CITY OF RICHARDSON CITY PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES – APRIL 19, 2011

The Richardson City Plan Commission met April 19, 2011, at 7:00 p.m. at City Hall in the Council Chambers, 411 W. Arapaho Road, Richardson, Texas.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bill Hammond, Vice Chair

Gerald Bright, Commissioner Janet DePuy, Commissioner Marilyn Frederick, Commissioner

Barry Hand, Commissioner Jim Henderson, Commissioner

Don Bouvier, Alternate Thomas Maxwell, Alternate

MEMBERS ABSENT: David Gantt, Chairman

CITY STAFF PRESENT: Cliff Miller, Assistant City Manager

Sam Chavez, Asst. Director of Dev. Svcs. – Planning Susan Smith, Asst. Director of Dev. Svcs. – Dev. & Engr.

Monica Heid, Community Projects Manager Israel Roberts, Development Review Manager

Keith Krum, Senior Planner 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 meeting of March 15, 2011.

Motion: Commissioner DePuy made a motion to approve the minutes as presented; second

by Commissioner Bright. Motion passed 7-0.

ZONING CASE

2. **Zoning File 11-04 (continued discussion from April 5, 2011 meeting):** A request by the City of Richardson to rezone approximately 198 acres north of West Spring Valley Road, between Coit Road and Central Expressway, extending north to Dumont Drive, from PD, A-950-M, D-1400-M, R-1500-M, LR-M(1), LR-M(2), C-M, O-M and MU to PD Planned Development.

Ms. Heid stated she would spend a short period of time on background information before proceeding with the changes requested by the Commission. She pointed out that the City was the applicant for the zoning request and, as such, the role of the City was to put regulations in place to encourage redevelopment and possibly partner in any major redevelopment efforts. In addition, the City has adopted a task force approach for implementing the plan with different staff groups to cover regulations and policy, infrastructure, communication, and when proposals come in from developers, negotiations.

Heid described the boundaries of the West Spring Valley Corridor (the Corridor) and noted that the land area was 188 acres with 10 additional acres of right-of-way. She added that the purpose of the zoning request was to:

- Encourage appropriate reinvestment and redevelopment in the Corridor
- Establish a vision
- Put the regulations in place to direct the redevelopment
- Improve the streetscape
- Diversify the retail mix and housing choices
- Build connections between the Corridor, stakeholders, surrounding neighborhoods, communities, and the region as a whole
- Stabilize property ownership and property values
- Change the perception of the Corridor

Ms. Heid reported that the redevelopment effort would be a long term, 10-20 year project, and because of that length of time it was likely the City might have to refine or revisit the Ordinance because of changing conditions or new information.

Regarding the existing zoning and property uses, Heid said the predominant zoning was Mixed Use, but there were also Apartment, Local Retail, Commercial, Duplex and Residential. She added that the Corridor was well-served by a network of roadways, and there are two creeks and a small lake, all of which are privately owned.

Ms. Heid stated that early in the project, a market study was performed and market demand was identified for both short-term and mid-term uses. As a result of the study, a Framework Plan was developed that identified land use categories for the future and also highlighted five

catalyst projects, which would help to begin the turn around process in the Corridor. They are:

- 1. Improvements to West Spring Valley Road will help change the perception of the Corridor and will include transportation oriented enhancements and pedestrian urban design improvements.
- 2. Parcel at Floyd, James and Hwy 75 (Continental Inn) potential redevelopment for mixed use and mid-rise buildings (i.e., retail, office) mixed use residential and perhaps a boutique hotel.
- 3. Spring Valley and Weatherred (northeast corner) mixed use at the same scale as the Continental Inn site retail, office, residential, open space, and the proposed new street from Weatherred to the frontage road of Hwy 75.
- 4. New Orleans Apartment Redevelopment forty-eight new townhomes with a trail connection along the creek.
- 5. Oncor substation enhancement of the facility.

Ms. Heid moved on to the discussion of the Ordinance, noting that it would require more in terms of design standards and streetscape improvements combined with traditional zoning concepts. She said the Ordinance was structured in sections and included key elements such as a District Plan, descriptions of land use Subdistricts, standards for streetscapes, building heights and types, landscaping, parking, signage, appendices and an administrative section.

In terms of the changes requested by the Commission, Heid noted that the map showing a lake opportunity with cross-hatch marks on a single piece of property had been revised to show a symbol that did not sit on a specific tract of land and related language had also been added stating the expansion and enhancement of Blue Lake would add value to the adjacent land. She explained that the consultants had prepared exhibits showing different concepts for an expanded lake that would straddle the property line leaving developable land on both tracts.

Another item of change requested by the Commission was the retail-ready requirement along the new road between Weatherred and Hwy 75. Heid said the retail-ready designation would be on both sides of the roadway from Weatherred to St. Paul, except for the area along the park, which meant buildings would be constructed with retail-ready spaces at grade.

Regarding the table showing building types by Subdistrict, Ms. Heid highlighted some of the changes noting that images and text descriptions relating to the table would be included in the document with the descriptions indicating the height of the building and what uses could take place at the ground floor and above. The changes included:

- Subdistrict B - no non-residential uses allowed within the 200-foot buffer in Subdistrict B west of St. Paul adjacent to the single family neighborhood.

- Subdistrict D Mixed Residential buildings built within the 200-foot buffer would require a Major Modification, and beyond the 200 feet would be a use "by right."
- Subdistrict A no Mixed Use buildings north of James Drive and east of Floyd Road.

Ms. Heid next reviewed the changes to the Height Zones noting that the previous draft recommended a single story for Patio Homes or Mixed Use buildings; however, the Commission felt the minimum height should be two stories unless the buildings were for a senior housing development or ADA accessibility.

Regarding building heights, Heid pointed out that in Subdistrict B, subject to certain requirements such as a minimum separation from single family of 300 feet and frontage on Central Expressway, the buildings could have as many as 8 stories. In area F, there are limitations on building heights varying from 1 to 4 stories that respect the proximity of single family neighborhoods, but within the core portion of Subdistrict F, there is the possibility of adding another story as long as there is compliance with LEED Silver construction methods.

Also allowed in Subdistrict B was the use of glass curtain walls on buildings of 6 or more stories, and any portion of the Corridor in the middle portion of a tri-partite building (Mixed Use, Live/Work, Mixed Residential, or Commercial).

Ms. Heid then looked at the Permitted Uses section of Appendix 1 noting that the various uses were divided by category, than there would be an enumeration of uses under each category heading and what would be allowed by subdistrict.

Regarding the bicycle parking requirements, Heid noted the Commission had revised the ratio from 1 space for every 20 vehicles spaces to 1 for every 25 spaces (1:25). The City Hall and Library sites were used as examples for purposes of calculations.

Ms. Heid indicated the Administration portion of the Ordinance had been expanded to clarify nonconforming uses and read the definition of nonconforming as "Any land use, structure, lot of record, or other situation related to the use or development of land that was legally established prior to the effective date of the PD Ordinance but does not fully conform as of the effective date of the new ordinance." She added that a nonconforming use, sign or structure that was on a property prior to adoption of the Ordinance may continue subject to certain requirements as follows:

Uses -

- Nonconforming use can only change to a conforming use, not to another nonconforming use after adoption of the Ordinance.
- Nonconforming use can not be expanded within an existing building, and the building can not be expanded to accommodate the nonconforming use.
- Nonconforming use can not be expanded to an area currently outside the building.

 If nonconforming use is changed to a conforming use, it can not revert back to the nonconforming use.

Structures -

- Nonconforming structures can continue to be used for a nonconforming use that was in place prior to the adoption of the Ordinance, or for a conforming permitted use after the adoption of the Ordinance.
- Nonconforming structures can be maintained and repaired as it pertains to health and safety, or to maintain minimum building standards (i.e., repainting allowed if occupied by a conforming use).
- If a structure was destroyed by a natural act or cause beyond the owner's control, and the damage exceeds 50% of the reasonable cost of repair or replacement, the structure can not be rebuilt except in conformance with the new Ordinance.
- If a structure was destroyed by a natural act or a cause beyond the owner's control and the damage is less than 50% of the reasonable cost of repair or replacement, the structure can be rebuilt to the previous nonconforming status, but there can be no expansion of the building.

Signs -

• The existing City sign ordinance has a section regarding rebuilding a nonconforming sign and rather than create a new statement, the Ordinance will refer to the existing City sign ordinance.

Discontinued Nonconforming Uses -

 A nonconforming use that is discontinued for a period exceeding six months, shall be deemed abandoned and can not be reestablished and any subsequent use shall be conforming.

Ms. Heid explained that the Design Guidelines section of the Ordinance was divided into four sections: urban context guidelines; architectural guidelines; streetscape guidelines; and sustainability. She gave brief examples of the material from each section, including a chart showing a side-by-side comparison of the Corridor's objectives and how they compared with the North Texas 2050 Sustainability Principles.

Ms. Heid reviewed a list of completed steps taken during the development of the Ordinance pointing out there had been a total of 5 community meetings including focus groups, both in Phase 1 and Phase 2, in addition to City Council and City Plan Commission briefings. She noted that the moratorium would expire on June 11, 2011, unless the Ordinance was adopted first, at which time the moratorium would expire.

Vice Chair Hammond suggested that Ms. Heid review the list of suggested revisions one by one so the Commission could express comments or concerns on each item prior to making a final decision.

Ms. Heid presented the revisions in more detail as follows:

<u>Lake Opportunity</u> (PD Ordinance, page 9, Item 8.d) - Within Area D, the improvement of existing Blue Lake as an amenity may be eligible for incentives. (Appendix 5 of Design Guidelines.)

<u>Lake Opportunity</u> (Design Guidelines, page 60, Paragraph 1) - Within Area D, there is an opportunity to expand existing Blue Lake to provide a view of this water feature from W. Spring Valley and to create an amenity for the W. Spring Valley Corridor. This improvement of Blue Lake may be eligible for financial or other incentives based on the proposed improvements and the resulting value to the overall District.

Commissioner DePuy felt the improvements in the verbiage would help the landowner who spoke at the previous meeting, and addressed the concerns about providing incentives. She felt the point had been very well addressed.

Commissioner Henderson asked if the two property owners had been notified and said he would like to know their opinion of the new concept.

Ms. Heid replied that she had sent the new concept to the property owner, who spoke at the April 5th meeting, but he was not present at the current meeting; however, the other property owner's representatives was in the audience.

Vice Chair Hammond stated that he would allow the representative to answer Mr. Henderson's question.

Mr. Warren Huddleston, 900 W. Spring Valley, Richardson, Texas, said he had not received the latest concept, but noted that Ms. Heid had been in contact with Mr. Dan Hopkins, who spoke at the previous meeting; however, Mr. Hopkins had not forwarded any information to him.

Commissioner Henderson asked if Mr. Huddleston owned the east portion of the new concept and he replied that he did.

Commissioner Hand stated he remembered the City Council recalling individuals to give testimony after a public hearing was closed and wanted to know if that same option was open to the Commission.

Vice Chair Hammond replied that the public hearing had been closed and he would make a decision on a case-by-case basis.

No other comments were made on the Lake Opportunity.

Garage Orientation (Patio Homes, page 19, Item F.i page 22) - Swing-entry garages may be permitted by Minor Modification due to site constraints, provided a minimum driveway length of 20 feet shall be provided to the garage door opening and provided the cumulative area of any driveway plus any impermeable surface area located between the front property line and any front building wall shall not exceed 50 percent of the area between the front property line and any front building wall.

No comments or questions from the Commission.

Design Guidelines (Appendix 5, page 49) – eliminate the last three bullets; add the following as the final bullet: Transparency: In general, windows shall represent 60-80% of the building façade at grade and 30 to 60% of the building façade above grade; however, glass curtain walls shall be permitted in any percentage on the "middle" portion of a building (as defined under tri-partite construction) and on any portion of a Commercial Building of six stories or more where allowed in Area B.

No comments or questions from the Commission.

W. Spring Valley Corridor District Uses (Appendix 1, page 1-1) – Add Area D to list of permitted subdistricts for Parking Lot Accessory (to support potential Mixed Use projects).

No comments or questions from the Commission.

Regarding Building Materials, Heid pointed out that the current draft listed the materials that were itemized in the presentation from the work session on April 12th, and Item (e) under Architectural Metal Panel or Tiles would be removed because it was actually part of one of the other materials. She said that specification language had been added and the names of the materials would need change to match industry standards.

Vice Chair Hammond asked if that would include that a system would need to be installed by certified installers, and Ms. Heid said that was correct.

Commissioner Hand said the definitions of the systems were correct, but asked to revise the names of the materials as follows:

Building Materials (PD Ordinance, page 27, Item 7.b.ii(b) -

Architectural metal panel or tile including:

- (a) Insulted Core Metal Wall Panel Systems
- (b) Metal Composite Wall Panel System (also strike ACM from title)
- (c) Titanium Zinc Alloy Sheet Metal Roofing Façade Cladding and Roof Drainage Components System
- (d) Colorized, Patterned and Textured Stainless Steel Sheet Classing Systems
- (e) Rear Ventilated Phenolic Rain Screen Wall Panel System

Commissioner Hand also requested to change the verbiage regarding installers to read "Systems to be installed by installers certified by the system manufacturer."

No further comments from the Commission.

Ms. Heid next described the section of the Ordinance concerning Exterior Façade Materials and the Commission's request to add the following verbiage "The use of durable, high-quality, high-performance materials is encouraged as a means of creating visual interest and building articulation." She said the information would be added to the opening paragraph.

Regarding the Exterior Walls sub-heading, Ms. Heid reported that the percentage of masonry would change from 85% to 50%, and that concrete tilt wall pre-cast concrete or similar materials were prohibited, except as provided in combination with glass curtain walls. She also stated that as she understood the Commission's request and the five new materials mentioned by Commissioner Hand would be allowed in any percentage above the ground floor in Mixed Use, Live/Work, Mixed Residential or Commercial buildings.

Commissioner Maxwell agreed with Ms. Heid, but asked why the same percentages were not applied to interior courtyards and suggested they should be.

Ms. Heid replied that interior courtyards were 100% masonry at the ground floor, but wanted to know if the Commission would like to leave that in place or modify it so that regardless of whether a wall was facing the street or a courtyard it would have the same requirements.

Commissioner Hand said that it would simplify it to make 50% on the base and any percentages above. He also wanted to know if the portion of the statement regarding "any percentage on the middle portion" was to be included, and suggested that pre-cast concrete panels should be allowed.

Ms. Heid replied that she understood the Commission wanted the "middle portion" statement taken out.

Commissioner Maxwell agreed with Mr. Hand, but suggested that concrete tilt walls and site-cast concrete panels should be prohibited.

Commissioner DePuy asked if the list of building materials would limit the vision of the project since it was a 10-20 year plan.

Mr. Hand replied that the problem with proposing a list could be that some materials would be left off, or there might be technology developed in the future that was not on the list; however, any change could be handled as a rezoning or revision of the Ordinance.

Mr. Chavez added that any changes could be handled in the future as an amendment to the Ordinance.

No further comments or questions from the Commission.

Ms. Heid stated that if all the items were amended to the satisfaction of the Commission, then at the time of the motion it should be stated "to incorporate the changes relative to lake opportunity, garage orientation, buildings materials, windows in the Design Guidelines, and district uses."

Vice Chair Hammond asked if there were any questions or comments about the changes that had been noted in the Commission's workbook.

Commissioner Bright asked if the information regarding nonconforming structures, as listed in Section 9, pages 56-57, would allow a structure to be redesigned or renovated without going through the Major Modification process if the use was permitted prior to the adoption of the Ordinance as well as after.

Ms. Heid replied that the structure could be painted and interior renovations would not be a problem as long as the original footprint was maintained, but any changes to the footprint or parking lot would have to comply with the new Ordinance.

Commissioner Maxwell asked if Item 2.f. could be changed to allow painting of a nonconforming structure and a nonconforming use.

Vice Chair Hammond said that suggestion would be included, and asked if there were any further comments or request for changes in Sections 1 through 9, and/or Appendix 1 through 5.

There were no further comments or questions from the Commission and Vice Chair Hammond called for a motion.

Before making the motion, Commissioner Hand commented that he lived within 1,000 feet of the Corridor for over 20 years and had worked with the Neighborhood Associations to address issues along Spring Valley and felt the project was an excellent opportunity to reinforce the vision for the next generation. He also commended the City and the citizens for working so diligently on the project.

Motion: Commissioner Hand made a motion to recommend approval of Zoning File 11-04 as amended; second by Commissioner DePuy.

Vice Chair Hammond called for any discussion on the motion and Mr. Henderson said he agreed with Mr. Hand that the area had been deteriorating for many years, but felt there had been too much of a rush to complete the project. He said he was disappointed the public hearing portion of the April 5th meeting had been closed and felt it should be reopened because of the recently proposed changes. In addition, Henderson stated that of the four public meetings only one was a public hearing, and felt the consensus vote of the Commission during a prior work session was not legal. Mr. Henderson reported that he was not opposed to the project, but was requesting to reopen the public hearing for comments.

Vice Chair Hammond replied that he felt the Commission had conducted itself in a legal manner throughout the process and there had been ample opportunity for the Commissioners and citizens to voice their opinions on the project since it was first proposed. He added that he did not see any reason to reopen the public hearing and pointed out that the citizens would have another opportunity to comment on the proposed Ordinance during the public hearing before the City Council.

Motion passed 6-1 with Commissioner Henderson opposed.

MASTER TRANSPORATION PLAN

3. MTP File 11-01 (continued discussion from April 5, 2011 meeting): A request by the City of Richardson to amend the Master Transportation Plan and Comprehensive Plan to add an east/west collector street between Weatherred Drive and Central Expressway, north of West Spring Valley Road.

Ms. Heid reported that the item was briefed during the April 5th meeting and a public hearing had been opened for comments. She added that the public hearing had been closed and the Commission requested to postpone their recommendation until the decision on Zoning File 11-04 had been made.

Heid noted that the request was to amend the Master Transportation Plan (MTP) to add the connection and was not meant to be a specific alignment. She said that as properties in the area redevelop, there would be the opportunity for the City to speak with landowners to acquire right-of-way.

Ms. Heid pointed out that the street would be a Minor Collector expected to carry 2,500 to 8,000 vehicles per day and could be configured to require shared lanes wide enough for both vehicles and bicycles, and to allow for either angled or parallel parking. She requested that the Commission add the street to the MTP to support Zoning File 11-04.

With no questions or comments, Vice Chair Hammond called for a motion.

Motion: Commissioner Bright made a motion to recommend approval of MTP File 11-01 as presented; second by Commissioner Frederick. Motion passed 7-0.

PUBLIC HEARING

4. MTP FILE 11-02: A request by the City of Richardson to amend the Master Transportation Plan and Comprehensive Plan to add the Cotton Belt rail corridor as a Regional Rail Transit Corridor, adjust the alignment of Routh Creek Drive, add an east/west collector between North Plano Road and Routh Creek Drive north of East Renner Road, add a north/south collector street between the State Highway 190 Access Road and West Renner Road east of the US 75 Access Road, add a north/south collector street between the State Highway 190 Access Road and Infocom Drive west of the DART Red Line rail corridor, and add a north/south collector street between the State Highway 190 Access Road and the new east/west collector street west of North Plano Road, and remove the designated grade separated intersection at North Plano Road and East Renner Road.

Mr. Carter advised that the MTP request was similar to the preceding request in the fact that it was in support of the previously approved rezoning of the Bush/75 Transit Oriented development. He noted that the intention of the amendment was to include the roadway plan as required in the Regulating Plans of the developments, and to update the diagrammatic plan.

Carter reviewed the different types of roads including Mandatory versus Non-mandatory, Minor Collectors, TOD Collectors, Main Street Collectors, etc. He added that the Regulating Plan within the Planned Development Ordinance defined the characteristics of the roads as well as the setbacks of the buildings, lane widths, and parking requirements.

Mr. Carter stated there were 8 revisions to the MTP and listed them as follows:

- 1. Add the Cotton Belt rail corridor as a Regional Rail Transit Corridor
- 2. Add a north/south collector street between the State Highway 190 access road and west Renner Road east of the U.S. 75 access road
- 3. Add a north/south collector street between the State Highway 190 access road and Infocom Drive west of the DART Red Line rail corridor
- 4. Delete the existing alignment of Routh Creek Drive
- 5. Add the new alignment of Routh Creek Drive
- 6. Add an east/west collector street between north Plano Road and Routh Creek Drive north of east Renner Road
- 7. Add a north/south collector street between the State Highway 190 access road and the new east/west collector street west of north Plano Road
- 8. Remove the designated grade separation intersection at Plano and Renner Roads

Mr. Carter stated that the Cotton Belt rail line runs from southwest Fort Worth to DART's Red Line with potential stations at the President George Bush Turnpike and 12th street in Plano. He added that in future plans the rail line could continue eastward towards the cities of Wylie, Sachse, and Greenville.

Commissioner Hand asked if the there had been a resolution regarding the future direction of the Cotton Belt.

Mr. Carter replied that by providing the right-of-way dedication through the zoning, and the implementation on the MTP, the City was making known its desire to have the rail line come through the city. He said that funding was still pending and would be a big hurdle, but DART would also have to finish the preliminary engineering and environmental impact statements before anything could happen.

Commissioner Frederick said she liked the redesign of Routh Creek Drive because it allowed for more green space between the rail lines and moved the traffic away from the area, which caused fewer disturbances to the park like setting.

Commissioner Bouvier asked why the existing alignment of Routh Creek Drive was being deleted (revision number 4), and he also wanted to know why the north/south collector from High 190 stopped at the east/west collector between Plan Road and Routh Creek Drive (revision number 7).

Regarding revision 4, Mr. Carter referred to the Regulating Plan of the PD Ordinance stating the streets shown as solid lines were mandatory, public streets; however, what was not shown were specific driveway locations and entrances to parking garages or other facilities. He said that in all likelihood there would be a driveway connection over to the development, but it would not be a mandatory street until it was determined what size of buildings would be built, whether one or two lanes were needed, or just a single driveway. Carter noted that the connection would be there as well as the cross connection to Infocom Drive.

In the area south of the east/west collector between Routh Creek Drive and Plano Road, Mr. Carter advised there were plans for a parkway with a green belt area; however, at this time it was not known if the property would remain as one large tract or be divided into multiple pieces of property. He added that the street was not designed as a mandatory street in the PD because it would have been tied to one specific location and they wanted to maintain flexibility if the property was divided.

Commissioner Bouvier asked about the importance of the park and green belt area that was shown on the MTP as connecting into a "T" and how would that be handled.

Mr. Chavez replied that when the land was developed there were would be two documents controlling the alignment and connections: the PD with the adopted Regulating Plan and street typologies; and the MTP.

Mr. Carter said the MTP was diagrammatic and more of a guideline, but it was the Regulating Plan and the zoning that would provide the needed details.

Commissioner Maxwell asked if all the solid lines on the Regulating Plan were mandatory, and wanted to know why western portion of revision 5 was not included in the Commission's packet.

Carter replied that all the solid lines were mandatory streets, but they did not necessarily have to be on the MTP. He added that the western portion had accidentally been deleted from the Commission's packet, but it was shown in the Regulating Plan so it would be included in the MTP.

Vice Chair Hammond said he had some concerns, specifically with revision 7 and circuitous route that was proposed.

Mr. Carter replied the Regulating Plan had placed an emphasis on view corridors in the plaza area, and revision 7 would be a connection of several different streets.

Vice Chair Hammond pointed out that the revision came off the highway frontage road then suddenly turned west and wanted to know if that design was for traffic calming.

Carter said the revision was flexible and could moved to the west making the street a direct connection between the frontage road and Infocom Drive, and once the development site plan was submitted the staff would have a better idea of how that street would be configured. He added that most of the traffic would be outbound from the site and traffic volumes would be minor compared to Infocom Drive.

Vice Chair Hammond noted that revisions 2 and 5 were less than 200 feet apart where they connected to Renner Road and expressed concern that additional intersection along such a busy road could be problematic.

Mr. Carter said he did share some of the same concerns, but the property was a fairly large tract of land that had rail adjacency on one side and creek adjacency on the other, so there was only one section of frontage to Renner Road, but noted that instead of individual driveways there would be a parkway.

Mr. Hammond reminded the Commission and staff of the concerns expressed during the original zoning case regarding traffic patterns in and out of the development and hoped those concerns would be taken into consideration during development of the property.

With no further questions or comments, Vice Chair Hammond opened the public hearing.

Mr. Jim Wills, Parliament Group, 2801 W. Lovers Lane, Dallas, Texas, stated he was generally in support of the proposed changes to the MTP. He said the area was being designed as a suburban/urban development with more pedestrian traffic and the proposed changes would facilitate that and slow down the traffic.

No further comments were made in favor or opposition and the public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Bouvier commented he was in support of adding the revisions, but asked if they had to be added to the MTP for financing reasons.

Mr. Carter replied that if the revisions were added to the MTP, it would allow the City to pursue funding from the county and other sources, but not adding it to the plan did not really cause a problem because the roads were covered under the Regulating Plan. He explained that the City could go forward without a change to the MTP, but it was always better to have both documents match.

Motion: Commissioner DePuy made a motion to recommend approval of MTP File 11-02 as presented; second by Commissioner Bright. Motion passed 7-0.

ADJOURN

With no further business before the Commission, Vice Chair Hammond adjourned the regular business meeting at 8:46 p.m.

FOR

David Gantt, Chairman City Plan Commission