

Section 1 of 2 | Please type your thoughts, comments, or edits to the Growth and Change Category Descriptions.

1. What are your initial thoughts on the Growth and Change Category Descriptions? What information would be helpful to include to help users understand how the map should be used?
 - **Member Crawford:** What measurement was used to determine areas in reclassification
 - **Member Dillavou:** The Growth and Change Map is inconsistent with the proposed FLUM and so is difficult to evaluate. I do not think it is very useful and I do not think that most people thought it was significant to the PTP because the statements are so broad they did not think they were particularly meaningful. I disagree with the “Evolve Urban” category because the areas involved are so large and it the category made general statements about the redevelopment that I think are unrealistic. That is, EU states “the area is expected to experience extensive large-scale change through major redevelopment projects that evolve into walkable districts.” The EU designation applied to the whole Hwy 75 corridor. Yet, outside of Collin Creek Mall, the changes in this corridor are likely to be incremental changes and in most places they will not create “walkable districts.” In fact, I think it is completely unrealistic and inconsistent with an expressway corridor to believe that the whole massive area should all be walkable. The areas around expressway exits are expected to carry large amounts of traffic and get people to and from their destination quickly. That is inconsistent with walkable. While it may be possible to create pockets of walkable districts, this should be confined to small pockets not be the objective for the whole massive 6 mile stretch from Richardson to Allen between Alma and Avenue P. I also believe EU is an inappropriate designation for the Willowbend Mall / International Business Park /Costco area. Far too many areas were labelled “Transform Center” and for some areas labeled “Improve and Refine,” it appears the planning department is advocating much larger changes be made (example Park-Preston).
 - **Member Doyle:** The Growth and Change Category Descriptions gives basic descriptions for each category, compared to the Future Land Use Category Dashboards real definitive comparison between the categories.
 - **Member Howe:** When Plano had lots of undeveloped land, it seemed the growth and change map (GCM) would highlight and provide guidance for expectations in the undeveloped land areas as to what might be developed there and what was planned to be preserved as open and social spaces. Now that Plano is almost built out, it seems more the role of a GCM would be on highlighting just the areas that remain to be developed and what might be in consideration most likely for redevelopment in the nearer term. The LUM has lots of information on the entire city of what is already there and maybe what might be changing, whereas the GCM focuses on only what might be changing - i.e. undeveloped to developed; or developed to redeveloped. So to me, the GCM is a quicker way to understand which specific land areas might be up for future change vs trying to figure that out from the more complete LUM. While there might be some confusion with the LUM categories, this could be resolved in the GCM category descriptions by selective use of LUM category examples in the major and minor change categories. See response to question 2.
 - **Member Lin:** The current descriptions are good. However, there should be more forward-looking language on them.

2. Do you think the written descriptions of each Growth and Change category are an accurate representation of to what extent these areas should change over the next 30 years? If not, which would you change and how?
- **Member Crawford:** There is no way to predict if representation is accurate
 - **Member Dillavou:** See #1 above. I do not think they are accurate representations – just some peoples’ wishful thinking.
 - **Member Doyle:** I understand the intent of each categories and the descriptions do communicate some guidance, however the page layout could be updated. Can the map descriptions be placed in a dashboard like format?
 - **Member Howe:**
Major change categories
 New Growth
 Evolve Urban
Minor change categories
 Transform Center
 Improve and Refine
Least change categories
 Conserve and Enhance
 Open and Social Space
 - **Member Lin:** In the short-term (next 5-10 years), yes; after that, no. Everything goes in cycles, so what’s less old now will be much older in 20-30 years. I’d ask the staff/consultants to include language on how each of these categories will change over time. I don’t think a lot of the communities that are “CE” right now will only “experience some minor infill and ongoing rehabilitation consistent with the present form and character.” 20 years from now, some communities might need major rehab and renovation and may not be as recognizable in the same present form with changes in housing designs, technology, etc.
3. What are your thoughts on the **Open and Social Space (OS)** category? Are there any specific changes you would make to the OS category?
- **Member Crawford:** No change
 - **Member Dillavou:** While I think Open Space is OK, it would probably be more useful if it subdivided between areas that a truly open for public use versus serve other functions. For instance, schools are included in open space even though the buildings are reserved for specific uses and the grounds are generally not accessible to the public. Similarly, libraries, while open to the public are not what people think of when discussing open space. More importantly, country clubs and institutional uses are not available to the general public. That creates confusion about this category.
 - **Member Doyle:** OS description provides what is expected. Could there be more depth within the description such as providing character defining elements and compatibility?
 - **Member Howe:** No recommended changes
 - **Member Lin:** Good as is.

4. What are your thoughts on the **New Growth (NG)** category? Are there any specific changes you would make to the NG category?
- **Member Crawford:** No change
 - **Member Dillavou:** It appears New Growth was mainly large parcels of undeveloped land. It seems intuitively obvious that this was labelled new growth but said little about how or when it might be developed.
 - **Member Doyle:** NG description provides what is expected. Could there be more depth within the description such as providing character defining elements and compatibility?
 - **Member Howe:** I would recommend including examples the types of new growth that might be invited or encouraged using the LUM categories
 - **Member Lin:** Good as is.
5. What are your thoughts on the **Evolve Urban (EU)** category? Are there any specific changes you would make to the EU category?
- **Member Crawford:** Seems some are in contradiction to LUM
 - **Member Dillavou:** See #1 above. I do not believe the Evolve Urban category description was realistic in its statements implying massive areas would be redeveloped into walkable districts. I also believe many areas designated EU are not appropriate locations for highly dense walkable districts.
 - **Member Doyle:** EU description provides what is expected. Could there be more depth within the description such as providing character defining elements and compatibility?
 - **Member Howe:** I would recommend including examples the types of changes that might be invited or encouraged using the LUM categories
 - **Member Lin:** Good as is.
6. What are your thoughts on the **Transform Center (TC)** category? Are there any specific changes you would make to the TC category?
- **Member Crawford:** I'm not sure all areas designated are going to have significant changes. We need coordination with LUM
 - **Member Dillavou:** There are too many areas labeled TC and the I do not agree that they will necessarily be transformed into "small scale pedestrian friendly centers" (nor should that be the result for all). For instance, some might be torn down altogether and largely replaced with a neighborhood, offices or healthcare facilities. If one counts corners individually, there are approximately 30 corners in this category and there other corners also slated for transformation but not identified because they are in the "Evolve Urban" category.
 - **Member Doyle:** TC description provides what is expected. Could there be more depth within the description such as providing character defining elements and compatibility?
 - **Member Howe:** I would recommend including examples the types of changes that might be invited or encouraged using the LUM categories
 - **Member Lin:** Good as is.

7. What are your thoughts on the **Improve and Refine (IR)** category? Are there any specific changes you would make to the IR category?
- **Member Crawford:** There are contradictions as LUM lists some areas Like Old Shepherd to Tulane along Preston/Parkas major change, while GACM list as improve and redefine. Some on LUM map are NC while IR on GACM. Need to align with LUM as there is a difference between improve and refine vs major changes in some areas
 - **Member Dillavou:** Improve and refine sounds fine as a description but the description implies to me that the changes will be relatively modest and incremental. It appears that some of these areas are actually being targeted for much more significant development / redevelopment. For instance, the proposed FLUM appears to be proposing major redevelopment of the Park-Preston area, but it is designated as “Improve and Refine.”
 - **Member Doyle:** IR description provides what is expected. Could there be more depth within the description such as providing character defining elements and compatibility?
 - **Member Howe:** No recommended changes
 - **Member Lin:** See answer to #2. Similarly, “moderate changes” might be enough for the next 5-10 years, but I’d expect major changes in 20-30 years.
8. What are your thoughts on the **Conserve and Enhance (CE)** category? Are there any specific changes you would make to the CE category?
- **Member Crawford:** Question: Isn’t the NW corner of Legacy and Preston agriculture? It is listed as CE.
 - **Member Dillavou:** Largely these are in the developed Neighborhood areas where not much change is expected. With respect to the commercial areas designated CE, it feels like it only has that designation until someone comes along and proposes something else.
 - **Member Doyle:** CE description provides what is expected. Could there be more depth within the description such as providing character defining elements and compatibility?
 - **Member Howe:** No recommended changes
 - **Member Lin:** See answer to #2
9. Are there any **additional** Growth and Change categories needed to better distinguish the various levels of change expected to occur and/or to provide better direction for new development or redevelopment projects?
- **Member Dillavou:** I am not sure the map tells us much so I am not sure how useful it is. I don’t think that when redevelopment occurs it will necessarily be consistent with the statements on walkability nor should all such projects be that type of change. I think the most significant aspect of the map are the sheer number of corners that are being advocated for redevelopment and the massive amount of land designated as Evolve Urban which is excessive.
 - **Member Doyle:** Is there a plan that includes developing waterways/ connections to water for boating activities/ man made beach activity.
 - **Member Howe:** See response to question 2.
 - **Member Lin:** No

10. Suggestions have been made to rename the Growth and Change Map to “**Growth and Stability Map**,” to better underscore that much of the city is expected to maintain its current development character. What are your thoughts on the name of the Growth and Change Map?
- **Member Crawford:** OK
 - **Member Dillavou:** I am not sure that the map is useful or that renaming it would help. It appears the end result could be described as follows without the MAP: “The Areas designated Neighborhoods on the FLUM are largely developed, are not expected to change much and any effort to change such areas should be heavily scrutinized. The areas with undeveloped land are expected to develop according to the FLUM. Commercial areas that are underutilized are expected to redevelop over time. Such areas will primarily remain commercial in nature, but where identified on the FLUM, may consider adding some residential uses.
 - **Member Doyle:** Actually I prefer Growth and Change Map primarily because the category that is expected to retain the form is CE, Most of the other category descriptions have elements of change with new development , large scale change , improvement, or moderate change.
 - **Member Howe:** I am OK with Growth and Change Map name.
 - **Member Lin:** I’d like to keep it as “Growth and Change”. What does stability even mean – the proposed naming sounds like an oxymoron with two words with conflicting meanings. Growth doesn’t always come with stability. I would not expect the growth to be stable. Some years we will see more growth, other years we won’t see any.
11. List the GACM categories that need **minimal to no** changes to the description.
- **Member Crawford:** The categories 11-16 I feel need discussion and decision on LUM to better answer
 - **Member Dillavou:** See above
 - **Member Doyle:** CE, OS and TC
 - **Member Howe:** IR, CE, OS
 - **Member Lin:** OS, NG, EU, TC
12. List the GACM categories that need **significant** changes to the description.
- **Member Dillavou:** See above
 - **Member Doyle:** IR, NG, and EU
 - **Member Howe:** NG, EU, TC
 - **Member Lin:** IR, CE

Section 2 of 2 | Please type your thoughts, comments, or edits to the Growth and Change Map.

13. What questions do you have about **how to read** the Growth and Change Map (GACM)? Are there any improvements that could be made to the colors, legend, etc.?
- **Member Doyle:** No questions regarding the map.
 - **Member Howe:** See response to question 2. Make the major change categories the brightest colors. Make the least change areas the lightest colors.
 - **Member Lin:** None
14. Are there any specific map areas that you think need **category or boundary refinement**? If yes, please include the location(s) and supporting reasons.
- **Member Dillavou:** There are many areas that are inconsistent with the proposed FLUM.
 - **Member Doyle:** Roadway names could be in a larger font to identify them more easily on the map.
 - **Member Howe:** No
 - **Member Lin:** None
15. Identify a few areas on the map that present the greatest **opportunity for change and improvement** over the next 30 years. In alignment with the Future Land Use Map, what scale of change and improvements would be appropriate in these areas?
- **Member Dillavou:** The areas with the most potential for change are Collin Creek Mall, Avenue K (downtown), Oak Point and other areas labeled as new growth.
 - **Member Doyle:** Transform Center (TC) and Evolve Urban(EU)
 - **Member Howe:** In general, the oldest areas will have the greatest opportunity to explore and invite innovative ideas for change and/or improvement.
 - **Member Lin:** Single Family Housing – there will need to be significant renovation/rehabilitation of these areas. The SFH stock is perfect for 1990s/early 2000s, but we are now in the 2020s where there have been material changes economically, technologically, and socially (e.g., Internet was dial up and smart phones weren't around). SFHs in Plano look old, outdated, and unattractive even at their lower price points compared to neighboring cities. The FLUM (and more broadly, Comp Plan) needs to do a better job at getting ahead of this trend.
Retail – COVID-19 has exposed the businesses not prepared for technological change. Some of our retail will remain, but a lot may go out of business, as their current business models are unsustainable.
Office space – COVID-19 will significantly increase work-from-home or work-from-anywhere opportunities. It may seem like a necessity due to COVID-19, but I have friends who have been working abroad pre-COVID-19 because they work for American companies that enable them to work from anywhere. This trend will continue, especially considering the tech giants, who set many office trends, are considering to enable employees to WFH permanently (e.g., Microsoft, Amazon, etc.).
Schools – Plano has seen a continual decline in the number of K-12 school children in the last decade. Without material action items in the plan to alter this trend, I don't foresee a shift in the decline. Closing schools will be a decision for PISD, but the FLUM/plan needs to address this.

16. Identify a few areas on the map that you perceive as **successful or stable** and should be maintained and enhanced to meet the needs of Plano over the next 30 years. In alignment with the Future Land Use Map, what should be maintained or enhanced in these areas?
- **Member Dillavou:** Neighborhoods, Parks, Legacy Business Park, Hospitals and most existing residential areas.
 - **Member Doyle:** Open Space Network(OS) and Open and Social Space (OS) are successful. Plano residents very much enjoy the parks, country clubs, youth events and their outside leisure and social activities which may include pets.
 - **Member Howe:** In general, the newest areas will have the least opportunity to explore and invite innovative ideas for change and/or improvement.
 - **Member Lin:**
Parks / recreational areas
Urban areas – these are some of the most vibrant areas of Plano (e.g., Shops of Legacy). As retail changes, these areas will need to be maintained so that people will have places to gather and enjoy after work, during evenings, and weekends.