

**Plan Map Amendments (Bundle 23)**

<b>Plan Map Amendments (Bundle 23)</b>	
<p><b>WEBSITE CONTEXT As Presented 11/20/2020</b></p>	<p>Because Plano is mostly developed, nearly all new development will have an impact on existing residents, businesses, and traffic. Developers may propose projects that deviate from existing land use rights and the Comprehensive Plan's policies. Proposed development that would cause a significant change in character inconsistent with this Plan is anticipated as a concern to residents, businesses, and property owners unless appropriately vetted. This review can be accomplished through a plan map amendment process. The Plano community needs confidence that any development proposals deviating from their adopted Plan are properly vetted by the community, yield improvements that were not previously conceived, and are desirable.</p> <p>To allow flexibility for innovative and market-responsive proposals, it is important that there is a process to engage the public and ensure adequate planning when development proposals substantially deviate from the current adopted Plan. Plan amendments should be considered based on the long-term impacts of the proposal and the impact of the amendment to the overall plan. To understand those impacts, additional data and analysis are useful to guide decision-makers in effectuating good long-term public policy for the area, and to avoid considering a single proposal in isolation without adequate information to understand the consequence of proposed changes.</p> <p>Maintenance of the Plan is also critical to its success. The City will keep it up to date to reflect citizen priorities and changing market conditions. Regular updates will be provided through annual reports and online publications, as well as information provided and collected at public meetings to ensure the community remains involved and knowledgeable of the Plan status.</p>
<p>Dillavou</p>	<p>Because Plano is mostly developed, nearly all new development will have an impact on existing residents, businesses, and traffic. Developers may propose projects that deviate from existing land use rights and the Comprehensive Plan's policies. Proposed development that would cause a significant change in character inconsistent with this Plan is anticipated as a concern to residents, businesses, and property owners unless appropriately vetted. This review can be accomplished through a plan map amendment process. The Plano community needs confidence that any development proposals deviating from their adopted Plan are properly vetted by the community, yield improvements that were not previously conceived, and are desirable.</p> <p>(continued on next page)</p>

**Commented [CS1]:**  
**Jeff Beckley:** I support the concept of Bundle 23. However, I am concerned that this may have the unintended consequence of adding bureaucratic hurdles that will limit responsible development, restrict attainable housing options, and adversely affect economic development and employment growth.

**Yoram Solomon:** I'm not completely sure what is the difference between the two bundles. There is a lot of overlap, and I feel that combining them would have made sense.

**Sara Wilson:** I have made some comments below, but I am rejecting the Plan Amendments Bundle. If the Developers are proposing something that deviates from the plan (especially substantially), it should not even be considered. I believe that the input from the Plano community is necessary WHEN the zoning and Plan agree to ensure that it is compatible with the surrounding areas. The Plan will be reviewed on set intervals and if there is a compelling reason why the city needs this type of development then it can be updated to the plan then vs an amendment.

**Commented [CW2]:**  
**Jack Liu:** The first paragraph of website content can be removed. Plano is almost developed should not be the reason for future change. Any plan will subject to change.

**Commented [CW3]:**  
**Salvator La Mastra:** The city and developers have a long history of changing the existing land use plans to give the developers what they want and not thinking of the long-term ramifications for the city and citizens.

### Plan Map Amendments (Bundle 23)

To allow flexibility for innovative and market-responsive proposals, it is important that there is a process to consider change while engaging the public for input and agreement. To ensure adequate planning when development proposals substantially deviate from the current adopted Plan, Plan amendments should be considered based on the impact to existing development, long-term impacts of the proposal and the impact of the amendment to the overall plan. To understand those impacts, additional data and analysis are ~~useful to~~ important to inform the community and guide decision-makers in effectuating good long-term public policy for the area, and to avoid considering a single proposal in isolation without adequate information to understand the consequence of proposed changes. In certain cases, it may be appropriate to consider a temporary Plan amendment so that a specific development request can be considered with the understanding that if that development request is not granted, the temporary amendment will expire.

Maintenance of the Plan is also critical to its success. History has shown that many developments have deviated from past Plans (and existing zoning) by proposing Planned Development Zones that ignored the existing Land Use Plan and Zoning. It is impractical for the public to be constantly engaged and assessing Planned Developments or Plan amendments that significantly deviate from the Comprehensive Plan. The City will keep it up to date to reflect citizen priorities and changing market conditions. Although, significant changes to the Plan should be infrequent, when zoning changes are proposed that are at conflict with the Plan, those changes should first require an amendment to the Plan. The amendment process will help assess the long-term impacts of the change and whether the proposed zoning request should be considered. To see that Plan amendments are well grounded, such amendments should require at least 65% approval of the city council.

Regular updates to the Plan to reflect any adopted amendments will be provided through annual reports and online publications, ~~as well as~~ and such updates shall include information provided and collected at public meetings to ensure the community remains involved and knowledgeable of the Plan status.

Shockey

Because Plano is mostly developed, nearly all new development will have an impact on existing residents, businesses, and traffic. Developers may propose projects that deviate from existing land use rights and the Comprehensive Plan's policies. Proposed development that would cause a significant change in character inconsistent with this Plan is anticipated as a concern to residents, businesses, and property owners unless appropriately vetted. This review can be accomplished through a plan map amendment process. The Plano community needs confidence that any development proposals deviating from their adopted Plan are properly vetted by the community, yield improvements that were not previously conceived, and are desirable.

(continued on next page)

### Plan Map Amendments (Bundle 23)

Solomon

To allow flexibility for innovative and market-responsive proposals, it is important that there is a process to engage the public [to seek input and approval](#), and [to ensure adequate planning](#) when development proposals substantially deviate from the current adopted Plan. Plan amendments should be considered based on the long-term impacts of the proposal and the impact of the amendment to the overall plan. To understand those impacts, additional data and analysis are useful to guide decision-makers in effectuating good long-term public policy for the area, and to avoid considering a single proposal in isolation without adequate information to understand the consequence of proposed changes.

Maintenance of the Plan is also critical to its success. The City will keep it up to date to reflect citizen priorities and changing market conditions. Regular updates will be ~~provided~~ [proposed](#) through annual reports and online publications, as well as information provided and collected at public meetings to ensure the community remains involved and knowledgeable of the Plan status.

Because Plano is mostly developed, nearly all new development will have an impact on existing residents, businesses, and traffic. [Some areas in Plano are becoming old, or incompatible with the evolving nature of the city, and require redevelopment that will have similar impact.](#) ~~Developers may propose p~~Projects that deviate from existing land use rights and the Comprehensive Plan's policies [may be proposed](#). ~~Proposed development that would cause a significant change in character inconsistent with this Plan is anticipated as could potentially be~~ a concern to residents, businesses, and property owners, [especially those living in the geographic vicinity of them](#), unless appropriately vetted. This review can be accomplished through a ~~plan-Plan map~~ amendment process [that will assure consistency between development and the comprehensive plan](#). The Plano community needs confidence that any development proposals deviating from their adopted Plan are properly vetted by the community, yield improvements that were not previously conceived, and are desirable.

To allow flexibility for innovative and market-responsive proposals, it is important that there is a process to engage the public and ensure adequate planning when development proposals substantially deviate from the current adopted Plan. Plan amendments should be considered based on the long-term impacts of the proposal and the impact of the amendment to the overall plan. To understand those impacts, additional data and analysis are useful to guide decision-makers in effectuating good long-term public policy for the area, and to avoid considering a single proposal in isolation without adequate information to understand the consequence of proposed changes.

(continued on next page)

**Commented [CW4]:**

**Yoram Solomon:** Here is a big question: if no zoning decisions would be made starting today, what COULD be built based on how the city is zone right now? I understand that the Comprehensive Plan is aimed at guiding future zoning decisions, but what about current zoning? How compatible are those with the plan?

**Commented [CW5]:**

**Yoram Solomon:** Not necessarily.

**Commented [CW6]:**

**Yoram Solomon:** It's not just the map. Later in this paragraph you are referring to the Plan in general.

Optional Policies and Action Statements  
Consolidated CPRC Feedback  
December 1, 2020

<b>Plan Map Amendments (Bundle 23)</b>	
Wilson	<p>Maintenance of the Plan is also critical to its success. The City will keep it up to date to reflect citizen priorities and changing market conditions. Regular updates will be provided through annual reports and online publications, as well as information provided and collected at public meetings to ensure the community remains involved and knowledgeable of the Plan status.</p> <p><a href="#">A Comprehensive Plan Review process will be initiated every five(?) years by establishing a Comprehensive Plan Review Committee made of members representing the Plano community.</a></p> <p>Because Plano is mostly developed, nearly all new development will have an impact on existing residents, businesses, and traffic. Developers may propose projects that deviate from existing land use rights and the Comprehensive Plan's policies. Proposed development that would cause a significant change in character inconsistent with this Plan is anticipated as a concern to residents, businesses, and property owners unless appropriately vetted. This review can be accomplished through a plan map amendment process. The Plano community needs confidence that any development proposals deviating from their adopted Plan are properly vetted by the community, yield improvements that were not previously conceived, and are desirable.</p> <p>To allow flexibility for innovative and market-responsive proposals, it is important that there is a process to engage the public and ensure adequate planning when development proposals substantially deviate from the current adopted Plan. Plan amendments should be considered based on the long-term impacts of the proposal and the impact of the amendment to the overall plan. To understand those impacts, additional data and analysis are useful to guide decision-makers in effectuating good long-term public policy for the area, and to avoid considering a single proposal in isolation without adequate information to understand the consequence of proposed changes. <a href="#">If the Developers are proposing something that deviates from the plan (especially substantially), it should not even be considered for approval.</a></p> <p>Maintenance of the Plan is also critical to its success. The City will keep it up to date to reflect citizen priorities <del>and changing market conditions</del>. Regular updates will be provided through annual reports and online publications, as well as information provided and collected at public meetings to ensure the community remains involved and knowledgeable of the Plan status.</p>

Optional Policies and Action Statements  
 Consolidated CPRC Feedback  
 December 1, 2020

Plan Map Amendments (Bundle 23)	
<b><u>POLICY</u></b> <b><u>As Presented</u></b> <b><u>11/20/2020</u></b>	To ensure that the Plan remains up-to-date and continues to reflect community values, Plano will require all development proposals that exceed the density limits of the Future Land Use Category Dashboard to undergo a Plan amendment process before being considered for approval, and will engage in regular Plan updates involving resident input on community priorities.
Dillavou	To ensure that the Plan remains up-to-date and continues to reflect community values, Plano will require all development proposals that exceed the density limits of the Future Land Use Category Dashboard to undergo a Plan amendment process before being considered for approval. <del>and will</del> While the update process should be relatively infrequent, at regular intervals the city should seek to engage in regular Plan updates involving residents and other constituencies for input on community priorities. When it is apparent that many requests for amendments are being received, a formal amendment process should be undertaken to assess the community's desires.
La Mastra	To ensure that the Plan remains up-to-date and continues to reflect community values, Plano <del>should not consider any</del> will require all development proposals that exceed the density limits of the Future Land Use Category Dashboard. <del>to undergo a Plan amendment process before being considered for approval, and will engage in regular Plan updates involving resident input on community priorities.</del>
Solomon	To ensure that the Plan remains up-to-date and continues to reflect community values, Plano will require all development proposals that exceed the density and height limits of the Future Land Use Category Dashboard to undergo a Plan amendment process before being considered for approval, and will engage in regular Plan updates involving resident input on community priorities.
<b><u>PMA1)</u></b> <b><u>As Presented</u></b> <b><u>11/20/2020</u></b>	<b>Develop a detailed Plan Map Amendment process, including but not limited to standards such as a minimum acreage, notification procedures, and timelines to accept amendment applications.</b>
Dillavou	Develop a detailed Plan Map Amendment process, including but not limited to standards such as a minimum acreage, notification procedures, and timelines to accept amendment applications. In many cases, it would make sense to accumulate requests and so that several can be considered at once (e.g., in annual cycle).
Solomon	Develop a detailed Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment process, including but not limited to standards such as a minimum acreage, notification procedures, and timelines to accept amendment applications. The Amendment process will include scheduled comprehensive plan reviews done every five(?) years and ad-hoc review process initiated by proposed development or redevelopment that is incompatible with the plan in existence at the time.

**Commented [CW7]:**  
**Larry Howe:** Based on the level of buildout of Plano is (or would) this policy considered a best practice by the American Planning Association (or other professional organizations) based on lessons learned from other cities? Are there any cities in North Texas or other parts of Texas that have already implemented this type of policy? If so, what has been their experience so far?

**Commented [CS8]:**  
**Jim Dillavou:** I do not agree with such dashboard limits.

**Commented [CW9]:**  
**Larry Howe:** OK with this action statement.

**Jack Liu:** PMA1 can be removed. It is not necessary. The city can develop a detailed Plan Map Amendment process if needed. But it is not necessary to make a requirement here.

**Commented [CS10]:**  
**Jim Dillavou:** A pro forma or model of the key components should be provided as annex to this document to assure it has adequate provisions for notification

Optional Policies and Action Statements  
 Consolidated CPRC Feedback  
 December 1, 2020

**PMA2)**  
**As**  
**Presented**  
**11/20/2020**

As part of the Plan amendment process, require developers to provide the following data and information relating to their proposal as part of their petition. This data should be backed by current, local data and studies from related professions, whenever available. City staff may also make related information available. This includes, but is not limited to:

- Impacts to existing neighborhoods;
- Impacts to public infrastructure, public safety operations, and school capacity;
- Impacts to the environment, including drainage, flooding, and air/water quality;
- The appropriate mix of uses in the development and overall balance with the surrounding area;
- Impacts to traffic congestion;
- Provision of open and green space and other amenities for existing and future residents;
- Design considerations (height, screening, buffering, nuisance mitigation, noise, odor, architectural design, etc.); and
- Market support for development and an explanation of why the proposed development cannot be achieved under existing Plan policies or zoning.

City staff may determine the appropriate parameters and methodology for developers to use in responding to the requirements above.

Dillavou

As part of the Plan amendment process, require developers to provide the following data and information relating to their proposal as part of their petition. This data should be backed by current, local data and studies from related professions, whenever available. City staff ~~may should~~ also make related information available to residents to facilitate their evaluation. This includes, but is not limited to:

- How the amendment deviates from the current Plan, the current zoning, how the resulting potential development could deviate from existing zoning and the potential Impacts to existing neighborhoods;
- Impacts to public infrastructure, public safety operations, and school capacity;
- Impacts to the environment, including drainage, flooding, and air/water quality;
- The appropriate mix of uses and housing types in the development and overall balance of housing types with the surrounding area, and with Plano's suburban community goals;
- Impacts to traffic congestion;
- Provision of open and green space and other amenities for existing and future residents;
- Design considerations (height, screening, buffering, nuisance mitigation, noise, odor, architectural design, etc.); and
- Market support for development and an explanation of why the proposed development ~~cannot be achieved under~~ deviates from existing Plan policies or zoning and is preferable to development envisioned by the existing Plan.

(continued on next page)

**Commented [CW11]:**

**Larry Howe:** Is (or would) this requirement be considered a best practice by the American Planning Association (or other professional organizations) based on lessons learned from other cities? Are there any cities in North Texas or other parts of Texas that have already implemented this type of requirement? If so, what has been their experience so far?

Optional Policies and Action Statements  
 Consolidated CPRC Feedback  
 December 1, 2020

<p>La Mastra</p>	<p>City staff <del>may</del><u>should</u> determine the appropriate parameters and methodology for developers to use in responding to the requirements above <u>and should supplement such information as needed. Such guidelines should emphasize balanced and full disclosure, not developers' hyperbole and misinformation. An example of such misinformation is that developers will tell a neighborhood that he has the existing right to build 25 stories on his land and tell the neighborhood that his proposal is a gift. He fails to mention that the zoning on his land includes a limitation of the floor to area ratio (FAR) of 0.5 to 1. This FAR means that highly unlikely that building even a 12-story building could be economically justified, let alone a 25-story building. The Neighborhood needs Planning's help dispelling such information.</u></p> <p>As part of the Plan amendment process, require developers to provide the following data and information relating to their proposal as part of their petition. This data should be backed by current, local data and studies from related professions, whenever available. City staff may also make <u>all relative</u> <del>related</del> information available <u>to citizens</u>. This includes, but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Impacts to existing neighborhoods;</u></li> <li>• <u>How the plan may differ from the existing zoning</u></li> <li>• Impacts to public infrastructure, public safety operations, and school capacity;</li> <li>• Impacts to the environment, including drainage, flooding, and air/water quality;</li> <li>• The appropriate mix of uses <u>and housing types</u> in the development and overall balance with the surrounding area;</li> <li>• Impacts to traffic congestion;</li> <li>• Provision of open and green space and other amenities for existing and future residents;</li> <li>• Design considerations (height, screening, buffering, nuisance mitigation, noise, odor, architectural design, etc.); and</li> <li>• Market support for development and an explanation of why the proposed development cannot be achieved under existing Plan policies or zoning.</li> </ul> <p>City staff <del>must</del><u>may</u> determine the appropriate parameters and methodology for developers to use in responding to the requirements above <u>and not allow the developers to mislead the residents with false statements or "bait &amp; switch" the options for the property.-</u></p>
<p>Solomon</p>	<p>As part of the <u>ad-hoc</u> Plan amendment process, require developers to provide the following data and information relating to their proposal as part of their petition. This data should be backed by current, local data and studies from related <del>professions</del><u>professionals</u>, whenever available. City staff may also make related information available. This includes, but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts to existing neighborhoods;</li> <li>• Impacts to public infrastructure, public safety operations, and school <u>capacity</u>;</li> <li>• Impacts to the environment, including drainage, flooding, and air/water quality;</li> </ul> <p>(continued on next page)</p>

**Commented [CW12]:**  
 Yoram Solomon: It's more than capacity. The increase in rental property percentage increases mobility, which has a dramatic impact on school performance.

Optional Policies and Action Statements  
Consolidated CPRC Feedback  
December 1, 2020

<b>Plan Map Amendments (Bundle 23)</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The appropriate mix of uses in the development and overall balance with the surrounding area;</li> <li>• Impacts to traffic congestion;</li> <li>• Provision of open and green space and other amenities for existing and future residents;</li> <li>• Design considerations (height, screening, buffering, nuisance mitigation, noise, odor, architectural design, etc.); and</li> <li>• <u>Market support for development and an explanation of why the proposed development cannot be achieved under existing Plan policies or zoning.</u></li> <li>• <u>Impact to the city budget, including analysis of the incremental property tax revenue and budget impact of the new development.</u></li> </ul> <p><u>Not all requirements above would be applicable for every application.</u> City staff may determine the appropriate parameters and methodology for developers to use in responding to the requirements above.</p>
<p><b><u>PMA3)</u></b> <b><u>As Presented</u></b> <b><u>11/20/2020</u></b></p>	<p><b>Develop and implement a formalized community forum process during which Plan Map Amendment petitioners engage with interested citizens and property owners as part of the map amendment process.</b></p>
Shockey	<p><u>As part of the Plan Map Amendment process,</u> <del>Develop and implement a formalized community forum process during which Plan Map Amendment petitioners engage with interested citizens and property owners</del> <u>to seek input and approval of any changes</u> <del>as part of the map amendment process.</del></p>
Solomon	<p>Develop and implement a formalized community forum process during which Plan <del>Map</del> Amendment petitioners engage with interested citizens and property owners as part of the map amendment process. <u>While it is understood that not all citizens would agree with the final decision, a genuine effort would be made to collect significant citizen and property owner input and to project it when not enough input was collected, after a genuine effort was made.</u></p>
Wilson	<p>Develop and implement a formalized community forum process during which Plan Map Amendment petitioners engage with interested citizens and property owners as part of the map amendment process. <u>This process makes an aggressive attempt to gather information directly from individual homeowners and citizens. Input from third party sources, such as HOA board members, are considered but only as a citizen or individual but not as a spokesperson for an entire community. I would like more detail in here, as develop and implement is too generic for me.</u></p>

**Commented [CW13]:**  
**Jim Dillavou:** Need to discuss specifics on how these forums occur and how the information is disseminated. Keep the developer from controlling the meeting and disseminating inaccurate information.  
**Larry Howe:** OK with this action statement.  
**Jack Liu:** PMA3 can be removed. It is not necessary. Same as PMA1, the city can develop and implement a formalized community forum process if needed. But it is not necessary to make a requirement here.

Optional Policies and Action Statements  
 Consolidated CPRC Feedback  
 December 1, 2020

Plan Map Amendments (Bundle 23)	
<b><u>PMA4)</u></b> <b><u>As Presented</u></b> <b><u>11/20/2020</u></b>	<b>Review the effectiveness of the Density Guidance Map after one year of implementation, or earlier if needed, and make necessary adjustments that continue to meet the intent established by the Comprehensive Plan Review Committee.</b>
Wilson	Review the effectiveness of the Density Guidance Map after <del>one year</del> <b>5 years</b> of implementation, or earlier if needed, and make necessary adjustments that continue to meet the intent established by the Comprehensive Plan Review Committee.
<b><u>PMA5)</u></b> <b><u>As Presented</u></b> <b><u>11/20/2020</u></b>	<b>Review and update the Future Land Use Map and Density Guidance Map every two years, or more often as needed, to update density thresholds and growth management priorities.</b>
Dillavou	Review and update the Future Land Use Map and Density Guidance Map every <del>two</del> <b>five</b> years, or more often as needed, to update density thresholds and growth management priorities.
La Mastra	Review and update the Future Land Use Map and Density Guidance Map every <del>five</del> <b>two</b> years, or more often as needed, to update density thresholds and growth management priorities.
Shockey	Review and update the Future Land Use Map and Density Guidance Map every <del>two</del> <b>five</b> years, or more often as needed, to update density thresholds and growth management priorities.
Wilson	Review and update the Future Land Use Map and Density Guidance Map every <del>two</del> <b>five</b> years, <del>or more often as needed,</del> to update density thresholds and growth management priorities.

**Commented [CW14]:**  
**Larry Howe:** OK with this action statement.

**Mary Jacobs:** I can see the potential need for tweaking going forward, but an annual (Density Guidance) or biennial (FLUM) review seems like a lot of additional effort for staff/citizens and could make long-term planning impossible for developers. I'm all for setting a high bar for developers, but moving the bar often, no. Think that would be bad for Plano as well as developers. I would like to hear staff's thoughts on this.

**Yoram Solomon:** By whom?

**Commented [CW15]:**  
**Jeff Beckley:** Update, as necessary

**Larry Howe:** Question to staff and consultants - Would three or five years (vs 2 years) be a more practical and effective time period for review and update? Is 2 years to frequent?

**Mary Jacobs:** I can see the potential need for tweaking going forward, but an annual (Density Guidance) or biennial (FLUM) review seems like a lot of additional effort for staff/citizens and could make long-term planning impossible for developers. I'm all for setting a high bar for developers, but moving the bar often, no. Think that would be bad for Plano as well as developers. I would like to hear staff's thoughts on this.

**Yoram Solomon:** By whom?

Optional Policies and Action Statements  
Consolidated CPRC Feedback  
December 1, 2020

<b>Plan Map Amendments (Bundle 23)</b>	
<b><u>PMA6)</u></b> <b><u>As Presented</u></b> <b><u>11/20/2020</u></b>	<b>Review and update the remaining maps (other than PMA4) of the Comprehensive Plan on a rotating basis, one per year, or more often as needed, to update data and review the effectiveness of the information on guiding policy consistent with current standards.</b>
Dillavou	<a href="#">Beginning in year 5</a> , Review and update the remaining maps (other than PMA4) of the Comprehensive Plan on a <a href="#">five-year</a> rotating basis, one per year, or more often as needed, to update data and review the effectiveness of the information on guiding policy consistent with current standards. <a href="#">Significant changes may require a plan amendment process.</a>
La Mastra	Review and update the remaining maps (other than PMA4) of the Comprehensive Plan on a rotating basis, <a href="#">every five <del>one per</del> years</a> , or more often as needed, to update data and review the effectiveness of the information on guiding policy consistent with current standards.
Shockey	Review and update the remaining maps (other than PMA4) of the Comprehensive Plan on a rotating basis, <del>one per year, or more often as needed</del> , to update data and review the effectiveness of the information on guiding policy consistent with current standards.
<b><u>PMA7)</u></b> <b><u>As Presented</u></b> <b><u>11/20/2020</u></b>	<b>Publish an annual update on the prioritization, status, timing, and any staff comments regarding actions in the Comprehensive Plan. Include related items regarding the use of the Plan in regard to zoning, land use, infrastructure capacity, budgeting, capital improvements, and other related programs. Present the update to City Council and Planning &amp; Zoning Commission in public meetings.</b>

**Commented [CW16]:**  
Jeff Beckley: Update, as necessary  
Larry Howe: OK with this action statement.

**Commented [CW17]:**  
Larry Howe: OK with this action statement.

Optional Policies and Action Statements  
 Consolidated CPRC Feedback  
 December 1, 2020

Plan Map Amendments (Bundle 23)	
<b><u>PMA8)</u></b> <b><u>As Presented 11/20/2020</u></b>	<b>Review and update at least 10% of the policy statements (with related actions, associated website context, and other content) annually or more often as needed, to maintain current status, relevant data, and review the effectiveness of the information on guiding policy consistent with current community standards.</b>
Dillavou	Review and update at least 10% of the policy statements (with related actions, associated website context, and other content) <del>annually</del> <u>every 10 years</u> or more often as needed, to maintain current status, relevant data, and review the effectiveness of the information on guiding policy consistent with current community standards.
La Mastra	Review and update at least 10% of the policy statements (with related actions, associated website context, and other content) <u>every five years</u> <del>annually</del> or more often as needed, to maintain current status, relevant data, and review the effectiveness of the information on guiding policy consistent with current community standards.
Shockey	Review and update <del>at least 10% of</del> the policy statements (with related actions, associated website context, and other content) <del>annually or more often</del> as needed, to maintain current status, relevant data, and review the effectiveness of the information on guiding policy consistent with current community standards.
Solomon	<del>Review and update at least 10% of the policy statements (with related actions, associated website context, and other content) annually or more often as needed, to maintain current status, relevant data, and review the effectiveness of the information on guiding policy consistent with current community standards.</del> <u>Once every five(?) years, establish a Comprehensive Plan Review Committee made up of Plano citizens representing as broad a section of the Plano community as possible to review the entire plan and update it.</u>
<b><u>PMA9)</u></b> <b><u>As Presented 11/20/2020</u></b>	<b>Consider a full review of the Comprehensive Plan each decade by a citizen committee, working collaboratively with the Planning &amp; Zoning Commission, if directed by City Council when warranted by changes in the community.</b>
Doyle	Consider a full review of the Comprehensive Plan <del>each decade</del> <u>every five years</u> by a citizen committee, working collaboratively with the Planning & Zoning Commission, if directed by City Council when warranted by changes in the community.
<b><u>PMA10)</u></b>	<i>This action was not originally presented as part of this bundle. The comment below is proposed as an additional action.</i>
Shockey	<u>Require a 75% affirmation vote of the Planning &amp; Zoning Commission and a super majority (67%) affirmation vote of the City Council to approve changes or updates to the Comprehensive Plan.</u>

**Commented [CW18]:**  
 Jeff Beckley: Update, as necessary  
 Larry Howe: OK with this action statement.  
 Jack Liu: PMA8 can be removed. This one can be combined into PMA5 and PMA9

**Commented [CW19]:**  
 Yoram Solomon: I'm not big on incrementalism. Plus, how do you decide which 10%? You might end up not modifying a certain section for 10 years. I don't like piece-milling this process.

**Commented [CW20]:**  
 Larry Howe: Would like to hear feedback from the staff on the effectiveness and practicality of this action statement.

Will there be a way over time to measure the advantages or disadvantages of our Comprehensive Plan approaches regarding (1) the quality of life of our citizens, (2) the impact of future property taxes and tax revenues and the city's ability to provide high quality services, and (3) sustaining balanced economic activity.

Jack Liu: PMA9 (incorrectly marked as PMA8). A full review of the Comprehensive Plan every decade might be too long. Maybe we change every decade to every four year?

Yoram Solomon: I don't like the non-committed language ("Consider," "if directed," "when warranted." These are too subjective and open to interpretation. I like the predictability of doing it every five (or so) years, period.

Especially since you named both PMA8 (...), there really should only be one, and I don't think the process should wait 10 years. Too long. You will end up with a plan with too many patches that might not make sense with one another. If the process only looks at 10% of the plan, the people working on the modification may not have enough focus on the big picture.