



**Meeting Minutes  
Planning and Zoning Commission**

---

**Tuesday, March 11, 2025**

**5:00 PM**

**Council Chamber**

---

*4:30 - 5:00 PM - Work Session for Agenda Review*

Chairman Mercer opened the work session at 4:30 p.m.

City Planner, Jessica Rees, presented Case PZ 25-002 via PowerPoint. Applicant Laura Lee Gunn, with Masterplan, representing deBoulle Diamonds requesting the creation of a Planned Development District with a detailed site plan for the property located at 6821 Preston Road. An image was shown of the two hundred (200) foot buffer around the property. Property owners within this buffer received notice of the public hearing by mail. Of twenty-two (22) notices mailed out, six (6) responses were received back. Four (4) were in favor and two (2) were opposed of the creation of the Planned Development District.

Mrs. Rees displayed the current structure's height, the ordinance's max height and the proposed height of the new addition to the structure.

*Call to Order*

Chairman Blair Mercer called the meeting to order at 5:04 p.m.

*Introduction of Commission Members*

Present: (7) Chairman Blair Mercer, John Walsh, Rusty Goff, Steve Hudson, Thomas Russell, Brian Smoot and Duncan Fulton

Seated: (5) Chairman Blair Mercer, John Walsh, Rusty Goff, Steve Hudson and Thomas Russell

Excused: (3) Ben Biddle, James Bristow and David Delorenzo

City Council Liaison: (1) Melissa Rieman

*Staff in Attendance*

Jessica Rees, City Planner  
Mary Oates, Community Development Technician  
Rob Dillard, City Attorney

[PZ 25-002](#)

PZ 25-002: Applicant Laura Lee Gunn, with Masterplan, representing DeBoulle Diamonds requesting the creation of a Planned Development District with a detailed site plan for the property located at 6821 Preston Road.

Chairman Blair Mercer read Case PZ 25-002

City Planner, Jessica Rees, presented Case PZ 25-002 via PowerPoint. Applicant Laura Lee Gunn, with Masterplan, representing deBoulle Diamonds requesting the creation of a Planned Development District with a detailed site plan for the property located at 6821 Preston Road. An image was shown of the two hundred (200) foot buffer around the property. Property owners within this buffer received notice of the public hearing by mail. Of twenty-two (22) notices mailed out, six (6) responses were received back. Four (4) were in favor and two (2) were opposed of the creation of the Planned Development District.

Mrs. Rees shows an aerial view of the property explaining that there is general retail to the north and the south and the current property is also general retail with residential behind it. The renderings of the proposed modifications was shown as well. The next rendering shows what is happening to the site. The existing building that sits at 12,017 square feet. The second story expansion over the existing parking lot, the exterior demolition that will be done to the structure and then the rest of the modifications that they are proposing. The building will increase to 16,552 square feet.

There were a few issues that staff has that were brought up by the opposition letters that staff did receive. The height is the first one. The general retail zoning ordinance does have a max height of forty (40) feet. The existing structure which is legal nonconforming, sits at forty-six (46) feet and the proposed addition will increase that height to forty-nine (49) feet. The existing structure does meet setbacks that as called out in the general retail zoning ordinance and is even set back even further than some of the requirements. The rear setback for the existing structure is roughly 54.5 feet. The zoning ordinance requirement is 12.6 feet and the proposed addition rear setback would be two (2) feet from the rear property line. Regarding parking, the existing structure totals 12,017 square feet requiring fifty-two (52) parking spaces by code. The property currently only has eighteen (18) parking spaces on site. The proposed structure will increase to 16,552 square feet requiring sixty-seven (67) parking spaces. The addition to the building will eliminate on site parking spaces, reducing from eighteen (18) to thirteen (13). So the addition to the building will eliminate some existing parking spaces on site. They will also have to do some re-striping in the parking lot because some of the existing parking spaces do not meet city standards today. So, with making those all fit correctly, there will only be thirteen (13) parking spaces on private property. We did briefly discuss the parking spaces that are in the right of way over on Grassmere and Preston. Since those are not fully on private property, those are considered public parking spaces that the city has and those are available to anyone in the public. Therefore, those spaces would not be included in the parking calculation.

Staff has voiced the concerns with this item based on those comments that

were received from the neighborhood. Staff recommends that the board conduct a public hearing, hear those comments, have a discussion and forward a recommendation onto City Council.

Dallas Cothrum with Masterplan representing the DeBoulle family addressed the board stating that if there are small things that are wrong, they would rather take the time to get everything right. This started because the owner has outgrown the building in terms of the back office people. He also stated that the DeBoulle family wants to keep their business in University Park so he started in Snider Plaza in 1983 and has stayed here. Mr. DeBoulle is the second best sales tax payer in University Park. Having Mr. DeBoulle stay and bringing with him this new Patek boutique which will help expand his business were the driving forces. Dallas showed a parking count of parking spaces being used and different times of the day. Dallas showed a slide comparing the current DeBoulles, Snider Plaza and the proposed DeBoulles with Patek sales tax per acre. He also showed the tax increase with the City Property tax and the HPISD Property tax.

Dallas shows the renderings from Omniplan for the proposed addition. Including the inside entertainment space that they have already been having events there for private purposes only. Letters were sent out to everyone within 1,000 feet of the property from Dallas and the DeBoulles. The letters sent out were sent out to invite the neighbors to come and hear their proposal and voice their opinions. Only 8 out of 60 or 70 attended the meeting at the store. Additional phone calls have come in to Dallas and Laura Lee and they have sent out the packet and had conversations with them.

Dennis DeBoulle , CEO of DeBoulle Diamonds, addressed Board Member Walsh's question of whether or not they have purposely parked a car on Grassmere to appear open. Mr. DeBoulle stated that they will take his and an employee car and park it in the front so that people will know that they are open because they do not have an open sign on the building.

Chairman Mercer confirmed with Dallas that they will be losing five (5) spots. Dallas confirmed and stated that they would be getting a licensing agreement with the city for the public spots on Grassmere and Preston.

Dallas also stated that they dumpster that they are required to have, they do not need because they do not produce enough trash to need a dumpster and would be able to get one parking space back if a dumpster was not there.

Board Member Goff asked if the neighbor directly behind the property across the alley came to the neighborhood meeting seeing as this neighbor had the most to say as an opposition. Dallas stated that the neighbor did not come to the meeting, however, he did come to the store and meet with Mr. DeBoulle personally.

Dennis DeBoulle stated that during the meeting he had with the neighbor, his main concerns were, the height of the new addition blocking the sun, the top window being able to see into the neighbors window, the turn into the alley

would get tighter and he was opposed to the dumpster being added.

Dallas stated that if they needed to move the windows, they could do that.

William Cravens, the son of William Cravens, came up to speak in opposition of the proposal. Mr. Cravens stated that he and his family owned and developed 4115 Grassmere since 1997. He states that he and his father has two (2) chief complaints. First of which is the parking. Reducing parking but adding square footage does not make sense to him. Also, he states that the parking on Grassmere is already very congested to the point that residents have to acquire a parking permit to park on the street overnight. Mr. Cravens says that as the owner and manager of that property, it is already very difficult to get delivery trucks through that street to accept deliveries of appliances as it is in its current position today. Their feeling is that the increased square footage will further hinder resident's ability to freely move through that street. The other concern is the setback and height of the proposed building. With the building going to forty-nine (49) feet, that will keep the sun from coming onto their property where it is already hard enough to get grass to grow on that property. Regarding the setback, they are proposing a setback of two (2) feet when the standard is 12.5. It would make it difficult for the residents and Mr. Cravens when he is managing the property to make the turn into the garage with that being the only access the residents have to the garage. They also have an issue with construction of the addition and how it will disrupt Grassmere and the alley. There is not any area for staging during the construction. The Cravens were not apart of the meeting that DeBoules held because they discovered an anomaly with their address on DCAD (Dallas County Appraisal District). If they would have gotten the invite, they would have gone to the meeting and voiced their concerns there as well. Mr. Cravens states that they are hoping that the board denies the request.

Dallas states that they will have to shuttle the construction workers during the construction. They do not currently have a plan because they do not have a company assigned yet.

Chairman Mercer summed up the comments made by the board. Windows in the rear will be looked at so that they are not looked on the triplex across the alley. The architect will take a look at lowering the height of the structure. Gather more information about the licensing agreement for the public parking spots. Regarding events, the board will make sure that staff properly writes into the PD that the events are solely in use for the owner. And staff look into a dumpster waiver.

Mr. Rob Dillard, City Attorney, confirmed that the public hearing should be tabled and continued.

**A motion was made by Board Member Walsh to table case PZ 25-002 until the next scheduled meeting on April 8, 2025 with the consideration that members expect the applicant to answer the questions that were proposed by the chairman along with any other questions they learn about from neighbors and bring any other materials brought by the architect and regarding parking. The motion was seconded by Board Member Russell. The motion was carried by a**

unanimous vote.

*Consider the previous meeting minutes with or without corrections:*

[25-054](#)

P&Z Meeting Minutes - 01/14/2025

A motion was made by Board Member Hudson, seconded by Board Member Walsh, that the minutes be approved. The motion was carried by unanimous vote.

**ADJOURNMENT:** With there being no further business before the Board, Chairman Mercer adjourned the meeting at 6:13 p.m.

Approved by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Acting Chairman, James Bristow

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date



**Meeting Minutes  
Planning and Zoning Commission**

---

**Tuesday, April 8, 2025**

**5:00 PM**

**Council Chamber**

---

*4:30 - 5:00 PM - Work Session for Agenda Review*

Acting Chairman Bristow opened the work session at 4:30 p.m.

City Planner Jessica Rees presented Case PZ 25-003 via PowerPoint. Applicant Joe Martin, with Paragon Sports Constructors, representing Highland Park Independent School District requesting the amendment of Planned Development District 33 with a new detailed landscape plan to allow synthetic turf and tree removal. The property is located at 4102 Grassmere Lane. An image was shown of the two hundred (200) feet buffer around the property. Property owners within this buffer received notice of the public hearing by mail. Of thirty-one (31) notices mailed out, one (1) response was received back opposing the request.

Mrs. Rees displayed a landscape plan showing the proposed synthetic turf field.

City Planner Jessica Rees presented Case PZ 25-002 via PowerPoint. Applicant Laura Lee Gunn, with Masterplan, representing deBouille Diamonds requesting the creation of a Planned Development District with a detailed site plan for the property located at 6821 Preston Road.

Mrs. Rees addressed the outstanding issues that staff has with the case including, the building height, the rear setback and the parking.

*Call to Order*

Acting Chairman Bristow called the meeting to order at 5:02 p.m.

*Introduction of Commission Members*

Present: (5) Acting Chairman James Bristow, Duncan Fulton, Thomas Russell, Ben Biddle and Brian Smoot

Seated: (5) Acting Chairman James Bristow, Duncan Fulton, Thomas Russell, Ben Biddle and Brian Smoot

Excused: (4) Chairman Blair Mercer, John Walsh, Steve Hudson, Rusty Goff and David Delorenzo

*Staff in Attendance*

Jessica Rees, City Planner  
Mary Oates, Community Development Technician  
Rob Dillard, City Attorney

[PZ 25-002](#)

PZ 25-002: Applicant Laura Lee Gunn, with Masterplan, representing Deboulle Diamonds requesting the creation of a Planned Development District with a detailed site plan for the property located at 6821 Preston Road.

Acting Chairman Bristow read Case PZ 25-002. He explained that this item was discussed at the last meeting and the public hearing and was left opened to be continued from that meeting. We are going to continue that public hearing now.

Mrs. Rees reinstated that this is a continuation and we did leave open the public hearing. The board did have some concerns and had somethings that they wanted the applicant to take a look at and see if there were any modification that could be made to the original proposal and then come back. There are a few changes that were made.

City Planner Jessica Rees presented Case PZ 25-002 via PowerPoint. Applicant Laura Lee Gunn, with Masterplan, representing deBoulle Diamonds requesting the creation of a Planned Development District with a detailed site plan for the property located at 6821 Preston Road.

With this being a continuation, staff did not do another legal notice or any additional mailings for the public hearing since we are continuing. Staff did receive another email from the property owner next door behind the property. They were the ones that came and spoke in opposition of the request in the previous meeting and had met with the applicant to go over some of the adjustments that were made so they wanted to respond to that. Copies of the response were provided to the board prior to the meeting.

Mrs. Rees presented the proposed rendering that was provided to staff of the proposed additions and renovations to that structure.

The three outstanding issues from the last meeting were, height, rear setback and parking. Those were the three biggest ones. We did talk about possibly having the applicant do a solar study to see if that much taller structure would effect any of the neighboring properties. We talked about the windows on the rear side of that structure. There have been changes made to those windows having film or something that will help them to not look out onto the neighboring property.

Getting into the three outstanding issues:

Height. The existing ordinance talks about a maximum height of forty (40) feet. There was a little confusion on how tall the actual structure is currently. It

was said it was forty-six (46) feet but after going back and looking at their revisions and everything, they found out that the actual height of the existing structure is fifty (50) feet tall. With looking at the height of the existing structure, what they had present before at forty-nine (49) feet, the new plan has talked about lowering that height to forty-six (46) feet eleven (11) inches. So they did look at it and change it from forty-nine (49) feet to forty-six (46) eleven (11) in this revision.

Rear Setback. Zoning ordinance code requires a twelve (12) six (6) rear setback for this structure. The original proposal that we looked at had a two (2) foot setback. After looking at the revisions in the last month, they did take that structure to a five (5) foot setback from that rear property line by the alley. Mrs. Rees shows an image that shows that there will be a film on those windows that are above seven (7) feet so that way they cannot be looked out of. The structure will be set back five (5) feet but the parking spaces will come out to that property line.

Parking. With the size and uses of the existing structure, it requires fifty-two (52) spaces on site. They are currently at sixteen (16) or eighteen (18) space. With this new renovation and addition, the new square footage would require sixty-seven (67) parking spaces straight code by the uses. The addition to the structure, would only allow thirteen (13) parking spaces to be on private property as of right now. The required by code would be sixty-seven (67) and they are providing thirteen (13) on site. There are additional parking spaces that are located off of Grassmere and off of Preston Road. Those parking spaces are actually public parking spaces, so they do not count towards this property. There was talk of possibly doing a licensing agreement with the city to use those spaces for the structure as far as staff is aware after checking with everyone in the Public Works department, nobody has started any of those conversations to look at doing a license agreement for those spaces. And so again those are public parking spaces, so those seventeen (17) or so parking spaces do not count towards this structure. Another thing we did briefly discuss in the work session was the size of the parking spaces. By code our parking spaces need to be 9X20, that is the minimum for our parking spaces. Looking at the size of the lot and the building and what room that they have it looks like the parking spaces they are requesting to have would be 9X8 feet parking spaces under that second floor addition in that rear of the property.

Staff recommends that the Planning and Zoning Commission continue this Public Hearing for the creation of the Planned Development district to listen to public comments and if the board wishes, forward a recommendation to City Council.

Board Member Russell asked Mrs. Rees if the original property owner that had the discussions with DeBoulle, were they satisfied with the with what they are wanting to do. Mrs. Rees explained that as per the emailed that staff received and gave to the board, it does not seem like they are completely happy with the changes that were made regarding the setback and the height.

Dallas Cothrum with Masterplan asked hold the public hearing open for



another month. He stated that they think they made progress with the neighbor but they probably are not all the way there. They want to try and come back to the board with more clear details. They are also asking now for a new door on the front for the Patek Boutique.

They have lowered the height from fifty (50) to forty-six (46) eleven (11) and they are not going to change that. They have lowered the height in the back as low as they can and are at a nine (9) foot ceiling in the new addition and really can't go any lower based on the existing floor plate. They have had several meetings with the neighbor and will continue to do so to get closer to some sort of resolution.

Acting Chairman Bristow requested that if they are interested in discussing any licensing agreement with the city for the public parking spots, those conversations need to be had before the next meeting. Mr. Cothrum stated that the city manager had asked him not to do that but states that he will start those conversations as per the board's direction.

**A motion was made by Board Member Thomas Russell, seconded by Board Member Duncan Fulton that the discussion will be postponed and the public hearing remain open until the May 13, 2025 meeting. The motion was carried by a unanimous vote.**

[PZ 25-003](#)

PZ 25-003: Applicant Joe Martin, with Paragon Sports Constructors, representing Highland Park Independent School District requesting the amendment of Planned Development District 33 with a new detailed landscape plan to allow synthetic turf and tree removal. The property is located at 4102 Grassmere Lane.

Acting Chairman Bristow read Case PZ 25-003

City Planner Jessica Rees presented Case PZ 25-003 via PowerPoint. Applicant Joe Martin, with Paragon Sports Constructors, representing Highland Park Independent School District requesting the amendment of Planned Development District 33 with a new detailed landscape plan to allow synthetic turf and tree removal. The property is located at 4102 Grassmere Lane. An image was shown of the two hundred (200) feet buffer around the property. Property owners within this buffer received notice of the public hearing by mail. Of thirty-one (31) notices mailed out, one (1) response was received back opposing the request.

Mrs. Rees displayed the location of the proposed landscape plan for the synthetic turf field. She explained that the applicant is requesting to remove all existing trees and shrubbery from the lot. A drainage plan was shown for the entire lot. Staff recommends that the Planning and Zoning Commission conduct a Public Hearing for the Planned Development district amendment to listen to public comments and forward a recommendation to City Council.

Casey Clyce with Paragon Sports Constructors explained the importance of removing the existing trees and shrubbery. He stated that they would all need to be removed so that the root barriers would not be under there messing up the field. They will need to stabilize the dirt under the field as per the geo tech report. The field will give the school more room for kids in band, soccer, field hockey, etc. Acting Chairman Bristow questioned if the turf would go completely corner to corner of the lot. Mr. Clyce confirmed that the turf would

in fact cover every square inch of the entire lot including where the trees currently sit.

**A motion was made by Board Member Biddle, seconded by Board Member Smoot, that a recommendation be sent to City Council to approve the request to amend the Planned Development District 33 with a new detailed landscape plan. The motion was carried by a unanimous vote.**

*Consider the previous meeting minutes with or without corrections:*

[25-071](#)

P&Z Meeting Minutes - 03.11.25

**A motion was made by Board Member Smoot, seconded by Board Member Fulton, that the minutes be approved. The motion was carried by a unanimous vote.**

**ADJOURNMENT: With there being no further business before the Board, Acting Chairman Bristow adjourned the meeting at 5:44p.m.**

Approved by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman, Blair Mercer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date



**Meeting Minutes  
Planning and Zoning Commission**

---

**Tuesday, May 13, 2025**

**5:00 PM**

**Council Chamber**

---

*4:30 - 5:00 PM - Work Session for Agenda Review*

Chairman Blair Mercer opened the work session at 4:29 p.m.

City Planner Jessica Rees presented Case PZ 25-002 via PowerPoint. Applicant Laura Lee Gunn, with Masterplan, representing deBoulle Diamonds requesting the creation of a Planned Development District with a detailed site plan for the property at 6821 Preston Road.

Mrs. Rees addressed the outstanding issues that staff and the planning and zoning commissioners have with the case including, the building height, the rear setback and the parking.

*Call to Order*

Chairman Blair Mercer called the meeting to order at 5:03 p.m.

*Introduction of Commission Members*

Present: (8) Chairman Blair Mercer, James Bristow, Duncan Fulton, Brian Smoot, Thomas Russell, Rusty Goff, Steve Hudson and Ben Biddle

Seated: (5) Chairman Blair Mercer, James Bristow, Duncan Fulton, Brian Smoot and Thomas Russell

Excused: (2) John Walsh and David Delorenzo

City Council Liaison: (1) Melissa Rieman

*Staff in Attendance*

Jessica Rees, City Planner  
Mary Oates, Community Development Technician  
Rob Dillard, City Attorney

[PZ 25-002](#)

PZ 25-002: Applicant Laura Lee Gunn, with Masterplan, representing DeBoulle Diamonds requesting the creation of a Planned Development District with a detailed site plan for the property located at 6821 Preston Road.

Chairman Mercer read Case PZ 25-002. Applicant Laura Lee Gunn, with

Masterplan, representing deBoulle Diamonds requesting the creation of a Planned Development District with a detailed site plan for the property at 6821 Preston Road.

City Planner Jessica Rees began with stating that this is the third meeting for this item. She stated that we have had time to look at some renderings, talk to the applicants and get some community input.

Staff did not do the mailings of the notices again since this item has been tabled for the past few meetings.

The three outstanding issues that we have been talking about for the last three (3) months are, height, rear setback and parking.

Height. The current zoning ordinance for this zoning district talks about a maximum height of forty (40) feet. For a PD you can request different changes which is what is being done for this item. The original proposal had about forty-nine (49) feet. The actual height of the existing structure is fifty (50) feet tall. Based on the talks at the meetings and staff talks with the applicant, they have reduced that height to forty-six (46) feet eleven (11) inches. So that is the proposed maximum height for the structure.

The second issue that we have discussed throughout this process is the rear setback. The current zoning requires it to be at twelve (12) foot six (6) inches rear setback from the rear property line. The original proposal had a two (2) foot setback, the second proposal had a five (5) foot setback and this new proposal has a two (2) foot six (6) inch rear set back and that is for the building itself.

They are wanting to add some screening to the back area so that way the cars are more secure in there. They are proposing to have the building at two and half (2 1/2) feet and then the screening fence would be on the property line in the rear area.

Parking. Parking is something we talk about with everything we do with the city. The building itself has onsite parking. That parking back there is not all uniform in space dimensions and such. With this new addition that they are proposing, and with re striping those parking spaces, they have about eighteen (18) onsite now and with these modifications, they will go down to thirteen (13) close to official 9X18 parking spaces back there on private property. There are some parking spaces that are along Grassmere and Preston and those are considered public parking spaces because they are located half in the public right of way so they are not fully on private property. Which we have talked about that as well.

Those are the three outstanding things we have been talking about through this whole planned development creation process. Staff recommends that the Planning and Zoning Commission conduct a Public Hearing for the creation of the Planned Development district to listen to public comments and forward a recommendation to City Council.

Tipp Housewright with Omniplan Architects as the design firm working with

the Boulle family for this project spoke to the commissioners. He stated that after many years, it is time to expand the business, freshen up the store and provide a space for the new boutique for Patek watches. Mr. Housewright presented the proposal via PowerPoint to the commissioners.

Dallas Cothrum addressed the commissioners with information regarding the deBoulle business. He states that they went out and asked for support for the proposal. Dallas provided a list of people in the community that are in support of the proposal. He shows that from where the screen on the building is, there is two and a half (2 1/2) feet from the property line. Then there is fifteen (15) feet of right of way to the neighbor's property line and the neighbor's landscaping is shown in part of the right of way too. He states that there's certainly more than twelve and a half (12 1/2) feet of separation between the two so they are not technically meeting code but they are certainly meeting it more than the spirit of what the adjacency is to it. Dallas shows other business that are setback very close to neighboring multifamily buildings throughout the city.

Chairman Mercer opened up the public hearing for anyone in favor of the proposal to speak.

David Projabian, property owner of 6619 Snider Plaza and is also the chairman of the Snider Plaza Parking Task Force spoke in favor of the proposal. He states that this is a company that adds a lot to University Park and he would hate to see them go somewhere else for a number of reasons.

Liz Farley at 3200 Greenbrier also spoke in favor of the proposal. She states how elegant and beautiful the design is and doesn't want the city to loose the business over two (2) feet in the back or the middle of the building being too tall. She also stated that Patek Phillippe will create tax revenue for the city that she wishes we could find in many more stores throughout the city. When you look at the financials of the city in the next five (5) years, more revenue is needed and the state is making it more difficult. She thinks it's a wonderful partnership with a great city and an incredible brand. She thinks we should be working towards a solution to welcome them and be grateful to have a building like this in the city. She has found that serving on the council, that gifts that have been brought to the city and offered, they will go elsewhere and other cities nearby will benefit.

Dr. Pete Dicer that has lived in University Park on Centenary for thirty-eight (38) years also spoke in favor of the proposal. He states that he thinks this will help raise the bar and set an example for future development. He thinks there is a strong economic rational to do this and is in total support of what they are proposing.

Chairman Mercer asked if anyone wanted to speak that is opposed to the proposal.

William Cravens is the property owner of 4515 Grassmere. He has owned the property since 1996. He has three (3) units in the building and rent those units

to three (3) different families currently. He states that the tenants will be highly impacted by these modifications. Mr. Cravens states that this is classified as a jewelry store and jewelry stores are residential uses and remain residential uses no matter who owns them. It would be very difficult to come up with a plan of designated uses in the future if it were to come down to that. His second concern would be that there is eighteen thousand (18000) square feet of space of what is anticipated with these improvements and at that many square feet, if you are running a retail operation, the parking ratio is 1:200. 1:200 would lead you to believe that there should be ninety-two (92) parking places for this improved space. The tenant has currently fifteen (15) or sixteen (16) parking places and is planning to drop down to thirteen (13) or fourteen (14). In the past he has used the spaces on Grassmere and Preston Road for exclusive use with signs out in place state that people would be towed if they parked in those public parking spaces. If the commission creates a setback line of two (2) feet as the applicant is requesting, this will then set a precedence for all the rest of the properties up and down Preston and where then would they park. He states that this is just bad planning for this particular location at this particular format. If the applicant is required to have ninety-one (91) parking spaces and they have tried to reduce that by somewhat claiming that a goodly portion of the building is office space, but they do not want to setback as office space, because office space is one (1) setback foot for every two (2) feet of height which would put it in the twenty-four (24) to twenty-six (26) range of setback from the rear. He states that it's inappropriate for someone to try to get this parking problem solved both ways and they can't have it both ways. If you are going to have an office building then you need to have parking for an office building or if you are going to have a retail store, have parking for a retail. The building that they are proposing creates such shade that Mr. Cravens building cannot get six and a half (6 1/2) hours of sunlight to grow St. Augustine grass. The overriding concern that Mr. Cravens has is one of traffic, parking and safety. He states that it is a very dangerous spot for garbage trucks to come from that alley onto Glenwick. In addition to the fact that there are telephone poles right up against the alley on the West side of the property which are closer to the alley than his bushes. Mr. Cravens states that he does not think it is a safe situation, it does not make since from a planning stand point and it has an effect on the surrounding properties. He hopes that Mr. Boulle can make his project work and it would be excellent for the city. But, Mr. Cravens cannot let Mr. Boulle do it when it has a detrimental effect on his property.

Dallas Colthum approached the commissioners again stating that if the changes were made for the Planned Development, anything changed would be a code issue and citations and/or warnings would be issued from the code enforcement officers. In regards to traffic, safety and parking, it is already a dense area and deBoules is not contributing to those issues. He also states that they did the shade study and there wasn't much time of shading the neighboring building.

Commissioner Russell states that he drives by the property multiple times a day and has never had trouble finding a parking spot in front of deBoules or had trouble finding a parking spot in front of the CVS pharmacy so parking is not an issue in his concern.

Commissioner Fulton states that his issue with the proposition is a safety issue. He states that he would not have an issue with the project if they could achieve the twelve (12) foot setback. He states that reluctantly he will not be able to support this proposal despite the fact that the Boule family is an important part of the community and has an excellent business.

Commissioner Smoot states that the parking is very disturbing to him. He does not feel he can support this unless this space be specifically designated so that it could not change in the future.

Commissioner Bristow states that he is concerned with the parking but suggested that the business have a license with the city to use the public parking spots.

Dallas suggested that the PD be created specifically as a high end jewelry store and that it would have to stay a jewelry store.

Chairman Mercer states that there is already a parking issue with the current structure the way it sits and there isn't any proposal that will fix that.

Jessica Rees addressed the commissioners stating that they could recommend that the space be limited to office and jewelry and limit the space used for each for this specific location for future uses.

Chairman Mercer reminds the commissioners that they are here to send a recommendation to City Council, not to officially approve or deny the proposal.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Bristow, seconded by Commissioner Russell that the proposal be sent to City Council with encouragement that they consider the comments that the Planning and Zoning Commission had including the consideration of a land use limitation for the retail and office purposes of the property. This motion was carried by a three (3) to two (2) vote in favor of the motion.**

*Consider the previous meeting minutes with or without corrections:*

[25-107](#)

P&Z Meeting Minutes - 04.08.25

**A motion was made by Commissioner Fulton, seconded by Commissioner Smoot, that the minutes be approved. The motion was carried by a unanimous vote.**

**ADJOURNMENT: With there being no further business before the Commissioners, Chairman Mercer adjourned the meeting at 5:53 p.m.**

Approved by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman, Blair Mercer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

