



# City of University Park

City Hall  
3800 University Blvd.  
University Park, TX 75205

## Meeting Minutes Planning and Zoning Commission

---

Tuesday, April 13, 2021

5:00 PM

Via Video Conference

---

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

The work session was called to order at 4:42 PM.

Prior to staff's presentation, Chairman West questioned if this meeting's motion can include that the applicant provide a detailed site plan. Jessica Rees, City Planner, stated a detailed site plan is not required for Zoning requests, but asked the City Attorney if special exceptions can be included in the motion.

Rob Dillard, City Attorney, clarified that zoning requests, such as PZ 21-002, typically do not consist of special conditions and both UC-1 and UC-2 have significant restrictions. Mr. Dillard stated if this Commission would like to include special conditions, he feels the applicant would not object to that.

Chairman West asked staff to proceed with their presentation.

Mrs. Rees presented case PZ 21-002 via PowerPoint. An aerial view of the two-hundred foot (200') buffer, SOR report, satellite view of the site address and the updated site plan was explained and displayed.

Chairman West questioned if SMU has considered re-zoning to UC-3 rather than UC-2. Mrs. Rees stated this has not been considered due to UC-3 being more restrictive. She stated the uses for UC-1 and UC-2 are similar and allow for future projects, such as the Moody Building.

Chairman West and Mr. Dillard clarified the Eastern most boundary for the main campus (Dublin Street).

Commissioner Mercer stated residents are not in favor of a parking garage and they would like more details for the potential projects under UC-2 zone. Chairman West agreed.

With no further questions to staff, Chairman West asked Mrs. Rees to present item PZ 21-003.

Mrs. Rees presented case PZ 21-003 via PowerPoint. An aerial view of the two-hundred foot (200') buffer, SOR report and proposed site plan was explained and displayed.

Commissioner Walsh questioned if the proposed green space will be accessible to neighbors or located behind the proposed wall. Mrs. Rees

stated this area will remain open, based on the provided site plan.

The work session closed at 5:00 PM.

#### *Call to Order*

Chairman West called the meeting to order at 5:00 PM.

#### *Introduction of Commission Members*

**Present:** 5 - Chairman Bob West, Commissioner John Walsh III, Commissioner Rusty Goff, Commissioner Phillip Philbin, and Blair Mercer

**Excused:** 2 - Commissioner Doug Roach, and Commissioner David DeLorenzo

**Seated:** 3 - Commissioner Jerry Jordan, Commissioner James Bristow, and Commissioner Doug Hanna

#### *Staff in Attendance*

Jessica Rees, City Planner  
Serena Palomino, Planning Technician  
Rob Dillard, City Attorney

*The Planning and Zoning Commission of the City of University Park will conduct a virtual public hearing via GoToMeeting. Consideration will be given to the following item(s):*

#### [PZ 21-002](#)

Consider a request to rezone the property bounded by McFarlin Boulevard to the south, University Boulevard to the North, Airline Road to the West, and Dublin Street to the East. The western portion of the property is to be rezoned UC-1, and the eastern portion is to be rezoned UC-2.

Jessica Rees, City Planner, presented case PZ 21-002 via PowerPoint. An aerial view of the two-hundred foot (200') buffer, SOR report, satellite view of the site address and the updated site plan was explained and displayed.

Chairman West requested that the applicant present their case.

Michael Molina, SMU Associate Vice President & Chief Architect, displayed and explained the neighborhood outreach process, the 2020 November Master Plan Survey, neighborhood feedback received, modified proposed zoning, proposed solutions and property value impact study. Mr. Molina proceeded to introduce Andrew McRoberts to discuss the property value impact study in detail.

Andrew McRoberts, McRoberts & Company Commercial Real Estate Services, introduced himself, his qualifications, relevant experience and Park Cities study involvements. Mr. McRoberts proceeded to explain his case study approach to similar studies which include, the George W. Bush Presidential Center study, Michael M. Boone Elementary School study and SMU Tennis Complex study. Mr. McRoberts stated based on his experience with these previous study findings, he believes there is no adverse impact to

Single-Family property values.

Mr. Molina thanked Mr. McRoberts. He also wanted this Commission to note that SMU continues to stay within a trend line of one thousand five hundred (1,500) of incoming freshmen students.

Chairman West asked if any Commissioners had any questions for the applicant.

Commissioner Philbin asked Mr. McRoberts if the three (3) studies mentioned were compared to property values city-wide. Mr. McRoberts confirmed they were not compared city-wide.

Commissioner Hanna questioned if property values for residents nearby the subject site versus outside the subject site can be compared. Mr. McRoberts replied it would be unrealistic to perform such data since many areas vary and have different factors.

Mr. Molina understands Commissioner Philbin and Hanna's concerns, however this study consisted only of nearby neighbors.

With no further questions to the applicant, Chairman West opened the public hearing for those who would like to speak in favor at 5:54 PM. With no one to speak in favor, Chairman West opened the public hearing for those to speak in opposition.

Douglas Clarkson, 2916 McFarlin, stated he agrees with the traffic island, the proposed wall and landscape plan. He questioned why is there a need for a new building and parking if the student body is not growing. Mr. Clarkson objects to UC-2 and suggests zoning to UC-3, UC-4 or a Planned Development. His main concern is the potential of a fifty-five foot (55') tall building and believes the proposal for UC-2 is inappropriate.

John Calhoun, 2936 University, expressed his concern regarding traffic, the potential for a fifty-five foot (55') structure and failing to receive a notice for PZ 21-002. He also mentioned residents have created an online petition to this matter. Mr. Calhoun does not agree to the property value study, but respects the Commissioner's comments in the work session.

Jan Rapp, speaking for Mary Lacy, 2945 University, stated Ms. Lacy opposes the wall, potential structure and prefers more landscaping/green space.

Matt Joy, 2924 University, stated he prefers more green space and underground parking. He expressed University Park should have high standards and it's tax paying citizens should remain firm footed on their concerns. He also stated this decision creates a lasting impact for future generations.

Michael Joy, 2924 University, does not agree with the performance for this request, the feels that SMU has not provided thorough details for future plans and this request is one sided. He agrees to the proposed Moody building, but

does not agree to the brick wall or parking lot. Mr. Joy suggests underground parking with a park above the surface called "Moody Park" and for traffic to be diverted to SMU Boulevard.

Banu Bilhan, 2944 McFarlin, expressed her traffic, parking lot aesthetic and environmental concerns. She stated there is limited green space, she does not agree with the property value study and this proposal creates a safety hazard for children. Mrs. Bilhan mentioned she is the creator of the online petition.

Kyle Pugh, 2924 McFarlin, agrees with the proposed Moody building and traffic barrier, but views UC-2 zoning as inappropriate. Mr. Pugh suggested that SMU come before this Commission if a structure is proposed. Mr. Pugh does not agree with Mr. McRobert's findings and believes other professionals with the same qualifications would disagree with Mr. McRobert's as well.

Steve Standbridge, 2921 Fondren, stated he agrees with Mr. Clarkson's and Mr. Pugh's comments. He stated SMU has done great things for the neighborhood, but disagrees with the wall providing separation between the campus and neighbors. Mr. Standbridge suggests if the intent is to propose a structure, address the zoning request at that time and he agrees for the use of underground parking and more green space.

Andrew Rubin, 2841 University, believes parks and green space are more important than parking lots, there is no need for a potential structure, traffic will enhance, and the property value study was inaccurate. Mr. Rubin suggested building a parking lot in the place of the soccer field (SMU Blvd. and Bush Ave.) and move the soccer field across from Burleson Park. He also stated moving traffic to SMU Boulevard is a bad idea.

Rebecca Colwill, 3000 Rosedale, stated her main concern is the increase of traffic this will cause. Ms. Colwill stated their block was previously assured by SMU that they had ample parking, so this request does not make sense. She suggests more visitor parking to alleviate residential street parking. Mrs. Colwill also stated she did not receive a meeting notice.

Micah Riddle, 2829 Fondren, stated a more appropriate designation would be to have SMU re-submit with a planned development district. She stated if SMU plans to construct a building at a later time, this request can be addressed then, rather than making a decision now. Ms. Riddle stated SMU is required to have five thousand seven hundred twenty three (5,723) parking spaces and surpasses that by one thousand eight hundred (1,800), therefore parking is not needed. Ms. Riddle stated the parking located on University Boulevard remains empty. She thanked Mr. Molina for his efforts and is in favor for the traffic island proposal and UC-3/UC-4 zoning.

Haydar Bilhan, 2944 McFarlin, does not agree with the aesthetic of this parking lot and future buildings, including the bright lighting the parking lot will create. Mr. Bilhan stated the three (3) existing parking lots are rarely at maximum capacity, which cause children to use for skateboarding. He believes more green space will benefit both the campus and city and this

should be the main focus.

Brenton Baxter, 2932 Fondren, thanked SMU for the neighborhood meetings and re-submittal to this request, but issues still remain. He mentioned the 1997 SMU Master Plan for this subject site consisted of administrative buildings, twenty (20) space parking lot and a green space along Dublin Street (about 3 lots wide). Mr. Baxter compared this Master Plan to this proposal. He suggested this Commission table the request, the UC-1 zoning proposal change to UC-2 and a Planned Development zoning for the Eastern side of the subject property.

Susan Jarzemsky, 2853 University, stated she did not receive a notice. She stated her husband was involved in the Master Plan Committee thirty (30) years ago, which was formed to aid traffic congestion on University Boulevard. She feels frustrated that this is happening again.

Ian Caruth, 2399 Dyer, believes a surface parking lot is not an institutional use and an unimaginative use for the land. Mr. Caruth suggests sub-level surface parking, increase of green space, and more parks. He hopes SMU can re-submit with a more livable, beautiful and neighborly plan.

Chris Eggemeyer, 2944 Fondren, agrees with everyone's comments and stated this land should be preserved for more green space.

With no one else to speak in opposition, Chairman West closed the public hearing at 6:52 PM.

Commissioner Mercer stated his appreciation to SMU's re-submittal, however, due to the residential concerns, he feels there needs to be continued discussion. He agrees traffic would increase from this proposal.

Commissioner Walsh questioned if the request can be recommended partially or entirely.

Mr. Dillard stated this must be recommended as a whole. This Commission can recommend requests with more restrictions, rather than less restrictions. Mr. Dillard provided an example that the Commission deny this request and re-submit as a planned development.

Commissioner Walsh explained the Planning & Zoning Commission is a recommending body that forwards to the City Council, who has the official authority to approve or deny.

Commissioner Philbin expressed his appreciation to both SMU and residents for handling this matter politely and professionally. He feels significant progress has been made thanks to everyone's efforts.

Commissioner Goff agrees with his fellow Commissioners comments and agrees to table this item.

Commissioner Walsh thanked the residents and his fellow Commissioners.

He agrees this would cause more traffic on University Boulevard. Commissioner Walsh views this case as a balancing act between SMU and UP citizens.

Chairman West allowed Mr. Molina to state his final comments for this case.

Mr. Molina expressed that UC-3 and UC-4 are not applicable for institutional or commercial uses. He clarified that UC-4 zones do not exist in the City and UC-3 zones exist only for the parking lot portions of Sorority and Fraternity houses. He also stated underground parking is not financially feasible. Lastly, Mr. Molina stated the soccer field land uses are restricted, therefore a parking lot cannot take its place.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Walsh, seconded by Commissioner Goff, that this item be tabled to the May 11, 2021 Planning and Zoning meeting. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.**

#### [PZ 21-003](#)

Consider minor amendments to PD-37 to allow removal of an existing wood fence, to add a masonry wall and to allow replacing the existing parking lot with green space or pedestrian amenities in the future.

Chairman West read case PZ 21-003 and requested the applicant present this case.

Mr. Molina explained and displayed the proposed brick wall renderings, language modifications in this planned development and proposed interior wall/green space.

Chairman West asked if any Commissioners had any questions.

Mr. Dillard clarified that no future amendments can be made to the site plan that was presented and the pedestrian amenities verbiage will not be included in the ordinance.

Chairman West opened the public hearing for those who would like to speak in favor at 7:18 PM. With no one to speak, Chairman West opened the public hearing for those in opposition.

John Calhoun, 2936 University, stated there are no definitions or specific limits regarding the green space or pedestrian amenities, therefore, he does not agree with the language for this proposal. He suggests this Commission not recommend for approval.

Mr. Molina stated this request goes hand in hand with the previous item and this was only made into a separate request based on the December P&Z meeting feedback.

Chairman West questioned if this item meets planned development qualifications.

Mr. Dillard confirmed it is an independent case and a concept plan was provided, therefore it can be acted upon.

Chairman West asked if there was anyone else who would like to speak in opposition.

Mike Joy, 2924 University, believes this case along with PZ 21-002 should be decided at the same time. He stated this land serves as a key element for the green space that residents envision.

With no one else to speak in opposition, Chairman West closed the public hearing at 7:26 PM.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Mercer, seconded by Commissioner Walsh, to table this item to the May 11, 2021 Planning and Zoning meeting. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.**

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

[21-065](#)

Minutes from the Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting dated March 9, 2021.

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

ADJOURNMENT: With there being no further business before the Commission, Chairman West adjourned the meeting at 7:30 PM.

Approved by:

\_\_\_\_\_

Chairman Robert H. West

\_\_\_\_\_

Date