

----- Original Message -----

Sent: Tuesday, May 10, 2006 8:57 PM

Subject: HNP: Townhome Meeting Summary / Results

Fellow HNP Block Captains;

Regarding the neighborhood meeting that was held on Monday night concerning the zoning change issue (proposed townhomes) at the NE corner of Matlock and Country Club, the attached meeting summary is for y'all's information.

The next Planning & Zoning Commission meeting is scheduled for May 15th (6:30 pm) at City Hall chambers and is open for formal public comment. It is easy --- just take a blue card from near the front door of the chambers, fill it in, and give it to the Secretary (desk is at far left, near front) before the meeting starts. If anyone feels a need to express their feelings for the record, this is the time to do it. I feel that the Planning & Zoning Commission will likely approve the zoning change at this next meeting. See the attached meeting summary for the process and what would be next.

The HNP is not taking a stance on this issue. The audience at the neighborhood meeting was very much neutral in their stance for or against the zoning change / townhome project.

If anyone has any questions, feel free to send them my way. Please distribute this message to your neighbors. Thanks!!

Greg Ajemian
Heritage Neighborhood Partnership

**HERITAGE NEIGHBORHOOD PARTNERSHIP (HNP)
NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING SUMMARY
TOWNHOME PROJECT / ZONING CHANGE PROPOSAL**

The HNP hosted a neighborhood meeting at the Walnut Ridge Baptist Church on May 8, 2006. The meeting started at 7:10 pm and was adjourned at 9:15 pm. The HNP invited several other adjacent neighborhoods to this meeting. Greg Ajemian facilitated the meeting. In addition to the speakers noted below, Angel Whaley from the City's Planning Department and Ralph Turpin of the Planning & Zoning Commission were present.

The purpose of the meeting was to extend an opportunity to residents to have direct access (Q&A) to the developer for the townhome project that would require a zoning change from C-2 to PD for a 7.2-acre tract at the NE corner of Matlock and Country Club. In addition to the presentation/Q&A that was provided by Terry Hawkins and Terry Jobe (developers), the other speakers included (in order) Dr. Claude Cunningham (Assistant Superintendent of MISD), Lisa Sudbury (Assistant Director of Planning Department, City of Mansfield), and Jan Sechrist (local real estate agent).

The following was noted from the jointly delivered presentation by the developers, Terry Hawkins and Terry Jobe:

1. The townhome project (14 structures) has been reduced from 96 units down to 82 units. The minimum size of a unit would be 1,600 ft². Most units would range between 2,000 and 2,200 ft². Most units are two-story, but some will have a loft as part of a 3rd story. The units would be priced at \$100 per ft². If the units have trouble selling, the price may be lowered. No swimming pool is included, but the townhome structures would have a 2.5 acre small park (common area) embedded in the middle of the footprint.

2. The project is expected to draw single, professional people. The developers believe that the proximity of the golf course and the medical facilities being located near Matlock/Broad will promote these type of people. The small yards and set up of the project is not attractive to families, so not many children are expected. Mandatory HOA would take care of all maintenance, including yards. The developers are currently interviewing prospective management companies to run this HOA.

3. Upper story views from these townhomes that look away from the tract will face south towards Country Club and north towards Man, not east towards Heather Estates. There will be some step down in ground elevation near Heather Estates for this project, which will slightly reduce privacy issues. Vegetation will also be incorporated around the perimeter to address privacy issues. The masonry percentage for these structures has been revised to 80%, instead of 40%. Sidewalks have been added.

4. Units will have one-door garages that have double bays. There will be 36 overflow parking spaces incorporated along the perimeter of the project footprint. No parking will be allowing on the streets. Entrances will be located along Country Club and Man.

5. Construction would start with the streets and then take on the townhome structures in three phases. Townhome project is similar to the townhome project next to the American Airlines training facility on the west side of HWY-360.

Dr. Claude Cunningham followed the developers with his talk and handling of Questions/Answers. The following was noted:

1. Single family homes average 0.68 kids per household for the 94-square mile area of Mansfield. Upscale townhomes / apartments that are not specifically designed for kids average 0.25 kids per unit. Richardson and Plano also carry this same average for upscale townhomes / apartments. Thus, this 82-unit project should be anticipated to bring in about 20 kids to our four schools (Timberview, Eisenhower, Coble, Martha Reid) that will be overcapacity by spring 2007. Conclusion is that 20 additional kids should not produce a significant impact to the overall school capacity issues for the four schools in this area of Mansfield.

The following were the high points from the presentation/Q&A from Lisa Sudbury, Assistant Director of the Planning Department for the City of Mansfield:

1. The subject 7.2-acre tract has poor overall visibility, which limits high-end commercial use. There is concern that an unwanted commercial venture could move in, if property remains commercially zoned. The townhome project offers a soft buffer to the adjacent neighborhoods, that commercial projects would not accomplish. Thus, the townhome project is a reasonable use of this property.

2. The developers would pay \$500 per unit into the park land fee bank for the City (funds accumulate and then are spent to acquire future park sites) and \$750 in the bank for future park development, each of which are spent in your quadrant. It was noted that this area of Mansfield is greatly lacking in parks and the City was actively working on the issue. The townhome project would not be gated, but would have brick columns with wood fence. Nothing more is required from City code.

3. Market analysis (how well the units will sell) for such projects is the sole responsibility of the developer, not the City. Addressing concerns about traffic that could be generated by this project, there's not enough traffic volume on Man street or volume of traffic impact for this relatively small-size project to warrant a traffic analysis that would be required by the City.

4. There is a Planning & Zoning meeting scheduled for May 15th that will address this townhome project. The Commission is a recommending body to Council. They are concerned with land use, architectural design and fit with the neighborhood. If it is passed by the commissioners, then it will be addressed by City Council in three meetings (called "readings"). The first "reading" (open for public comment) will be held about three weeks after approval by the Planning & Zoning Commission. The second "reading" will also be open for public comment. No public comments will be allowed for the third "reading". City Council will vote its position at each of the three "readings", but the vote at the third "reading" will be the ultimate decision for approving or disapproving the zoning change / project.

5. If City Council approves the zoning change and the project, but then something falls through with the townhome project, the tract will remain zoned for PD (Planned Development) and is only approved for the approved use (townhomes). Any other type of project would have to go through rezoning process again and gain City Council approval.

6. It is a State requirement that requires use of a 200-foot wide zone around the subject townhome project that is used for mandatory City notification to property owners within the zone. If property owners sign a petition that represents more than 20 percent of the total area within the 200-foot wide zone, then a "super majority" vote (6-1 at minimum, instead of 4-3 simple majority at minimum) is required of City Council to approve the zoning change / project.

7. The ongoing construction project that is next to the proposed townhome project is an assistant living facility (60 units) for elderly and memory care.

Jan Sechrist, a local real estate agent, shared her insights about the area with respect to property values:

1. The main problem for property value loss that has recently been experienced for this area is the result of school attendance zone issues.
2. The townhome project offers a good alternative for adjacent land use for the area neighborhoods that will not produce excessive activity, noise, smells (restaurants), etc that could lower property values. The townhome project would eliminate that risk of getting an incompatible neighbor, while offering a good buffer for the neighborhoods.

Greg Ajemian wrapped up the meeting by taking a poll of the audience.

1. The audience was near equally split between “support”, “neutral”, or “against” the townhome project. A separate vote was taken for those located within the 200-foot wide zone around the proposed townhome project. This group was also equally split on the project.
2. The next vote was to compare the audience’s primary concern between having a zoning change and accepting the design/look of the townhome project. The audience is much more concerned with the zoning change, while the portion of the audience located within the 200-foot zone was equally split with its concerns.
3. Regarding the proposed zoning change, the audience was asked what was their greatest concern between “impact to schools”, “reduction in commercial and business opportunities”, and “property values”. Overwhelmingly, the audience was most focused on property values as their main concern.
4. It is fair to note that the audience was anxious about the project and proposed zoning change at the outset of the meeting. The presenters reduced the overall concerns of the audience to an overall neutral stance with the presentations and discussions.
5. 80 residents were in attendance and they were asked to sign in with their names, addresses, and contact info. Of the 80 residents, five homes were represented by 6 residents that reside within the 200-foot zone around the proposed townhome project. The contact info will be used to keep the audience updated on this zoning change / townhome project issue.

This summary was prepared by Greg Ajemian

