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Chair Shockey convened the Committee into the regular meeting on Tuesday, January 5, 2021, at 6:04 p.m. at the Plano Municipal Center Senator Florence Shapiro Council Chambers and via videoconference. Five members were present. Eleven members were present via videoconference. Chair Shockey led the Committee in the Pledge of Allegiance.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

1) Minutes: December 1, 2020, and December 9, 2020

MOTION: Upon a motion made by Vice Chair Bronsky and seconded by Member Liu the Committee voted 15-0 to approve the December 1, 2020, meeting minutes. Member Jacobs was not present for this vote.

MOTION: Upon a motion made by Member Liu and seconded by Member Solomon the Committee voted 14-0-1 to approve the December 9, 2020, meeting minutes. Member Jacobs was not present for this vote and Vice Chair Bronsky abstained.

Chair Shockey moved Agenda Item 5 to the next item of business.

5) CPRC Work Plan Updates and Outstanding Items

Chair Shockey gave a brief overview of his discussions with others within the Committee and outside regarding the schedule, progress, and hopeful success of this Committee.

MOTION: Member Crawford motioned for the Committee to go into detail on Member Solomon and Member Dillavou’s homework responses. No action was taken on this Motion.

Questions were asked and discussion was held regarding the Work Plan.

2) Discussion and Direction: Homework Responses

Mr. Sefko began a presentation on the homework responses. Chair Shockey opened discussion on the path forward. The Committee informally voted to participate in a poll before discussing the homework responses. Due to technical difficulties, two members added their responses after the meeting – those responses are reflected in the polling results below.

POLL-1: I generally like the draft plan we are working on and think it is close to receiving my vote of approval. Do you agree?
A) Yes: 6
B) No: 10

POLL-2: I feel the draft plan is too narrowly focused on restricting residential density. Do you agree?
A) Yes, I will not vote for the draft plan because of this: 3
B) Yes, but I would still support the draft plan: 4
C) No, the focus is appropriate: 6
POLL-3: I feel the draft plan is not forward-thinking enough (lacks vision). Do you agree?
   A) Yes, I will not vote for the draft plan because of this: 3
   B) Yes, but I would still support the draft plan: 4
   C) No, the draft plan is forward-thinking: 4

POLL-4: I feel the draft plan places too much emphasis on redevelopment or new housing. Do you agree?
   A) Yes, I will not vote for the draft plan because of this: 7
   B) Yes, but I would still support the draft plan: 3
   C) No, the emphasis is appropriate: 5

POLL-5: I feel the draft plan lacks a set of overarching guidelines. Do you agree?
   A) Yes, I will not vote for the draft plan because of this: 6
   B) Yes, but I would still support the draft plan: 0
   C) No, the Guiding Principles are sufficient: 8

POLL-6: What does high density mean to you?
   A) Any density higher than those typical of single-family houses: 0
   B) Any density higher than those typical of townhomes: 2
   C) Any density that allows apartments (all types): 7
   D) Any density that allows Main Street-Style, Mid-Rise, or High-Rise (higher density apartments): 6

POLL-7: There are areas in Plano that are appropriate for new high density housing developments. Do you agree?
   A) Yes: 12
   B) No: 4

POLL-8: What level of support for new housing should the Plan include to get your vote?
   A) New housing should not be supported: 0
   B) New housing should be supported when the citywide ratio of single-family to multifamily is maintained or increased: 6
   C) New housing should be supported when proposed in appropriate areas that meet citywide goals: 9
   D) New housing should be broadly supported across the city: 0

POLL-9: Underperforming retail shopping centers are a long-term planning issue for Plano. Do you agree?
   A) Yes: 11
   B) No: 4
POLL-10: Renovating and revitalizing commercial buildings should be the city’s most preferred strategy for improving underperforming retail shopping centers. Rezoning to allow residential uses should be the least preferred strategy. Do you agree?
   A) Yes: 7
   B) No: 3
   C) No, but I would not strongly object if this were included as a policy in the plan: 4

POLL-11: Should the city have different priorities for redevelopment of four-corner retail and retail along commercial corridors?
   A) Yes, four-corner retail is a higher priority: 4
   B) Yes, retail along commercial corridors is a higher priority: 1
   C) No, both should have the same priority: 7
   D) No, neither is a priority: 3

POLL-12: Should additional housing be allowed where necessary to redevelop or revitalize commercial areas?
   A) Should be encouraged if in the best interest of Plano: 5
   B) Should be considered with a high bar to prove it is beneficial/not harmful to existing residents: 10
   C) Should never be allowed: 1

POLL-13: For NC, CC, and SA areas on the Density Guidance Map, should the map show the exact density as calculated using the average density formula?
   A) Yes: 9
   B) No: 2

POLL-14: I feel the red-yellow-green approach to the Density Guidance Map is:
   A) Too restrictive and will deter potential projects and opportunities: 3
   B) Appropriate as proposed: 3
   C) Not restrictive enough (too easy to meet) to set a high bar for residential development: 6

POLL-15: The Density Guidance Map should address building height (beyond the residential adjacency standards included in the DGM categories) in addition to density. Do you agree?
   A) Yes, this is critical to get my vote: 4
   B) Yes, but it is not critical to get my vote: 4
   C) No, the residential adjacency standards as proposed are sufficient: 5
   D) No, height is not an issue: 1

POLL-16: The plan should address commercial intensity in addition to residential density. Do you agree?
   A) Yes this is critical to get my vote: 3
   B) Yes, but it is not critical to get my vote: 7
   C) No, commercial intensity is not an issue: 4
POLL-17: Should we continue to refine the Density Guidance Map and Bundles 23 and 24 in pursuit of agreement on the plan?
   A) Yes, but they should be more restrictive: 6
   B) Yes, but they need to be less restrictive: 5
   C) No, we should pursue another strategy to manage density: 2

POLL-18: I am in favor of Option 1 or Option 2 as proposed by staff and the consultants. Do you agree?
   A) Yes, I prefer Option 1: 1
   B) Yes, I prefer Option 2: 3
   C) Yes, I can get behind either Option 1 or 2: 5
   D) No, I prefer the current draft plan: 0
   E) No, we need a completely new approach: 3

POLL-19: Understanding the lack of precedence and potential risk, I would only vote for the plan if it includes some form of population or housing targets/caps. Do you agree?  
**note: caps and targets are different from population and housing projections, which are standard for a comprehensive plan and intended as part of this plan**
   A) Yes, population or housing caps are needed: 2
   B) Yes, population or housing targets are needed: 3
   C) No, I would not support a plan with population or housing caps or targets: 4
   D) We need more details on the potential impacts of implementing population or housing caps or targets: 5

POLL-20: Is there any purpose for which you would support increasing the population of Plano?
   A) Yes: 7
   B) No: 6

POLL-21: Are there situations where Plano should add housing to attract or retain business?
   A) Yes, many situations: 4
   B) Yes, a few situations: 8
   C) No, no situations: 2

POLL-22: The City should pursue strategies to grow our population. Do you agree?
   A) Yes, strategic population growth benefits existing residents: 4
   B) Yes, other reason: 2
   C) No, growing the population harms existing residents: 5
   D) No, other reason: 5

POLL-23: I think small-lot, single-family homes have a place in Plano. Do you agree?
   A) Yes: 14
   B) No: 1
POLL-24: I think small-scale multiunit buildings can have a place in Plano if designed and managed appropriately. Do you agree?
   A) Yes: 11
   B) No: 4

POLL-25: I support including Midtown Housing in the plan. Do you agree?
   A) Yes, both Multi-unit and Single-unit: 9
   B) Yes, but only Multi-unit: 0
   C) Yes, but only Single-unit: 3
   D) No, I will not vote for the plan if it includes any Midtown Housing: 4

POLL-26: I would support the Future Land Use Map and Dashboards as drafted today. Do you agree? (Does not include the Density Guidance Map references.)
   A) Yes: 8
   B) No: 7

POLL-27: The Future Land Use Dashboards should describe the existing character of the areas, not the desired character. Do you agree?
   A) Yes: 5
   B) No: 7

POLL-28: Housing should never be appropriate in the Expressway Corridors. Do you agree?
   A) Yes: 6
   B) No: 8

POLL-29: After a year of discussion, I think there is an agreement to be reached regarding the plan. Do you agree?
   A) Yes: 9
   B) No: 4

POLL-30: Another 4 to 6 meetings will be enough time to reach agreement to send the plan to P&Z. Do you agree?
   A) Yes, this is more than enough time: 5
   B) Yes, 4 to 6 meetings will be adequate: 2
   C) No, I think we’ll need substantially more time: 2
   D) No, I don’t think we’ll be able to reach agreement: 3

Chair Shockey opened discussion on the homework responses and polling results. Questions were asked and discussion was held.

Chair Shockey reopened discussion regarding the schedule for additional meetings. The Committee discussed forming a subcommittee to focus on remaining issues, consisting of Members Dillavou, Kong, and Solomon. Chair Shockey asked the Committee to plan on meeting again on January 12, 2021, but with the understanding the meeting may be cancelled, and Committee meetings temporarily suspended, if progress is made on forming a subcommittee.
3) Discussion and 2nd Consideration: Bundle 18

No discussion was held or action was taken on this item.

4) Discussion and Direction: Future Land Use Map and Dashboards

No discussion was held or action was taken on this item.

With no further discussion, Chair Shockey adjourned the meeting at 9:49 p.m.

Doug Shockey, Chair