

**CITY OF RICHARDSON
CITY PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES – SEPTEMBER 4, 2012**

The Richardson City Plan Commission met September 4, 2012, at 7:00 p.m. at City Hall in the Council Chambers, 411 W. Arapaho Road, Richardson, Texas.

MEMBERS PRESENT: David Gantt, Chairman
Barry Hand, Vice Chair
Gerald Bright, Commissioner
Janet DePuy, Commissioner
Marilyn Frederick, Commissioner
Eron Linn, Commissioner
Don Bouvier, Alternate

MEMBER ABSENT: Thomas Maxwell, Commissioner

CITY STAFF PRESENT: Michael Spicer, Director- Development Services
Sam Chavez, Asst. Director of Dev. Svcs – Planning
Susan Smith, Asst. Director of Dev. Svcs – Dev. & Eng.
Israel Roberts, Development Review Manager
Chris Shacklett – Planner
Kathy Welp, Executive Secretary

BRIEFING SESSION

Prior to the start of the regular business meeting, the City Plan Commission met with staff to receive a briefing on staff reports and agenda items. No action was taken.

MINUTES

1. Approval of the minutes of the regular business meeting of August 21, 2012.

Vice Chair Hand asked to make a change to Page 9, paragraph 3, last sentence to better reflect the intention of his comments.

Motion: Commissioner Frederick made a motion to approve the minutes as amended; second by Commissioner Linn. Motion passed 7-0.

CONSENT AGENDA

All items listed under the Consent Agenda are considered to be routine by the City Plan Commission and will be enacted by one motion in the form listed below. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless desired, in which case any item(s) may be removed from the Consent Agenda for separate consideration.

Commissioner Bouvier requested that Items 2 and 3 be removed for separate consideration.

2. **Revised Building Elevations for Alta Creekside:** A request for approval of revised building elevations concerning the mortar color, garage door design, and the peak of the gable wall design. The 13.64-acre, 162-unit multi-family community is located at the southeast corner of President George Bush Highway and Custer Parkway.

Mr. Roberts advised the applicant was requesting approval for three revisions to the previously approved elevations for Alta Creekside:

- Change in mortar color – the mortar color was too dark on a larger scale and a lighter grey color would provide a more contemporary design and a better contrast with the darker brick.
- Change carriage style garage doors – with the more contemporary look of the brick and mortar, the carriage style doors were too traditional and a change to a more contemporary style was being requested.
- Change gable vent design – the previous design reflected brown horizontal vents that matched the trim color of the building and the change would add a vertical element with fiber cement siding and wood bracketing.

Commissioner Bouvier asked for further description of the outriggers, the material to be used in the garage doors, and why the design of the doors was so plain.

Mr. Roberts replied that the garage doors were required to be metal and, because of the change in the mortar color, the applicant felt the traditional design of the carriage style doors would not be a good fit and suggested a more contemporary style.

Regarding the outriggers, Mr. Roberts stated those would be a decorative wood bracketing similar to the bracketing on other areas on the building making the overall look more uniform.

Commissioner Bouvier asked if the Commission could discuss other items related to the development (i.e., fencing and entry feature) and Chairman Gantt replied that the discussion would have to address the elevations changes listed on the agenda.

Motion: Commissioner Bright made a motion to approve Item 2 as presented; second by Commissioner DePuy. Motion passed 7-0.

3. **Concept Plan for Turnpike Commons West:** A request for approval of a revised concept plan for Turnpike Commons West to reflect the proposed development of two apartment communities totaling 360 units. The approximate 94-acre site is located at the southwest corner of President George Bush Highway and Custer Parkway.

Ms. Smith advised the applicant was requesting approval of a revised concept plan for development of two tracts of land that were subdivided into six development areas. She added that since the property was zoned PD Planned Development the Commission would be required to approve a concept plan prior to approving detailed development plans.

Ms. Smith described the boundaries of the property and noted that the existing north/south private drive would be extended to Greenside Drive and, consistent with City policy, the hike and bike trail adjacent to the City's retention pond would be extended to Renner Road.

Regarding the six development areas on the two tracts of land, Ms. Smith provided a description of the areas:

- A1 – 20 acres, proposing 240, 3-story multi-family units
- A2- 10 acres, proposing 120, 3-story multi-family units

As required by City zoning, each of the proposed communities would be enclosed by a perimeter fence with emergency access points on the north and south.

- A3 – 29.81 acres, proposed for future development with the potential to go up to 20 stories, a maximum of 385 multi-family units, and 1.9 million square feet of building area.
- Area B – 4.05 acres, existing Hilton Garden Inn
- Area C – 15 acres, Pradera West, 176, 2-3 story multi-family units
- Area D – 15.33 acres, 184, 3-story multi-family units

Ms. Smith concluded her presentation by noting the applicant was requesting approval of a revised concept plan and the Commission would be making a final decision.

Commissioner Bouvier acknowledged that the developer had met with the Homeowners Association (HOA) in the area and the HOA expressed concern whether the sidewalk would go under Renner Road and be continued around the retention pond.

Ms. Smith replied that she would defer the question of the sidewalk to the applicant, and, consistent with a request from the City's Park and Recreation Department, the applicant was proposing to extend the hike and bike trail to the end of their property. She added there were small portions of the property that belong to the City and staff would work with the Parks Department to connect the two areas, but she had not heard of any connection going under Renner Road.

Chairman Gantt expressed concern that with the existing, proposed, and future multifamily units there would be a little over 1,000 multifamily units along an entryway to the City and asked the applicant to come forward to answer some questions.

Ms. Smith replied that the number of units was what was currently permitted under the development rights.

Mr. Kevin Gasky, 12750 Merit Drive, Dallas, Texas, stated he was available to answer any questions.

Chairman Gant noted that City ordinance did not allow more than 250 units without a fence, therefore, the proposed development would be split in two, but he was wondering if the applicant was planning to market them as two completely separate complexes and if the proposed apartments would be the same style as the existing Pradera apartments.

Mr. Gasky replied that in speaking with the developer, it was noted the properties would have the same name with only a slight variation such as east and/or west. Also, he thought the reference to the Pradera apartments was a fair characterization to what they were proposing for the new development.

Vice Chair Hand commented that the last time the Commission discussed the project he thought that 12 units per acre was not dense enough for the property and suggested an increase in vertical mass along the President George Bush Turnpike (PGBT) would be more appropriate. He asked if it would be possible to develop 3 or 4 story iconic buildings along PGBT and stay at the same density by developing other amenities closer to the neighborhood.

Mr. Gasky cautioned that noise would be a factor if the buildings were pushed closer to the highway as well as the 100-foot setback line required under the PGBT guidelines. He added that their proposal was also what the market was asking for at this time.

Commissioner Bouvier asked if Mr. Hand was referring to something similar to the six-story Monterrey development along Highway 75 south of Mockingbird that was right up against the highway.

Vice Chair Hand replied the Monterrey was a good project to look at for a much denser and urban environment, and asked the Commission to compare that to 2 and 3 story apartment buildings adjacent to highways that do not seem to have the right scale. He felt it was a mistake to construct the development in the current proposed format.

Mr. Ray Taylor, 600 E. Las Colinas Boulevard, Irving, Texas, stated that a higher density would go against what the property is currently zoned for and any change to that would have to come from the City.

Chairman Gantt asked the applicant if they had any idea as to what would be developed on Tract R1, area A-3 at the southwest corner of PGBT and Custer Parkway.

Mr. Gasky replied the property owner did not want to show anything on the proposed concept plan because they did know what might develop at that location.

Commissioner Bouvier questioned the layout of the western most building noting the power lines in that area as well as the long drive leading up to the club house. He also wanted to know if a drive could be added from PGBT to the clubhouse.

Mr. Gasky stated they had discussions about moving the power lines, or possibly moving the building footprint to the east 10-15 feet; however, any changes would have to be evaluated based on the cost involved and the cost for moving the power lines would be very expensive.

Commissioner Bouvier said he thought it would be better to put the athletic courts to the west and move the apartment building closer to the club house because, left as is, it was not an ideal situation for leasing apartments in that building.

Regarding an access point along PGBT closer to the clubhouse, Mr. Gasky replied they were focused on accessing the property off the existing drive to the west, plus there was a gore point at the suggested area which required the addition of a turn lane into the development.

Chairman Gantt asked staff if the City's Traffic Department had looked at the concept plan and expressed any concerns.

Ms. Smith replied the Traffic Department had looked at the plan and had no concerns. In addition, they supported the extension of the existing road connecting to Greenside Drive.

Motion: Commissioner Bright made a motion to approve Item 3 as presented; second by Commissioner Linn.

Commissioner Bouvier explained the HOA thought one of the last remaining open tracts of land in the City should have something more iconic and urban in design especially along the PGBT. He added that if the motion passed and development plans were received, the plans would be reviewed very closely and asked the staff to insure that the quality of the development was up to par with the two existing developments in the area.

Motion failed 2-5 with Chairman Gantt, Vice Chair Hand and Commissioners Bouvier, DePuy, and Frederick opposed.

Motion: Vice Chair Hand made a motion to deny Item 3 as presented without prejudice; second by Commissioner Bouvier.

Ms. Smith asked the Commission to give the applicant a reason for the denial and some direction to move forward.

Vice Chair Hand restated his earlier comments about the need for a more iconic design that was closer to the PGBT, and was pleased the HOA was also in support of this idea. He added that keeping the design in the current form was not the best use of the land.

Ms. Smith reminded the Commission that the application was for a revised concept plan and they were not reviewing building form and the applicant did have the development rights to what they were proposing.

Vice Chair Hand said he understood, and with comments from the neighborhood and community, he thought this was an opportunity to do something special that would most likely yield bigger returns.

Chairman Gantt asked to clarify that the development rights on the property not only included multifamily but also the right to construct buildings up to 10 to 20 stories. He added that he was not suggesting a 20 story apartment complex, but something bigger in scale.

Ms. Smith confirmed the development rights on the property did include structures up to 20 stories.

Commissioner DePuy stated she would like to hear comments from the HOA about the population increase if the buildings were 4 to 5 stories in height.

Ms. Smith reminded the Commission that the item was not a public hearing so that type of input was not available, and Chairman Gantt stated that any testimony received would only be hearsay because the neighborhood was not present in the Chamber.

Vice Chair Hand said he was not suggesting that the property should be a higher density or population, but the design needed to be arranged in a more iconic or special layout; something more appropriate to the scale of the PGBT.

Commissioner Linn asked Mr. Hand to define the term “iconic” to better assist the applicant in determining what the Commission was looking for.

Vice Chair Hand stated that “iconic” could include the height, the design, the materials, and sited an example of “iconic” architecture in the City with the new building at the University of Texas at Dallas that used metal panels in the design. He added that making the building a little taller, closer to the freeway, and adding more green space closer to the neighborhood could be seen as “iconic”.

Commissioner Bright asked staff about their earlier comments regarding the development rights on the property.

Ms. Smith replied that she wanted to make sure the Commission understood the applicant met all the development regulations and the Commission could not suggest that the applicant move forward with higher density because that would require a zoning case.

Chairman Gantt concurred and stated the Commission should not be reviewing the concept plan for density or zoning, but simply as a concept plan.

Commissioner DePuy asked to confirm the Commission would have another chance to review the elevations and design if the item was approved.

Chairman Gantt replied that if the item was approved and the applicant proceeded with the development, they would come back before the Commission with development plans.

Ms. Smith added that the elevations, landscape and site plans would have to be in substantial conformance with the concept plan.

Chairman Gantt summarized that the question before the Commission was whether they wanted the applicant to come back with a different concept before they proceeded, or was the current concept plan acceptable.

Commissioner Bouvier acknowledged that the developer had the right to build multi-family, and the density could not change, but suggested the buildings could be moved closer to the freeway and be more urban and a better fit for the area. He added he also wanted to see different treatments for the building on west side of the property and the problem with the power lines addressed.

Mr. Bouvier stated that he understood the economies of scale and the number of units needed for profitability, but wondered what the development could become if the interior fence between the two sections was removed and the clubhouses and pools were combined. He said the combined product would be able to act as one big community versus trying to be two complexes acting as one.

Chairman Gantt reminded everyone that a variance would be required for the fence to be removed and the Commission was only reviewing the concept plan.

Ms. Smith explained that the concept plan would have to respect the area regulations that govern the property, such as relocating buildings, but the buildings would have to abide by the 100-foot building setback line. She added that if the applicant wanted to combine the two communities, they would have to ask for a variance that would come before the Commission and, if approved, go to the City Council, but there were no guarantees that it would be approved.

Vice Chair Hand stated he wanted to be clear that at the current density it would be difficult to achieve an urban scheme, but it should not keep the Commission from exploring a more “iconic” layout, concept, and building form, which would prove beneficial to the whole neighborhood.

Commissioner DePuy asked to confirm the development could not move any closer to the PGBT without a variance.

Ms. Smith replied they would have to respect the 100-foot building setback line.

Motion passed 4-3 with Commissioners Bright, DePuy and Linn opposed.

PUBLIC HEARING

- 4. Zoning File 12-11 (continued from August 21, 2012 meeting):** Consider and take necessary action on a request by John S. Kirk, representing Embry Partners, Ltd., for a change in zoning from I-FP(2) Industrial with special conditions to PD Planned Development for the development of a multi-family community. The 12.75-acre site is located at the southeast corner of Greenville Avenue and Collins Boulevard and is zoned I-FP(2) Industrial.

Mr. Shacklett advised the applicant was requesting to rezone the property at the southeast corner of Greenville Avenue and Collins Boulevard for development of a 351-unit multifamily community. He added that Exhibit "F" in the Commission's packet would be the proposed PD conditions for the development relating to height, buildings, landscaping and other regulations. Mr. Shacklett provided background information on the property including (1) the 2001 land use study for the area in and around the Arapaho DART Station including the subject property and the property located directly south with designated office, open space, and mixed-use office/urban residential, (2) the 2005 City initiated zoning request for a transit oriented development (TOD) around the Station that did not include the subject property (the City Plan Commission recommended approval and the City Council tabled it, but a decision was never made therefore leaving the existing Industrial zoning on the property), (3) the 2009 Comprehensive Plan update designated six areas throughout the City as enhancement/redevelopment with the subject property listed as part of the third study area that will be taking place in the near future.

Mr. Shacklett stated the applicant was proposing 351 multi-family units in a total of eight (8) buildings with the majority of the buildings being 3-stories in height. The only exception would be Building 1 which will have 3-story units that have a second story (loft) within the unit thereby creating a 4-story building. He added that there will be a number of open spaces provided throughout the community including the largest area behind the leasing office/clubhouse where a pool and other amenities would be located.

Mr. Shacklett pointed out that the site would have access from Greenville Avenue and Alma Road via an east/west drive aisle with parallel parking adjacent to the buildings. He added that the applicant was also proposing landscape buffers and fencing around the property with tree and a shrub row alternating on centers along the fence providing a buffer from the property to the south.

Mr. Shacklett reported the applicant was requesting the following amendments to the development standards of the A-950 District:

- Parking ratio of 1.5 per unit, the same as provided at Eastside, due to an apartment mix of 70/30 (one to two bedrooms). Also providing 158 garages and tuck-under spaces.
- Requesting 100 amenity points as opposed to the typical 70 points for each 250 units in A-950 Regulations.
- Requesting the property be considered one large community and that no physical separation be required.
- Reduction in masonry material from 75% to 50% for any one elevation, and the non-masonry materials allowed would be a three-stage stucco, metal and hardy panels. Some elevations will have upward of 77% of masonry, but the lowest would be 50%.

Mr. Shacklett explained that rather than having dumpsters in the parking lot, the applicant was proposing internal trash rooms within each building where residents would take their trash and then maintenance staff would move the trash to an enclosed compactor area on the north side of the property.

In closing his presentation, Mr. Shacklett stated that if the zoning request was approved, the property will be zoned PD Planned Development, developed in accordance with Exhibit "F" (list of conditions), Exhibit "B" and the three elevation sheets.

Vice Chair Hand said he understood the legality of making the property a PD Planned Development district, but had a concern about exempting the property in question from residential requirements listed in the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance (CZO).

Chairman Gantt replied that the PD would be creating a new ordinance and would define the use and what could be built.

Mr. Chavez added that Section 8(c) of the Proposed Conditions was added to clarify that the property would be a PD as opposed to a residential district, which is where the CZO would apply additional heights limitations and performance standards on adjacent property.

Vice Chair Hand asked if the item was approved, would the surrounding properties be nonconforming and would the new zoning exempt adjacent properties from what a residential property would do to them. He also felt the property did not meet the definition of a PD.

Mr. Chavez replied that based on the staff analysis, and in accordance with the CZO, none of the residential performance standards would apply to the surrounding properties because the property would be zoned PD, which by definition has to be more than 10 acres and the property met that requirement.

Chairman Gantt asked if Mr. Hand's concern was the property to the south and what might be built there in the future that would normally not be allowed adjacent to a residential area.

Vice Chair Hand confirmed that was an area of concern for him.

Commissioner Linn asked staff if the property in question would be in the Arapaho Collins redevelopment/enhancement study area. He also wanted to know if the item was approved, would the PD supersede the study area recommendations, or would it be removed from the study area.

Mr. Shacklett replied that the 2009 Future Lane Use plan called for six areas to be studied and the study for the proposed area had not been undertaken as yet. In addition, he said the development might be considered as a factor in the future study, but it was not known at this time if it would be

Commissioner Linn stated the 2000 ULI study for the area surrounding the Arapaho Station called for residential as well as mixed-use retail, similar to other TOD areas, and wanted to know why mixed-use was not part of the proposal. He also wanted to know if there would be sidewalks around the development.

Chairman Gantt pointed out that the ULI study covered a much broader area than the proposed property and Mr. Shacklett noted that there would be a 10-foot trail along all three frontages.

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

Mr. William Dahlstrom, representing Embry Partners, 901 Main Street, Richardson, Texas, stated Embry Partners was a fully-integrated development and property management company with 40 years of experience and they were proposing a high quality urban residential community. He added that the project could be a catalyst for the area and could trigger development around the Arapaho Station.

Mr. John Kirk, Executive Vice President, Embry Partners, 1020 NE Loop, San Antonio, Texas, stated that Embry specialized in multi-family developments and has developed over 30,000 residential units and over 6 million square feet of office in the past 40 years. He added that their projects cover much of the south and they pride themselves on building quality products with long term value.

Mr. Kirk highlighted some of materials to be used in construction of the project including brick, stone, hardy plank, three-stage stucco, and metal accents. In addition, the development would have amenities such a pool, club house/fitness center, dog park, and a hike and bike trail that would tie into the City's trail system via a trail head that will be paid for and constructed by Embry.

Mr. Kirk concluded his presentation noting the high demand for the type of product they were proposing and cited similar projects in the area that are all above 90% occupied.

Mr. Scott Polikov, President, Gateway Planning Group, 101 Summit Avenue, Fort Worth, Texas, stated that the area needed a jump start with an urban residential, TOD project, and felt the proposed project could be the catalyst that has been discussed in some of the redevelopment and enhancement studies in the City. He added that the 2000 Land Use study called for urban residential for the property as opposed to retail, and suggested the project would serve the type of residents who work for the large employers in the Telecom Corridor.

In closing, Mr. Polikov acknowledged that his company did not usually handle this small a project, but when Embry Partners, who has an outstanding reputation, asked his company to participate they were eager to do so.

Mr. Tod Fobare, Property Owner, 5825 Park Lane, Dallas, Texas, stated his company owned a lot of property in the area and felt the proposed project would act as a catalyst to increase development from Arapaho Road north to Campbell Road. He thought that more vertical developments would follow as properties redevelop closer to the Arapaho DART Rail station and noted that plans are in the works for an office building on the property to the south.

Mr. Dahlstrom stated he wanted to conclude the group's presentation by answering two of the questions posed by the Commission: 1) item 8(c) in the proposed conditions was put in place to head off any unintended consequences from putting a residential use next to a nonresidential use; and 2) mixed-use can be horizontal as well as vertical and the proposed project would be a component of that mixed-use in and around the Arapaho station.

Commissioner Bouvier asked if the hardy panels referred to in the Commission's packet were one solid piece as opposed to the typical hardy planks.

Mr. Eric Ernschaw, BGO Architects, 4144 N. Central Expressway, Dallas, Texas, replied that hardy panels were fiber cement panels that come in 4' by 8' sheets with the joints concealed so there are no battens or reveals and looks like a smooth stucco or wood textured panel.

With no other comments in favor or opposed, Chairman Gantt closed the public hearing.

Commissioner DePuy asked about vertical access to the apartments.

Mr. Kirk replied the units would be accessed via interior corridors and stairwells.

Vice Chair Hand asked why gates were listed on the concept plan when the project was suppose to be urban.

Mr. Polikov replied that there had been concern on the part of the applicant about cut through traffic, but after speaking with staff, an agreement was reached to return to the original proposal and remove the gates. Also, in areas where gates would be needed for internal parking security, the engineering staff thought something could be worked out to avoid turn around conflicts.

Chairman Gantt stated he understood the possibility of security issues, but did not think there would be a problem with cut through traffic and Mr. Polikov agreed.

Vice Chair Hand asked why the applicant was proposing 3-story buildings throughout most of the project as opposed to 4 stories, especially along the frontage road to Highway 75.

Mr. Polikov replied the proposal was the maximum urban format possible under the rent structure in the market place going forward for the next several years. In addition, the proposed development served the mid-level market and more closely matched the wages in the Telecom Corridor at \$1.30 to \$1.40 per square foot for rent. He did not think the market would support rent on podium or structured parking construction.

Regarding 4 stories along the frontage road to Highway 75, Mr. Ernschaw replied there will be three stories of residential units in the building along the frontage road, but the perception of the height of the building will be greater than 3 stories with a vertical elevation of 50 feet.

Vice Chair Hand stated he could accept 3-story buildings down the center boulevard because of the outdoor space being developed, but wanted to know if the green spaces in front of the buildings were patios or yards, which he felt took away from the urban feel of the design.

Mr. Ernschaw replied there would be a meandering sidewalk with 8-foot tree wells against the parallel parking, and between the sidewalk and the building there will be landscaping.

Mr. Shacklett replied that there would be approximately 12 feet between the balcony/patio and the parallel parking (5-foot walkway, 7-foot landscape).

Commissioner DePuy stated that the proposed concept plan reminded her of a project in Uptown Dallas with buildings close to the sidewalk and some landscaping, which makes it a very comfortable environment for the residents. She added that the concept plan made sense to her and thought it was the right fit for the site.

Commissioner Frederick stated she liked the plan and felt it was distinctive enough to attract attention along Highway 75. She felt the green space in front of the buildings softened the hardscape just a little bit, but left the urban feel.

Chairman Gantt stated at first he was having a hard time seeing how the proposed concept plan was a good idea because of the industrial zoning to the south, but after a more detailed look at the plan and listening to the presentation, he concurred that the project was a good fit for the area.

Vice Chair Hand noted that proposals had come before the Commission in the past with plans for small apartments, and he acknowledged that the applicant was proposing high quality premium units with the smallest at 550 square feet, but wanted to know how the Commission could codify that the units would not be small, cheap efficiencies.

Mr. Kirk replied they had designed one-bedroom apartments that were high in quality and efficient, but were not the typical efficiency apartments.

Mr. Polikov stated that he could understand the concern of a smaller unit if there were no other elements in the PD conditions that required quality construction, and felt the type of resident who would live in the development would be interested in the amenities, location, and the lifestyle. In addition, for the City to remain competitive they would have to look at changes in the market and the current zoning ordinance was not nuanced enough to do that so that was why the PD made sense.

Vice Chair Hand stated he understood financially why the applicant was not building podium with retail/live/work type units, but asked why that type of environment was not being built and filled with residential for now.

Mr. Polikov replied the market was in the City and not in the site, and may very well never be in the site. He added the amenity level was part of the rent structure renters would be willing to pay. If the developer wanted to go to podium construction and have the retail space to eventually fill in, there might be a problem because higher rents would have to be charged, higher than what was called for in the market. Polikov urged the Commission to view the project as an incremental investment to up-tick the market to allow future developments to build mixed-use, podium style construction.

Commissioner Linn stated he thought the proposed development was a good idea for the area, but would prefer to wait until the Arapaho Collins redevelopment/enhancement study was complete and let the study dictate the land use around the station. In addition, he did not feel there was enough data to back up the claim that the project could be a catalyst for the area.

Mr. Polikov replied that his company had worked on other area studies for Cities in the Metroplex, including Richardson, and, based on his opinion, if his company was working on the contract for the Arapaho Collins study, he felt their recommendations would not be that much different from the concept plan being presented to the Commission. He added that the development would act as a catalyst by making a statement to the market that if Embry was willing to invest in the location, then maybe other investors and developers should too.

Mr. Dahlstrom added they had visited with the staff and were told the Arapaho Collins study would be a different type of study and that the request was a reasonable use of the property.

Mr. Chavez stated that the proposed study for Arapaho Collins would be a market study, which could possibly lead to a land use study of the area, but there were no guarantees that would happen and that the market study would be completed in the first quarter of 2013.

Mr. Kirk addressed the catalyst statement by citing a redevelopment project Embry did in San Antonio on the site of a run-down motel and how the area is now home to a new Target,

Wal-Mart Supercenter, and Chick-fil-A. He also mentioned some areas in Dallas where residential made an impact and started the turn around process.

Commissioner DePuy stated the area was definitely a TOD area and felt the apartments would appeal to young professionals. She added that to wait on the project would be detrimental to other developments starting to take place along Highway 75.

Motion: Commissioner Frederick made a motion to recommend approval of Zoning File 12-11 as presented, with an additional condition to allow the option to remove the gates at both the east and west drives; second by Commissioner DePuy.

Vice Chair Hand stated he thought the proposal was interesting, but was hoping to have more time to deliberate and negotiate with the applicant. He also thought the motion should state the gates should be removed as opposed to having the option of removing them.

Mr. Hand closed his comments by citing a section of the Gateway Planning document about older apartment complexes and cautioned the Commission to apply the lessons learned when making their decision.

Motion passed 4-3 with Vice Chair Hand and Commissioners Bouvier and Linn opposed.

ADJOURN

With no further business before the Commission, Chairman Gantt adjourned the regular business meeting at 9:24 p.m.

David Gantt, Chairman
City Plan Commission