

Planning & Zoning: 3/7/2011 **Staff Contact:** Erin Sellers, Planner II
City Council: 3/22/2011 **E-mail:** erins@cityofpflugerville.com
City Council: 4/12/2011 **Phone:** 512-990-6300

SUBJECT: Discuss and consider approving an ordinance on first reading with the caption reading: AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE CITY OF PFLUGERVILLE CODE OF ORDINANCES TITLE XV LAND USAGE, CHAPTER 157 UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT CODE REPEALING AND REPLACING SUBCHAPTER 5 ESTABLISHMENT OF OVERLAYS AND SPECIAL DISTRICTS, SECTION (B) SH 130 AND SH 45 CORRIDOR DISTRICTS; REPLACING ALL ORDINANCES IN CONFLICT; CONTAINING A SAVINGS CLAUSE AND DECLARING AN EFFECTIVE DATE. Case# CA1102-03

BACKGROUND

The Corridor Review Committee was established in June 2010 by the City Council to assist the Planning and Zoning Commission in an effort to review the Corridor regulations and make code amendment recommendations if necessary. Per the Corridor regulations, the Planning and Zoning Commission shall examine the success of the corridor, at minimum, once every two years following the approval of the SH 130 and SH 45 Corridor ordinance to determine if Base Development requirements remain necessary. This item is staff initiated to follow through with the recommendations of the Corridor Committee and the Planning and Zoning Commission.

SUMMARY

The Corridor Review Committee was composed of the following representatives:

- City of Pflugerville City Council – Wayne Cooper and Darelle White
- Pflugerville Community Development Corporation (PCDC) – Janice Heath
- City of Pflugerville Planning and Zoning Commission – Naji Norder and Tom Anker
- City of Pflugerville Parks and Recreation Commission – Pat McCord
- Pflugerville Council of Neighborhoods (PfCONA) – Marshall Addington
- Landowners in the Specified Corridor – Newland Communities and Tim Timmerman
- Citizen-at-large – (1 member) – Rob Reyes

There were a total of 4 meetings discussing a variety topics pertaining to the Corridor provided below.

Meeting Dates	Topics Discussed
July 26, 2010	SWOT analysis (Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats)
August 30, 2010	SWOT findings, Survey that included design and land use questions. (“What sets the Corridor apart from other development city-wide?”)
October 18, 2010	Survey results showing higher emphasis on design and streetscaping rather

	than on Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND).
November 15, 2010	Discussion, Wrap-up

Overall, minor changes to the Corridor ordinance are recommended due to the minimal activity in the market place. It is difficult to determine at this time whether the Corridor regulations are effective since most of the Corridor tracts have limited access to utilities.

PROPOSED CHANGES:

Most of the proposed changes reside within Table 1: Permitted Uses. The table provided below includes the amendments to the applicable land uses that are proposed to be permitted by right (P), permitted with conditions (indicated with a number), by Special District (SD) or by Special District with conditions (SD followed by a number). Please refer to pages 2 through 8 in the excerpt of the ordinance provided. Also, proposed changes are represented in green below.

Table 1: Permitted Uses (Excerpt) pgs. 3-4	BASE			TND		
	CL3	CL4	CL5	CL3	CL4	CL5
Residential - USES						
Multi-Family Suburban	SD11	SD11	11	SD11	SD11	11
Multi-Family Urban		SD12	12		SD12	12
Single Family Detached Sub.	11					
Single Family Detached Urban		12		12		

The conditions indicated above are simply code references to the architectural section of the UDC.

Conditions

- 11 – Shall follow the design standards established in Subchapter 9 of the Unified Development Code for Suburban structures.
- 12 - Shall follow the design standards established in Subchapter 9 of the Unified Development Code for Urban structures.

Table 1: Permitted Uses (Excerpt) pg. 4	BASE			TND		
Education, Institutional, Public, Special - USES	CL3	CL4	CL5	CL3	CL4	CL5
Clinic	Removed as a use (Medical Facility is already included as a permitted use)					
Hospital		SD	SD		SD	SD
Drive-in/thru	5	5	5	5	5	5
Overhead/Rollup Doors	Removed as a use (Relocated to Site Development Standards) - to be oriented to the side or rear.					
Park or Playground	P	P	P	P	P	P

Table 1: Permitted Uses (Excerpt) pg. 5	BASE			TND		
Office & Commercial- USES	CL3	CL4	CL5	CL3	CL4	CL5
Medical Office (no longer limited by size)	P	P	P	P	P	P
Research and Development Center		SD	SD		SD	SD
Bicycle Shop	P	P	P	P	P	P
Business Services	Removed as a use (May be considered a Light Industrial use)					
Catering Establishment	13	P	P	13	P	P
Commercial Amusements, Indoor (no longer limited by size)		P	P		P	P
Day Care Facility, Incidental	P	P	P	P	P	P

Condition # 13

- 13 – Maximum square footage must be 5,000 square feet or less.

Table 1: Permitted Uses (Excerpt) pgs. 5-6	BASE			TND		
Office & Commercial- USES	CL3	CL4	CL5	CL3	CL4	CL5
Financial Institution	P	P	P	P	P	P
Dance Studio	13	P	P	13	P	P
Health/Fitness Center	13	P	P	13	P	P
Hotel		P	P		P	P
Massage Therapy, Licensed	P	P	P	P	P	P
Mortuary/Funeral Parlor		P			P	
Personal Services Shop	P	P	P	P	P	P
Print Shop, Minor	P	P	P	P	P	P

Condition number 13 is reflected in CL3 zoning (Pfennig Lane area) for some of the land uses to accommodate smaller businesses in order to be more compatible with the single-family adjacency.

Also, in Table 2: General Regulations for Base Development, the maximum impervious cover (including parking structures) requirements were altered to be congruent with the landscape area requirements. This reflects an increase by 5-10% of maximum impervious cover.

BASE DEVELOPMENT Pg. 11	EXISTING			PROPOSED		
Table 2: General Regulations	CL3	CL4	CL5	CL3	CL4	CL5
Maximum Impervious Coverage (includes parking structures)	50%	70%	80%	60%	75%	85%

Parking in the Corridor has been difficult to administer with insufficient minimum parking standards in Base Development. Base Development is characterized, in short, as big box retail accompanied by pad sites or outparcels. The automobile is still the most predominant method of mobility and circulation throughout Base Development and there are few alternatives. Therefore, staff recommends the minimum parking requirements in Base Development refer back to the city-wide requirements established per Subchapter 10 of the UDC.

Table 5: Required Spaces	BASE DEVELOPMENT			TRADITIONAL NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT		
	Suburban (Level 3)	Urban (Level 4)	Urban Center (Level 5)	Suburban (Level 3)	Urban (Level 4)	Urban Center (Level 5)
MINIMUM NUMBER OF SPACES						
Residential (unit)				2	2	1
Lodging (bedroom)				1	1	1
Office (1,000 sq ft)	2211113323.53.52.5NANA Table 1: Required Parking Ratio of Subchapter 10 shall apply.			3	2.5	1.75
Commercial (1,000 sq ft)				3.5	3.5	2
Industrial (1,000 sq ft)				NA	NA	NA

As for changes to the Landscaping requirements, minimal changes have been proposed since most of the existing requirements dove-tail already with the city-wide requirements. Among the proposed changes, the tree planting requirement has been proposed to be reduced by 40% from the existing standard. After further examination of approved landscape plans in the Corridor, a reduction in the tree count appears to be more achievable for most sites. Even with the 40% reduction from the existing requirement, the requirement still exceeds that of a similar General Business 1 (GB1) zoning standard of “1 tree per 500 square feet of landscape area required. An extra provision was included to identify specific tree requirements for industrial uses permitted by Special Districts. Council may choose through the Special District process to requirement additional landscaping to address adjacency concerns. Since there is a wide range of uses permitted in the Corridor either by right or Special District, an industrial use may call for a different minimum standard. The proposed industrial standard indicated in the table reflects the current standard in the Light Industrial zoning requirements per Subchapter 11. Please refer to the table below for the proposed changes or refer to page 22 in the excerpt provided.

Table 7: Landscaping Elements	BASE DEVELOPMENT			TRADITIONAL NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT		
	Suburban (Level 3)	Urban (Level 4)	Urban Center (Level 5)	Suburban (Level 3)	Urban (Level 4)	Urban Center (Level 5)
Minimum Landscape Area (total lot area)	40%	25%	15%	25%	15%	NA 10%
Tree Requirements (For non-industrial uses)	Minimum 1- 3" caliper tree per 250-300 sq ft landscape area					
Tree Requirements (For industrial uses permitted by Special District)	Minimum 1- 3" caliper tree per 500 sq ft landscape area					
Shrub Requirements	Minimum 4 shrubs per 250 sq ft landscape area					
Parking Lot Landscaping Total sq. ft. of landscaped area within the parking area. (For every 250 sq. ft., 1-3" caliper tree.)	20 sq. ft. per surface parking space	15 sq. ft. per surface parking space	10 sq. ft. per surface parking space	20 sq. ft. per surface parking space	15 sq. ft. per surface parking space	10 sq. ft. per surface parking space
Parking Lot Design	Subchapter 11 Landscaping and Screening Standards, Section F. Parking Lot Landscaping, Subsection (1) Parking Lot Design shall apply.					
Street Trees (Required for all collector and arterial roadways.)	Subchapter 11 Landscaping and Screening Standards Section D. Streetscape Standards shall apply except street trees must be planted within 50 feet from back of curb					
Building Landscaping	Subchapter 11 Landscaping and Screening Standards Section E. Building Landscaping shall apply.					

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the proposed text amendment as presented.

NOTIFICATION:

Newspaper Notification Published on February 24, 2011.

ATTACHMENTS:

Subchapter 5 with proposed amendments.
Resolution creating the Corridor Review Committee