**CITY OF RICHARDSON**
**CITY PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES – NOVEMBER 5, 2019**

The Richardson City Plan Commission met on November 5, 2019, at 7:00 p.m. at City Hall in the Council Chambers, 411 W. Arapaho Road, Richardson, Texas.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Ron Taylor, Chairman
Randy Roland, Vice Chairman
Ken Southard, Commissioner
Stephen Springs, Commissioner
Marilyn Frederick, Commissioner
Thomas Maxwell, Commissioner
Scott Zimmerman, Commissioner
Dorthy McKearin, Alternate

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Gwen Walraven, Alternate

**CITY STAFF PRESENT:** Michael Spicer, Director of Development Services
Sam Chavez, Assistant Director Planning
Doug McDonald, Planning Projects Manager
Chris Shacklett, Development Review Manager
Amy Mathews, Senior Planner
Keith Krum, Senior Planner
Connie Ellwood, Executive Secretary

## BRIEFING SESSION

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

## REGULAR BUSINESS MEETING

1. Approval of minutes of the regular business meeting of October 22, 2019.

**Commission Action**

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

## CONSENT

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. **Amending Plat – Richardson Heights Estates, Lot 9A, Block 81:** Consider and act on a request for an amending plat of the south 105 feet of Lot 9, Block 81 of the Richardson Heights Estates Addition to reflect the current ownership boundary and accommodate the construction of a single-family residence. The 0.42-acre lot is located at 516 West Shore Drive, on the east side of West Shore Drive, where Clearwater Drive intersects West Shore Drive and currently zoned R-1500-M Residential. *Owner: Joe Scolaro, representing Fairview Custom Homes, LLC. Staff: Chris Shacklett.*

**Commission Action**

Motion: Commissioner Maxwell made a motion to approve the consent agenda as presented; second by Commissioner Southard. Motion approved 7-0.

## PUBLIC HEARINGS

3. **Replat – Telecom Park Addition, Lots 3C, 6A, & 8 Block A:** Consider and act on a request to replat Lots 3B and 6, Block A of the Telecom Park Addition to subdivide two (2) lots into three (3) lots to accommodate the development of an office/warehouse building on Lot 3C and an office/warehouse building on Lot 8. The three (3) lots, totaling 7.146 acres is located at 3100-3200 Research Drive, east of Shiloh Road, on the south side of Research Drive and currently zoned PD Planned Development. *Owner: David Schlimme, representing Raymond Construction Co., Inc. Staff: Chris Shacklett.*

**Staff Comments**

Mr. Shacklett stated the applicant was requesting to sub-divide two (2) existing lots into three (3) lots to accommodate the development of two (2) office warehouse buildings. One each to be located on Lots 3C and Lot 8. Additionally, Lot 6A the larger lot to the east is included only to relocate the existing common lot line exiting between lot 6A and the current Lot 3B to shift the lot line to align with the edge of an existing mutual access easement. There will be a relocated mutual access and utility easement on lots 3C and 8 to accommodate the proposed drive isles through the property. A sanitary sewer easement coming southward from Research Drive to provide sewer access to lot 8 to the south as well as an ONCOR easement along the west property line to provide access for electrical services to both lots. He continued by stating the plat was rezoned as part of a Planned Development District (PD) earlier this year to allow lot 8 to be a lot platted without frontage on a public or private street, however it does have access to Research Drive via an existing mutual access easement that runs along the eastern property line. Finally, there is also an access easement being granted at the northeast corner of 8 to provide access through lot 3C to lot 8 for use of a shared dumpster which was approved as part of the PD.

Mr. Shacklett concluded his presentation stating the plat does comply with the city's zoning and subdivision regulations and made himself available for questions.

**Public Comments**

With no questions of staff, Chairman Taylor opened the public hearing and asked if there was anyone to speak in favor or in opposition to this request. None were received, therefore Chairman Taylor closed the public hearing and asked for a motion.

**Commission Action**

Motion: Commissioner Springs made a motion to approve the replat - Telecom Park Addition as presented; second by Vice Chairman Roland. Motion approved 7-0.

4. **ZF 19-28 – Special Development Plan – Town North Mazda**: Consider and act on a request for a special development plan for a new motor vehicle sales/leasing (new) facility on 3.25-acres currently zoned Main Street/Central Expressway PD in the Central Place Sub-District located at 307 S. Central Expressway, on the northeast corner of S. Central Expressway and W. Phillips Street. *Property Owner: Max Wedell, Town North Automotive, Inc. Staff: Amy Mathews.*

**Staff Comments**

Ms. Mathews presented regarding Zoning File 19-28 – Special Development Plan – Town North Mazda stating the subject property was located at 307 S. Central Expressway (north of W. Phillips Street and west of S. Sherman Street). It is zoned PD Planned Development District Central Expressway Form Based Code and it is under the Central Place Sub-district. The property is roughly 3.25-acres and contains the Town North Mazda dealership which includes a 15,000-square foot building and a 4,200-square foot building.

The applicant was requesting approval of Special Development Plan for a new motor vehicle sales and leasing facility which was an allowed use in this sub-district. The PD required approval of a Special Development Plan for modifications to the Code's standards that were not considered Minor Modifications.

The proposed development would be completed in three (3) phases. During the first phase, the existing wash bay at the southeast side of the existing larger building would be demolished along with the entire smaller building to make room for the new 29,922-square foot sales and service building and would include a car wash and a service reception area. As part of this request, the northern most driveway on Sherman Street would be closed, with fire lanes connecting the two existing driveways from South Sherman Street to Central Expressway as well as two existing driveways on Phillips Street. The dumpster and screening wall on the southeast corner of the site would be relocated closer to the building.

Parking would be provided on-site. In accordance with the Central Place sub-district, the site is required to provide on-site parking at a ratio of one (1) space per 300-square feet of non-residential use.

Based on the 29,922-square foot building, 100 spaces are required while a total of 226 spaces for customers, employees, and vehicle display/inventory were proposed, including 20 customer parking spaces and 32 employee parking spaces. Much of this parking was existing and most of the remainder of it would be utilized for vehicle inventory. Phase 2 consists of all the new construction. Phase 3 would be the demolition of the remainder of the existing larger building. The portions of the existing facility not demolished during the 1st phase would continue to be used while the new facility was being constructed.

The applicant had requested the following modifications which do not qualify as minor modifications.

- Landscape Buffer Width along Central Expressway - The applicant requested 10 feet in lieu of 15 feet which was required per the PD. Increasing the landscape buffer width would require eliminating the existing parking spaces along Central Expressway; therefore, the applicant requested to maintain the existing 10-foot wide landscape buffer.
- A solid evergreen landscape hedge was required to screen vehicle headlights adjacent to Central Expressway. The applicant requested to not provide a solid hedge to increase visibility of vehicle display. No customer parking would be provided fronting to Central Expressway, which should drastically limited headlight activity.
- Open Space required to be provided at a percentage of 15% for public or 8% for private use. The applicant was proposing not to provide any open space since the development of a motor vehicle sales business and not intended for public/private gatherings. They would provide 14% landscaping that was separate for the open space requirement.
- Interior Parking Lot Landscaping – Per the PD each row of parking was required to have a minimum 10-foot wide landscape island with each run of eight (8) parking spaces and a shade tree was required to be provided internal to the parking lot at a rate of one (1) street tree for every six (6) parking spaces. Currently, there were no internal parking islands. The applicant was proposing to reconfigure much of the parking and provide parking islands, however they requested not to provide the required internal parking lot trees except where shown on the plan which were adjacent to customer parking spaces since trees attract birds and can discard pollen, leaves, and other debris on cars.
- Maximum Block Face - The PD designates that buildings must be placed parallel to all streets. The applicant was proposing a new building to be situated at the same angle as the existing building which is also limited or restricted to the orientation of the existing buildings. The new building was positioned parallel to Central Expressway but not parallel to Phillips Street or Sherman Street.
- Build-to-Zone: Per the PD building fronts and sides are required to be placed parallel to the adjacent street within a specific build-to-zone. The build-to-zone requirement for the proposed building was only being met along Central Expressway, and not on Philips Street or Sherman Street. The applicant was requesting no change to the Build-to-zone which would have a deficient building frontage buildout percentage.
- Building Materials – The Central Place sub-district required a minimum of each exterior wall to be a minimum of 75% primary materials (masonry, stone, and glass) and a maximum of 25% secondary material (stucco and metal grading, cladding and panels). The proposed building was composed primarily of concrete masonry units (CMU), glass curtain walls and aluminum composite panels except for the east elevation, the buildings do not meet the required percentages for primary and secondary materials. Recent changes in state law with HB 2439 limits the ability for local regulation of building materials in new construction.

Ms. Mathews concluded her presentation stating the concept plan and building elevations referred to as special development plan were allowed in the Main Street/Central Expressway Form based code with the following conditions: The motor vehicle sales/leasing (new) facility would be constructed in conformance with the Special Development Plan and the property shall be replatted as one (1) lot prior to the issuance of any building permits then made herself available for questions.

Vice Chairman Roland asked for clarity on if the 100 parking spaces were counted as part of the inventory parking ratio.

Ms. Mathews stated no. They are separate.

Commissioner Maxwell asked about the 10-foot landscape buffer along Central Expressway and the exhibits seem to illustrate a 1-foot impediment. He wanted clarity on if it was 10-foot or was it less. He asked if the applicant was proposing to provide the landscaping, only modifying the width of the landscape buffer and separate from that also eliminating the headlight screening.

Ms. Mathews stated the applicant requested the 10-foot landscape buffer and they are required to have trees, 30-feet on center. The trees could be planted as much as 40-feet apart. She also confirmed the questions concerning landscape buffer width and the headlight screening.

Commissioner Springs asked about elevations and rooftop screening units on Buildings 2, 3 and 4 and what the code stated in terms of screening requirements.

Mr. Chavez responded that they could use a combination of a parapet wall, but it was limited to a maximum height of 6-feet. The applicant had a parapet wall that was 1.5-foot in height. They were using a rooftop mounted screen to screen the unit themselves which was allowed.

**Public Comments**

With no further comment from staff, Chairman Taylor opened the public hearing

Mr. Alex Tsvang, General Manager of Town North Mazda came forward to speak in favor of this request and made himself available for questions.

Commissioner McKearin asked about the fencing at the back of the facility and the plans for that area.

Mr. Tsvang responded that it would be steel picket fencing on the along S. Sherman Street. At the present time it was a chain-link fence but would be replaced with the steel pickets.

Commissioner Zimmerman asked about the gates in both the front and back of the facility.

Mr. Tsvang stated the rear of the facility would be a full-size gate with the steel picket fencing and the front would be on low hinges.

Vice Chairman Roland asked if there would be a 6-foot chain link fence on Phillips Street, because none of the renderings illustrated this. He asked for clarity on exactly what would be seen from South Sherman Street and Phillips Street under the new code.

Mr. Tsvang stated that he would clarify this with his architects because there had been several ongoing changes since resetting the building and modifying the parking, etc. The trash can would be relocated closer to the Phillips and Sherman corner. He was unclear of the 6-foot opener for that matter or if it was separate for parts delivery trucks to come in.

Ms. Mathews stated she spoke with the owner, and he stated he would be willing to install tubular steel along Phillips Street and South Sherman Street. She then confirmed the 6-foot screening would be for the dumpster enclosure that was relocating to that area.

Mr. Chavez stated the recommendation would need to include the modification to allow the fencing within the front yard since the PD does allow it. The material shown on the exhibit, the chain-link fence, is not a material that was allowed in the Code. The metal material that it was changed to is allowed in the PD. The modification should you recommend approval should include to allow fencing within the front yard along South Sherman Street and Phillips Street. The metal gate along Central and Phillips would be low security pipe gate.

Commissioner Maxwell asked both staff and the applicant about the dumpster and the transformer placement at the corner of South Sherman Street and Phillips and why it was placed there.

Mr. Tsvang stated it was what was recommended by his architects, that the dumpster be relocated closer to the new building.

Mr. Chavez stated they would revisit the dumpster location to see if it could be placed elsewhere while addressing serviceability; however, the transformer placement is dictated by ONCOR.

Commissioner Springs expressed his concern about the limiting of trees on site because of messiness especially since there would be a car wash on site. Commissioner Frederick concurred stating that trees add value to a property.

Mr. Tsvang responded that they currently experience this challenge on South Sherman Street because the back-parking lot had nine (9) large trees. The vehicles parked beneath the trees become covered by bird refuse making it difficult to keep up with available inventory presentable to customers daily. It was more challenging in the summer months as the refuse dries more quickly making the car wash ineffective and requiring hand washing and detailing.

Commissioner Zimmerman asked if covered parking was a consideration.

Mr. Tsvang responded no.

Mr. Chavez provided an explanation of what the facility would look like regarding landscaping. There would be the canopy shade trees along the perimeter of the site. There would also be some limited tree placements within the site itself predominately shading those areas that are customer based. The balance of the islands would not have shade trees but will have turf grass.

With no further comment from staff and no additional comments received in favor or in opposition from the public, Chairman Taylor closed the public hearing and asked for further deliberation or a motion.

Vice Chairman Roland asked for clarity regarding the placement of the dumpster and the transformer at the corner of South Sherman Street and Phillips and his concern for placement of these items in this area.

Mr. Chavez explained that the dumpster location could be worked on with the cooperation of our Solid Waste Department to determine if there would be an alternate placement. The transformer placement would be mandated by ONCOR. Staff could work with ONCOR to determine if there was a different location that the transformer could be located. Ultimately, it would be based on ONCOR's accessibility to that transformer.

Chairman Taylor reopened the Public Hearing so that the project architect could have an opportunity to answer questions.

Mr. Jim Stevenson, 2821 West 7th Street, Fort Worth, Texas came forward to respond to commissioner comments. He first addressed the placement of the transformer stating the location was his interpretation of where it might work. He continued saying coordination efforts would be taking place with ONCOR to determine the placement. Ideally, he would like to see it placed closer to the building to keep the secondary run short to the panels. Next, he commented to the dumpster placement stating the location seemed to be the most practical location considering where the waste is generated and truck maneuvering in and out of the site. Finally, he stated the modifications could be made to the fencing at South Sherman Street and Phillips Street corner saying they could remove the fencing and move the security gate towards the rear of the property at the entrance island and then begin the steel picket fencing from the island going north on South Sherman Street to the end of the property.

With no further comment from staff and no additional comments received in favor or in opposition from the public, Chairman Taylor asked for a motion.

**Commission Action**

Motion: Vice Chairman Roland made a motion to approve Zoning File 19-28 - Special Development Plan – Town North Mazda as presented, subject to the following amendments:

- In lieu of a 6-foot chain link fence, tubular steel fencing will be used and shall be allowed within the front yard, and
- The dumpster and the transformer shall be relocated to an alternate location

Second by Chairman Taylor. Approved 7-0.

5. **ZF 19-25 PD Planned Development – Collins Arapaho TOD & Innovation District** (continued from October 22, 2019) : Consider and act on a request to change the zoning on approximately 1,144 acres generally bounded by Campbell Road to the north; Apollo Road, the Richardson Terrace North Addition, Hilltop Avenue, Arapaho Road and Collins Boulevard to the south; Plano Road to the east; and Dorothy Drive, Greenville Avenue, Central Expressway, Alma Road, Collins Boulevard and Greenville Avenue to the west from R-1500-M Residential, LR-M(1) Local Retail, LR-M(2) Local Retail, C-M Commercial, IM(1) industrial, I-FP(2) Industrial, IP-M(1) Industrial Park and PD Planned Development Districts to PD Planned Development to allow greater flexibility with regard to types of uses, development standards and parking standards Property Owner: Multiple Owners Staff: Doug McDonald.

**Staff Comments**

Mr. Doug McDonald, Planning Project Manager introduced himself along with the consultants that had been working closely with staff over the last year; Mr. Mark Bowers of Kimley Horn & Associates and Ms. Karen Walz from Strategic Community Solutions, LLC who would also be presenting.

Mr. McDonald presented regarding zoning file 19-25 PD Planned Development – Collins Arapaho TOD & Innovation District Form Based Code providing an in-depth project overview of what had taken place over the past two years for context to the vision study as well as the current zoning initiative. He stated the City of Richardson adopted its Comprehensive Plan in 2009 identifying six different areas within the city for enhancement and redevelopment opportunities: The West Spring Valley Corridor; Old Town/Main Street/Central Expressway Corridor; East Arapaho/Collins; West Arapaho/Coit. New visions and new codes were adopted for the West Spring Valley Corridor; Old Town/Main Street/Central Expressway. The East Collins/Arapaho was the focus area of this request.

In 2017 the City Council identified the station area and the East Arapaho areas for a study. Concurrently, the Chamber of Commerce developed its East Collins/Arapaho Task Force and developed the East Collins/Arapaho game plan which set for much of the initial steps for what the Chamber was going to be doing to enhance, market and re-brand the area, and identified obstacles in terms of zoning that the city can assist with in reducing said barriers

and enhance redevelopment. This led to the visioning study for 2018 comprised of many community outreach and consensus building efforts.

A District vision was developed with ten (10) main strategies as part of our next steps for implementation. In 2019 we moved into year-1 of implementation with the zoning and re-zoning of this area to align the district entitlements with the vision. Mr. McDonald then provided updates on:

- The Greenville Avenue & Block Party Demonstration Projects were successful, and we continue to get input from property owners.
- The Duck Creek Trail construction is under construction today.
- Engagement with DART on the Arapaho Center DART Station is in progress now to determine what the city can do to partner with DART on the development of the site at the station itself.
- The Alma Road mobility improvements (bike lanes and bike improvements) had been installed to extend the connection and make the bicycle network greater in the development area.
- The Business Association formation district branding and naming which were all initiatives headed by the Chamber and the Chamber's Task Force. Staff was working very closely with the Chamber in terms of implementation through year-1 and further on through 2020.

Mr. McDonald provided a district vision map and stated the subject area had decreased in size from the visioning effort due to the newly rezoned properties and new development along Greenville Avenue to reserve existing entitlements compatible to the vision. He continued by stating the north boundary is Campbell Road; to the east is Plano Road; to the south is Alma Road; and to the west is the US-75 Corridor. The area was approximately 1,200 acres and over 92% of this area was zoned Industrial so there were limitations in terms of new uses that could go inside these buildings as currently zoned.

He reiterated the importance of mentioning the substantial consensus among City Council, the City Planning Commission, the Chamber of Commerce stakeholders, the University of Texas at Dallas, DART, stakeholders and property owners as well as the public in helping to identify what the vision would be and next steps moving forward in the Innovation District.

The district vision that was created would be that Richardson would be the premier tech hub in Texas, and to achieve this we would provide a place where a range of businesses across industries at different points in their growth could thrive and to support the existing businesses while attracting new ones. A goal for the district was to continue to be the center of innovation and entrepreneurship; the true DNA of Richardson; which was pioneering technology. Also being introduced were spaces that had more visually unique green and lively active spaces to encourage more active uses which were very important characteristics of innovation districts across the country. The district would be walkable, bikeable and have other modes of transit to get to and from areas instead of utilizing a vehicle for every trip during the day thus providing options for people to improve mobility around the district. The Arapaho DART Station area would serve as a primary gateway or

entry point to the Innovation District at the Arapaho DART Station like those located at CityLine/Bush Station, Galatyn Park Station and Spring Valley Station.

Mr. McDonald stated that this rezoning initiative touched five (5) of the ten (10) main strategies of the District vision directly and felt strongly that all ten (10) strategies were being advanced allowing zoning flexibility within the industrial zones by: improving edges and gateways; re-designing key streets with better mobility; creating new open space amenities to attract and retain new and existing businesses and redeveloping some key opportunity sites to bring in new uses and activities within the district.

He stated the zoning initiative was the first step to implement the vision created in 2018. It established rezoning strategies for the area focusing on implementation. It created standards for new zoning districts and new implementation strategies for reinvestment, redevelopment and new construction. The new Form Based Code also standardized items such as building envelope, building setbacks; building height, building use, architecture and signage.

Mr. McDonald provided an overview of the project schedule and a high-level overview of the outreach efforts as part of the Vision Study and concluded his presentation and introduced Ms. Karen Walz to provide background on the Community Input Process to date.

Ms. Walz stated the Vision Study phase of this project included a very extensive public involvement and public outreach component. The vision study was adopted directly with public involvement to include:

- 29 public events/presentation
- 41 interviews with property owners and key stakeholders
- 588 event participants (interviews, open houses, popups)
- 914 online surveys completed
- stakeholder interviews with the Mayor and City Council
- community workshop and block party events

As the vision study progressed to implement the vision, there was extensive opportunity for public and stakeholder involvement to include:

- Two sets of stakeholder interviews with major property owners within the district. The first interview was to establish their interest and the second was to solicit input while developing the direction
- Interviews were conducted with the Mayor and City Council
- Presentations to Stakeholder Groups throughout the process (5 presentations)
- Several major public events were held providing the opportunity for the public to participate and ask questions regarding the vision, the zoning.

Ms. Walz then elaborated on specific outreach events:

- Innovation District Block Party (373 Participants)
    - at City-owned property along Duck Creek
    - Thursday evening and Friday lunch

  - presentation, keypad polling, input stations
  - food games, music and a Duck Creek pop-up park for participants to get a true idea of how an open amenity space might work for this District
  - participants included property and business owners; Richardson residents in walking distance and further of which one-half come to the District nearly every weekday
  - online Survey for those who could not attend the Block Party (383 Participants)

- Community Open House (follow-up open house where 'Draft Direction' for the code was in place) (80 Participants)

  - Overall, supported the draft code direction
  - Multiple comments indicated support for:
    - trails and bike lanes
    - proposed amenities along Duck Creek (open space and gathering places throughout the District)
    - expanded range of uses and additional development flexibility
    - some inclusion of residential (live-work)

Ms. Walz concluded her presentation and introduced Mr. Mark Bowers who would present the Code overview.

Mr. Mark Bowers began his presentation stating the primary purpose for undergoing this rezoning initiative was to enable the vision for the subject area to occur in the future. There are many parts of the vision that can not occur today because of existing zoning. He then provided the definition of what Form Based Code was and how the Collins/Arapaho TOD and Innovation District Vision would provide flexibility and predictability for property owners and investors than currently exits and built off the best form of each area to encourage a more cohesive design with a mix of uses and additional uses that are not currently allowed. It would also promote a connected pedestrian, bicycle and street network to allow for easy entrance to/exit from the district. The overall direction from City Council and CPC included:

- remove barriers and increase flexibility to maximize development potential and building envelope of each site within the 1,200-acres
- limit the creation of new non-conforming uses additive layer of new allowable uses
- support existing businesses and their growth
- emphasize Duck Creek as a District amenity
- position the Arapaho Center Station as a walkable mixed-use front door to the District
- introduce residential uses where appropriate to support employment and activity uses
- use current residential adjacency standards approach to development near existing neighborhoods
- maintain access for freight trucks where needed but add multi-modal – bike, pedestrian rideshare, shuttle to DART, etc.

The 1,200-acres had been divided into four distinct sub-districts in the Collins-Arapaho TOD & Innovation District:

- Duck Creek Sub-district (along the Duck Creek corridor to the east)

- Greenville Avenue Sub-district (along Greenville Avenue up to the north coming down from Campbell Road)
- Station Area Sub-district (the immediate property surrounding Arapaho Station)
- Employment Area Sub-district (encompasses approximately 730-acres of the 1,200-acre site)

He continued by stating the following Planned Developments (PD) along Greenville Avenue had been removed from the rezoning initiative to reserve existing entitlements compatible to the vision:

- Greenvue Apartments
- The Mallory Apartments
- Eastside
- Planned Development between Eastside and The Mallory

A regulating plan had been created for each sub-district which sets of perimeters for future development. It identifies Street Types & Streetscape Standards unique to those specific areas: Different Building Envelope Standards (Heights, Setbacks or build-to lines); Uses (Uses allowed "By Right", "By Right with Supplemental Regulations", or with Special Permit which would be required to go before the City Planning Commission and City Council for approval. Uses not listed are prohibited and would require an amendment to the entire code to include those uses.

District-Wide Regulations apply to all four (4) sub-districts:

- Non-Residential Uses
    - 92% of the District currently zoned only for Industrial/Office uses
    - Expand non-residential opportunities in all sub-districts while minimizing creation of new non-conformities throughout the District
        - Only 4 new non-conforming uses created (all 4 located in the Station Area Sub-district):
            - 2 are motor vehicle sales and/or leasing
            - 1 is a motor vehicle storage lot
            - 1 is a smoking establishment
        - Example uses added in each sub-district: restaurants, retail, collaborative co-working space, microbrewery, winery, commercial entertainment (e-sports)

Mr. Bowers then spoke to the non-residential on-site parking ratios. Per the City Council's direction, parking ratio requirements have been lessened to provide greater flexibility for leasing and reuse of properties, and for redevelopment of small sites. New parking spaces shall be provided for building expansions or new building construction only. Uses of certain square footage and less, are exempt from providing parking. Additionally, allowances have been made in the Code within all four sub-districts to allow for on-street parking to be counted towards satisfying off-street parking requirements and shared parking areas are encouraged to meet the needs of multiple property owners and businesses. Furthermore, a

credit may be requested to allow for off-site shared parking or public parking within 600 feet of a property to satisfy off-street parking requirements.

He touched on the added types of Residential Uses allowed across the sub-districts. The types of residential uses allowed are:

- Adaptive Reuse (adaptive reuse of a building for a residential use)
- Live-Work (use that includes units that include live and work)
- Single-Family Detached
- Townhomes
- Multi-Family

He then presented examples of live-work development incentives being offered:

- Greenville Avenue and Station Area Sub-districts
    - Allow a reduction in parking requirements for any live-work developments to encourage live-work throughout the sub-district
    - Until market supports new innovation/commercial uses (e.g. new innovation space is constructed), allow non-residential space to be used for other uses, including residential, common areas, etc.

- Greenville Avenue Sub-district Only
    - Allow up to eight-stories in height for live-work (could include multifamily with ground floor commercial space).

He provided examples of supplemental or restrictive regulations for multifamily and townhome developments:

- Station Area Sub-district
    - Multifamily or townhome uses are prohibited along Greenville Avenue unless they meet the definition and supplemental regulations of "Live-Work".
        - 100% of the gross linear footage of the development's first floor to consist of non-residential/coworking/innovation space; encouraging ground-floor activation.
        - Multi-family or townhome units in this sub-district are required to have ground floor entrances fronting the street (not internal to building) to encourage street activation.

- Greenville Avenue Sub-district
    - Multifamily is restricted to three-stories in height.
        - Live-work allowed eight-stories
    - Multifamily or townhome units in this sub-district are required to have ground floor entrances fronting the street (not internal to building) to encourage street activation.

He discussed on-site residential parking rations and provided examples of changed ratios depending on certain circumstances where each of the sub-districts were located and the activities taking place within each.

He went on to say the code provides a higher level of direction than was provided in the prior form-based code and then spoke to the eight (8) gateways/portals that had been identified district-wide:

- US 75 Bridges (2); KSC Bridges (2); DART Bridge (1)
- Duck Creek (2); US 75 at Arapaho (1)
- City should consider acquiring land/easements for gateway signage/portals, and/or open spaces as properties become available.
- Many gateways (5 bridges) identified require working with other institutional partners but could be implemented today.
- Public/Private partnerships, and/or business association is likely the responsibility of the city.

Next, Mr. Bowers gave an overview of the following areas and the requirements for each:

- Open Space Requirements on Private Property
- Landscape Screening and Buffers
- Interior Parking Lot Landscaping
- Signage
- Architectural Standards

He touched on some administrative processes that have already taken place along with actions moving forward:

- April 1, 2019 – Phase I – 58 inactive & obsolete Special Permits (SP) were repealed
- December 9, 2019 – Phase II – 47 Special Permits were repealed
    - 42 Inactive
    - 3 Obsolete
    - 2 Removed with new zoning district use regulations
- Active Special Use Permits – 20 Active SUPs will be retained and carried over with the rezoning initiative
- Drive-thru banks (6) have been 'Grandfathered' through this process along with potential to have adaptive reuse associated with those drive-thru (e.g. drive thru banks can be converted to other non-residential drive-thru uses such as a pharmacy, restaurant, dry-cleaning service, etc.). If an existing drive-thru is demolished, it cannot be rebuilt.
- No changes to the process for Special Development Plans, Minor Modifications, Non-Conformities from Main/Central Form Based Code.
- Additional flexibility with non-conforming structures that may not meet new setback or build-to zones:
    - Non-conforming structures may be expanded or enlarged if the expansion or improvement brings the structure closer to compliance, even if the expansion or improvement does not bring the structure into full compliance.

Mr. Bowers elaborated on the District specific standards for each of the following sub-districts along with Sub-district Regulating Plan Highlights:

**Employment Sub-district**

- Support existing business

    - No new non-conforming uses created
- Promote as the center for business innovation and entrepreneurship
- Allow wider range of uses to bring new activities to the District
    - e.g. Retail, Restaurant, Service, Microbrewery, Winery, Food Truck Park (SP), drive-thru facilities (SP)
- Increase flexibility in the building envelope while maintaining height restrictions for residential adjacency
- By special permit only, allow for adaptive reuse of buildings on a case-by-case basis for residential and live-work uses

The Employment Sub-district would be regulated by the following:

- Maintain height restrictions when adjacent to residential zoning
- Remove height maximums in the sub-district with the exception of residential adjacency
- Extend Columbia Drive from Glenville Drive to International Parkway
- Special Sites:
    - Duck Creek connecting the Greenville Sub-district and Duck Creek Sub-district: encourage redevelopment to incorporate open space amenities
    - KCS line if/when line becomes inactive to promote connection to UTD
    - Abandoned rail spur south of E. Arapaho: encourage redevelopment to incorporate open space amenities

**Greenville Avenue Sub-district**

- Support existing business
    - No new non-conforming uses created
- Allow a wider range of uses to create more attractions that complement residential on west side of Greenville Avenue (Eastside/Mallory)
    - e.g. Retail, Restaurant, Service, Microbrewery, Winery, Food Truck Park (SP), drive-thru facilities (SP)
- Increase flexibility in the building envelope
- Create opportunities for new residential uses as redevelopment occurs to support employment base
    - Allow multifamily, townhome, live-work, and adaptive reuse residential uses
    - Allow by Special Permit single-family detached

The Grenville Avenue Sub-district would be regulated by the following:

- Restrict height to 189 feet (approximately 15 stories) along Campbell Road, 105 feet (approximately 8 stories) along Greenville Drive, and remove height maximus south of Alma Road adjacent to US 75
- Encourage redevelopment to incorporate open space amenities along Duck Creek, labeled “Special Site” on Regulating Plan
- Prohibit new surface parking lots along the Duck Creek “Special Site”

**Duck Creek Sub-district**

- Support existing business
    - No new non-conforming uses created
- Encourage new uses that ‘face the creek’ and benefit from City’s open space investments

- Allow a wider range of uses to create more attractions after work and on weekends
    - e.g. Retail, Restaurant, Service, Microbrewery, Winery, Food Truck Park (SP), drive-thru facilities (SP)
- Increase flexibility in the building envelope while maintaining height restrictions for residential adjacency
- Create opportunities for entrepreneurs to live where they work
    - Allow adaptive reuse of existing buildings for residential or live-work
    - Allow by Special Permit for live-work use for new construction or additions

The Duck Creek Sub-district would be regulated by the following:

- Maintain existing height restrictions when adjacent to residential zoning
- Limit building heights to a maximum of 69 feet (approximately 5 stories) beyond existing residential adjacency restrictions for properties along Plano Road
- Remove height maximums in sub-district for properties along Collins Boulevard and for properties west of Duck Creek
- Potential public open space at the intersection of E. Collins Boulevard and Glenville Drive
- Prohibit outside storage for properties in the Duck Creek sub-district
- Prohibit any new loading dock doors along Duck Creek
- Prohibit surface parking adjacent to Duck Creek as redevelopment occurs
- Encourage outdoor dining or patios along Duck Creek

Mr. Bowers concluded his presentation and Mr. Doug McDonald provided final comments.

Mr. McDonald stated that some additional recommended changes were made to the draft ordinance based on feedback received from the public for the Commission to consider.

- Allow accessory buildings in all four sub-districts with a maximum height of 15-feet to match Main/Central Code. Accessory buildings would exclude parking structures.
- Remove the requirement that all identification signs within a development be similar in design to enhance consistency and project identity
- Clarify in all four sub-districts that shared parking agreements can occur with properties in different sub-districts if they are within 600 feet.

Mr. McDonald concluded his presentation and made himself available for questions.

Vice Chairman Roland asked Ms. Walz about meetings with key people, and property owners and how many meetings occurred.

Ms. Walz responded there were twelve (12) meetings hosted in 2 phases: early and late during the process with property owners and even partners within one location.
Vice Chairman Roland asked about the Greenville Avenue Station and if the idea was to remove the underground crosswalk area or to provide an option for crossing in that area.

Mr. Bowers responded that it was to provide an option.

Mr. McDonald added that the city was approached by DART initially because of concerns with riders who were jumping the fence to cross Greenville Avenue. Feedback from users also indicated they were not comfortable with utilizing the tunnel at night and individuals that

had mobility challenges found it difficult to navigate the ramps at the station going underground and then back up the AVA ramps.

**Public Comments**

With no further questions from staff, Chairman Taylor opened the public hearing.

The following individuals came forward to speak in support of this request:

- Bill Dhalstrom, 2323 Ross Avenue, Ste. 600, Dallas, Texas 75201
- Dave Anderson, 3602 Blackwood Court, Richardson, Texas 75082
- Roy Greensberg, 5604 Stone Cliff Court, Dallas, Texas 75087
- Jeff Paschal, 2524 Meadow Hills Lane, Plano, Texas 75093
- Bryan Marsh, 2611 Sherrill Park Drive, Richardson, Texas 75082
- Aaron Hollis, 400 Fireside Drive, Richardson, Texas 75081
- Rick Cunney, 18111 Preston Road, Ste. 1000, Dallas, Texas 75252

The following individuals came forward to speak in opposition of this request:

- Melissa Davis, 1709 E. Spring Valley Road, Richardson, Texas 75081
- Jess Pettit, 908 Quality Way, Richardson, Texas 75081
    - Mr. Pettit was in opposition of portions as drafted

Mr. McDonald provided responses addressing questions or concerns brought up through public comment.

He began by addressing the concern regarding the security fencing requirement and stated that security fencing would be allowed on a case-by-case basis through a minor modification for security purposes which had been built into the new code. He spoke to requirements concerning street frontage and stated the frontage along both streets had been removed from the code. Mr. McDonald also confirmed that the cemetery would stay in place as a component of the district. He then spoke about the blank walls and the articulation of flat blank walls stating a 50-foot requirement was put in place that if a wall became more than 50-feet long, some type of treatment would have to be applied for aesthetics such as different colored paint every 50-feet, or a mural could be utilized that would provide visual interest. This requirement was put in place to discourage long flat blank walls.

He then spoke regarding the open space requirements stating they were modeled after the Main Street/Central District which is located just south of this district and comprises 540-acres which was in implementation phase. The open space percentage and the requirement of a certain percentage up front was to ensure more open spaces and amenities could be available in the District and that the development itself was not fragmented. The City of Richardson did not have a park dedication fee for new development or redevelopment. A way for the city to provide open spaces in lieu of a fee would be done through actions such as substantially removing parking requirements, removing setbacks, and no height restrictions. He continued by stating the open space requirement percentage could be reduced

based on Commission feedback but reiterated that a larger percentage of open space phasing in at one time would ensure more functionality and usability for the public.

Mr. McDonald stated that 92% of the current district area was zoned Industrial but would now be able to request a drive-through restaurant through the Special Permit process opening this use up to approximately 730-acres of the 1,200-acres subject area. This was however intentionally left out of the Greenville Avenue; the DART/Arapaho Center Station and Duck Creek sub-districts to maintain the vision of providing walkable, pedestrian oriented areas.

He continued by stating the district naming and branding was yet to be identified. The portals represented areas considered gatewayed entries into the District and special attention should be directed towards as these gateway entries as they are redeveloped. These portals provide an avenue fostering conversation with the property owners on the types of treatments that could be done to enhance the sense of arrival into the district. This is not a requirement, but a tool to essentially foster dialog.

Major arterials require 200-feet for driveway spacing (e.g. Plano Road, Campbell Road, Arapaho Road). There was in increase in the spacing requirement on the interior roads from 50-feet to 200-feet. A minor modification was written into the code for certain instances that could not meet this requirement due to land configuration. If a property owner needs to go below the 200-foot requirement, they could go through a staff approval process illustrating the constraints that would allow for less than the 200-foot requirement. This requirement was however intentionally left out of the Greenville Avenue; the DART/Arapaho Center Station and Duck Creek sub-districts to maintain the vision of providing walkable, pedestrian oriented areas.

In closing, Mr. McDonald stated that in the event of a disaster with over 50% loss of a structure or an element of a building you would lose your non-conforming status. This was a City standard and could be re-evaluated by the Commission for this district to increase the percentage amount that it would take in order to lose your non-conforming status. He then made himself available for questions.

Vice Chairman Roland asked if any thought or dialog had been given to shared open-space agreements and clarity on the portals and if this meant the portals would feature monument signs, a direction sign, special lighting, etc.

Mr. McDonald responded shared open-space agreements were not something that had been looked at; however, if this was an area the Commission wanted explored, they would be willing to do so. He confirmed that the portals would feature specific branding and staff would be working not only with some of the property owners within the portal areas but primarily we would be partnering with entities such as the State of Texas, DART, KCS Rail Line.

Commissioner Maxwell asked for clarity on the portal areas identified and if the code was written requiring property owners to provide a portal or to conform to the visioning for the

portal area. He also expressed concern about the percentages provided for the open-space requirement and if the percentage was an accurate figure.

Mr. McDonald stated that the code is written so that in the event of development or redevelopment, properties within or adjacent to a portal improvement site would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis for potential inclusion of portal/POA features. By wording it in such a way, it does not tie a property owner or the City to a specific type of portal element or even having a portal.

Commissioner Southard asked about the property owners within portal spaces and if there would be a shared cost? He concurred with Commissioner Maxwell, Chairman Taylor and Commissioner Springs that the open-space percentage requirement may be an inaccurate number.

Mr. McDonald stated no.

Commissioner Springs stated he was not comfortable with the 50% calamity threshold requirement or loss of a structure or an element of a building forcing the loss of non-conforming status. He stated he felt the percentage needed to be investigated further. Finally, he asked for clarity on the separation of drives and was it related to street type.

Mr. McDonald responded that all major arterials require 200-feet for driveway spacing (e.g. Plano Road, Campbell Road, Arapaho Road). Spacing for internal streets increased from a 100-foot separation or a 50-foot separation depending upon what road you were on to a standard 200-foot separation. If a property owner needs to go below the 200-foot requirement, they could go through a staff approval process illustrating the constraints that would allow for less than the 200-foot requirement. This requirement was however, intentionally left out of the Greenville Avenue; the DART/Arapaho Center Station and Duck Creek sub-districts to stay in line with the vision of providing walkable, pedestrian oriented areas.

Commissioner's Maxwell asked what percentage of the District fell into sites less than 1-acre in relation to the open-space requirement. He also asked for clarity on the difference between open-space versus landscape requirements and how do they interact with each other?

Mr. McDonald responded he would have to research the percentage of 1-acre or less property ownership and respond back to the Commission. He continued by stating there is a difference between open-space requirements and landscaping requirements and gave an example of a landscape buffer along the frontage road on instances where you don't have build-to lines. There is also landscaping internal to the site which is not included in the percentages for open-space requirements. Open-space is active, open, usable space.

Commissioner Southard suggested potential discussion for shared open space that might qualify as both open-space and landscaping as a potential relief mechanism for concerns about open space requirements.

Commissioner Zimmerman commented about realistic expectations for use of the open-spaces due to the heat and or weather and suggested consideration be given to covered areas or collaborative spaces for innovators and entrepreneurs.

Mr. McDonald responded that the open-space utilization would depend on how it is programmed. If the space is programmed with shade and activities, it would draw people and they would utilize it regardless of the heat.

Commissioner Springs concurred with Commissioner Maxwell's comments to the 1-acre sites and suggested it be revisited further going forward to determine if there is some type of gradient for the smaller land owners.

Vice Chairman Roland asked staff and the consultants for direction on verbiage that should be included for this zoning request to move the recommendation forward.

Mr. McDonald responded that it should include language to clarify the items for which staff should continue collaborative work on with the Task Force or the public on such as the driveway space. This will give staff the ability to continue working with the task force or public to come up with a compromise that is Possibly have that written into the motion to have a compromise between the two groups that best fits both parties. Additionally, the other recommended amendment that were added should also be included within the recommendation as they are not currently incorporated in the Code today.

Vice Chairman Roland also commented to revisiting catastrophic damage thresholds which might be something that needed to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

Chairman Taylor commended both staff and the consultants on the outstanding plan that has been put in front of the Commission.

With no further comment from staff and no additional comments received in favor or in opposition from the public, Chairman Taylor asked for a motion.

**Commission Action**

Motion: Vice Chairman Roland made a motion to recommend approval of Zoning File 19-25 – PD Planned Development – Collins Arapaho TOD & Innovation District with the following recommended changes:

- To include the recommended amendments that were incorporate by staff, which were not included in the Commission packet, but presented by staff
- Allow accessory buildings at all four sub-districts with a maximum height of 15-feet to mirror the Main Street/Central Code
- Remove requirement that all identification signs within the development be similar in design to enhance consistency and project identity

- Clarify within all four sub-districts that shared parking agreements can occur within properties in different sub-districts as long as they are within 600-feet
- Implement open-space discussions between stakeholders and City staff to better define the definition of open-space and the percentages needed to activate certain areas of the overlay district
- Review and subdivide areas of curb separations or entrances to properties based on different subdivisions and the needs of traffic within those subdivisions, and
- In the event of catastrophic damage to continue discussions on what percentages and matrix would be used to rebuild damaged properties

Second by Commissioner Springs. Motion approved 7-0.

With no further business before the Commission, Chairman Taylor adjourned the regular business meeting at 10:11 p.m.

_____
Randy Roland, Vice Chairman