

**CITY OF RICHARDSON  
CITY PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES – MAY 21, 2013**

The Richardson City Plan Commission met on May 21, 2013, 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  
Janet DePuy, Commissioner  
Marilyn Frederick, Commissioner  
Thomas Maxwell, Commissioner  
Randy Roland, Alternate

**MEMBER ABSENT:** Don Bouvier, Alternate  
Gerald Bright, Commissioner  
Eron Linn, Commissioner

**CITY STAFF PRESENT:** Sam Chavez, Assistant Director – Dev. Svcs - Planning  
Chris Shacklett, Sr. 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 May 7, 2013.**

**Motion:** Commissioner DePuy made a motion to approve the minutes as presented; second by Commissioner Maxwell. Motion passed 6-0.

**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.

- 2. Galatyn Park North Addition, Lots 1 and 2, Block B; Lots 1 and 2, Block C; and Open Space Lots 1 and 2, Block X:** A request for approval of a final plat for six (6) lots within 147.52 acres, located at the northeast corner of Renner Road and Plano Road. Applicant: Brad Moss, Kimley-Horn and Associates, representing BCS East Land Investments, L.P. *Staff: Susan Smith.*
- 3. Bush Central Station Addition, Lots 1 and 2, Block D:** A request for approval of a final plat for two (2) lots within 7.61-acres, located north of Renner Road, west of the future extension of Routh Creek Parkway. Applicant: Brad Moss, Kimley-Horn and Associates, representing BCS West Land Investments, L.P. *Staff: Susan Smith.*

4. **Bush Central Station Addition, Lot 1, Block A; Lot 1, Block B; and Lot 1, Block C:** A request for approval of a final plat for three (3) lots within 18.96-acres, located at 3451 N. Plano Road, 1225 E. Renner Road, and 1125 E. Renner Road; the northwest corner of Renner Road and Plano Road. Applicant: Hugo Morales, Kimley-Horn and Associates, representing BCS MFI, LLC. Staff: Susan Smith.

**Motion:** Vice Chair Hand made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as presented; second by Commission Roland. Motion approved 6-0.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

5. **Zoning File 13-11:** A City-initiated amendment to the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance (Appendix A), Article XXI-C (PD Planned Development District Regulations) Section 1 through Section 8, inclusive, of the *Code of Ordinances* relative to Intent, Use Regulations, Building Regulations, Area Requirements, Parking Regulations, Planned Development Review Procedure, and Amendments.

Mr. Shacklett advised that the current regulation requires a minimum 10-acre tract of land for an applicant to request a Planned Development (PD) designation. He added that as the City of Richardson becomes more fully built out, additional flexibility in the minimum acreage requirement is desirable due to the likely development in the future of smaller properties and infill development that are less than 10 acres.

Mr. Shacklett noted that the purpose of the proposed amendments was to create the opportunity to craft development standards that can be tailored to be context sensitive than the current regulations. He added that the current regulations provide a specific list of allowable uses, but a PD would provide a specific flexibility in mixing of uses, building materials and residential density requirements that would be listed in each individual PD.

In addition, Shacklett stated that staff was suggesting the removal of the requirement for a Conceptual Drainage Plan because any drainage issues would be handled during the development review process; however, the requirement for a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) would remain as part of the regulations.

Mr. Shacklett reviewed a map noting there are only twenty-five sites in the City that are over 10 acres and the remaining forty-five sites under 10 acres in size would not be allowed under the current regulations to request a PD designation. He added that there are also six different enhancement/redevelopment zones in the City, and although there are no large areas of undeveloped land within the zones, most of the property within those zones would be covered under any zoning changes proposed for the area similar to the West Spring Valley District.

Mr. Shacklett concluded his presentation by noting the proposed amendments to the PD section of the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance would potentially impact future development in the City in multiple ways, including:

- Providing for greater content sensitivity;
- Providing increased flexibility for allowable uses, site layout, and building design and materials;
- Facilitating incremental redevelopment;
- Facilitating infill development;
- Providing for a broader range of development types, residential, non-residential, and mixed-use; and
- Providing better responsiveness to changing markets.

Additionally, the proposed amendments would not affect previously zoned PD's, but would preserve the existing requirement for public hearings before the Commission and Council, as well as complete legislative discretion the City Council currently has when considering and acting on any zoning change request.

Commissioner Roland asked if the revision in Section 6 was an administrative change.

Mr. Shacklett replied that the revision was simply an administrative change to make sure all relevant material accompanied the submittal of the application, but the Commission would still have the ability to request additional information if necessary.

Vice Chair Hand asked if there would be flexibility in the masonry requirements of 85 percent as mentioned in Section 3 of the building regulations.

Mr. Shacklett replied the current section only lists "masonry construction or other approved materials" and staff thought this would give applicants a baseline to work from. Also, the verbiage gives applicants the flexibility of using "other approved materials" and the Commission and Council will still approve the requests.

Commissioner Maxwell stated if the purpose of the proposed changes was to maintain consistency, and the applicant was able to request whatever they want, he wanted to know why the proposed changes was being made.

Mr. Shacklett replied that currently the section states "should be of masonry construction or other approved materials" and the change would say "85 percent masonry construction or other approved materials," but the Commission could change the verbiage.

Commissioner Maxwell also noted that the proposed changes states the "Director of Development Services" has the authority to make any changes, whereas, in other PD regulations the term "City Manager or his designee" was the verbiage most often used.

Mr. Shacklett replied that change could be made and suggested that it be part of the motion.

Commissioner DePuy stated that in other PD regulations the City Manager approval was used when minor modifications were requested and did not feel the proposed changes were the same issue and should be left as is.

Commissioner Maxwell said that for him it was a matter of consistency and the City Manager had the ultimate authority and he could assign the approval rights to a designee, which would most likely be the Development Services Director.

Chairman Gantt said he thought there was a difference in previous PD regulations because a minor modification would not come back before the Commission or City Council so he felt Mr. Maxwell's suggested change was appropriate.

Commissioner DePuy asked if it was the staff's opinion that the proposed changes would make it a more favorable environment for developers. She also wanted to know if there had been requests from developers for the proposed change.

Mr. Shacklett replied that the proposed changes would provide a new tool, but will not make it easier because they will still have to go through the zoning and development process.

Regarding requests from developers for the proposed changes, Mr. Shacklett replied that most of the recent zoning cases had been Special Permits and related to specific uses, but he was sure there had been developers over the years that would have chosen the proposed changes because it would have been more tailored to what they wanted to do.

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

No comments were received in favor or opposed and Chairman Gantt closed the public hearing.

Chairman Gantt said he was in favor of the request and thought it would be a positive change and would give developers another tool for developing smaller tracts of land.

**Motion:** Commissioner Roland made a motion to recommend approval of the revision to Article XXI-C, PD Planned Development Regulations, per the attached Exhibit "A" (Proposed PD Regulations), and replacing the term "Director of Development Services" with "City Manager or his designee"; second by Commissioner DePuy. Motion approved 6-0.

## **ADJOURN**

With no further business before the Commission, Chairman Gantt adjourned the regular business meeting at 7:26 p.m.

---

Barry Hand, Vice Chair  
City Plan Commission