



AGENDA
City of Dallas Planning Commission
TUESDAY, April 14, 2015 - 7:00 p.m.
City Hall Council Chambers
187 SE Court Street

**Planning
Commission**

President
Chuck Lerwick

Vice President
Dave Shein

Commissioner
Chris Castelli

Commissioner
Marc Pazina

Commissioner
Carol Kowash

Commissioner
Les Oehler

Commissioner
Bob Wilson

Staff

Community
Development
Director
Jason Locke

City Attorney
Lane Shetterly

Planner
Suzanne Dufner

Recording Secretary

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. ROLL CALL
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - Regular meeting of March 10, 2015
4. PUBLIC COMMENT – This is an opportunity for citizens to speak to items not on the agenda (3 minutes per person please.)
5. PUBLIC HEARINGS
 - A) None
6. OTHER BUSINESS
 - Discussion of Dallas Development Code Revisions
7. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS
8. STAFF COMMENTS
9. ADJOURN

The next meeting is scheduled for May 12, 2015

Dallas City Hall is handicapped-accessible. Any requests for accommodation should be made at least 48 hours before the meeting to the Community Development Department, 503-831-3565 or TDD 503-623-7355.

For questions or comments on the agenda, contact: Suzanne Dufner at 503.831.3572 or suzanne.dufner@dallasor.gov



**City of Dallas
Planning Commission
Council Chambers - City Hall
March 10, 2015 - 7:00 p.m.**

DRAFT

MINUTES

1 **CALL TO ORDER**

2 President Chuck Lerwick called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

3 **ROLL CALL**

4 Commissioners Present: Chuck Lerwick, Chris Castelli, David Shein, and Robert Wilson.

5 Absent: Carol Kowash, Les Oehler, and Marc Pazina.

6 Staff present: City Attorney Lane Shetterly, Community Development Director
7 Jason Locke, Planner Suzanne Dufner, and Recording Secretary
8 Jeremy Teal.

9 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

10 President Chuck Lerwick presented the minutes of the regular meeting of February 10, 2015.
11 Commissioner Shein made a motion to approve the minutes as presented and Commissioner
12 Wilson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

13 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

14 President Chuck Lerwick explained the rules for making public comment.

15 There were no public comments.

16 **PUBLIC HEARING**

17 **SUB 15-01 - 11-LOT SUBDIVISION APPLICANT: MULTITECH ENGINEERING**

18 President Lerwick opened the official Public Hearing for SUB 15-01 – 11 Lot Subdivision
19 Applicant: Multitech Engineering at 7:04 p.m. He asked if any members of the Planning

20 Commission needed to declare ex parte contact or a conflict of interest. There were no
21 declarations. President Lerwick reviewed the procedures for a public hearing.

22 STAFF REPORT:

23 Ms. Dufner reviewed the staff report for the 11 lot subdivision located east of NW Denton and
24 south of NW Hillcrest zoned Residential Low Density.

25 Commissioner Shein asked about Condition 3 in the staff report regarding payment in lieu of
26 open space for parks in new developments. Mr. Locke explained that the fee was determined by
27 6% of the total real market value of the property at the time of application.

28 Commissioner Shein asked if the street extension would be completed with the SDC fees
29 collected for the project. Mr. Locke noted the street connections would be done at the expense of
30 the developer.

31 Commissioner Shein asked if the water and sewer were in place. Mr. Locke stated there was
32 water, some storm drain, and some sewer already installed. He commented that there would be
33 more utilities to install as the project progressed.

34 APPLICANT PRESENTATION

35 Gordon Hanna, 1011 Commercial St NE, Salem, attorney of applicant, reported the applicant
36 would accept the recommendation from City staff and would comply with all the
37 recommendations.

38 Commissioner Shein asked if any citizen concerns had been expressed. Mr. Hanna noted the
39 biggest concern was traffic and speed issues regarding NW Hillcrest and NW Denton streets
40 connecting, and those issues would be addressed and complied with according to City standards.

41 PERSONS SPEAKING FOR OR AGAINST

42 Mary Samerotte, PO Box 777, Dallas, commented that she was interested in the lot next to the
43 development on Byers Lane, and was concerned about the french drains on her property and
44 water drainage with the new development.

45 Mr. Shetterly noted that would be answered in the rebuttal from the engineers.

46 Scott Turpen, 463 NW Fairhaven Lane, asked about the park land or open space in lieu of
47 payment and was concerned there wasn't enough area for a park.

48 Mr. Locke reported that a Parks Master Plan was almost complete and would identify areas that
49 are deficient with park space. He stated with a smaller subdivision only 6% of land is the
50 requirement and that doesn't get you what you need for a park. He noted the City would look at
51 the land the applicant doesn't own to the south of the development and attempt to acquire that

52 land and develop a park. Mr. Shetterly noted that Park SDC fees could be used for the purchase
53 of the land.

54 **REBUTTAL**

55 Mark Grenz, 1155 13th SE, Salem, Multitech Engineering, reported that storm and water were
56 already installed on the property. He noted he was a geotechnical consultant and had examined
57 the soils at the development. He explained the expansive soils were moderate and there were
58 only pockets of expansive soils, and that special designs for home foundations that counter
59 expansive soils would be used and comply with the criteria the City required.

60 Mr. Locke noted that geotechnical information was useful in the construction of new streets.

61 Chair Lerwick closed the Public Hearing at 7:32 p.m.

62 **COMMISSIONER QUESTIONS**

63 There were none.

64 **DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION**

65 Mr. Locke commented that the street connections were always meant occur since the City didn't
66 create dead ends. He noted the safety issues and the standard requirements for infrastructure like
67 fire hydrants and other issues that coordinated with fire code would be addressed. He stated a
68 traffic study would be completed before streets were opened to ensure safety.

69 It was moved by Commissioner Shein to approve SUB 15-01 with the 11 staff recommended
70 conditions outlined in the staff report. The motion was duly seconded and carried with a vote of
71 4-0.

72 Mr. Locke noted he would prepare a notice of decision and distribute it to everyone that has
73 given testimony or been involved in the process that gives them appeal rights to the City
74 Council.

75 **OTHER BUSINESS**

76 **DISCUSSION OF DALLAS DEVELOPMENT CODE REVISIONS**

77 Ms. Dufner introduced the next code update that required no action at this time. She noted this
78 update addressed the "tiny" home boom that is happening across the nation. She explained she
79 would be keeping a running list of any issues that come to the surface, and schedule work
80 sessions and then run the revisions through the Planning Commission and then on to City
81 Council.

82 Mr. Locke asked if everyone liked the new format of the Development Code revision process.
83 He asked that everyone make a list of changes and the commission would go over specifics and
84 have a discussion regarding the issues at the next meeting. Everyone agreed they liked the new
85 format.

86 **COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

87 There were none.

88 **STAFF COMMENTS**

89 There were none.

90 **The meeting adjourned at 7:52 p.m.**

APPROVED:

President

Date



Community Development Department

Memo

To: Planning Commission
From: Suzanne Dufner, Planner
Date: 4/9/2015
Re: Development Code Update

At the March 10th Planning Commission meeting staff introduced an outline of issues to consider during the next update of the Dallas Development Code. At the April 14th Planning Commission meeting, staff will begin a more in depth discussion of several substantive issues to consider during the code update as described in the attached table.

**2015 DALLAS DEVELOPMENT CODE UPDATE
DRAFT OUTLINE – 4/9/15**

SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES

#	Chapter & Section	Issue	Current Code Language	Proposed Fix
1.	6.1 Definitions - Residential Structure Types	The code is currently missing a definition for modular home .	See Chapter 6.1 Definitions, Residential Structure Types page 6-32.	Add a definition for modular home.
2.	2.2 Residential Districts – 2.2.020 Allowed Land Uses and Building Types	The code does not currently specify what residential zones allow modular homes .	See Table 2.2.020 – Land Uses and Building Types Allowed in Residential Districts.	Define what residential zones allow modular homes as either permitted or permitted with special standards.
3.	2.2 Residential Districts - 2.2.120.F Manufactured Homes on Individual Lots	Recent interest and development of “ tiny homes ” has led to a demand for manufactured and modular homes that are less than 1,000 sf.	1. Floor Plan. The manufactured home shall be multi-sectional and have an enclosed floor area of not less than 1,000 square feet;	Consider allowing the minimum size of a manufactured home on an individual lot to be reduced outright, or adjusted through the Type II process.
4.	2.2 Residential Districts - 2.2.020 Allowed Land Uses and Building Types	The code does not have any provisions for “ short-term vacation rentals .”	See Table 2.2.020 – Land Uses and Building Types.	Consider allowing short term vacation rentals under certain conditions within the city.

#	Chapter & Section	Issue	Current Code Language	Proposed Fix								
5.	2.2 Residential Districts - 2.2.100.C(1) Garage Orientation and Design	The City receives frequent requests to allow wider driveways in residential areas.	<p>e. Driveway Approaches.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="995 347 1411 492"> <tr> <td><i>Lot frontage</i></td> <td><i>Driveway width</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u><55'</u></td> <td><u>20'</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>56'-70'</u></td> <td><u>24'</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>>70'</u></td> <td><u>28'</u></td> </tr> </table> <p>Driveways may expand to a width greater than the maximum width where they are located more than ten (10) feet from a sidewalk (or street right-of-way if no sidewalk is present).</p>	<i>Lot frontage</i>	<i>Driveway width</i>	<u><55'</u>	<u>20'</u>	<u>56'-70'</u>	<u>24'</u>	<u>>70'</u>	<u>28'</u>	<p>Options to consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Allow driveways to widen behind the property line, 2. Consider allowing minor adjustments to driveway widths under certain circumstances.
<i>Lot frontage</i>	<i>Driveway width</i>											
<u><55'</u>	<u>20'</u>											
<u>56'-70'</u>	<u>24'</u>											
<u>>70'</u>	<u>28'</u>											
6.	3.6 Signs – 3.6.070.B Permanent Sign Regulations CBD and CN Zones	The sign code is missing a maximum height for freestanding signs in the CBD and CN zones.	<p>B. Central Business District (CBD) and Neighborhood Commercial (CN) Zones. Signs in the CBD and CN zones may be directly or indirectly lit. Each building or multi-tenant complex may have any combination of wall sign, monument sign, canopy sign, hanging sign, projecting sign, or freestanding sign not to exceed, in total, two (2) square feet for each foot of lot frontage on a street. In the case of two frontages, the larger frontage will be used to compute total sign size.</p>	<p>Adopt a maximum height for freestanding signs in the CBD and CN zones. Consider prohibiting new pole signs.</p>								

#	Chapter & Section	Issue	Current Code Language	Proposed Fix
7.	4.2 Land Use and Site Design Review - 4.2.080.D Phased Development	Several larger developments have expressed a desire for phased development approvals that exceed the current limitation of two (2) years.	2. The Planning Commission shall approve a time schedule for developing a site in phases, but in no case shall the total time period for all phases be greater than 2 years without reapplying for site design review.	Consider allowing phased development approvals for five (5) to seven (7) years.