

MINUTES**July 13, 2026****PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
CITY OF MESQUITE, TEXAS****City Hall
City Council Chambers
757 North Galloway Avenue
Mesquite, Texas****REGULAR MEETING****ATTENDANCE: COMMISSIONERS (REGULAR MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES)**

POSITION NO.	REGULAR NAME	MEMBER	ATTENDANCE	
Position No. 1	Michael Morris		☒ Present In-Person Telephone/Video	☐ Absent ☐ Present by
Position No. 2	Millie Arnold, Chairwoman		☐ Present In-Person Telephone/Video	☒ Absent ☐ Present by
Position No. 3	Roger Melend		☒ Present In-Person Telephone/Video	☐ Absent ☐ Present by
Position No. 4	Ronnie Chenault		☒ Present In-Person Telephone/Video	☐ Absent ☐ Present by
Position No. 5	Rick Cumby		☒ Present In-Person Telephone/Video	☐ Absent ☐ Present by
Position No. 6	Jeffrey Walker, Vice- Chairman		☒ Present In-Person Telephone/Video	☐ Absent ☐ Present by
Position No. 7	Soira Teferi		☒ Present In-Person Telephone/Video	☐ Absent ☐ Present by
ALTERNATE NO.	ALTERNATE NAME		ATTENDANCE	
Alternate No. 1	Vacant		☐ Present In-Person Required: ☐ No ☐ Yes	☐ Absent (* Attendance
Alternate No. 2	Debbie Screws		☒ Present In-Person Required: ☐ No ☒ Yes	☐ Absent (* Attendance

ATTENDANCE: STAFF

Adam Bailey	Director, Planning & Development Services	☒ Present In-Person
Garrett Langford	Assistant Director, Planning & Development Services	☒ Present In-Person
Elizabeth Douglas	Planner	☒ Present In-Person
Carolyn Horner	Senior Planner	☒ Present In-Person
Jennifer Horton	Planner	☒ Present In-Person
Karen Strand	Deputy City Attorney	☒ Present In-Person
Millie Laird	Administrative Aide, Planning & Development Services	☒ Present In-Person

CALL TO ORDER**1. ROLL CALL**

The meeting was called to order by Vice-Chairman Walker at 7:00 pm; Planner Elizabeth Lonix took roll call and declared a quorum was present.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

2. There were no comments.

CONSENT AGENDA**3. MINUTES.**

Consider approval of the minutes for the June 22, 2026, Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.

ACTION

Mr. Melend made a motion to approve the minutes; Mr. Chenault seconded. The motion passed 7-0.

PUBLIC HEARINGS**4. ZONING APPLICATION NO. Z0426-0449**

Conduct a public hearing and consider recommending approval of Zoning Application No. Z0426-0449 submitted by Maxwell Fisher, ZoneDev, LLC, on behalf of Dominion Development and Acquisition, LLC, for a zoning change to amend Planned Development – Multifamily Ordinance No. 5116 to adopt a new concept plan and revised development standards for a 277-unit multifamily development located at 21701 IH 635.

Planner Elizabeth Lonix presented.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Cumby recalled previous discussions where Staff had recommended developments with one- and two-bedroom units. He asked whether the City's position had officially changed or if the recommendation was specific to this application.

Mr. Langford responded that the City's position has not changed and that Staff evaluates each project on a case-by-case basis, considering whether the proposed development is appropriate for the surrounding area. He explained that the original proposal presented to City Council included one- and two-bedroom units, whereas the current proposal is intended to serve families, which is why the applicant is requesting primarily three- and four-bedroom units.

Ms. Lonix added that the development could be constructed in accordance with the existing Planned Development standards; however, the applicant is requesting the amendment to create a more family-oriented development.

APPLICANT

Maxwell Fischer, ZoneDev, presented to the Commission on behalf of Dominion Development and Acquisition.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Cumby asked Mr. Fischer to return to the modifications slide for review.

Ms. Teferi asked where the ADA-accessible units would be located within the development, specifically whether they would be distributed throughout the property or concentrated in one area.

Mr. Fischer responded that the ADA-accessible units would be distributed throughout the development. He noted that they are distinguishable on the concept plan, as they appear slightly larger than the other units.

Mr. Meland asked for clarification regarding the proposed perimeter fencing. While he understood the reasoning behind no gates, he requested additional explanation as to why portions of the development would remain unfenced.

Mr. Fischer explained that the applicant has been coordinating with adjacent property owners regarding fencing, screening, and landscaping, which were requested to address neighboring properties' concerns. He stated that the applicant does not intend to fence the entire development. He noted that discussions are ongoing with the property owner to the southwest regarding an appropriate fencing, screening, or landscape solution. Along the eastern property line, the development borders the highway, while the northern property line is separated from adjacent properties by a public right-of-way that will remain wooded. He added that a future roadway could eventually be constructed within that right-of-way, but based on current information, it is not anticipated for many years. Therefore, no fencing is proposed along that boundary at this time.

Mr. Meland also asked whether sidewalks would be installed along New Market Road and Rodeo Center Boulevard.

Mr. Fischer confirmed that sidewalks are required and will be constructed along both New Market Road and Rodeo Center Boulevard.

Mr. Chenault asked for clarification that there would be no access point to the development from the Interstate 635 frontage.

Mr. Fischer confirmed that there would be no entrance along the Interstate 635 side of the property because there is no service road providing access.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Vice-Chairman Walker opened the public hearing.

Sherry Turner, Living Gospel (700 Rodeo Center Blvd), expressed concern about the added traffic due to the increase in bedrooms. Further requested that a fence be required along their property line, stating that the burden to build a fence should not be on the church.

Mr. Chenault asked where the church was located in relation to the proposed development and requested that it be identified on the map.

Ms. Lonix displayed an aerial map of the property and identified the church's location relative to the proposed development.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Fischer returned to the podium to address the traffic concern and added that the applicant would be happy to work with the church to add a fence but cannot be sure if it is necessary.

Mr. Cumby asked whether the small cutout shown on the concept plan represented the fire station.

Mr. Fischer confirmed that it did.

Mr. Cumby then asked whether there was, or would be, a fence separating the development from the fire station property.

Mr. Fischer responded that no new fence is proposed along that property line but confirmed that an existing fence is already in place.

Mr. Cumby commented that it appeared the previous speakers were requesting additional security measures between the development, the church, and the fire station, and asked whether that was a reasonable interpretation.

Mr. Fischer agreed, stating that it appeared the speakers were requesting fencing to discourage pedestrians from crossing directly between the proposed development and the church property.

Mr. Chenault acknowledged the concerns raised by both sides and asked whether a fence would help prevent individuals experiencing homelessness from entering the development.

Mr. Fischer responded that the development would be institutionally managed and monitored with security cameras throughout the property. He stated that, once developed, he did not anticipate issues related to homelessness, noting that individuals experiencing homelessness generally seek areas that provide shelter and avoid locations where they are likely to be asked to leave.

Mr. Chenault then asked how far the fence along the fire station property extended.

Mr. Fischer clarified that the applicant is not proposing a new fence adjacent to the fire station. He explained that the existing fence is located on the fire station property and is not part of the proposed development.

Vice-Chairman Walker commented that an existing fence already surrounds the fire station, leaving only a small section where additional fencing would be needed. He stated that extending the fencing would help separate the development from the fire station and acknowledged the church's concerns, noting that the proposed residential community would back up to the church property. He added that, if concerns related to homelessness were to arise, a fence could benefit both properties by providing additional separation. Vice-Chairman Walker then asked whether the applicant had any objection to installing the additional fencing.

Mr. Fischer responded that the applicant had no objection and would be willing to install the additional fencing.

Mr. Chenault stated that he understood and appreciated the applicant's desire to maintain an open look and feel for the development. He asked whether the applicant would consider installing a decorative wrought iron or similar metal fence that would provide separation while preserving the open appearance.

Mr. Fischer responded that the applicant would be agreeable to install a decorative metal fence.

Ms. Screws asked whether installing a fence adjacent to the church would prevent individuals from simply walking around the fence near Interstate 635.

Mr. Fischer responded that an existing fence is currently located in that area. He explained that, during development, it will be determined whether the fence remains based on its location, specifically whether it is on private property or within the public right-of-way, and whether the Texas Department of Transportation requires it to remain.

Mr. Meland stated that, given the family-oriented nature of the development and the presence of children, maintaining the fencing would be an important safety consideration.

Mr. Fischer responded that he was not aware of the existing fence being removed and clarified that it is a TxDOT fence.

Vice-Chairman Walker closed the public hearing.

ACTION

Mr. Melend made a motion to approve with Staff's recommendations and the addition of a six-foot wrought iron fence along the norther boundary of the property. Mr. Chenault seconded. The motion passed 7-0.

5. ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT NO. 2026-02

Conduct a public hearing and consider recommending approval of Zoning Text Amendment No. 2026-02, amending the Mesquite Zoning Ordinance by making certain additions and deletions to sections contained in Sections 3.200 "Nonresidential Use Regulations," 3.500 "Supplementary Use Regulations," 3.700 "Accessory Structure Regulations," and Section 6.102 "Definitions" pertaining to revising and establishing regulations regarding, but not limited to, drone delivery and autonomous package loading devices.

Director Adam Bailey presented.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Screws asked about the Walmart drone staging areas located along Interstate 80 and whether they were already operational.

Mr. Bailey confirmed that Walmart's drone staging areas, including the associated zipline delivery system, were previously approved and became operational in April 2025.

Ms. Teferi requested clarification regarding the inclusion of key standards, specifically whether requirements related to accessible parking spaces and electric vehicle (EV) parking spaces were addressed as part of the text amendment.

Mr. Bailey explained that the amendment would not allow a reduction in required parking spaces. He stated that the purpose of the amendment is to allow locations with excess parking capacity to utilize some parking areas for these operations, provided the required parking is maintained. He added that applicants would be required to demonstrate safe circulation for employees and ensure adequate space to safely operate the equipment, including addressing situations where an autonomous loading device may fall or malfunction. He confirmed that these considerations are addressed within the proposed standards.

Ms. Teferi stated that, after reviewing the provided images, she was concerned about potential impacts from severe Texas weather conditions. She asked whether the equipment could fall onto a vehicle, such as one parked in an EV charging space, or impact employees working nearby.

Mr. Bailey responded that the proposed standards would require adequate clearance to ensure that, in the event the equipment were to fall, it would not impact parking spaces, drive-through lanes, sidewalks, or other areas used by vehicles or pedestrians.

Mr. Chenault requested clarification regarding the screening requirements for the drone staging areas and asked whether a masonry fence would be required.

Mr. Bailey clarified that, referring to the previously discussed Walmart drone staging areas, any side of the staging area that faces a public right-of-way would be required to have masonry screening. He explained that if two sides of the staging area face a public right-of-way, those sides would require masonry screening, while the remaining sides could utilize decorative metal fencing, such as wrought iron. He noted that the screening would not need to be solid on all sides.

Mr. Bailey added that Staff has observed examples in other cities where similar facilities have incorporated screening successfully and stated that if these facilities can be designed attractively in other communities, they can also be appropriately designed within Mesquite.

Mr. Chenault stated that his understanding was that a masonry fence could create operational issues for the staging area.

Mr. Bailey asked Mr. Langford for clarification regarding the example city previously discussed.

Mr. Langford explained that the drone staging area in Waxahachie was located behind an existing screening wall. He noted that requiring a masonry wall around the entire facility could create challenges; however, the proposed requirement is limited to the sides facing the street, where screening would be appropriate.

Mr. Meland commented that similar concerns were raised when Zipline was proposing a staging area near Quality Home.

Mr. Langford responded that the Zipline facility near Quality Home utilized wrought iron fencing around the entire site.

Mr. Meland stated that he recalled discussions with Zipline requesting screening all the way around, and Zipline expressed concerns that fully screening the staging area would interfere. He added that a similar situation occurred with the proposed facility at the mall.

Mr. Bailey clarified that the mall location was slightly different, as it was intended to be a temporary testing site for the delivery provider. He noted that the facility was not intended as a permanent operation and that the applicant has not moved forward with the required Conditional Use Permit.

Mr. Chenault stated that the Zipline representatives previously indicated that a solid wall would not be appropriate for the staging areas, that it would interfere with the technology.

Mr. Meland agreed, stating that was his understanding as well.

Mr. Bailey responded that Staff has information supporting the use of solid screening and noted that Mr. Langford could confirm the discussion from a recent call. Mr. Chenault clarified that his

comment was based on what had been stated by the applicant. Mr. Bailey acknowledged that the applicant may have expressed that concern during the public hearing but stated that similar facilities have been constructed with at least two solid screening walls.

Mr. Chenault discussed the neighborhood Walmart drone staging areas, noting that the staging areas had been moved around different locations within the parking lot and that the operator had expressed concerns with requiring permanent screening.

Mr. Bailey clarified that the proposed amendment would establish standards moving forward. He explained that if an applicant proposes a drone staging area similar to the Walmart facility or the conditionally approved mall location, any portion of the staging area facing a public street would be required to provide solid screening.

Mr. Chenault stated that he supported the concept.

Ms. Screws explained that, at the Walmart location, the staging areas are positioned against a wall. She described observing the delivery process, where employees bring the packages to the staging area, the drone retrieves the package, and the drone departs.

Mr. Bailey stated that Ms. Screws brought up an important point regarding public interest in the technology. He explained that drone operations are visually appealing and attract attention from bystanders, which creates safety considerations. He noted that Building Inspection and the Fire Marshal have also provided input regarding safety concerns, and that safety is a primary consideration in establishing these standards.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Vice-Chairman Walker opened the public hearing. No one came forward; the public hearing was closed.

ACTION

Mr. Chenault made a motion to approve; Ms. Screws seconded. The motion passed 7-0.

DIRECTORS'S REPORT

6. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Adam Bailey, Director of Planning & Development, advised the Commission on Planning and Zoning cases on July 6, 2026, Council Agenda.

I. City Council, 07/06/2026

- The 7-11 convenience store at FM 740 and FM 2757 was approved.
- Prosperity Fire CUP was approved.
- Data Center ZTA was tabled until July 20, 2026.

II. Preparing for City Council July 20, 2026

- Pre-meeting, Planning and Development Services will be presenting our proposed budget to council; 2 budget offers: electronic plan review platform and offer to hire a consultant to assist in a full zoning ordinance overhaul – making it more modern and user-friendly
- Public Hearings include:
 - PD with CUP to allow for electrical contractor office and warehouse with accessory storage
 - CUP to allow for Accessory Dwelling Unit
 - Zoning Text Amendments for Data Centers

III. Special Projects

- Update on NGTCS, open house, July 11, 10 am – 1 pm at the Elks Lodge
- Update on Roadway Impact Fee Study; data gathering
- Update on Comp Plan update; strategic plan kickoff
 - Next steps are stakeholders meeting with city council, CMO July 23, 24
- Upcoming Zoning Text Amendments
 - Infill, Multifamily housing standards & SB 840
 - Sign ordinance
 - Drive-through facility

IV. Miscellaneous

- Planning and Development Service department is fully staffed
- Director to attend NAPC FORUM 2026, July 22-26, 2026, Minneapolis
- Downtown Mesquite and Economic Development on establishing a Historic Overlay (HPOD); Tentative September/ October for project kickoff

7. Discussion Training topics and options for the Planning and Zoning Commission

- Saturday, August 1st will be a training day for the Commission as well as for members of the Board of Adjustment, Landmark Commission, and Building Standards Board. City Manager's Office and City Council will be included. The training session will be from 8:30 am to noon. Breakfast will be provided.
- State Conference APA will be held in the Metroplex (Irving) on October 16-18, 2026.

The next meeting will be held on Monday, July 27, 2026.

Chairman Walker adjourned the meeting at 8:12 pm.

Vice-Chair Jeffrey Walker