

MINUTES
Main Street Board
Meeting of September 19, 2011

The Main Street Development and Preservation Board of the City of Cedar Hill, Texas met on Monday, September 19, 2011 at 6:00 pm. in Conference Room D-106 of the Cedar Hill Government Center.

The following members were present; Al Armistead, Lois Cannady, Jerry Korkisch, Albert Mack, Jami McCain, Norman Patten and Russell Read. The following City Staff members were present; Don Gore, City Planner, Rod Tyler, Director of Planning and Belinda Huff, Development Services Coordinator

I. Call the meeting to order.

Chairman Russell Read called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm declaring it an open meeting with notice of the meeting duly posted and a quorum present.

II. Review and Consider site plan proposal and building elevations for office conversion of house located at 401 Houston Street, presented by Norman Patten of Norman Patten and Associates, Architecture and Planning.

Chairman Read asked Mr. Gore, Planner, to explain to the Board what changes have occurred to the site plan from the version previously approved.

Mr. Gore stated that the primary changes to the site plan show the removal of on-site parking and a large tree located in the street yard, as well as the addition of a sidewalk along Houston St.

Additionally Mr. Gore pointed out the inconsistencies with the plan relative to the Uptown Overlay District standards; specifically the requirement of a 30 ft. landscape buffer on street side yards and parking requirements to be located to the side or rear of the building.

Board member McCain asked Mr. Gore to illustrate where the 30 ft. and/or 5 ft. landscape buffer would be located.

Mr. Gore explained that the 5 ft. landscape buffer would be contained within the 30 ft. buffer required by the Uptown Overlay District standards, and pointed out where that would be located relative to this particular site.

Given Mr. Gore's explanation of the 30 ft. landscape buffer requirement, Chairman Read surmised that in order to accommodate this buffer, the existing structure would have to be removed, which is obviously not a feasible option for the applicant.

For reference, Board member McCain asked Mr. Gore to name an example of a property located in the Uptown area that has a 30 ft. landscape buffer.

Mr. Gore could not name a specific example, but stated that the Main Street Board has a history of granting variances to this particular requirement.

Board member Armistead asked the applicant to explain why they were considering a revised site plan after one was already approved.

Applicant Norman Patten of Norman Patten and Associates, 413 Cedar Street, Cedar Hill, TX 75104, stated that the site plan before the Main Street Board this evening was one of the versions previously seen by the Board; however, they did not formally act on it. This plan has been revised to show the addition of the sidewalk and the 7 parking spaces are shown on site, with no on street parking.

Chairman Read commented on the applicant's good faith effort to save a large tree located on site.

Mr. Patten noted that he made every attempt to save the tree, but because of the installation of the parking area, with all of the concrete that would be surrounding the tree, it would not survive. Mr. Patten also pointed out that the tree was not a protected tree, as defined by ordinance.

Board member Armistead stated that the pavement shown is basically the same as what was shown before. He also expressed concerns that more could have been done with the design on this site to come closer to complying with the Uptown Overlay District standards. He stated that he believes from the measurements he took at the site; 3 parking spaces could be provided to the rear of the site.

Mr. Patten stated that given the spacing requirements between the drive approach and the intersection, as specified by the City Engineer, it did not allow for adequate vehicular maneuvering in the rear.

Board member Armistead, referring to the Old Town Corridor zoning district standards, suggested that perhaps an alley could be constructed to accommodate a parking area in the rear. He again stressed that the Board should adhere to the ordinances currently in place and that he believed, based on the measurements he took, 3 parking spaces could be provided in the rear.

Mr. Patten stated that he has worked on the design of this site; trying several different configurations and there just is not enough maneuvering room to provide any parking in the rear.