



CITY OF DALLAS

RECEIVED

2008 MAR -7 AM 9:07

**Joint Meeting with the City Plan Commission Trinity River Corridor Ad Hoc
Committee and the Urban Design Advisory Committee***
Tuesday, March 11, 2008
City Hall, Room 6ES
5:30 p.m.

AGENDA

- (I) Approval of Minutes**
- (II) Mixmaster Riverfront Study Area Recommendation (Z067-148)**
David Whitley, Chief Planner
Trinity River Corridor Planning & Development
- (III) Other Matters**
- (IV) Adjourn**

* A quorum of the City Plan Commission might be present

Memorandum



CITY OF DALLAS

DATE March 6, 2008

TO CPC Trinity River Corridor Ad Hoc Committee and Urban Design Advisory Committee Members

SUBJECT **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Attached for your review is the Meeting Record from the City Plan Commission Trinity River Corridor Ad Hoc Committee and Urban Design Advisory Committee meeting held on February 26, 2008.

Please let me know if you have any questions or need additional information.

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Paul Lehner".

Paul Lehner, Director of Planning & Development
Trinity River Corridor Project

Attachment

CPC Trinity River Corridor Ad Hoc Committee Meeting

Meeting Record

Meetings are recorded. Agenda materials and audiotapes may be reviewed/copied by contacting Trinity River Corridor Project Office at 214-671-9500.

Meeting Date: 02/26/2008

Meeting Start time: 5:42 p.m.

Committee Members Present:

Neil Emmons
Robert Ekblad
Tom Lueder
James Prothro
Robert Weiss

Staff Present:

Paul Lehner
John Rogers
JoAnn Wilkerson
Santiago Abasolo
Rick Roth

John Lozano
Virginia McAlester
Lauren Odell
Judy Pollock
Linda Tycher

CPC Members Present:

Sally Wolfish

Committee Members Absent:

Erma Jones-Dodd
Michael Davis
Ann Bagley

Guests:

Brian Caine, CHPD Property
Ignacio Bunster, WRT Design
Jonathan Vinson, Jackson Walker

AGENDA:

1. Approval of Minutes

Action Taken/Committee Recommendation(s):

It was moved to approve the minutes of the February 12, 2008 meeting, subject to corrections.

Motion made by: Weiss

Item passed unanimously: X

Item failed unanimously: _____

Motion seconded by: Odell

Item passed on a divided vote: _____

Item failed on a divided vote: _____

2. Mixmaster Riverfront Study Area Recommendation

Presenter: Ignacio Bunster, WRT Design

Information Only: X

Speakers:

Brian Caine, CHPD Property

Jonathan Vinson, Jackson Walker

Lauren Oznick, Jiffy Properties

3. Cedars West Study Area Recommendation

Presenter: Santiago Abasolo, Senior Planner

Information Only: X

This item was not briefed.

4. Other Matters

5. Adjourn

Meeting Adjourned: 7:00 p.m.

Neil Emmons, Chair

Memorandum



CITY OF DALLAS

DATE March 6, 2008

TO CPC Trinity River Corridor Ad Hoc Committee and Urban Design Advisory Committee Members

SUBJECT **Mixmaster Riverfront Study Area Recommendation**

On February 26, 2008, the committee was briefed regarding conceptual development plans from property located at the northwest corner of Industrial Boulevard and Reunion Boulevard, adjacent to the proposed Reunion Overlook. At that meeting a number of issues were raised for further discussion. Staff has reviewed each of the concerns discussed and has outlined options to approach each issue for continued discussion. Key issues to keep in mind as these items are discussed include:

- Development of this site will have to function on two levels: Street level and levee height. This is also true of any development at or near primary access points into the Trinity park. It is important not to focus solely on the connection to the park to the detriment of the connection to the surrounding area, and vice versa.
- Development of this site needs to serve both as an attraction to the park, and a catalyst to redevelop the area.
- Downtown Form District regulations need to function for large and small-scale development in the Mixmaster area, as well as other areas where downtown development is desired near the river. Regulations must also recognize unique development opportunities and allow for large scale, catalyst project that involve multiple properties.

SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENT CONCERNS RAISED:

Issue: Street level uses

Current recommendation: Thirty percent of the street-level uses must be active, pedestrian oriented uses along Industrial Boulevard. Seventy-five percent of the street-level uses must be active, pedestrian oriented uses along Reunion Boulevard and Commerce Street. Pedestrian oriented uses include: retail and personal service, residential, office, and lodging uses to a minimum depth of 40 feet.

Rationale: Maintain a hierarchy of pedestrian oriented streets, with pedestrian oriented uses concentrated on the streets approaching the river. The current

recommendation tracked with street hierarchy in the JPI PD approved at Continental Street and Industrial Boulevard.

Concern raised/requested change: Require pedestrian-oriented use requirement to 25 percent for Commerce Street and 50 percent on Industrial Boulevard.

Staff response: Create three levels of pedestrian-oriented use requirements to build greater flexibility into the regulations since we are dealing with a number of unknowns in redeveloping areas. Requirements should allow for a clearly defined retail street, and other ancillary or active streets with activity concentrated at the corners perhaps. Reunion at 75%, Industrial at 50% [preferably located at intersections or pedestrian crosswalks], and Commerce at 25% [preferably located at intersections or pedestrian crosswalks].

Issue: Maximum Block Perimeter

Current recommendation: Maximum block perimeter of 1,600 feet

Rationale: Maintain a walkable environment through a defined street grid

Concern raised/requested change: Eliminate maximum block perimeter requirements to accommodate development of their site as a series of buildings connected by a plaza rather than part of a street network.

Staff response: Amend the block perimeter requirements to grant credit for pedestrian access ways or plazas, and create criteria for their amenities and connections to the street network. Credit for plazas should be limited to those that provide access from the street network to the levees and park amenities, to enhance connectivity between the park and adjacent neighborhoods. This could also allow for flexibility where street construction might be inappropriate or impractical, maintain a pedestrian-friendly environment, and provide for improved access from development into the park.

Issue: Towers and views

Current recommendation: Sets minimum and maximum heights ranging from 36 feet to 75 feet minimum, to 375 maximum. Any portion of a building above 75 feet cannot exceed 12,500 square feet and coverage may not exceed 50 percent of the block area.

Rationale: Maintains view permeability, and prevents a wall of buildings along the levee.

Concern raised/requested change: Allowing 25,000 sf floor plates without orientation restrictions would be more structurally efficient.

Staff response: Height is not as large of an issue as floor plate and orientation requirements. Options:

- 1) No change to recommendation
- 2) Maintain recommendation as the standard rule; however, define a Special Exception process to provide a finer-grain height map amendment that would be more restrictive on portions of a development site and less restrictive on a small portion of the development site, and allow for flexibility in floor plate, orientation and height requirements. Criteria would need to be clearly defined and view studies submitted in order to ensure that view permeability would not be compromised or slowly eroded through a series of revisions.

Potential range for exception:

	Height Coverage	Tower Coverage (Maximum)	Tower Orientation	Floor Plate
Existing	Maximum heights defined on height map	50% of block over 75'	1:3 above 75'	12,500 square feet maximum above 75'
Maximum allowed through the exception process	Maximum heights would have to be reduced to 75' on the remainder of the site	No more than 25% of block area	1:1 above 75'	25,000 square feet maximum above 75'

- 3) Clarify the subarea amendment process outlined in Part 1 of the document that allows for future changes to the PD, and allow for regulations to be tailored to site or area.
- 4) Combination of options 2 and 3. Staff recommends this alternative, possibly to include a 5-acre minimum.

Issue: Residential density

Current recommendation: Minimum 60 dwelling units per acre based upon the following calculation:

$$\frac{\text{residential floor area}}{\text{total project floor area}} \times 60 \text{ units per acre} \times \text{acres} = \text{required dwelling units}$$

Rationale: Defines a minimum density to help build a critical mass of residential as a component of the development and creates some flexibility for mixed-use development.

Concern raised/requested change: Eliminate or simplify

Staff response: Provide a clearer description for the density requirement.

Issue: Pedestrian skybridges

Current recommendation: Pedestrian skybridges are prohibited

Rationale: Pedestrian skybridges can be detrimental to activity at street level by reducing foot traffic.

Concern raised/requested change: Allow pedestrian skybridges to connect parts of their development, as well as connections to the levee.

Staff response: Clarify definition of what constitutes a skybridge to allow for bridging the gap between private property to the levee and park system. Appropriate performance standards for the review of skybridges as outlined in 51A should be incorporated into the PD requirements.

Issue: Flexibility to accommodate future redevelopment

Current recommendation: Allows for CPC approved site plans that deviate from regulating plans only under circumstances resulting from changes in right-of-way or street alignments.

Rationale: Restricts ability to circumvent regulations in the future.

Concern raised/requested change: More flexibility needs to be built into the regulations to allow for future amendments.

Staff response: Amendment process is outlined in Part 1 of the document. There are provisions for the amendments of a regulating plan, height map, or form district regulations. The potential addition would provide a streamlined process for height map amendments and clarification of the ability to tailor rules through the amendment process and would also allow for greater flexibility to accommodate unique development opportunities, while still allowing for public review and input.

POTENTIAL ADDITIONAL ISSUE:

Issue: Renovation of State Jail facility

Current recommendation: Building standards are triggered by substantial remodels that are defined as any reconstruction, alteration, or renovation of a building that exceeds 50 percent of the value of the original building or an increase in floor area of greater than 50 percent.

Rationale: Would ensure the incremental implementation of building and development standards as properties are improved or redeveloped.

Potential issue: Could impede the redevelopment of large buildings that would be difficult to bring into compliance with the proposed building standards (i.e. the State Jail facility).

Staff response: Landscape and streetscape standards should still be triggered to improve the public realm; however, alternatives should be discussed regarding dealing with structural nonconformities:

- Defer to 51A rules, which allow for an existing structure to be renovated and enlarged, provided the work does not cause the structure to become more nonconforming; or
- Trigger the applicability of building standards based upon increase in floor area along, allowing for reinvestment to improve existing structures, but requiring substantially enlarged structures to comply with building standards.

Staff has also attached additional information from the property owner regarding these issues. Please let me know if you have any questions.



Paul Lehner, Director of Planning & Development
Trinity River Corridor Project

Attachment

Brian Caine
P.O. Box 594
Solana Beach, CA 92075
Tel: (858) 350-1365 Fax: (858) 720-9090

March 5, 2008

Mr. Paul Lehner
Mr. David Whitley
Trinity River Project
City of Dallas
1500 Marilla, 6BS
Dallas, TX 75201

Re: Zoning Ad Hoc Committee Meeting

Dear Messrs. Lehner and Whitley:

We appreciated the opportunity to appear in front of the Dallas zoning Ad Hoc Committee to discuss our requested zoning modifications. We were greatly encouraged by the tone of the conversation and impressed by the depth and concern of the committee members.

I walked away from the meeting feeling a need to further address the following issues.

(a) Industrial Blvd. There was a significant concern regarding the issue of retail at the podium level versus the Industrial Blvd. street level. I believe I did a poor job of explaining that it is not one or the other, but rather both are extremely important and we intend to address both in our development. The presence and vitality of urban street life along the Industrial Blvd. corridor is important and is and has always been an intended major element in our development.

(b) Trinity River Park and Overlook. The presence of retail at the podium level is reflective of our desire to take advantage of the park setting as well as the very unique circumstances we have at this specific property. Our property is contiguous to the intended Reunion Overlook which is potentially a huge opportunity for the citizens of Dallas. As our project progresses, it is our hope to work closely with the City of Dallas to possibly extend and broaden the Overlook and create an exceptional amenity and entry into the park. Our property is also of a very large size which allows us an opportunity to interact with the Overlook and create a project that would not be possible on a smaller property.

Mr. Paul Lehner
Mr. David Whitley
March 5, 2008
Page 2

(c) Commerce Street. There was much mention of the jail on the other side of Commerce Street (“The White Elephant”) and the many problems and issues that come along with being close to such a facility. An answer in part to this difficult condition is raising a large portion of the pedestrian experience to the podium level which will allow us to create a more secure environment. In the perfect world The White Elephant wouldn’t exist, but it does so we need to react to it in the most positive way possible.

(d) Vibrant Urban Life. I am not sure I was forceful enough in stressing that as designed our project is very much about vibrant urban life. Our intent is to create an energized mixed use environment that is significantly pedestrian friendly while being sensitive to view corridors and other concerns of the citizens of Dallas. Our project is precisely the type of develop the City of Dallas should encourage and support particularly in this blighted area. Without the right zoning, development along Industrial Blvd. is likely to be tough and difficult. It is an area that is not impacted by sensitive neighbors and one that requires flexibility and creative thinking.

In summary, I believe our requested zoning modifications meet the spirit of the originally proposed zoning and when we again meet with the Ad Hoc Committee; we hope to show how our project will provide a far better result than if we built to the originally proposed zoning. Development in our location is going to be very challenging and we will need all the reasonable flexibility possible. We look forward to working closely with the Ad Hoc Committee, the Planning Commission, and of course your offices, to achieve a positive result that all parties in the long run will look to with pride.

Very truly yours,



Brian Caine

BC:fp
b:Lehner Whitley.022908