

**CITY OF RICHARDSON
CITY PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES – MAY 20, 2014**

The Richardson City Plan Commission met on May 20, 2014, at 7:00 p.m. at City Hall in the Council Chambers, 411 W. Arapaho Road, Richardson, Texas.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Barry Hand, Chairman
Gerald Bright, Vice Chair
Janet DePuy, Commissioner
Randy Roland, Commissioner
Bill Ferrell, Alternate
Stephen Springs, Alternate

MEMBERS ABSENT: Marilyn Frederick, Commissioner
Thomas Maxwell, Commissioner
Eron Linn, Commissioner

CITY STAFF PRESENT: Sam Chavez, Assistant Director – Dev. Svcs – Planning
Israel Roberts, Development Review Manager
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 a work session. No action was taken.

MINUTES

1. Approval of the minutes of the regular business meeting of May 6, 2014.

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

CONSENT ITEMS

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, Landscape and Building Elevation Plans – AutoNation Volkswagen (companion to Item 4):** A request for approval of a site and landscape plan with building elevations to reflect the demolition of three (3) 10,000 square foot buildings and the addition of a 9,800 square foot showroom to the existing service building. The 7.06 acre site is located at 300 N. Central Expressway, at the northeast corner of N. Central Expressway and Greer Street.
- 3. Site and Landscape Plans – Richardson Chrysler:** A request for approval of a revised site and landscape plan to reflect an expansion to the existing showroom and service center building. The 4.8 acre site is located at 1321 N. Central Expressway, at the northwest corner of N. Central Expressway and Monte Blaine Lane.

Motion: Vice Chair Bright made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as presented; second by Commissioner DePuy. Motion approved 6-0.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

4. **Replat – North Richardson Addition, Lot 1C, Block 1 (companion to Item 2):** Consider and take necessary action on a request for a replat of Lot 1B, Block 1 and Lot 1C, Block 6 of the North Richardson Addition into one (1) lot. The 7.06 acre site is located at 300 N. Central Expressway, at the northeast corner of N. Central Expressway and Greer Street.

Mr. Roberts stated the purpose of the replat was to dedicate and abandon easements to accommodate the development of a new showroom for AutoNation. He added that the replat complied with all City subdivision regulations.

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

No comments were received in favor or opposition and Chairman Hand closed the public hearing.

Motion: Vice Chair Bright made a motion to approve Item 4 as presented; second by Commissioner Roland. Motion approved 6-0.

5. **Zoning File 14-13 – Palisades:** Consider and take necessary action on a request for a change in zoning from LR-M(2) Local Retail, TO-M Technical Office, and PD Planned Development to PD Planned Development to develop a pedestrian oriented, mixed-sue development on approximately 80 acres located at the west side of Central Expressway, generally bounded by Collins Boulevard to the west, Palisades Boulevard and Galatyn Parkway West Extension to the south, and Palisades Creek Drive to the north.

Mr. Shacklett advised that the applicant was requesting to rezone the property for a pedestrian oriented, Mixed-Use development encompassing 58.5 acres from a previous zoning request noting the addition of 19 acres, which had not been part of the original request. Mr. Shacklett provided a comparison between the development rights under the existing PD versus the proposed Code (changes noted in bold text):

	EXISTING (58.5 acres)	PROPOSED (approx. 80 acres)
Residential Uses	600 multi-family units <i>(maximum 40% of total (240 units) may be located within Dallas County)</i> 80 single-family units	1,400 multi-family units <i>(maximum 20% of total (280 units) may be located within Dallas County)</i> 110 single-family units
Minimum Unit Sizes	Townhomes – min. 1,650 s.f. Single-family detached – min. 2,000 s.f. Lot Area – No minimum requirement Multi-Family Units – Efficiency – min. 525 s.f.	Townhomes – min. 1,650 s.f. Single-family detached – min. 1,600 s.f. Lot Area – min. 2,000 s.f. Multi-Family Units – Efficiency – min. 525 s.f.

	1-bedroom – min. 675 s.f. 2-bedroom – min. 1,000 s.f.	1-bedroom – min. 675 s.f. 2-bedroom – min. 1,000 s.f.
Non-Residential Uses	Retail/Service – max. 200,000 s.f. Office – 1,500,000 s.f. (this is in addition to existing 10-story and 16-story office buildings which are part of the proposed PD) <i>(The additional acreage being added to the PD includes approximately 19 acres of undeveloped land which is zoned LR-M(2) Local Retail and TO-M Technical Office and could be developed as approximately 200,000 square feet of additional office space).</i> Total Office Development Rights within 80 acres per current zoning (existing plus entitled): 2,157,000 s.f. Full-service Hotel – maximum 300 rooms	Retail/Service – max. 200,000 s.f. Office – 2,000,000 s.f. (this is in addition to existing 10-story and 16-story office buildings which are part of the proposed PD) Total Office Development Rights within approx. 80 acres per proposed zoning (existing plus entitled): 2,457,000 s.f. Full-service hotel – maximum 300 rooms
Max. Building Heights (by Tract/Sub- District)	Inner Ring Mixed Use – 20-story/270 feet Outer Ring Mixed Use – 6-story/75 feet Freeway High-Rise – 20-story/270 feet Urban Neighborhood – 2-story/30 feet	Inner Ring Mixed Use – 20-story/270 feet Outer Ring Mixed Use – 6-story/75 feet Freeway High-Rise – 20-story/270 feet Urban Neighborhood – 2-story/30 feet Freeway Mixed Use – 20-story/270 feet
Parking Regulations	Single-family lots – 2 enclosed off-street parking spaces plus 0.5 visitor parking spaces per unit Multi-family units – 1 parking space per bedroom Non-residential uses (including hotel) – 1 parking space per 300 s.f.	Single-family lots – 2 enclosed off-street parking spaces plus 0.5 visitor parking spaces per unit Multi-family units – 1 parking space per bedroom Non-residential uses – 1 parking space per 300 s.f. Hotel/Lodging – 1 space per room
Street Designations	Streets within the PD are required to be private streets. There are eight (8) distinct street types within the PD to allow for automotive and pedestrian-oriented streets to fit the needs of specific areas within the PD.	Streets within the PD are required to be private streets. There are nine (9) distinct street types within the PD to allow for automotive and pedestrian-oriented streets to fit the needs of specific areas within the PD. Additionally, a non-mandatory portion of the Ring Road is proposed.

Mr. Shacklett stated the proposed Palisades Planned Development Code (Code) was a form based code that has two main components: first, the Development Standards describe how the buildings will be placed on the property, the design of the buildings, and placement and design of individual streets, and the open space areas. The second component of the Code will be the Regulating Plan (Plan) which operates as the zoning map outlining the sub-districts and the specific guidelines within each sub-district (i.e., height of buildings, allowed uses, proximity to street, and pedestrian or vehicular oriented streets, etc.).

Mr. Shacklett explained that the proposed Code would create a fifth sub-district, the Freeway Mixed Use district, which would encompass a portion of the property being added that fronts US 75, and the western portion of the new property that would become part of the Outer Ring Mixed Use sub-district.

Mr. Shacklett noted that nine (9) street types and one (1) alley type was being proposed and dedicated a portion of his presentation explaining the number of travel lanes required, on-site street parking, and the fact that the applicant was requesting a change in the urban neighborhood from front entry garages to rear entry, alley access, garages. He added that the proposed Regulating Plan notes the location of an additional portion of the Ring Road that runs east to west along the north side of Palisades Park and would be non-mandatory. This portion of the Ring Road will allow flexibility with regard to how this portion of the Inner Ring Mixed Use sub-district may be developed.

In closing his comments on the Plan, Mr. Shacklett pointed out the open space areas, the 40 to 80-foot landscape buffers along Collins Boulevard, and the fact that the 25-foot landscape buffer along Palisades would be extended along the north side of the property to Central Expressway.

Regarding the key sections of the Code, Mr. Shacklett highlighted the four main sections that would control where buildings would be located and how they would be designed around specific streets:

- Building Form & Development Standards (Section 7) – provides building placement, build-to zone/setback, building frontage, building heights (different for each sub-district), ground floor requirements, parking/service access areas, and encroachments.
- Building Design Standards (Section 8) – establishes a coherent urban character by use of building orientation, design of parking structures and single family garages, design of automobile related building site elements, roof form, façade composition, requirements for windows and doors, and Urban Neighborhood to Outer Ring Mixed-Use screening/transition.
- Street and Streetscape Design Standards (Section 9) – illustrates the design, configuration and development contest for all streets including lane widths, number of lanes, on-street parking, sidewalks, and street trees.

- Civic/Open Space Standards (Section 11) – creates standards for open spaces (large park areas and smaller neighborhood scaled plazas connected via a network of trails and paths), the 4-acre Palisades Park with landscaped areas for active and passive recreation, a landscape buffer and 8-foot meandering pedestrian path, canopy and ornamental trees along Collins Boulevard, and a 25-foot wide landscape buffer along Palisades Creek Drive with a 12-foot multi-use trail.

Mr. Shacklett stated that although a Phasing Plan had not been part of the original Code, the City Council had requested that one be included. Under the proposed new Code, the Phasing would consist of two parts with Phase 1 covering the following items:

- Infrastructure
- Collins Boulevard buffer,
- Palisades Park,
- South Entry,
- The portion of Ring Road from South Entry to North Entry,
- The portion of Mews Drive “1”, and
- The portion of the Urban Neighborhood and Outer Ring Mixed use sub-district located in Dallas County.

Phase 2 – building permits can be applied for at any time, but Certificates of Occupancy cannot be issued for any multi-family units until all items in Phase 1 are completed.

In closing his presentation, Mr. Shacklett noted that 149 pieces of correspondence had been received with a position statement from the local homeowners association in opposition and 1 piece of correspondence in favor.

Mr. Carter discussed the revised Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) and the effect an additional 800 multi-family units and 300,000 square feet of office would have on the traffic. He said that the analysis included the existing traffic conditions with no site development; traffic in the years 2020 and 2035 – both with and without site development; and the developments on both sides of US 75 north of Renner Road and west of Wyndham Lane.

Mr. Carter stated that the proposed changes to the development would result in higher traffic projections than the existing entitlements, but there would be a significant number of access and circulation drives, plus some mitigation would be necessary. He added that the level of service would be diminished, but most of that would be within the site trying to exit onto the US 75 frontage road. However, the arterial and collector roadways as well as the freeway itself would not be impacted by the development.

Mr. Carter reviewed some of the proposed mitigation measures including acceleration and deceleration lanes, turning bays, and median openings.

Chairman Hand asked if the TIA actually states the development would not have an effect on the traffic. He also wanted to know if the analysis took into consideration the possibility that some residents would be walking to work.

Mr. Carter replied the TIA stated there would not be a significant effect on the traffic and the level of service at the intersections evaluated was considered to be at an acceptable level of “D” or better. He added that the intersection showing future failure in the year 2035 was Renner Road and that would be a result of traffic from the State Farm development, but the City already had mitigation measures planned for that intersection.

Regarding residents walking to work, Mr. Carter said the report did include internal trip capture rates, which resulted in some reduction of vehicular trips (residential to business trips as well as to restaurants and retail). He added there was also a small reduction in trips due to the close proximity of the Galatyn shuttle that would take people to and from the DART Light Rail station on the east side of US 75.

Commissioner DePuy asked for the location of the county line and the distribution of single and multi-family homes within each area.

Mr. Shacklett replied that as proposed, 110 single-family units would be allowed in the Urban Neighborhood, which is split half and half between the two counties. However, there is no requirement as to how many single-family homes can be developed on one side versus the other.

Regarding the multi-family units, Mr. Shacklett stated the current zoning allowed 600 multi-family units and up to 40 percent of those units in Dallas County (from zero to 240 units), but with the proposed changes of an additional 800 units the percentage had been reduced to 20 percent in Dallas County (from zero to 280 units). He added that any multi-family units in Dallas County would have to be constructed within the Freeway High Rise zone or the southern portion of the Inner Ring Mixed-Use area.

Chairman Hand asked how much of the development was in Dallas County.

Mr. Shacklett replied that 26-27 percent was in Dallas County.

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

Mr. Larry Good, Chairman of Good Fulton and Farrell Planning (GFF), 2808 Fairmount Street, Dallas, Texas, stated that the benefits of adding the approximately 20 acres to the development was far greater than the footprint the 20 acres held including allowing a common vision over the entire Palisades property, eliminating any inconsistencies in urban form, and increase vehicular and pedestrian movement. He added that in the past several months there has been a realization of how many corporate users are interested in locating in the development and the proposed changes would allow flexibility in the development.

Mr. Good indicated that since the original Code was approved in 2013, the owner has identified some of the development partners they would use with K Hovnanian Homes for the single-family development, Wood Partners for the multi-family units, and TGB Landscape Architects for Palisades Park and the buffer along Collins Boulevard. In addition, the owner has directed GFF to prepare marketing packages for three corporate users.

Mr. Good explained that the addition of the new land would offer the ability to add another ingress/egress from Palisades Creek Drive to US 75 and indicated the platting and permitting for the single-family neighborhood was underway and should be completed by the middle of the summer. He stated that the first design session for Palisades Park, the Collins landscape buffer and the Ring Road would take place in June and should be ready for review with the City in August, after which the design work for the multi-family units would begin.

Mr. Good said their request for three-story multi-family was a result of discussions with the multi-family partners to offer a more diverse product type and cited the CityLine project as a product that was too similar to the proposed development.

Mr. Good offered examples of developments in other cities that would be similar to the proposed development including the relationship of the multi-family units to the street, landscape, private patios, and rear entry garages. In comparing the proposed development, he stated it was roughly the same size in land area as Addison Circle, half the size of Legacy Town Center and much smaller than Las Colinas. In regard to multi-family, the proposed development was roughly half the size of Addison Circle and Legacy Town Center and two-fifths the size of Las Colinas.

Mr. Good stated that although they were requesting an increase in multi-family, they were not requesting an increase to the hotel or retail space because of discussions with professionals in the commercial real estate industry who pointed out that the development was not an anchor tenant location, but a location that will serve the surrounding community.

Another change to the proposed development would occur in the single-family neighborhood where some of the homes would face Collins Boulevard and have a slip road and some homes would face the interior Ring Road, but all the homes would have rear entry garages.

Mr. Good pointed out that one of the important things about a Regulating Plan was that within the permissions of the Plan an individual zone could have a street, office building or multi-family and two restaurants, or it could have a corporate user with two towers depending on the opportunities that present themselves.

Commissioner DePuy asked where the alleys and street would be located on the illustrative plan.

Mr. Good replied the streets were the ones lined with trees and those without trees would be the alleys.

Commissioner Ferrell asked if there were a maximum number of three-story multi-family buildings under the proposed plan.

Mr. Good said the tract of land along Palisades Creek Drive would be the only area where three-story, multi-family buildings would be allowed and there would be approximately 200 units with at least half having individual garages.

Commissioner Roland said the project seemed to be more “complete” with the additional land and asked the reason for the requested additional multi-family units.

Mr. Good replied that their intention was to create a vibrant village that would attract sophisticated corporate users where the option of living “on campus” was available to their employees. He added that the best economic situation would be to have four multi-family units with 350 units in each and that is where the requested 1,400 total units came from.

Commissioner Roland asked staff how much office square footage and multi-family units there would be between the proposed development and CityLine.

Mr. Shacklett replied that CityLine had 1.5 million square feet of office space, 2,000 multi-family units, and one hotel with 250 beds.

Chairman Hand added that Addison Circle had approximately 75,000 square feet of retail, which was less than the proposed retail space at the Palisades, but there are 2,800 multi-family units in that development.

Vice Chair Bright noted that the City Council had previously approved 600 multi-family units for 57 acres and wanted to know why the applicant was requesting 800 more units with the addition of only 19 acres of land.

Mr. Good replied their original request in 2013 was for 1,000 multi-family units, which was the best case scenario, but they compromised in order to help get the deal done so they were looking at it now as only an increase of 400 units. He added that the impact of the additional land was greater than the percentage of increase to the overall development in terms of the corporate users who could be attracted, the unity, and what could be accomplished.

No other comments were made in favor.

The following individuals made comments in opposition based on concerns the request for an increase in multi-family units was disproportionate to the original request based on the amount of additional land; adverse impacts to the school districts and traffic, specifically traffic in the surrounding neighborhoods; too much multi-family density in the northern portion of the City; misnomer as a traffic oriented development; impact on property values; and the choice of development partners and previous sub-standard apartments that were built.

- Ms. Susan Kassam, 2431 Fairway Drive, Richardson, Texas, speaking on behalf of the Canyon Creek Homeowners Association (CCHOA)
- Mr. John Geesland, 1133 Bull Run, Richardson, Texas
- Mr. Jim Watson, 203 Bridge Canyon Ct., Richardson, Texas
- Mr. Mike Kilgard, 205 Crooked Creek, Richardson, Texas
- Mr. Brian Bolton, 200 High Canyon Ct., Richardson, Texas
- Ms. Patricia Simmons 2 Round Rock Cir., Richardson, Texas
- Mr. Tom Benson, 205 High Canyon Ct., Richardson, Texas
- Ms. Sandhya Seshadri, 2702 W. Prairie Creek Dr., Richardson, Texas
- Ms. Barbara Gilbert, 2309 W. Prairie Creek Dr., Richardson, Texas
- Mr. Don Dickerson, 319 Ridge Crest, Richardson, Texas
- Mr. Emilio Guarnero, 2208 Eastwood Dr., Richardson, Texas

In addition to those who spoke, the Commission received 32 appearance cards in opposition to the proposed increase in multi-family units.

Chairman Hand asked if the applicants had any comments in rebuttal and they declined to make any additional statements. He also asked if there were any comments from the Commission or staff.

Mr. Shacklett stated there had been questions during the public hearing on the proposed phasing plan and noted that prior to occupancy of any multi-family buildings, the infrastructure (utilities, roads) would need to be completed. He added that multiple phases could be permitted at one time, but Certificates of Occupancy would not be issued.

Chairman Hand asked about the zoning on the additional 20 acres.

Mr. Shacklett replied the current zoning was split between technical office and local retail, which could accommodate approximately 200,000 square feet of office development based on setbacks and height requirements.

Commissioner DePuy asked for the unit sizes for the multi-family development and whether there would be three bedroom units available.

Mr. Shacklett replied the size of the units had not changed from the original request with a minimum dwelling unit of 525 square feet for an efficiency apartment, 675 square feet for a one bedroom, and 1,000 square feet for a two bedroom.

Regarding three bedroom units, Mr. Shacklett said there was no minimum dwelling size listed in the Code.

Mr. Good added there was nothing in the code prohibiting a three bedroom unit, they just did not set a minimum size for a three bedroom but that could be added.

Commissioner DePuy suggested it would not be a good idea to have a three bedroom unit and felt the development should be targeted towards young professionals or empty nesters instead of families.

Commissioner Ferrell asked where the three story, multi-family buildings could be built. He also wanted to know if there was a minimum amount of retail that was mandated in the current zoning.

Mr. Shacklett replied those buildings could be built in the Outer Ring Mixed-Use, north of pedestrian passageway between the Ring Road and Palisades Creek Drive up to the north entry.

Regarding the amount of retail, Mr. Shacklett said that in the current zoning there is a maximum amount allowed but not a minimum, but there are requirements for the areas along the Park as it relates to ground floor activated uses (i.e., commercial type uses).

Commissioner Ferrell asked to confirm if there were any conditions in the current zoning that would allow ground floor residential.

Mr. Shacklett replied that in the ground floor activated use area retail ready standards applied to the ground floors.

Commissioner Roland pointed out that under the current zoning 600 apartments are allowed within the 57 acres, which equals approximately 10 apartments per acre, but with the proposed additional units the number would rise to 17.5 apartments per acre. He also asked what roads would exit onto Collins Boulevard.

Mr. Carter replied that Palisades Creek Drive and Palisades Boulevard both currently have access to Collins Boulevard, and in the current and proposed Plan, the Urban Neighborhood and Outer Ring Mixed-Use would also exit onto Collins. He added that traffic could flow from the Ring Road north to Palisades Creek Drive then west to Collins, as well as go south to Palisades Boulevard and west to Collins.

Commissioner Roland asked if there will be a parallel road next to the Galatyn Overpass.

Mr. Carter replied there is an existing roadway at that location and portions of Palisades Boulevard would be abandoned under the current proposal, but there would still could driveways through to the frontage road and maybe one into a parking garage.

Commissioner Ferrell said his understanding was that under the current approved Code, the developer would have to construct the roads, the parks, and the single-family homes, but wanted to confirm the phasing under the proposed Plan.

Mr. Shacklett replied that was correct and noted it would be in the portion of the development between Collins Boulevard and Ring Road in Dallas County. However, in the

proposed Plan, roadway and utilities throughout Phase 1 were required but not the single-family homes.

Chairman Hand asked if the applicant had discussed the proposed changes with anyone from the surrounding neighborhoods.

Mr. Mark Jordan, 14801 Quorum Drive, Dallas, Texas, stated he had met with 3 or 4 of the board members from the CCHOA as well as many individuals who have called or stopped by the office.

Chairman Hand concurred with Mr. Roland's statement that the development looked more "complete" and said he was excited about the possibilities the development could offer. However, he was also haunted by the diminishing open space in the City and stressed how important it was for the Commission and City to get this project "right".

Mr. Hand said he could agree with the three story product because it would provide diversity in the housing stock, but felt that the proposed Plan was not diverse enough because he felt the location was ripe for a premium product, one that the corporate users would be drawn to. He added that he was disappointed to see so much wood frame housing and felt it was a lost opportunity because the location would be an excellent place for an iconic, luxury, high-rise living product that corporate users would want.

Chairman Hand concluded his comments by stating that the two issues in the project that were the deal killer for him were the lost opportunity for high end housing and finding a way to get back to an equitable distribution of housing.

Commissioner Springs said he thought the problem with the project boiled down to traffic versus density and stated that you cannot have one without the other. He added that if there was less density, which would reduce the traffic, then the project had the possibility of not being successful. If the density was increased, then the traffic will increase so the problem is creating the right balance.

Mr. Springs concurred with Mr. Hand's statement regarding an over-abundance of wood frame, low rise density as opposed to high rise density. He added that high rise density would also allow flexibility in the uses if there is a change in the market.

Mr. Good stated they did not have any intent to prohibit high rise development and the illustrative plan did not feature it because it would be a harder element to deliver. However, the applicant was not opposed to transitioning some of the multi-family to high rise.

Chairman Hand pointed out that in a previous design from an architectural company on another project where there had been a proposal to set a height minimum, which could be used to dictate the construction type into a more permanent type construction. He also felt it was fair to have a discussion about the project being a "place maker" taking into

consideration the location across from the Eisemann Center, but was disappointed it was not part of the Code.

Mr. Hand suggested that the addition of a luxury, high-rise element to the development could possibly change the dynamic of the opposition from the neighborhoods.

Commissioner Springs acknowledged that a fear of the unknown, of who would be moving into the area, might be driving the opposition, but quoted from a *Dallas Morning News* article that people are coming from all over to relocate to north Texas. He also suggested that if the product was built at a higher level it would insure the longevity of product and draw in the corporate users wanted in the City.

Commissioner DePuy complimented the developer on a more cohesive plan, but agreed that a high-rise luxury element would work well in the development. She also thought the additional single-family homes was a good idea and pointed out that high-rise luxury developments adjacent to affluent areas worked well as long as the development was a quality product.

Ms. DePuy pointed out that the residents who bought their homes on the edge of the Canyon Creek area knew the Palisades would eventually develop, which would increase the traffic on Collins Boulevard. She also thought the Commission could push a little harder to get a product with a higher quality, multi-family use.

Vice Chair Bright said he thought the requested 800 additional multi-family units was out of proportion and asked how a luxury, high-rise product in-lieu-of the wood frame construction would affect the applicant's request.

Mr. Good replied that in high-rise luxury housing the number of units delivered would only be between 100 to 140 units and they could only commit to converting 10 percent of the multi-family to high rise. He added that they understood the Commission's desire was to have a certain percentage of high-rise units and a maximum number of units to be located in Collin County and offered to re-work the Plan based on those desires.

Chairman Hand pointed out that the Commission had recently toured Uptown (Dallas) and understood that some of the Commission's suggestions might not be viable in the City at the present time, but if they are in the near future and this project was not approved, it could be a lost opportunity for the City.

Mr. Good said he understood the essence of the feedback and will work with staff and leaders of the CCHOA to see if a better product can be presented.

Commissioner Ferrell thought there was too much housing, and of the housing proposed it should be higher and not wider. In addition, he said he would like to see more phasing and save part of the multi-family units until a certain amount of office and/or retail was completed.

Commissioner Roland acknowledged that the Commission heard and understood comments from both sides of the question, but thought the requested 1,400 multi-family, low rise units were excessive. He also said he would like to see some numbers on what percentage of the proposed units would be Type 1 and the absolute maximum number of multi-family units needed to make a viable project.

Mr. Roland pointed out the amount of growth north Texas is experiencing and many of those individuals are coming from the north side of the metroplex and traveling into Dallas and Fort Worth and the proposed development might provide a solution.

Chairman Hand stated the Commission was entrusted with doing what was best for the City as a whole and felt this project was an opportunity to compose a project that will bring value to the City.

Vice Chair Bright asked staff if the Commission wanted to continue the item should it be continued indefinitely or to a specific date.

Mr. Shacklett replied that the applicant was in agreement with continuing the item to the June 3rd meeting.

Motion: Vice Chair Bright made a motion to continue the public hearing to the June 3, 2014 meeting; second by Commissioner Roland. Motion approved 6-0.

ADJOURN

With no further business before the Commission, Chairman Hand adjourned the regular business meeting at 9:33 p.m.

Barry Hand, Chairman
City Plan Commission