

Council Minutes May 29, 2014

STATE OF TEXAS §

COUNTY OF TARRANT §

CITY OF BEDFORD §

The City Council of the City of Bedford, Texas, met in joint work session with the Planning and Zoning Commission at 6:30 p.m. in the TXI Conference Room, 1805 L. Don Dodson on the 29th day of May, 2014 with the following members present:

Jim Griffin	Mayor
Michael Boyter	Council Members
Ray Champney	
Jim Davisson	
Steve Farco	
Roger Fisher	
Roy W. Turner	

constituting a quorum.

The following members of the Planning and Zoning Commission were present:

Bill Reese	Chairperson
Todd Carlson	Commissioners
Jason Sinisi	
Tom Stroope	
Mitchell Austin	Alternates
Lee Pierson	

constituting a quorum.

Staff present included:

Beverly Griffith	City Manager
David Miller	Deputy City Manager
Michael Wells	City Secretary
Meg Jakubik	Assistant to the City Manager
Mirenda McQuagge-Walden	Managing Director
Jacquelyn Reyff	Planning Manager
Bill Syblon	Development Director

Also in attendance:

Jayashree Narayanal	Gateway Planning
Jim Tharp	Oxley Williams Tharp

CALL TO ORDER/GENERAL COMMENTS

Mayor Griffin called the meeting to order at 6:36 p.m. He discussed the resignation of Planning and Zoning Commission member Hank Henning and stated he was told it had to do with Mr. Henning's health. He is impressed and excited about the draft of the design guidelines

document and the process tonight is to shape the document into what the Council and Commission want. One additional step for the night is to rename the CBDZ to the "Bedford Commons," and there was discussion on whether there is an apartment complex or strip center in the City with that name. Commission Chairperson Reese stated that he appreciated the Council's help and thanked the consultants for doing such a thorough job. He stated that Commissioner Henning will be missed.

JOINT WORK SESSION

- **City Council and Planning and Zoning Commission Joint Work Session to discuss the Central Bedford Development Zone (aka CBDZ) and to review and discuss the draft of the design guidelines document. (A-039)**

Development Director Bill Syblon stated that they will all get to know this material together and this is a new way of looking at things. He discussed presenting the draft plan to brokers at the International Council of Shopping Centers.

Jayashree Narayanan with Gateway Planning discussed the central square of the CBDZ being named the Bedford Commons. She stated that they can discuss the overall structure of the document and then hold another meeting to go over the details. She showed the original vision of the plan area and the revised vision, which includes Parkwood Drive serving as "Main Street," a central square, and potential redevelopment of vacant land along L. Don Dodson with a civic anchor. She discussed the conceptual zoning framework with standards tailored to central Bedford. The main element of the Development Code is the regulating plan or zoning map, which is geared toward the plan area. It identifies different character zone standards for each zone. She discussed frontage types and stated that all four sides of a City block would not be treated the same. For example, Type A frontages would be pedestrian friendly and Type B would be for parking or service areas. Since it will be unknown what future blocks are going to be, the Code specifies that at least one frontage has to be Type A, and its placement would depend on the surrounding context to maintain the continuity of pedestrian frontage. She discussed street classification as what happens between right-of-way lines. She displayed street cross sections, and discussed these standards being in the City's Public Works manual and that the streets need to be looked at differently than other streets in the City. She stated the standards could be attached as an appendix to the Code or put in a technical manual. She stated that there would be a need to have cross sections of future streets as well as alleys. She displayed the Code's table of contents, which includes such sections such as administration, sign standards and subdivision regulations. There was discussion on the sign standards being applied City-wide or just in the CBDZ; there being a symbiotic relationship between signs as well as being points of differentiation; that for the highway and regional retail zones, the Code defaults to the City's current Sign Ordinance; sign regulations being based on the type of street; setting up standards for pedestrian, walkable streets and defaulting to the regular Sign Ordinance for auto-oriented streets; the Code containing a list of signs and if one is not listed, it is not permitted; and that the section on signs can be adjusted.

Ms. Narayanan discussed the process of using the Code. Steps including finding out where the property is located on the Regulating Plan; identifying the character zone, frontages, and civic/open space types that affect the property; looking at the schedule of uses; looking at the Site Development Standards; and looking at the Building Design Standards, including the building's skin, windows, doors, materials, screening and shading along the front of the building. She discussed building residential to commercial code standards; specifying materials that would be prohibited; locating drive-throughs on Type B or highway frontages; parking garages and how they would be designed; terminated vistas; and gateway features. She discussed Street Design Standards including addressing new streets; and Streetscape and Landscape Standards including having higher standards on Type A street frontages as opposed to Type B,

and elements such as sidewalks, street trees and streetscape, screening, street lighting, street furniture, utilities, and parking lot landscaping. She discussed not including standards for street lighting; creating a palette of street lighting in the Public Works manual that makes sense for the CBDZ and which can evolve over time; and not having to have a zoning change to change a light standard. She discussed the Open Space Standards including how it relates to development; that there are no existing standards for residential development; ten percent as the minimum of a site area that has to be open space; that they can be privately owned but publicly accessible; that the Code provides in the attachment the types and standards of open spaces with characteristics that would be recommended; and that the types and standards would not be regulatory but would let a developer know the intent of the Code. There was discussion on the difference between intent and having it in the Code; flexibility; approval of items through the staff review process versus going to the Commission and Council; having enough detail in the Code; and drainage, including what is going to happen when impervious surfaces are created over what is currently dirt, not being able to capitalize on the overall development plan if there has to be on-site detention, and taking a more regional approach and creating a plan. There was discussion on open green space including creating green space on prime commercial real estate; open space creating value; and the "Texas Superstar" program. Ms. Narayanan displayed the Sign Standards, which includes a table with images. She discussed Type I applications that meet the Code or meet it with a minor modification; Type II applications where there are some gray areas, staff is not comfortable approving it at their level, and/or is a big enough project that it would have to go through the Commission and Council; and that any changes to the overall boundary of the CBDZ would have to go through the Commission and Council. There was discussion on site plan reviews including that if a use is allowed by right, it can be done at the staff level; and if a specific use permit or zoning change is required, or the site is commercial and over three acres in size, it would have to go to the Commission and Council. There was discussion on minor modifications including that they are defined and have specific criteria and standards. There was discussion on non-conforming uses and structures; that most current structures would be made non-conforming; that currently, if 50 percent or more of a building is destroyed, or the building footprint is changed by more than 20 percent of the overall site, it has to be built to current standards; making the regulations loose as it will take time for the market to evolve; allowing the market to drive the development and allowing building owners to make minor changes to their property; the impetus for owners to change non-conforming buildings; having an area that is eclectic; that it may take years for buildings to be scraped and rebuilt; and the City creating a matching fund to incentivize property owners.

Ms. Narayanan discussed the next steps in the process including working with stakeholders and property owners to go through the details of the Code, holding public meetings and an open house, and then formal adoption of the Code. There was discussion on the Cultural District; tying it to the CBDZ through signage and street-scaping; signage being used for FourthFest; examples of signage found on Abrams Street in Arlington; 1,500 people attending Twilight Thursdays in May; and the City's reputation as a cultural center and getting the attention of developers and retailers. There was discussion on the cost and length of the development of the City of Roanoke's "Main Street," which included drainage, roundabouts, utility poles and on-street parking. There was discussion on the measurement of mileage of the streets in the CBDZ; the proposed streets and side streets; the creation of roundabouts; the City owning a lot of property offsetting costs; whether the City would define the proposed streets or if they would be defined in discussions with developers; building required and recommended streets including block standards and dimensions; the City making some investment; one side of the central square facing the wall of a neighboring subdivision, which can be hidden by trails and landscaping; access and exits; reducing Forest Ridge Drive to three lanes and adding a turn lane; the expenses related to work on Forest Ridge Drive; phasing and determining priorities; the project having a single developer or multiple developers; the Schedule of Uses and using the term "stacked residential" instead of apartments; the timeframe after approval of the Code;

Council Minutes May 29, 2014

the City doing street modifications first or working with developers; establishing seed money, and frontloading the infrastructure and costs; determining a clear answer on costs to include City owned land; the impact of the Harley-Davidson development; marketing the plan to developers; the feasibility of requesting developers participate in public art; what would happen to City Hall property and replacing City offices, including locating them in the southern part of the City; having a vision and a concept; mechanisms for funding; and the CBDZ bringing in people and utilizing the increased funds in the southern part of the City. There was discussion on the public process including being honest with the citizens regarding this being the first phase, that there that there will be analysis of how the development will be financed, and that it is an evolving process. There was discussion regarding the point at which the City would determining cost estimates for the initial designs and the parks; having design charettes for the public meetings; the City's revenue sources; the City's property currently being zero on the tax rolls; the financial analysis having to have some assumptions; utilizing the data from Catalyst Commercial; performing a fiscal impact analysis and returns from property and sales tax; being prepared for questions at the public forums; the plan being a template and developer driven; and putting notices for the public meetings in the Bedford Connection. The Council and Commission agreed to have questions and comments back to staff by June 13.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:32 p.m.

Jim Griffin, Mayor

ATTEST:

Michael Wells, City Secretary