

**Planned Development
District Amendment
PDD-07-02(B)**

**McCarty Commons Planned
Development District**



Summary

Request:	An amendment to the sign standards applicable to the HEB site within the McCarty Commons Planned Development District (PDD).		
Applicant:	Joshua V. Elledge, P.E Quiddity Engineering, LLC 601 Northwest Loop 410, Suite 453, San Antonio, TX, 78216	Property Owner: (HEB Site only)	HEB Grocery Company LP 646 South Flores Street San Antonio, TX, 78204

Notification

Application:	March 17, 2026	Neighborhood Meeting:	N/A
Published:	April 12, 2026	# of Participants	N/A
Posted:	April 10, 2026	Personal:	April 10, 2026
Response:	1 objection received (see attached comments)		

Property Description

Legal Description:	259.52 acres, more or less, out of the Nathaniel Hubbard Survey, Abstract No. 230, and the Cyrus Wickson Survey, Abstract 474, Hays County, Texas, generally located southeast of the intersection between I-35 and E McCarty Lane		
Location:	IH-35 / E McCarty Lane		
Acreage:	Approx. 259.52 acres (HEB site – 17.669 acres)	PDD/DA/Other:	McCarty Commons PDD Ord. #2013-26
Existing Zoning:	Base Zoning: General Commercial (GC), Community Commercial (CC), Public (P) Overlay: PDD	Proposed Zoning:	Same
Existing Use:	Single-Family, Commercial, Parks, Multifamily	Proposed Use:	Same (The site subject to the request is proposed as a grocery store)
Preferred Scenario:	Commercial Employment-Medium, Neighborhood Low, Conservation/ Cluster	Proposed Designation:	Same
CONA Neighborhood:	N/A	Sector:	5
Utility Capacity:	Available	Floodplain:	Partial (no floodplain within HEB site)
Historic Designation:	N/A	My Historic SMTX	No

**Planned Development
District Amendment
PDD-07-02(B)**

**McCarty Commons Planned
Development District**



Surrounding Area

	Zoning	Existing Land Use	Preferred Scenario
North of Property:	General Commercial/ Heavy Industrial	Embassy Suites and City Convention Center/Amazon	Commercial Employment Medium
South of Property:	General Commercial/ Smart Code	Outlet Malls	Commercial Employment Medium
East of Property:	Character District-5	Vacant	Mixed Use Medium (East Village)
West of Property:	Public and Institutional	I-35/ Fish Hatchery	Conservation Cluster

Staff Recommendation

☒	Approval as Submitted	☐	Alternate Approval	☐	Denial
Staff: Julia Cleary, AICP					
			Title: Senior Planner		Date: April 22, 2026

Commission Recommendation

☒	Approval as Submitted	☐	Approval with Conditions / Alternate	☐	Denial
Speakers in favor or opposed Joshua Elledge, Quiddity Engineering (applicant- in favor) Recommendation from the Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting held April 28, 2026 A motion was made by Commissioner Dunn, second by Commissioner Burleson to recommend approval of the request. The vote passed with a 7-0 vote For: 7 (Agnew, Burleson, Costilla, Dunn, Hardy, Johnson, Van Oedekerke) Against: 0 Absent: 2 (Bryan, Case)					

**Planned Development
District Amendment
PDD-07-02(B)**

**McCarty Commons Planned
Development District**



History

In 2008 the McCarty Commons PDD was adopted via Ordinance No. 2008-41. The approved PDD encompasses approximately 260 acres and is intended to facilitate mixed-use development that will include employment, commercial, multifamily, and single-family uses, as well as approximately 58 acres of parks and open space.

This is the third amendment for the McCarty Commons PDD. It was initially amended in 2009 (Ord 2009-63) to allow a call center as a specific use, and then again in 2013 (Ord 2013-26) to carve out and establish specific rules for the HEB site, including the location and dimensions of all proposed signage as part of Exhibit D.

The site subject to this specific request is approximately 17 acres and is located within Area A-1 in the Concept Plan, which has a base zoning of GC (General Commercial). The HEB site is located at the intersection of the I-35 frontage road and E McCarty Lane, with the DR Horton Sales office located on the adjacent property to the east and the Embassy Suites Convention Center on the other side of McCarty Lane to the north of the site. Although only the HEB site is impacted by the request, the PDD in its entirety is included within the amendment, and all property owners within the PDD have been notified accordingly.

Additional Analysis

The purpose of this amendment is to revise the approved signage plan within the HEB site to allow an approximately 60 ft tall freestanding sign, with the objective of increasing the site's visibility for those travelling on I-35 southbound, according to the applicant. The sign face would be approximately 417 square feet and would include the words "San Marcos" within an outline of the state of Texas in addition to the specific HEB logo. This would replace the proposed gas pricing sign due to the gas station being moved further down the property. No additional changes to the PDD are proposed.

The proposed sign would be greater than the dimensions allowed in the current Development Code. Per Section 7.3.3.2.A of the current Development Code, on premise freestanding signs along I-35 are limited to 42 ½ feet, and the maximum effective sign area per side per sign may not exceed 260 square feet. It should be noted that the majority of the proposed sign face is made up of the outline of the state of Texas with "San Marcos" lettering, and the red and white part of the sign with HEB lettering will not be larger than the HEB lettering on the other 40' sign already permitted on the site.

The criteria for zoning changes and Planned Development District are outlined below however please note that the analysis relates only to this specific request to amend the PDD to allow a 60' sign within the HEB site. Other elements such as architectural standards and the mixture of allowed uses were not considered as they are already approved within the PDD.

Comments from Other Departments

Police	No Comment
Fire	No Comment
Public Services	No Comment
Engineering	No Comment

**Planned Development
District Amendment
PDD-07-02(B)**

**McCarty Commons Planned
Development District**



Evaluation			Criteria for Approval (Sec.2.5.1.4 Current Code)
Consistent	Inconsistent	Neutral	
		<u>X</u>	Whether the proposed zoning map amendment implements the policies of the adopted Comprehensive Plan and preferred scenario map. <i>The HEB site is classified as "Mixed Use Medium" on the Preferred Growth Scenario. There are no specific policies in the Comprehensive Plan. The larger sign is considered to be more auto oriented.</i>
		<u>N/A</u>	Whether the proposed zoning map amendment is consistent with any adopted small area plan or neighborhood character study for the area <i>There are no adopted Small Area Plans or Neighborhood Character studies available for this site. It is located adjacent the draft area plan boundary for the "East Village".</i>
		<u>X</u>	Whether the proposed zoning map amendment implements the policies of any applicable plan adopted by City Council <i>The requested change to the signage plan does not impact this criteria.</i>
		<u>N/A</u>	Whether the proposed zoning map amendment is consistent with any applicable development agreement in effect
		<u>X</u>	Whether the uses permitted by the proposed change in zoning district classification and the standards applicable to such uses shall be appropriate in the immediate area of the land to be reclassified <i>The requested change to the signage plan does not impact this criteria as the use has already been approved.</i>
<u>X</u>			Whether the proposed zoning will reinforce the existing or planned character of the area <i>The proposed sign is located in a busy, auto oriented location adjacent to the interstate.</i>

**Planned Development
District Amendment
PDD-07-02(B)**

**McCarty Commons Planned
Development District**



Evaluation			Criteria for Approval (Sec.2.5.1.4, Current Code)
Consistent	Inconsistent	Neutral	
<u>X</u>			Whether the site is appropriate for the development allowed in the proposed district <i>There are no environmental constraints on the property, and the larger sign will be placed outside any sight distance triangle and existing or proposed easement.</i>
	<u>X</u>		Whether there are substantial reasons why the property cannot be used according to the existing zoning <i>An approximately 40' tall HEB sign is already permitted on the site within the existing PDD signage plan.</i>
		<u>X</u>	Whether the City and other service providers will be able to provide sufficient public facilities and services including schools, roads, recreation facilities, wastewater treatment, water supply and stormwater facilities, public safety, and emergency services, while maintaining sufficient levels of service to existing development <i>The requested change to the signage plan does not impact this criterion.</i>
		<u>X</u>	Whether there is a need for the proposed use at the proposed location <i>The requested change to the signage plan does not impact this criterion.</i> <i>This is not a request for a change of use, however it should be noted that as part of outreach for the draft East Village Area Plan, the need for an HEB within this area was frequently cited by local community members.</i>
<u>X</u>			Whether the proposed rezoning will have a significant adverse impact on property in the vicinity of the subject property <i>The amendment to the signage plan is not anticipated to have any significant adverse impact on property in the vicinity of the subject property.</i>
		N/A	For requests to a Neighborhood Density District, whether the proposed amendment complies with the compatibility of uses and density in Section 4.1.2.5

**Planned Development
District Amendment
PDD-07-02(B)**

**McCarty Commons Planned
Development District**



Evaluation		Evaluation	Criteria for Approval (Sec.2.5.1.4, Current Code)
Consistent	Inconsistent	Neutral	
<u>X</u>			The impact the proposed amendment has with regard to the natural environment, including the quality and quantity of water and other natural resources, flooding, and wildlife management <i>Staff are not aware of any impacts the additional sign area and height will have on the natural environment. The HEB site is located outside the floodplain and Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone, and there are no other known environmental constraints on the site.</i>
<u>X</u>			Any other factors which shall substantially affect public health, safety, morals, or general welfare <i>There are no factors which will impact public health or safety.</i>

Evaluation			PDD Criteria for Approval (Sec 1.5.3.5, 2015 Development Code) - <i>Please note the analysis below applies only to the specific request to amend the Signage Plan, not the PDD as a whole</i>
Consistent	Inconsistent	Neutral	
		<u>X</u>	The extent to which the land covered by the proposed PD district fits one or more of the special circumstances in Section 4.2.6.1 warranting a PD district classification. - The land is located in close proximity to established residential neighborhoods where conventional zoning classifications may not adequately address neighborhood concerns regarding the quality or compatibility of the adjacent development, and where it may be desirable to the neighborhood, the developer or the City to develop and implement mutually-agreed, enforceable development standards; <i>McCarty Commons received approval for enhanced development standards through a PDD in 2008, 2009.</i> - The land, or adjacent property that would be impacted by the development of the land, has sensitive or unique

**Planned Development
District Amendment
PDD-07-02(B)**

**McCarty Commons Planned
Development District**



			environmental features requiring a more flexible approach to zoning, or special design standards, in order to afford the best possible protection; • The land is proposed for development as a mixed-use development or a traditional neighborhood development requiring more flexible and innovative design standards; • The land consists of inner-City or downtown property that is proposed for redevelopment or infill development, and special design considerations are deemed desirable; • The land serves as transition between different and seemingly incompatible land uses • The land is proposed for development as an employment center, and special design standards may be warranted; and • The land is of such a character that it is in the community's best interest to encourage high quality development through flexible development standards to further the goals and objectives of the City's Comprehensive Plan.
		<u>X</u>	The extent to which the proposed PD district furthers the policies of the Comprehensive Plan <i>There are no policies in the Comprehensive Plan which would be applicable to an increased sign size and height at this location</i>
	<u>X</u>		The extent to which the proposed PD district will result in a superior development than could be achieved through conventional zoning classifications. <i>The amendment to signage plan would allow a sign which is 41% higher than the maximum height allowed by code and a sign face than is approx. 37% larger than the square footage allowed by code.</i>
		<u>X</u>	The extent to which the proposed PD district will resolve or mitigate any compatibility issues with surrounding development. <i>The requested change to the signage plan does not impact this criterion. There are no anticipated compatibility issues with surrounding development due to the site's location adjacent the interstate.</i>

**Planned Development
District Amendment
PDD-07-02(B)**

**McCarty Commons Planned
Development District**



			Criteria for Approval (Sec 1.5.3.5, 2015 Development Code)
Consistent	Evaluation Inconsistent	Neutral	
		<u>X</u>	The extent to which the PD district is generally consistent with the criteria for approval of a watershed plan for land within the district. <i>The requested change to the signage plan does not impact this criterion.</i>
		<u>X</u>	The extent to which proposed uses and the configuration of uses depicted in the Concept Plan are compatible with existing and planned adjoining uses; <i>The requested change to the signage plan does not impact this criterion as no changes to the Concept Plan are proposed.</i>
		<u>X</u>	The extent to which the proposed development is consistent with adopted master facilities plans, including without limitation the water facilities, master wastewater facilities, transportation, drainage and other master facilities plans; and <i>The requested change to the signage plan does not impact this criterion.</i>
		<u>X</u>	The extent to which the proposed open space and recreational amenities within the development provide a superior living environment and enhanced recreational opportunities for residents of the district and for the public generally. <i>The requested change to the signage plan does not impact this criterion.</i>