

CITY OF RICHARDSON
CITY PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES – DECEMBER 20, 2016

The Richardson City Plan Commission met on December 20, 2016, at 7:00 p.m. at City Hall in the Council Chambers, 411 W. Arapaho Road, Richardson, Texas.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Gerald Bright, Chairman
Ron Taylor, Vice Chair
Janet DePuy, Commissioner
Bill Ferrell, Commissioner
Marilyn Frederick, Commissioner
Tom Maxwell, Commissioner
Randy Roland, Commissioner
Stephen Springs, Alternate
Ken Southard, Alternate

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 regarding staff reports, agenda items and rezoning initiatives. No action was taken.

REGULAR BUSINESS MEETING

MINUTES

1. Approval of minutes of the regular business meeting of December 6, 2016.

Motion: Commissioner Maxwell made a motion to approve the minutes as presented; second by Vice Chair Taylor. Motion approved 7-0.

CONSENT ITEM

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. Site and Landscape Plans – Aldi Food Market: A request for approval of revised site and landscape plans for the construction of a 1,700-square foot building addition to the south side of the existing grocery store. The 2.20-acre site is located at 1549 E. Belt Line Road, on the north side of Belt Line Road, east of Plano Road.

Motion: Commissioner Frederick made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as presented; second by Commissioner Ferrell. Motion approved 7-0.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

- Floyd Terrace Addition:** Consider and take the necessary action on a request for approval of a replat to subdivide Lots 12 and 13, Block 7, of the Floyd Terrace Addition into four (4) single-family lots. The 1.09-acre site is located at 1016 and 1018 N. Lindale Lane at the southeast corner of Lindale Lane and Arapaho Road.

Mr. Shacklett advised the applicant was requesting to replat two (2) existing single family lots at 1016 and 1018 N. Lindale Lane and subdivide those lots into four (4) single family lots. He added all four lots would face onto Lindale Lane and met the City's minimum zoning requirements as it related to lot width, depth, and area, and the drainage easement on the southern lot would remain in place.

Mr. Shacklett noted a variance was approved by the City Council in October 2016 to allow side lot lines that were not radial or tangent to the street, which meant the new side lot lines would run east to west matching other lots in the subdivision.

Chairman Bright asked if the applicant could have replatted the four lots with radial lot lines without coming before the Commission for a variance.

Mr. Shacklett replied yes.

Commissioner DePuy asked if the drainage easement on the southern lot was the cause of the increased width for that lot.

Mr. Shacklett said that may have been the reason for the platting of the lot and noted the lot encompassed a larger portion of the drainage easement.

Commissioner Roland asked staff if the original developer had access to the parcels of land under consideration, could the property have been developed with four homes instead of two and would it look similar to many of the surrounding properties.

Mr. Shacklett replied it would have been possible during the original development of the land to construct four homes instead of two and did not know if there was a requirement in existence at that time for radial or tangent side lot lines.

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

Mr. Don Reavis, 633 Silverstone Drive, Richardson, Texas, stated he had lived in the city for over 20 years and felt the applicant's request was reasonable and thought the development would be similar to the Villas of Nantucket. He also pointed out it was better to have the property replatted as residential instead of someone coming in and requesting a rezoning to commercial for the property along Arapaho Road.

Ms. Melanie Ekblad, 601 W. Arapaho Road, Richardson, Texas, said her property was closest to the subject property and her major concern was the curve on Lindale Lane and the thought of adding four additional driveways might exacerbate an already existing safety hazard with vehicles turning on to Lindale Lane off Arapaho Road. She also did not think homes similar to those at the Villas of Nantucket would fit in with the character of the neighborhood.

Mr. Scott Ekblad, 601 W. Arapaho Road, Richardson, Texas, stated he concurred with his wife, but was also concerned with the flow of traffic through the curve and the impact additional homes would have on that problem.

Mr. Shacklett said he wanted to clarify that the homes to be built on the four lots would not be similar to the Villas of Nantucket, which has thirteen lots on 1.7 acres, whereas, the property in question would come under the same design regulations as the other homes on Lindale Lane from Arapaho Road to Twilight Trail.

Commissioner Roland asked if the existing setbacks would stay the same when the new homes were built.

Mr. Shacklett said there would still be a 30-foot setback along Lindale Lane and a 40-foot setback along Arapaho Road; however, the northern lot would take on a larger interior side setback.

Commissioner Southard asked if the regulations required driveways off Lindale Lane or off the alley.

Mr. Shacklett replied it could be either and there was nothing in the zoning or subdivision regulations that required front or rear entry driveways. He added that the City's Traffic Department had reviewed the current plans and determined there were two guidelines that should be adhered to: no driveway on Lindale Lane within 85 feet of Arapaho Road, and no driveways within 25 feet of Arapaho Road if it is located off the alley.

Commissioner Frederick asked if there was a reason why residents could not park their vehicles on Lindale Lane.

Mr. Shacklett replied there were already "No Parking" signs on Lindale Lane from Arapaho Road to Twilight Trail.

Commissioner Depuy asked to confirm that the City's Traffic Department would be involved in the review process if the proposed homes have driveways on Lindale Lane.

Mr. Shacklett said when a single-family home was built, the permits and plans go through the Building Department, but they ask the Traffic Department to review the plans as well.

Mr. Dan Balch, 604 Kirby Lane, Richardson, Texas, stated he was neither in favor nor against, but had questions for the staff. He wanted to know if a home could be built over the drainage canal; were there any deed restrictions on the northern most lot that would prevent the lot from being used for commercial development; and were the lot sizes closer to the minimum City requirements. He concluded his comments by expressing concern about front facing garages and the curve on Lindale Lane.

Mr. Shacklett replied to Mr. Balch's questions:

- Drainage – currently there is an open drainage easement and nothing can be built in the area, and if in the future the drainage was moved underground no structures could be built over that easement.
- Commercial Development – if the developer wanted to change the zoning on the northern most lot, he would have to submit an application for rezoning and come before the Commission and City Council, which would produce the need for public hearings for citizens to express their concerns.
- Minimum Home Size – the minimum home size would be 1,100 square feet, however, most of the residential homes in the City exceed the minimum size.
- Minimum Lot Size – the minimum lot size would be 8,000 square feet, which is the same as the other homes on the east side of Lindale Lane. In addition, the two southern lots would be closer to the minimum and the two northern lots would be significantly larger.
- Traffic on Lindale Lane – the City's Traffic Department would review the plans when and if there were driveways proposed along Lindale Lane.

Commissioner Roland wanted to know if the four lots would have sidewalks and a parkway, which, if they did, would mean the existing brush would be removed and that would open up the site lines on the curve.

Mr. Shacklett replied yes.

Ms. Nanci Duplant, 530 Twilight Trail, Richardson, Texas, said the curve along Lindale Lane was very dangerous and suggested the developer might want to take some of the land from the larger, most northern lot to straighten Lindale Lane and remove the curve.

Chairman Bright called for any rebuttal comments from the applicant.

Mr. Ben Henderson, 100 S. Central Expressway, Richardson, Texas said he was the project manager for the developer and said two driveways for the lots would exit through the alley and two driveways would front on Lindale Lane. He added that once the lots were cleared and the sidewalks added, the line of sight would improve along Lindale.

Regarding the home sizes, Mr. Henderson said the plan was to build 3,000-square foot homes, which would increase the value of the surrounding properties.

In closing his comments, Mr. Henderson stated the northern-most lot was larger in size because of the required 40 foot setback from Arapaho Road.

Vice Chair Taylor asked which lots would have front facing garages and which would have the garage off the alley.

Mr. Henderson replied the design of the home would determine the placement of the garage.

With no further comments or question in favor or opposed, Chairman Bright closed the public hearing.

Chairman Bright asked if the replat complied with all zoning and subdivision regulations, and was in compliance with the variance.

Mr. Shacklett confirmed that was correct.

Commissioner Frederick pointed out the house immediately to the west of the northern lot had the same percentage of setback that would be required on the proposed lot, which should calm some of the concerns expressed by those in the audience.

Motion: Commissioner DePuy made a motion to approve Item 3 as presented; second by Commissioner Roland. Motion approved 7-0.

4. **Zoning File 16-28 – Main Street:** Consider and take the necessary action on a request for approval of a Special Development Plan for a 14.5-acre tract of land to allow for a mixed-use development and a Special Permit for a drive-through bank on 3.05 acres of land within the 14.5-acre tract of land located between Central Expressway and N. Interurban Street, and W. Main Street and Greer Street. The property is currently zoned PD Planned Development Main Street/Central Expressway Form Based Code (Central Place Sub-District).

Mr. Chavez advised the applicant was requesting a Special Development Plan and a Special Permit to accommodate the development/redevelopment of the property located at the northeast corner of Central Expressway and W. Main Street. He added the property is approximately 17.5 acres and is zoned under the Main Street/Central Expressway Form Based Code and is located in the Central Place Sub-district.

Mr. Chavez stated the property currently has an existing 200,000-square foot, multi-story office building with parking and a motor bank facility. He added that under the Special Development Plan, the property would be divided into four parcels: Parcel A, Parcel B, Parcel C and Parcel D.

Regarding Parcel A, Mr. Chavez explained the applicant was proposing a five story, multi-use project with 332 multifamily units, or 64.72 units to the acre, which was above the minimum density of 40 units to the acre in the form based code. In addition, the proposed building would have 15,000 square feet of retail along Main Street. He added there would be Special Development Standards related to the site such as block length, building frontage and the standards for the street cross section along Main Street.

Mr. Chavez explained Parcel B would be a multifamily product in an apartment/townhome design with 83, two and three story units. He added the parcel is overparked with a total of 222 parking spaces – 2 parking spaces per unit, 9 parking spaces on site and another 47 parking spaces on the street, which are allowed under the code. He added there would be Special Development Standards related to the site such as minimum density, block length, building frontage and open space requirements.

Regarding Parcel C, Mr. Chavez stated there were no improvements proposed for the existing 200,000 square foot office building, but the parking area would be the new location for the motor bank and drive-through lanes to free up space on Parcel A for the new proposed development. He added there would be Special Development Standards related to the site such as build-to-zones, block length, building frontage, open space requirements and the standards for the street cross section at Main Street.

Mr. Chavez clarified that Parcel D would contain a free-standing, 6,500-square foot restaurant with Special Development Standards related to increased built-to zones, block lengths, building frontage and open space requirements.

Mr. Chavez concluded his presentation by noting the Main Street/Central Expressway Code allowed for Special Development Plans with regard to sites that do not comply with development standards in the sub-district. He added the areas that did not comply with the Code were depicted on Exhibit B in the Commissioner's packet.

Commissioner DePuy asked about the masonry wall along Main Street for Parcel C and whether it was meant to block foot traffic from the site. She also wanted to know if the parking would include spaces for the office tower.

Mr. Chavez replied that wall would act as a visual barrier and that there were 66 parking spaces designated for the office, with shared parking in the garage on Parcel A.

Commissioner Springs asked for further clarification on the interior lots located on Parcel C and the easements involved for those lots.

Mr. Chavez replied the two parcels currently exist and the bank has a ground lease for those parcels. In order to plat the property in the future, the applicant will dedicate a mutual access easement adjacent to the two parcels with the replat of Parcel C thus providing the two parcels frontage on an access easement for platting purposes.

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

Mr. Todd Fobare, 5825 Park Lane, Dallas, Texas, gave a brief history of the project noting his company was in partnership with Embrey Development to redevelop the property. He added the redevelopment effort had been a long and complicated process, but they were excited to move forward on the project and felt it would be a catalyst for future development in the Main Street area.

Mr. Bryan Moore, GFF Architects and Planners, 2808 Fairmount Street, Dallas, Texas, said they were finally comfortable bringing the project before the Commission after resolving most of the concerns with the property.

Mr. Moore stated the project would be a mixed-use, infill oriented site in a somewhat neglected area of the City. In addition, he outlined some of the changes they were requesting from the form based code and offered a quote from the Main Street/Central Expressway Form Based Code, stating that it could not be a better description of their project: *“To create a high quality, legible public realm and provide predictability of the built environment consistent with the community’s vision. Also provide a well-connected pedestrian, bicycle and street network that builds on existing infrastructure and balances appropriate densities and uses for creating a vital urban environment.”* This is part of the intent and vision purpose for Richardson’s code for this project. He stated that alterations would have to be made and that is the reason this request is being made for a Special Development Plan as stated by Mr. Chavez.

Mr. Moore stated there are certain complexities that any form based code cannot address in full. This project is one of the most complex sites that they have worked on. There is a strong relationship between the predictable realm and the flexible realm.

Chairman Bright asked if there would be a certain number of parking spaces in the garage on Parcel A for the tenants of the office building.

Jacob Shelley, 1020 Northeast Loop, San Antonio, Texas, was called upon to answer this question regarding parking in the office building. He stated that a consultant was hired out of Austin to assess the parking demand. One of the items important to all parties was that the garage be sized appropriately for shared office and residential use. One of the things to be aware of is that it has to have the ability to expand upon as work environments change. The garage as planned has 700 spaces; the consultant stated that it only needed to be about 620 spaces.

Commissioner Roland asked about the existing Spring Creek Barbecue restaurant adjacent to Parcel D and what spaces they are able to use on Parcel D or if there were any agreements in place with Spring Creek.

Mr. Shelley stated that there are currently no agreements.

Commissioner Roland stated that the density in that area was set at a certain level. During their tours and discussions the Commission did not talk about rental townhomes. There has been some experience in other areas of Richardson with townhome products where they worked well at some points and did not work at other points.

Mr. Shelley stated that with all the job growth in the city, different types of residences were needed. Different types of renters wanting a rental product for different reasons.

Commissioner Roland then asked about the 6 foot sidewalk as opposed to a 9 foot sidewalk along Main Street and Central Expressway. It appears that is the most dangerous part of the project. They are narrowing the space where people ride their bicycles and walk and no protection is available.

Mr. Shelley explained there are some existing constraints, referring to the point Mr. Moore made that this is an existing office space with existing office requirements where Chase Bank is requesting to relocate their drive-through.

Commissioner Roland asked about the timing regarding the existing office building with existing clients.

Mr. Shelley stated that it would be a juggling act. Part of the challenge is that there are some existing storm water lines that are being worked around and the addition of others. There is an 18 month time line with Parcel B serving as a temporary construction lot.

Commissioner Depuy said that she was looking at the corner where the ATM is and was wondering if there was any thought about putting the restaurant at that corner instead of the ATM drive-through.

Mr. Moore stated that Chase wants the ATM drive-through at the hard corner due to the existing parking easements already in place. That area would not be allowed to develop as a building area as opposed to a parking and circulation area.

Chairman Bright asked Mr. Chavez if there was something that didn't make it to the Commission regarding what was being developed at that corner.

Mr. Chavez replied that the Chairman must have been thinking about the property at the intersection of Spring Valley and Central Expressway. Mr. Chavez added that to help with Commissioner Roland's question about the buffering area along Main Street, the code itself requires a minimum 6-foot landscape amenity area and then the sidewalk. In this particular case two landscape amenity areas plus a reduced sidewalk are being provided.

Chairman Bright asked the width of the current sidewalk.

Mr. Moore answered that it was about 4 feet wide.

Commissioner Depuy asked how many of the parking spaces inside the garage on Parcel A were for public use.

Mr. Shelley answered that there were 39 spaces open to the public.

Commissioner Taylor asked what a full resident number would be for Parcels A and B.

Mr. Shelley stated that he believed the number would be close to 600 residents.

Chairman Bright asked if the guests at the tower, not tenants, would be able to park in parcel D, south of parcel C and along Street A.

Mr. Moore said yes and also along Street. B.

Mr. Chavez stated that there were actually 916 parking spaces within 600 feet of the office building, which included the parking garage, on-site parking spaces for Parcels A, C and D and the on-street parking spaces.

Commissioner Ferrell asked if there was public open space built into this project.

Mr. Moore stated that it is all private.

Mr. Springs asked if a traffic study was included with the submittal.

Mr. Chavez answered that the applicant did submit a traffic impact study to assess turning movements and the need for additional traffic mitigation elements, which were depicted on the Special Development plan.

Mr. Rick Shaey, 201 and 209 W. Main Street, stated that he is not in favor or in opposition to the request. He is just glad to finally see something being developed in the area.

Mr. Chavez remarked that before the Commission made a motion, the Commission should be aware that there are sets of conditions in the staff report regarding the Special Permit, the Special Development Plan, the parking requirements for Parcels A and C, the mutual access easement that is required for Parcel C for the ground leases, and that Parcels A through D would be considered a single site for the purpose of requesting a Master Sign Plan due to the Code only allowing sites of 7 acres or greater the ability to request a Master Sign Plan.

With no further comments or question in favor or opposed, Chairman Bright closed the public hearing.

Chairman Bright stated that this is a difficult property and he appreciates the developer, applicant and owners efforts.

Commissioner Springs stated he was thrilled to see a large project of this scale happening in the area that the Commission had been working on for so long, and that as an architect, he appreciated the complexity of the project. In addition, he added that he understood that not every single problem could be solved as well as you would like given the existing situation, but, notwithstanding some of those issues, he was thrilled to see a development of this scale happening in the downtown area.

Motion: Commissioner Roland made a motion to recommend approval of Zoning File 16-28 as presented; second by Commissioner Frederick. Motion approved 7-0.

ADJOURN

With no further business before the Commission, Chairman Bright adjourned the regular business meeting at 8:41 p.m.

Gerald Bright, Chairman
City Plan Commission