CITY OF RICHARDSON
CITY PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES – AUGUST 18, 2020

The Richardson City Plan Commission met on August 18, 2020, at 7:00 p.m. Chairman Taylor convened the Commission into the Regular Session via videoconference. A quorum was present.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ron Taylor, Chairman
Randy Roland, Vice Chairman
Ken Southard, Commissioner
Stephen Springs, Commissioner
Joe Costantino, Commissioner
Gwen Walraven, Commissioner
Scott Zimmerman, Commissioner
Gary Beach, Commissioner
Michael Keller, Commissioner

CITY STAFF PRESENT: Sam Chavez, Assistant Director – Dev. Services – Planning
Chris Shacklett, Development Review Manager
Daniel Harper, Senior Planner
Connie Ellwood, Executive Secretary

BRIEFING SESSION

Prior to the regular business meeting, the City Plan Commission will meet with staff via videoconference to receive a briefing on:

A. Discuss prospective amendment to the Main Street/Central Expressway PD regarding non-conforming uses. No action was taken.

REGULAR BUSINESS MEETING

1. **Approval of Minutes of the regular business meeting on August 4, 2020.**

   Motion: Commissioner Springs made a motion to approve the minutes as presented; second by Commissioner Walraven. Motion passed 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. **Replat – Telecom Industrial Park, Lot 2A, Block 1:** Consider and act on a request for approval of a replat of Lot 2, Block 1, Telecom Industrial Park to dedicate and abandon easements to accommodate the development of a 1,024,661-square foot fabrication facility. The 92.455-acre site is located at 300 W. Renner Road, at the northwest corner of Renner Road and Alma Road. Applicant: Patrick Braun, Pacheco Koch Consulting Engineers, representing Texas Instruments.

Motion: Commissioner Springs made a motion to approve the consent agenda; second by Commissioner Southard. Motion passed 7-0.

PUBLIC HEARING

3. **Zoning File 19-32 – Owens Farm:** Consider and act on a request to change the zoning on approximately 26.7 acres located at the northeast corner of N. Plano Road and Lookout Drive from I-M(1) Industrial to PD Planned Development for the RA-1100-M Residential Attached (townhome) District and RP-1500-M Patio Home District and the LR-M(1) Local Retail District with modified development standards to allow development of approximately 204 residential lots with retail development on 1.65 acres of the 26.7-acre tract of land. *Property Owner: Tommy Crowell, Lookout Pig, Ltd. Staff: Sam Chavez*

Mr. Chavez stated the applicant request for a change in zoning of 26.67 acres located at northeast corner of N. Plano Road and Lookout Drive from IM (1) Industrial to PD Planned Development District for 25 acres residential development under the RA-1100-M Patio Home District and the RP-1500-M Residential Attached (Townhome) District with modified development standards and 1.6 acres tract at the hard corner of North Plano Road and Lookout Drive for the LR-M(1) Local Retail District with modified development standards. The intent was to accommodate development of a maximum 203 residential lots on the 25 acres and one (1) retail lot at the hard corner.

The proposed PD consisted of three (3) distinct residential categories. The "Villas" would comprise twenty-seven (27) lots and would be zoned single-family patio. The lots would be street served or driveways would be located off the street. The "Cottages" would comprise sixty-seven (67) lots zoned single-family patio district. The Cottage lots would be alley served. There would be one-hundred and nine (109) "Townhome" lots all alley served. The proposed Townhome lots would be 3- story in height with a maximum height of fifty-five (55) feet. In total the applicant proposed two-hundred and three (203) lots. The 1.6-acre commercial tract would be zoned LR-M(1) Local Retail District with modified development standards.

Included throughout the development were seven (7) common area lots. The common area lots would be owned and maintained by the Homeowner's Association (HOA). Along Owen's Boulevard or the east property line, the applicant proposed an eight (8) foot board-on-board wooden fence with steel posts. Along Lookout Drive the applicant proposed a six (6) foot masonry screening wall. Along the east property line of the commercial tract, the applicant proposed an eight (8) foot board-on-board masonry columns. Along the frontages of the commercial tract and the open space along Plano Road for the residential portion of the development, the applicant proposed a four (4) foot tall split-rail fence. There are also perimeter trails and multi-use trails throughout the development. Along the north side of the property, the applicant proposed to connect the existing sidewalk along North Plano Road with a proposed multi-use trail on the far east side of the property. This sidewalk would be ten (10) foot wide. Along the east property line there would be a ten (10) to twelve (12) foot wide multi-use trail. The location and the designation of the multi-purpose trail conforms with the City's Master Trail Plan.

The applicant also proposed to include planting of street and alley trees. There were provisions in the code that allowed this to happen as well as provided a list of plant materials that would be allowed within those areas as well as setbacks that would apply to those areas.

As part of the application staff also reviewed other elements of not only the City's Comprehensive Plan, but also the adjacent property existing development. Staff looked at the future land use plan which was part of the Comprehensive Plan. As proposed, the use of the property as single-family did not comply with the land use designation for the subject property. The property was designated as Office and Industry. As proposed, the land use designation would be Residential.

Other considerations were the Lookout Transfer Station location and other municipal facilities located adjacent to the Lookout Transfer Station (City of Richardson's BABIC Yard, Emergency Operations Center or EOC). The Lookout Transfer Station had been in operation since 1970. License capacity increases for the site from January of 2020 to 2025 to a total of 700 tons of waste per day. The permitted increase in the facility's capacity over the next several years would result in an increase in the number of truck/vehicles trips to and from the site, and thus impact the area in the way of increased noise and truck/vehicles traffic.

Staff also reviewed the slope easement or setback from the bottom of the creek's bank. The applicant proposed a 2.5:1 slope easement or setback from the bottom of the creek's bank, while staff recommended a 3:1 setback from the bottom of the creek's bank plus an additional fifteen (15) feet to accommodate any the natural erosion of the creek bank.

The applicant submitted a Traffic Impact Analysis which was reviewed by staff. The current level of service for Plano Road was a Service Level D. The proposed application did increase the level of service, however still within the city's standards. The Traffic Impact Analysis also identified the existing median opening the applicant intended to use for a left turn for south bound traffic would operate at a level of service beyond or worse than the current level of service. In order to provide the left turn lane, a lane would be created. To provide the new left turn lane, the width of the through lanes north of the median opening would be reduced in width by less than one (1) foot which created an approximate 1-foot off-set in the lane alignments across the length of the median opening. The applicant intended to mark the pavement through the median opening intersection with "puppy tracks".

The Townhome District required parking be provided at a ratio of 0.5 spaces per unit. Based on the applicant's number of Townhomes, fifty-five (55) guest parking spaces would need to be provided. The proposed plan does not provide off-street parking; however, the ordinance allows for on-street parking as guest parking. Based on the length of street frontage adjacent to the Townhomes, they could accommodate fifty-seven (57) on-street parking spaces.

The "Villas" and "Cottages" did not require guest parking. However, on street parking would be more difficult along streets that service the "Villa" style homes because they are designed with front loaded garages with driveways from the street. This design created a discontinuous curb pattern by the driveway entrances. Each "Villa" lot would be able to accommodate one (1) vehicle on the street before interfering with driveway access.

There are provisions for any of the lots should they be back to back or side to side on a designated "Zero Side" the applicant was required to provide courtyard sides on the opposite side for those lots.

The commercial tract that would be rezoned to LR-M(1) illustrated sidewalks along North Plano Road and Lookout Drive. Along the east property line was the proposed location for the eight (8) foot tall board-on-board fence with brick columns. This screening fence would be on the property line; however, there would be a three (3) foot maintenance easements on each side of the wall for maintenance by the HOA and not the retail tract owner.

Mr. Chavez spoke about the Street and Alley Cross sections. He stated the proposed streets met the city standards with fifty (50) foot of right-of-way and twenty-seven (27) foot of pavement. A difference was there would be a five (5) foot sidewalk as opposed to a four (4) foot sidewalk and a six and one half (6.5) foot parkway where the street trees would be planted. Along the alley there was a fifteen (15) foot wide street right of way with twelve (12) feet of paving. There was a one and one half (1.5) foot on each side of the paving referred to as the parkway for the alley as well as the proposed setbacks with fences setback a minimum of three (3) feet from the property line. This would allow for the planting of alley trees that would be set back a minimum of five (5) feet from the property line.

The applicant in their proposal also requested some alternate materials although the City cannot regulate materials. The applicant proposed to use fiber cement board as accents on some of the buildings.

Staff reviewed the proposed 2.5:1 Erosion Hazard Setback and the 3:1 slope would impact the development and would have to relocate the street along the North edge out of the 3:1 slop easement as well as any lots that would fall within that area which would be approximately six (6) to seven (7) lots.

The applicant also submitted a schematic illustrating the turn movements that they would be possible through the median turn lane opening located on Plano Road. It also illustrates how they were reducing existing lanes. As proposed, the new deceleration lane would conform with the City's standards. However, to provide the new left turn lane, the width of the through lanes north of the median opening must be reduced in width by less than one (1) foot which creates an approximate 1-foot of proposed lane alignment off-sets which are not uncommon. The applicant intends to mark the pavement through the median opening intersection with "puppy tracks" to guide vehicles through the off-set alignment.

For the Villas, which would be street served, the minimum front setback would be 10 feet from the main building and 20 feet for the opening of the garage face.

The Cottages were all alley served and abut a fifteen (15) foot wide alley and the setbacks would vary from seven (7) to nine (9) feet in depth to allow for a variety of garage placement whether it be detached or attached. There was a provision the applicant was requesting for the required depth of the maneuvering apron to be reduced from twenty-four (24) feet to twenty (20) feet.

The Townhomes lots would be owned individually, but the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance restricts a maximum of six (6) units per building. The applicant requested a maximum of ten (10) units per building. Once the number of units in a building exceeds six (6) units per building a fire sprinkler would be required for the building which the applicant was intending to do. The buildings would have between six (6) and (10) units each.

Mr. Chavez concluded his presentation stating the applicant would provide a presentation and answer any questions from staff. He stated there had been correspondence received on this case which had been provided within the packet along with a supplemental email provided to the Commissioners before the evenings briefing session. Within the correspondence received, nine (9) were in opposition of the applicant's request, three (3) were in support of the applicant's request and three (3) were neutral on the subject request.

Vice Chairman Roland asked for an example of board-on-board fencing with metal posts being allowed.

Mr. Chavez responded the standard in the zoning ordinance required a masonry screening wall or an alternate fencing with landscaping. What the applicant was proposing within the right-of-way for Owen's Boulevard was to provide a shrub planting along the east side of this fence line to soften the appearance. Mr. Chavez also stated there was an example of the board-on-board fencing would be the Mimosa's development located south of Campbell Road and Mimosa.

Vice Chairman Roland asked if the city had ever allowed a developer to change a lane size on a major thoroughfare such as Plano Road before and was it a common occurrence. He also asked if the turn lane would continue as a service level D as well as the where the mailboxes would be located for the development.

Mr. Chavez responded it was common for the lane modification. The lanes that would be reduced would still be within the city standard of eleven (11) feet. He further stated that median openings usually have a level of service D because of how they function (not a free left or right). The challenge with the level of service was addressed by the applicant by providing a second point of connection to Lookout Drive. Previously the center drive was not there. By providing the second drive the applicant reduced the impact on median opening on Plano Road by allowing secondary more convenient access to a signal light at Lookout Drive and Plano Road. He also responded that the developer would be installing gang-mail boxes for the development.

Vice Chairman Roland asked for clarity on the parking for a ten (10) unit building.

Mr. Chavez stated that each townhome would be required to have a two (2) car garage. He added that any guest parking would occur along the street and concluded his presentation.

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

Public Comments

Mr. William Gietema, Arcadia Realty, 3500 Maple Avenue, Dallas, Texas came forward to speak in favor of this application and present the case for the Owen's Farm neighborhood.

Mr. Ned Wilson, 3301 North I-35 East, Carrollton, Texas 75007 came forward to speak in favor of this application also providing his case in supplement to Mr. Gietema's presentation.

The CPC meetings official record and the applicant's presentation can be viewed at: http://richardsontx.swagit.com/play/08182020-1501

Vice Chairman Roland asked if the entire property would be scraped and leveled or would there still be some of the undulation and trees for this development.

Mr. Gietema stated the property slopes from south southeast to north northwest. The streets were oriented in such a way that there would be no large breaks in the grade or retaining walls. The grade would be supported with dropped side beams within the homes which provides a shallower slope down the roads. It will be grated all the way down and the existing trees would be replaced with street trees. In the end there will be more trees on the site than before.

Vice Chairman Roland asked why the developer chose to install a board-on-board fence along the transfer station. He also expressed some concerns about maintenance of this type of fence in the future and would prefer to see something such as a masonry and rod-iron fencing which weathers well through the years and were consistent.

Mr. Gietema responded the fence would be an eight (8) foot fence with hedge row located in front of it that would be maintained by the HOA. The hedge row provides a more aesthetically pleasing appearance. The thought was it would be more acceptable along a trail because it would be facing the transfer station and not facing the road. There was a commitment to build the city trail along the north end of the property. He also pointed out that within the zoning a board-on-board fence as well as the split rail ornamental fence along N. Plano Road are all maintained by the HOA and are in maintenance easements so they are not actually located in yards aside from one that has a portion located in a yard. He felt the board-on-board fencing with the hedge in front of it would be aesthetically pleasing and easier to maintain for the HOA.

Vice Chairman Roland asked for clarity on the trail that would surround the subject property. Was the applicant proposing to construct the city trail that would be located between the subject property and the transfer station.

Mr. Gietema stated they proposed to build half and the funding would be placed in escrow to pay for the applicant's portion of the trail. The applicant was funding the bridging portion that would go all the way to N. Plano Road.

Chairman Taylor asked about parking at the various units and how that would be addressed. He also asked if cars were parked on either side of the street throughout the development, would a passing car be able to do so.

Mr. Gietema stated each unit would be required to have a two (2) car garage and the alley loaded homes would have a parallel parking space in front of the garage. The Villas also have a two (2) car garage with a conventional driveway in the front for parking allowing for approximately four (4) cars. He continued by stating that yes traveling vehicles would be able to pass through the development streets should vehicles be parked on both sides.

The following individuals called into speak in opposition of the application:
- Mr. Tommy Bano, 1401 Braeburn Drive, Richardson, Texas
- Mr. Robert Allen Davis, 1501 Wood Oak Drive, Richardson, Texas
- Mr. Aaron Baldwin, 1604 Pickwick Lane, Richardson, Texas
- Ms. Darlene Davidson, 1407 Braeburn Drive, Richardson, Texas

Mr. Gietema came forward to provide response to points made regarding drainage out of the flood plain, the developer was mitigating traffic in backs as opposed to adding to them. The program would cut truck traffic and not add to it. There was confidence in their builders who have looked at the environmental issues. He felt the use was good due to the adjacent properties and their uses. This would be a product of an in-fill development where people were deciding based on all the amenities provided.

With no further comments received in favor or in opposition from the public, Chairman Taylor closed the public hearing and asked the Commission if they had any additional questions for staff or would like to move for a motion.

Vice Chairman Roland asked about the slope easement and how that was determined.

Mr. Chavez responded that staff met with the applicant who had met with Geo Technical consultants. The Geo Technical consultants provided a recommendation for a slope easement. Staff reviewed the recommendation as well as current situations within the city where a greater slope easement or setback should have been applied, which was the basis for staff's recommendation projecting a 4:1. The fallback position was a 3:1 setback. With the 3:1 setback an additional 15' of setback would be more appropriate for this site. As preferred, a 3:1 projection would reduce the total developable area but would accommodate the natural future erosion of the creek bank, as opposed to constructing gabion walls.

Commissioner Springs asked staff to provide more insight to the concern of the left turn out of the development onto Plano Road. Was it dimensional versus traffic congestion? What would the impact be if nothing were done to adjust the medians? He also wanted to know if the residential area was connected to the retail lot.

Mr. Chavez confirmed that the traffic at this intersection pre-Covid more than likely operated at a level of service D. With the addition of the new homes, the left turning movement either into the site or out of the site would make that condition worse. However, when you consider if the site was a residential subdivision or non-residential subdivision the existing median opening today does not allow for a left turn out of the subject site. Whatever development goes on the subject site would more than likely increase or make the level of service D worse and the City has the authority to deny those modifications.

He also confirmed that there was a vehicular connection well as a pedestrian connection between the residential area and the retail lot tying those two properties and to allow ingress and egress (vehicular or pedestrian) with that neighborhood.

Mr. Gietema provided a response to question regarding left turns out of the development onto Plano Road stating the Lee Engineering traffic study indicated it worked the 95th percentile with the stacking provided. Five (5) spaces would be provided as well as a full transition going all the way back towards the bridge area that would be improved also. The requirements were met in terms of level of service, stacking, transition. The point of access is essential for the residents but also in terms of marketing the neighborhood off Plano Road.

With no further questions for staff, Chairman Taylor asked for a motion.

Vice Chairman Roland asked for a point of consideration. Individuals that purchase within this neighborhood do so being fully aware of the abutting properties. He would be more apt to support this if things such as fewer units with more space, possibly additional greenspace or more land between the homes and the transfer station. He also spoke about Plano Road being a level of service D already and making it worse wasn't the goal.

He recommended the main entrance be located on Lookout Drive making it the most convenient exit point for the development which would be a safer option. He reiterated that he would be more apt to support the zoning change to residential, however it would require less units or saturation and for Lookout Drive to be the primary exit point for the development for his consideration.

Chairman Taylor agreed with Vice Chairman Roland's comments regarding the density of the development.

Commissioner Springs stated he felt this should be deliberated further. He agreed that the subject area should be less dense and seemed to be laid out in a way to maximize the number of units. He recommended that the case be continued in order for the developer to consider some of the recommendations and provide modifications. He asked if the applicant could speak more to the retail or commercial corner and about the willingness to consider suggestions regarding density.

Mr. Gietema stated the commercial corner property would be staying with the current owner who were retail developers. The development was designed in collaboration with them as a single project, but it was actually a piece they are keeping. Mr. Gietema recommend that the application be continued in order to address some of the issues then reconvene to discuss.

Motion: Commissioner Springs made a motion to continue Zoning File 19-32 Owens Farm until September 1, 2020; second by Commissioner Costantino. Motion assed 7-0.

Adjourn

With no further business before the Commission, Chairman Taylor adjourned the regular business meeting at 9:29 p.m.

_____
Ron Taylor, Chairman