

# “Destination Colleyville”

*Not all Growth is “Progress”*

Protecting the character and uniqueness of our  
community

Chris Putnam, Colleyville City Council Place 3

# What is a Comprehensive Plan?

- “Long-term vision” for what the city will become in the future
- “Determine the highest priorities, steps to implement recommended changes”
- “Colleyville is at a crossroads in determining its future, one where decisions made today will help re-confirm the vision, set the action agenda, and determine the highest priorities for moving forward”

*2015 Comprehensive Plan*

*Texas zoning laws state that zoning regulations must be adopted in accordance with a comprehensive plan.*

“This document serves two purposes. First, it includes the future land use plan for Colleyville, which is used as a guide by city officials for making zoning and related development decisions. And second, it is a resource document, intended to include basic data and information about Colleyville for general use by the public” – 2004 Comprehensive Plan

# Why does Density Matter?

*Colleyville's bucolic, small-town feel and semi-rural character is what makes it unique and different from our neighbors – it's why we live here*

Residential density has been increasing in Colleyville for the past 10 years

- Proliferation of zero lot communities, townhomes, condos and other “attached residential”
- Not all of these developments are bad – many are appropriate – but we need to carefully manage the placement and types of developments
- Little remaining open space so re-development becomes the critical issue
- Pressure from real estate community to make density standards more flexible
- Residents shouldn't be pressured to cooperate when their properties are impacted
- Developer and real estate friendly administration

We have not been managing to our own Land Development Code standards

- PUD C maximums – 1.8 dwellings per acre
- Open space loophole allows anything a developer can sell to be approved
- Increasing density will not reduce your taxes, reduce crime or make schools less crowded
- As city becomes more dense and population grows costs to manage increase (see water rate increases)



# Land Development Code

- Maximum Residential Density – The maximum residential density permitted in a PUD-R district, or in a PUD-C district where residential uses are proposed, shall not exceed 1.8 dwelling units per gross acre. For the purpose of this regulation, the density calculation shall include all residential areas of the project and one-half of any abutting street situated adjacent to the project. This calculation shall exclude all proposed non-residential acreage from the gross acreage.
- Density Bonus – A proposal for a PUD-R or a PUD-C containing a residential density exceeding 1.8 dwelling units per acre may be considered where the amount of open space area provided exceeds the minimum open space requirement or where additional amenities are provided within the open space area. A PUD proposal which contains a density exceeding 1.8 dwelling units per acre shall only be acceptable in an area consistent with sound land use planning, such as a transitional area situated between a non-residential area and less dense residential developments, or near a major street intersection, or for smaller parcels with unique topographical features that make less dense development economically difficult.
- Minimum Residential Lot Size – Notwithstanding Paragraph G above regarding maximum density, the minimum lot size in a PUD-R district shall be 13,000 square feet, with an average lot size of 16,000 square feet. No lot shall have less than 100 feet of width at the building line. The minimum lot size in a Planned Unit Development district shall be stated in the approving ordinance.

PREVIOUS

Small Lot Development Comparison Chart - 1996 to 2013

Subdivision Name	Total Lots	Minimum Lot Width (feet)	Minimum Lot Depth (feet)	Minimum Lot Size (square feet)	Average Lot Size (square feet)	Maximum Lot Coverage	Master Plan Density - Dwelling Units Per Acre *	Land Development Code Density - Dwelling Units Per Acre **	Total Acres	Open Space	Approval Date	Ordinance
Spring Garden	45	36	70	2,520	2,700	90%	8	16.1	5.4	31.3%	12.17.96	O-96-1052
Villas of Caldwell Creek	43	59	115	6,594	7,408	50%	3.7	5.9	11.6	18.3%	4.1.97	O-97-1062
Bridges at Riverwalk	32	56	106	6,001	6,479	50%	3	6.7	10.0	24.0%	12.21.99	O-99-1192
Riverwalk at Colleyville	53	60	115	6,331	7,666	50%	3.2	5.7	20.0	20.0%	4.4.00	O-00-1210
Rosewood Villas	53	59	110	6,482	6,899	60%	3.6	6.3	14.8	21.4%	8.8.01	O-01-1286
Emerald Park	72	60	120	7,200	7,508	50%	3.5	5.8	20.2	19.6%	10.1.02	O-02-1366
Tiffany Park	25	60	100	7,200	7,580	50%	3.5	5.7	7.2	20.0%	10.21.03	O-04-1487
Tuscany	35	60	110	6,600	7,878	50%	3.9	5.5	8.8	6.6%	2.17.04	O-04-1442
Cambridge Place	38	50	58	4,500	5,300	60%	4.2	8.2	9.0	22.0%	7.6.04	O-04-1467
Heritage Oaks	103	30/40	90	2,700/3,600	3,600	90% and 75%	4.6	12.1	22.9	25.0%	03.21.06	O-09-1715
Villas at Oak Pointe	74	30/56	90/95/115	2,700/6,440	5,000	90% and 58%	3.7	8.7	13.6	22.0%	08.02.06	O-06-1584
Copperglen	22	55	105	5,924	6,650	65%	3.9	6.6	5.6	20.0%	10.17.06	O-06-1595
Villas of Colleyville	67	59	115	6,655	8,936	60%	3.4	4.9	19.8	21.0%	08.21.07	O-07-1627
Enclave at Arbor Estates	16	65	120	8,700	9,350	50%	2.9	4.7	5.6	19.3%	09.18.07	O-07-1634
Creekside at Colleyville	269	50	105	5,000	7,257	65%	2.4	6.0	108.5	20.0%	11.27.07	O-07-1645
Somerset Manor	77	50/60	100/110	5,000/6,600	6,000	50%	4	7.3	18.2	20.3%	05.05.08	O-08-1672
Ivy Glen	10	55	110	5,890	8,200	65%	3.4	5.3	3.0	20.0%	03.05.13	O-13-1864
The Preservation	36	60	140	8,500	9,170	50%	3	4.7	12.0	23.0%	05.14.13	O-13-1867
Heron Pond	49	47	120	7,000	7,800	65%	3.2	5.6	15.4	22.0%	11.19.13	O-13-1894
<b>Average</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>6,260</b>	<b>6,915</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>6.9</b>	<b>17.4</b>	<b>20.8%</b>		
<b>Zoning Case ZC14-019</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>4,400</b>	<b>5,000</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>5.4</b>	<b>8.6</b>	<b>11.2</b>	<b>1.8%</b>		

Master Plan Density is calculated by dividing the total units in the development by the total acreage of the development

\* Land Development Code Density is calculated by dividing the total units in the development by the total development acreage minus open space and right-of-way acreage

# Abuse of Open Space “Bonus”



## Small Lot Development Comparison Chart - 1996 to 2015

REVISED

Subdivision Name	Total Lots	Minimum Lot Width (feet)	Minimum Lot Depth (feet)	Minimum Lot Size (square feet)	Average Lot Size (square feet)	Maximum Lot Coverage	Gross Density - Dwelling Units Per Acre *	Net Density - Dwelling Units Per Acre **	Total Acres	Open Space	Approval Date	Ordinance
Spring Garden	43	100	120	2,412	NA	50%	6.4	8.2	6.7	19.4%	12.17.96	O-96-1052
Villas of Caldwell Creek	43	100	120	NA	NA	50%	3.7	4.5	11.5	28.0%	4.1.97	O-97-1062
Bridges at Riverwalk	32	56	106	6,001	6,479	50%	2.7	3.5	12.0	25.5%	12.21.99	O-99-1192
Riverwalk at Colleyville	68	115	60	6,331	7,666	50%	3.3	4.2	23.7	20.7%	4.4.00	O-00-1210
Rosewood Villas	53	59	110	6,490	6,753	60%	3.6	4.5	14.8	24.0%	8.8.01	O-01-1286
Emerald Park	71	60	120	7,200	NA	50%	3.6	4.6	20.0	20.0%	10.1.02	O-02-1366
Tuscany	32	60	110	6,600	8,304	50%	3.6	4.8	8.8	6.6%	2.17.04	O-04-1442
Tiffany Park	25	60	100	7200	NA	50%	3.5	4.0	7.2	19.5%	11.16.04	O-04-1487
Cambridge Place	36	50	58	4,500	5,300	60%	3.9	4.9	9.2	22.5%	7.6.04	O-04-1467
Villas at Oak Pointe	74	30/56	90/115	2,700/6,440	NA	90% and 58%	3.7	5.4	19.8	22.9%	8.2.06	O-06-1584
Copperglen	22	55	105	5,924	NA	65%	3.9	4.9	5.6	20.0%	10.17.06	O-06-1595
Villas of Colleyville	67	59	115	6,655	7,936	60%	3.3	3.9	20.5	21.0%	08.21.07	O-07-1627
Enclave at Arbor Estates	16	65	120	10,000	NA	50%	2.8	3.3	5.6	19.3%	09.18.07	O-07-1634
Creekside at Colleyville	228	50	105	5,000	7,257	65%	2.4	3.0	96.4	29.0%	11.27.07	O-07-1645
Somerset Manor	77	50	110	5000	6,500	50%	4.2	5.0	18.3	21.5%	05.05.08	O-08-1672
Heritage Oaks	100	30/50	90	2,700/4,500	NA	75% and 90%	4.4	6.6	22.8	30.4%	03.21.06	O-10-1749
Ivy Glen	10	55	110	5,890	8,200	65%	3.4	4.0	2.9	20.1%	03.05.13	O-13-1864
The Preservation	36	60	140	8,500	NA	50%	3.0	3.5	12.0	23.0%	05.14.13	O-13-1867
Heron Pond	49	60/74	120	7,000/9000	NA	65%	3.2	3.7	15.4	22.1%	11.19.13	O-13-1894
<b>Average</b>	<b>56.95</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>6,247</b>	<b>7,155</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>17.5</b>	<b>21.9%</b>		
<i>Zoning Case ZC15-011 - Roberts</i>	12	50	97	4,882	5,145	66%	4.6	6.4	2.6	17.3%		
<i>Zoning Case ZC15-012 - Lavaca</i>	16	50	75	7,050	7,488	60%	3.1	5.5	5.1	19.1%		

Gross Density is calculated by dividing the total number of lots by the total acres of the development.

\* Net Density is calculated by dividing the Total Lots by the Total Acres of the development, less any Right of Way dedication.

\*\* Items in BLUE are not referenced in ordinance or supporting materials therefore items defaulted to Section 3.24.G Schedule of District Regulations of the LDC.



# Plan language has changed but not Intent

- Introduction - "...a growing segment of the population is increasingly interested in more neighborhood amenities where large yards and a pastoral *landscape are replaced by more compact but still luxurious homes*"
- Implementation and Next Steps - "Revised PUD-R standards to allow greater flexibility in lot sizes"
- Housing & Neighborhoods - "New residential growth will often be in the form of infill neighborhoods where larger homestead sites are further subdivided into single family lots."
- \_Housing and Neighborhoods - "The consolidation of larger estate and remnant ranch lots, and their conversion to smaller lot developments, has been occurring for the last decade and is anticipated to continue"
- Housing and Neighborhoods - "For properties close to Colleyville Blvd, consider allowing the conversion of larger estate lots into smaller lot configurations."
- \_Housing and Neighborhoods - "As Colleyville approached build-out, some consolidation of larger lots on either side of Glade Road, and they conversion into smaller lot developments may occur in the future. With the lower residential densities in this area, that consolidation can significantly impact the character of the area."
- \_Future Land Use - "Attached housing types (e.g. town homes and upper-floor residential) and planned unit developments may be appropriate"
- Future Land Use - Land Use Types, "attached residential" and "alternatively smaller lots (under 20,000 square feet in size)"
- Future Land Use - "A range of high-quality housing types as transitions (e.g. town homes) between residential and non-residential areas"

# The Density Calculation Shell Game

Plan density definitions, formulas and calculations have been changed by staff – not city council

Plan Area	Location	Density pre 11/26	Density post 11/26	% reduction
1	southeast	1.91	1.54	20%
2	southwest	2.2	1.6	27%
3	south central	1.25	1	20%
4	northeast	2.4	1.59	24%
5	western central	1.46	1.16	21%
6	northwest	1.47	1.06	28%

The Village of Colleyville is not included in any of these calculations

# Why are we still fighting about Glade Road?

*Do we want to promote Colleyville as a commuter cut-through or protect our neighborhoods and homeowners?*

- The Master Thoroughfare Plan affects many residents and homes
  - Property rights considerations
  - Voters were deliberately misled about right-of-way and eminent domain before
- Creating east-west commuter routes has been tried before
  - North Tarrant Express
  - Cheek-Sparger
  - now Glade
- Different philosophies on character and rehabilitation versus re-development
- Costs and timeline
- Property Value impacts

# What is the Solution?

Slow down - what's the hurry to rush passage, and why do stakeholders want to limit public discussion?

- Intent for zoning or LDC changes needs to be made explicit like the 2004 plan
- City council – not staff or consultants – needs to agree on the basic density definitions, formula and calculation before plan is approved
  - Current calculations establishes a precedence that could be used in land development code amendment discussions
  - Need to provide the community with a fair assessment of our current density –not a politically convenient one
- “Transition areas” where PUD R and PUD C developments in particular can be approved should be discussed/debated and plotted on the Future Land Use Map before the plan is approved.
- City needs to clarify intent of not including agricultural designations in the plan
- McDonwell extension should be removed from the plan until the development plan is well understood and impacted community has provided feedback
- Glade Road re-developed should occur within the existing right of way as promised by our elected officials
- Final version of the Comprehensive Plan should be voted on by the entire community

# What You Can Do...

- Attend the December 15 public meeting at 7:30pm at City Hall
  - Either sign up to speak or simply register opposition or support
- Call and send emails to your elected officials
- Stay engaged after the comprehensive plan vote
  - Follow the Land Development Code revision process closely
  - Watch for zoning change signs across town
- Participate actively in the electoral process
  - 3 seats up for re-election in May

# A Word about Water

- 2 separate rate increases 2013 and 2015
  - The 2015 increase kicked in this month
- TRA/TRWD and revenue diversions
- City has made no attempt to negotiate better rates with our sole source supplier
- Political solutions include partnering with other impacted communities to challenge the TRA/TRWD rate increases

*What are we doing to protect residents?*

*Nothing and it will only get worse from here unless we take action.*

Thank You  
Chris Putnam  
Colleyville City Council Place 3  
972-839.2343  
[cputnam@colleyville.com](mailto:cputnam@colleyville.com)  
[Facebook.com/chrisputnamcampaign](https://www.facebook.com/chrisputnamcampaign)