To: Mayor Pat McGrail and Keller City Council Members

Subject: Case No. Z-17-0004

Dear Mayor McGrail & Keller City Council Members,

My name is Jennifer King. My husband, Dale, and I live at 1542 Briar Meadow Drive. Our property backs up to the lot that Mr. Roszell wants to develop at 1801 Rufe Snow Drive. This letter is to express our strong opposition to the extreme zoning changes that have been requested for this property.

My main opposition is that Mr. Roszell is trying to squeeze too large of a building onto the lot. He is requesting numerous zoning changes just to meet the MINIMUM parking requirements. My husband and I work for a company that does not have enough parking. We see the daily problems with not being able to provide adequate parking required for a building. This causes tension between the employees and with the companies that are next to us. I'm afraid that this will push their overflow parking into our neighborhood causing too much congestion onto the main entrance to our neighborhood.

The Roszell's have also requested zoning changes for the type of businesses allowed. The zoning for these types of properties are there for a reason. Developments such as banks, professional buildings, and child care facilities mesh well with the surrounding neighborhoods. Their work hours do not disrupt the daily lives of the home owners that live next to them. They are normally 8-5 with no weekend hours. The zoning for the type of businesses should be kept neighborhood friendly and should not be changed from their current zoning.

I don't think exceptions should be made to allow the garages to face the street. The Roszell's spoke very highly of their properties during the town hall meeting. After this comparison, I decided to try to find the properties they boasted about during our meeting. I found the following eye-sore in Saginaw. I have attached pictures of the property and its garages. I don't believe that Mr. Roszell is being honest about his use for the garages on the property. The uses he stated in the meeting do not require having a garage. Cleaning supplies can be stored in closets. Files are stored in rooms, not garages. Per the attached picture, it looks like he leases them out as workshops that will be loud and disruptive to our neighborhood.





Mr. Roszell stated during the city hall meeting that he believed this change would increase his property taxes he pays. I do not believe that the small tax amount he gave during the meeting justifies the extreme exceptions he has requested or the burden it will put on our neighborhood. Mr. & Mrs. Roszell's statements during the meeting mislead everyone by implying that the neighborhood was run down. The homes in the cul-de-sac in question are \$350,000 plus homes that are overseen by a strict HOA.

Mr. Roszell believes that he should be granted exceptions because exceptions have been granted before to developments such as the day care center and CVS. Those are highly profitable developments that bring in high taxes for Keller. CVS and the day care had the space and accessibility that his lot does not have.

The excerpt below from the City of Keller's website is what we are trying to preserve. We believe that we should fight to keep Keller a scenic city and one of the best places to live.

Keller has been named to CNN/Money Magazine's biennial listing of "Top 100 Places to Live — America's Best Small Towns" three times since 2007, including taking seventh place in 2009. And recent awards have included a spot in D Magazine's "Top 20 Dallas-Fort Worth Metroplex Suburbs," mentions in Fort Worth, Texas Magazine's "Best Places to Live" lists, recognition as an "Emerging Art Town" by Southwest Art Magazine, certification as a Scenic City by the Scenic Texas organization, and third place among the "Top 10 Most Notable High-Growth Areas in the Country," according to the Gadberry Group.

We'd like to thank you for allowing us another opportunity to maintain the value of our neighborhood that we love so much.

Sincerely,

Dale & Jennifer King

enny King

Bryan and Stacey Cornell 1536 Briar Meadow Drive Keller, Texas 76248

nthi 0 9 2017

BY:

August 5, 2017

Keller City Council 1100 Bear Creek Parkway Keller, Texas 76248

Re: Case No. Z-17-0004: David Hawkins, Planning Manager

To: The Keller City Council

My husband and I are strongly opposed to several of the requested variances for the undeveloped portion of Highland Oaks Crossing at 1801 Rufe Snow Drive.

Our main concerns are about the privacy and noise issues that will arise if the proposed variances are passed. The current concept plan shows parking spaces on the East side of the property that is parallel to our residential fence. When vehicles enter those parking spaces, which are not blocked by the building, headlights will shine directly into our backyard and home. There will also be noise from both the businesses that will reside on the property and the prospective customers. The proposed alternative screening method does not protect us from the parking lot. A screening wall would offer protection from people seeing into our home and help limit any noise or light disturbances associated with the business.

We understand the regulations from Atmos Energy as our property also contains a utility easement from the gas company. The full <u>Atmos Energy Hello Neighbor</u> document details the remaining portion regarding fence restrictions which are cut off mid-paragraph in Exhibit A. It also states that height-restricted landscaping is allowed for some bushes, shrubs, and ornamental trees within the easement. We feel the owner should build a proper screening wall on his property past his section of the easement as required by Atmos. The owner should also provide the landscaping buffer on the East side of the property within the limits described on page four of the Atmos document.

Last September, the owner mailed us a letter that included a brief description of the owner's intent, a site plan, and a picture. We were informed that an office space for a medical profession was the intended use of this property. The only variances mentioned were that landscaping could not be done and nothing could be built on the easement. The original site plan provided in the letter included a 6' wood fence that spanned the length of the owner's property. It had the garage doors facing away from the city streets and a screened dumpster facing the city streets.

The reason we did not previously oppose this public hearing is simply due to our inexperience with local government. We were not concerned about the wood fence or lack of lands \mathcal{D}

from the owner's letter, because we believed that the standards of Keller would be upheld. We also felt that what the owner proposed was a quiet, daytime business; not a bustling retail center with a late night parking lot.

We agree that the current property uses need to be updated to allow the owner to obtain value from the property. Several of the services listed in the NS Zoning District Table are acceptable to us. The following are not: all of the SUP labeled uses, restaurant/café/cafeteria, retail uses and services wholly enclosed within a building, bakery, barber shop, building material and hardware, copy/print shop, dance studio or aerobics center, dry cleaning, fitness center, or pet grooming. We feel that these services would be open late, cause excessive noise, and lower the property value of our home. We would prefer businesses that would attract professionals living within our community such as lawyers, doctors, and CPAs.

We ask for a building that more closely resembles the current UDC approved plan. The proposed concept plan requires a busy parking lot for a structure of that size. The plan strips down the landscaping in order to replace it with the required parking needed to justify the illusion that this large of a building can fit on the lot. A smaller building would negate the need for so many variances, including the screening wall and landscaping between our properties. The garage door could be placed away from the city streets and provide landscaping islands to separate the parking. It would allow sufficient room for the dumpster to be properly enclosed and oriented away from the street.

We moved to Keller because it is a beautiful city with an outstanding school district. When we bought our home, we had the expectation that anything built in the empty lot would meet the unified development code standards set by the city of Keller. These regulations are an important part of what makes Keller a great place to live. We know that we are late in our opposition, but we hope that this letter helps you understand how we feel. We would like to see a building that is profitable for the owner, while maintaining the comfort and esthetics of this community.

Yours Respectfully,

Story Cornell

Bryan Cornell & Stacey Cornell