

**CITY OF RICHARDSON  
CITY PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES – JUNE 18, 2024**

The Richardson City Plan Commission met on June 18, 2024, at 7:00 p.m. in the Multipurpose Room #CH157 of the Richardson City Hall, 2360 Campbell Creek Boulevard, Suite 525, Richardson, TX.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Kenneth Southard, Vice Chairman  
Gary Beach, Commissioner  
Sebrena Bohnsack, Commissioner  
Joe Costantino, Commissioner  
Michael Keller, Commissioner  
Rebecca Poynter, Commissioner  
Byron Purdy, Commissioner  
Nate Roberts, Commissioner

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Bryan Marsh, Chairman

**CITY STAFF PRESENT:** Sam Chavez, Director of Development Services  
Derica Peters, Senior Planner  
Anna Jo Castaneda, 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 June 4, 2024.**

**Motion:** Commissioner Costantino made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Commissioner Beach seconded the Motion. Motion passed 7-0.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**2. ZF 24-11 Cityline East PD Amendment** - A request to amend the development regulations of the 62.5-acre CityLine-East Planned Development PD to increase the number of residential units, and to modify the Regulating Plan to increase the acreage of Mandatory and Mandatory/Non-Mandatory Open Space. *Owner: Walter Mountford, KDC. Staff: Sam Chavez.*

Mr. Chavez began by stating that ZF 24-11 is a request for an amendment to the CityLine East Planned Development District, located between CityLine Drive and President George Bush Freeway and east of Plano Road. The subject site encompasses 62.5 acres in area.

Mr. Chavez continued stating that the request is to amend the PD to increase the number of residential units and to amend the regulating plan to increase the acreage of the mandatory civic/open space and the mandatory/non mandatory civic/open space area categories.

The first is a text amendment to increase the number of residential units from 1,925 units to 3,100 units which is an increase of 1,175 additional units with a minimum density of sixty (60) units per acre instead of the approved thirty (30) units per acre requirement.

The next amendment is to the Regulating Plan to increase the acreage of the 100% Mandatory Civic/Open Area requirements from 6.44 acres to 6.60 acres, and the last amendment relates to the 60% mandatory/40% non-mandatory requirement for civic open space area for an increase from 3.44 acres to 4.64 acres.

Mr. Chavez compared the approved conditions and the proposed increase in entitled units and open space acreage. He estimated the current population in this area by applying a standard 90% occupancy rate to be approximately 3,207 individuals. He also called attention to examples of successful mixed-use developments where residential density appears to support the commercial elements at Legacy West in, Cypress Waters, and Downtown Plano.

Mr. Chavez showed the current regulating plan followed by the proposed plan that shows how the civic open space will be expanded and which would connect as a linear pedestrian trail corridor. The only other modification is the Non-Mandatory Street which has been moved slightly north.

Mr. Chavez provided a summary of the request and concluded his presentation.

Commissioner Roberts asked if there was a requirement of percentage of retail vs residential.

Mr. Chavez replied no and that there is not a phasing element to this project.

Commissioner Roberts followed up to ask if the project had this requirement in the past.

Mr. Chavez answered no, this was a form based code which provides flexibility so that the market could guide the development that is necessary to support the area.

Commissioner Purdy asked if there is a recommended maximum density recommendation.

Mr. Chavez replied no, instead there is a minimum density applied to densify the area to support the mixed-use environment.

Commissioner Beach asked if staff had received any correspondence on this request.

Mr. Chavez replied yes, it was included in the meeting packet.

Commissioner Costantino asked if the reason the developer is not tied to the retail is because they desire to have residents before the retail is constructed.

Mr. Chavez advised they try not to place a limitation that would hinder the development from meeting market demands.

Commissioner Roberts asked if there were any other developments in this area that are sixty (60) units per acre.

Mr. Chavez stated that all areas of the CityLine developments are developed at a minimum of sixty (60) units per acre.

Commissioner Beach asked how many stories would be constructed.

Mr. Chavez stated he believed the buildings could be five (5) stories, but the Regulating Plan allows up 350 feet in the TOD Core and 225 feet in the TOD Mixed Use districts.

Commissioner Poynter asked if there was a comparison of this development with the retail at the example locations.

Mr. Chavez replied no.

Commissioner Poynter asked if CityLine would have comparable market users as the example locations.

Mr. Chavez stated that CityLine is more of a TOD area, and the nearest comparable site would be downtown Plano.

Commissioner Poynter asked if Whole Foods Market would be equivalent to the type of retail at the example locations.

Mr. Chavez answered yes, as well as the restaurants on the ground floor along State Street.

Commissioner Poynter asked if Cityline has shopping or entertainment options.

Mr. Chavez said yes.

Commissioner Poynter acknowledged that the advantage in this location is the access to transit.

Commissioner Roberts asked if there had been any discussion as to a timeline.

Mr. Chavez stated no.

Commissioner Keller asked if there is a limitation on the total number of allowed units separate from the density requirement.

Mr. Chavez said that the maximum number of units is 1,925, but they also must meet the minimum density of thirty (30) units to the acre, so it may take only the next two developments to meet the maximum units currently allowed.

Vice Chairman Southard asked if there were any other questions for staff, seeing none the public hearing was opened and the applicant was asked to come forward.

Mr. Walter Mountford, KDC, 5132 Horseshoe Trail, Dallas stated he has been with the project since it started in 2012. He provided background on the project and explained they had a lot of office space planned but after the shift from work to work from home the potential futures of office buildings became limited, and they have an excess of office zoning. They are seeking an

opportunity to support the development by providing more residential units at CityLine East to add more people in the area to support the retail elements. He explained that people drive to the Whole Food Market, but all the shops along State Street are individual mom and pop restaurants and retail. There is a significant portion of the State Street retail lease space that has never been occupied. He described the advantages of this location. They still have office space planned in this development. He also explained they plan to have units focused inward and toward the green areas to provide an urban pedestrian-oriented experience.

Vice Chairman Southard asked about their commitment to build the additional office space they are still entitled to.

Mr. Mountford stated they intend to build more offices when there is a market demand.

Vice Chairman Southard clarified his question to ask how long the developer could wait.

Mr. Mountford explained they are holding out hope for the office development in the future, and pointed out in the northern area of the property which is still reserved for office developed.

Commissioner Roberts asked if they plan to build the type of retail or entertainment that attracts people from the wider area.

Mr. Mountford answered no. He described the history of a potential theater development which failed due to complications in property ownership, parking, and getting financing.

Commissioner Poynter asked if CityLine residents work locally, ride transit, or commute.

Mr. Mountford guessed that most work at home and occasionally go to the office; ridership data from DART coincides with this.

Commissioner Poynter asked if they were appealing to commuters or people who work from home.

Mr. Mountford stated it could be either.

Commissioner Purdy inquired if the project would fail if the demand for corporate office space further declined.

Mr. Mountford replied no, however situations like COVID leave office spaces unoccupied or sub-leased, which thwarts new development.

Commissioner Beach asked about the size of the units.

Mr. Mountford stated that 70% of the units are one-bedrooms and efficiencies, 25% are two-bedrooms and a small portion are three-bedrooms.

Commissioner Poynter asked what was the most vibrant component that makes the area attractive.

Mr. Mountford replied that it will feel urban, as well as have access to DART, open space, and the nature trail.

Vice Chairman Southard asked if there were any other questions for the applicant, seeing none, he asked if there was anyone present who wishes to speak in favor or in opposition to the request.

Mr. Paul Voelker, 3308 Calloway Court, resident, and former mayor, stated he is a fan of Cityline and is a big believer of form-based zoning and transit-oriented development. He said this is the poster child for development around DART. He described a TOD as a four (4) legged stool, with one supporting element being employment, as well as retail and residential uses. He explained there is a nice mix here, but some elements are missing, so the applicant should consider options like live-work space, multi-story condominium, and high-rise apartments constructed of concrete and rebar, instead of the typical stick-built wrap-style apartments which would not age as well. He said the form-based zoning allows flexibility to meet market conditions, and it could even allow the repurposing of empty office buildings into a high-rise apartment. He then emphasized that the final supporting element is entertainment, which the applicant should focus on providing more activity which is needed to support the retail.

Seeing no more questions, Commissioner Purdy made a motion to close the public hearing. Commissioner Beach seconded the motion and motion passed 7-0.

Commissioner Costantino commented that there are pros and cons to making this approval, and there may be limitations on future developments by approving this zoning case now.

Commissioner Beach commented he did not think this request was ideal, but it allows the opportunity to keep the development viable into the future, which is good because the region expects continued population growth.

Commissioner Bohnsack suggested the applicant consider more entertainment or retail to attract more people to this development, and to consider more options than just apartments, like condos.

Mr. Chavez informed the Commission that the Code allows multiple types of commercial uses and does not prohibit the ones that had been discussed; however, a denser population is needed to support those uses.

Commissioner Costantino suggested if this request isn't approved, the applicant could still build units, but it may not be well-financed or well-constructed, based on the factors explained by the applicant.

Commissioner Keller commented that there are alternatives and trade-offs, as they may decide to allow modifications that allow a more economically viable product today, but they should consider that may come at a cost if that means losing opportunities in the future.

**Motion:** Commissioner Beach motioned to recommend approval of the request as presented. Commissioner Costantino seconded. Motion failed 3-4 (Southard, Keller, Purdy, Bohnsack opposed).

Vice Chairman Southard stated the motion failed and asked if the Commission had any further action they could take.

Mr. Chavez stated the Commission could seek a different motion, or you could accept that the motion to recommend approval failed and therefore, the case was denied.

Vice Chairman Southard asked if they could ask the applicant if he would like a continuance.

Mr. Chavez stated yes, that was an option.

Vice Chairman Southard stated there was no mention of without prejudice in the motion and asked if it was understood that it was with prejudice if it was not stated.

Mr. Chavez stated yes, it would be with prejudice if not stated.

Vice Chairman Southard asked for different motion or an amendment.

**Motion:** Commissioner Beach made a motion to recommend approval of the request without prejudice if it fails. Commissioner Bohnsack seconded. Motion failed 3-4 (Southard, Keller, Purdy, Bohnsack opposed).

### **ADJOURN**

With no further business before the Commission, Vice Chairman Southard adjourned the regular business meeting at 8:08 p.m.

---

Ken Southard, Vice Chairman