

**Section 1 of 2 | Please type your thoughts, comments, or edits to the Future Land Use Map Category Page Descriptions.**

1. What are your initial thoughts on the FLU dashboards?

- **Member Crawford:** The intensity scale percentages are too high: low 25-30, medium 30-50, high never 100. Retirement needs to be divided into 2 categories; retirement and senior living. Retirement requires, meals and transportation services. Senior 55+ which can include single detached, or apartments. 2 dots should read : could be compatible in limited circumstances. 1 question 1 dot. Midtown housing needs to come out of all categories. We already have a number of housing options which all include parking. Midtown does not. I believe there should be a 70% parking requirement. Open space should be labeled green space. Open space now can mean a concrete area with a fountain and no green.

- **Member Dillavou:** Too complex. I do not agree with some of the definitions – for instance intensity low should be up to 35 or 40% lot coverage medium should be 35 to 60%. High should max at 80%. I do not think anything should be 100% ever.

Low rise should be 3 stories or less. Open space – need a standard on green space not just open space. I do not think the FLU dashboard should be focused solely on “new uses”. Especially for areas that are conserve and enhance, it should include an emphasis on preserving what is already there. I believe one bubble should be defined as “Generally not compatible.” Two bubbles should be defined as compatible in limited circumstances. I do not understand the distinction of “primary use” versus “secondary use.” Generally, it is the location of the secondary use that creates the problem. E.g., if an area is mostly SF-D and someone wants to put a MF-3 project on 10% of the land in the middle of the development, that is likely a lot more problematic than putting the secondary use on the edge of the development.

- **Member Howe:** Lots of good information provided in a compact form. The dashboard format makes it easy to compare and contrast the different FLU categories which is very useful.
- **Member Kong:** I like them.
- **Member Lin:** From a presentation standpoint, the dashboards provide a nice, easy-to-follow summary of each land use category.

From an implementation perspective, the dashboards are a disappointing way to micromanage our city leadership (council, P&Z, etc.) and limit Plano’s ability to reach its vision. The vision of Plano is: “Plano is a global economic leader bonded by a shared sense of community where residents experience unparalleled quality of life.” The dashboards themselves do not appear to help Plano achieve this vision. How do these dashboards or maps (and more broadly, the Comp Plan) reach the vision? Which actions, policy statements, FLU dashboards, maps, etc. help us reach this aspirational vision?

The dashboards reflect a desire to restrict growth and/or density throughout the city. While I believe density is an issue for **some** residents, I believe that it is not an issue for all residents. For example, I see people of all ages having a great time at Shops of Legacy.

The FLU dashboards are overly prescriptive of what to do with residential areas, yet are under prescriptive of commercial areas (e.g., I don’t have an issue with density, but if some do...why not be consistent with how we manage density between residential and commercial areas?).

- **Chair Shockey:** I really like the concept. Great tool for citizens.

2. What questions do you have about how to read the FLU dashboards? What information would be helpful to include in the “How To” on Pages 1 and 2?
- **Member Crawford:** I think how to read dashboards is acceptable.
  - **Member Howe:** I am comfortable with the content and descriptions of these pages. I would recommend bolding the second sentence in the “description” section – These descriptions are aspirational in nature, indicating the desired future conditions.
  - **Member Kong:** How do the dots relate to the zoning process. Which dot would trigger the extra process we are contemplating.
  - **Member Lin:** No question on how to read the dashboards.  
There needs to be more flexibility on section 4 (Compatibility of New Uses). While in 2020 some of the land uses may not be appropriate, technological/environmental/social changes may change how the bubbles are filled in, even 5 or 10 years from now.
  - **Chair Shockey:** Good layout/Easy to read. I would change the definition of low-rise to 1 to 3 stories. I also think the intensity scale could change 0-40 on the low end. Also would like to understand the definition of open space and how it relates to each category.
3. Do you think the written descriptions of each FLU are an accurate representation of how these areas should develop? If not, which would you change and how?
- **Member Crawford:** They need revisions which are addressed in the categories
  - **Member Dillavou:** NO! See individual categories below. However, in general I cannot support Mid-Town housing in category because it is not a defined or accepted term. That is unacceptable to me. I think it is misleading. Our zoning standards define housing types SF-A, SF-D MF-1, MF-2, Patio Homes, etc. that have specific definitions on density, open space, parking, height etc. Midtown is none of that and the types generally should fit within a pre-existing zoning term. It seems to me that most Midtown housing could better described as “small scale multi-family” but would be defined to fit within MF-1 or MF-2 designations. Most importantly, it appears to me that much of what is called “middle housing” (or now redefined as midtown housing) is intended to skirt zoning requirements regarding open space and off-street parking. I think those rules are important.
  - **Member Howe:** I am comfortable with these descriptions.
  - **Member Lin:** Generally yes, but they should be more forward looking and contain more flexibility.
  - **Chair Shockey:** Definition of Neighborhoods should not include mixed-up development.

4. What are your thoughts on the **Neighborhoods (N)** category? Are there any specific changes you would make to the Neighborhoods dashboard?
- **Member Crawford:** No Midtown single or main street. I would give garden 2 dots as they are in many existing neighborhoods. True retirement is appropriate as I have defined. Senior as I have defined above; no
  - **Member Dillavou:** I do not support midtown housing see above. I do not understand Garden style MF being a single bubble. WE have thousands of garden style MF in existing neighborhoods that are preserve and enhance. I actually think they mostly fit where they are at and should be 2 bubbles. Meanwhile Mainstreet MF does not fit in neighborhoods. I think Retirement housing is a misnomer. It needs to be split into retirement housing that is for independent living and above and that category needs to require services be provided (offered) including meals, transportation, and recreation. I would distinguish that from senior housing, which is over 55 housing with no services. For neighborhoods, the inclusion of either senior housing or retirement housing is more about scale than whether it is for seniors or not. A four-story building in the middle of a neighborhood is just not appropriate no matter its purpose. Finally, the categories for Employment in the compatibility table should be modified or notated to state, "Employment – generally located at edge of a neighborhood along arterial streets." Even though that is in the text, many people will focus on the table and be taken aback seeing it in "neighborhood." Regarding "parking for non-residential, I don't really agree that parking at rear is preferred. Parking is often at the front of buildings for convenience and safety. Parking at rear is generally less safe. Some might think that is more aesthetic but aesthetics could be improved with landscaping. Finally, given that the average bus on Plano city streets has zero riders, I do not think that buses rate a medium.
  - **Member Howe:** I am comfortable with this category dashboard.
  - **Member Kong:** I think we need an additional dot for each of the midtown housing options
  - **Member Lin:**  
Specific changes:
    - More flexibility in housing options
      - Increase the dots for midtown housing up 1 or 2 dots each
      - Increase the dots for retirement housing up 1 dot
      - More focus on redevelopment and upkeep of aging stock
  - **Chair Shockey:** Density for "Other" is too high. I like 12.  
Reduce % of multifamily from 15% to 10% with single family at 80%.

5. What are your thoughts on the **Neighborhood Corners (NC – formerly Neighborhood Centers)** category? Are there any specific changes you would make to the Neighborhoods dashboard?

- **Member Crawford:** I'd remove Midtown and retirement. Density would be no more than 15. I'd change open to green space and include 70% off street parking.
- **Member Dillavou:** I do not support Midtown housing for the reasons discussed above. Similar to discussion in neighborhoods, I think garden style apartments are a part of corners and should not be rated a zero. I think it is important that there be adequate off-street parking for residents and on street parking should be used for overflow (visitors and some residents that have excess vehicles). While residents will inevitably use some of the street parking, there needs to be adequate parking so that that residents are not having to go down the block and park on someone else's street.

I think Retirement housing is a misnomer. It needs to be split into retirement housing that is for independent living and above and that category needs to require services be provided (offered) including meals, transportation, and recreation. I would distinguish that from senior housing, which is over 55 housing with no services. For neighborhoods, the inclusion of either senior housing or retirement housing is more about scale than whether it is for seniors or not. A four-story building at a neighborhood corner is just not appropriate no matter its purpose. I do think that for true retirement housing, there is more acceptance of some scale and density at neighborhood corners. I think the density should be limited to 16 DUA.

- **Member Howe:** I am comfortable with this category dashboard. I would recommend that "increase and improve walkability" be added to the "priorities" section on the second page.
- **Member Kong:** I think we need an additional dot for each of the midtown housing options

• **Member Lin:**

Specific changes:

- More flexibility in housing options:
  - Increase dots for single family (both SFD and SFA), midtown, and retirement housing
- **Member Liu (general comment specific to NC):** I looked through the material. I have no problem with the house type definition. However, regarding to the future land use map, I do have some thought. My suggestion is that not all Neighbour Corner, which are marked as TC and IR in the map, should have residential component in there. The city should experiment with a few places and evaluate the result. In the long run, I don't think there should be residential area in every Neighborhood Corner. We want diversity instead of the same pattern everywhere. I agree we should not dedicate which NC should have residential units and which one should not. However, if possible, I would like to set a cap on by 2050 on how many percentage of Neighborhood Corners will have residential units in there.
- **Chair Shockey:** Reduce density to "up to 15 DUA"

6. What are your thoughts on the **Community Corners (CC - NEW)** category? Are there any specific changes you would make to the CC dashboard?
- **Member Crawford:** Retirement only if redefined as above, and remove midtown. Parking requirement of 70% off street
  - **Member Dillavou:** The words “the big box retailer” should be “other big box retailer”  
Regarding the statement “are increasingly susceptible to decline” is not necessarily true or the problem. The issue in many cases is that retail was overbuilt from the start and the center never did develop.  
The statement, “residential uses are encouraged” should be “residential uses are acceptable.”  
I think that SF-A should be three bubbles.  
I do not agree with midtown housing for the reasons discussed above. Similar to discussion in neighborhoods, I think garden style apartments are a part of corners and should not be rated a zero. I think it is important that there be adequate off-street parking for residents and on street parking should be used for overflow (visitors and some residents that have excess vehicles). I think there is too much emphasis on Integrating streets into the network. I believe there are opportunities for neighborhoods, especially townhome developments where the preferred layout may be a self-contained development. Not everyone is in love with a mix of uses. Depending on the businesses that will remain in the corner and the size of the residential development, a self-contained development is more likely to offer amenities like a fitness center and pool than an area with short block grids.
  - **Member Howe:** I am comfortable with this category dashboard. I especially like the paragraph in the description section labeled as “Redevelopment and Innovative Concepts”. It is important to invite innovation into these areas to help them be relevant and sustainable for the next many decades. I would recommend that “increase and improve walkability” be added to the “priorities” section on the second page.
  - **Member Lin:**  
Specific changes:
    - More flexibility in housing options:
      - Increase dots for single family (both SFD and SFA), midtown, and retirement housing
  - **Chair Shockey:** I think we need to get away from the concept of community corners being a quadrant. Each corner should be evaluated on its own. This is where I have issues with the FLUM as well.
7. What are your thoughts on the approach to separating Neighborhood Corners from Community Corners? What improvements could be made, if any?
- **Member Crawford:** It’s an improvement. I’d increase SFD to 2 dots, SFA 3 dots, remove midtown, and retirement as I have redefined
  - **Member Dillavou:** I think it is appropriate to separate the two. Mostly, neighborhood corners are doing fine and do not need redevelopment and are not good candidates for such due to their relatively small size.
  - **Member Howe:** It is a good idea to have these two distinct categories because we have a wide range of corner developments (2,3, or 4 corners) and acreage sizes. It would be difficult to have only one category that covers all of them.
  - **Member Kong:** I would like to hear the criteria used for separating the two and making the determinations particularly when both include medium size.
  - **Member Lin:** It’s overly prescriptive and unnecessary. The two are similar and how these areas are developed or redeveloped will follow the guidance of the Comp Plan, along with P&Z/Council oversight.
  - **Chair Shockey:** Love the concept. I would have liked to break it out even more. As stated above, each corner should be considered on its own. We could have a corner where some are labeled as CC and some as NC.

8. What are your thoughts on the **Suburban Activity Centers (SA - formerly Regional Center)** category? Are there any specific changes you would make to the SA dashboard?

- **Member Crawford:** 75 DUA is way too much. I'd remove midtown, increase SFA to 3 dots and include garden style. There are no dots in this area and Preston Park area has around 1500 units, so why aren't there at least 2 dots. The new map greatly enlarged the Park Preston area. This has potential for far too many apartments.
- **Member Dillavou:** Midrise residential is a nonstarter for these areas except possibly Preston and Razor and Coit and George Bush where they already exist and the portion of Oakpoint where this was part of the Oakpoint plan. I disagree with the statement "residential development should be incorporated within cohesively planned mixed-use developments." I also disagree with the statement that they should be "destination shopping and entertainment areas." This is the same sort of hubris that caused Plano's retail to be grossly overbuilt to begin with. When we already have Legacy Town Center / Legacy West, coming Collin Creek Mall area and downtown Plano (not to mention Stonebriar), we must be realistic about what these areas will be. For example, at Preston-Park, people are never going to walk between the corners crossing 8 to 10 lanes of traffic. Therefore, we should be discussing each of the four corners as standalone redevelopment. That is not say redevelopment of one corner may help other corners, just that it is not going to be one huge walkable development. It is not what area residents want anyhow. They do not want 75 DUA. (75 DUA is totally inconsistent with moderate intensity). Autos will continue to be the primary (high) means of access. As to Main Street MF, I would rate it as a two at most using the scale discussed above and limiting to three stories.

Out city planners' obsession with "cohesively planned mixed use developments comprised of short blocks to make it "a highly walkable form" is overstated and trite and does not reflect what people really want. What we really want is solid development that is well utilized and removes excess retail space. We would all be happy if the excess retail was totally torn down and replaced with offices and homes. Replacing with more retail but calling it a mixed-use destination does not solve the over-retailing issue. Recently, Lucy Billingsley testified that at Austin Ranch (the Colony) the retail was unsuccessful and constantly turning over, despite being in a mixed-use setting with around 5,000 multi-family units.

I found it incredible that it was proposed to expand the Preston Park SA all the way south to Old Shepard North to Tulane and east to Ohio. That said, it does point out a number of factors. First of all, there are already about 2,500 MF units in the SA. Most area residents feel that is too many already. What would be appropriate to add would be SF-A, which is in short supply and more office.

- **Member Howe:** I am comfortable with this category dashboard.
- **Member Lin:**  
Specific changes:
  - More flexibility in housing options:
    - Increase dots for midtown, multifamily and retirement housing
- **Chair Shockey:** This is another area that I think could be broken into two. As large as these areas are the height, density, intensity and scale allowances could be too much for certain areas to handle. Especially where it is next to neighborhoods with no transition to Single family.

9. What are your thoughts on the **Urban Activity Centers (UA – formerly Compact Complete Center)** category? Are there any specific changes you would make to the UA dashboard?
- **Member Crawford:** These areas are either built or already approved, however the area from Plano Pkwy to 15 along Alma is an issue
  - **Member Dillavou:** Mostly these are already approved Planned Developments so not much to say. Again, I do not support the inclusion of Midtown Units for the reasons stated above.
  - **Member Howe:** I am comfortable with this category dashboard.
  - **Member Lin:**  
Specific changes:
    - More flexibility in housing options:
      - Increase dots for midtown, multifamily and retirement housing
10. What are your thoughts on the **Employment Centers (EC)** category? Are there any specific changes you would make to the EC dashboard?
- **Member Crawford:** I think the reference to the silver line and DFW airport in the description is inappropriate. The silver line is not near these areas unless on the East side. It is not reasonable to think these areas are going to utilize this form of transportation. On a note Evoke would not be considered appropriate on this map category
  - **Member Dillavou:** Mostly the areas identified as Employment Centers are appropriate. There needs to be more emphasis on appropriate transition in scale from residential areas and the fact that many areas are zoned Low intensity office with less than 50% FAR and those should generally remain that way.
  - **Member Howe:** I am comfortable with this category dashboard.
  - **Member Lin:**  
Specific changes:
    - More flexibility in housing options:
      - Increase dots for all housing – we need to get ahead of the work from home trend. It may still be a few years before some of these EC will change, but we should have some housing options available even if these areas remain large office buildings.

11. What are your thoughts on the **Downtown Corridors (DT – formerly Transit Corridors)** category? Are there any specific changes you would make to the DT dashboard?
- **Member Crawford:** 100 DUA is too high. I'd remove midtown and retirement
  - **Member Dillavou:** I do not support Midtown units for the reasons discussed above. I note that autos are rated medium for access because they may require a short walk but they are the primary mode of transportation and generally transit will require a longer walk. I agree that Mid-rise MF should be a one and that Main street MF and SF-A and SF-D should be the primary housing. The active open spaces requirement should be met by developers not by city funded projects.
  - **Member Howe:** I am comfortable with this category dashboard.
  - **Member Kong:** I like this new category, but I wish that there was still an extension of more intensive land use along Silver line and into Wylie
  - **Member Lin:**
    - More flexibility in housing options:
      - Increase dots for all housing
  - **Chair Shockey:** The defined area is too big for the concept of downtown. The area north of Park should be redesignated as N, NC, CC, or EX.  

Only a portion of what is designated as DT is considered to be truly historic. Preservation should be encouraged. In these areas, I don't see how 5 story buildings and high density are compatible with the historic character.
12. What are your thoughts on the **Expressway Corridors (EX)** category? Are there any specific changes you would make to the EX dashboard?
- **Member Crawford:** I do not believe residential is appropriate in these areas
  - **Member Dillavou:** I disagree with the statement that "residential development should be considered where necessary to revitalize declining commercial centers." That is the wrong approach – Residential development should be placed where it serves an appropriate purpose, not in a declining area. On bubble, using the scale I outlined above is appropriate.
  - **Member Howe:** I am comfortable with this category dashboard.
  - **Member Lin:**
    - More flexibility in housing options:
      - Increase dots for midtown, multifamily and retirement housing
13. What are your thoughts on the **Social Network** category? Are there any specific changes you would make to the SN dashboard?
- **Member Crawford:** OK with this area
  - **Member Dillavou:** No
  - **Member Howe:** I am comfortable with this category dashboard.
  - **Member Lin:**
    - More flexibility in housing options:
      - Increase dots for all housing – we need to be prepared if a school were to close. It may still be a few years before a school closes, but we should have some housing options available.
  - **Chair Shockey:** Good

14. What are your thoughts on the **Open Space Network (OS)** category? Are there any specific changes you would make to the DT dashboard?
- **Member Crawford:** This should be renamed to Green Space as I have previously stated
  - **Member Dillavou:** No
  - **Member Howe:** I am comfortable with this category dashboard.
  - **Member Lin:** None- these are fine
  - **Chair Shockey:** Good
15. What are your thoughts on the Midtown housing locations?
- **Member Crawford:** I think this area should be removed s previously stated
  - **Member Dillavou:** See discussion of Midtown above. I generally do not support the ill-defined concept
  - **Member Howe:** I am OK with the Midtown housing locations as indicated. I have noticed that we have existing duplex and triplex housing in existing neighborhood category areas such as the Springwood Creek Condominiums at the northwest corner of Spring Creek and Blue Ridge Trail. These appear to be part of the transition between single family and garden style apartments near the corner of Custer and Spring Creek. We also have suitable existing duplexes integrated into the Country Place neighborhood along the south side of Tree House Ln.
  - **Member Lin:** They are a nice middle ground between SF and MF. They should be in our toolbox as a housing option. Whether they are actually used is a different question.
16. List the FLU categories in order from **LEAST** amount changes needed to **MOST** amount of changes needed.
- **Member Crawford:** SA the most EM and SN the least
  - **Member Dillavou:** Most change is needed to the Suburban Activity Center. Second most change to the Community Centers
  - **Member Howe:** Except for the walkability comments for NC and CC, I do not think any additional changes are needed.
  - **Member Lin:** Everything needs the same amount of change except OS, so OS needs no change, followed by everything else.
  - **Chair Shockey:** OS, N, SN, EM, EX, UA, SA, DT, NC, CC

**Section 2 of 2 | Please type your thoughts, comments, or edits to the Future Land Use Map.**

17. What are your initial thoughts on the proposed change to the Future Land Use Map (FLUM)?
- **Member Crawford:** Already stated
  - **Member Dillavou:** See answers to specific question below
  - **Member Howe:** In general, I am OK with the proposed changes. However, a question - How do we obtain feedback, buy-in, and/or acceptance from land owners that may be impacted by these changes?
  - **Member Lin:** No thoughts - it appears to be nomenclature changes except the addition of 1 need category. I'd like to focus on striving to achieve our vision.
  - **Chair Shockey:** Better, still needs a few changes.
18. What questions do you have about how to read the FLUM? Are there any improvements that could be made to the colors, legend, symbology, etc.?
- **Member Crawford:** How do we make it easy for the average citizen to quickly look at the map and understand
  - **Member Dillavou:** Its very complex for the public to read and understand
  - **Member Howe:** No questions for me on this topic.
  - **Member Lin:** N/A
  - **Chair Shockey:** None
19. Are there any specific areas that you think should be looked at more closely? If yes, please include the location(s) and supporting reasons.
- **Member Crawford:** SA as I have stated
  - **Member Dillavou:** See discussions throughout
  - **Member Howe:** No comment on this item.
  - **Member Lin:** No
  - **Chair Shockey:** My biggest concerns are still with the new community corners. Especially along Parker rd. Three straight corners with CC designated at all 4 corners may lead to an east/west corridor where it was not intended nor would it be appropriate. Some of these corners are smaller than the others with no transition between them and the Single family homes. I would suggest the NW and SW corners at Parker and Independence should be NC as well as the NW and SW corners of Parker and Alma.  
Additionally, as stated before, I think the DT area north of Park rd. should be designated as N, NC, CC, or EX.
20. Staff and the consultants proposed major changes in the following areas. Please share any thoughts you may have on these changes:
1. **Oak Point Area** | Changed to Suburban Activity Center (formerly Regional Center) as this more accurately represents the adopted Envision Point Plan.
    - **Member Dillavou:** I see Oak Point, a largely undeveloped area with an approved area development plan as completely different than established areas that may have some re-develop. I do not think it fits in the same category as others labelled SA
    - **Member Howe:** I am in agreement with staff recommendation.

2. **Willow Bend Mall Area** | Changed to Suburban Activity Center (formerly Regional Center) and Expressway Corridors (EX) as this was determined to be a more appropriate scale and mix of compatible uses for the area.
  - **Member Dillavou:** The move of the area south of park to Expressway Corridor was appropriate as the area never made sense as Complete Compact Center. Renaming the remainder SAC does mean much to me as I do not agree with the SAC Vision and Dashboard in general as it advocates excessive density.
  - **Member Howe:** No comments. I am in agreement with staff recommendation.
  
3. **Transit Corridors changed to Downtown Corridors** | Based on committee feedback, the vision for this area was narrowed to focus on Downtown Plano and redevelopment of the K Ave and 14<sup>th</sup> Street corridors. This area now ends at Parker Road to the north and Shiloh Road to the east. TOD would be limited to within ½ mile of transit stations. Areas formerly within Transit Corridors beyond those endpoints were changed accordingly.
  - **Member Dillavou:** I believe this change is appropriate and positive.
  - **Member Howe:** A question – what have we given up, if anything, by eliminating the Transit Corridor category?
  - **Chair Shockey:** As stated earlier, if you focus is on Downtown Plano, the area is still too large. Also, I know it's a challenge but revitalization does not have to conflict with historical preservation and character. In an area this diverse, the defined height, density, etc. could easily conflict with historical preservation and character. Is there anything that can be added to ensure that future changes adhere to the city's preservation plan.
  
4. **Community Corners** | Based on committee feedback, staff and the consultants split Neighborhood Centers into two categories, Neighborhood Corners and Community Corners. Community Corners were selected based upon their size and suitability for redevelopment slight more intense than Neighborhood Corner locations.
  - **Member Dillavou:** I believe this change is appropriate. I still have some issues with the proposed descriptions and parameter of the of the corners
  - **Member Howe:** I am in agreement with staff recommendation.
  - **Chair Shockey:** More needs to done to distinguish CC and NC. If one quadrant is CC they don't all have to be.
  
5. **Park and Preston** | The boundaries of the Suburban Activity Center (SA) were revised to match existing conditions on the ground. Community Corner was added to the south of the center as it approaches Plano Parkway.
  - **Member Dillavou:** I was taken aback by the massive increase in the land area and my initial reaction was that it was ridiculous. However, as I looked at it more, maybe it makes sense. There are already 2500 MF units, mostly garden style apartments in this "SAC." Or immediately adjoining it. This brings home the point of area residents that it already is relatively dense, has more than enough multi-family and does not need more. It also shoes that garden style apartments are an integral part of this area that is not going to change. I have many issues with the SAC vision and Dashboard
  - **Member Howe:** I am in agreement with staff recommendation.

6. **Alma Rd b/n Park and 15<sup>th</sup>** | Changed to Suburban Activity Center (SA) to better reflect existing conditions and approved zoning for the area. This area was formerly Compact Complete Center.
  - **Member Dillavou:** I believe its removal and separation from the Collin Creek area was needed and appropriate. I have many issues with the SAC vision and Dashboard
  - **Member Howe:** I am in agreement with staff recommendation.
  
7. **Communications Pkwy** | Shifted the line dividing Employment Center and Urban Activity Center to follow Communications Pkwy.
  - **Member Dillavou:** This change makes sense and reflects the development pattern
  - **Member Howe:** I am in agreement with staff recommendation.
  
8. **PGBT at US 75** | The area along either side of US 75 from President George Bush Turnpike to Plano Parkway was changed to Expressway Corridors.
  - **Member Dillavou:** This change is appropriate and I support it.
  - **Member Howe:** I am in agreement with staff recommendation.
  
9. **New Neighborhood Corners** | The intersections of Spring Creek Dr. and Alma Dr. was changed from Neighborhoods to Neighborhood Corners to match existing conditions. The north side of the Jupiter Rd and 14<sup>th</sup> St was changed to Neighborhood Corners to more accurately reflect anticipated scale of redevelopment.
  - **Member Dillavou:** This change is acceptable
  - **Member Howe:** I am in agreement with staff recommendation.
  
10. **Other Minor Misc. Changes** | Other minor miscellaneous changes were match existing conditions on the ground that are not anticipated to change within the planning horizon of this comprehensive plan. This include narrowing of Expressway Corridors along 121, expansion of Suburban Activity Center to cover Mustang Square development east of Ohio Dr., and other misc. changes.
  - **Member Dillavou:** Seems like you missed the Commodore / Alta 289 south of Razor at Preston.
  - **Member Howe:** I am in agreement with staff recommendation.