

### Section 1 of 1 | Please type your thoughts, comments, or edits on the Housing Types Menu.

1. What are your initial thoughts on the September 25, 2020, Draft of the Housing Types Menu?

- **Member Dillavou:** I believe that it creates confusion about housing. I do not agree with the use of the meaningless undefined term “Midtown housing” and using that term to group many very different housing types with no defined parameters. Separating Midtown housing into “single unit” and “multi-unit” categories also appears to be intended to create confusion as several of the “single-unit” housing types are actually multi-family housing. See questions 2 through 4 for further discussion.

The Housing menu also seeks to create several other categories that do not exist in Plano’s Zoning Code and are not defined such as “Mainstreet Multi-Family” and “retirement housing.” Meanwhile, housing types that do exist in the zoning code such as “Patio Home” are ignored.

- **Member Doyle:** The illustrations provided ranges of housing options which was good to have.
- **Member Howe:** In general, I am OK with it.
- **Member Lin:** They are good.

2. What would you change about Midtown Housing and what would you keep?

- **Member Dillavou:** I would eliminate this category altogether. It confuses the matter. I have never heard of categories such as “detached townhomes, stacked flats, manor homes” and there is no such definition in Plano’s zoning code. I believe detached townhomes may fit under Plano’s patio home designation or may be commonly known as zero lot line homes but this is unclear because they were never defined. Townhomes are well defined in Federal terminology as well as Plano’s zoning code (Single Family Attached.) The rest of the “single unit” products such as “bungalow courts” and “stacked townhomes” appear to be multi-family products and should not be labeled in a way that makes them appear otherwise. If the intent was to describe multifamily developments that may have fewer units in a complex than Plano’s traditional apartment complexes, then a term such as “small scale multi-family” may be acceptable but the parameters should be described in the context of the MF-1, MF-2, MF-3 zoning designations, noting whether they fit within those parameters or deviations there from such as density per acre, floor to area ratio, occupancy per unit, building height, open space, off-street parking requirements per unit. Finally, density should not be described on the basis of the number of units per lot as lot size is highly variable and so the units per lot is meaningless for CPRC purposes.
- **Member Doyle:** Description touched on greater spectrum of price points and lower maintenance options which a buyer would be interested in. This information should remain in the description.
- **Member Howe:** In general, I am OK with it as is.
- **Member Lin:** I would increase the options in the toolkit. For example, ADUs/granny flats could also be an option to be used in the city. They may not actually be used, but all options should be available.

3. What are your thoughts on the **Midtown Housing – Single Unit** category? Are there any specific changes you would make to the description of this category?

- Member Dillavou:** As noted above, I do not agree with the terminology “midtown housing” and in particular, I believe the “single-unit” category creates confusion between this term (which is undefined) and “single-family” (attached or detached) which is defined in the zoning code and by Federal guidance and is well understood and accepted. I believe that stacked flats and bungalow courts are multi-family housing and should not be labelled otherwise. As to live/work units, a recent zoning case has shown they may be essentially multi-family housing mislabeled as retail. I do not believe they should be recognized in buildings that are essentially residential buildings and they definitely should not be counted as retail for determining the mix of uses. The purpose of live/work designation, if used, should be for very limited situations to allow an owner of a commercial building to live in his place of work. It should be clear that the primary function and square footage of the building is commercial enterprise and that the building is located in a commercial area that generally does not allow residential uses but an exception is granted in limited circumstances. It is clear to me that when multiple live /work units exist in a single structure, they are primarily residential in nature and the units should be considered multi-family not “single unit.” As multi-family units, they should be subject to Plano’s code regulation and inspection programs for multi-family housing.

Finally, Plano’s UMU regulations allow single-family units that are much smaller and higher density than allowed generally (40 units per acre versus 10-12 units per acre for townhomes) and there should be a distinction made as to what type of housing is being proposed when referring to single family attached.

- Member Doyle:** Not sure what Bungalow Courts are. There should be an illustration of each product type.
- Member Howe:** I would include triplexes in both this category and Midtown Housing – Multi-unit, because we already have triplexes in existing neighborhoods, and I think they may be appropriate in certain cases for redevelopment. For example, Springwood Creek Condominiums at the northwest corner of Spring Creek and Blue Ridge Trail include both duplexes and triplexes.
- Member Lin:** The category is good.

4. What are your thoughts on the **Midtown Housing – Multi-unit** category? Are there any specific changes you would make to the description of this category?
- **Member Dillavou:** As stated above, I disagree with the term Midtown Housing as it is not defined and does not exist in Plano’s housing code. I believe it should be eliminated. For instance, it appears to me that the term “Manor House” is more commonly known as a boarding house or rooming house. Boarding houses are defined and regulated in Plano’s zoning code and their inclusion here under a different name that is not defined is confusing. Boarding houses are not allowed in neighborhoods under Plano’s zoning code, but their inclusion in “Midtown housing” implies they should be. The use of the term triplex and fourplex is also not defined. Some three or four-unit buildings may meet the definition of Single Family Attached but others are multi-family products. More importantly in some cities, buildings were called triplex or fourplex because they included three or four common areas with kitchen / bathroom facilities but in reality, in each unit were several bedrooms separately available for rent; making the building essentially 3 or 4 boarding houses with 12 to 20 bedrooms. Without a definition and description of the parameters in relation to Plano’s established zoning regulations (density per acre, floor to area ratio, height, occupancy per unit, minimum square footage, open space and off-street parking per unit) I have no understanding of what is meant by these terms.  
  
If the intent was to describe multifamily that may have fewer units under single ownership than Plano’s traditional apartment complexes, then a term such as “small scale multi-family” may be acceptable but the parameters should be described in the context of the MF-1, MF-2, MF-3 zoning designations, noting whether they fit within those parameters or deviations there from such as density per acre, floor to area ratio, occupancy per unit, minimum square footage, building height, open space, and off-street parking requirements per unit.
  - **Member Doyle:** Not sure what a Manor Home is. Again there should be an illustration of each product type.
  - **Member Howe:** In general, I am OK with it as is.
  - **Member Lin:** The category is good.

5. What are your thoughts on the other housing types in the Housing Types Menu (Traditional Single-family Detached, Traditional Single-family Attached, Retirement Housing, Garden-style Multifamily, Main Street-style Multifamily, Mid-rise Multifamily, and High-rise Multifamily)? Do the descriptions appropriately communicate the intent of these housing types? Are there any types that need further clarification?

- **Member Dillavou:** I think “Retirement Housing” is ill-defined needs to be separated into two categories; true “retirement housing,” which requires that certain services be offered including meal service, transportation and recreational activities versus “55&Over” restricted housing that does not offer such services. The 55&Over category should be subject to the same regulation and zoning as unrestricted multifamily of single family attached/detached, patio home etc.

I do not know what is meant by “Main Street Multi-family” and it does not appear to be defined. What are the requirements for density per acre, Floor to area ratio, occupancy per unit, minimum square footage, building height, open space, off-street parking per unit? Currently this type of housing only appears to be allowed in special districts (Business Govt (downtown Plano), CE and CB districts (Legacy area) and UMU Planned development. Each of those districts have specific requirements. Is the intent to allow this housing in many more areas?

As to Midrise Residential I would like to see a distinction between the 6 or fewer story buildings that are made of lightwood construction versus taller units that are constructed of steel and concrete. When the interim amendments to the comprehensive plan were made in 2012-2013, the Planning Director, Staff and Deputy City Manager stated several times, “Mid-rise multifamily residential development is typically defined as 5 to 12 stories; anything less than 5 stories is considered low-rise multifamily residential. This distinction is made primarily based on the type of construction required for residential buildings of 5 stories or taller. Multi-family wood frame construction is limited to 4 levels, or 4 levels above a concrete podium base; for a taller structure the International Building Code requires noncombustible construction of steel and concrete, thus increasing construction costs. Structured parking is usually provided instead of surface parking, further increasing costs.”

The reality was that the International building code had already been changed to allow 5 and potentially 6 story buildings to be constructed of light wood and most of the midrise residential we have seen constructed in Plano is light wood, not steel and concrete. I do think there is a significant difference in the quality of these two types of products and it would be good to recognize the distinction.

As to single family attached, Plano’s UMU regulations allow single-family units that are much smaller and higher density than allowed generally (40 units per acre versus 10-12 units per acre for townhomes) and there should be a distinction made as to what is being proposed.

- **Member Doyle:** More clarification of product types in comments above for questions 3 and 4.
- **Member Howe:** In general, I am OK with it as is.
- **Member Lin:** They are generally good; however, I think we are overly prescriptive and not futuristic enough. For example, “at least two parking spaces in the driveway” for traditional SFD is unnecessary and points to a necessity of have two car parking spaces, when most of the communities I drive through have plenty of space on the street for parking.

Having a description like this may suggest poor use of land in the future – a future where self-driving cars or other transportation technology is available. A future where the housing trend is toward smaller, yet higher quality homes and living spaces as opposed to large houses on large plots of land with at least two parking spaces. Why not build smaller homes and save some space for more community parks and recreational areas? Why not use the land for a bigger backyard to play in or to plant more trees instead of simply suggesting the necessity of two carports? The point is – we are too prescriptive and not thinking enough about the future. The descriptions need to provide more flexibility for innovation and unknown changes coming in the future.