

DRAFT



Minutes

Town of Little Elm

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

Thursday, DECEMBER 4, 2025 - 6:00 pm

- Present: Robert Martin, Chairman; Tom Ocelli, Vice-Chairman; Ron Trees, Commissioner; Brian Kuberski, Commissioner; Brandon McLemore, Commissioner; Nisha Singla, Alternate Commissioner
- Absent: Jack Skinner, Commissioner; Paula Ward, Commissioner; Debra Cadet, Alternate Commissioner
- Staff Present: Olga Chernomorets, Managing Director of Planning Services
Citlali Castro, Senior Planner
Thomas Mitchell, Planner

1. **5:45 PM Work Session**
2. **6:00 PM Regular Meeting**
3. **Roll Call**
4. **Public Comments**
Persons may address the Planning & Zoning Commission on any issue for up to three (3) minutes. This is the appropriate time for citizens to address the Commission on any concern whether on this agenda or not. In accordance with the State of Texas Open Meeting Act, the commission may not comment or deliberate such statements during this period, except as authorized by Section 551.007, Texas Government Code.
5. **Consent Agenda**

Motion: Approve consent agenda as presented.

Motion by Commissioner Ron Trees, seconded by Commissioner Brian Kuberski

AYE: Chairman Robert Martin, Vice-Chairman Tom Ocelli, Commissioner Ron Trees, Commissioner Brian Kuberski, Commissioner Brandon McLemore, Alternate Commissioner Nisha Singla

6 - 0 Passed - Unanimously

1. Adoption of the November 6, 2025 Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes.

Motion: Approve minutes as presented.

2. Adoption of the November 20, 2025 Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes

Motion: Approve minutes as presented.

3. **FINAL PLAT/ Panther Creek Plaza (FP-25-004314).** Presentation, discussion, and consideration on a request for approval of a Final Plat consisting of 1.537 acres, generally located at the intersection of Woodlake Pkwy and FM 423, within Little Elm's extraterritorial jurisdiction (ETJ), in order to establish one lot, along with easements necessary for development.

- Presentation
- Discussion
- Consideration

Motion: Move consent agenda item to the regular agenda.

Motion by Vice-Chairman Tom Ocelli, seconded by Commissioner Ron Trees

AYE: Chairman Robert Martin, Vice-Chairman Tom Ocelli, Commissioner Ron Trees,
Commissioner Brian Kuberski, Commissioner Brandon McLemore, Alternate
Commissioner Nisha Singla

6 - 0 Passed - Unanimously

Motion: Defer authority to Director of Development Services to approve plat once completed.

Motion by Vice-Chairman Tom Ocelli, seconded by Commissioner Ron Trees

AYE: Chairman Robert Martin, Vice-Chairman Tom Ocelli, Commissioner Ron Trees,
Commissioner Brian Kuberski, Commissioner Brandon McLemore, Alternate
Commissioner Nisha Singla

6 - 0 Passed - Unanimously

4. **REPLAT/Little Elm Court Addition (RP-25-004065).** Presentation, discussion, and consideration on a request for a replat consisting of 2.219 acres, being a replat of Lot 4R, Block A, Little Elm Court Addition, generally located south of the intersection of Woodlake Pkwy and Farm to Market Road, within Little Elm's Town limits to establish easements for development.

- Presentation
- Discussion
- Consideration

Motion: Move consent agenda item to regular agenda.

Motion by Vice-Chairman Tom Ocelli, seconded by Commissioner Ron Trees

AYE: Chairman Robert Martin, Vice-Chairman Tom Ocelli, Commissioner Ron Trees, Commissioner Brian Kuberski, Commissioner Brandon McLemore, Alternate Commissioner Nisha Singla

6 - 0 Passed - Unanimously

Motion: Approve agenda item as presented.

Motion by Commissioner Ron Trees, seconded by Commissioner Brian Kuberski

AYE: Chairman Robert Martin, Vice-Chairman Tom Ocelli, Commissioner Ron Trees, Commissioner Brian Kuberski, Commissioner Brandon McLemore, Alternate Commissioner Nisha Singla

6 - 0 Passed - Unanimously

5. **REPLAT/B&G Addition Lot 2A1 (RP-25-004063).** Presentation, discussion, and consideration on a request for a replat consisting of 2.159 acres, being a replat of Lot 2A, Block 1, B&G Addition, generally located southwest of the intersection of East Eldorado Parkway and Castle Ridge Drive, within Little Elm's town limits.
- Presentation
 - Discussion
 - Consideration

Motion: Approve to extend to the December 18, 2025, Regular Planning and Zoning Meeting.

6. **Regular Agenda**

1. **PUBLIC HEARING/The Whiskey Blendery (PD-25-003261).** Presentation, Public Hearing, Discussion, and Recommendation on a request to establish a new Planned Development District based on the Lakefront District, with modified uses and development standards, on approximately 2 acres of land currently zoned Lakefront District (LF), approximately 100 feet southeast of the intersection of East Eldorado Parkway and Hardwicke Lane, within Little Elm's town limits, in order to allow a new commercial development consisting of four commercial buildings for purposes of offices, meeting and event space, barrel storage, cigar lounge, and sale of alcohol for on- and off-premises consumption associated with a craft whiskey distillery operation.
- Presentation
 - Open Public Hearing
 - Receive Public Comment
 - Close Public Hearing
 - Discussion
 - Recommendation

Staff presented the agenda item.

Chairman Martin requested further clarification on details surrounding the cigar lounge and event center.

- Staff explained the cigar lounge use is tied specifically to Building B as stated in the planned development and will only be accessible to members. As for the event center, Staff stated the event center aligns with the Town's definition of a "banquet hall" and the applicant will

be able to expand upon it further.

Chairman Martin asked if the lack of canopies is due to the walkway space outside of the existing building and the proposed alignment of Building B.

- Staff mentioned the current canopies on the existing building are not over the sidewalk due to a landscaped area and suggested asking the applicant for further clarification.

Commissioner Kuberski asked for confirmation that the proposal is not a distillery and therefore will not contain any production or assembly equipment on-site.

- Staff confirmed the proposal is not a distillery and will not contain any relevant production or assembly items. Staff explained the proposal will be a location to mix and blend already premade whiskeys.

Vice-Chair Ocelli inquired about the depth of the loading bay and whether parking will be shared with the existing Tender's.

- Staff stated the loading bay has a depth of roughly sixty-five feet and confirmed the proposal would share parking with Tender's. They explained the entire district allows for shared parking across property lines.

Vice-Chair Ocelli inquired about the capacity of the event center.

- Staff clarified the event center is not a "ballroom" and more a collection of private meeting spaces to be used for small gatherings such as a conference or corporate lunch. Staff mentioned that to their understanding these spaces will largely be used by members.

Commissioner Trees pointed out the applicant's intention to keep an existing fence along the edge of the property, bordering the residential neighborhood, and inquired about its current condition.

- Vice-Chair Ocelli stated some parts of the fence are acceptable while other areas are dilapidated. Commissioner Trees acknowledged and stated he will save his questions for the applicant.

Commissioner Kuberski asked whether it is the responsibility of the applicant to maintain the fence.

- Staff confirmed it would be the applicant's responsibility to provide maintenance for the fence.

Chairman Martin asked if the fence is the only border between the properties or if it backs up to residential fencing.

- Staff stated the fence is the only boundary between the proposal and the neighboring residences.

Chairman Martin asked in the hypothetical event the proposal is denied, given the current Lakefront zoning that has been in place since 2017, what would be able to go on this property by right and therefore not require a decision by the Planning & Zoning Commission. He inquired about how tall of a building could be developed, and overall what could be in place of the proposal were it to be denied.

- Staff stated that although it is reduced compared to other districts, the Lakefront district still allows for a building height maximum of forty-five feet which is the height of a three-story building. Staff mentioned any alcoholic manufacturer (e.g. winery, brewery, distillery) would be allowed by right barring individual sales of alcoholic drinks on premises, unlike the proposed member type of facility. They stated any type of retail or commercial establishment (other than those requiring an SUP) that meets the standards of the Lakefront District would be allowed by right with a three-story building.

Chairman Martin clarified for the audience that "by right" means a business following Town regulations would be able to develop this land without needing approval from the Planning & Zoning Commission or Town Council.

Commissioner Kuberski questioned if there were any windows facing the residential homes. Additionally, he pointed out the eastward second-story patio on the proposal and inquired about its use.

- Staff stated there are no windows facing any residencies, and the Ordinance does not allow for smoking on the patio space. The patio space is intended for congregation purposes.

Vice-Chair Ocelli asked if there were patio spaces on both the first and second floors, as well as how high the second-floor patio is situated. He expressed concern over patrons having a line of sight into neighboring backyards.

- Staff confirmed there is both a first and second floor patio, and the second-story patio is roughly fifteen feet off the ground. Staff recommended referring to the applicant for additional specifications regarding the line of sight.

The applicant, Tim Huels, was present to answer questions.

The applicant provided a brief overview of his operation's history, opening their first location in Oak Point in 2022. He expressed he has no desire for this to become a "typical" bar or distillery business and that there is no other whiskey blendery in the United States. He stated safety is one of his top priorities, and referenced how he wouldn't want to build anything that he personally wouldn't be comfortable in proximity to his three-year-old daughter. They only offer 50 memberships and currently have a waitlist of 350 people. They prioritize the experience of whiskey over the consumption of it. He pointed out the outside staircase to the second-floor patio is only for emergency purposes and will not serve as a point of traffic. He also mentioned the second-floor patio will have wooden slats around it to help restrict vision into neighboring backyards.

Chairman Martin asked if the slats around the patio will be fully enclosed or if there will be spaces in-between them.

- The applicant stated they have imagined spacing between the slats with potential screening as well.

Chairman Martin inquired about the benefits provided to members versus non-members. He noted the concern of this being a high-traffic venue.

- The applicant stated that currently the only non-member space is the gift shop where they can partake in small sampling before making a purchase and leaving. Everything past the gift shop is currently only accessible to members and any guests they bring. However, he stated they do have plans to add a non-member tasting area that includes a craft cocktail bar.

Chairman Martin inquired about serving limits the applicant plans to have in place.

- The applicant stated this is a very important to them and since opening their primary location there has not been a single incident. He mentioned every employee is TABC certified and does not foresee this being an issue in the future. He stated that in the past when they deemed a customer to be inebriated, they have either made the person stay for an extended time or called them a ride.

Chairman Martin asked if the proposed cocktail bar would be held to the same serving standards as the rest of the establishment.

- The applicant confirmed they will be tracking consumption as they do normally, and they are able to do so with the assistance of their POS system. He expressed that the proposal is not a location for customers to get drunk, but rather an experience for them to learn about what they are tasting.

Chairman Martin inquired about the operating hours of the proposal, and if the event space creates the potential for gatherings after-hours.

- The applicant stated their operating hours are currently Tuesday through Friday from 12:00pm to 6:00pm, and Saturdays from 11:00am to 4:00pm. He mentioned that Fridays and Saturdays are their busiest times and the hours are likely to change. He confirmed they

do currently offer after-hours events. For example, a private group of roughly fifteen people may have an experience from 6:00pm to 9:00pm and they usually aim to have the place closed by 9:30pm.

Chairman Martin mentioned the Planning & Zoning Commission typically adds specifications for similar proposal, and asked if the applicant would be comfortable with setting a set closing time of 9:00pm or 9:30pm.

- The applicant stated that in most instances he would be comfortable with having a set closing time. He reiterated he has a daughter he wishes to get home to, and most private events are for a celebration as opposed to just “partying.”

Vice-Chair Ocelli asked how they are intending for a semitruck to enter and exit the designated loading space.

- The applicant stated a semitruck would have to back-in from Hardwicke Ln. He reiterated they are not a typical distillery that would require frequent shipments, and currently only receive a truck maybe once every two months.

Jason Faigle, a civil engineer on the proposal, chimed into the discussion. Jason stated one of the first things they did when considering a loading dock was calculate the movements of a semi into the area. He stated the semi would have to come down Hardwicke and back-in to the loading dock, and when leaving would be able to pull straight out before turning north.

Vice-Chair Ocelli stated some of his concerns regarding this include the safety of people walking on the street and the semi blocking the road preventing residents from exiting the neighborhood, possibly when they are trying to get to work. He expressed this would be unfair to the residents assuming it could take up to five minutes to back-in.

- The applicant stated from his experience it usually takes the semis less than a minute to back into the loading dock at their current location.

Vice-Chair Ocelli pointed out that the applicant’s current operation is not along a residential road.

- Jason stated that the trucks are required to pull a very similar maneuver to what would be required in the proposal, and overall it is a very quick maneuver. He inquired the applicant as to when he usually receives his deliveries.
- The applicant stated he typically receives deliveries between the hours of 10:00am and 2:00pm. He added it is usually only a palette or two, and by the time the paperwork is handled the entire exchange roughly takes a couple of minutes. However, he mentioned the longest unload would be when they receive barrels of whiskey and have to roll them off of the truck.

Vice-Chair Ocelli inquired how many barrels of whiskey they anticipate to have stored on-site.

- The applicant stated they anticipate to have up to 1000 whiskey barrels stored on-site. Their current operation has around 120 on-site in a roughly 900 square foot area. He compared the scale of their operation to mainstream distilleries which can have up to 60,000 barrels stored. He mentioned Texas’s unique climate which requires the majority of their barrels stored off-site.

Chairman Martin, noting the difference in scale of the proposal compared to the current operation, asked if they still expect deliveries to be limited to about once every other month.

- The applicant denied and stated they would expect an increase in deliveries and production. He referred to the high evaporation rate of their whiskey in the Texas climate. He estimated the proposal could receive deliveries as often as once per week.

Vice-Chair Ocelli asked for further clarification on the process that will be taking place inside the blendery and how it varies from a common distillery.

- The applicant explained how they source their barrels from large producers, the producers being the ones actually distilling the whiskey. Once they bring in the barrels, the blendery will mix into a single barrel or create a custom blend using multiple barrels. Because of

this, the smells of manufacturing or chemicals often associated with a distillery will not be present at this location.

Vice-Chair Ocelli inquired about the smoking areas in the proposal.

- The applicant stated the smoking areas will be in Buildings B and D, and the enclosed smoking areas will have an installed filtration system similar to those found at industrial cigar companies.

Vice-Chair Ocelli asked if the tours are only open to members who then bring in guests with them.

- The applicant denied and stated their current operation has select tasting and tours non-members can sign-up for. He expressed his wishes to be able to offer these tasting and tours every day.

Vice-Chair pointed out the applicant's request to waive the tree mitigation fee. He inquired if the applicant would be willing to take the money saved and use it towards replacing the current fence with a masonry wall up to Town standards. He pointed out a masonry wall would provide more soundproofing and increased privacy.

- The applicant stated the proposed buildings will be an insulated barrier, and the low level of noise is currently a non-issue. He stated that if he felt the noise would be problematic he would be happy to construct a masonry wall, but he cannot see how constructing a masonry wall would lead to any noise reduction.

Commission Trees asked if the applicant would be open to closing off one side of the patio to prevent any possible sight into neighboring backyards.

- The applicant stated the southside on both the first and second floor patios would be where the wooden slats and screening are placed.

Vice-Chair Ocelli pointed out the applicant's mention of artificial turf in the proposal and asked where he intends to place it.

- The applicant stated the artificial turf would be placed on the southside in the twenty-foot setback because the fencing and trees might create a heavily shaded environment too difficult for natural grass.

Chairman Martin noted the façade facing towards the neighborhood and questioned the applicant if he would be open to refacing it should the residents be unhappy with a charcoal-colored wall.

- The applicant stated he assumes it would be an easy fix if this proved to be a concern. He expressed his desire to have an attractive and uniform establishment.

Chairman Martin pointed out that on the applicant's website, underneath the FAQs, it's mentioned that the applicant wishes to distill his own whiskey and is a couple years away from doing so.

- The applicant stated he wrote the responses to his FAQs a couple of years in the past and has since changed his perspective. He has learned how much goes into distilling and does not believe this would be an optimal site to do so. The majority of their business model entails finding rare barrels for their blending operation.

Chairman Martin opened the public hearing at 7:14pm.

In opposition to the proposal, there were seven speakers and six non-speakers present, and seven emails submitted for the record. The speakers present were as follows:

- Dina Bonacek – 110 Lakeside Ln. Little Elm, TX
- Tim Lukes – 117 Woodrow Cir. Little Elm, TX
- Richard Marcus – 121 Woodrow Cir. Little Elm, TX
- Michelle Rodgers – 115 Lakeside Ln. Little Elm, TX
- Ryan McCallion – 105 Woodrow Cir. Little Elm, TX

- Yann Sommer – 109 Woodrow Cir. Little Elm, TX
- Jessica Nelson – 125 Woodrow Cir. Little Elm, TX

An overview of the concerns raised by those in opposition include but are not limited to:

- The southward second-story patio providing a line of sight into nearby residential homes.
- Semitrucks impeding access in/out of the neighborhood while delivering to the blendery.
- Increased noise and rambunctious atmosphere as a result of alcoholic sales.
- Increased traffic caused by clientele.
- Safety hazards such as the storage of highly flammable materials and released vapor from whiskey's evaporation rate.
- Proximity to children in neighborhood and nearby daycare.
- Possibility of business failure, leaving oddly unique structure unattractive to future prospects.
- Too many compromises in Town Ordinance to allow for construction.
- Decrease in property values due to reasons listed above.

In support of the proposal, there were four speakers present and one email submitted for the record. The speakers present were as follows:

- Neil Blais – 4017 Moonlight Dr. Little Elm, TX
- Jennete Espinosa – 1976 Sunny Side Dr. Little Elm, TX
- Chance Downs – 89 County Road 3246 Mount Pleasant, TX
- Duffy Nabois – Queen Anne Dr. McKinney, TX

An overview of the reasons raised by those in favor include but are not limited to:

- Significant economic impact capable of attracting national clientele to Little Elm.
- Applicant is a well-established businessperson with national reach, who chose Little Elm above other attractive locations.
- Compatibility with the long-term plan for the Lakefront area.
- Unique business model on a national level.
- Creates opportunity to develop this land carefully with considerations to economy and resident, as opposed to another entity developing by-right without input from the Planning & Zoning Commission.
- Connects Little Elm to a national community.
- Increase in property values due to reasons listed above.

Olga Chernomorets, Managing Director of Planning, read into the record a letter of support from absent Commission member Jack Skinner. He stated that The Whiskey Blendery proposal brings a vibrant, community-focused development. Measures are included to minimize impacts on neighbors, and the project is broadly supported for its economic and community benefits.

Chairman Martin closed the public hearing at 7:50pm.

Alternate Commissioner Singla asked if there is an age restriction for those who can enter the building, either members or non-members.

- The applicant stated currently patrons must be twenty-one or older to enter but would be interested in creating a more family-friendly environment as long as they remained compliant with TABC regulations.

The applicant asked the Commission if he could address concerns mentioned by those present in opposition.

- The Commission agreed the applicant could address comments brought up in the public discussion.

The applicant stated the proposal contracted one of the top fire safety firms in the country that specializes in these sorts of developments. They are closely following very strict regulations and will utilize a system capable of containing any fire within the establishment. Additionally, the

ventilation system is the same used for the distilleries containing tens of thousands of barrels, and the vapor output from this location is comparatively nonexistent. As for the comments regarding nearby failed businesses, the applicant expressed his respectful sentiments that those are of no relation to him and his operation. He is confident in his current business model and pointed out the amount of traffic it brings in from various other cities and states. He stated he has invested everything into this business and it has maintained consistent growth. He has no intention of building something that can peer into neighboring properties and is open to the idea of fully enclosing the second-floor patio. He expressed his appreciation for everyone who came to speak out in opposition and how it makes communities stronger. He stated that if the motion is approved he will do his best to mitigate any issues faced by the residents. Chairman Martin thanked everyone in the audience for their attendance and inquired the Commission for where they stand.

Alternate Commissioner Singla stated that as long as the privacy of the residents is addressed more thoroughly then she is in support of the proposal.

Commissioner Trees stated the proposal is a classic example of developmental needs against residential needs. He expressed his sincere empathies for the residents' concerns, and recalled an earlier point that it's a matter of time before somebody develops this land without needing to go before the Planning & Zoning Commission. If it were it to reach that point it would be of considerable more concern to the residents. He stated he is generally supportive of the proposal but does not like the location. However, if they were able to construct a new fence and address the privacy concerns then he would be supportive of the proposal.

Vice-Chair Ocelli agreed that he likes the idea but not the location. He expressed his primary concerns are installing a masonry wall and properly screening the second-floor patio. He mentioned he is also very concerned about a different developer building on this land by-right, which could potentially be a three-story building. He stated that by going through with this proposal offers the Town a chance to address the residents' concerns. He pointed out an additional point of concern of how there are currently mature trees present that will not survive the development, and how this can be addressed besides just an eight-foot-tall fence.

Chairman Martin asked Staff if there are any conditional provisions that could be placed along the longevity of the existing trees.

- Staff stated that whatever is approved on-site must be maintained. For example, if a tree dies then Neighborhood Services will issue a citation for the tree to be replaced, the minimum requirement being four-inch caliper.

Vice-Chair Ocelli pointed out that a four-inch caliper tree is similar to "starting over" when compared to the much more mature trees being removed.

Commissioner Kuberski noted that the proposal intends to keep some of the existing trees on the property.

- Staff confirmed the proposal will not remove every tree from the site and the landscaping plan is intended to not interfere with the existing canopy on the residential side of the fence.

Commissioner Kuberski stated his approval of the business model and foresees a lot of potential. However, he is also not a fan of the location but understands the desire to have the operation near the Lakefront District and the benefits that stem from it. He reiterated his belief in the potential for success of this proposal.

Commissioner McLemore expressed his concern over the privacy issues being raised, but he is also supportive of the business model and what it brings to Little Elm.

Chairman Martin recalled previous inquiries into this tract of land and its potential development. One of these inquiries was to possibly turn the land into a more permanent area for food trucks.

but this raised concern over potentially fostering excessive noise. He stated that he had a lot of questions in his initial review of the blendery proposal that were answered tonight. He expressed he was relieved to learn of the proposal's operation hours from a noise perspective. If the Commission moves towards approval, he would like to see a closing time that would apply specifically to events. As for deliveries, he would rather not see the loading dock entrance on Hardwicke but understands the limitations to this site. Regarding alcohol consumption, his bigger concern would be an establishment such as the adjacent Tenders and does not believe they have had any issues stemming from that. Most importantly overall, his primary worry is a different entity developing this land by-right and therefore bypassing the Planning and Zoning Commission, leaving both Staff and residents without much say in the matter. He reiterated his understanding of all concerns mentioned, but expressed there is no perfect solution and views the proposal as a viable option to send up to Town Council for their decision. Alternate Commissioner Singla inquired about possible noise concerns during construction of the proposal.

- Staff stated there are requirements set by building permits based on previous noise complaints. They explained construction is not allowed to create noise above a certain decibel level within set timeframes. If these restrictions are broken then the police department will become involved in correcting the situation.

Motion: Approve the agenda item with the following conditions in addition to staff's recommendations:

- Installation of an 8-foot masonry wall along the adjoining residential properties to provide additional screening and privacy.
- A required closing time of 9:30 p.m. to help minimize late-evening noise and activity near the neighborhood.
- Enclosure of the second-floor patio to ensure that there is no visibility in nearby residential backyards, further protecting the privacy of adjacent homeowners.
- Within the landscape section, perimeter landscape requirements, the statement "A perimeter landscape buffer of 5 feet in width shall be provided along the southern property line that abuts residential use." shall be corrected to 20 feet.
- Landscape plan note to be revised to require screening shrubs to be installed at a height of 36 inches instead of the current 24–30 inches.

Motion by Commissioner Ron Trees, seconded by Commissioner Brandon McLemore

AYE: Chairman Robert Martin, Vice-Chairman Tom Ocelli, Commissioner Ron Trees, Commissioner Brian Kuberski, Commissioner Brandon McLemore, Alternate Commissioner Nisha Singla

6 - 0 Passed - Unanimously

2. **PUBLIC HEARING/ Spiritas East Commercial PD Amendment (PD-25-004242).** Presentation, Discussion, and Consideration for a request to amend existing Planned Development based on Light Commercial (LC) district with modified development standards, through Ordinance No. 1660, as amended by Ordinance No. 1783, on 5.353 of land generally located approximately 2,500 feet east of Providence Boulevard, on the south side of East University Drive, within Little Elm's town limits, in order to modify parking requirements.

- Presentation
- Open Public Hearing
- Receive Public Comments
- Close Public Hearing
- Discussion
- Recommendation

Staff presented the agenda item.

Chairman Martin inquired as to who would work with the applicant on the design.

- Staff stated that they would be the ones to work with the applicant on the design. They mentioned that it is written a little more broadly in the narrative, but it is ultimately up to the Director of Development Services to finalize what is approved.

Chairman Martin asked if there were any plans to utilize stamped concrete as mentioned in the overall 380 Overlay plan.

- Staff confirmed the town would require stamped concrete on the interior of the site. They stated one area of concern is they do not wish to block off an entire area to break up existing concrete to be replaced with stamped concrete, which could be a disturbance to residents.

Commissioner Kuberski questioned which direction the main storefronts will be facing.

- Staff stated the main entrances to the storefronts will be along the residential entryways and not 380.

Commissioner Trees inquired if the future vision entails housing along the south side of the proposal.

- Staff confirmed the plan for the future envisions housing along the south border of the proposal.

Chairman Martin opened the public hearing at 8:36pm. There were no speakers.

Chairman Martin closed the public hearing at 8:36pm.

Motion: Approve the agenda item as presented.

Motion by Commissioner Brian Kuberski, seconded by Vice-Chairman Tom Ocelli

AYE: Chairman Robert Martin, Vice-Chairman Tom Ocelli, Commissioner Ron Trees, Commissioner Brian Kuberski, Commissioner Brandon McLemore, Alternate Commissioner Nisha Singla

6 - 0 Passed - Unanimously

3. **PUBLIC HEARING/ Victory Creekside (PD-25-002433).** Presentation, Discussion, and Consideration for a request to rezone approximately 1.245 acres of land, currently zoned Light Commercial, generally located about 800 feet south of the intersection of Little Elm Parkway and FM 423, within the Town of Little Elm limits, to establish a new Planned Development District based on the Light Commercial District, with modified development standards for a new commercial building.
 - Presentation
 - Open Public Hearing
 - Public Hearing
 - Close Public Hearing
 - Discussion
 - Recommendation

Staff presented the agenda item.

Staff stated they have recently received updated plans and requested to table the item for the next meeting on December 18, 2025.

Motion: Table the agenda item for the next Planning & Zoning Commission meeting on December 18, 2025.

Motion by Vice-Chairman Tom Ocelli, seconded by Commissioner Brian Kuberski

AYE: Chairman Robert Martin, Vice-Chairman Tom Ocelli, Commissioner Ron Trees,
Commissioner Brian Kuberski, Commissioner Brandon McLemore, Alternate
Commissioner Nisha Singla

6 - 0 Passed - Unanimously

7. **Discussion of future agenda items, update on Council action, and requests for new business considerations.**

The Commission discussed future development updates.

0. Discuss proposed revisions to the January 2026 Zoning Calendar, which include adjusting the meeting dates from January 1 and January 20 to January 8 and January 22.

The Commission agreed to reschedule the meetings originally set for January 1, 2026, and January 15, 2026, to new dates of January 8, 2026, and January 22, 2026.

8. **Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:44pm.