

ITEM 3 HOLD PUBLIC HEARING FOR PLANNED DEVELOPMENT CASE NO. 12-01-PD AND CONSIDER RECOMMENDATION OF AN ORDINANCE.

Receive public input regarding a request for a Planned Development to change the zoning of BBB & C RR Survey, A-204, Tracts 5 and 5D; J. Doss Survey, A-441, Tracts 3C, 4A1, 4A1A, 4B, 4B1, 4B2, 4C, 5, 6, 6A, 6A1, 6A2, 6B, 6B1, 6B1A, and 6B2; and J. Havens Survey, A-685, Tracts 2A and 3; and Glade Parks Addition Block A, Lots 1 and 2, Block B, Lots 1 and 2, Block G, Lot 1, Block H, Lot 1 from Planned Development 1916 (PD 1916) to Planned Development (PD) zoning and consider recommendation for an Ordinance.

Stephen Cook, Senior Planner, gave a brief description of the case. The applicant, Glade 121, LP is requesting approval of modifications to the Glade Parks Planned Development (PD) zoning district (Ordinance Number 1916) in order to provide modified design regulations for signage throughout the development; update the associated graphics and exhibits of the Planned Development zoning district to accurately reflect current development goals for signage; and to create conditions for the development of a gas well pad site.

Previous modifications to the approximately 193 acre Glade Parks Planned Development zoning district was recommended for approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission on June 21, 2011 and approved by the City Council on June 28, 2011.

Unified Sign Development Plan

The developers of Glade Parks are seeking to amend the Unified Sign Development Plan of Glade Parks to allow the construction of monument signs specific to the outparcels of the development.

Section 7.9 of the Glade Parks Planned Development District sets standards (size, type and location) for all signs in non-residential areas as part of a Unified Sign Development Plan. The Sign Ordinance of the City of Euless provides that modifications to a Unified Sign Development Plan may be submitted to the City and approved by the City Council to determine a consistency and uniformity of signs within the development.

In the original Unified Sign Development Plan, individual monument signs for out parcels were not considered as part of the development. The state of the economy has created a need to make available to potential end users for the Glade Parks development, opportunities to gain competitive advantages through the use of additional marketing tools. While meeting the quality aesthetic standards established in the Glade Parks PD, the developer is requesting that uniform and consistent monument signs be allowed.

The following development standards would be established:

- Signs shall be constructed with a stone cladding to the ground with cast stone edging as depicted in the Exhibit BB.
- Setbacks will be set at the property line.
- Any signs proposed to be located within an easement would require approval from the City Manager.
- Signs located along the SH 121 frontage where there are issues with grade change will be measured in height from the grade at the property line.

Single Tenant Monument Signs

- Along SH 121 Frontage – Max six (6') feet in height by ten (10') feet wide.
- Along Rio Grande Blvd – Max three and a half (3.5') feet in height by six (6') feet wide.
- Along Cheek-Sparger - - Max six (6') feet in height by ten (10') feet wide.

Multi-Tenant Monument Signs

- Along SH 121 Frontage – Max eight (8') feet in height by ten (10') feet wide.
- Along Rio Grande Blvd – Max four and a half (4.5') feet in height by six (6') feet wide.

The physical location of the signs will be regulated through the sign permit process.

Gas Well Site

Consistent with the master planning of Glade Parks, the location of a gas drill site has been contemplated from the very start. There are multiple parties that have interest in this issue. The original owners of the property retained mineral rights and established a potential drill site when the property was sold to the current developer. A single family home builder has property under contract from the developer adjacent to the proposed gas drill site. In order to create a level playing field for all interested parties, the timing could not be any better to establish minimum distance relationships between the proposed development and the future gas drilling site. A major objective of the proposed amendments is to ensure that there is thorough and complete disclosure of information to potential home buyers related to the approved gas well site.

The proposed amendment language contained in a new Section 12 sets the minimum distance of the pad site exterior boundary and storage tanks on the pad site from the future surrounding single-family residential development, as represented on Exhibit II. The proposed amendment requires the pad site boundary be fenced with a masonry wall on areas which will be brought out of the floodplain and a sign erected which would clearly state that the area has been approved as a gas well site. It further sets out timelines for the construction and requires homeowner acknowledgements of the pad site prior to completion of the construction. Coupled with information that will be recorded by plat and included with some of the homebuilder's marketing materials,

these actions will enable potential home buyers within the subdivision to be fully aware that a gas well site has been approved at that location. All other provisions of the Chapter 40 "Gas Drilling and Production", except as modified with this amendment apply to future drilling.

Staff recommends approval of the Planned Development Ordinance.

Chairman McNeese asked for any proponents/opponents to come forward for any comments.

Charles Crook, 1506 Pioneer Parkway, Arlington, Texas, spoke. He attended as a proponent of the amendments on behalf of the Harrington family. We wanted it to be noted on the record that he was supportive of the gas related amendments that will establish specific provisions for a development of a future gas drill site.

Seeing no others wanting to speak, the public hearing was closed.

There were no questions among the Commission.

Commissioner Huffman made a motion to approve case #12-01-PD

Chairman McNeese said that he thought what staff had brought forward, working with the developer, will get us a quality product that conforms to the vision created in the Planned Development.

There were no other comments or questions among the Commission.

Commissioner Brown seconded the motion. The vote was as follows:

Ayes: Chairman McNeese, Vice Chairman Mennis, Commissioners Huffman, Portugal, Tompkins, and Brown.

Nays: None

Abstention: None

The motion carried (6-0-0).