

8. [PUBLIC HEARING: Consider a recommendation of a Planned Development Amendment Zoning Change from PD-SF-36 \(Planned Development – Single Family Residential – 36,000 square foot minimum\) to PD-SF-36 \(Planned Development – Single Family Residential – 36,000 square foot minimum\) to amend the previously approved Planned Development for a tennis club and training facility, located on an approximately 26.99-acres of land, being Tract 3D and 3D01 out of the Daniel Bancroft Survey, Abstract No. 141, located on the west side of Keller Smithfield Road, approximately 400 feet north of Johnson Road, at 660 and 680 Keller Smithfield Road. D.R. Newton, owner. Jennifer Dent, applicant. Adams Engineering, engineer.\(Z-17-0001\)](#)

Michele Berry, Senior Planner, came forward to give staff's presentation and recommendation for Item F-8. Taylor Dent, applicant, was present to answer questions.

Chairperson Ponder opened the public hearing for Item F-8.

Matt Shaltry, 1323 Johnson Road, Keller TX, 76248, spoke in opposition.

Brenda Sexton, 1347 Johnson Road, Keller TX, 76248, spoke in opposition.

Gerald Kinman, 645 Keller Smithfield Road, Keller TX, 76248, spoke in opposition.

Bill Thoma, 633 Keller Smithfield Rd, Keller TX, 76248, spoke in opposition.

Rich Walton, 661 Keller Smithfield Road, Keller TX, 76248, spoke in opposition.

Brian Campbell, 1201 Johnson Road, Keller TX, 76248, spoke in opposition.

Greg Jackson, 1215 Johnson Road, Keller TX, 76248, spoke in opposition.

Speakers in opposition sited aesthetics of the bubble dome, lack of architecture style, size of the facility, close proximity to Keller-Smithfield Road, reduction of property values, height of the structures, close proximity of homes to the bubbles, the desire to keep the existing planned development standards, dislike of the change in hours of operation, and asked about additional screening.

Commissioner Page moved to close the public hearing for Item F-8. Commissioner Sagar seconded and the motion carried unanimously (7-0).

Additional discussion was held regarding location of mechanical equipment, screening of mechanical equipment, building safety, building specifications, occupancy load,

location of the bubble, noise generated from the mechanics, location of bubble enclosures, potential to relocate bubble enclosures, changing the phasing plan, planned time between phases, hours of operation, the variance request for the power lines to remain above ground, history of the request, and the portability of the bubble enclosures. Several commissioners stated they may support the enclosures in a different location on the site while others said they could not support any bubble enclosures.

Commissioner Reid moved to deny Item F-8. Commissioner Page seconded and the motion carried unanimously (7-0).

H. ADJOURN