

**Arte PUD #139 Amendment 1
Planned Unit Development PUD25-00000**

HISTORY: The Planning and Zoning Commission approved the original Arte PUD (PUD #139) on May 12, 2022.

DATE OF REVIEW: June 04, 2025

LOCATION: East of S. Mays St. and north of E. Logan St.

STAFF REVIEW AND ANALYSIS:

Comprehensive Plan and Zoning: The Round Rock 2030 Comprehensive Plan designates the subject property for residential development. Residential development was proposed with the original PUD and is proposed for this amendment.

This project is located approximately 0.4 miles from Main Street. Included in the list of Round Rock 2030 Plan implementation strategies for Downtown is the direction to facilitate a mixture of residential development types and to develop a minimum of 1,000 residential dwelling units within one quarter mile of Main Street. While this property is located slightly further than one quarter mile from Main Street, the close proximity to downtown and direct connection for pedestrians and vehicles will serve to bring people to the downtown area.

The Code limits the scope of minor PUD amendments and the proposed changes to this PUD were determined by the Planning and Development Services Director to exceed what could be approved administratively through a minor PUD amendment.

Traffic, Access, and Roads:

The original PUD provided for potential access points from S. Mays St. and Logan St. as depicted on Exhibit "B". The existing rights of way for Tassey St. and E. Nash Street are proposed to be vacated while still preserving access to the property located at 603 S. Mays Street. The proposed PUD amendment proposes no change to the previously approved terms of access.

Proposed PUD Amendment:

To provide clarity and aid in administering the PUD for future permitting processes, staff reorganized the development standards within the PUD document which makes it difficult to provide the typical red lines. New and/or revised language which was added to the PUD is highlighted in yellow and underlined. Additionally, below is a chart with staff analysis that highlights the proposed changes:

Existing PUD	Proposed PUD Amendment 1
Parking for Multifamily-Urban (MF-3):	Parking for Multifamily-Urban (MF-3):
A minimum of 90% of required parking spaces shall be located within a structured	There is no minimum percentage of parking that is required to be covered or enclosed.

Arte PUD #139 Amendment 1
Planned Unit Development PUD25-00000

parking garage. A maximum of 10% of required parking spaces may be in surface parking areas.	Required parking may be comprised of surface parking areas, garage parking, tuck-under parking spaces, or carport covered surface parking areas.
---	--

Permitted Unit Count and Multifamily-Urban (MF-3) Building Height:	Permitted Unit Count and Multifamily-Urban (MF-3) Building Height:
Unit Count: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 410 max - Multifamily-Urban (MF-3) Units. • 19 max – Townhouse (TH) Units Multifamily-Urban (MF-3) Building Height : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 stories for the building furthest from Logan St. • 5 stories for the building closest to Logan St. 	Unit Count: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 350 max - Multifamily-Urban (MF-3) Units. • 6 max - Townhouse Units + Duplex/Attached Single Family Units Multifamily-Urban (MF-3) Building Height : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 stories for all MF-3 buildings

Staff Analysis: Citing changing market conditions and construction costs, the applicant proposes to amend the PUD to eliminate the requirement for 90% of required Multifamily-Urban (MF-3) residential parking to be located within structured parking. Eliminating structured parking in favor of surface parking areas, garage parking, tuck-under parking spaces, or carport covered surface parking areas results in a lower unit potential for the site which is reflected in the lower unit counts and reduced MF-3 building height that are proposed with PUD Amendment 1.

The Multifamily-Urban (MF-3) zoning district specifies that all required parking shall be located within structured parking. Other less intense multifamily zoning districts (MF-2 and MF-1) require a specific percentage of garage and/or covered parking.

Amending the PUD to remove the requirement for structured parking without implementing a minimum percentage of parking that is required to be covered or enclosed is a tradeoff to incentivize additional housing units within close proximity to Main Street as directed by the Round Rock 2030 Downtown Implementation Strategy.

Existing PUD	Proposed PUD Amendment 1
Permitted Uses:	Permitted Uses:
Multifamily-Urban Residential (MF-3) Townhouse (TH)	Multifamily-Urban Residential (MF-3) Townhouse (TH) Duplex/Attached Single Family

Staff Analysis: The addition of duplex/attached single family to the PUD is not intended to allow for a new, separate use category but instead to allow for two (2) unit buildings. The

Arte PUD #139 Amendment 1
Planned Unit Development PUD25-00000

Townhouse (TH) base zoning district allows for 5% of a townhouse development area to be comprised of two-unit duplex/attached single family buildings; however, the proposed total number of townhouse units in the PUD amendment is too low to generate an allowance for any duplex/attached single family units (6 units proposed \times 0.05 = 0.3 unit). Duplex/attached single family shall be developed in accordance with the standards of the **Townhouse (TH)** zoning district, and it is anticipated they will be visually similar to the larger three (3) unit townhouse buildings.

Existing PUD	Proposed PUD Amendment 1
Location of Townhouse Areas:	Location of Townhouse Areas:
A single development area for townhomes was previously proposed along the eastern property line as depicted on Exhibit B.	Parcel Areas 2 and 3 depict Townhouse and/or duplex/attached single family development areas on the western side of the PUD area. Exhibit B has been revised to show those areas.

Setbacks for Townhouse Areas:	Setbacks for Townhouse and Duplex/Single-family attached:
Side setbacks from the eastern property line adjacent to single family zoned lots: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two story townhouses – 10 feet • Three story townhouses – 20 feet • Rear setbacks – 40 feet 	Setbacks to the south, west, and east shall be 10 feet.

Building Orientation and Balconies:	Building Orientation and Balconies:
Multifamily-Urban (MF-3) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No orientation restrictions • No balcony restrictions Townhouse (TH) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buildings shall be oriented such that no fronts of structures face the eastern property line adjacent to single family zoned lots. • No Balconies shall face the eastern property line adjacent to single-family zoned lots. 	Multifamily-Urban (MF-3) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Balconies shall not be permitted on building facades facing the eastern property line adjacent to single-family residential zoning or use. Townhouse (TH) development areas are no longer proposed adjacent to single family zoned lots with PUD Amendment 1.

Staff Analysis: The applicant proposes to relocate the townhouse development areas from the east side of the PUD area to the west side as depicted on Exhibit “B”.

The setbacks for the townhouse development area that were approved with the existing PUD anticipated the adjacent existing single family neighborhood to the east. Now that the

Arte PUD #139 Amendment 1
Planned Unit Development PUD25-00000

townhouse development areas are no longer proposed adjacent to single family development, the proposed setbacks have been reduced to account for adjacent non-residential uses.

Previously the Townhouse (TH) development area was along a portion of the eastern property line and provided a transition to the existing single family neighborhood located east of the PUD area; however, the existing PUD required a minimum setback of seventy five feet (75') from the Multifamily-Urban (MF-3) structures to the eastern property line as well as a ten foot wide (10') landscape buffer. These standards are proposed to remain unchanged with PUD Amendment 1. Additionally, the applicant has proposed language that would prohibit balconies on Multifamily-Urban (MF-3) building facades that face the eastern property line adjacent to the single-family residential zoning or use.

Existing PUD	Proposed PUD Amendment 1
Amenities:	Amenities:
The existing PUD specifies that 6 amenities be provided from the list in Section 2-24 (d)(4) of the code	Added language that clarifies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amenities are to be shared between the Multifamily-Urban (MF-3) and Townhouse development areas. • Additional amenities shall not be required to serve the Townhouse and duplex/single family attached development areas • Amenities may be located in Parcel areas 1, 2, or 3.

Staff analysis: This PUD is anticipated to function as a single rental community, and it was always anticipated that amenities be shared. To avoid any future confusion, and because the Townhouse (TH) zoning district also has an amenity requirement, language was added to clarify the amenity requirements of the PUD.

Existing PUD	Proposed PUD Amendment 1
Foundation Treatment for Multifamily-Urban MF-3):	Foundation Treatment for Multifamily-Urban (MF-3):
Foundation treatment was not proposed in the PUD, nor is it required by Section 8-10 landscaping for the Multifamily-Urban (MF-3) zoning district.	Foundation treatment shall be provided along all street facing building facades in accordance with Chapter 8, Article 2, Section 8-10 Landscaping.

Site Lighting:	Site Lighting:
No standards for parking lot lighting were included in the existing PUD because structured parking was anticipated.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Added LED lighting as a permitted light source type • Limited pole light fixtures to a maximum height of 20 feet.

**Arte PUD #139 Amendment 1
Planned Unit Development PUD25-00000**

Staff Analysis: The Multifamily-Urban (MF-3) zoning district is a customized zoning district that does not include development standards that are commonly prescribed by other zoning districts. The proposed elimination of structured parking will result in surface parking, so staff recommended adding a maximum height for pole light fixtures that were typical for other districts that permit surface parking in proximity to single family zoning or use. Staff recommended adding a requirement for foundation treatment to improve the aesthetic of Multifamily-Urban (MF-3) structure facades that could potentially face Logan St. or N. Mays St.

Existing PUD	Proposed PUD Amendment 1
Interior Parking Lot Landscaping for Multifamily-Urban (MF-3):	Interior Parking Lot Landscaping for Multifamily-Urban (MF-3):
The existing PUD proposed structured parking with limited surface parking permitted. Where surface parking was proposed, it would have been in accordance with Section 8-10 Landscaping.	<p>In lieu of the Section 8-10 requirement that one interrupting island with 3" caliper tree be provided to break up rows of parking so that no more than 10 spaces are in a row, the following is proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In all surface parking areas, a minimum of ninety (90) square feet for each twelve (12) parking spaces must be devoted to landscaped strips, islands, peninsulas, medians, or other landscaped areas. • Upgraded tree sizing for interior parking lot landscape and parking lot landscape buffer requirements where such requirements are applicable: Large Trees – 4" caliper Medium Trees – 3" caliper Ornamental Trees – 2" caliper

Staff Analysis: If approved, the elimination of the structured parking requirement for the Multifamily-Urban (MF-3) project that is proposed with PUD Amendment 1 would be a large concession from the City; therefore, staff does not recommend approval of a lesser landscape standard for interior surface parking areas because the Code requires that PUDs be equivalent or superior to standard zoning districts. Interrupting tree islands are required for all zoning districts in the city with the exception of industrial zoning districts. These tree islands break up areas of surface parking and add to the city's tree canopy thus reducing the urban heat island effect which is vital for projects where city residents frequent.

**Arte PUD #139 Amendment 1
Planned Unit Development PUD25-00000**

Existing PUD	Proposed PUD Amendment 1
Revision Criteria for PUDs:	Revision Criteria for PUDs:
The existing PUD included outdated language describing the process by which PUDs could be amended.	Updated PUD to include the Code language for Major and Minor PUD Amendments.

Staff Analysis: The existing PUD was approved before standardized language for Major and Minor PUD Amendments was provided by legal and adopted into the Code. The PUD was revised to include the updated language for PUD amendment processes.

RECOMMENDED MOTION:

Staff recommends approval with the following conditions:

1. The interior parking lot landscaping shall be in accordance with Section 8-10 Landscaping.

Staff does not support the proposed language to reduce/eliminate parking lot interrupting tree islands as specified in proposed PUD Amendment No. 1.