

**CITY OF RICHARDSON  
CITY PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES – JULY 5, 2011**

The Richardson City Plan Commission met July 5, 2011, at 7:00 p.m. at City Hall in the Council Chambers, 411 W. Arapaho Road, Richardson, Texas.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** David Gantt, Chairman  
Bill Hammond, Vice Chair  
Gerald Bright, Commissioner  
Janet DePuy, Commissioner  
Marilyn Frederick, Commissioner  
Barry Hand, Commissioner  
Jim Henderson, Commissioner  
Thomas Maxwell, Alternate  
Don Bouvier, Alternate

**CITY STAFF PRESENT:** Sam Chavez, Asst. Director of Dev. Svcs. – Planning  
Chris Shacklett, Planner  
Kathy Welp, Executive Secretary

**BRIEFING SESSION**

Prior to the regular business meeting, the Plan Commission met with staff to receive a briefing on:

**A. Agenda Items**

The Commission was briefed on the agenda items. No action was taken.

**B. Staff Reports**

The Commission was briefed on upcoming development items. No action was taken.

**MINUTES**

**1. Approval of the minutes of the regular business meeting of June 21, 2011.**

**Motion:** Vice Chair Hammond made a motion to approve the minutes as presented; second by Commissioner Frederick. Motion passed 7-0.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**2. Zoning File 11-10:** A request by Richard Ferrara, representing Moroney Renner 37, LP, Evergreen Richardson Senior Community LP, and SSAA Ventures Corporation for an amendment to the PD Planned Development zoning to remove the condition regarding the

maximum number of pad sites and/or freestanding buildings for approximately 12.80 acres located at the southwest corner of Renner Road and North Star Road.

Mr. Shacklett advised that the applicant was requesting to amend the existing PD Planned Development to remove Special Condition #8 regarding the maximum number of pad sites and/or freestanding buildings on the 12.8-acre property located at the southwest corner of Renner and North Star Roads. He said the current ordinance allowed only two free standing pads, and with the Kids R Kids and Evergreen Senior Living Center developments those two pads were taken leaving 4.8 acres of undeveloped property along Renner Road.

In addition, Mr. Shacklett noted that the PD would maintain the Special Permits granted in Ordinances 3752 and 3781 ensuring any future development on the south side of Renner Road would be in the same design style as Breckinridge Corners on the north side of the road.

With no comments or questions from the Commission, Chairman Gantt opened the public hearing.

Mr. Ron Walden, 405 N. Waterview, Richardson, Texas, representing the three property owners, complimented the staff on their thorough job and said the request was meant to clean up old language dating back to 1988, and to make the property more developable.

There were no other comments in favor or opposition and Chairman Gantt closed the public hearing.

**Motion:** Commissioner Hand made a motion to recommend approval of Zoning File 11-10 as presented; second by Commissioner DePuy. Motion passed 7-0.

- 3. Zoning File 11-11:** A request by Kent Junkert, representing KJ Auto, for a Special Permit for a motor vehicle repair shop – major at 405 S. Central Expressway, southeast corner of Central Expressway and Phillips Street.

Mr. Shacklett noted that a Special Permit was requested for a major motor vehicle repair shop located at 405 S. Central Expressway, and the lease space in question would be among six or seven other vehicle repair businesses in the Texas Automotive Center (TAC).

Mr. Shacklett stated he had spoken with the owner about the changes to the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance that required almost every auto use to obtain a Special Permit. He added they had discussed the fact that the request would require an exception to Article XXII-E of the Ordinance which states “major auto repair facilities would not be allowed in multi-tenant buildings;” however, that language was intended to discourage the placement of major vehicle repair shops within typical retail shopping centers. Although the TAC is zoned for retail, it did not develop as such, but as a completely automotive repair center.

Commissioner Bright asked about the surrounding retail areas and Mr. Shacklett indicated those on the displayed map.

With no further questions for the staff, Chairman Gantt opened the public hearing.

Ms. Regina Ferree, 205 Betty, Richardson, Texas, stated she was in favor of the request, but had a concern about the state of the area along Sherman Drive.

There were no other comments in favor or opposition and Chairman Gantt closed the public hearing.

Chairman Gantt stated he was in favor of the request and suggested the Special Permit be issued to the lessee so he could operate his business until either the City recalls the permit or the business ceases to exist.

Commissioner Frederick stated she was in favor of encouraging businesses to come into the City, but would like to have it on record that the overall appearance of the building could be improved and the owner of the building should understand that when a business is located in the City it should be maintained to the City's standards.

Commissioner Henderson asked if enhancement and redevelopment requirements were discussed with the applicant.

Mr. Shacklett replied that the subject had been discussed with the applicant noting the future land use plan designated the area as an enhancement and redevelopment district. He explained that the plan listed the area among six within the City where reinvestment/redevelopment would be encouraged; however, the plan did not specifically state what would be appropriate for the area, but that there was a need for further study similar to the one for the West Spring Valley Corridor.

Commissioner Henderson asked if there had been a date set for the area to be studied for redevelopment/enhancement, and what was the applicant's response when he was told about the future plans.

Mr. Shacklett replied there was no date set for further studies, and the applicant stated he understood what the City's future plans were, but asked that in the mean time to have his request approved.

Commissioner DePuy asked if the property was located within the Tax Increment Financing District (TIF) and did that mean that once the area was redeveloped it would participate in the TIF, or was there a time limit on the TIF.

Mr. Shacklett replied that any improvements on the property increased the value and the taxes obtained from the added value would go into the TIF fund to be used for the reimbursement of any project within the district that improved public infrastructure.

Commissioner Hand thanked the applicant for bringing their business to the City and concurred with Mr. Gantt's suggestion that the Special Permit should be tied to the lessee. He also wanted to emphasize that the principal behind the redevelopment/enhancement areas was based on the City's decision that auto uses was not the highest and best use of the property along Central Expressway.

With no further comments, Chairman Gantt called for a motion.

**Motion:** Commissioner Bright made a motion to recommend approval of Zoning File 11-11 with the condition that the Special Permit was limited to Mr. Kent Junkert; second by Commissioner DePuy. Motion passed 7-0.

4. **Zoning File 11-12:** A request by Chris Ray, representing Centennial Park Richardson, Ltd., to revise the PD development rights for the Spring Valley Station District to include 1.9 acres within the PD, allow a maximum of either 95 apartment or condominium units rather than just 95 condominium units for Lot 1B, Block O, McKamy Park Addition and an additional 1.9 acres, to allow surface parking for the proposed 95 units, and the removal of residential development rights on Lot 1B, Block Q, McKamy Park Addition. The property is located on the north side of Spring Valley Road between the DART Light Rail and Greenville Avenue

Mr. Shacklett advised that the applicant was requesting four amendments to the existing PD Planned Development rights:

- Add an additional 1.9-acres into the PD;
- Allow either 95 apartments or condominium units to be located in Lot 1B, Block O and the additional 1.09-acres;
- Allow surface parking to serve the proposed 95 apartment or condominium units;
- Remove the residential development rights from Lot 1B, Block Q.

Shacklett explained that the entire development had entitlement rights for 500 apartments, 300 condominiums and 150 townhomes, and between Buildings A, B and C the 500 apartment limit had been reached. He added that there were several townhomes built, with another group under construction, but no condominiums as yet, therefore, the request was to increase the number of apartments allowed by 95 while decreasing the number of condominiums by the same amount and keeping the total number of multi-family units at 800.

Mr. Shacklett reviewed the history of the project noting that in September 2010 a similar request had come before the Commission asking to change the development rights of the 300 condominium units to allow for up to 300 apartments on Blocks O, Q, and the two tracts east of the creek. After listening to comments in opposition from townhome owners and individuals from the surrounding neighborhood, the Commission stated they did not want to see apartments east of the creek and made that recommendation to the City Council. In October of 2010, the request was denied by the City Council.

In December of 2010 another request was presented regarding Lot 1B, Blocks O and Q and the 1.9-acres of additional land asking for an additional 90 apartments and/or condominium units in lieu of 90 condominium units along with surface parking. The Commission recommended approval of the request subject to removing the residential rights from Lot 1B, Q. The request went forward to the City Council in January 2011 and was again denied with the Council listing three areas of concern:

- Condition of the site – At the time of the request, Building A was still under construction and the Council was concerned about construction debris and equipment being removed before moving forward.
- McKamy Park – The park was still under construction with substantial work to be done before it could be turned over to the City.
- Leasing of Ground Floor Spaces – The Council expressed frustration with the lack of progress in leasing the ground floor spaces in Buildings A and B and did not want to grant additional development rights for more apartments until they saw an increase in the mixed-use part of the development.

Mr. Shacklett indicated the applicant was now back before the Commission after addressing the issues mentioned by the City Council:

- Condition of the site – The site had been significantly cleaned up, especially with the completion of the construction on Building A and residents had started moving in.
- McKamy Park – The City Parks Department conducted walkthroughs in June and July and the park was expected to receive final City acceptance.
- Leasing of Ground Floor Spaces – Letters of Intent (LOIs) had been received and negotiations were ongoing with three tenants for retail space along Spring Valley totaling 7,000 square feet.

Prior to any questions or comments from the Commission, Commissioner Bright recused himself from the Chamber and Chairman Gantt asked Commissioner Bouvier to take his place during deliberation and voting.

Commissioner Hand noted that in previous submissions there had been a plan presented of what would be constructed on the additional 1.9-acre tract and wanted to know if there was more detail available for the current submission.

Mr. Shacklett replied that at the time of the earlier submission the applicant had a rendering of what they might do, but it was not something that was required by the City. He said the applicant was simply using the rendering to depict the fact that only the western portion of the 1.9-acres could be developed because of the creek running through the tract.

Chairman Gantt asked to confirm that development plans were not required during the zoning process.

Mr. Shacklett replied that was correct and the applicant would have to go through a concept plan and development plan stages prior to coming back before the Commission. He added that the earlier rendering was very generic and would not have been attached as an exhibit.

Commissioner Hand asked about the composite overlay on the aerial picture of a future bank building.

Mr. Shacklett replied that the overlay was simply a concept the applicant was looking at and had not been submitted for review and/or approval and was not an exhibit. In addition, the only exhibit that would be attached to the ordinance was Exhibit B.

With no further questions for staff, Chairman Gantt opened the public hearing.

Mr. Chris Ray, Winston Capital, 744 Brick Row, Richardson, Texas, said he felt the conditions requested by the City Council had been completed including cleaning up the site, finishing McKamy Park, and moving closer to leasing some of the ground floor space.

Mr. Ray noted that the leasing of apartments was exceeding expectations with the market rate at \$1.48 per square foot as opposed to their original projection of \$1.30 per square foot. He said their plan for the proposed 95 units was to take the most successful floor plans from the 500 apartments already constructed and use those plans to develop the new building.

Regarding the proposed building, Mr. Ray advised that under the current zoning they would be allowed to go 6 stories; however, the construction costs for a 6-story building would be prohibitive. Another option would be to scale the plan down to 3 or 4 stories, but a 4-story building would require additional work along the creek so they were leaning more towards a 3-story building with 77 units.

Mr. Ray stated that the area located next to the park was originally zoned for condominiums, but they were proposing to build an additional amenity center consisting of a pool and cabana that would be open to the proposed apartment building and the 1.9-acre addition, as well as the townhome owners. He added that the townhome absorption rate had been lower than expected because of economic conditions, but with the addition of the proposed amenity the builder was hoping to increase the sales velocity.

Commissioner DePuy asked if there was information available about the townhome sales.

Mr. Ray replied that the builder had hoped for 3 sales per month at the beginning of the project; however, in 2010 they were only able to sell 8 townhomes for the whole year. In 2011, the sales had picked up and they were selling approximately 1 townhome per month, and had purchased additional lots to prepare for future sales. He noted that the addition of the amenity center would most likely help the builder increase their per month sales figures.

Commissioner Frederick asked to clarify who would have access to the amenity center.

Mr. Ray replied the amenity center would have secured entry and be available to the townhome owners and the tenants from the proposed building. He added that 1 sale per month was keeping the townhome builder active and alive, but with 140 lots to be sold an amenity center would probably help.

Commissioner Hand asked why the request was being made now when the leasing was going so well.

Mr. Ray replied that since the last time he was before the Commission two things had changed: first, the apartment market had improved; and second, the condominium market had declined even farther. He added that the market in Dallas had begun to turn around for multi-family developments and felt their project was in a good position to take advantage of this fact because their infrastructure was already in place. Also, by increasing the number of residents at Brick Row it would help to develop the retail.

Commissioner Hand asked about the possibility of doing a 4-story building and the whether the property would allow parking for 92 units as opposed to 77 units.

Mr. Ray stated that the area marked on Exhibit B as "Additional Acreage to be Re-zoned" covered both buildable land and the creek so the footprint of a 4-story building would require retaining walls because of the proximity to the creek.

Commissioner Henderson asked if he would recognize the names of the tenants who had submitted LOIs. He also wanted to know how many builders were building in the townhome area.

Mr. Ray said two of the LOIs were from a higher-end Chinese restaurant and an Italian restaurant, which matched their vision of local boutique retail; the third LOI was from a local cell phone provider.

Regarding the townhomes, Mr. Ray replied that only David Weekley was building in the townhome area and explained the area was designed to have only one builder because more than one could have an adverse impact on the aesthetics of the development.

Commissioner DePuy complimented the Mr. Ray on his attempts to bring in higher-end retail tenants.

Mr. Ray thanked Ms. DePuy and added that they were eager to complete the vision for the project because the common areas were maintained through homeowner association (HOA) funds and the more people who were actively paying into that fund, the more sustainable the development would be.

Commissioner DePuy asked if the townhomes owners had expressed any concerns about the development.

Mr. Ray replied the townhome owners were more concerned with some of the construction equipment that had been on site, and the change over from the builder's landscape maintenance to the HOA maintenance. He said the construction issues had been addressed with the completion of Building A; they had taken steps to increase their maintenance of the townhome lots; and temporary irrigation and hydro mulch had been added to the vacant lots.

Commissioner Henderson asked if Mr. Ray had had any discussions with the Highland Terrace HOA.

Mr. Ray replied they had not had a chance as yet because of his schedule, but had exchanged many emails and wanted to meet with them prior to the City Council meeting.

Commissioner Bouvier asked if removing the residential rights from Lot 1B, Block Q was intended to increase the developable area in the acreage to be rezoned (1/2 acre net).

Mr. Ray said he had not looked at it that way, but honestly felt the common area amenity zone was a better use of that land because of its proximity to the townhomes and apartments. He also pointed out that the additional acreage to be re-zoned was a land-locked piece of property purchased from the Richardson Independent School District and was zoned for office, but stated offices did not have a place in the development.

Vice Chair Hammond said he was pleased that the developer had agreed to add the amenity zone, and that the development was unique among the other transit oriented developments in the metroplex by having both "for sale" and "for rent" units.

Mr. Ray closed his presentation by stating the rents for apartments in the DFW area had gone up 6% in the last year and Brick Row had gone up 13%, which indicated they were doing something right, and construction on "for sale" multi-family housing (condos) plunged 28% leaving many local condo developers facing default. He added that they had no plans for the remaining pad sites that had been designated for condominiums, but it would be an issue that would eventually have to be addressed by both the developer and the City.



Vice Chair Hammond asked Mr. Ray if there was a true comparison between Brick Row and some of the other condominium developments in Dallas, specifically the Palomar development, which was a redevelopment as opposed to the new development at Brick Row

Mr. Ray replied that the Palomar would sell faster and have a higher price, and the condominiums were a new development but the hotel was a redevelopment. Also, at the time the Palomar received their financing, the hotel/condominium development was the most highly sought after product to finance, but now if a developer was trying to build a hotel with a condominium section, lenders will not even speak to the developer.

Vice Chair Hammond asked about the retail demographics for the Victory development.

Mr. Ray replied that the Victory was having trouble with retail, the amount of investors in the project and he was happy his company owned Brick Row and not the other development.

Chairman Gantt asked what were the occupancy rates were in Buildings A, B and C.

Mr. Ray replied that their original estimate was an average of 30 units leased per month; however, in July and August of 2010 the rate jumped to 55 units per month. In Building A, which opened early in 2011 and had higher rents, 60 units were leased within the first two months and Buildings B and C were at 94% in June 2011. Overall, the whole project was leased at 70% and the retention rate was higher than the market average.

Chairman Gantt asked if Mr. Ray had any other comments regarding the three recommendations from City Council.

Mr. Ray replied that he had addressed most of the recommendations in the applicant statement, but reiterated the construction clean up after completion of Building A, the increase in retail leasing, and the status of McKamy Park.

No further comments were made in favor of the item.

Ms. Regina Ferree, 205 Betty, Richardson, Texas, stated that much discussion had been made about the three recommendations from the City Council, but noted that a fourth recommendation had been made to work with the neighborhood association. She said no meetings had taken place and felt there had been a lack of communication on the part of the developer.

Ms. Ferree said she felt the developer had taken up too much of the City Council and Plan Commission time and could not understand why they could not get retail to come into their development citing the retail growth at the Eastside development. She suggested that if the

Commission was leaning towards approving the item, the approval should be for three stories and 77 units, which would be a nice compromise.

Ms. Shelly McCall, 538 Highland Boulevard, Richardson, Texas, asked how many of the Commissioners had driven through the development, stopped and looked at the apartments, and suggested that it should be a requirement for every project that comes before the Commission.

Ms. McCall said she felt that the residents of the apartments would be short-term based on the size of the apartments, and felt the City was simply moving the undesirable situation from the apartments on West Spring Valley to East Spring Valley. She added that the small amount of available retail space would not bring in the higher-end retail promised by the developer.

Ms. McCall concluded her comments by stating she felt the developer had been deceitful in his dealings with the City and asked the Commission to hold him to his promises.

Commissioner Hand asked if Ms. McCall was asking if the Commission had driven through the development, or actually gone inside the buildings. He also wanted to know if she was referring to retail or residential when stating the tenants would be short-term.

Ms. McCall replied that the Commission should take the time to go inside the buildings and felt the development had not come through with their promise of an aesthetically pleasing development.

Regarding the short-term tenants, McCall said she was referring to residential because the apartments were only 875 square feet, but also felt the overall retail space was too small.

Commissioner Hand said Ms. McCall had stated what she did not want to see in the development, but asked that she verbalize what she did want to see.

Ms. McCall said she wanted high-end apartments and really good retail. She added that if the market was not right for condominiums, then the developer should build larger apartments or more townhomes.

Mr. Rahim Shaikah, 711 S. Grove Road, Richardson, Texas, Vice President of the Highland Terrace Neighborhood Association, pointed out that the developers would be involved with the City for only a short time and their main objective was to maximize their investment, but those who live in the neighborhood would be there for the long haul. He asked the Commission to consider the impact of the development on the surrounding neighborhoods. Chairman Gantt asked Mr. Ray if he had any comments in rebuttal.

Mr. Ray said that the average length of a lease for the last 15 units had been 13 months, which indicated a higher retention rate. He acknowledged that apartments were definitely a shorter term living arrangement than single-family homes, but pointed out that the demographics for their residents were varied, with the majority being young professionals.

Mr. Ray advised that Fossil would be moving into the old Blue Cross Blue Shield campus that was close by, plus they had tenants from the telecom corridor and students that go to the Art Institute in Dallas.

Regarding the creek, Ray noted some of the flooding problems in the area had been partially fixed by the work they did on the creek and that the creek was a City and State issue. He added that when they were building the retaining walls for the creek they scraped the creek bed, but those plants will grow back in time, and it would be up to the City and the HOA to make sure the funds were available to maintain the creek.

Mr. Ray reiterated that their effective rental rate was \$1,124 per apartment per month (\$1.30 per square foot) which would almost be equal to a \$200,000 house at 5-1/4% interest with good credit and believed that spoke to the quality of their tenants.

Mr. Ray said the individual units had some of the same materials used in the uptown Dallas units, but the different in price was the cost they had to pay for the land versus what the uptown developers had to pay.

Vice Chair Hammond asked if Mr. Ray was willing to commit to three stories and 77 units.

Mr. Ray said he would rather not be limited because of economics and would like the ability to choose. He said that having the option for the larger amount of units would ensure the viability of the project, and assured the Commission the building would be architecturally compatible with the existing buildings.

Commissioner Hand asked if the new units would be 875 square feet.

Mr. Ray replied that the smallest units, 560 square feet, were located over the retail spaces, had not been the most successful, and would not be part of the make up for the new building. He said he expected the average unit size would be greater than the units in Building B.

Commissioner Bouvier asked if the units in excess of 77 would be precluded from being built anywhere else in the development because the limit was a total of 800 units, and that such a plan would actually push density away from the neighborhoods.

Mr. Ray replied that they would not be able to add those additional units anywhere else in the development, and Mr. Bouvier's assumption about the density was correct.

Commissioner Henderson asked how many 875 square foot units were already built in the development, and how many of each unit would be built in the new building noting that the difference between 77 units versus 95 units left a lot of room.

Mr. Ray replied that the average size was 875 square feet, but they had units ranging from 560 square feet to just over 1,400 square feet, with the majority of the units having one bedroom.

Regarding the mix of units in the new building, Ray replied there would be less of the smaller units in the new building, but pointed out that the zoning process was not as precise as when they would come through for the concept and development plan processes.

Mr. Shacklett stated he also wanted to point out that there was statement in the multi-family development regulations that the average residential floor unit area per building shall be a minimum 800 square feet, so the ordinance calls out what the minimum floor area should be.

Commissioner Henderson asked about the hike/bike trail that was planned next to their development.

Mr. Ray replied that he was excited about the trail and noted there would be a trail head coming into the development between building C and the new building that was being proposed. He added that the trail would then cross Brick Row and meander through McKamy Park at which point there would be two options: reconnect through the cul-de-sac, or follow the creek to Spring Valley and cross in front of the development's retail spaces.

Commissioner Henderson asked about the drainage and parking for the proposed building and how it might impact the trail. He also wanted to know when the current item would come before the City Council and asked if Mr. Ray would meet with the homeowners before the Council meeting.

Mr. Shacklett replied that the trail would come down the east side of the DART rail and would not be impacted by the new building and the item was scheduled for the July 25<sup>th</sup> City Council meeting.

Mr. Ray said he would meet with the homeowners before the City Council meeting.

With no other questions or comments, Chairman Gantt closed the public hearing.

Chairman Gant stated he perceived this submittal as almost identical to the application received in January and the only change was the removal of residential rights from Block Q. He noted that the completion of Building A, the clean up of the site and status of the park were all positives.

Commissioner DePuy stated she had driven through the site and was happy to see the improvements, but noted there were still some items to be finished. She added that it was unrealistic to expect the amenities to be finished before the residential units were completed because once the roof tops were in the retail should follow.

Commissioner Frederick reiterated that the issue before the Commission was a zoning issue as opposed to a design issue and wanted to make four points based on statements made during the public hearing:

- 800 square foot apartments were not only in this development, but many apartment developments in the City. Also, many tenants think their stay in an apartment will only be short-term, but they end up staying longer.
- Communication should be a two-way street between the homeowners and the developer.
- Regarding larger versus smaller apartments, this might not be a good idea and probably was not what the townhomes and neighborhoods would like to see.
- Expectations for higher amenities were unrealistic.

Ms. Frederick stated that it will take time to finish the development and suggested to the Commission and audience that they should be in support of the development instead of opposed.

Commissioner Hand noted that many of the comments made regarding the development were repetitive, having been made at previous meetings and added that the comments did not match with the reality or the economics of a development. He reiterated Ms. DePuy's statement that retail would follow the creation of roof tops and was bewildered at the comments of "let's not build this, but where is the great retail that was promised" because those two statements did not go hand-in-hand.

Mr. Hand stated that limiting the developer to 77 units would be counterproductive and he would like to see more units and structured parking even though that might not fit with the developer's business plan. He added that mid-level residential and retail was where the market was currently going and to leave the development unfinished would not be appropriate.

Commissioner Hand asked the staff if the Commission could limit the size and number of units once the project went through the zoning process.

Mr. Shacklett replied the size was regulated by the Planned Development (PD) and the item before the Commission was a request for an amendment to the PD regulations asking to change the development rights from 500 apartments and 300 condominiums to 595 apartments and 205 condominiums. He added that the project would still have to come back through the concept and development review processes at which time the developer would submit their site plans and building elevations for approval. Also, the site plan would lay out the locations of their amenity zones, the sidewalk areas, and build-to zones.

Chairman Gantt noted that the Commission had already covered many of the initial requirements for the development and the proposal was simply a modification. He added that one of the key aspects of the current proposal was the addition of the 1.9-acres which made the development larger, lowered the density per acre, and if the land was not included in the PD it would be virtually undevelopable.

Mr. Shacklett replied there were so many regulations written into the original PD that the developer had no choice but to follow those exactly.

Commissioner Hand asked if there was anything the Commission would not be able to review later on in the development process.

Mr. Shacklett indicated that the Commissioner's packets contained a 12 page document that was the non-residential, multi-family, and mixed use building development regulations, which covers unit size and type, materials, service areas, roof-mounted equipment, residential adjacencies, amenity zones, yards, etc. He said that what the Commission would not be able to do was direct that the building had to be built at a certain height with a certain number of units.

**Motion:** Vice Chair Hammond made a motion to recommend approval of Zoning File 11-12; second by Commissioner Bouvier. Motion passed 7-0.

## **ADJOURN**

With no further business before the Commission, Chairman Gantt adjourned the regular business meeting at 8:57 p.m.



David Gantt, Chairman  
City Plan Commission