



Alaina Helton  
Senior Planner  
City of College Station  
P.O. Box 9960  
College Station, TX 77842

October 5, 2017

**Re: University Town Center (REZ) – (REZ-2017-000023)**

**Staff Review Comments #2  
PROJECT: University Town Center (REZ) - (REZ2017-000023)**

**TRANSPORTATION**

1. Based on the schematic drawings provided for the Lincoln/Ashburn intersection, please remove the waiver request to driveway offset as it does not appear necessary. The driveway section provides staff the discretion to factor in existing conditions as needed.

**Response: Understood. We have removed this from the bulk variances request.**

2. Confirm that the intent is to replace the existing private alley intersection Lincoln Avenue with the proposed public way.

**Response: Correct. In addition to providing connectivity between our property and Lincoln Avenue, the intent of the public way is also to maintain connectivity for the residents that currently utilize the private alley.**

3. The private alleys looping at the end of Wellesley Court and Vassar Court would be parallel and directly adjacent to the proposed public way and is a concern as it would result in almost no throat depth. Staff is willing to help engage with the adjacent property owners to remove the alley connections to Wellesley and Vassar so they can be tied into the proposed public way as similar as they are at Tarrow Street.

**Response: Thank you. We would be happy to talk with the property owners to resolve connecting the existing alley to the public way and would appreciate your involvement in those discussions.**

**PLANNING**

1. Please label concept plan as “Concept Plan”.

**Response: The concept plan has been labeled “Concept Plan.”**

2. In your list of requested bulk variances, it’s noted that the nonresidential base zoning districts will be General Commercial (GC) and Multi-family (MF). However, the concept plan does not identify which districts (GC & MF) apply to which areas. This is important to note because this will dictate which Dimensional Standards staff applies to each

property during the site plan process. In order to provide consistency, staff recommends providing a base zoning district of General Commercial for all of the non-residential portion of the property, with the additional use of Multi-family with applicable MF density requirements (30 units/acre). This can be added as a note on the concept plan.

**Response: At this time, we aren't able to identify exactly which areas will be dedicated for either GC General Commercial or MF Multifamily. We've added a note to the concept plan that establishes GC General Commercial and MF Multifamily as our base zoning districts, where applicable. We expect at time of site plan that all non-residential areas will be reviewed according to GC district standards and that the multi-family portions will be reviewed according to the MF district standards.**

3. The request to have “no setbacks to interior lot lines and instead that the buildings are governed by building code” is not necessary because the UDO already provides for zero lot line construction, that speaks to fire protection, which is line with the Building Code. The Building Code requires fire-rated walls with no openings for zero lot line construction, the intent of which is to ensure adequate fire protection. Section 5.4 Non-Residential Dimensional Standards - states in Note (B) “Lot line construction on interior lots with no side yard or setback is allowed only where the building is covered by fire protection on the site or separated by a dedicated public right-of-way or easement of at least fifteen (15) feet in width”. Since the variance request is not needed, please remove it.

**Response: Understood. We have removed this from the bulk variances letter.**

4. As stated in the 1<sup>st</sup> Review Comments: Campus Wayfinding Signs are typically reserved for commercial or mixed-use tracts of 20 acres or more (the GC/MF portion of this PDD is roughly 6 acres) and also require a sign package submittal. A well-designed wayfinding system should start with a careful study of the location's needed and where traffic flows; as well looking at key factors such as appropriate size, location and consistent design. This is why the UDO requires a sign package as part of these requests. In previous meetings you stated that the justification is not showing building and parking locations on the concept plan was that, at this time, you do not know what land uses are going to be developed on this site, nor where they will be located. If this is the case, then staff feels that it is not appropriate to request wayfinding signage this time; nor is it appropriate to request a 100% increase in the maximum size of wayfinding signage when the land uses and locations are not yet known. Staff does not support this request.

**Response: We understand your position; however, we would like to proceed without staff's support for this request. We believe this sign modification is important for this design as there is limited visibility from Lincoln Avenue. It is our hope that the P&Z and City Council will also be supportive of this modification rather than going through the ZBA process.**

5. Since you are requesting to provide streetscaping only one side of the proposed public way, please note which side of the public way you will be providing streetscaping on.

**Response: The streetscaping will be planted on the east side of the public way.**

6. Staff reviewed the proposed layouts for the intersection of Lincoln Avenue and Ashburn Street with Transportation, Traffic Engineering and Greenways. Based on your illustrations, option 33 meets both the public way requirements and the multi-use path by providing both a 5' sidewalk on the west side of the public way, and a 10' sidewalk on the east side. Therefore, a variance will likely not be required for either the offset, or the public way definition to combine the two 5' sidewalks on one side. Staff also strongly recommends providing a sidewalk on both sides of the public way as required, to ensure access from the existing residential uses to the west as well as pedestrian connectivity to the east. At the time of site plan review staff will work with the applicant and may consider design alternatives to the size and location of the multi-use path while making sure the intent of the Bike Ped Plan is still being met.

**Response: Understood. We have removed this from the bulk variances letter request.**

7. Please resubmit revised plans and comments response letter tomorrow, October 5<sup>th</sup>, by 5:00 PM in order to stay on schedule for the October 19<sup>th</sup> Planning & Zoning Commission meeting.

**Response: Understood.**

8. Water comments are forthcoming. Additional comments and/or revisions may be required based on staff comments.

**Response: Understood. We will address them as soon as we receive them.**

9. On the concept plan please change labels from "potential uses" to "allowed uses" as shown.

**Response: This has been changed on the concept plan.**

10. The "Flex Zone" shown on the concept plan notes that uses from both the pink and blue zones are allowed, which conflicts with the notes provided that state that the hotel and multifamily will be located toward the Lincoln side of the property, and that the retail and restaurant uses will be located on the University Drive side. Please remove this zone as it appears to conflict with the written notes provided.

**Response: We would prefer not to omit the flex space, rather we have amended the applicable notes on the concept plan to make this less confusing.**

If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to call our office at 979-260-6963.

Sincerely,



Crissy Hartl, AICP  
Staff Planner

cc: File