

MINUTES
Main Street Board
Meeting Minutes of August 22, 2016

The Main Street Development and Preservation Board of the City of Cedar Hill, Texas, met Monday, August 22, 2016, at 6:00 pm. in the *4th Floor Conference Room of the Cedar Hill Government Center, 285 Uptown Blvd., Cedar Hill, Texas.

The following members were present; Al Armistead, Albert Mack, Randy Moon, Pamela Morris, Norman Patten, Gordon Penelton and Gary Reed. Gabriel Allred and Alice Atchison were absent with prior notice. The following City Staff members were present: LaShondra Stringfellow, Assistant Planning Director and Patricia Bushart, Tourism Marketing/Main Street Manager. The board was joined by guest Steve Smith, Leadership Southwest and Best Southwest Partnership.

I. Call the Meeting to order.

Chair Gary Reed called the meeting to order at 6:04 pm declaring it an open meeting with notice of the meeting duly posted and a quorum present.

II. Approve the Minutes of the June 20, 2016 Special Called Meeting.

Norman Patten made a motion, seconded by Pamela Morris, to approve the minutes of the June 20, 2016, Special Called Meeting. The motion was approved unanimously.

III. Review and Recommend Action regarding request for alternative design standards to site plan for fuel station located at 605 Uptown Boulevard, requested by Brian Rose on behalf of Bassam Ziada for Murphy Oil Fuel Station.

Ms. Stringfellow outlined the components of the site plan for which the Main Street Board, acting in the capacity of Architectural Review Board (ARB), were to review and recommend action, those being; 1) Roof Requirements and, 2) Parking Lot Location and Screening Requirements. Applicant representatives Bassam Ziada and Pou Chin were present to address any questions.

In the first alternative, the canopy proposal in question was similar to a mansard roof and therefore could satisfy one of the element requirements of two or more roof slope planes and the height of the canopy essentially concealed the flatness of the roof from public view, therefore meeting a second requirement.

In the second alternative, while the drive area at the extreme northeast corner of the site did not meet the 30' setback requirement, the proposed design included enhanced landscaping that exceeded requirements and improved vehicular circulation as it related to the adjacent property.

In a related discussion outside the board's purview as ARB for this specific site plan, they

**Meeting relocated to second floor Planning Conference Room*

suggested substituting a hardier decorative grass, possibly Parson's Juniper, for the Gulf Coast Mulhy shown on the landscaping plan, as being better suited for the local climate. The applicants agreed to take the board's recommendation into consideration.

Al Armistead made a motion, seconded by Norman Patten, to forward a recommendation to Planning and Zoning to accept the request for alternative design as submitted. The motion was approved unanimously.

IV. Receive Update of the City Center Development Code Assessment Report.

Ms. Stringfellow briefed the board on the report provided, highlighting significant changes to the current ordinance and procedure(s):

1. Concept of site plan reviews and proposed changes:
 - a. Streamlining (page 23)
 - b. Establishing criteria for classification of submittals as minor or major and delegating:
 - i. Minor = staff review
 - ii. Major = Planning and Zoning Commission review
 - iii. Minor and major plans, when reviewed and passed, would appear as consent items on City Council agenda
 - c. Only politically sensitive plans would require full City Council consideration and approval
 - d. Frees up boards for other activities
2. Number of zones reduced from twelve (12) to five (5). See chart page 8 with more detailed description on pages 11 and 14.
 - a. Greatly simplified, more unified, easier to understand and to implement.

The board discussion included the following:

- Concerns about elimination of 'other set of eyes'
- Site plans need input from other sources
- Staff missing ARB site review triggers now as it is
- Simplification noted in 2. a. is zoning and/or simplification of review?
- Engineering is biggest headache particularly in Historic Downtown district
- Board agreed on need for general process overhaul

The board presented the following ideas and recommendations for consideration:

1. Create process for cursory look by Main Street, via email or closed group, for those site plans specific to Urban General-Historic District (UG-HD) or those requesting variances or alternative design.
2. Take Main Street Board out of Midtown review process.
3. Require applicants to appear at Design Review Committee (DRC) meetings to receive first-person comments.
 - a. Ms. Stringfellow noted that DRC process was currently under review and that planning is working to have online, digital plan review available soon.