

**PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**  
**Work Session**  
**March 22, 2006**

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT**

Carolyn Kalchthaler, Chairman  
Joyce Beach, 1st Vice Chair  
Dennis Abraham, 2nd Vice Chair  
Joy Flick  
Lisette Briley  
Jim Norton  
Maggie Armstrong  
James Duggan

**STAFF PRESENT**

Phyllis M. Jarrell, Director of Planning  
Tom Elgin, Development Review Manager  
Jeff Zimmerman, Long Range Planning Manager  
Steve Sims, Sr. Planner

The Planning & Zoning Commission work session was called to order by Chairman Kalchthaler at 6:30 p.m., Wednesday, March 22, 2006.

**Agenda Item No. 1 - Discussion and Direction: Proposed Mixed-Use Concept (Retail/Office and Multifamily) at the Southwest Corner of S.H. 121 and Preston Road. Applicant: Lincoln Properties**

Phyllis M. Jarrell, Director of Planning, introduced this item. Ms. Jarrell noted that staff, at the request of Lincoln Properties, had met to discuss the possible development of this 81± acre tract of land as a mixed use, retail, office and multifamily residential development. The staff discussion covered land use, comprehensive plan, form of development, access, and utility availability issues.

Kirk Williams and Larry Good, representing the applicants, and Jeff Courtwright and Robert Dozier, of Lincoln Properties, explained their development proposal. Their proposal contained three major elements: an “office gateway” component at the northeast corner, a “lifestyle” component west and east of the office gateway component, and a “residential village” component to the south of the lifestyle component. The office gateway component would be primarily general and professional offices with a service retail component. The lifestyle component would be predominately retail and personal service uses with some second-floor office use. The residential village component is primarily urban density multifamily residences with some townhouse residences. Approximately 54 of the 81 acres would be office and retail development; the other 27 acres would be residential development.

The Commission and the applicant discussed the development proposal. Areas of discussion included the overall mix, integration, and architecture of office retail and residential uses; the mix, anticipated turnover, and school impact of proposed multifamily and townhouse residential uses; and the use of the existing drainage way as an amenity.

Chairman Kalchthaler opened the meeting for comments from the public. Dennis Brent with Frisco Independent School District (FISD) told the Commission of the district's difficulties in keeping up with the growth in student population. Mr. Brent noted that any time property in Plano within FISD was rezoned to residential use, it would result in additional student population that was not in their growth projections and school facilities programming.

The public discussion was then closed. The Commission provided the applicants with comments on their development proposal.

Chairman Kalchthaler left the meeting at the conclusion of the discussion of Agenda Item No. 1. First Vice Chair Beach assumed the chair.

### **Agenda Item No. 2 - Discussion and Direction: Utilities Element Update**

Steve Sims, Sr. Planner, presented the list of key factors and issues of the Utilities Element of the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Sims concluded the presentation by asking the Commission the following questions:

1. Are there any issues we need to add to the list?
2. Are there specific issues that deserve emphasis?
3. Are there any additional questions or comments?

The commissioners indicated general agreement with the key factors and issues listed. The Commission stated that storm water management is a topic that deserves more emphasis.

Comments and questions from the commissioners and staff responses included:

- **How is public education relating to the disposal of household chemical wastes addressed?**

The Environmental Waste Services division has an education program for residents regarding disposal of household chemical wastes.

- **How can Plano conserve water under the North Texas Municipal Water District's (NTMWD) "take or pay" purchase system without paying for unused supply?**

NTMWD must be able to provide a certain amount of water to each city whether it is consumed or not and there is no economical way to store excess supply. NTMWD currently provides a 50% rebate for unused water, but cities can still be “penalized” for conserving water. The solution would involve a district-wide approach as opposed to Plano negotiating a separate agreement with different stipulations.

- **Can the city “force” sharing of conduits in its rights-of-way by different utility providers?**

No, Plano has procedures for contractors to follow when installing utilities in its rights-of-way, but it cannot deny or limit usage.

- **Why can’t we use the Impact Fee program for replacement and maintenance of existing facilities beyond 2008?**

The state enabling legislation limits their use to new infrastructure and a city cannot collect fees in excess of the cost of improvements.

The Commission directed staff to move forward with the update and develop objectives and strategies for discussion at a future work session.

There being no further discussion, 1st Vice Chair Beach adjourned the work session at 8:29 p.m.

---

Planning & Zoning Commissioner

xc: Honorable Mayor and City Council  
Thomas H. Muehlenbeck, City Manager