Location:

35.20 acres

Applicant:

Trenton Robertson (Masterplan) Nicholas Balsamo (Kalterra)

Item for approval:

Zoning Change (Case22-058)



<u>Comprehensive Plan</u>

Transit Oriented District (TOD)









Proposed phasing:

North Site would be Phase 1 with core Civic/Open Space required to be completed prior to issuance of any Certificate of Occupancies. Market would dictate whether West or East Site would be Phase 2.





Proposed Density: Overall -747 units total — 21.22 DU/acre

North Residential Site	East Residential Site	West Residential Site
10.28 dwelling units per acre	31.35 dwelling units per acre	23.61 dwelling units per acre



Notable changes with current zoning proposal:

- Multifamily is not required to have rear loaded parking.
- Off street parking lots no longer limited to a 65 foot maximum width along Hulen and Alsbury.
- Multifamily apartments (non-endcap or live-work mixed-use apartments) now allowed by right.
- Multifamily is allowed to have a smaller minimum dwelling unit size than what would be allowed in previous PD, reduced minimum unit size from 750 SF to 600 SF
- Mixed-use and multifamily apartments allowed up to 4 stories by right
- Increasing maximum lot coverage for multifamily from 70% to
 80%
- Added metal as finish option and changed warranty from 50 to 30 years for cementitious-fiber clapboard.
- Increased minimum tree caliper and landscaping.
- All townhomes will be on individually platted lots.



Utilities/Drainage:

 Detention is required for developments 1 acre in size or larger; however, none is shown on the conceptual site plan. Detention of storm water shall be incorporated into the design of the Development.

• Water is provided for a portion of the Development by the City of Burleson and the remainder provided by JCSUD. The Development is proposing two separate water systems at this time. Sanitary sewer will be extended by the Development from an existing sewer line located adjacent at the intersection of Alsbury Boulevard and Candler Drive.

Traffic:

The access to the mixed-use development including space for restaurant/retail, multifamily, and townhomes. Based on information provided by the developer, the development is anticipated to include approximately 50,000 square feet of commercial space (assumed to be 25,000 square feet of restaurant and 25,000 square feet of general retail), 615 multifamily units, and 144 townhomes. Build-Out of the development is anticipated to be completed by 2027. A traffic impact analysis has been submitted and is currently being reviewed. The report indicated that access would be provided by four (4) proposed access connections; three (3) connections to Hulen Street and one (1) connection to Alsbury Boulevard, and that northbound right-turn auxiliary lanes should be constructed along Hulen Street (1 drive only) and Alsbury Boulevard. The traffic engineering consultant for the City has not given final approval to the TIA therefore neither has the Development Services Department.

Legend

- Public Hearing Notice Public notices mailed to property owners within 300 feet of subject property.
- Published in newspaper Signs Posted on the property



Staff's Recommendation

 Staff recommends denial of the zoning change request due to the proposed changes that would allow a greater residential density at the 4 story level height, without a proportional increase in the amount of commercial and retail or civic open spaces.

 The commercial/retail component of this area comprises approximately 50,000 gross SF, while the multifamily components compromise a disproportionately larger percentage of the 35 acre site.
 Additionally the lack of vertical mixed-use components, a parking structure, and features that could be considered as a benefit to the public make this project less desirable than what exists in the current PD outlined in ordinance D-065-06.



P&Z Action Requested

- 1. Open the Public Hearing;
- 2. Close the Public Hearing; and
- Recommend disapproval of a zoning change request from "PD" Planned Development District to "PD" Planned Development District (Case 22-026).



Questions/Discussion