

# Memorandum



CITY OF DALLAS

DATE June 6, 2008

TO Trinity River Corridor Project Committee Members:  
David A. Neumann (Chairman) Pauline Medrano  
Mayor Pro Tem Dr. Elba Garcia (Vice-Chair) Mitchell Rasansky  
Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Dwaine Caraway Steve Salazar  
Carolyn R. Davis  
Linda Koop

SUBJECT **Mixmaster Riverfront Rezoning Follow Up**

On May 20, 2008, staff briefed the committee on the zoning case for the Mixmaster Riverfront study area [Z067-148(DW)]. During the meeting the committee requested follow-up information. Attached is a presentation for the June 10 committee meeting that outlines options on the final three outstanding issues. Staff is seeking direction on each of these items.

If you have further questions, please let me know.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jill Jordan".

Jill A. Jordan, P.E.  
Assistant City Manager

## Attachment

C: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council  
Mary K. Suhm, City Manager  
Ryan S. Evans, First Assistant City Manager  
Ramon F. Miguez, P.E., Assistant City Manager  
A. C. Gonzalez, Assistant City Manager  
David O. Brown, Interim Assistant City Manager  
Dave K. Cook, Chief Financial Officer  
Deborah A. Watkins, City Secretary  
Thomas P. Perkins, Jr., City Attorney  
Craig D. Kinton, City Auditor  
Judge Jay E. Robinson  
Chandra Marshall-Henson, Assist. to the City Manager  
Frank Libro, Director, Public Information Office

# Mixmaster Riverfront Rezoning Follow Up

Trinity River Corridor Project  
Committee  
June 10, 2008



THE TRINITY  
DALLAS



# Purpose

- Provide requested information regarding the Mixmaster Riverfront rezoning
  - **Issue 1:** Retail uses greater than 50,000 square feet
  - **Issue 2:** Pedestrian lighting standards
  - **Issue 3:** Open space standards
  - **Issue 4:** Inside uses permitted



# Issue 1: Retail Uses Greater than 50,000 sf



- Council requested additional information regarding standards for urban big box retail
- Staff has spoken with representatives of the brokerage and design/planning community
  - UCR Urban
  - RTKL
  - Feedback indicates that many retailers are ready to go vertical in urban markets
  - Could also give an option to line the big box with ancillary retail for those products on a single floor



# Local Examples of Multi-level Retail



- Crate & Barrel, Knox Street
  - Approximately 38,000 sf, 3 stories
- Borders Books and Music, McKinney Ave
  - Approximately 7,500 sf, 2 stories
  - Part of a mixed use project
- Barnes and Noble, Northwest Highway
  - Approximately 30,000 sf, 2 stories



# National Examples of Multi-level Retail



- Pentagon Row, Arlington, VA
  - Retail as a podium for mixed use development



# National Examples of Multi-level Retail



- The Market at 9<sup>th</sup> and Flower, Los Angeles, CA
  - Full service grocery surrounded by ancillary retail, with residential above



# Issue 1: Retail Uses Greater than 50,000 sf (continued)



- Current recommendation requires retail greater than 50,000 square feet to be located on a minimum of 2 stories or be part of a vertical mixed use project
- Alternative:
  - Add additional requirement that big box, at ground level, be lined with other retail to minimize big box frontage.







# Issue 1: Decision

- Must be located on a minimum of two floors or be integrated as a part of a multi-story mixed use development with residential, office or lodging uses located on upper floors.

## – Decision:

- A) Over 50,000 square feet
- B) Over 75,000 square feet
- C) Over 100,000 square feet





## Issue 2: Open Space Standards

- Current proposed PD condition:
  - 10% of the lot area must be provided in private open space, either at, above or below grade.
- Proposed Form-based Development Code Amendment requires no less than 4% of the net land area in a subdivision, and may be privately owned if the City chooses not to accept the dedication of land
  - Must be a separate lot, or artificial lot



# Issue 2: Open Space Standards

(continued)

- Alternative:
  - Offer option to provide either 10 percent private open space, or provide public open space, (or “public access” private open space) at a possibly reduced land area





# Issue 2: Decisions

- “The area required for **private** open space must be at least **10%** of the lot area, and may be located **below**, **at**, or **above** grade.” (p 2.2)
- **Three decisions are needed:**
  - **Decision 1: Accessibility**
    - A) **Private** (accessible only to building occupants and guests)
    - B) **“Public Access” Private** (accessible to the general public during reasonable hours – minimum of 10 hours per day)
    - C) **Public** (fully accessible to public at all times and dedicated to the City. May remain private if City chooses not to accept dedication.)



# Issue 2: Decisions

(continued)



## – Decision 2: Percentage of Lot Area

A) 5%

B) 10%

C) 15%

## – Decision 3: Location of Open Space

A) At grade

B) At or Below grade

C) At, Below, or Above grade (“Above” may be difficult if open space is public.)



# Issue 3: Pedestrian Lighting Standards



- Current proposed PD condition:
  - One light, either ground or wall mounted, per **50** feet of frontage
- The city is currently developing a policy for pedestrian street lights
  - Recommendation in policy is one light per **75** feet
  - Proposed Form-based Development Code Amendments being developed by Development Services is consistent with this policy
- Alternative:
  - One light per **75** feet





## Issue 3: Decision

- “At least one pedestrian street lamp, either free standing or wall mounted for every 50 feet of street frontage” (p 2.5)
  - **Decision: Street Light Spacing (pedestrian level). Need to also specify minimum/maximum lumens.**
    - A) 50 feet
    - B) 75 feet
    - C) 100 feet



## Issue 4: Inside Uses Permitted



- Even though the emphasis in form-based code zoning is on buildings and mixed uses, our proposed code still precludes certain (mostly industrial) uses which may not fit the desired development profile.
  - **Question:** Should any use (e.g., leather and fur tanning) be permitted as long as the structure is conforming?





# Issue 4: Decision



## – Decision:

- A) **Same** as written
- B) Allow **any** uses inside a conforming structure
- C) Allow any “Not potentially incompatible **inside** Industrial Uses” by SUP only
  - Such uses include manufacturing of drapes, apparel, and computers





# Questions and Comments

