If we can be of further assistance, please contact Andrew Hollie, at (817) 222-5933, or andrew.hollie@faa.gov. On any future correspondence concerning this matter, please refer to Aeronautical Study Number 2023-ASW-13751-OE.

Signature Control No: 598974877-600361931
Mike Helvey
Manager, Obstruction Evaluation Group
Attachment(s)
Additional Information
Case Description
Map(s)

Issued Date: 09/27/2023

Deepak Bhavi
Deepak Bhavi
835 Tillman Drive
Allen, TX 75013

## ** DETERMINATION OF NO HAZARD TO AIR NAVIGATION **

The Federal Aviation Administration has conducted an aeronautical study under the provisions of 49 U.S.C., Section 44718 and if applicable Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations, part 77, concerning:

| Structure: | Commercial Use Building Flex Space Business Park Bldg 3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location: | Rockwall, TX |
| Latitude: | $32-55-28.50$ N NAD 83 |
| Longitude: | 96-25-57.80W |
| Heights: | 578 feet site elevation (SE) |
|  | 23 feet above ground level (AGL) |
|  | 601 feet above mean sea level (AMSL) |

This aeronautical study revealed that the structure would have no substantial adverse effect on the safe and efficient utilization of the navigable airspace by aircraft or on the operation of air navigation facilities. Therefore, pursuant to the authority delegated to me, it is hereby determined that the structure would not be a hazard to air navigation provided the following condition(s) is(are) met:

As a condition to this Determination, the structure is to be marked/lighted in accordance with FAA Advisory circular 70/7460-1 M, Obstruction Marking and Lighting, red lights-Chapters 4,5(Red),\&15.

Any failure or malfunction that lasts more than thirty (30) minutes and affects a top light or flashing obstruction light, regardless of its position, should be reported immediately to (877) 487-6867 so a Notice to Air Missions (NOTAM) can be issued. As soon as the normal operation is restored, notify the same number.

It is required that FAA Form 7460-2, Notice of Actual Construction or Alteration, be e-filed any time the project is abandoned or:
_ X _ At least 10 days prior to start of construction (7460-2, Part 1)
__X_ Within 5 days after the construction reaches its greatest height (7460-2, Part 2)
See attachment for additional condition(s) or information.

The structure considered under this study lies in proximity to an airport and occupants may be subjected to noise from aircraft operating to and from the airport.

This determination expires on 03/27/2025 unless:
(a) the construction is started (not necessarily completed) and FAA Form 7460-2, Notice of Actual Construction or Alteration, is received by this office.
(b) extended, revised, or terminated by the issuing office.
(c) the construction is subject to the licensing authority of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and an application for a construction permit has been filed, as required by the FCC, within 6 months of the date of this determination. In such case, the determination expires on the date prescribed by the FCC for completion of construction, or the date the FCC denies the application.

## NOTE: REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF THE EFFECTIVE PERIOD OF THIS DETERMINATION MUST BE E-FILED AT LEAST 15 DAYS PRIOR TO THE EXPIRATION DATE. AFTER RE-EVALUATION OF CURRENT OPERATIONS IN THE AREA OF THE STRUCTURE TO DETERMINE THAT NO SIGNIFICANT AERONAUTICAL CHANGES HAVE OCCURRED, YOUR DETERMINATION MAY BE ELIGIBLE FOR ONE EXTENSION OF THE EFFECTIVE PERIOD.

This determination is subject to review if an interested party files a petition that is received by the FAA on or before October 27,2023. In the event an interested party files a petition for review, it must contain a full statement of the basis upon which the petition is made. Petitions can be submitted to the Manager of the Rules and Regulations Group via e-mail at OEPetitions@faa.gov, via mail to Federal Aviation Administration, Air Traffic Organization, Rules and Regulations Group, Room 425, 800 Independence Ave, SW, Washington, DC 20591, or via facsimile (202) 267-9328. FAA encourages the use of email to ensure timely processing.

This determination becomes final on November 06, 2023 unless a petition is timely filed. In which case, this determination will not become final pending disposition of the petition. Interested parties will be notified of the grant of any review. For any questions regarding your petition, please contact Rules and Regulations Group via telephone-202-267-8783.

This determination is based, in part, on the foregoing description which includes specific coordinates, heights, frequency(ies) and power. Any changes in coordinates, heights and frequencies or use of greater power, except those frequencies specified in the Colo Void Clause Coalition; Antenna System Co-Location; Voluntary Best Practices, will void this determination. Any future construction or alteration, including increase to heights, power or the addition of other transmitters, requires separate notice to the FAA. This determination includes all previously filed frequencies and power for this structure.

If construction or alteration is dismantled or destroyed, you must submit notice to the FAA within 5 days after the construction or alteration is dismantled or destroyed.

This determination does include temporary construction equipment such as cranes, derricks, etc., which may be used during actual construction of the structure. However, this equipment shall not exceed the overall heights as indicated above. Equipment which has a height greater than the studied structure requires separate notice to the FAA.

This determination concerns the effect of this structure on the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace by aircraft and does not relieve the sponsor of compliance responsibilities relating to any law, ordinance, or regulation of any Federal, State, or local government body.

This aeronautical study considered and analyzed the impact on existing and proposed arrival, departure, and en route procedures for aircraft operating under both visual flight rules and instrument flight rules; the impact
on all existing and planned public-use airports, military airports and aeronautical facilities; and the cumulative impact resulting from the studied structure when combined with the impact of other existing or proposed structures. The study disclosed that the described structure would have no substantial adverse effect on air navigation.

An account of the study findings, aeronautical objections received by the FAA during the study (if any), and the basis for the FAA's decision in this matter can be found on the following page(s).

If we can be of further assistance, please contact Andrew Hollie, at (817) 222-5933, or andrew.hollie@faa.gov. On any future correspondence concerning this matter, please refer to Aeronautical Study Number 2023-ASW-13752-OE.

Signature Control No: 598974878-600361928
Mike Helvey
Manager, Obstruction Evaluation Group
Attachment(s)
Additional Information
Case Description
Map(s)

Mail Processing Center
Federal Aviation Administration
Southwest Regional Office
Obstruction Evaluation Group
10101 Hillwood Parkway
Fort Worth, TX 76177
Issued Date: 09/27/2023

Deepak Bhavi
Deepak Bhavi
835 Tillman Drive
Allen, TX 75013

## ** DETERMINATION OF NO HAZARD TO AIR NAVIGATION **

The Federal Aviation Administration has conducted an aeronautical study under the provisions of 49 U.S.C., Section 44718 and if applicable Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations, part 77, concerning:

| Structure: | Commercial Use Building Flex Space Business Park Bldg 4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location: | Rockwall, TX |
| Latitude: | 32-55-30.50N NAD 83 |
| Longitude: | 96-25-59.40W |
| Heights: | 573 feet site elevation (SE) |
|  | 22 feet above ground level (AGL) |
|  | 595 feet above mean sea level (AMSL) |

This aeronautical study revealed that the structure would have no substantial adverse effect on the safe and efficient utilization of the navigable airspace by aircraft or on the operation of air navigation facilities. Therefore, pursuant to the authority delegated to me, it is hereby determined that the structure would not be a hazard to air navigation provided the following condition(s) is(are) met:

As a condition to this Determination, the structure is to be marked/lighted in accordance with FAA Advisory circular 70/7460-1 M, Obstruction Marking and Lighting, red lights-Chapters 4,5(Red),\&15.

Any failure or malfunction that lasts more than thirty (30) minutes and affects a top light or flashing obstruction light, regardless of its position, should be reported immediately to (877) 487-6867 so a Notice to Air Missions (NOTAM) can be issued. As soon as the normal operation is restored, notify the same number.

It is required that FAA Form 7460-2, Notice of Actual Construction or Alteration, be e-filed any time the project is abandoned or:
$\qquad$ At least 10 days prior to start of construction (7460-2, Part 1)
$\qquad$ Within 5 days after the construction reaches its greatest height (7460-2, Part 2)

See attachment for additional condition(s) or information.
The structure considered under this study lies in proximity to an airport and occupants may be subjected to noise from aircraft operating to and from the airport.
(a) the construction is started (not necessarily completed) and FAA Form 7460-2, Notice of Actual Construction or Alteration, is received by this office.
(b) extended, revised, or terminated by the issuing office.
(c) the construction is subject to the licensing authority of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and an application for a construction permit has been filed, as required by the FCC, within 6 months of the date of this determination. In such case, the determination expires on the date prescribed by the FCC for completion of construction, or the date the FCC denies the application.

## NOTE: REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF THE EFFECTIVE PERIOD OF THIS DETERMINATION MUST BE E-FILED AT LEAST 15 DAYS PRIOR TO THE EXPIRATION DATE. AFTER RE-EVALUATION OF CURRENT OPERATIONS IN THE AREA OF THE STRUCTURE TO DETERMINE THAT NO SIGNIFICANT AERONAUTICAL CHANGES HAVE OCCURRED, YOUR DETERMINATION MAY BE ELIGIBLE FOR ONE EXTENSION OF THE EFFECTIVE PERIOD.

This determination is subject to review if an interested party files a petition that is received by the FAA on or before October 27,2023. In the event an interested party files a petition for review, it must contain a full statement of the basis upon which the petition is made. Petitions can be submitted to the Manager of the Rules and Regulations Group via e-mail at OEPetitions@faa.gov, via mail to Federal Aviation Administration, Air Traffic Organization, Rules and Regulations Group, Room 425, 800 Independence Ave, SW, Washington, DC 20591, or via facsimile (202) 267-9328. FAA encourages the use of email to ensure timely processing.

This determination becomes final on November 06, 2023 unless a petition is timely filed. In which case, this determination will not become final pending disposition of the petition. Interested parties will be notified of the grant of any review. For any questions regarding your petition, please contact Rules and Regulations Group via telephone-202-267-8783.

This determination is based, in part, on the foregoing description which includes specific coordinates, heights, frequency(ies) and power. Any changes in coordinates, heights and frequencies or use of greater power, except those frequencies specified in the Colo Void Clause Coalition; Antenna System Co-Location; Voluntary Best Practices, will void this determination. Any future construction or alteration, including increase to heights, power or the addition of other transmitters, requires separate notice to the FAA. This determination includes all previously filed frequencies and power for this structure.

If construction or alteration is dismantled or destroyed, you must submit notice to the FAA within 5 days after the construction or alteration is dismantled or destroyed.

This determination does include temporary construction equipment such as cranes, derricks, etc., which may be used during actual construction of the structure. However, this equipment shall not exceed the overall heights as indicated above. Equipment which has a height greater than the studied structure requires separate notice to the FAA.

This determination concerns the effect of this structure on the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace by aircraft and does not relieve the sponsor of compliance responsibilities relating to any law, ordinance, or regulation of any Federal, State, or local government body.

This aeronautical study considered and analyzed the impact on existing and proposed arrival, departure, and en route procedures for aircraft operating under both visual flight rules and instrument flight rules; the impact
on all existing and planned public-use airports, military airports and aeronautical facilities; and the cumulative impact resulting from the studied structure when combined with the impact of other existing or proposed structures. The study disclosed that the described structure would have no substantial adverse effect on air navigation.

An account of the study findings, aeronautical objections received by the FAA during the study (if any), and the basis for the FAA's decision in this matter can be found on the following page(s).

If we can be of further assistance, please contact Andrew Hollie, at (817) 222-5933, or andrew.hollie@faa.gov. On any future correspondence concerning this matter, please refer to Aeronautical Study Number 2023-ASW-13753-OE.

Signature Control No: 598974879-600361932
(DNH)
Mike Helvey
Manager, Obstruction Evaluation Group
Attachment(s)
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Map(s)

Issued Date: 09/27/2023

Deepak Bhavi
Deepak Bhavi
835 Tillman Drive
Allen, TX 75013

## ** DETERMINATION OF NO HAZARD TO AIR NAVIGATION **

The Federal Aviation Administration has conducted an aeronautical study under the provisions of 49 U.S.C., Section 44718 and if applicable Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations, part 77, concerning:

```
Structure: Commercial Use Building Flex Space Business Park Bldg 5
Location: Rockwall,TX
Latitude: 32-55-28.50N NAD 83
Longitude: 96-25-59.50W
Heights: }\quad574\mathrm{ feet site elevation (SE)
    22 feet above ground level (AGL)
    596 feet above mean sea level (AMSL)
```

This aeronautical study revealed that the structure would have no substantial adverse effect on the safe and efficient utilization of the navigable airspace by aircraft or on the operation of air navigation facilities. Therefore, pursuant to the authority delegated to me, it is hereby determined that the structure would not be a hazard to air navigation provided the following condition(s) is(are) met:

As a condition to this Determination, the structure is to be marked/lighted in accordance with FAA Advisory circular 70/7460-1 M, Obstruction Marking and Lighting, red lights-Chapters 4,5(Red),\&15.

Any failure or malfunction that lasts more than thirty (30) minutes and affects a top light or flashing obstruction light, regardless of its position, should be reported immediately to (877) 487-6867 so a Notice to Air Missions (NOTAM) can be issued. As soon as the normal operation is restored, notify the same number.

It is required that FAA Form 7460-2, Notice of Actual Construction or Alteration, be e-filed any time the project is abandoned or:
_X__ At least 10 days prior to start of construction (7460-2, Part 1)
__X_ Within 5 days after the construction reaches its greatest height (7460-2, Part 2)
See attachment for additional condition(s) or information.
The structure considered under this study lies in proximity to an airport and occupants may be subjected to noise from aircraft operating to and from the airport.

This determination expires on 03/27/2025 unless:
(a) the construction is started (not necessarily completed) and FAA Form 7460-2, Notice of Actual Construction or Alteration, is received by this office.
(b) extended, revised, or terminated by the issuing office.
(c) the construction is subject to the licensing authority of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and an application for a construction permit has been filed, as required by the FCC, within 6 months of the date of this determination. In such case, the determination expires on the date prescribed by the FCC for completion of construction, or the date the FCC denies the application.

## NOTE: REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF THE EFFECTIVE PERIOD OF THIS DETERMINATION MUST BE E-FILED AT LEAST 15 DAYS PRIOR TO THE EXPIRATION DATE. AFTER RE-EVALUATION OF CURRENT OPERATIONS IN THE AREA OF THE STRUCTURE TO DETERMINE THAT NO SIGNIFICANT AERONAUTICAL CHANGES HAVE OCCURRED, YOUR DETERMINATION MAY BE ELIGIBLE FOR ONE EXTENSION OF THE EFFECTIVE PERIOD.

This determination is subject to review if an interested party files a petition that is received by the FAA on or before October 27,2023. In the event an interested party files a petition for review, it must contain a full statement of the basis upon which the petition is made. Petitions can be submitted to the Manager of the Rules and Regulations Group via e-mail at OEPetitions@faa.gov, via mail to Federal Aviation Administration, Air Traffic Organization, Rules and Regulations Group, Room 425, 800 Independence Ave, SW, Washington, DC 20591, or via facsimile (202) 267-9328. FAA encourages the use of email to ensure timely processing.

This determination becomes final on November 06, 2023 unless a petition is timely filed. In which case, this determination will not become final pending disposition of the petition. Interested parties will be notified of the grant of any review. For any questions regarding your petition, please contact Rules and Regulations Group via telephone - 202-267-8783.

This determination is based, in part, on the foregoing description which includes specific coordinates, heights, frequency(ies) and power. Any changes in coordinates, heights and frequencies or use of greater power, except those frequencies specified in the Colo Void Clause Coalition; Antenna System Co-Location; Voluntary Best Practices, will void this determination. Any future construction or alteration, including increase to heights, power or the addition of other transmitters, requires separate notice to the FAA. This determination includes all previously filed frequencies and power for this structure.

If construction or alteration is dismantled or destroyed, you must submit notice to the FAA within 5 days after the construction or alteration is dismantled or destroyed.

This determination does include temporary construction equipment such as cranes, derricks, etc., which may be used during actual construction of the structure. However, this equipment shall not exceed the overall heights as indicated above. Equipment which has a height greater than the studied structure requires separate notice to the FAA.

This determination concerns the effect of this structure on the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace by aircraft and does not relieve the sponsor of compliance responsibilities relating to any law, ordinance, or regulation of any Federal, State, or local government body.

This aeronautical study considered and analyzed the impact on existing and proposed arrival, departure, and en route procedures for aircraft operating under both visual flight rules and instrument flight rules; the impact
on all existing and planned public-use airports, military airports and aeronautical facilities; and the cumulative impact resulting from the studied structure when combined with the impact of other existing or proposed structures. The study disclosed that the described structure would have no substantial adverse effect on air navigation.

An account of the study findings, aeronautical objections received by the FAA during the study (if any), and the basis for the FAA's decision in this matter can be found on the following page(s).

If we can be of further assistance, please contact Andrew Hollie, at (817) 222-5933, or andrew.hollie@faa.gov. On any future correspondence concerning this matter, please refer to Aeronautical Study Number 2023-ASW-13754-OE.
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Mike Helvey
Manager, Obstruction Evaluation Group
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Issued Date: 11/08/2023

Deepak Bhavi
Deepak Bhavi
835 Tillman Drive
Allen, TX 75013

## ** DETERMINATION OF NO HAZARD TO AIR NAVIGATION **

The Federal Aviation Administration has conducted an aeronautical study under the provisions of 49 U.S.C., Section 44718 and if applicable Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations, part 77, concerning:

```
Structure: Commercial Use Building Flex Space Business Park Bldg 6
Location: Rockwall, TX
Latitude: 32-55-28.60N NAD 83
Longitude: 96-26-00.50W
Heights: }573\mathrm{ feet site elevation (SE)
    23 feet above ground level (AGL)
    596 feet above mean sea level (AMSL)
```

This aeronautical study revealed that the structure would have no substantial adverse effect on the safe and efficient utilization of the navigable airspace by aircraft or on the operation of air navigation facilities. Therefore, pursuant to the authority delegated to me, it is hereby determined that the structure would not be a hazard to air navigation provided the following condition(s) is(are) met:

As a condition to this Determination, the structure is to be marked/lighted in accordance with FAA Advisory circular 70/7460-1 M, Obstruction Marking and Lighting, red lights-Chapters 4,5(Red),\&15.

Any failure or malfunction that lasts more than thirty (30) minutes and affects a top light or flashing obstruction light, regardless of its position, should be reported immediately to (877) 487-6867 so a Notice to Air Missions (NOTAM) can be issued. As soon as the normal operation is restored, notify the same number.

It is required that FAA Form 7460-2, Notice of Actual Construction or Alteration, be e-filed any time the project is abandoned or:
$\qquad$ At least 10 days prior to start of construction (7460-2, Part 1 )
$\qquad$ Within 5 days after the construction reaches its greatest height (7460-2, Part 2)

See attachment for additional condition(s) or information.

This determination expires on 05/08/2025 unless:
(a) the construction is started (not necessarily completed) and FAA Form 7460-2, Notice of Actual Construction or Alteration, is received by this office.
(b) extended, revised, or terminated by the issuing office.
(c) the construction is subject to the licensing authority of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and an application for a construction permit has been filed, as required by the FCC, within 6 months of the date of this determination. In such case, the determination expires on the date prescribed by the FCC for completion of construction, or the date the FCC denies the application.

## NOTE: REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF THE EFFECTIVE PERIOD OF THIS DETERMINATION MUST BE E-FLLED AT LEAST 15 DAYS PRIOR TO THE EXPIRATION DATE. AFTER RE-EVALUATION OF CURRENT OPERATIONS IN THE AREA OF THE STRUCTURE TO DETERMINE THAT NO SIGNIFICANT AERONAUTICAL CHANGES HAVE OCCURRED, YOUR DETERMINATION MAY BE ELIGIBLE FOR ONE EXTENSION OF THE EFFECTIVE PERIOD.

This determination is subject to review if an interested party files a petition that is received by the FAA on or before December 08,2023 . In the event an interested party files a petition for review, it must contain a full statement of the basis upon which the petition is made. Petitions can be submitted to the Manager, Rules and Regulations Group via email at OEPetitions@faa.gov, or via mail to Federal Aviation Administration, Air Traffic Organization, Rules and Regulations Group, Room 425, 800 Independence Ave, SW., Washington, DC 20591. FAA encourages the use of email to ensure timely processing.

This determination becomes final on December 18, 2023 unless a petition is timely filed. In which case, this determination will not become final pending disposition of the petition. Interested parties will be notified of the grant of any review. Any questions regarding your petition, contact Rules and Regulations Group via telephone (202) 267-8783.

This determination is based, in part, on the foregoing description which includes specific coordinates, heights, frequency(ies) and power. Any changes in coordinates, heights and frequencies or use of greater power, except those frequencies specified in the Colo Void Clause Coalition; Antenna System Co-Location; Voluntary Best Practices, will void this determination. Any future construction or alteration, including increase to heights, power or the addition of other transmitters, requires separate notice to the FAA. This determination includes all previously filed frequencies and power for this structure.

If construction or alteration is dismantled or destroyed, you must submit notice to the FAA within 5 days after the construction or alteration is dismantled or destroyed.

This determination does include temporary construction equipment such as cranes, derricks, etc., which may be used during actual construction of the structure. However, this equipment shall not exceed the overall heights as indicated above. Equipment which has a height greater than the studied structure requires separate notice to the FAA.

This determination concerns the effect of this structure on the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace by aircraft and does not relieve the sponsor of compliance responsibilities relating to any law, ordinance, or regulation of any Federal, State, or local government body.

This aeronautical study considered and analyzed the impact on existing and proposed arrival, departure, and en route procedures for aircraft operating under both visual flight rules and instrument flight rules; the impact on all existing and planned public-use airports, military airports and aeronautical facilities; and the cumulative impact resulting from the studied structure when combined with the impact of other existing or proposed
structures. The study disclosed that the described structure would have no substantial adverse effect on air navigation.

An account of the study findings, aeronautical objections received by the FAA during the study (if any), and the basis for the FAA's decision in this matter can be found on the following page(s).

If we can be of further assistance, please contact Andrew Hollie, at (817) 222-5933, or andrew.hollie@faa.gov. On any future correspondence concerning this matter, please refer to Aeronautical Study Number 2023-ASW-13755-OE.
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Issued Date: 11/08/2023
Deepak Bhavi
Deepak Bhavi
835 Tillman Drive
Allen, TX 75013

## ** DETERMINATION OF NO HAZARD TO AIR NAVIGATION **

The Federal Aviation Administration has conducted an aeronautical study under the provisions of 49 U.S.C., Section 44718 and if applicable Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations, part 77, concerning:

| Structure: | Commercial Use Building Flex Space Business Park Bldg 7 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location: | Rockwall, TX |
| Latitude: | $32-55-30.50 \mathrm{~N}$ NAD 83 |
| Longitude: | 96-26-00.40W |
| Heights: | 572 feet site elevation (SE) <br>  |
|  | 23 feet above ground level (AGL) |
|  | 595 feet above mean sea level (AMSL) |

This aeronautical study revealed that the structure would have no substantial adverse effect on the safe and efficient utilization of the navigable airspace by aircraft or on the operation of air navigation facilities. Therefore, pursuant to the authority delegated to me, it is hereby determined that the structure would not be a hazard to air navigation provided the following condition(s) is(are) met:

As a condition to this Determination, the structure is to be marked/lighted in accordance with FAA Advisory circular 70/7460-1 M, Obstruction Marking and Lighting, red lights-Chapters 4,5(Red),\&15.

Any failure or malfunction that lasts more than thirty (30) minutes and affects a top light or flashing obstruction light, regardless of its position, should be reported immediately to (877) 487-6867 so a Notice to Air Missions (NOTAM) can be issued. As soon as the normal operation is restored, notify the same number.

It is required that FAA Form 7460-2, Notice of Actual Construction or Alteration, be e-filed any time the project is abandoned or:
__X_ At least 10 days prior to start of construction (7460-2, Part 1)
__X_ Within 5 days after the construction reaches its greatest height (7460-2, Part 2)
See attachment for additional condition(s) or information.
This determination expires on 05/08/2025 unless:
(a) the construction is started (not necessarily completed) and FAA Form 7460-2, Notice of Actual Construction or Alteration, is received by this office.
(b) extended, revised, or terminated by the issuing office.
(c) the construction is subject to the licensing authority of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and an application for a construction permit has been filed, as required by the FCC, within 6 months of the date of this determination. In such case, the determination expires on the date prescribed by the FCC for completion of construction, or the date the FCC denies the application.

## NOTE: REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF THE EFFECTIVE PERIOD OF THIS DETERMINATION MUST BE E-FILED AT LEAST 15 DAYS PRIOR TO THE EXPIRATION DATE. AFTER RE-EVALUATION OF CURRENT OPERATIONS IN THE AREA OF THE STRUCTURE TO DETERMINE THAT NO SIGNIFICANT AERONAUTICAL CHANGES HAVE OCCURRED, YOUR DETERMINATION MAY BE ELIGIBLE FOR ONE EXTENSION OF THE EFFECTIVE PERIOD.

This determination is subject to review if an interested party files a petition that is received by the FAA on or before December 08, 2023. In the event an interested party files a petition for review, it must contain a full statement of the basis upon which the petition is made. Petitions can be submitted to the Manager, Rules and Regulations Group via email at OEPetitions@faa.gov, or via mail to Federal Aviation Administration, Air Traffic Organization, Rules and Regulations Group, Room 425, 800 Independence Ave, SW., Washington, DC 20591. FAA encourages the use of email to ensure timely processing.

This determination becomes final on December 18, 2023 unless a petition is timely filed. In which case, this determination will not become final pending disposition of the petition. Interested parties will be notified of the grant of any review. Any questions regarding your petition, contact Rules and Regulations Group via telephone (202) 267-8783.

This determination is based, in part, on the foregoing description which includes specific coordinates, heights, frequency(ies) and power. Any changes in coordinates, heights and frequencies or use of greater power, except those frequencies specified in the Colo Void Clause Coalition; Antenna System Co-Location; Voluntary Best Practices, will void this determination. Any future construction or alteration, including increase to heights, power or the addition of other transmitters, requires separate notice to the FAA. This determination includes all previously filed frequencies and power for this structure.

If construction or alteration is dismantled or destroyed, you must submit notice to the FAA within 5 days after the construction or alteration is dismantled or destroyed.

This determination does include temporary construction equipment such as cranes, derricks, etc., which may be used during actual construction of the structure. However, this equipment shall not exceed the overall heights as indicated above. Equipment which has a height greater than the studied structure requires separate notice to the FAA.

This determination concerns the effect of this structure on the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace by aircraft and does not relieve the sponsor of compliance responsibilities relating to any law, ordinance, or regulation of any Federal, State, or local government body.

This aeronautical study considered and analyzed the impact on existing and proposed arrival, departure, and en route procedures for aircraft operating under both visual flight rules and instrument flight rules; the impact on all existing and planned public-use airports, military airports and aeronautical facilities; and the cumulative impact resulting from the studied structure when combined with the impact of other existing or proposed
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structures. The study disclosed that the described structure would have no substantial adverse effect on air navigation.

An account of the study findings, aeronautical objections received by the FAA during the study (if any), and the basis for the FAA's decision in this matter can be found on the following page(s).

If we can be of further assistance, please contact Andrew Hollie, at (817) 222-5933, or andrew.hollie@faa.gov. On any future correspondence concerning this matter, please refer to Aeronautical Study Number 2023-ASW-13756-OE.

Signature Control No: 598974882-604223804<br>David Maddox<br>Manager, Obstruction Evaluation Group<br>Attachment(s)<br>Additional Information<br>Case Description<br>Map(s)
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|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROCKWALL INDUSTRIAL } \\ & \text { NORTH JOHN IKING BLVD. } \end{aligned}$ | IMAGES |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13501 KATY FREEWAY <br> SUITE 3180 <br> houston, texas 7 roz9 <br> PH. 713-783-7777 <br> TBPE FIRM \#: 15498 |  | Project No: | SHEET No: <br> 01 |




|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
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| Project | ROCKWALL <br> FLEXSPACE | Catalog \# | Type | PL2, PL4, PL5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Prepared by | PSA LIGHTING | Notes | Date |  |



## Interactive Menu

- Ordering Information page 2
- Mounting Details page 3,4
- Optical Configurations page 5
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- Energy and Performance Data page 6,7
- Control Options page 8


## Quick Facts

- Direct-mounted discrete light engine for improved optical uniformity and visual comfort
- Lumen packages range from 4,300-68,000 nominal lumens (30W-550W)
- Replaces 70W up to 1,000 W HID equivalents
- Efficacies up to 157 lumens per watt
- Standard universal quick mount arm with universal drill pattern


## Lumark

## Prevail Discrete LED

## Area / Site Luminaire

## Product Features



Product Certifications


## IP66



CAN ICESS-005

## Connected Systems

- WaveLinx


## Dimensional Details


notes:

1. Visit https://www.designlights.org/search/ to confirm qualification. Not all product variations are DLC qualified.
2. IDA Certified for 3000 K CCT and warmer only.

Ordering Information
SAMPLE NUMBER: PRV-XL-PA4B-740-U-T4W-BZ

| Product Family ${ }^{\text {1,2 }}$ | Light Engine |  | Color <br> Temperature | Voltage | Distribution | Mounting (Included) | Finish |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Configuration | Drive Current ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| PRV-P=Prevail Petite BAA-PRV-P=Prevail Petite BAA Buy American Act Compliant ${ }^{3}$ <br> TAA-PRV-P=Prevail Petite TAA Trade Agreements Act Compliant ${ }^{3}$ | PA1=1 Panel, 24 LED Rectangle | $A=400 \mathrm{~mA}$ Nominal <br> $B=700 \mathrm{~mA}$ Nominal <br> C=950mA Nominal <br> $D=1200 \mathrm{~mA}$ Nominal | $\begin{aligned} & 740=70 \mathrm{CRI}, 4000 \mathrm{~K} \\ & 730=70 \mathrm{CRI}, 3000 \mathrm{~K} \\ & 750=70 \mathrm{CRI}, 5000 \mathrm{~K} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { U=Universal, } 120-277 \mathrm{~V} \\ & \mathrm{H}=\text { High Voltage, } 347-480 \mathrm{~V} \\ & 9=347 \mathrm{~V} \\ & 8=480 \mathrm{~V} \\ & \text { V } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { T2R=Type II } \\ & \text { Roadway } \\ & \text { T2U=Type II Urban } \\ & \text { T3=Type III } \\ & \text { T4W=Type IV Wide } \\ & \text { 5WQ=Type V Square } \\ & \text { Wide } \end{aligned}$ | SA=QM Standard Versatile Arm <br> MA=QM Mast Arm <br> FMA=Fixed Mast Arm ${ }^{28}$ <br> WM=QM Wall Mount Arm <br> ADJA-WM= Adjustable <br> Arm - Wall Mount ${ }^{30}$ <br> ADJA=Adjustable Arm - <br> Pole Mount ${ }^{30}$ <br> ADJS=Adjustable Arm <br> - Slipfitter, $3^{\prime \prime}$ vertical tenon ${ }^{30}$ <br> SP2=Adjustable Arm Slipfitter, 2 3/8" vertical tenon ${ }^{28,30}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AP=Grey } \\ & \text { BZ=Bronze } \\ & \text { BK=Black } \\ & \text { DP=Dark Platinum } \\ & \text { GM=Graphite } \\ & \text { Metallic } \\ & \text { WH=White } \end{aligned}$ |
| PRV=Prevail <br> BAA-PRV=Prevail BAA Buy American Act Compliant ${ }^{3}$ <br> TAA-PRV=Prevail TAA Trade Agreements Act Compliant ${ }^{3}$ | PA1=1 Panel, 24 LED Rectangle PA2 $=2$ Panels, 48 LED Rectangles |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PRV-XL=PRV XL <br> BAA-PRV-XL=Prevail XL BAA Buy American Act Compliant ${ }^{3}$ <br> TAA-PRV-XL=Prevail XL TAA Trade Agreements Act Compliant ${ }^{3}$ | PA3=3 Panels, 72 LED Rectangles PA4=4 Panels, 96 LED Rectangles |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PRV-M=Prevail Maxx <br> BAA-PRV-M=Prevail Maxx BAA Buy American Act Compliant ${ }^{3}$ <br> TAA-PRV-M=Prevail Maxx TAA Trade Agreements Act Compliant ${ }^{3}$ | PA6= 6 Panels, 144 LED Rectangles | A $=600 \mathrm{~mA}$ Nominal <br> $B=800 \mathrm{~mA}$ Nominal <br> C $=1000 \mathrm{~mA}$ Nominal <br> $D=1200 \mathrm{~mA}$ Nominal |  |  |  |  |  |
| Options (Add as Suffix) |  |  |  | Accessories (Order Separately) ${ }^{20,21}$ |  |  |  |
| 10K=10kV UL 1449 Fused Surge Protective 20MSP=20kV MOV Surge Protective Device 20K=20kV UL 1449 Fused Surge Protective L90 $=$ Optics Rotated $90^{\circ}$ Left R90 $=$ Optics Rotated $90^{\circ}$ Right CC=Coastal Construction finish ${ }^{31}$ HSS=House Side Shield (Factory Installed) HA $=50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ High Ambient Temperature ${ }^{8}$ PR=NEMA 3-PIN Twistlock Photocontrol Re PR7=NEMA 7-PIN Twistlock Photocontrol R MS/DIM-L08=Motion Sensor for Dimming to $8^{\prime}$ Mounting Height ${ }^{11,12,13,22}$ <br> MS/DIM-L20=Motion Sensor for Dimming $9^{\prime}-20^{\prime}$ Mounting Height ${ }^{11,12,13,28,29}$ <br> MS/DIM-L40=Motion Sensor for Dimming $-40^{\prime}$ Mounting Height ${ }^{11,12,13}$ <br> SPB1=Motion Sensor for Dimming Operatio Interface, Up to $8^{\prime}$ Mounting Height ${ }^{11,14,22}$ SPB2=Motion Sensor for Dimming Operatio Interface, $8^{\prime}$ - 20' Mounting Height ${ }^{11,14,28,29}$ SPB4=Motion Sensor for Dimming Operatio Interface, $21^{\prime}$ - $40^{\prime}$ Mounting Height ${ }^{11,14,29}$ <br> ZW=Wavelinx-enabled 4-PIN Twistlock Rec <br> ZD=DALI-enabled 4-PIN Twistlock Receptac |  | 4XX=Wavelinx Pro, Dim NAC Programmable, 7' 22 <br> 5XX=Wavelinx Pro, Dim NAC Programmable, 15 28, 29 <br> 4XX=Wavelinx Pro, SR ht, 7' $-15^{\prime}$ Mounting He XXX=Wavelinx Pro, SR ht, $15^{\prime}-40^{\prime}$ Mounting Below)=LumenSafe In amera ${ }^{18,19}$ | ing Motion and 5' Mounting Height <br> ing Motion and 40' Mounting Height <br> ver, Dimming Motion ht ${ }^{11,12,15,16,17,22}$ <br> iver, Dimming Motion ght ${ }^{111,12,15,16,17,28,29}$ grated Network | PRVSA-XX=Standard Arm Mounting Kit ${ }^{22}$ <br> PRVMA-XX=Mast Arm Mounting Kit ${ }^{22}$ <br> PRVWM-XX=Wall Mount Kit ${ }^{22}$ <br> PRV-ADJA-XX=Adjustable Arm - Pole Mount Kit ${ }^{22}$ <br> PRV-ADJS-XX=Adjustable Arm - Slipfitter Kit ${ }^{22}$ <br> PRV-ADJA-WM-XX=Adjustable Arm - Wall Mount Kit ${ }^{22}$ <br> PRVXLSA-XX=Standard Arm Mounting Kit ${ }^{29}$ <br> PRVXLMA-XX=Mast Arm Mounting Kit ${ }^{29}$ <br> PRVXLWM-XX=Wall Mount Kit ${ }^{29}$ <br> PRV-XL-ADJA-XX=Adjustable Arm - Pole Mount Kit ${ }^{29}$ <br> PRV-XL-ADJA-WM-XX= Adjustable Arm - Wall Mount Kit ${ }^{29}$ <br> PRV-XL-ADJS-XX= Adjustable Arm - Slipfitter Kit ${ }^{29}$ PRV-M-ADJA-XX=Adjustable Arm - Pole Mount $\mathrm{Kit}^{28}$ <br> PRV-M-ADJS-XX=Adjustable Arm - Slipfitter Kit ${ }^{28}$ PRV-M-ADJA-WM-XX=Adjustable Arm - Wall Mount Kit ${ }^{28}$ <br> MA1010-XX=Single Tenon Adapter for 3-1/2" <br> 0.D. Tenon <br> MA1011-XX=2@180ºTenon Adapter for 3-1/2" <br> O.D. Tenon |  | MA1017-XX=Single Tenon <br> O.D. Tenon <br> MA1018-XX=2@180 ${ }^{\circ}$ Teno <br> O.D. Tenon <br> SRA238=Tenon Adapter fro PRV/DIS-FDV=Full Drop Vi PRVXL/DIS-FDV=Full Drop HSS-VP=House Side Shield HSS-HP=House Side Shiel <br> VGS-ARCH= Panel Drop Sh VGL-ARCH= Panel Drop Sh OA/RA1013=Photocontrol OA/RA1014=NEMA Photoc OA/RA1016=NEMA Photoc 105-285V <br> 0A/RA1201=NEMA Photoc 0A/RA1027=NEMA Photoc FSIR-100=Wireless Config Occupancy Sensor ${ }^{25}$ <br> WOLC-7P-10A=WaveLinx (7-PIN) ${ }^{27}$ <br> SWPD4-XX=WaveLinx Wire Mounting Height $15,16,17,22$, SWPD5-XX=WaveLinx Wir Mounting Height 15,16 , 17, 26, | dapter for 2-3/8" <br> Adapter for 2-3/8" <br> $3^{\prime \prime}$ to $2-3 / 8^{\prime \prime}$ <br> ${ }^{23}$ <br> isor ${ }^{18}$ <br> Kit, Vertical Panel ${ }^{7,24}$ <br> Kit, Horizontal Panel <br> Id, Short <br> ld, Long <br> orting Cap <br> trol-120V <br> trol - Multi-Tap <br> trol-347V <br> trol-480V <br> ation Tool for <br> tdoor Control Module <br> ss Sensor, 7' - 15' <br> ss Sensor, $15^{\prime}-40^{\prime}$ |
| NOTES: <br> 1. DesignLights Consortium ${ }^{\oplus}$ Qualified. Refer to www.designlights.org Qualified Products List under Family Models for details. <br> 2. Customer is responsible for engineering analysis to confirm pole and fixture compatibility for applications. Refer to installation instructions and pole white paper WP513001EN for additional support information. <br> 3. Only product configurations with these designated prefixes are built to be compliant with the Buy American Act of 1933 (BAA) or Trade Agreements Act of 1979 (TAA), respectively. Please refer to DOMESTIC PREFERENCES website for more information. Components shipped separately may be separately analyzed under domestic preference requirements. <br> 4. Nominal drive currents shown here. For actual drive current by configuration, refer to Power and Lumens tables. <br> 5. 480 V not to be used with ungrounded or impedance grounded systems. <br> 6. DuraVolt drivers feature added protection from power quality issues such as loss of neutral, transients and voltage <br> fluctuations. Visit www. signify.com/duravolt for more information. <br> 7. House Side Shield not for use with 5WQ distribution. <br> 8. Not available with PA1D light engine in Petite housing (PRV-P). <br> 9. Coastal construction finish salt spray tested to over 5,000 -hours per ASTM B117, with a scribe rating of 9 per ASTM D1654. <br> 10. If High Voltage (H) or DuraVolt (DV) is specified, use a photocontrol that matches the input voltage used. <br> 11. Controls system is not available in combination with a photocontrol receptacle (PR or PR7) or another controls system (MS, SPB, ZD, or ZW). <br> 12. Option not available with High Voltage (H) or DuraVolt (DV). Must specify Universal (U), 347V (9), or 480 V (8) voltage. <br> 13. Utilizes the Wattstopper sensor FSP-211. Sensor color white unless specified otherwise via PDR. To field-configure, order FSIR-100 accessory separately. <br> 14. Utilizes the Wattstopper sensor FSP-3XX series. Sensor color determined by product finish. See Sensor Color Reference Table. Field-configures via mobile application. See Controls section for details. <br> 15. Sensor passive infrared (PIR) may be overly sensitive when operating below $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\left(-4^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\right)$. |  |  |  | 16. In order for the device to be field-configurable, requires WAC Gateway components WAC-PoE and WPOE-120 in appropriate quantities. Only compatible with WaveLinx system and software and requires system components to be installed for operation. See website for more Wavelinx application information. <br> 17. Replace $X X$ with sensor color (WH, BZ or BK). <br> 18. Only available in PRV-XL configurations. <br> 19. Not available with High Voltage (H, DV, 8 or 9 ) or HA options. Consult LumenSafe system product pages for additional details and compatability information. <br> 20. Replace XX with paint color. <br> 21. For BAA or TAA requirements, Accessories sold separately will be separately analyzed under domestic preference requirements. Consult factory for further information. <br> 22. Not for use with PRV-XL or PRV-M configurations. <br> 23. Only for use with PRV. Not applicable to PRV-M, PRV-XL, or PRV-P. <br> 24. Must order one per optic/LED when ordering as a field-installable accessory ( $1,2,3,4$, or 6 ). Refer to House Side Shield reference table for details. <br> 25. This tool enables adjustment to Motion Sensor (MS) parameters including high and low modes, sensitivity, time delay, cutoff and more. Consult your lighting representative for more information. <br> 26. Requires 4-PIN twistlock receptacle option (ZD or ZW) option. <br> 27. Requires 7-PIN NEMA twistlock photocontrol receptacle (PR7) option. The WOLC-7 cannot be used in conjunction with other controls systems (MS, ZD, ZW or LWR). Only for use at 120-347V. <br> 28.Only available for PRV-M configurations. <br> 29. Only for use with PRV-XL. <br> 30. Fixed for PRV-M |  |  |  |

LumenSafe Integrated Network Security Camera Technology Options (Add as Suffix)

| Product Family | Camera Type | Data Backhaul |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L=LumenSafe Technology | H=Dome Camera, High Res <br> Z=Dome Camera, Remote PTZ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { C=Cellular, Customer Installed SIM Card } \\ & \text { A=Cellular, Factory Installed AT\&T SIM Card } \\ & \text { V=Cellular, Factory Installed Verizon SIM Card } \end{aligned}$ | S=Cellular, Factory Installed Sprint SIM Card E=Ethernet Networking |

## Mounting Details

SA=QM Pole Mount Arm (PRV \& PRV-P)


WM=QM Wall Mount Arm (PRV \& PRV-P)


MA=QM Mast Arm (PRV \& PRV-P)


ADJA=Adjustable Arm Pole Mount (PRV \& PRV-P)


ADJA-WM=Adjustable Arm Wall Mount (PRV \& PRV-P)


ADJS=Adjustable Slipfitter 3 (PRV \& PRV-P)


SA=QM Pole Mount Arm (PRV-XL)


WM=QM Wall Mount Arm (PRV-XL)


MA=QM Mast Arm (PRV-XL)


ADJA=Adjustable Arm Pole Mount (PRV-XL)


AD_JA-WM=Adjustable Arm Wall Mount (PRV-XL)


ADJS=Adjustable Slipfitter 3 (PRV-XL)


## Mounting Details

SA=QM Pole Mount Arm (PRV-M)


WM=QM Wall Mount Arm (PRV-M)


MA=QM Mast Arm (PRV-M)


FMA=Fixed Mast Arm (PRV-M)

DM=Direct Pole Mount Arm (PRV-M)


## Versatile Mount System



ADJS=Adjustable Slipfitter (PRV-M)


SP2=Adjustable Slipfitter 2-3/8" (PRV-M)


## Mounting Details

Mounting Configurations and EPAs
 analysis to confirm pole and fixture compatibility for applications

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Housing Size | Tilt Angle (Degrees) | Arm Mount Single | Arm Mount 2 @ 180 | Arm Mount 2 @ 90. | Arm Mount 3 @ 90 | Arm Mount 4 @ 90 |
| Prevail Petite | $0^{\circ}$ | 0.54 | 1.08 | 0.84 | 1.38 | 1.38 |
|  | $60^{\circ}$ | 1.68 | 1.85 | 2.42 | 3.15 | 3.30 |
| Prevail | $0^{\circ}$ | 0.92 | 1.35 | 1.42 | 1.63 | 1.63 |
|  | $60^{\circ}$ | 2.20 | 2.40 | 3.05 | 3.88 | 4.07 |
|  | $60^{\circ}+$ Full Drop Visor | 2.20 | 2.40 | 3.25 | 4.28 | 4.47 |
| Prevail XL | $0^{\circ}$ | 1.12 | 2.25 | 2.13 | 2.52 | 2.52 |
|  | $60^{\circ}$ | 3.99 | 4.30 | 5.26 | 6.51 | 6.79 |
|  | $60^{\circ}+$ Full Drop Visor | 3.99 | 4.30 | 5.59 | 7.17 | 7.49 |
| Prevail Maxx | $0^{\circ}$ | 1.28 | 2.56 | 1.7 | 2.69 | 2.69 |
|  | $60^{\circ}$ | 5.09 | 5.52 | 6.34 | 7.49 | 7.81 |

## Optical Configurations

PRV-P-PA1X

PRV-PA1X

PRV-XL-PA3X

PRV-M-PA6X


## Optical Distributions


5WQ (Type V Square Wide)

$=$ Distribution with House Side Shield (HSS)
$\square=$ Optical Distribution

## Product Specifications

Construction

- Single-piece die-cast aluminum housing
- Tethered die-cast aluminum door

Optics

- Dark Sky Approved (3000K CCT and warmer only)
- Precision molded polycarbonate optics

Electrical

- $-40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ minimum operating temperature
- $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ maximum operating temperature
- >.9 power factor
- <20\% total harmonic distortion
- Class 1 electronic drivers have expected life of 100,000 hours with $<1 \%$ failure rate
- 0-10V dimming driver is standard with leads external to the fixture
- Standard MOV surge protective device designed to withstand 10 kV of transient line surge

Mounting

- Versatile, patented, standard mount arm accommodates multiple drill patterns ranging from 1-1/2" to 4-7/8" (Type M drilling recommended for new installations)
- A knock-out on the standard mounting arm enables round pole mounting
- Adjustable pole and wall mount arms adjust in $5^{\circ}$ increments from $0^{\circ}$ to $60^{\circ}$; Downward facing orientation only (Type N drilling required for ADJA mount)
- Adjustable slipfitter arm adjusts in $5^{\circ}$ increments from $-5^{\circ}$ to $85^{\circ}$; Downward facing orientation only
- Prevail and Prevail Petite: 3G vibration rated (all arms)
- Prevail XL Mast Arm: 3G vibration rated
- Prevail XL Standard Arm: 1.5G vibration rated
- Adjustable Arms: 1.5G vibration rated

Finish

- Five-stage super TGIC polyester powder coat paint, 2.5 mil nominal thickness
- Finish is compliant to 3,000 hour salt spray standard (per ASTM B117)

Typical Applications

- Parking lots, Walkways, Roadways and Building Areas

Shipping Data

- Prevail Petite: 18 lbs. (7.94 kgs.)
- Prevail: 20 lbs. (9.09 kgs.)
- Prevail XL: 45 lbs. (20.41 kgs.)
- Prevail Maxx: 49 lbs. (22.23 kgs.)

Warranty

- Five year limited warranty, consult website for details. www.cooperlighting.com/legal

Energy and Performance Data
Power and Lumens
View PRV-P IES files

View PRV IES files

View PRV-XL IES files

| Product Family |  | Prevail Petite |  |  |  | Prevail |  |  |  | Prevail XL |  |  |  | Prevail Maxx |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Light Engine |  | PA1A | PA1B | PA1C | PA1D | PA1A | PA1B | PA2A | PA2B | PA3A | PA3B | PA4A | PA4B | PA6A | PA6B | PA6C | PA6D |
| Power (Watts) |  | 31 | 53 | 72 | 93 | 54 | 74 | 113 | 151 | 172 | 234 | 245 | 303 | 274 | 366 | 457 | 544 |
| Drive Current (mA) |  | 375 | 670 | 930 | 1200 | 670 | 930 | 720 | 970 | 750 | 980 | 785 | 970 | 600 | 800 | 1000 | 1200 |
| Input Current @ 120V (A) |  | 0.26 | 0.44 | 0.60 | 0.78 | 0.45 | 0.62 | 0.93 | 1.26 | 1.44 | 1.95 | 2.04 | 2.53 | 2.30 | 3.05 | 3.83 | 4.54 |
| Input Current @ 277V (A) |  | 0.12 | 0.20 | 0.28 | 0.35 | 0.21 | 0.28 | 0.41 | 0.55 | 0.62 | 0.85 | 0.93 | 1.12 | 0.99 | 1.30 | 1.62 | 1.94 |
| Input Current @ 347V (A) |  | 0.10 | 0.17 | 0.23 | 0.29 | 0.17 | 0.23 | 0.33 | 0.45 | 0.52 | 0.70 | 0.74 | 0.90 | 0.78 | 1.05 | 1.32 | 1.60 |
| Input Current @ 480V (A) |  | 0.07 | 0.13 | 0.17 | 0.22 | 0.12 | 0.17 | 0.24 | 0.33 | 0.39 | 0.52 | 0.53 | 0.65 | 0.58 | 0.76 | 0.95 | 1.14 |
| Distribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Type II Roadway | 4000K/5000K Lumens | 4,505 | 7,362 | 9,495 | 11,300 | 7,605 | 9,896 | 15,811 | 19,745 | 24,718 | 30,648 | 34,067 | 39,689 | 41,611 | 52,596 | 61,921 | 67,899 |
|  | BUG Rating | B1-U0-G1 | B1-U0-G2 | B1-U0-G2 | B1-U0-G2 | B1-U0-G2 | B1-U0-G2 | B2-U0-G3 | B2-U0-G3 | B3-U0-G3 | B3-U0-G4 | B3-U0-G4 | B3-U0-G4 | B3-U0-G4 | B4-U0-G5 | B4-U0-G5 | B4-U0-65 |
|  | Lumens per Watt | 147 | 139 | 132 | 121 | 141 | 134 | 141 | 131 | 144 | 131 | 139 | 131 | 152 | 144 | 135 | 125 |
|  | 3000K Lumens ${ }^{1}$ | 4,103 | 6,705 | 8,647 | 10,291 | 6,926 | 9,012 | 14,399 | 17,982 | 22,511 | 27,912 | 31,025 | 36,145 | 37,896 | 47,900 | 56,392 | 61,837 |
| Type II Roadway w/ HSS | 4000K/5000K Lumens | 3,727 | 6,091 | 7,855 | 9,349 | 6,006 | 7,815 | 12,487 | 15,594 | 19,521 | 24,204 | 26,094 | 31,334 | 32,874 | 41,553 | 48,919 | 53,642 |
|  | BUG Rating | B0-U0-G1 | B0-U0-G2 | BO-U0-G2 | B1-U0-G2 | B0-U0-G1 | B1-U0-G2 | B1-U0-G2 | B1-U0-G2 | B1-U0-G3 | B1-U0-G3 | B1-U0-G4 | B1-U0-G4 | B2-U0-G4 | B2-U0-G4 | B2-U0-G5 | B2-U0-G5 |
|  | Lumens per Watt | 121 | 115 | 109 | 100 | 111 | 106 | 111 | 103 | 113 | 103 | 107 | 103 | 120 | 114 | 107 | 99 |
|  | 3000K Lumens ${ }^{1}$ | 3,394 | 5,547 | 7,154 | 8,514 | 5,470 | 7,117 | 11,372 | 14,201 | 17,778 | 22,043 | 24,502 | 28,545 | 29,939 | 37,843 | 44,552 | 48,853 |
| Type II Urban | 4000K/5000K Lumens | 4,496 | 7,347 | 9,476 | 11,277 | 7,597 | 9,886 | 15,795 | 19,724 | 24,692 | 30,616 | 34,031 | 39,647 | 41,372 | 52,294 | 61,565 | 67,509 |
|  | BUG Rating | B1-U0-G1 | B2-U0-G2 | B2-U0-G2 | B3-U0-G3 | B2-U0-G2 | B3-U0-63 | B3-U0-63 | B3-U0-G3 | B4-U0-G4 | B4-U0-G4 | B4-U0-G4 | B4-U0-G4 | B4-U0-G4 | B5-U0-65 | B5-U0-G5 | B5-U0-65 |
|  | Lumens per Watt | 146 | 139 | 131 | 121 | 141 | 134 | 141 | 131 | 144 | 131 | 139 | 131 | 151 | 143 | 135 | 124 |
|  | 3000K Lumens ${ }^{1}$ | 4,095 | 6,691 | 8,630 | 10,271 | 6,919 | 9,003 | 14,384 | 17,963 | 22,488 | 27,882 | 30,992 | 36,107 | 37,678 | 47,625 | 56,068 | 61,481 |
| Type II Urban w/ HSS | 4000K/5000K Lumens | 3,253 | 5,316 | 6,856 | 8,160 | 5,297 | 6,893 | 11,013 | 13,753 | 17,217 | 21,347 | 23,728 | 27,644 | 28,951 | 36,594 | 43,082 | 47,241 |
|  | BUG Rating | B1-U0-G1 | B1-U0-G1 | B1-U0-G2 | B1-U0-G2 | B1-U0-G1 | B1-U0-G2 | B1-U0-G2 | B2-U0-G2 | B2-U0-G2 | B2-U0-G3 | B2-U0-G3 | B3-U0-G4 | B3-U0-G4 | B3-U0-G4 | B3-v0-G5 | B3-U0-65 |
|  | Lumens per Watt | 106 | 101 | 95 | 87 | 98 | 93 | 97 | 91 | 100 | 91 | 97 | 91 | 106 | 100 | 94 | 87 |
|  | 3000K Lumens ${ }^{1}$ | 2,963 | 4,841 | 6,244 | 7,431 | 4,824 | 6,277 | 10,029 | 12,525 | 15,680 | 19,441 | 21,609 | 25,176 | 26,366 | 33,327 | 39,235 | 43,023 |
| Type III | 4000K/5000K Lumens | 4,443 | 7,261 | 9,364 | 11,145 | 7,575 | 9,857 | 15,749 | 19,667 | 24,621 | 30,527 | 33,932 | 39,532 | 41,155 | 52,020 | 61,242 | 67,155 |
|  | BUG Rating | B1-U0-G1 | B1-U0-G2 | B2-U0-G2 | B2-U0-G2 | B1-U0-G2 | B2-U0-G3 | B3-u0-63 | B3-U0-G3 | B3-U0-G4 | B3-U0-G5 | B3-U0-G5 | B4-U0-G5 | B4-U0-G5 | B4-U0-G5 | B4-U0-G5 | B4-U0-G5 |
|  | Lumens per Watt | 145 | 138 | 130 | 119 | 140 | 133 | 141 | 130 | 143 | 130 | 138 | 130 | 150 | 142 | 134 | 123 |
|  | 3000K Lumens ${ }^{1}$ | 4,046 | 6,612 | 8,528 | 10,150 | 6,899 | 8,977 | 14,343 | 17,911 | 22,423 | 27,802 | 30,903 | 36,002 | 37,480 | 47,375 | 55,774 | 61,159 |
| Type III w/HSS | 4000K/5000K Lumens | 3,406 | 5,566 | 7,179 | 8,543 | 5,592 | 7,277 | 11,626 | 14,519 | 18,176 | 22,536 | 25,049 | 29,183 | 30,159 | 38,121 | 44,879 | 49,212 |
|  | BUG Rating | B0-U0-G1 | B1-U0-G2 | B1-U0-G2 | B1-U0-G2 | B1-U0-G2 | B1-U0-G2 | B1-U0-G2 | B1-U0-G3 | B2-U0-G4 | B2-U0-G4 | B2-U0-G4 | B2-U0-G5 | B2-U0-G5 | B3-U0-G5 | B3-U0-G5 | B3-U0-65 |
|  | Lumens per Watt | 111 | 105 | 100 | 91 | 104 | 98 | 103 | 96 | 106 | 96 | 102 | 96 | 110 | 104 | 98 | 90 |
|  | 3000K Lumens ${ }^{1}$ | 3,102 | 5,069 | 6,538 | 7,781 | 5,093 | 6,627 | 10,588 | 13,222 | 16,553 | 20,524 | 22,813 | 26,578 | 27466 | 34717 | 40872 | 44818 |
| Type IV Wide | 4000K/5000K Lumens | 4,348 | 7,106 | 9,164 | 10,906 | 7,484 | 9,738 | 15,560 | 19,431 | 24,325 | 30,161 | 33,525 | 39,057 | 41,207 | 52,086 | 61,320 | 67,240 |
|  | BUG Rating | B1-U0-G2 | B2-U0-G2 | B2-U0-G2 | B2-U0-G3 | B2-U0-G2 | B2-U0-G3 | B3-u0-63 | B3-U0-G4 | B3-U0-G4 | B3-U0-G5 | B3-U0-G5 | B4-U0-G5 | B4-U0-G5 | B4-U0-G5 | B4-U0-G5 | B4-U0-G5 |
|  | Lumens per Watt | 142 | 135 | 127 | 117 | 139 | 132 | 139 | 129 | 141 | 129 | 137 | 129 | 151 | 142 | 134 | 124 |
|  | 3000K Lumens ${ }^{1}$ | 3,960 | 6,471 | 8,346 | 9,932 | 6,816 | 8,869 | 14,170 | 17,696 | 22,153 | 27,468 | 30,531 | 35,570 | 37,528 | 47,435 | 55,845 | 61,236 |
| Type IV Wide w/ HSS | 4000K/5000K Lumens | 3,318 | 5,422 | 6,993 | 8,323 | 5,420 | 7,053 | 11,268 | 14,072 | 17,617 | 24,843 | 24,279 | 28,286 | 30,005 | 37,926 | 44,650 | 48,961 |
|  | BUG Rating | Bo-U0-G1 | B1-U0-G2 | B1-U0-G2 | B1-U0-G2 | B1-U0-G2 | B1-U0-G2 | B1-U0-G3 | B1-U0-G3 | B1-U0-G4 | B2-U0-G4 | B2-U0-G4 | B2-U0-G5 | B2-U0-G5 | B3-U0-65 | B3-U0-G5 | B3-U0-65 |
|  | Lumens per Watt | 108 | 103 | 97 | 89 | 100 | 95 | 100 | 93 | 102 | 106 | 99 | 93 | 110 | 104 | 98 | 90 |
|  | 3000K Lumens ${ }^{1}$ | 3,022 | 4,938 | 6,369 | 7,580 | 4,936 | 6,423 | 10,262 | 12,816 | 16,044 | 19,892 | 22,111 | 25,760 | 27,326 | 34,540 | 40,664 | 44,589 |
| Type V Square Wide | 4000K/5000K Lumens | 4,497 | 7,349 | 9,478 | 11,280 | 7,831 | 10,190 | 16,281 | 20,332 | 25,453 | 31,559 | 35,079 | 40,868 | 42,947 | 54,285 | 63,909 | 70,079 |
|  | BUG Rating | B3-U0-G1 | B3-U0-G2 | B4-U0-G2 | B4-U0-G2 | B3-U0-G2 | B4-U0-G3 | B4-U0-G3 | B5-U0-G3 | B5-U0-G4 | B5-U0-G5 | B5-U0-G5 | B5-U0-G5 | B5-U0-G5 | B5-u0-G5 | B5-U0-G5 | B5-U0-65 |
|  | Lumens per Watt | 146 | 139 | 131 | 121 | 145 | 138 | 145 | 135 | 148 | 135 | 143 | 135 | 157 | 143 | 136 | 129 |
|  | 3000K Lumens ${ }^{1}$ | 4,095 | 6,693 | 8,632 | 10,273 | 7,132 | 9,280 | 14,827 | 18,517 | 23,180 | 28,741 | 31,947 | 37,219 | 39,112 | 49,438 | 58,203 | 63,822 |

notes:

1. For 3000 K or HSS BUG Ratings, refer to published IES files

## Energy and Performance Data

House Side Shield Reference Table

| Product Family |  | Prevail | Prevail |  | Prevail XL | Prevail Maxx |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Light Engine | PA1 | PA1 | PA2 | PA3 | PA4 | PA6 |  |
|  | Standard | HSS-HP (Qty 1) | HSS-VP (Qty 1) | HSS-HP (Qty 2) | HSS-HP (Qty 3) | HSS-VP (Qty 4) | HSS-HP (qty 6) |
|  | L90 or R90 option | HSS-VP (Qty 1) | HSS-HP (Qty 1) | HSS-VP (Qty 2) | HSS-VP (Qty 3) | HSS-HP (Qty 4) | HSS-VP (qty 6) |

Sensor Color Reference Table (SPBx)

| Housing Finish | Sensor Color |
| :---: | :---: |
| AP=Grey | Grey |
| BZ=Bronze | Bronze |
| BK=Black | Black |
| DP=Dark Platinum | Grey |
| $\mathbf{G M}=$ Graphite Metallic | Black |
| WH=White | White |

## Lumen Multiplier

| Ambient <br> Temperature | Lumen <br> Multiplier |
| :---: | :---: |
| $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 1.02 |
| $10^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 1.01 |
| $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 1.00 |
| $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 0.99 |
| $50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 0.97 |

## Lumen Maintenance

| Ambient Temperature | TM-21 Lumen <br> Maintenance <br> (78,000 Hours) | Theoretical L70 <br> (Hours) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Up to $50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | $96.76 \%$ | $>896,000$ |

## Control Options

$\mathbf{0 - 1 0} \mathrm{V}$ This fixture provides $0-10 \mathrm{~V}$ dimming wire leads for use with a lighting control panel or other control method.
Photocontrol (PR and PR7) Photocontrol receptacles provide a flexible solution to enable "dusk-to-dawn" lighting by sensing light levels. Advanced control systems compatible with NEMA 7-PIN standards can be utilized with the PR7 receptacle.
Dimming Occupancy Sensor (SPB, MS/DIM-LXX) These sensors are factory installed in the luminaire housing. When the SPB or MS/DIM sensor options are selected, the luminaire will dim down after five minutes of no activity detected. When activity is detected, the luminaire returns to full light output. These occupancy sensors include an integral photocell for "dusk-to-dawn" control or "daylight harvesting." Factory default is enabled for the MS sensors and disabled for the SPB. SPB motion sensors require the Sensor Configuration mobile application by Wattstopper to change factory default dimming level, time delay, sensitivity and other parameters. Available for iOS and Android devices. The SPB sensor is factory preset to dim down to approximately $10 \%$ power with a time delay of five minutes.


WaveLinx Wireless Control and Monitoring System Available in 7-PIN or 4-PIN configurations, the WaveLinx Outdoor control platform operates on a wireless mesh network based on IEEE 802.15 .4 standards enabling wireless control of outdoor lighting. At least one Wireless Area Controller (WAC) is required for full functionality and remote communication (including adjustment of any factory pre-sets).
WaveLinx Outdoor Control Module (WOLC-7P-10A) A photocontrol that enables astronomic or time-based schedules to provide ON, OFF and dimming control of fixtures utilizing a 7-PIN receptacle. The out-of-box functionality is ON at dusk and OFF at dawn.
WaveLinx Wireless Sensor (SWPD4 and SWPD5) These outdoor sensors offer passive infrared (PIR) occupancy sensing and a photocell for closed-loop daylight sensing. These sensors can be factory installed or field-installed via simple, tool-less integration into luminaires equipped with the Zhaga Book 18 compliant 4-PIN receptacle (ZD or ZW). These sensors are factory preset to dim down to approximately 50 percent power after 15 minutes of no activity detected, and the photocell for "dusk-to-dawn" control is default enabled. A variety of sensor lenses are available to optimize the coverage pattern for mounting heights from 7'-40'.


LumenSafe (LD) The LumenSafe integrated network camera is a streamlined, outdoor-ready camera that provides high definition video surveillance. This IP camera solution is optimally designed to integrate into virtually any video management system or security software platform of choice. No additional wiring is needed beyond providing line power to the luminaire. LumenSafe features factory-installed power and networking gear in a variety of networking options allowing security integrators to design the optimal solution for active surveillance.

## SSP Square Non-Tapered Steel Poles



SSP

## Pole Shaft

The pole shaft is one piece construction, being fabricated from a weldable grade carbon steel structural tubing which has a uniform wall thickness of 11 gauge ( $0.1196^{\prime \prime}$ ), 7 gauge ( 0.1793 "), or 3 gauge ( 0.2391 "). The pole shaft material shall conform to ASTM A-500 Grade C with a minimum yield strength of 50,000 psi. The pole shaft has a full length longitudinal resistance weld and is uniformly square in cross-section with flat sides, small corner radii and excellent torsional properties.

## Base Plate

The anchor base is fabricated from structural quality hot rolled carbon steel plate that meets or exceeds a minimum yield strength of 36,000 psi. The anchor base telescopes the pole shaft and is circumferentially welded top and bottom. All welds are performed in accordance with the American Welding Society specification AWS D1.1, latest edition.

## Anchor Bolts

Anchor bolts are fabricated from commercial quality hot rolled carbon steel bar that meets or exceeds a minimum yield strength of 55,000 psi. Four properly sized anchor bolts, each with two regular hex nuts and washers, are furnished and shipped with all poles unless otherwise specified. Anchor bolts shall have the threaded end galvanized a minimum of 8 inches in accordance with ASTM A-153. Fully galvanized anchor bolts are available upon request.

## Handhole

An oval reinforced gasketed handhole, having a nominal $3^{\prime \prime} \times 5^{\prime \prime}$ or $4^{\prime \prime} \times 6-1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ inside opening, located $1^{\prime}-6$ " above base, is standard on all poles. Optional $5^{\prime \prime} \times 8^{\prime \prime}$ and $4^{\prime \prime} \times 10^{\prime \prime}$ handholes are available (see options). A grounding provision is located inside the handhole ring.

## Finishes

The Standard Finish is a polyester thermosetting powder coating applied to the surface of the substrate to a minimum of 3 mils for all color finishes. Hot dip Galvanized finish to a ASTM A-123 specification or primed finish is also available. For optional finishes, see K-KLAD and K-KLAD Over Galvanizing.

## HOW TO ORDER

When ordering KW lighting standards, mounting adaptors and accessories, be sure to specify the complete catalog number. Our catalog numbers reflect the precise specifications of the item ordered to ensure our customers will receive the product which meets their exact requirements.
The following explanation of the catalog numbers will be helpful in placing orders:


| Catalog Number | Nominal Height | Pole Shaft | Gauge | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Handhole } \\ \text { Size } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Anchor Bolt | Bolt | $\begin{gathered} \hline \mathbf{8 0} \\ \text { MPH } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 90 \\ \text { MPH } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \\ & \text { MPH } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Ship WT. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SSP10-4.0-11 | 10 | $4.0 \times 10.0$ | 11 | $3 \times 5$ | $0.75 \times 17 \times 3$ | 8 | 42.1 | 33.5 | 27.1 | 87 |
| SSP10-4.0-7 | 10 | $4.0 \times 10.0$ | 7 | $3 \times 5$ | $0.75 \times 30 \times 3$ | 8 | 55 | 44 | 35.5 | 130 |
| SSP10-5.0-11 | 10 | $5.0 \times 10.0$ | 11 | $3 \times 5$ | $1.00 \times 36 \times 4$ | 11 | 58 | 44 | 34 | 151 |
| SSP12-4.0-11 | 12 | $4.0 \times 12.0$ | 11 | $3 \times 5$ | $0.75 \times 17 \times 3$ | 8 | 33.7 | 26.7 | 21.4 | 100 |
| SSP12-4.0-7 | 12 | $4.0 \times 12.0$ | 7 | $3 \times 5$ | $0.75 \times 30 \times 3$ | 8 | 47.5 | 37.3 | 29.8 | 150 |
| SSP12-5.0-11 | 12 | $5.0 \times 12.0$ | 11 | $3 \times 5$ | $1.00 \times 36 \times 4$ | 11 | 49 | 38 | 29 | 168 |
| SSP14-4.0-11 | 14 | $4.0 \times 14.0$ | 11 | $3 \times 5$ | $0.75 \times 17 \times 3$ | 8 | 27.4 | 21.5 | 17.1 | 113 |
| SSP14-4.0-7 | 14 | $4.0 \times 14.0$ | 7 | $3 \times 5$ | $0.75 \times 30 \times 3$ | 8 | 40 | 31 | 24.5 | 170 |


| SSP14-5.0-11 | 14 | $5.0 \times 14.0$ | 11 | $3 \times 5$ | $1.00 \times 36 \times 4$ | 11 | 40 | 30 | 23 | 184 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SSP14-5.0-7 | 14 | $5.0 \times 14.0$ | 7 | $3 \times 5$ | $1.00 \times 36 \times 4$ | 11 | 65 | 52 | 41.5 | 242 |
| SSP15-4.0-11 | 15 | $4.0 \times 15.0$ | 11 | $3 \times 5$ | $0.75 \times 17 \times 3$ | 8 | 20.7 | 16.1 | 12.6 | 119 |
| SSP15-4.0-7 | 15 | $4.0 \times 15.0$ | 7 | $3 \times 5$ | $0.75 \times 30 \times 3$ | 8 | 30.9 | 24.4 | 19.6 | 172 |
| SSP15-5.0-11 | 15 | $5.0 \times 15.0$ | 11 | $3 \times 5$ | $1.00 \times 36 \times 4$ | 11 | 36 | 27.5 | 21 | 192 |
| SSP15-5.0-7 | 15 | $5.0 \times 15.0$ | 7 | $3 \times 5$ | $1.00 \times 36 \times 4$ | 11 | 59 | 46.5 | 37 | 254 |
| SSP16-4.0-11 | 16 | $4.0 \times 16.0$ | 11 | $3 \times 5$ | $0.75 \times 17 \times 3$ | 8 | 18.7 | 14.4 | 11.2 | 125 |
| SSP16-4.0-7 | 16 | $4.0 \times 16.0$ | 7 | $3 \times 5$ | $0.75 \times 30 \times 3$ | 8 | 27.2 | 20.7 | 16 | 210 |
| SSP16-5.0-11 | 16 | $5.0 \times 16.0$ | 11 | $3 \times 5$ | $1.00 \times 36 \times 4$ | 11 | 33.5 | 25 | 18 | 201 |
| SSP16-5.0-7 | 16 | $5.0 \times 16.0$ | 7 | $3 \times 5$ | $1.00 \times 36 \times 4$ | 11 | 54 | 43 | 34 | 266 |
| SSP18-4.0-11 | 18 | $4.0 \times 18.0$ | 11 | $3 \times 5$ | $0.75 \times 17 \times 3$ | 8 | 15.2 | 11.5 | 8.7 | 138 |
| SSP18-4.0-7 | 18 | $4.0 \times 18.0$ | 7 | $3 \times 5$ | $0.75 \times 30 \times 3$ | 8 | 27.2 | 20.7 | 16 | 210 |
| SSP18-5.0-11 | 18 | $5.0 \times 18.0$ | 11 | $3 \times 5$ | $1.00 \times 36 \times 4$ | 11 | 27 | 19.5 | 15 | 218 |
| SSP18-5.0-7 | 18 | $5.0 \times 18.0$ | 7 | $3 \times 5$ | $1.00 \times 36 \times 4$ | 11 | 46 | 36 | 28 | 291 |
| SSP20-4.0-11 | 20 | $4.0 \times 20.0$ | 11 | $3 \times 5$ | $0.75 \times 17 \times 3$ | 8 | 12.3 | 9 | 6.5 | 151 |
| SSP20-4.0-7 | 20 | $4.0 \times 20.0$ | 7 | $3 \times 5$ | $0.75 \times 30 \times 3$ | 8 | 19.6 | 15 | 11.5 | 219 |
| SSP20-5.0-11 | 20 | $5.0 \times 20.0$ | 11 | $3 \times 5$ | $1.00 \times 36 \times 4$ | 11 | 22.2 | 16.8 | 12.6 | 235 |
| SSP20-5.0-7 | 20 | $5.0 \times 20.0$ | 7 | $3 \times 5$ | $1.00 \times 36 \times 4$ | 11 | 35.4 | 27.5 | 21.5 | 313 |
| SSP20-6.0-7 | 20 | $6.0 \times 20.0$ | 7 | $3 \times 5$ | $1.00 \times 36 \times 4$ | 11.5 | 56 | 42.5 | 33.5 | 368 |
| SSP22-4.0-11 | 22 | $4.0 \times 22.0$ | 11 | $3 \times 5$ | $0.75 \times 17 \times 3$ | 8 | 6.9 | 4.3 | 2.3 | 182 |
| SSP22-4.0-7 | 22 | $4.0 \times 22.0$ | 7 | $3 \times 5$ | $0.75 \times 30 \times 3$ | 8 | 12.2 | 8.7 | 6 | 266 |
| SSP22-5.0-11 | 22 | $5.0 \times 22.0$ | 11 | $3 \times 5$ | $1.00 \times 36 \times 4$ | 11 | 18.5 | 13.6 | 9.8 | 252 |
| SSP22-5.0-7 | 22 | $5.0 \times 22.0$ | 7 | $3 \times 5$ | $1.00 \times 36 \times 4$ | 11 | 30.2 | 23.2 | 17.8 | 337 |
| SSP22-6.0-7 | 22 | $6.0 \times 22.0$ | 7 | $3 \times 5$ | $1.00 \times 36 \times 4$ | 11.5 | 49 | 37.5 | 28 | 398 |
| SSP24-4.0-7 | 24 | $4.0 \times 24.0$ | 7 | $3 \times 5$ | $0.75 \times 30 \times 3$ | 8 | 12.2 | 8.7 | 6 | 266 |
| SSP24-5.0-11 | 24 | $5.0 \times 24.0$ | 11 | $3 \times 5$ | $1.00 \times 36 \times 4$ | 11 | 15.2 | 10.8 | 7.4 | 268 |
| SSP24-5.0-7 | 24 | $5.0 \times 24.0$ | 7 | $3 \times 5$ | $1.00 \times 36 \times 4$ | 11 | 25.8 | 19.4 | 14.6 | 361 |
| SSP24-6.0-7 | 24 | $6.0 \times 24.0$ | 7 | $3 \times 5$ | $1.00 \times 36 \times 4$ | 11.5 | 42 | 31.5 | 23 | 428 |
| SSP25-4.0-11 | 25 | $4.0 \times 25.0$ | 11 | $3 \times 5$ | $0.75 \times 17 \times 3$ | 8 | 6.9 | 4.3 | 2.3 | 182 |
| SSP25-4.0-7 | 25 | $4.0 \times 25.0$ | 7 | $3 \times 5$ | $0.75 \times 30 \times 3$ | 8 | 12.2 | 8.7 | 6 | 266 |
| SSP25-5.0-11 | 25 | $5.0 \times 25.0$ | 11 | $3 \times 5$ | $1.00 \times 36 \times 4$ | 11 | 13.8 | 9.5 | 6.3 | 276 |
| SSP25-5.0-7 | 25 | $5.0 \times 25.0$ | 7 | $3 \times 5$ | $1.00 \times 36 \times 4$ | 11 | 23.8 | 17.7 | 13.1 | 373 |
| SSP25-6.0-7 | 25 | $6.0 \times 25.0$ | 7 | $3 \times 5$ | $1.00 \times 36 \times 4$ | 11.5 | 39 | 28.5 | 21 | 443 |
| SSP26-4.0-7 | 26 | $4.0 \times 26.0$ | 7 | $3 \times 5$ | $0.75 \times 30 \times 3$ | 8 | 6.9 | 4 | 1 | 312 |
| SSP26-5.0-11 | 26 | $5.0 \times 26.0$ | 11 | $3 \times 5$ | $1.00 \times 36 \times 4$ | 11 | 12.4 | 8.3 | 5.2 | 284 |
| SSP26-5.0-7 | 26 | $5.0 \times 26.0$ | 7 | $3 \times 5$ | $1.00 \times 36 \times 4$ | 11 | 21.9 | 16.1 | 11.8 | 384 |
| SSP26-6.0-7 | 26 | $6.0 \times 26.0$ | 7 | $3 \times 5$ | $1.00 \times 36 \times 4$ | 11.5 | 35.5 | 25.5 | 18.5 | 457 |
| SSP28-4.0-7 | 28 | $4.0 \times 28.0$ | 7 | $3 \times 5$ | $0.75 \times 30 \times 3$ | 8 | 6.9 | 4 | 1 | 312 |
| SSP28-5.0-11 | 28 | $5.0 \times 28.0$ | 11 | $3 \times 5$ | $1.00 \times 36 \times 4$ | 11 | 9.8 | 6.1 | 3.2 | 300 |
| SSP28-5.0-7 | 28 | $5.0 \times 28.0$ | 7 | $3 \times 5$ | $1.00 \times 36 \times 4$ | 11 | 18.4 | 13.2 | 9.2 | 408 |
| SSP28-6.0-7 | 28 | $6.0 \times 28.0$ | 7 | $3 \times 5$ | $1.00 \times 36 \times 4$ | 11.5 | 30 | 21.5 | 15 | 487 |
| SSP30-4.0-7 | 30 | $4.0 \times 30.0$ | 7 | $3 \times 5$ | $0.75 \times 30 \times 3$ | 8 | 6.9 | 4 | 1 | 312 |
| SSP30-5.0-11 | 30 | $5.0 \times 30.0$ | 11 | $3 \times 5$ | $1.00 \times 36 \times 4$ | 11 | 6.5 | 3.5 | 1.2 | 315 |
| SSP30-5.0-7 | 30 | $5.0 \times 30.0$ | 7 | $3 \times 5$ | $1.00 \times 36 \times 4$ | 11 | 13.4 | 9.1 | 5.9 | 432 |
| SSP30-6.0-7 | 30 | $6.0 \times 30.0$ | 7 | $3 \times 5$ | $1.00 \times 36 \times 4$ | 11.5 | 27.5 | 19.9 | 14.1 | 512 |
| SSP30-6.0-3 | 30 | $6.0 \times 30.0$ | 3 | $3 \times 5$ | $1.00 \times 36 \times 4$ | 12 | 34.3 | 25.3 | 18.5 | 645 |
| SSP35-5.0-7 | 35 | $5.0 \times 35.0$ | 7 | $3 \times 5$ | $1.00 \times 36 \times 4$ | 11 | 7.2 | 3.7 | 1 | 491 |
| SSP35-6.0-7 | 35 | $6.0 \times 35.0$ | 7 | $3 \times 5$ | $1.00 \times 36 \times 4$ | 11.5 | 15 | 9.5 | 5.3 | 584 |
| SSP35-6.0-3 | 35 | $6.0 \times 35.0$ | 3 | $3 \times 5$ | $1.00 \times 36 \times 4$ | 12 | 19.7 | 13.2 | 8.2 | 739 |
| SSP39-6.0-7 | 39 | $6.0 \times 39.0$ | 7 | $3 \times 5$ | $1.00 \times 36 \times 4$ | 11.5 | 9.2 | 4.3 | 0.6 | 642 |
| SSP39-6.0-3 | 39 | $6.0 \times 39.0$ | 3 | $3 \times 5$ | $1.00 \times 36 \times 4$ | 12 | 13 | 7.4 | 3.1 | 814 |

## FINISHES

| Standard |  | Galvanized |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BRZ | Bronze | G |
| BLK | Galvanized |  |
| GRY | Gray |  |
| GRN | Green |  |
| WHT | White |  |
| P | Primed |  |
| NA | Natural Aluminum |  |

Standard
BRZ Bronze

A Natural Aluminum

K-KLAD
K813 Bronze
$K 821$ Black
$K 841$ Gray
K891 Green
$K 881$ White
K845 Natural Aluminum

K-KLAD Over Galvanizing
KZ13 Bronze
KZ21 Black
KZ41 Gray
KZ91 Green
KZ81 White
KZ45 Natural Aluminum

## MOUNTING DESIGNATIONS

| Tenon Mount |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | :--- |
|  | $23 / 8^{\prime \prime} \times 4^{\prime \prime}$ TENON |  |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | $27 / 8^{\prime \prime} \times 4^{\prime \prime}$ TENON |  |
| 3.5 | $31 / 2^{\prime \prime} \times 6^{\prime \prime}$ TENON |  |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | $4^{\prime \prime} \times 6^{\prime \prime}$ TENON |  |


| Drill Mount |  |
| :---: | :--- |
| DM10 | Drilled for 1 Luminaire |
| DM2090 | Drilled for 2 Luminaires @ $90^{\circ}$ |
| DM2180 | Drilled for 2 Luminaires @ $180^{\circ}$ |
| DM3090 | Drilled for 3 Luminaires @ $90^{\circ}$ |
| DM4090 | Drilled for 4 Luminaires @ $90^{\circ}$ |


| Open Mount |  | Gain Mount |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OT | Open Top | 1GSS4 | (1) CXA |
| OTC | Open Top includes Pole Cap | 2GSS4 | (2) CXA's located on the Same Side |
|  |  | 3GSS4 | (3) CXA's located on the Same Side |
|  |  | 4GSS4 | (4) CXA's located on the Same Side |
|  |  | 2GBB4 | (2) CXA's located Back to Back |
|  |  | 4GBB4 | (4) CXA's located Back to Back |
|  |  | 1GSS9 | (1) CXASQ |
|  |  | 2GSS9 | (2) CXASQ's located on the Same Side |
|  |  | 3GSS9 | (3) CXASQ's located on the Same Side |
|  |  | 4GSS9 | (4) CXASQ's located on the Same Side |
|  |  | 2GBB9 | (2) CXASQ's located Back to Back |
|  |  | 4GBB9 | (4) CXASQ's located Back to Back |

## OPTIONS

There are numerous options that can be ordered. Please indicate these selections under the options column in the catalog number. Example: CPL-WPR2-BC.

```
Accessories
    BC Base Cover
    CPL Threaded Coupling*
    NPL Threaded Nipple*
WPRP Festoon Opening**
    LAB Less Anchor Bolt
```

Optional Handholes
58HH $5^{\prime \prime} \times 8^{\prime \prime}$ Handhole*
Extra Handholes
XHH Extra Handhole*

| Embedment Pole Options |  |
| ---: | :--- |
| E | Embedded Pole |
| GS | Ground Sleeve |
| CTE | Coal Tar Epoxy |

For Embedment Poles:

CTE Coal Tar Epoxy
Recommended Mounting Height Recommended Embedment Depth

Additional Simplex
Less than 20
$4^{\prime}$
20' - 33' 6'
Greater than 33' 7'
1S 1 @ $00^{*}$
Greater embedment depths are available upon request.
2S 2 @ $180^{\circ}$ *
Embedment poles greater than 35' are not available.
3S 3 @ $90^{\circ}$ *
4S 4 @ $90^{\circ}$ *

* Please advise size, location, and orientation. (Handholes are restricted by size of pole shaft diameter)
** Located 24" above baseplate and same side as handhole. (No electrical included)


## PACKAGING

Immediately after coating, the lighting standard including the baseplate shall be wrapped in heavy corrugation specially designed and sized to achieve maximum protection in transit
KW Industries, Inc. coating process system and stringent quality control procedures provide our customer the finest quality lighting standards in the industry.


November 13, 2023

Mr. Ryan Miller
City of Rockwall Director of Planning
385 S. Goliad
Rockwall, TX 75087

## Re: SP2023-xxx Exceptions/ Variances Requested

Flex Office/ Warehouse Development
1760 Airport Road
Rockwall, TX. 75087

Mr. Miller,

I am writing to formally request exceptions/variances to specific sections of the UDC (Unified Development Code) as detailed below:

1. Primary \& Secondary Articulation Standards - UDC Subsection 04.01 Cl of Article 5.
2. $90 \%$ Primary/ $10 \%$ Secondary Material - UDC Subsection 05.01 A. 1 (a) of Article 05.
3. Screening of Loading Docks (Bay Doors) - UDC Subsection 05.02 (A) of Article 08.

Our architectural design team has made following design changes to lessen the effects of above variances.

- Primary and Secondary Articulation Standards Variance - We have tried to meet the spirit of the code with respect to these articulation standards in order to achieve the same look the city is seeking. One, we have created a version of vertical articulation with a stair step pattern across the top parapets of the front and side façades which provides a visual line break. Two, we are providing covered awnings at each entry point.

- $\quad \mathbf{9 0 \%}$ Primary Materials \& $\mathbf{1 0} \%$ Secondary Materials Variance - We are requesting that the materials requirement not be applied to the hidden rear side elevations of interior buildings 2-7. Building 1 meets all material requirements standards i.e. 90\% Primary Material, $10 \%$ Secondary Material, less than 50\% Stucco, and minimum $20 \%$ natural stone. The front, left, and right elevations of Buildings 2-7 meet all material requirements standards.
- $\quad$ Screening of Loading Docks (Bay Doors) Variance - This variance pertains to required 3 -tier screening of bay doors on buildings $6 \& 7$. Due to the FAA runway protection zone in the southwest corner of the property, we are unable to extend 3-tier screening along the western property line all the way to the southwest corner - we stopped at the boundary of FAA restriction zone. However, we upgraded the caliper size of canopy trees from 4 " to 5 ", and planted taller than normal shrubs in the FAA restricted zone.

We are providing 2 compensatory items for each requested variance for a total of eight (8) compensatory items for this development. They are detailed below:

- ( 2 points) - We are providing 2 canopy trees along the east property line behind buildings $2 \& 3$
- (1 point) - We are providing 3 tier screening along the west property line from Airport Road to the FAA line. We are continuing the screening along the west property line to provide additional screening of the loading dock area with taller shrubs in the FAA Zone
- (1 point) - We are providing to upgrade the canopy trees in the 3-tier screening along the west property line from $4 "$ to $5^{\prime \prime}$ trees.
- (2 points) - We are providing two (2) decorative benches west of building 1 along the landscape detention pond.
- (1 point) - We are providing more landscaping than required
- (1 point) - We are providing a row of canopy trees $40^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ on center along the Railroad south property line.


Thank you for your consideration and reviewing our request. We can adjust the actual location of these trees per your recommendations.

Sincerely,


Deepak "Roy" Bhavi

Principal \& Founder | FlexSpace Business Parks

