

# Memorandum

---

**To:** Planning and Zoning Commission  
**CC:** Jim Stendebach, Director of Planning  
**From:** Will Hampton, Communications Director  
**Date:** 11/12/2009  
**Re:** Downtown Master Plan

---

## **Input to Downtown Master Plan document**

Attached is a document that consolidates the input the planning team has received from the Commission, the public and staff on the most recent published draft version of the Downtown Master Plan.

The input is referenced by page number in the document, to make the changes easy to find.

# **Consolidated Input on Final Draft Downtown Master Plan**

**As of Nov. 5, 2009**

## **Project Acknowledgements**

Add: Councilmember John Moman

## **Executive Summary**

Add comma after word “downtown” in sentence (at bottom of third leg of text): The Code will be the tool through which the vision for downtown articulated by the City Council, will be achieved.

Final sentence in Executive Summary should state that Chapter 4 provides basis for a future Form-Based Code.

## **Chapter 1**

P. 5 – Change second paragraph to match revised vision on p. 25

P. 7 – Step 4: Add that an Open House was conducted for the public to review and comment on a Draft of the Plan.

P.9 – Land use map does not have an associated date with it and is not current... some single family has been converted

P. 13 – Delete the word “former” before “City Hall”

Page 14: add “In addition much of the area immediately north of the historic downtown is suited for higher intensity redevelopment”.

Page 15: add “in portions of the study area” after the word infrastructure in line 1.

Page 15: add sentence to end of paragraph: “There is a lack of water quality infrastructure in the southeast portion of the plan area.”

Page 16: add “A review of potentially historic buildings in the study area is currently underway”.

P 16-17: Confusion about transition from “analysis diagrams” to topic overviews ... especially for historic preservation from p.16 to p.17. Headings and introduction for Historic Preservation (p.17) are different from other sections.

P. 18 historic design guidelines were not just “published”, they were adopted by Council.

Page 21 – Traffic Analysis – Key Roads: Delete sentence: “There is not a direct connection along the Brushy Creek trails at Georgetown.”

## Chapter 2

Page 26 – Downtown: Sentence should read: “At this entry point, a potential new theater and hotel are regional draws that help assure a 24-hour activation of the street.”

Page 26: “Sports Capital of Texas” should be capitalized since it is a program

Page 26: change 7 key strategic projects to 6 and remove “Roundabouts along Palm Valley Boulevard”.

Page 26: add “or restaurant and galleries” for the Nelson-Crier House.

Page 26 – Downtown: Graphic cutline should read “*Initial* Master Plan concept ....”

Page 26 – Palm Valley Boulevard: Remove references to roundabouts from first paragraph and projects list.

Page 27: delete the roundabouts on Hwy 79 AND EVERYWHERE ELSE IN THE DOCUMENT!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Page 27: Shade the Community Foundation tract and add this call out: “The Round Rock Community Foundation property (old Main Street ball fields) should be designed as a combination open space and uses for the Round Rock Community Foundation, who currently owns the majority of the property. The property should be comprehensively planned to effectively integrate these uses.”

Page 28 – Transforming the Public Realm: Add a #4 that references another key difference in the photos. Overhead utilities are removed which have a significant aesthetic value but come at a significant cost.

P. 29 Top right box says “approx...” Spell out please

Page 30: Delete last sentence of second paragraph

Page 30: Remove small building from former Senior Center site at 205 E. Main St.

Page 30: Remove the word “temporary” from call out on 205 E. Main St.

Page 30: Remove call out referring to new Main Street Park and community facilities

Page 32 – Southwest Downtown: Call out should refer to “Preferred” hotel and “Preferred” theater sites. Should there be a sentence or two describing the theater’s importance?

Page 32: Connecting Main Street West: In chapter one, we cite 50,000 cars a day on IH-35. Here, it states 62,000. We need to be consistent.

P.32: First sentence should read: “Southwest Downtown hosts the existing City building and new City Hall, an extended Main Street ....” State Route 45 is actually “State Highway 45” in first sentence under

Connecting Main Street.

Page 34: Delete “single-family” in first sentence, and also delete it from the call-out on the map.

Page 34: Fourth sentence should now read: A pedestrian paseo within a 50 foot public easement (or 10 feet, if constructed by developers) along the creek is lined by restaurants, patios, and balconies to create an activated urbane area to take advantage of the creek itself.

Page 34 – Creekside District: The high bluff area south of the creek near Mays needs to show more significant redevelopment.

Add an additional area 5 “East End Residential” as an area to protect for single family uses. HRC zone is a good go-by for boundary

Page 36: Remove “Alternative A” from title. Move additional callouts from Page 37 and add them to this page.

Page 36: Remove reference to raised crosswalks

Page 37 – Palm Valley Alternative B: Remove this page and make a reference to Alternative B on page 36.

Page 38 – Gateways: Text references 6 gateways but graphic only depicts 5.

P. 40 Error in heading “within in”

Page 40 – Roundabouts: We should add the word “possibility” to first sentence.

Page 40: Roundabouts: “Since then further research and design modifications ~~has~~ have yielded an intersection control method ...”

Page 41 – Recommendations for Circulation: update graphic per all previous comments – remove reference to roundabouts on 79; NO BACK-IN PARKING ANYWHERE IN PLAN (see call out on Main/Round Rock/Mays Intersection and Main from Interstate 35 to Mays)

Page 42 – Remove word “Temporary” from third bullet under “Enhancements of existing greenspaces include:”

P. 42 Chapter 4 is still referred to as a “code” instead of “guide” in last paragraph.

Page 42: Add Heritage Trail to call out on “Enhanced creek and Veterans Park”

Page 42: Delete call out text on Community Foundation Development and East Main Street Park

Page 42: Add word “Potential” to call out on Nelson-Crier home

Page 43: Remove “single-family residential” as an infill use in callout

Page 43: Remove “Start of” from call on Heritage Trail

Page 43: Move point of “Existing Memorial Park” to the softball field

Page 47: Remove “agricultural zone” from Materials and Landscaping column.

P. 47 In materials & landscaping, there is no discussing of preserving existing quality materials and workmanship (instead of putting materials into a landfill)/preservation.

Page 48: Delete word “temporarily” from second paragraph reference to Senior Center site

Page 48: Change “North Round Rock Park” to Memorial Park in call out

Page 48: Change See-Saw graphic call out to read “Community facilities and open space”

P. 49 No heading on the page or description of content/purpose.

Page 49: Remove column on Main Street Park and Community Facilities

Page 49: Replace “North Round Rock Park” with “Memorial Park” in column header; delete “Horse Stables” In text of that column add bullets “Civic and Eco-tourism” and “Public and Performance Spaces”

P. 50 Should state that HRC overlay will need to have standards as part of the form-based code.

Page 50: Add “Uses should be restricted to single-family residential to preserve the residential character.”

Page 52: Needs wording regarding the need to prioritize infrastructure improvements.

Page 52: Start the first sentence under Fire Protection with “Portions of” and change is to are.

Page 52: Remove third paragraph under Fire Protection section

Page 52 – Regional Water Quality: Remove the following from the analysis: “Although a regional system may not be able to include all the redeveloped area within the ponds drainage area, the design could treat some existing imperious cover which is not currently being treated. It would be necessary under this approach to obtain approval from TCEQ to treat runoff from some untreated existing development in lieu of capturing all of the redeveloped area. There is precedent for this approach and it should merit approval by TCEQ. This would allow for the construction of one pond, say at the end of Mays Street that would allow for redevelopment within the Mays, Shephard or Spring Street storm sewer system although the actual capture volume comes from the Mays Street system. Once redevelopment exceeded the pond design volume, than another pond would need to be constructed.”

Page 55: Remove “(incl industrial)” from new uses.

### **Chapter 3**

Page 59: Change completed to adopted in paragraph 3.

Page 59: add the word “in” before turn in second paragraph under Form Based Code.

Page 60, 67: Projects 1 and 2 should be referred to as 1 and 1A – per P&Z recommendation. Doesn’t make sense to do one without the other. Main Street bridge should be completed before the Town Green, for logistical reasons.

Page 60 – Catalytic Projects: Add item “CS2b: Direct staff to work with TxDOT to acquire RM 620 Right-of-way.” to “sites” (aka projects) 2 and 3.

Pages 60 through 65: There are additional sources of funding other than CIP for some of these items.

Page 62: add “and standards” after guidelines in paragraph 3.

Page 62: add a note that the form based code will require separate standards for different areas or phases.

P. 63 Item OS3 should reference “future” City Hall actually referring to Policy Center

Page 63: Item OS4 should fix typo on “alternations” and replace “trails along creek” with “Heritage Trail”

Page 63: Item OS7 should be removed

P. 64: Edit HP3 table: delete words “update the Guidelines” and replace with “the Form-Based Code.”

Page 64: Item HP7 change laod to “loan”.

Page 64: Item PR4 change Board to Process.

Page 64: Item HP8 add “quality” before adaptive reuse.

Page 67: Remove roundabout at Mays and 79 from map.

Page 68: Broaden the uses that would achieve the vision at Main & San Saba.

Page 74: Option 2 should be the Preferred Option and thus listed first. We also are recommending adopting HRC overlay in first phase of zoning changes.

Page 74: At the end of the first column add “This will require ordinance language that provides a process for alternative compliance”.

Page 74: Error in Option 2, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph (... allow less development “than”).

Page 74: Change “impossible” to “impractical” in paragraph 2 of Option 1 section

Page 74: Second to last word under Option 3 should be “and” instead of “an”

Page 75: Change adoptive to “adaptive” in the first bullet point.

Page 75: Add “Prioritize and” before the word undertake in the second bullet point in column 2.

Page 76: The City program referenced in Column 2 is “Tax exemption” not abatement.

P. 76 Issues with formatting of bold text. McNeil should be boundary instead of Bellview.

Page 77: The 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point under Economics should replace al with “all”.

Page 77: The Parking Review Board should be changed to “Parking Review Process” wherever it appears.

Page 77: The 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point in the 3<sup>rd</sup> column should read “prohibits feeding the meter and requires...”

Page 77: Change the 5<sup>th</sup> bullet point in column 2 to read “Encourage or require” in place of allow.

Page 78: Change allow to “Encourage or require” at the beginning of line 1.

P. 81 Incorrect that special exception allows mixed-use.

Page 82: Add the word “could” after the word s Property owners in paragraph 2 in the 3<sup>rd</sup> column.

Page 82 – Subdivision Act: Text still contains inaccuracies. We have sent to Legal for review and received back Charlie Crossfield’s comments.

P. 82 Under section on subdivision act, is the second paragraph saying that property owners are having trouble selling their properties due to rezoning...? Think use of term “as such” may be the issue.

#### **Chapter 4**

Page 90: HRC box has typo, ref to “RH” zone instead of HRC. Also, See pages 110-111 for recommended historic guidelines for area. In addition, section does not specify what to do with existing H Overlay.

Page 91 – Graphic:

- T3 section at Mays and south Brushy Creek does not conform to staff discussions. Maybe T4+
- Henna tract designation as civic?
- P. 91 T4L South along Main and south of Main, east of Lewis? Doesn’t seem like area east of Lewis and flat would have same density. What is mixed use in the use table? Does use size limitation pertain to a single unit or building as a whole? Where upper floor use is specified in historic core, is this only for existing upper floors in two-block historic district?
- Plan area needs to include the corner of McNeil and IH 35 frontage road on map. It has been excluded from this map.

Page 95 – Graphic: Should retail be recommended along the south Brushy Creek shore to the park?

Page 95 – A note on priority areas: “and along the part of Burnet near ~~Brushy Creek~~ Main Street.”

P.110 Need to add this sentence: The differences or gaps between the recommended HRC and existing H overlay design guidelines need to be addressed in the development of the Form-Based Code.

Page 110: If residential uses other than SF are allowed in HRC, recommended guidelines should be specified.

Page 110: Photo on of 103 E. Main is not a good example because cannot see façade and has changed significantly.

P. 111: The State Farm office building is not a designated historic property, so isn't a good example of adaptive reuse. We should remove that image and replace with an image of 400 W. Main Street, which has been adaptively reused. We should also remove the image on the bottom right of the page (that adaptive reuse doesn't comply with existing code) and replace it with a picture of 309 E. Main Street (which does comply).

P. 115: Add "No freestanding signs with the exception of monument signs" to list of Non-Recommended signs. Need something about temporary signs such as A-frames addressed in this section. The glossary. How did you decide what to include and what to leave out in the glossary. Seems a little random.

P. 119: We need text noting where fencing should be required, specifically for compatibility purposes between land uses, especially for certain more residential areas such as T4L?

## **Transects**

T2 Transect:

1. Maximum dwelling units of 10 per acre should be deleted.
2. Open space and civic uses should be the only uses permitted.

T3 Transect:

1. These areas should be predominantly single family residential with the possibility of low density town homes where property is not suited for single family.
2. Residential densities of 10 units per acre seem too high for most of this area.

Exceptions in the T3 Transect include the following:

3. The T3 area north of Pecan could be used for town homes or condominiums at higher densities.
4. The T3 area east of Mays on the south side of Brushy Creek has potential for either T3 or T4+ residential densities plus restaurant and commercial uses that would utilize the proximity of the creek.
5. The Nelson Crier house has potential for a number of civic uses, restaurants and galleries once it is no longer retained as a residence.

6. The Round Rock Community Foundation property (old Main Street ball fields) should be designed as a combination open space and uses for the Round Rock Community Foundation, who currently owns the majority of the property. The property should be comprehensively planned to effectively integrate these uses.
7. The T3 north of sunset may have T4L opportunities due to the expansion of church ownership in this area.
8. The T3 designation on portions of the Henna Estate should be a place holder pending decisions by the Henna family.
9. We will likely recommend splitting the T3 transect into a T3+ and T3L, with T3+ allowing some commercial and MF, and T3L being SF only with some civic uses (and civic uses need to be better defined). The area along Main Street between Lewis and Georgetown is a good example of where we think T3+ would work. We will seek definitive direction on this issue at P&Z retreat.

T4 Transect:

1. The uses and densities in transect T4L seem appropriate.
2. The uses and densities in transect T4+ seem appropriate due to the interface with Brushy Creek.

T5 Transect:

1. The Uses and densities in transect T5L seem appropriate due to the fact they are adjacent to historic core that forms the center of the plan. These areas also front on arterial roads in many cases.
2. The uses and densities in transect T5+ seem appropriate due to their location at the intersection of Mays and Palm Valley Boulevard.
3. The boundary between the T5+ and the T6 on the old HEB site should be flexible to take maximum advantage of the intersection of IH 35 and Palm Valley Boulevard, but the T5+ should remain along Mays.

T6 Transect:

1. The uses and densities for the one T6 parcel at the intersection of IH-35 and Palm Valley Boulevard seem appropriate due to the high profile of this site on IH 35.

Special District:

1. The densities along IH 35 seem appropriate where they interface with lower transects. The residential use along IH 35 may be questionable.

Civic Overlay:

1. The exact boundaries of the Civic Overlay along Brushy Creek should remain flexible so that parkland and trail uses can be integrated with future development near the Creek. The fact that the Henna Estate is currently being planned by the family adds to the need for some flexibility provided the park and civic uses are a comprehensive part of any final plan.
2. The Civic uses in the T2 and T5L transects seem appropriate.