



Code SMTX Think Tank Meeting

Wednesday, November 21, 2015

6:00 pm

San Marcos Activity Center RM#1, 501 E Hopkins St

AGENDA

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Roll Call**
3. **30 Minute Citizen Comment Period.** The Think Tank welcomes citizen comments. Anyone wishing to speak must sign in with the secretary before the meeting and observe a three-minute time limit.
4. **Approval of Minutes from October 21, 2015**
5. **Introduction of newest Think Tank Member**
6. **Review and Discuss Think Tank Response to October 21 Issue Exploration Items**
7. **Receive a presentation and discuss themes presented as part of the Transportation Master Plan**
8. **Reflection and Discussion on Think Tank Review Process**
9. **Next Steps**
 - a. **Future Agenda Items**
 - b. **~~November 10~~ December 3 CodeSMTX Open House**
 - c. **Outreach Efforts**
10. **Questions from the Press and Public.**
11. **Adjourn.**

1 **Review and Discuss Think Tank Response to September 16 Issue Exploration Items**

2
3 Abby Gillfillan provided a summary of topics discussed at the September 16 Think Tank
4 Meeting: Development Process, Employment and Light Industrial within Intensity Zones, and
5 Architectural Standards.

6
7 The Think Tank requested that the following ideas for the *Development Process* issue
8 exploration item be included. The Think Tank suggested to specify deviations of the
9 development process that are not permissible in lieu of itemizing standards that are available.
10 Alternatively, The Think Tank suggested to allow for other items to be proposed through a more
11 rigorous process.

12
13 **Issue Exploration**

14
15 **a. Employment Districts**

16
17 Abby Gillfillan provided an overview of existing standards of Employment Districts
18 and proposed Code SMTX standards.

19
20 A met interest identified by the Think Tank is that the proposed Code SMTX strategy
21 eliminates the requirement of going through a re-zoning process based on use.

22
23 An unmet interest identified by the Think Tank is that the process for developing in
24 Employment Districts has not been made easier for employers. Additionally, potential
25 increased cost could negate attractiveness. The Think Tank commented that higher
26 standards may be necessary.

27
28 The Think Tank suggested to combine the office and retail categories within
29 Employment Districts and to allow individuals to choose between zoning categories.

30
31 Chair Carson provided suggestions for employment center standards such as
32 prohibiting utilities within the middle of parking pods and to prohibit large trees
33 within parking lots which could cause potential problems for re-development of the
34 lot. Betsy Robertson further commented that trees provide shade for pedestrians and
35 cars within parking lots. The Think Tank will further analyze parking standards.

36
37 Chair Carson commented that the current material and design standards need to be
38 further addressed during a future conversation.

39
40 **b. Parking**

41
42 Abby Gillfillan provided an overview of the proposed Code SMTX strategy for
43 parking. Proposals include encouraging shared parking and shared access, adding
44 some parking maximums, and possible mitigation for excessive parking.

45 Additionally, Abby commented that San Marcos has high multi-family parking
46 standards compared to other cities.

1 The Think Tank commented that the proposed Code SMTX strategy of 1.05 parking
2 spaces per bedroom as part of the downtown parking regulations is not satisfying the
3 goal to make a more walkable and pedestrian-oriented downtown.
4

5 Further ideas expressed by the Think Tank include creating strategies for including a
6 fee-in-lieu for developers who do not meet the parking requirements. The Think Tank
7 brainstormed that this fee can be towards the Parking Management fund.
8

9 The Think Tank commented that in conventional zoning districts next to existing
10 neighborhood areas the 1.05 parking spaces per bedroom requirement is creating
11 overflow parking into neighborhoods.
12

13 The Think Tank further discussed that Code SMTX it is not satisfying the vision to
14 make downtown more walkable and pedestrian-oriented. Contrastingly, the Think
15 Tank discussed that without sufficient parking, people will bring a car and not have a
16 place to park, resulting in downtown parking being filled with cars.
17

18 Chris Wood commented that unnecessarily large parking lots and parking
19 requirements in certain zoning districts such as retail/office create excess space and
20 impervious cover problems. Chris suggested that certain zoning districts or uses that
21 are over-parked result in an identified unmet interest. The Think Tank suggested
22 adding a maximum parking requirement.
23

24 **Reflection and Discussion on Think Tank Review Process**

25
26 Abby Gillfillan discussed the Think Tank review process and will provide additional resources to
27 Monica McNabb.
28

29 **Next Steps**

30 31 **a. Future Agenda Items**

32
33 Abby Gillfillan stated that *Transportation* will be a future agenda item at the
34 November 4, 2015 Think Tank Meeting. The Issue Exploration Process Review and
35 the topic of material standards will be further discussed at a later date.
36

37 **b. October 23 – Initial Working Draft for Public Review**

38
39 Abby stated that the draft Code SMTX will be on the website for the public on
40 October 23.
41

42 **c. November 10 – Code SMTX Open House**

43
44 Abby commented that the Open House will be from 10 a.m. to 8 p.m. with
45 presentations every hour on the hour. Abby encouraged all Think Tank members to
46 attend.

1
2 **d. Outreach Efforts**

3
4 Abby requested that the Think Tank continue to provide any possible Speaker's
5 Bureau contacts to Abby.
6

7 **Questions from the press and public**

8
9 There were no questions from the press or public.
10

11 **Adjourn**

12
13 **THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:27**
14 **P.M.**
15

16 _____
17 John David Carson, Chair

Betsy Robertson, Vice-Chair

18
19 _____
20 Shawn DuPont

Diann McCabe

21
22 _____
23 Chris Wood

Monica McNabb

24
25 _____
26 David Singleton

Tom Wassenich

27
28
29 **ATTEST:**

30
31 _____
32 Andrea Villalobos, Planning Technician

CHARACTER DISTRICTS

October 21, 2015; ISSUE EXPLORATION

Employment Centers

Vision San Marcos Comprehensive Plan:

“Employment Centers are appropriate for industrial, large office park and intensive commercial uses. Typically these uses are located on large sites with excellent road and rail access and access to water and sewer infrastructure.”

Goals:

- “Expedite the entitlement process for high performance local or preferred industry employers locating in Employment Centers or Preferred Scenario”
- “Develop Industrial Settings that provide shovel ready opportunities for prospective companies”
- “Increase the amount of Class A office and industrial space that is attractive to target industries”

Current Code Provisions

The Land Development Code currently has several commercial districts with relatively similar standards utilized to regulate development in commercial and industrial settings including the following zoning districts and standards:

Zoning Districts

- General Commercial (GC); Heavy Commercial (HC); Light Industrial (LI); Heavy Industrial (HI)

Standards

- Lot Dimensions: 50' minimum width
- Use Standards: No Residential
- Setbacks: 5' to 10' minimum side and 20' – 25' minimum front
- 80 – 85% impervious cover
- 10% Landscaped Area
- Horizontal and Vertical Articulation every 50' in HC and GC
- Material requirements in HC and GC

Initial Proposed CodeSMTX Strategy

CodeSMTX is proposing standards that are flexible enough to accommodate Intensive or Specialized Uses while supporting an attractive environment for target industries. CodeSMTX is proposing three separate districts with distinct standards and regulations to support Regional Retail, Office, and Industrial Employment Districts. Below is a breakdown of the proposed standards in these districts:

ED - Regional Retail – Intended for Big Box Stores and accessory retail services

- Lot Dimensions: 50' Minimum Frontage on Public Street or Platted Internal Accessway;
- Use Standards: No Residential
- Setbacks: 5' to 10' Min; Front 15' Min
- Parking Location: Any Layer
- Internal Circulation System Required - with parking/ sidewalks/ Trees/ limited drives (See attached Illustration)
- Individual Parking Pods: 70,000 Sq Ft Max (See illustration)
- Landscape or wall at frontage to screen parking areas
- Articulation Standards
- Material Standards

ED – Office - Intended for Large or smaller format office parks

- Lot Dimensions: 50' Minimum Frontage on Public Street;
- Use Standards: No Residential
- Setbacks: 5' to 10' Min; Front 15' Min
- Parking Location: 2nd Layer
- Internal Circulation System Required – with parking/ sidewalks/ Trees/ limited drives
- Individual Parking Pods: 60,000 Sq Ft Max (See illustration)
- Landscape or wall at frontage to screen parking areas
- Articulation Standards
- Material Standards
- Glazing Requirements

ED – Industrial – Intended for large format Industrial Development and Employment Centers

- Lot Dimensions: 50' Min Frontage on Public Street
- Use Standards: No Residential
- 10' minimum side and 20' – 25' minimum front
- Parking Location: Any Layer
- Landscaping to screen parking at frontage

<p>TT Discussion/ Response</p>	<p>Does the Proposed CodeSMTX Strategy meet the Comprehensive Plan goals and the interests of stakeholder groups?</p> <p>Met Interests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Parking pods make redevelopment easier• Eliminates requirement to go through rezoning based on use <p>Unmet Interests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Have not made process much easier for employers• Potential increased cost could negate attractiveness (higher standards)
<p>Brainstormed Solutions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Combine Retail and Office and allow people to just choose between 2 categories• Don't have utilities running through parking pods and it may be better not to plant large trees (however, trees provide shade)	
<p>Final Proposed CodeSMTX Strategy</p>	

Parking Requirements

Vision San Marcos Comprehensive Plan:

Develop a plan to reduce congestion and parking issues caused near campus and in dense housing areas.

Current Code Provisions

Current Parking requirements are attached here for both the LDC and the Smart Code.

Proposed CodeSMTX Strategy

CodeSMTX is proposing the following updates to the parking standards in CodeSMTX:

- Two sets of parking requirements one for Conventional Districts and one for Character Based Districts.
- No changes to the existing parking requirements in the Downtown.
- Simplification of the parking table in Conventional Districts
- Better options for shared parking in conventional and character districts
- Encourage shared access parking lots in the code

<p>TT Discussion/ Response</p>	<p>Does the Proposed CodeSMTX Strategy meet the Comprehensive Plan goals and the interests of the stakeholder groups?</p> <p>Met Interests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Current, unnecessarily large parking requirements at retail and office are creating a waste of space and are a poor use of resources <p>Unmet Interests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Downtown parking requirement not satisfying goal to make a more walkable downtown• In conventional districts next to existing neighborhood areas, even the current 1.05/ bed parking requirements are creating overflow parking in neighborhoods
<p>Brainstormed Solutions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Create strategies to charge for parking for multi-family occupants• Create a Fee-in-lieu of for developers who don't want to meet parking requirements	
<p>Final Proposed CodeSMTX Strategy</p>	



CODES MTX

5. Introduction of newest Think Tank Member

**6. Review and Discuss Think Tank
Response to October 21 Issue
Exploration Items**

Employment Centers

Vision San Marcos Comprehensive Plan:

“Expedite the entitlement process for preferred industry employers

“Develop Industrial Settings that provide shovel ready opportunities for prospective companies”

“Increase the amount of Class A office and industrial space that is attractive to target industries”

Initial Proposed CodeSMTX Strategy

CodeSMTX is proposing three separate districts with distinct standards and regulations to support Regional Retail, Office, and Industrial Employment Districts.

Employment Centers

Unmet Interest

Have not made process much easier for employers
Potential increased cost could negate attractiveness (higher standards)

Met Interest

Parking Pods make redevelopment easier
Eliminates requirement to go through rezoning based on use

Brainstormed Solutions

- Combine Retail and Office and allow people to just choose between 2 categories
- Don't have utilities running through parking pods and it may be better not to plant large trees (however, trees provide shade)

Parking Requirements

Vision San Marcos Comprehensive Plan:

Develop a plan to reduce congestion and parking issues caused near campus and in dense housing areas.

Initial Proposed CodeSMTX Strategy

- Different parking requirements for conventional and Character Based Districts
- No Changes to parking requirements Downtown
- Simplification of the parking table in Conventional Districts
- Better options for shared parking in conventional and character
- Encourage Shared access parking

Parking Requirements

Unmet Interest

- 1) Downtown parking requirement not satisfying goal to make a more walkable downtown
- 2) In conventional districts next to existing neighborhood areas, even the current 1.05/ bed parking requirements are creating overflow parking in neighborhoods

Met Interest

Current unnecessarily large parking requirements at retail and office are creating a waste of space and are a poor use of resources

Brainstormed Solutions

- 1) Create strategies to charge for parking for multi-family occupants
- 2) Create a Fee-In-Lieu for developers who don't want to meet parking requirements

7. Receive a presentation and discuss themes presented as part of the Transportation Master Plan

8. Reflection and Discussion on Think Tank Review Process

Schedule for Completion

Think Tank Issue Exploration

Schedule: Sept – Jan

Documents: Working Draft
and Proposed Strategies

Feedback: Policy level

Revisions

Schedule: Feb – March

Documents: Draft Code and
Final Strategies based on
Initial Feedback

Feedback: Specific

Approval Meetings

Schedule: April – June

Documents: Draft Code and
Revisions Memo

Feedback: Policy and
Specific

Schedule for Completion

Think Tank Issue Exploration

Schedule: Sept – Jan

Detailed Schedule:

December 2 – Issue Exploration; Environmental Standards

December 16 – Issue Exploration; Deviations

January 6 – Issue Exploration; ??

January 20 – Review of Final Proposed Strategy Report

Schedule for Completion

Revisions

Schedule: April - May

Documents:

- Strategies and Revisions Memo – Final Proposed Strategies based on TT issue Exploration with any proposed Revisions
- Draft Code
- Comments - Spreadsheet based on a publicly available and circulated Comment Form

Schedule for Completion

Approval Meetings

Schedule: June - August

Documents:

- Strategies and Revisions Memo Including TT Issue Explorations
- Revised Code
- Comments Spreadsheet with Staff Responses

9. Next Steps

Future Agenda Items:

December 2: Chapter 6 – Environmental Standards

9. Next Steps

December 3 CodeSMTX Open House

9. Next Steps

Outreach Efforts