

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE
DGM Questionnaire – Combined Results



Section 1 of 2 | Please select the answer you most identify with in regards to the Density Guidance Map and Categories.

1. The Density Guidance Map will be a useful tool to manage and guide residential density in Plano.
 - Strongly Agree (1) Yoram Solomon
 - Agree (7) Jim Dillavou, Carolyn Doyle, Larry Howe, Mary Jacobs, Doug Shockey, Salvator La Mastra, Sara Wilson
 - Undecided (1) Jeff Beckley,
 - Disagree (1) Michael Lin
 - Strongly Disagree (1) Jaci Crawford

2. The “How to use the Density Guidance Map” process is user-friendly and understandable.
 - Strongly Agree (0)
 - Agree (10) Jaci Crawford, Jim Dillavou, Carolyn Doyle, Larry Howe, Mary Jacobs, Michael Lin, Doug Shockey, Yoram Solomon, Salvator La Mastra, Sara Wilson
 - Undecided (1) Jeff Beckley,
 - Disagree (0)
 - Strongly Disagree (0)

3. The Density Guidance Map thresholds are appropriate and accurately represent the existing and anticipated levels of density in Plano.
 - Strongly Agree (0)
 - Agree (3) Carolyn Doyle, Larry Howe, Mary Jacobs
 - Undecided (3) Jeff Beckley, Doug Shockey, Yoram Solomon
 - Disagree (2) Jim Dillavou, Michael Lin
 - Strongly Disagree (3) Jaci Crawford, Salvator La Mastra, Sara Wilson

4. The criteria to analyze residential uses that exceed density thresholds are appropriate and will help ensure that redevelopment project are suitable and compatible with the existing community context.
 - Strongly Agree (0)
 - Agree (3) Larry Howe, Mary Jacobs, Yoram Solomon
 - Undecided (2) Jeff Beckley, Carolyn Doyle
 - Disagree (4) Jim Dillavou, Michael Lin, Doug Shockey, Sara Wilson
 - Strongly Disagree (2) Jaci Crawford, Salvator La Mastra

5. The Density Guidance Map is a tool that should only be utilized in conjunction with Bundle 24.
 - Strongly Agree (0)
 - Agree (2) Jeff Beckley, Carolyn Doyle
 - Undecided (6) Jaci Crawford, Jim Dillavou, Larry Howe, Mary Jacobs, Doug Shockey, Sara Wilson
 - Disagree (3) Michael Lin, Yoram Solomon, Salvator La Mastra
 - Strongly Disagree (0)

Commented [KP1]: Larry Howe: (wouldn't it be used to determine if a plan amendment might be appropriate - bundle 23?)

Section 2 of 2 | Please type your thoughts, comments, or edits to the Density Guidance Map and Categories.

6. What are your initial thoughts on the Density Guidance Map concept? If any, what are your biggest concerns about the Density Guidance Map?

Jeff Beckley - I like the concept of the DGM but I am concerned about how the tool will be explained and implemented with development projects. In general concept, it is a measurable way to help ensure residential development is consistent with surrounding neighborhoods. My biggest concern is that it seems likely to inhibit important projects and may have the unintended consequence of stifling attainable and affordable housing in Plano.

Jaci Crawford - It's an invitation to developers to justify more density

Jim Dillavou - The concept has merit; however, the issue is that it appears to open up way too much of Plano to re-development or inappropriate development. It implies residential development is appropriate almost anywhere that retail exists. Regardless it is clear that developers will immediately go to at least the upper limit of the dashboards which are generally too high.

Carolyn Doyle - The Density Guidance Maps with Categories defined are helpful because they show the process flow starting from the Rezoning Request to whether Density is supported for Future Land Use.

Larry Howe - Generally agree with the concept. A concern might be – will it be overly burdensome for city staff to use and maintain.

Mary Jacobs - I think we need to strike the right balance between specificity and micromanaging. At this point it feels a bit too much like the latter, but I need to think on this more.

Salvator La Mastra - I don't like it since it opens up too much of Plano for high density development of all retail sites. The developers will take advantage of this and cram as many apartments into the space as allowed by the density guidance will allow which is way too much. The only option being pushed are apartments....

Michael Lin - I dislike it – again, I see it as a way to micromanage change in Plano. It's not forward thinking enough – it's a retrospective document that considers the past more than the future. I also think City Council and other leaders have done an amazing job. We don't need to micromanage them or P&Z, since we aren't elected officials and in my personal opinion don't represent Plano well.

Doug Shockey - Initially, I like the concept. Perhaps too much reliance will be placed on the DGM. I would like to see the primary reliance be on the density limitations in the Dashboards.

Yoram Solomon - Well, I'm obviously in support of it... I have three concerns. One is that I believe it should include height limitations (based on surrounding neighborhoods). There are obviously different ways to achieve the same density. The second is that I think we should also have city-wide caps. We are looking at density in a very local way, but what should the overall density be in the city? The third is that

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE
DGM Questionnaire – Combined Results



I'm not sure how current zoning plays into it. We may have a great density/height guidance map, but what if the current zoning allows more than the map would guide?

7. What questions do you have about how to read the Density Guidance Map? Are there any improvements that could be made to the colors, legend, symbology, etc.?

[Jeff Beckley](#) - I like to readability of the DGM. Again, I am concerned about how easily the DGM can be explained and implemented. I have no suggestions for improvement

[Jaci Crawford](#) – None

[Jim Dillavou](#) - See comments on Map sent separately.

[Carolyn Doyle](#) - Will every request need to comply with the Expressway Corridor Environmental Health Policy? Detailed information is provided so no improvements to be made on Map.

[Larry Howe](#) - There are not enough colors to easily distinguish the tones, so it is important to include the DUA numbers in the map as has been done with the recent map distribution.

[Mary Jacobs](#) - More contrasty color differentiation might be helpful.

[Salvator La Mastra](#) - Colors are confusing on the map since they are very similar, need a more drastic color variation for the map to be read clearly.

[Michael Lin](#) – No

[Doug Shockey](#) - Colors could be improved.

[Yoram Solomon](#) - None. See above.

8. What questions do you have about how to read the Density Guidance Map Categories? What information would be helpful to include in the Density Guidance Map Categories?

[Jeff Beckley](#) - No suggestions

[Jaci Crawford](#) – None

[Jim Dillavou](#) - See comments on DGM Categories sent separately.

[Carolyn Doyle](#) - No questions about how to read Map Categories.

Add (FLU) after 'Future Land Use' in first paragraph third line. This will help when reviewing the Density Thresholds.

[Larry Howe](#) - No comments.

[Salvator La Mastra](#) - See map comments

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE
DGM Questionnaire – Combined Results



Michael Lin - We need to be consistent in messaging. You cannot micromanage residential density and do nothing about commercial density. If the goal of this committee is to control traffic, lower the probability of events requiring police/fire, etc., we need to not focus on half of the problem. The problem is not solely dense living structures.

Doug Shockey - No Questions.

Yoram Solomon - None. See above.

9. What questions do you have about the Density Guidance Map Categories? Do you agree with this process? Should any steps be added and/or removed?

Jeff Beckley - I would like to see a streamlined process that helps encourage projects to the community. The less red tape, the better

Jaci Crawford - I strongly disagree with SA. There is far too much residential density. I don't agree Expy Corridors should include residential. Identifying every corner for red-development seems unrealistic. Some may exist and be appropriate with face lifts and landscaping. Including residential DUA means more density

Jim Dillavou - I do not think Bundle 24 has enough requirements to be effective. See comments on Bundle sent separately. We need to discuss the "Flagstaff Provisions for public participation"

Carolyn Doyle - The Density Guidance Map provides detail information. The statement that 'The effects of increased density will vary from location to location' communicates that a developer or investor will need to be knowledgeable about the land they need and determine what the land can be used for and plan accordingly to request rezoning if required.

Larry Howe - Ok with process and process description

Salvator La Mastra - See map comments

Michael Lin - Yes – we should trust the process and trust our city leaders, rather than a body of 16 individuals that do not represent Plano well.

Yoram Solomon - Again, I do think that a "total city density cap" should also be included.

10. What are your thoughts on the **Very Limited Circumstances** criteria? Are there any specific changes you would make to the criteria, including the text and listed Future Land Use Categories (N, EX, EX, OS, SN)?

Jeff Beckley - I don't understand this question. I don't know what the "Very Limited Circumstances" criteria is referring to. Does this refer to the Compatibility of New Uses matrix on the dashboard? If so, I assume "Very Limited Circumstances" is referring to the rating currently identified as "Compatible uses in limited circumstances."

Jaci Crawford - It doesn't matter whether you give one dot, 2, or 3. Developers will view as an invitation to add more density

Jim Dillavou - I don't see use of the term "very limited circumstances" with respect to EX. The Dashboards appear to open up the Expressway corridors to high density residential development.

Carolyn Doyle - Criteria is fine however for Very Limited circumstances for Expressway Corridors (EX) only.

Larry Howe - Assuming this is referring to the group "Areas of Minimal Change, I am OK with it.

Salvator La Mastra - I am confused with the EX category – I thought high density apartments were not going to go near the expressway due to pollution concerns? The dashboard clearly shows high density throughout the corridor.

Michael Lin - Very limited circumstances seem shortsighted. Again our neighborhoods are aging and unattractive. Not having the flexibility to incorporate different housing styles and types will continue to limit our ability to attract others to the city. We should be open minded to what could be built – it could be single family, it could be multifamily. Similarly in other land use categories, COVID-19 and other changes will affect how these spaces are used. We don't need to micromanage what we do 30 years from now.

Doug Shockey – Good

Yoram Solomon - I presume you are referring to the "Areas of Minimal Change?"

11. What are your thoughts on the **Redevelopment of Retail Corners** criteria? Are there any specific changes you would make to the criteria, including the text and listed Future Land Use Categories (NC, CC)?

Jeff Beckley - At this point I am wary of the impact the criteria will have on future growth in our community and long-term economic impact. I certainly recognize the need to be mindful of controlled future growth. But a burdensome and overly bureaucratic set of criteria may lead to employment and economic stagnation

Jaci Crawford - All are creating an opportunity to be developed as multi family rentals and increase density

Jim Dillavou - I have a problem with marking so many corners as if they will be redeveloped. I think this will be poorly received and is wrong.

Carolyn Doyle - Criteria is fine. Any retail redevelopment with residential uses include planned green spaces.

Larry Howe - OK with it. No recommended changes.

Salvator La Mastra - I think the plan is pushing the corner redevelopment too much. Very few corners in Plano are candidates for this in my opinion, however the city is pushing for ANY retail space, especially corners to be redeveloped with high density apartments.

Michael Lin – See 10

[Doug Shockey](#) – Good

12. What are your thoughts on the **Activity Areas** criteria? Are there any specific changes you would make to the criteria, including the text and listed Future Land Use Categories (SA, UA, DT)?

[Jeff Beckley](#) - See comments in #11

[Jaci Crawford](#) - Promote single family ownership were appropriate not multi midtown

[Jim Dillavou](#) - I wholly disagree with SA. The Urban Activity Areas are overly expansive. I do not understand how the Floor to Area ratios will be enforced.

[Carolyn Doyle](#) - Can we review the specifics of Small Area Plan for Activity Areas?

[Larry Howe](#) - OK with it. No recommended changes.

[Salvator La Mastra](#) - The urban activity area seems to be very large, I don't agree with the SA requirements as well as the DT requirements due to the high density.

[Michael Lin](#) - See 10

13. How frequently should the Density Guidance Map process, criteria and formula be evaluated for accuracy?

[Jeff Beckley](#) - The DGM should be reviewed at the end of 12 months (if not sooner) and every 2 -3 years thereafter. The review should consider the opportunity costs of projects lost or not considered as a result of the extra criteria.

[Jaci Crawford](#) - Depends on what may be approved

[Jim Dillavou](#) - At least 5 years between significant changes in criteria – as frequent changes will dilute public participation

[Carolyn Doyle](#) - Bi-Yearly / Every 2 years.

[Larry Howe](#) - Defer to staff's judgement on this.

[Salvator La Mastra](#) - I would suggest every three or five years

[Michael Lin](#) - As often as the city leaders see fit – let's trust that they can do their jobs. If not, vote them out.

[Yoram Solomon](#) - Every time a zoning decision is made, initially (maybe the first year, as Bundle 23(?) suggests). It really shouldn't take long. Just ask the question—does this process make sense? Is there a flaw in the process—fix it. If there is a flaw in the parameters of the process, fix it. Over time, the process will prove stable enough to not have to challenge it as frequently.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE
DGM Questionnaire – Combined Results



14. Please provide any additional comments or suggestions that you may have about the Density Guidance Map.

Jeff Beckley - I have an overarching concern that adding extra filters serves to inhibit redevelopment and increase project costs. The end results may further accelerate unattainability of housing for newcomers, young adults and essential service providers to our community including public safety and health care workers, teachers and community volunteers. The DGM seems redundant to the other filters already included in the dashboards (density limits, intensity & scale, height limits, setbacks and new uses).

Does the DGM further complicate an already burdensome process that will further discourage attainable housing and limit future employment and economic growth? If so, I will have a difficult time supporting this process.

Jaci Crawford - This committee was formed because citizens strongly objected to the PTP, so much so they filed a lawsuit and fought the city for years for a right to vote on the plan. They won and Council voted the PTP out.

In my opinion we started with a flawed directive. We were supposed to amend the PTP and find a way to make it acceptable to the many who opposed. Nothing presented to date has given the residents what they wanted: No more apartments. They want one story homes, smaller single story patio homes for residents wanting to downsize. They can accept attached single family, but not 15-22 DUA. They are alarmed our percentage of home ownership is now 60/40. We are below the national average. So how does this committee address and resolve the issues that resulted in the formation of this committee. Nothing we are being asked to approve resolves the problem, it only makes it worse by the possibility of increasing density.

Jim Dillavou - See markups to materials submitted. I think the process and meaning will be difficult to convey to the public at large.

Carolyn Doyle - Density Guidance Map clarifies residential density and provides the guidance for development of Land Use of residential and areas not supported.

Larry Howe - no additional comments.

Salvator La Mastra - As a committee we have had time to understand the map, however the general public will have difficulty understanding the map.

Michael Lin - Let's not keep micromanaging the city and pretending like we should be dictating what needs to be built everywhere for the next 30 years. I firmly believe the city leaders have done a great job or else they wouldn't be in office.