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Project Team Roles

Freese and Nichols, Inc. (Lead Firm)

Freese and Nichols is a Fort Worth-based engineering, planning, architectural and environmental science firm. Since 1894, Freese and Nichols has built its practice on a strong foundation of client service and a continued commitment to project excellence. With offices throughout Texas, the firm retains a professional group of nearly 400 planners, architects, engineers, environmental scientists, construction managers, technical professionals and support personnel.

Freese and Nichols’ role on this project was to lead the urban design and planning effort and serve as project manager, coordinating all team efforts. Freese and Nichols provided oversight and facilitation for stakeholder and public meetings, coordinated with City staff, and produced the existing conditions and recommendations sections of this report.

Komatsu Architecture

Komatsu Architecture is a Dallas-based architecture firm providing expertise in architecture, established in 1959, Komatsu has enjoyed a long history providing architecture and related services to local, state, national, and international clients.

Komatsu’s role on this project was to recommend urban village boundaries and identify appropriate and realistic development opportunities based on existing use analysis, available land, proposed zoning and preferred densities.

Buxton Company

Buxton Company is the industry leader in customer analytics and retail site selection technology, providing strategic target marketing research services to major retailers, cities and economic development groups throughout the United States.

Buxton’s role on this project was to perform site visits and initial analysis of the retail potential on the urban village. Its team identified retail matches for each village’s trade area and assembled individual marketing packages for each targeted retailer. The market analysis is a separate document that accompanies this master plan.

Open Channels Group

Open Channels Group, L.L.C. is a minority-owned public affairs firm, which provides services to public, private, special interest groups, and grassroots organizations.

Open Channels Group led the public involvement plan by identifying and contacting Southeast Fort Worth stakeholders for input and involvement during the urban village planning process. Open Channels organized stakeholder roundtable discussions, community stakeholder public meetings, and provided information for neighborhood association newsletters, mailings, and meeting notes to keep the public informed.
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In April 2007, the City of Fort Worth engaged the planning, architectural and engineering firm of Freese and Nichols, Inc. to produce a master plan for five of the City’s urban villages in southeast Fort Worth. This document addresses the Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village.

Purpose

A master plan provides a process to make informed decisions, manage development in an orderly fashion, and guide the physical evolution of the built environment. The master planning process is intended to engage participants, build consensus, and provide a road map to achieve desired growth and development of an area.

As a result of a planning grant awarded for the Polytechnic/Wesleyan area, the City selected a team of consultants led by Freese and Nichols to focus on issues that included:

- Determination of additional areas to include in the urban village and rezone to mixed-use.
- Analysis of existing and proposed land uses.
- Identification of transportation needs and priorities.
- Exploration of development opportunities.

This plan is designed to attract new and quality businesses, promote higher-density residential development, generate economic opportunities, and improve the pedestrian experience. It is a working document and can assist the City of Fort Worth in prioritizing capital improvement projects for urban villages over the next decade and beyond.
Background
Since 2002, the City of Fort Worth has been working with private developers, business groups, and neighborhood associations to transform many of the central city’s older yet memorable commercial districts into vibrant “urban villages.” Active, diverse and prosperous urban villages will help promote the central city as an appealing alternative for families, businesses, and individuals.

What Are Urban Villages?
Urban villages are defined urban places where concentration of jobs, housing, commercial uses, public spaces, public transportation, and pedestrian activity is desired and actively promoted. They are frequently centered around significant intersections. Urban villages serve as catalysts for public and private investment and support renewed economic activity in the central city, effectively building on the strengths of the area and connecting to adjacent neighborhoods.

In order to take advantage of the incentives available, an urban village must be zoned for “Mixed-Use” (MU). Because of the variation of stages in which planning has been done in these areas, each village requires its own unique planning emphasis. The villages vary in community involvement, status of mixed-use zoning, and previous planning efforts.

Urban Village Program History
The mayor-appointed Commercial Corridors Task Force, with guidance from neighborhood stakeholders and community leaders, identified 13 urban villages along seven high-priority commercial corridors. The villages were identified as areas that are ripe for development and that hold investment potential despite social and economic redevelopment challenges. The identification and study of these villages was the subject of a two-year planning effort overseen by the Task Force.

The resulting Commercial Corridors Revitalization Strategy provided specific recommendations and strategies for revitalization that were adopted by reference into the City’s Comprehensive Plan. Three strategies are central to the revitalization effort: mixed-use zoning, economic incentives, and capital improvements.

In 2005, the City Council directed the City Plan Commission to evaluate existing and potential new urban villages. As a result, six commercial districts were designated as urban villages. Several villages have been added or combined, and two have been eliminated from the original 13, bringing the total number of urban villages to 16.

Currently, the City is implementing strategies from the original report for these 16 urban villages. In the FY 2004 and FY 2005 federal appropriations bills, the City of Fort Worth received $4.5 million in transportation funds (“Urban Village Funds”) from the Federal Highway Administration earmarked for 12 urban villages. These funds were allocated for planning and transportation-related capital improvement projects within those urban villages.

The Urban Village Development Program
The Urban Village Development Program uses mixed-use zoning, Neighborhood Empowerment Zone benefits, and capital improvements to promote redevelopment and economic growth in the areas that have been designated as urban villages.

Mixed-Use Zoning
Mixed-use zoning helps provide a desirable combination of compatible residential, office, retail, and selected light industrial uses. Vibrant, compact, mixed-use districts:
• Help reduce the frequency and distance of car trips.
• Foster safe, active pedestrian environments.
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- Provide residential and employment density to support public transportation and neighborhood businesses.
- Attract residents and employees looking for urban amenities.

Neighborhood Empowerment Zones
The City's principal incentive for urban village revitalization is the Neighborhood Empowerment Zone (NEZ) program. Economic incentives greatly increase the success of the urban villages by promoting desirable residential and commercial development and density. Household growth in and around the villages strengthens the market for area businesses. These businesses, in turn, provide goods, services and jobs for area residents. Central city economic redevelopment also expands the city’s tax base.

An NEZ designation offers incentives to qualified mixed-use, residential (owner-occupied, investor-owned single-family, and multifamily developments), community facilities, commercial, and industrial projects. Incentives include, but are not limited to, municipal property tax abatement, development fee waivers, and release of city liens.

Capital Improvements
One of the strategies for revitalizing the urban villages is to provide capital improvements that leverage private investment and enhance pedestrian and transit access. Three types of public investment will help spur development in the villages:
- Off-site improvements (infrastructure, streetscape, and landscape improvements).
- Specific community facilities (structured parking, water and sewer service, roadways and sidewalks, or other public amenities).
- Collaboration with developers and investors through Community Facilities Agreements (CFA) or by facilitating the approval process.

There are other funding options that may be available for urban village development, such as the State Transportation Enhancement Program and the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) Sustainable Development program. The urban village development program uses the tools described above to create and promote compact, pedestrian-oriented mixed-use development.

Priority Task
As part of the application for funding, stakeholders identified priority tasks for their respective villages choosing between four tasks: market analysis, traffic engineering, mixed-use zoning, and design guidelines. The chart below depicts the priority in which these items were ranked for each village. Based on this stakeholder prioritization, the Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village master plan includes a market analysis. The market analysis will be used to identify potential businesses for future economic development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>PHASE ONE</th>
<th></th>
<th>PHASE TWO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Zoning</td>
<td>Market Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry/Riverside</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry/Stalcup</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Eastside</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Corners</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polytechnic/ Wesleyan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Previous Planning Documents
Below are previous plans and documents that have addressed the Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village, which can also be used in coordination with this Master Plan for guidance in the village’s future growth and development.

For additional information on these plans, contact the Planning and Development Department at 817-392-8000, or visit the websites referenced below.

Comprehensive Plan, City of Fort Worth (2007)
The Comprehensive Plan is the City of Fort Worth’s official guide for making decisions about growth and development. The Plan is a summary of the goals, objectives, policies, strategies, programs, and projects that will enable the City to achieve its mission of focusing on the future, working together to build strong neighborhoods, developing a sound economy, and providing a safe community.

The City’s mission is evident in the Comprehensive Plan’s promotion of the Urban Village Development Program, which encourages mixed-use zoning in designated villages and Neighborhood Empowerment Zone benefits for qualifying development projects. The Urban Village Development Program provides capital improvements that leverage private investment and enhance pedestrian and transit access.

The Comprehensive Plan lists criteria for urban village designation, including:
• Presence of a market opportunity in the near/long-term.
• Upward trend in local investment.
• Ability to create mixed-use activity centers, emphasizing live/work/play opportunities with multi-modal access.
• Demonstrated community need, both perceived and quantified, and presence of unified, energetic stakeholders.
• Compatibility with the Comprehensive Plan.
• Physical environment including parks and open space, public improvements, historic building stock, etc.
• Potential for creating key entryways or gateways into development areas.

For more information, go to www.fortworthgov.org (navigate to the Comprehensive Plan on the Planning and Development Department’s web page).

Commercial districts located on commercial corridors are reemerging as regional destinations in cities throughout the nation. In virtually every story of success, redevelopment and new development within these districts has been the result of nurturing and growing each diverse segment of the local economy, eliminating barriers to investment, and marketing positive changes through an overall image of vitality.

The City of Fort Worth seeks to revitalize its central city and commercial corridors by promoting redevelopment in mixed-use growth centers – districts that are compact, contain a mix of land uses, and give emphasis to pedestrian and transit access. Encouraging new investment to develop a mix of land uses in an environment that promotes pedestrian and transit access and that creates a unique sense of place has been identified as the central goal in the renaissance of these mixed-use growth centers. The Commercial Corridors Revitalization Strategy provides the direction to move this vision towards reality.
The Commercial Corridors Task Force identified and prioritized commercial corridors located in the central city. City staff identified 31 corridors, based on three criteria:

- Corridors must be located along a designated arterial street.
- Corridors must be one mile or greater in length.
- Corridors must be characterized by predominantly commercial land uses.

Given the large number of corridors and limited City resources, the Task Force asked staff to analyze the corridors according to criteria related to economic distress and development potential. Based on this analysis, the Task Force assigned priority to 15 corridors. In an effort to further concentrate revitalization efforts, the Task Force then assigned top priority to five corridors: East Lancaster Avenue, East Rosedale Street, Hemphill Street, West Seventh Street, and Camp Bowie Boulevard. In addition to the five commercial corridors selected by the Task Force, the City Council had previously assigned priority to Berry Street, North Main Street, and the Downtown portion of Lancaster Avenue. In 1998, the City allocated capital improvement bond funds to these three corridors, and has subsequently secured significant amounts of federal and state funding to provide streetscape and landscape improvements.

For more information, go to www.fortworthgov.org (navigate to the Commercial Corridors report on the Planning and Development Department’s web page).

**Fort Worth’s Mixed-Use Zoning Standards (2005)**

The City of Fort Worth Comprehensive Plan designates mixed-use growth centers as areas where compact, pedestrian-scaled, mixed-use neighborhoods and commercial districts should be developed. Within these growth centers, and in other appropriate areas, such as designated urban villages, mixed-use zoning helps provide a desirable combination of compatible residential, office, retail, and selected light industrial uses.

Mixed-use zoning standards are significantly different than the conventional standards of other commercial districts. Because the classifications are intended to encourage a compatible mix of residential and non-residential uses, the mixed-use standards place more emphasis on the form, or design, of new development. This illustrated guide is the most effective way to present these form-based standards.

The mixed-use zoning classifications are:

- MU-1 Low-Intensity Mixed-Use District — Provides areas in which a variety of housing types may exist among neighborhood-serving commercial and institutional uses.
- MU-1G Greenfield Low-Intensity Mixed-Use District* — Promotes low intensity mixed-use development in undeveloped mixed-use growth centers.
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- MU-2 High-Intensity Mixed-Use District — Provides areas in which a variety of higher density housing types may exist among commercial, institutional, and selected light industrial uses.
- MU-2G Greenfield High Intensity Mixed-Use District* — Promotes high-intensity, mixed-use development in undeveloped mixed-use growth centers.

* The greenfield zoning classifications are limited to sites of at least 100 acres.

For more information, go to www.fortworthgov.org (navigate to the Mixed-Use Zoning Guide on the Planning and Development Department’s web page).

Southeast Fort Worth Action Plan (1999)
The Southeast Fort Worth Action Plan identified more specific plans and a series of action steps to fulfill specified economic goals over a 10-year period. These economic development actions are designed to complement neighborhood development initiatives and the City’s Comprehensive Plan. The goals of the action plan include major business growth, new business locations, and the creation of quality jobs close to home for southeast residents. This will result in substantial economic empowerment of southeast residents when combined with focused workforce development, training, and neighborhood capacity building.

This plan established key action steps:
- Establish and sufficiently fund Southeast Fort Worth, Inc. The absence of “master developers/investors” to plan and promote all or portions of the southeast is the main obstacle to attaining the economic potential and goals of the area. Businesses that are expanding and relocating expect to find the services and investment confidence that comes from committed investors/developers.
  1. Apply an “all-day-every-day” focus on the economic development action steps.
  2. Fulfill the role of “master developer/investor.” Advocate for the economic zones and business park areas in collaboration with all stakeholders.
  3. Be a facilitator for investors and businesses to be assured that their investments will have short term and long term value success.
- Start immediate implementation of one or two initiatives in each of the target areas. There are nine initiatives recommended for immediate implementation.
- Create hiring priorities, customized training, and similar programs to maximize hiring and upward mobility for residents of the southeast area.

The Southeast Fort Worth Action Plan provides a strategic opportunity for business development, workforce development, and retail development.

For more information, contact Southeast Fort Worth, Inc. at 817-871-6542 or www.southeastfw.com
Polytechnic Heights/Wesleyan Corridor Preliminary Strategic Plan (July 2000)

This preliminary strategic plan summarizes the vision of corridor property owners and stakeholders that participated in a strategic planning process in 2000. Although the plan was not officially adopted by the City, it provides thorough background information on past developments and stakeholder aspirations in 2000.

Economic Development Initiative - Special Project Grant for Building Restoration in the Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village

On September 30, 2003, the City Council authorized execution of two grant agreements for receipt of Economic Development Initiative (EDI) – Special Project Grants in the amounts of $223,538 and $737,674 from the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development for the revitalization of the Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village. The combined grants total $961,212 and are intended to leverage private sector investment for façade renovation and redevelopment of buildings in the Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village.

On December 18, 2007, the City Council approved an economic development agreement with Texas Wesleyan University (TWU) to use the $961,212 EDI grant for façade renovation and redevelopment of the East Rosedale storefronts located in the 3000, 3100, and 3200 blocks of East Rosedale Street. The TWU bookstore, which is planned to relocate from the campus to 3020 East Rosedale, will act as the anchor site for the redevelopment.

The total private investment for the project is estimated at $2.7 million. TWU will partner with TSC Poly Retail, LLC on the project, which is expected to begin in January 2008.

For more information, contact the City’s Economic and Community Development Department at 817-392-6103.
Project Process
The planning team employed a proven planning methodology which included five phases of work: Mobilization, Data Gathering, Analysis, Review and Recommendations.

Mobilization
During the Mobilization Phase, the planning team met with stakeholders and City staff to kick-off the urban village planning process. At that time, the schedule and a public involvement process plan was established.

Data Gathering
During the Data Gathering Phase, the planning team collected and compiled a large amount of data to provide essential background information necessary to adequately assess the urban village. The planning team collected site data, photographs, maps, plans, and reports.

The planning team also conducted a series of public meetings with community stakeholders. On three occasions, the meetings were held at locations within or near three of the urban villages. The meetings were well attended and the team received a tremendous amount of information and input that helped shape the final plan.

Breakout sessions for the five urban villages were also conducted at each meeting. These breakout sessions gave stakeholders from each village the opportunity to present their collective vision and discuss in detail the issues in their village.
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Analysis
During the Analysis Phase, the planning team gave thorough consideration of existing conditions. Issues were summarized and potential recommendations were explored. The team received continual feedback from various stakeholders; City staff; District 8 representative and Mayor Pro Tem Kathleen Hicks; and affected agencies, which brought consensus to recommendations and future improvements.

Recommendations
During the Recommendation Phase, draft reports were written summarizing the process, issues, and outcomes of the planning effort. These reports were presented to the City Plan Commission and City Council for review and comment.

This report concludes the recommendations of a seven-month planning effort to ultimately be adopted by the City Council and serve as a guide for future development in the Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village.

Review
During the Review Phase, the planning team drafted concepts and preliminary recommendations and presented to the community at the second public meeting to gather feedback. The draft concepts and recommendations were reviewed by City staff and a group of developers and investors for a reality check.

The input from all the parties above resulted in some changes made and new information added to the concepts and recommendations.
Public Involvement

Public involvement and community support are critical components of the urban village planning process. It is imperative to understand the dynamics from a neighborhood and business stakeholders’ perspective. The public involvement in Polytechnic/Wesleyan’s master plan was an integral part of the planning effort to help build consensus among stakeholders.

Open Channels Group, a local public affairs firm located in southeast Fort Worth, provided an array of services to ensure ongoing stakeholders’ input and involvement. Because people appreciate the ability to be heard and give their input, public and stakeholder meetings were held throughout the project.

Following is a summary of the overall public involvement plan:

- Held three public meetings at facilities in or near one of the five southeast urban villages.
- Outreach made to Hispanic residents by drafting the meeting notice in Spanish, distributing those notices to organizations with a high number of Hispanic clients, and providing Spanish translation at the public meetings.
- Mailed and distributed over 550 meeting notices and placed notices at libraries and community centers located in the southeast sector, and sent email reminders prior to each public meeting.
- Used a questionnaire to receive stakeholder input.
- Drafted meeting notes.
- Posted the meeting presentations and other information on the City’s website.

During these meetings, a broad spectrum of issues and needs were discussed including traffic circulation, streetscape improvements, mixed-use development, transportation, etc. A summary of the most notable issues for the Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village are listed in the recommendations section.

### Public Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-12-07</td>
<td>6:30-8:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Public Meeting #1</td>
<td>Polytechnic United Methodist Church</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-19-07</td>
<td>6:30-8:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Public Meeting #2</td>
<td>Dunbar High School</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-25-07</td>
<td>1:30-4:00 p.m.</td>
<td>City Plan Commission Briefing</td>
<td>City Hall</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-20-07</td>
<td>5:30-8:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Congressman Burgess’ Economic Summit</td>
<td>Tarrant County Resource Connection</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-27-07</td>
<td>6:30-8:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Public Meeting #3</td>
<td>Morningside Middle School</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-16-07</td>
<td>10:00 a.m.- noon</td>
<td>City Plan Commission Briefing and Public Hearing</td>
<td>City Hall</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-27-07</td>
<td>8:30-10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Pre-Council Briefing</td>
<td>City Hall</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-4-07</td>
<td>7:00-9:00 p.m.</td>
<td>City Council Public Hearing</td>
<td>City Hall</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These meetings were open to the public. Attendance was not taken.
existing conditions

Many of the major issues and needs were discovered through a thorough study of the existing conditions. The planning team noted many recurring themes, statements, and observations.

This section captures the existing conditions of the village including context, zoning, ownership, and other conditions related to land use and development.
Urban Village Context
Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village is located in southeast Fort Worth about three miles southeast of downtown. East Rosedale Street runs through the heart of the urban village. Interstate 30 is less than three miles north of the village.

The Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village is approximately 170.8 gross acres. Low intensity mixed-use, medium-density multifamily, and two-family residential are the predominant zoning classifications in this village. Texas Wesleyan University is located in the urban village and is planning for future development of its campus.

The Fort Worth Independent School District has three schools less than a mile from this urban village: D. McRae Elementary School, William James Middle School, and Polytechnic High School.

There are six parks within a mile of the urban village. The Sycamore Creek Golf Course is located one mile northwest of the village.

The Fort Worth Transportation Authority has several routes that run through the village.

Major Accomplishments
Several major activities have been accomplished within this village, including:
- MU-1 zoning.
- Texas Wesleyan University’s 250 apartment-style student housing units.
- Street and sidewalk improvements along Nashville Avenue.
- Expanded police station.
- HUD EDI grant for renovation of the historic Rosedale storefronts.

Source: Freese and Nichols, Inc.
Existing conditions

Urban Village Existing Conditions

Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village Boundary

This village is bounded on the north by the Union Pacific railroad line and the northern lots fronting East Vickery Street; roughly Nashville and Corner Streets to the west; one or two lot depths south of Rosedale Street until Vaughn Boulevard, where the village extends southward to include parcels fronting Vaughn Boulevard to Avenue J; and East Vickery and Bishop to the east, except for a group of lots near Vickery.
The properties immediately surrounding the Texas Wesleyan University campus are zoned low intensity mixed-use (MU-1). MU-1 zoning allows a variety of housing types to exist among neighborhood-serving commercial and institutional uses.

Within the expanded village area, which currently has no MU-1 zoning, the zoning is primarily duplex (B) and medium density multifamily (C). Some commercial and light industrial zoning also exists in this area. The development standards associated with these zoning districts are not conducive to creating a compact, pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use urban village.
The future land use maps of the City of Fort Worth’s 2007 Comprehensive Plan designate the Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village as a mixed-use growth center.

The mixed-use growth center designation promotes a compact urban land use that includes a concentration of jobs, housing, recreational open space, and public facilities. The mixed-use growth center designation is key to achieving a lively urban environment that is pedestrian-oriented, accessible to public transportation, and embodies a strong sense of place.

The current and proposed MU-1 zoning conforms to the mixed-use growth center designation.
Based on Tarrant Appraisal District property records, much of the property in this village is in single-lot ownership. The largest property owner is Texas Wesleyan University with close to 64 acres. The other property owners listed own between one and six acres, while the remaining owners (mostly single-family residential owners) less than an acre.

Source: Tarrant Appraisal District, 2007
Brownfield
Brownfield sites are “real property, the expansion, redevelopment, or reuse of which may be complicated by the presence or potential presence of a hazardous substance, pollutant, or contaminant.” Brownfield sites may or may not have environmental contamination.

Brownfields are land previously used for certain industrial or commercial purposes that may be contaminated by low concentrations of hazardous waste or pollution, but which has the potential to be reused if cleaned up. Land that has higher concentrations of hazardous waste or pollution, such as Superfund or hazardous waste sites, does not fall under the brownfield classification.

Generally, brownfield sites are found in a city’s industrial section. Brownfield sites may contain abandoned factories or commercial buildings, or other potentially polluting operations. Many brownfield sites are close to important shipping routes such as highways and rivers. Small brownfield sites also may be found in older residential neighborhoods. For example, former dry cleaning establishments and gas stations used and stored materials that could contaminate the environment. Such real or perceived contamination may cause land to sit idle for decades. Cleaning up and reinvesting in these properties increases the local tax base, facilitates job growth, capitalizes on existing infrastructure, reduces the need to consume raw land for development, and protects the environment.

Fort Worth’s Brownfield Program encourages the redevelopment of economically distressed areas through environmental assessment, remediation, and education. The Environmental Management Department oversees the City’s Brownfield Program. The Department has an extensive database of environmentally contaminated sites, as well as abandoned or
idle commercial and industrial properties. Financial assistance in the form of grants and loans is available to assess and clean up environmental contamination on a property. The City can provide information on the history of a property and assist with streamlining the regulatory and development process.

Redevelopment of brownfield sites plays an important part in the revitalization of older commercial districts, while supporting economic development and providing land needed for housing, transportation improvements, green spaces, and recreational facilities. For more information on redeveloping a brownfield site, go to www.fortworthgov.org/dem, or call 817-392-6088.
recommendations

Recommendations for improvements and future development are depicted in the following section. These include:
• Summary of Recommendations
• Concept Plan
• Development Opportunities
  – Land Analysis
  – Zones
  – Building Opportunity Analysis (see Appendix for calculations)
• Zoning
• Streetscape and District Identity
• Historic Preservation
• Transportation Improvements
• Market Analysis
Summary of Recommendations
The following is a summary of recommendations pertinent to this village, followed by concept plans depicting proposed developments.

Development
- Encourage more retail-restaurants to support the neighborhood and college population.
- Expeditiously apply the approved EDI grant to new development plan before grant expiration date in 2008.
- Establish Texas Wesleyan University campus boundary from Binkley on the west to Collard on the east.

Zoning
- Adopt the Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village boundary as depicted in the concept plan on the following page.
- Rezone the expanded Nashville area to Mixed-Use (MU-1).
- Extend the urban village boundary west to South Beach Street along the south side of East Rosedale. This allows for an extension of development and continuity along East Rosedale and an identity gateway at the intersection of East Rosedale and South Beach Streets.
- Rezone above expansion area to MU-1.

Streetscape/District Identity
- Improve gateways and pedestrian improvements along East Rosedale Street and Nashville Avenue.
- Create district identity, including monument signs, banner poles, and public art.
- Encourage streetscape improvements that enhance pedestrian connectivity between the village and the new community center planned to be located adjacent to the village on Avenue I.

Transportation
- Within the village boundary, keep East Rosedale Street a pedestrian-friendly street and do not widen.
- Preserve land at northwest corner of Vickery Boulevard and Collard Street for a future commuter rail station site.
- Screen all parking lots adjacent to residential neighborhoods with appropriate landscaping to provide a buffer between commercial areas and existing residential neighborhoods.
- Continue to work with NCTCOG and The “T” for transit contingency planning.

Historic Preservation
- Preserve historic buildings including the storefront facades along East Rosedale Street between Vaughn Boulevard and Binkley Street. These buildings provide a distinct architectural character that enhances the neighborhood’s sense of place. Once renovated, the buildings can accommodate a variety of neighborhood-serving uses.

Market Analysis
- Target and pursue retailers based on the Buxton market analysis that accompanies this report.
Concept Plan
Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village

Legend
- Mixed-Use
- Commercial/Retail
- Residential
- Institutional
- Existing Building
Development Opportunities
To determine viable opportunities for future development, the land within the village boundary was assessed for the following:
• Land recommended to continue current usage for the foreseeable future (shown in red).
• Underutilized land recommended for higher and better uses (shown in green).
• Unimproved or vacant land that offers a potential for development (shown in purple).
• Unimproved land recommended for open space (shown in gray).

This land analysis was used as a basis for development of the concept plan.
Development Opportunities Zones
The concept plan is divided into 12 zones for the purpose of focusing on the detail of proposed improvements, approximate land area, density, and development potential.
recommendations

Zone A contains the Texas Wesleyan University campus. This area is not included in the calculations of developable land for the Urban Village.

### Building Opportunity Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GROSS LAND AREA</td>
<td>2,170,609 SF/49.83 ac.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND WITH DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL</td>
<td>0 SF/0 ac.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENSITY/SF OF BUILDING AREAS</td>
<td>0 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLOOR AREA RATIO</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations
Zone B contains the proposed eastern terminus gateway to the Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village, which will be developed at the intersection of East Rosedale Street and South Collard Street. Recommended uses include mixed-use, retail, and apartment-like residential to support Texas Wesleyan University’s population.

Building Opportunity Analysis
- Gross Land Area: 450,000 SF/10.33 ac.
- Land with Development Potential: 450,000 SF/10.33 ac.
- Density/SF of Building Areas: 309,200 SF
- Floor Area Ratio: 0.69
**Zone C**

**Recommendations**

The recommended uses in Zone C include a mix of small professional and retail/commercial development, with three existing structures retained to accommodate retail commercial functions.

**Building Opportunity Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Land Area</td>
<td>181,850 SF/4.16 ac.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land with Development Potential</td>
<td>181,850 SF/4.16 ac.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density/SF of Building Areas</td>
<td>65,100 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Zone D

Recommendations
Zone D will see the development of new married-student housing on a mix of primarily TWU property and a smaller area of private property. The potential for this tract is the long-range acquisition of the entire area for the TWU married-student housing. A component of this overall plan is the relocation of the historic Dillow House, a property also owned by TWU. This house is targeted for restoration and rehabilitation to become an administrative and visitor center for the school. These objectives for the Dillow House are not part of the urban village concept.

The Boys and Girls Club also occupies part of this zone; this property to remain and continue its current function and purpose.

Building Opportunity Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GROSS LAND AREA</td>
<td>158,350 SF/3.64 ac.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND WITH DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL</td>
<td>60,400 SF/1.39 ac.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENSITY/SF OF BUILDING AREAS</td>
<td>48,000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLOOR AREA RATIO</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Zone E

Recommendations
Zone E embraces the most concentrated and contiguous opportunities for combined retail/commercial and residential in the village.

Zone E includes several historic or potentially historic structures. These properties are targeted for restoration/adaptive reuse. Façade preservation is recommended for these structures. Retaining the character of these buildings will contribute to the return of the vibrant retail climate that once existed in the Polytechnic/Wesleyan neighborhood.

The first of two western terminus gateways to the Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village will be developed at the intersection of East Rosedale Street and South Beach Street.
Zone F contains a mix of retail/commercial, limited mixed-use, and institutional uses. The police substation will remain and retain its functionality. There are two potential historic buildings located in this zone that are planned for new adaptive commercial reuse (retail/commercial). Several new structures are proposed for retail/commercial purposes.

### Building Opportunity Analysis

- **GROSS LAND AREA**: 335,432 SF/7.7 ac.
- **LAND WITH DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL**: 254,432 SF/5.84 ac.
- **DENSITY/SF OF BUILDING AREAS**: 94,900 SF
- **FLOOR AREA RATIO**: 0.37
Zone G

**Building Opportunity Analysis**

- **GROSS LAND AREA**: 599,330 SF/13.76 ac.
- **LAND WITH DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL**: 465,050 SF/10.68 ac.
- **DENSITY/SF OF BUILDING AREAS**: 284,000 SF
- **OPEN SPACE**: 24,180 SF/.56 ac.
- **FLOOR AREA RATIO**: 0.61

**Recommendations**

Zone G offers the most contiguous and concentrated potential for townhouse residential in the village. In addition, a small number of existing single-family dwellings are slated to remain and offer potential for long-term residential development. One small structure is recommended for new retail/commercial.

The second of two western terminus gateways to the Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village will be developed at the intersection of Vickery Boulevard and South Beach Street.
**Recommendations**

Twelve units of new townhomes are contemplated for Zone H. Long-range planning for Texas Wesleyan University could result in the entire Zone H being incorporated into a contiguous TWU campus. The school’s internal plan envisions a central contiguous campus bounded by Vickery Boulevard on the north, Collard Street to the east, East Rosedale Street on the south, and Binkley Street on the west.

**Building Opportunity Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GROSS LAND AREA</td>
<td>142,250 SF/3.27 ac.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND WITH DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL</td>
<td>142,250 SF/3.27 ac.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENSITY/SF OF BUILDING AREAS</td>
<td>80,200 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLOOR AREA RATIO</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Zone J

Recommendations
Zone J consists of several discreet properties offering potential for recommended retail/commercial and/or professional service functions. The YWCA Fort Worth & Tarrant County is teaming up with TWU to establish an early childhood development center on a portion of this property. The center will provide child day-care services to students, faculty, and staff of TWU as well as to the greater Polytechnic/Wesleyan neighborhood. Additionally, the center will serve as a laboratory for an Early Childhood Studies curriculum to be offered by TWU.

Building Opportunity Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GROSS LAND AREA</td>
<td>228,000 SF/5.23 ac.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND WITH DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL</td>
<td>216,280 SF/2.8 ac.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENSITY/SF OF BUILDING AREAS</td>
<td>95,300 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLOOR AREA RATIO</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Zone K

Recommendations
Zone K is planned for redevelopment from single-family dwellings to multifamily dwellings/townhomes. The success of this area is dependent upon the potential market generated in part by future residential needs of Texas Wesleyan University.

Building Opportunity Analysis
- **GROSS LAND AREA**: 182,500 SF/4.19 ac.
- **LAND WITH DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL**: 182,500 SF/4.19 ac.
- **DENSITY/SF OF BUILDING AREAS**: 141,200 SF
- **FLOOR AREA RATIO**: 0.77
Zone L encompasses the property of the William James Middle School. No new development is recommended for this area.

**Recommendations**

**Building Opportunity Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GROSS LAND AREA</td>
<td>461,400 SF/710.59 ac.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND WITH DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL</td>
<td>0 SF/0 ac.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENSITY/SF OF BUILDING AREAS</td>
<td>0 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLOOR AREA RATIO</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Zone M**

**Recommendations**

Zone M is a large undeveloped area adjoining the railroad right-of-way at the northern edge of the village. This tract is currently the subject of a preliminary evaluation by the North Central Texas Council of Governments of transit-oriented development (TOD) opportunities associated with the potential siting of a commuter rail station at this location. For this reason, no development is proposed for Zone M at this time. All efforts to secure funding and commuter rail access to the Union Pacific railroad right-of-way should be strongly encouraged.

**Building Opportunity Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Land Area</td>
<td>338,900 SF/7.78 ac.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land With Development Potential</td>
<td>60,000 SF/1.38 ac.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density/SF of Building Areas</td>
<td>0 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>278,900 SF/6.4 ac.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Low intensity mixed-use (MU-1) is recommended for the properties located in the recently expanded village area, as well as in the proposed expansion area outlined in this master plan.

MU-1 zoning allows a variety of housing types to exist among neighborhood-serving commercial and institutional uses, while encouraging a pedestrian-oriented urban form. MU-1 supports the urban village concept outlined in this master plan.

The design characteristics of MU-1 development include pedestrian-friendly streets with wider sidewalks; taller buildings with minimal setbacks and transparent storefronts; on-street parking and street trees to help separate pedestrians from street traffic; and structured parking or surface lots located behind buildings.
Recommendations for streetscape and district identity include:

- Improve gateways and pedestrian improvements along East Rosedale Street and Nashville Avenue.
- Create district identity, including monument signs, banner poles, and public art.
Historic Preservation

Preserve historic buildings including the storefronts or at least facades along East Rosedale Street between Vaughn Boulevard and Binkley Street. These buildings provide a distinct architectural character and can be used for neighborhood serving retail.

Proposed TWU Art Gallery/Cafe. Source: Texas Wesleyan University
Transportation Improvements

Assessment
The two primary corridors within the Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village are East Rosedale and Nashville Boulevard. Both of these corridors vary from four-lane undivided roadways to five-lane sections. In addition, East Vickery serves as the east and west corridor along the northern boundary of the village.

Transportation Deficiencies
This village does not have any significant transportation deficiencies; however, all corridors need some sidewalk and ADA ramp improvements.

Transportation Recommendations
- Add intersection sidewalks.
- Sidewalk repair where needed.
- Traffic calming features along Nashville Boulevard and East Vickery Street.
- Create bicycle and pedestrian pathways.

| Planning Level Cost Estimate for Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village |
|------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Project                | Construction Cost | Design and Administration | Funding Source   |
| Rosedale Streetscape Improvements | $900,000.00 | $130,000.00 | Unknown, CIP, Developer Assisted |
| Nashville Streetscape Improvements | $940,000.00 | $130,000.00 | Unknown, CIP, Developer Assisted |
| East Vickery Streetscape Improvements | $1,280,000.00 | $240,000.00 | Unknown, CIP, Developer Assisted |

Source: Freese and Nichols, Inc.
Market Analysis

Purpose of the Market Analysis
The Buxton Company was retained to undertake a market analysis to determine the viability of the Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village and its surrounding neighborhood to attract retailers and restaurants. The market analysis study that accompanies this master plan is intended to identify specific retailers and restaurants that are most likely to consider the Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village as a potential location. The information from the market analysis was used to develop the concept plan by identifying the types and associated size of retail uses that could be sustainable and meet community retail needs.

The Buxton Company used its economic and demographic analysis program (CommunityID) to analyze the characteristics of the Polytechnic/Wesleyan trade area. Designed specifically for use in community economic development CommunityID analyzes data down to the household level and looks at lifestyle, behavior patterns, and buying habits.

Findings
The market analysis findings for the Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village are:
- The urban village possesses large numbers of nearby households with strong purchasing habits that appeal to a wide variety of retailers and restaurants.
- The urban village benefits from large traffic counts on East Rosedale and its relative proximity to Interstate 30.
- Overall, the urban village is well situated to attract a quality mix of desired retailers and restaurants.

Selected Retailers and Restaurants
Buxton examined thousands of retailers and restaurants to determine those with location requirements that best match the buying habits and demographics within the Polytechnic/Wesleyan trade area. Initially, hundreds of quality matches surfaced which is a testament to the character of the Polytechnic/Wesleyan trade area as an attractive retail location. The initial list was narrowed to approximately 50 targets based on additional research of each retailer and restaurant. Factors used in the additional research included relative match scores, community preference, business strategies and conditions, and proximity to existing retail locations.
How to Use The Market Analysis Report
The Buxton market analysis report will be used in conjunction with the master plan to market sites within the Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village market to the retail and restaurant firms identified as a good match for the Polytechnic/Wesleyan area. The City of Fort Worth, Southeast Fort Worth, Inc., and Polytechnic/Wesleyan stakeholders will market the urban village to the retail and restaurant firms identified in the market analysis report.

Local small businesses seeking to fill the area’s market demand can also use the market analysis to determine if the Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village is an appropriate location for their business. Small businesses that may need financial and technical assistance can use the services offered at the Fort Worth Business Assistance Center (BAC). For a complete list of services offered at the BAC, visit www.fwbac.com.

For additional information on the market analysis results, visit www.fortworthgov.org (navigate to the Urban Village section on the Planning and Development Department’s webpage, or call 817-392-8000).
Building Opportunity Analysis

Based on proposed land uses and preferred densities, this analysis depicts the potential amount of retail, residential, commercial, and institutional uses with associated parking.

This table indicates the assumptions made related to mix of use, height, and unit size for each new building depicted on the concept plan. The building square footages reflect the actual building footprints shown on the plan, and parking requirements are based roughly on the requirements of the City’s development codes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Use Key</th>
<th>Estimated Ground Floor SF</th>
<th>2nd Floor SF</th>
<th>3rd Floor SF</th>
<th>4th Floor SF</th>
<th>5th Floor SF</th>
<th>Total SF</th>
<th>Parking Required</th>
<th>Total Residential Area</th>
<th>Residual</th>
<th>Parking Required</th>
<th>Parking Required</th>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Future Use Key</th>
<th>Land Use Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>NWM Campus</td>
<td>U1</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>U1</td>
<td></td>
<td>PAU Campus</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>U1</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>U1</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>3,750</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>U1</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>U1</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>1,875</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>1,875</td>
<td>B4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>U1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>4,250</td>
<td>5,250</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>B5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>U1</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>3,250</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>B6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>U1</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>3,750</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>U1</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>U1</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>1,875</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>1,875</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>U1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>4,250</td>
<td>5,250</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>U1</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>3,250</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>U1</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>3,250</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>C6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- **PAU Campus Area**
- **Existing Buildings**
- **Commerical/Retail**
- **Residential**
- **Continued areas**
- **Mixed Use**
- **General Commercial**
# Building Opportunity Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Estimated Gross SF</th>
<th>Parking Required Gross</th>
<th>Parking Required Residential</th>
<th>Parking Required Commercial</th>
<th>Parking Required Retail</th>
<th>Parking Required REX</th>
<th>Parking Required Retail Parking Criteria</th>
<th>Building Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-1</td>
<td>28,069 Res.</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>Total: 13,000</td>
<td>Police Substation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-2</td>
<td>22,000 Res.</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Total: 10,000</td>
<td>Existing Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-3</td>
<td>11,000 Res.</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>Total: 5,000</td>
<td>Existing Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-4</td>
<td>13,000 Res.</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>Total: 6,000</td>
<td>Existing Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-5</td>
<td>5,000 Res.</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>Total: 2,000</td>
<td>Existing Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-6</td>
<td>4,000 Res.</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>Total: 2,000</td>
<td>Existing Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-7</td>
<td>8,000 Res.</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>Total: 4,000</td>
<td>Existing Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-8</td>
<td>12,000 Res.</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>Total: 6,000</td>
<td>Existing Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>109,014 Res.</td>
<td>47,000</td>
<td>47,000</td>
<td>47,000</td>
<td>47,000</td>
<td>47,000</td>
<td>Total: 47,000</td>
<td>Existing Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-1</td>
<td>19,000 Res.</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>Total: 8,000</td>
<td>Existing Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-2</td>
<td>21,000 Res.</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>Total: 9,000</td>
<td>Existing Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-3</td>
<td>18,000 Res.</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>Total: 7,000</td>
<td>Existing Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-4</td>
<td>15,000 Res.</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>Total: 6,000</td>
<td>Existing Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-5</td>
<td>15,000 Res.</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>Total: 6,000</td>
<td>Existing Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-6</td>
<td>8,000 Res.</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>Total: 4,000</td>
<td>Existing Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-7</td>
<td>10,000 Res.</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>Total: 5,000</td>
<td>Existing Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-8</td>
<td>8,000 Res.</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>Total: 4,000</td>
<td>Existing Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>82,000 Res.</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>Total: 33,000</td>
<td>Existing Retail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the sake of the analysis, the table outlines the estimated gross floor area for each building type and the parking requirements for gross, residential, and commercial spaces. The totals indicate the overall parking requirements for each category, highlighting the importance of planning for adequate parking infrastructure in the Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village Master Plan.
Building Opportunity Analysis Legend
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SOUTHEAST CLUSTER URBAN VILLAGES

PUBLIC MEETING NOTES

Public Meeting #1
April 12, 2007
6:00 p.m.
Polytechnic United Methodist Church
1310 Collard Street, Fort Worth

Prepared by: Open Channels Group, LLC and Frease and Nichols, Inc.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Patricia Newton
Senior Planner
City of Fort Worth
817-877-7259
patricia.newton@fortworth-tx.gov

Wendy Shobay
Project Manager
Frease and Nichols
817-322-9666
wendyshobay@gmail.com

Tanya Veney
Public Information
Polytechnic United Methodist Church
817-333-6990
OpenChannelsGroup@bkvdial.net

Opening Session

The April 12 public meeting is the first of three scheduled meetings for the southeast cluster urban villages. The purpose of the public meetings is to receive citizens' input on the development of master plans for five urban villages located in southeast Fort Worth. The City of Fort Worth hired a consultant team led by Frease and Nichols, Inc., to develop the master plans for the southeast cluster villages that include BerryRiviere, BerryRocks, Near East Side, Oak Hill Commene, and Polytechnic/Wesleyan, and to engage the community in this process by holding these public meetings.

The meeting was convened by the City of Fort Worth and Frease and Nichols, Inc. Fort Worth Councilmember Kathleen Hicks made opening remarks.

At the April 12 public meeting, the consultant team presented an overview of the five urban villages, along with a timeline of the master planning process. The meeting format included an opening session and separate breakout sessions for the five urban villages. The breakout sessions provided an opportunity to focus on issues unique to each urban village.

The following information was presented. The City of Fort Worth approved twelve urban villages for master plan development, which includes the five southeast cluster villages. The remaining seven villages are located in either the central or southwest clusters, which are located in other parts of the central city. The City allocated $50,000 each to twelve urban villages to develop master plans. The master plan process, or Phase One planning, began in March 2007 and is scheduled to end in November 2007 when the plans are scheduled to be presented to the City Council for adoption. In addition, the City allocated $740,571 each to five villages for the design and construction (Phase Two) of transportation-related improvements that would be determined during the planning phase. The Berry/Riviere and Near East Side villages were approved for design and construction work.

An urban village is an urbanized place with a mix of uses, jobs, public spaces, transportation corridors, pedestrian activity, and a sense of place. The City is promoting the development of urban villages for constructing capital improvements to upgrade infrastructure and create high quality public spaces; applying economic incentives to make urban villages competitive with suburban development; and applying mixed-use zoning to permit high-density, pedestrian-oriented development consistent with the community's vision.

The urban village master plans outline strategies to revitalize each village and include transportation and infrastructure improvements, development opportunities, and zoning recommendations. Shobay explained that the consultant team is in the process of reviewing and analyzing the data collected during Phase One to develop a vision for development, identify potential improvements, and work with community stakeholders in a collaborative effort. The purpose of Phase Two is to design and construct transportation-related improvements with the $740,571 funds that stakeholders prioritized during the planning phase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Southeast Cluster Urban Villages</th>
<th>Phase One Unsolicited Improvements</th>
<th>Phase Two Improvements</th>
<th>Total (Minimum)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BerryRiviere</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$740,571</td>
<td>$940,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BerryRocks</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$740,571</td>
<td>$940,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Hill Commene</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$740,571</td>
<td>$940,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polytechnic/Wesleyan</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$740,571</td>
<td>$940,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$3,481,142</td>
<td>$4,281,142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix

**Breakout Session: Berry/Riverside**
Facilitator: Wendy Shalvey, Freese and Nichols

**Question:** What improvements would you like to see?
- Signal light at the corner of Riverside and Berry.
- Getting rid of the messes around Riverside and Berry.
- Systematic catch channel needs to be cleaned after a heavy rain to stop the street overflows [Comment made that the Parks and Community Services Department is already working on this problem].
- Minimize the small convenience and liquor stores which turn into hang out spots for young people.
- Get rid of all the parking yards.
- Build a major grocery store.
- Give Berry/Riverside the same renovation as seen on West Rosedale near Forest Park and the Evans & Rosedale village.
- Remove the old Montgomery Ward store like the Montgomery Ward renovations on 7th Street. Preferred uses include:
  - AMC theater
  - New restaurants
  - Grocery store
  - Bank
  - Drug store.

**Question:** What type of character changes would you like to see?
- Preserve the Briosco school's architectural character.
- Add sidewalks and curbs.
- Landscape (remove weeds, illegal dumping of trash).
- There is too much garbage in the district. Therefore, this area doesn't have a lot of history or architectural character to play off for future development.
- There are too many parking yards.
- Give the district a historic preservation fame.

**Question:** What about Cobb Park?
- On the southside, the mess up is the problem.
- In the westside, the misuse of the land is the problem.
- Safety is a huge issue.
- Block the channel and add a road which is accessible.
- Land use around Cobb Park: lack of access and lighting have created a huge safety concern. Nobody goes there at night and the neighborhood doesn't see it the way they should because of safety.
- Create a Walk Zone in the park.

**Question:** If improvements are made to the park, would it then be considered an asset?
- In answer the reply was yes.

**Question:** Would crossing Cade or neighborhood associations improve the conditions at the park?
- In answer the reply was no.

**Question:** What type of transportation improvements would you like to see?
- Railroad
- Glen Garden is the correct street, in need of many repairs.
- Buses are fairly adequate, many people no longer use the buses.
- Lighting: pedestrian and street (on Berry after you pass 105th/there is no lighting).
- Sidewalks: ADA compliant, pedestrian crosswalks, signal buttons for pedestrians.
- Implementations of the signal light at the intersection of Berry and Riverside to include a better pedestrian crossing.
- Zoning change for Berry at 102nd to get rid of all the diesel trucks.

**Question:** What final comments do you have regarding improvements in this district?
- Pressure the city to support the vacant lots, bounded up houses and buildings.
- Bring the zoning up to compliance.
- Beautification—too much concrete and asphalt.
- Create a noise ordinance—the noises have to go.
- Whatever you do, take your time and do it right and proper, even if that means development is slow to start.
- Have police do their job.

**Final Comments and Summary**
- Grade better usage of land.
- Safety.
- Clean up Cobb Park.
- Beautify throughout the district.
- Lighting.

**Berry/Riverside Breakout Session Attendance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ballew</td>
<td>New Improved Hillsdale RA</td>
<td>Margaret Daniels</td>
<td>New Improved Hillsdale RA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deanna Vasquez</td>
<td>Siens Vista</td>
<td>Tom Carter</td>
<td>New Improved Hillsdale RA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Gilly</td>
<td>New Improved Hillsdale RA</td>
<td>Ande McElwain</td>
<td>Fort Worth Metro (Black Chamber)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Dobler</td>
<td>Southwest FM Inc</td>
<td>Kevin G. Beene</td>
<td>Code Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junie Allen Harris</td>
<td>Womansville RA</td>
<td>Greg &amp; Jessica Scott</td>
<td>Hillsdale IVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessie Kemp</td>
<td>Berry Street T/F</td>
<td>Kathleen Harris</td>
<td>District 8 Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Tomeson</td>
<td>A Prep Center of TC</td>
<td>Janice Martin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn Forbes</td>
<td>Southeast Fort Worth Inc</td>
<td>Gerri Haudlak</td>
<td>The T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammad Rokem</td>
<td>Food Heaven</td>
<td>Sherril Cherwally</td>
<td>Food Heaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacq Duncan</td>
<td>Planning Commissioner</td>
<td>Patricia Newton</td>
<td>City of Fort Worth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Brotski</td>
<td>Congressman Burgess</td>
<td>Clifford Martin</td>
<td>Railing Hills Addition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on the sign-in sheet*
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Question: What land uses are not wanted?
- Adult entertainment
- Liquor stores
- Convenience stores
- Service stations
- RV parks
- What about churches? Not an asset in a mixed use development.
- Nightclubs (avoid uses that attract prostitution)
- Car washes
- Anything that creates an unsafe environment.
- Retail with backrooms
- Blood and plasma donor stations
- Theaters
- Homeless shelters (there are enough on the Eastside).
- More apartments
- Gentrification is a major concern
- Increased taxes
- Trailers blechs
- "Gentrification" development

Question: What land uses are wanted?
- Marketing to people with disposable income
- Funding for home improvements
- Crime free community
- Name brand restaurants (e.g., Chilis, La Madeleine, Panera Bread)
- Small business development (Fords, Subway)
- Migrant owned businesses (butten can help)
- Startups
- Young urban professionals returning to neighborhood
- Spas & boutiques
- Department stores
- Check-FIX-It
- Replace of "Camp Review" shops
- Create jobs for people selling drugs
- Wire-Wrench
- Two-story development
- True mix use is desired and will bring new developers

Final comments and summary
- 50% of property currently vacant
- Transplanting a major factor
- Landscaping
- Purpose is to create culture and an enhanced environment
- Healthy eating establishments
- The location of the village boundaries were discussed

Brookside Breakout Session Attendees*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trudy White</td>
<td>Marty Carver Heights</td>
<td>Louis Armstrong</td>
<td>EXACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane McKeown</td>
<td>Marty Carver Heights</td>
<td>Jason Jones</td>
<td>Working Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Blass</td>
<td>Council Candidate</td>
<td>Franklin D. Watts</td>
<td>Dept of Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estelle Connick</td>
<td>Marty Carver Heights</td>
<td>Jacq A. Duncan</td>
<td>CHA Plan Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tommy Penn</td>
<td>Marty Carver Heights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on sign in sheet

Breakout Session - Oakland Corners Facilitator: Scott Fisher, Fowles & Nicholls

Question: What improvements would you like to see?
- Intersection safety improvements at East Lovers and Oakland
- Extent sidewalks, add cutouts and gutters
- Request for additional street signs to say "Oakland Corners"
- Mass transit
- Need for public art
- Drainage problems need to be addressed before any improvements can be made (residents feel it is a waste of money if city does not fix drainage problems before making other improvements)
- Street improvements (allow property owners to do their own landscaping, some property/business owners would be willing to maintain their landscaping)
- Comment from a resident "TxDOT has to approve infrastructure. State does not allow planting in median. If you invest in median landscaping TxDOT will reimburse 50% of all median improvements. Most residents in this area do not know about this 50% reimbursement information. If I can't do a TxDOT requirement it's only the responsibility of the person who rent some of the trees"
- Recycle area. Comment: Councilwoman has requested help from property owners to rezone the village
- Problem with automotive and motel business in the area
- Point of issue is to encourage a mix of businesses. Request for lights to be turned off (deterrent for some residents only, others disagree)
- Improvements parallel with the street art for pedestrian sidewalks
- Building closer to the street
- Safety and accessibility with single family homes is major concern with the village concept that encourages parking to be located on the rear of a business instead of the front
- Incorporate some of the downtown design and signs into the standards for this area
- What is the future outlook of busplas still in the area
- Safety for pedestrian in crosswalk
- Landscaping
- Suggestions: have a landscape contest for medians, suggest to local business owners, schools and residents to get involved
- Residents with disabilities. what is being done to improve handicap ramps and accessibility to business
- More police stations
- Address vagrancy while implementing the program
- Liquor stores and panhandling is a problem
- Can these meetings start later, e.g., 6:30 or 7:00 p.m.?

Oakland Corners breakout session Attendees"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harvey Carew</td>
<td>Central Meadowbrook</td>
<td>F. Shulman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Matthews</td>
<td>Central Meadowbrook</td>
<td>O. Giegling</td>
<td>West Meadowbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Novak</td>
<td>West Meadowbrook</td>
<td>N. Pfluger</td>
<td>West Meadowbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Phillips</td>
<td>West Meadowbrook</td>
<td>W. Vandenbush</td>
<td>West Meadowbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy Sheadoni</td>
<td>Fort Worth PD</td>
<td>Sam Benitez</td>
<td>Fort Worth PD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Colvin</td>
<td>CP&amp;TPW</td>
<td>Don Bonan</td>
<td>West Meadowbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Bevis</td>
<td>Central Meadowbrook</td>
<td>Repeat Jenks</td>
<td>Central Meadowbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan Townsend</td>
<td>Swords Co.</td>
<td>Mary Dellis</td>
<td>West Meadowbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis M. Bax</td>
<td>West Meadowbrook</td>
<td>Ray Maw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence and Margaret</td>
<td>CWNRA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on sign in sheet
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Question: What are your dreams for this community?
- Better traffic flow.
- Sidewalks and crosswalks.
- Better lighting for pedestrians.
- Clean, bright and safe streets within the village and extend to Riverside Drive.
- Style not as important as functionality.
- Again, lighting, really bright lighting, no pockets of darkness, particularly under I-30W.
- Landscaping.
- Buffers to control business perimeters.
- Signage.
- Create a campus for Presbyterian Night Shelter.
- U.S. Hwy 367 ramp is very dangerous, improvement is needed.
- Funding for building improvements.
- Create a sense of safety is most important.
- Stop the flow of drug traffic and��情.
- Become an art district.
- Add warehouse tracts.
- Add retail studies.
- Add a variety of retail businesses to include a coffee house, photography studio, performance studio, etc.
- A plan to better accommodate the homeless population and create a safe clean village for the local community.
- A new police station located within the village.
- Benches (at least same method of controlling loitering and the homeless sleeping on the benches). Be more aggressive on design and placement of benches.

Question: What do you not want in this community?
- Satellite towers/review or at least reconstituted so they are more pleasing to look at.
- Do not want a Sodom (street closed), but would like to see no parking signs put up.

Final comments and summary
- The plan should consider fencing along the railroad right-of-way. A significant amount of drug activity occurs south of the railroad tracks.
- The steel rails would line the City to install 'The Treescaping' signs on City-owned property.
- The Day Resource Center has outgrown its building and needs to be relocated within the village.
- The Presbyterian Night Shelter would like to consider fencing their facility to create a campus environment.
- Promote safety features on East Lancaster.
- Address traffic.
- Consider street closures on Bluff, Chambers, Presidio and Cypress.
- Improve lighting.

Name| Organization| Name| Organization
---|---|---|---
Gregg Peronneau| TPH| Susan Daffin| Exodus
Tod James| CBH| Beata Vukina| Riverside
Canon Mitchell| Code Compliance| Barney Apkull| MVP
D.H. Elledge| Fort Worth PD| D.L. Grant| Fort Worth PD
Leona Thorne

Breakout Session: Polytechnic/Wesleyan

Question: What are your dreams for the Polytechnic/Wesleyan Village?
- Cyberpark is the area.
- There are elementary, middle & high schools, lots of walk to have access to computers.
- Bring more retail establishments that are attractive to younger population.
- There's an essential need to provide connectivity, particularly to the college students, need restaurants.
- Connectivity exists via a long time ago, smartphones between students and police department. No connectivity between the school and adjacent neighborhood. We need to outreach where people want to partake. Currently, residents do not go to the existing convenience stores. Business owners need to improve their services. Bring in the next level, not just a store.
- Businesses that were part of the Poly area have gone to other areas. Overall improvement to the area is necessary in order for development to occur.
- People are afraid to get out at night.
- There is a sense of isolation, not more than it was more农田. This was an incorporated city at one time. Wesleyan (TWU) cannot be expected to take the full load. Business needs to be encouraged. There are new businesses, take out stores (especially). The consultant team needs to be aware of who is in the room (African Americans). They are not representative of the Poly area. The area is highly populated by Hispanics. The consultant team needs to go out in the community and get their input.
- We will not do the same things, stores, restaurants and we should have what other areas have.
- Number one priority is to prevent students from staying in and throwing up 760, you know. More design guidelines are needed. Currently, there are no residential guidelines and builders are 'setting up all kinds of stuff' (houses) over here.

Question: What is this meeting intended to do for the community?
- This is an issue we need to bring to the foundation.
- Dean Chisholm worked with the City and made several notices to several neighborhood associations and property owners along with sending email reminders.
- Group doesn't think this meeting was well advertised—should have been in the Black Voice and/or the LaVista newspapers.
- Everyone in this area doesn't have computers and they are Spanish speaking.
- Hispanic community—It is hard to reach them because of language barrier. The way to reach them is through churches & schools.
- A Spanish translator is needed at the public meetings.

Questions and comments regarding TWU and crime
- Number one priority for Polytechnic is marketing. TWU is going to have to investigate what's going on in the neighborhood. TWU representatives state they work to learn what the community wants.
- The proportion of Rosedale from TWU have been vacated for over 10 years.
- Friends of Wesleyan (TWU) have made an offer and worked to buy.
- Group would like to see developments such as Mamis Pizza, Cyberpark Cafe, coffee shops, eateries, and gas stations around the university.
- Technology students say it's not just about the students, they are also interested in what the community wants.
- We had those things but student/faculty didn't partake.
- Wesleyan has been around for a long time but has not had the money to invest in land owned by third parties.
- The vacant Rosedale storefront buildings are having a negative impact on the remaining existing businesses.
- The vacant buildings represent a code violation that they want to part of the solution but we lack the community is identifying retail users that the community would like to see along with costs that would be sustainable.
- What is the City going to do about this crime in the area? Cars are broken into, trees stolen. Before improvements are made the crime issue would need to be addressed.
- Comment from a police officer in the group:
  o The police are doing fine but... police are doing fine.
- Final thoughts and summary
  o The Polytechnic/Wesleyan area is stereotyped. Perception has been around for years. Reprint stereotypes.
  o We know we need to deal with infrastructure and stereotypes but Wesleyan (TWU) is stereotyped also as the money maker.
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- Market the area to quality convenience stores, outlet stores, cleaners, franchise stores, health food store, drugstore, etc.
- Cyberspace walk.
- Build open houses.
- Address sustainability.
- Historic preservation is important.
- Fox & Hook type restaurants.
- Nightlife venues (acc clubs).
- Arts & cultural type pleasure (art galleries).
- A Community/educational center is needed.
- Improve overall neighborhood image by holding block parties, celebrations, etc.

Polytechnic/Wesleyan Breakout Session Attendance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guerrer Jones</td>
<td>New World Industries</td>
<td>Sharon Armstrong</td>
<td>Polytechnic/Wesleyan Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foyle M Brown</td>
<td>Poly Heights</td>
<td>Paul &amp; Trunn Meadows</td>
<td>Burgo Hanover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramon Romero</td>
<td>Plan Commission &amp; EL</td>
<td>JoAnn Turner</td>
<td>Home Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Oliviera</td>
<td>Sigma Alpha Lambda</td>
<td>L.E. Walker</td>
<td>Herzog &amp; Wagner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Gilliam</td>
<td>Texas Wesleyan University</td>
<td>Christopher Johnson</td>
<td>Herzog &amp; Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra Roeski</td>
<td>Texas Wesleyan University</td>
<td>Sara Notterle</td>
<td>Texas Wesleyan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold D. Jefford</td>
<td>Texas Wesleyan University</td>
<td>Multasia Natalie</td>
<td>Royal Childrens Home Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Woodbridge</td>
<td>President &amp; Business Owner</td>
<td>Edward Kelley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudine Lowe</td>
<td>Polytechnic UCC</td>
<td>Raulo Harry</td>
<td>Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolores Garcia</td>
<td>CFV/City and Community Dev. Dept</td>
<td>Eric Regnier</td>
<td>CFV Planning and Dev. Dept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on notes in session
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Participants</th>
<th>Public Meeting #1</th>
<th>Stakeholder Participants</th>
<th>Public Meeting #1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Williams</td>
<td>Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village Master Plan</td>
<td>Michael Matthews</td>
<td>Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Brakewood</td>
<td>New Improved Hillsdale NA</td>
<td>Migi Gwendo, West Meadowbrook NA</td>
<td>Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Gray</td>
<td>New Improved Hillsdale NA</td>
<td>Tonya Ferguson, West Meadowbrook NA</td>
<td>Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Davis</td>
<td>New Improved Hillsdale NA</td>
<td>C. Adams &amp; Mesler</td>
<td>Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonia Carter</td>
<td>New Improved Hillsdale NA</td>
<td>Don Slifer, East Fort Worth Business Association</td>
<td>Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lea Marie Bosi</td>
<td>Sierra Vista</td>
<td>Karan Foy, mom in health</td>
<td>Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelvin Borne</td>
<td>Code Compliance</td>
<td>Julie Seid, Central Meadowbrook NA</td>
<td>Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jura Allen Heinl</td>
<td>Morninglade NA</td>
<td>Mary Delia, West Meadowbrook NA</td>
<td>Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda &amp; Jessica Scott</td>
<td></td>
<td>Logan Swoford, Swedes</td>
<td>Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse Kemp</td>
<td>Entry Street TIF</td>
<td>Edward Selenka, West Meadowbrook NA</td>
<td>Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Hicks</td>
<td>City of Fort Worth, District 8</td>
<td>Michael Phillips, West Meadowbrook NA</td>
<td>Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Tzombi, A Prep Center</td>
<td></td>
<td>William Vandeberg</td>
<td>Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jersey Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Louis McRae, West Meadowbrook NA</td>
<td>Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifford Martin</td>
<td>Rolling Hills Addition</td>
<td>Gunnar James, New World Industries, Inc.</td>
<td>Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Sandin</td>
<td>Congressional Burgess Office</td>
<td>Sharleen Armstrong, Blankington NA</td>
<td>Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Ottery, Southeast Fort Worth Inc</td>
<td></td>
<td>Faye M. Brown, Poly Heights</td>
<td>Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn Forbis</td>
<td>Southeast Fort Worth Inc</td>
<td>Paul &amp; Thann Meadows, Barger Hardware</td>
<td>Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyma Hawkins</td>
<td>The T</td>
<td>Claude Lene, Polytechnic CDC</td>
<td>Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammad Rahim</td>
<td>Food Heaven</td>
<td>Reba Henry, Resident</td>
<td>Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shafijama Chehata, Resident</td>
<td></td>
<td>John Turner, Homeowner</td>
<td>Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tondy White</td>
<td>Historic Hideaway Heights NA</td>
<td>Cindy Ohnema, Sigma Kappa Lambda</td>
<td>Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Armstrong, SEMCON</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.E. Walker, Helsing &amp; Wagner</td>
<td>Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Cole</td>
<td>Eastland NA</td>
<td>Jason Gaskin, Helsing &amp; Wagner</td>
<td>Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammy Pierce, Council Candidate, District 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Christopher Johnson, Helsing &amp; Walker</td>
<td>Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Moss, Moss Real Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>Albert Wasbigna, Resident &amp; Business Owner</td>
<td>Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Jones, Railin Developement Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>Edward Kelley</td>
<td>Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Meagerston, Historic Hideaway Heights NA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harold Jeffress, Texas Wesleyan University</td>
<td>Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Pearsonston, PHS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Delisa Raff, Texas Wesleyan University</td>
<td>Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trudi Jones</td>
<td>CRW</td>
<td>Muratse Nalakwala, Royal Children’s Home</td>
<td>Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzette Wilkins</td>
<td>Riverside Kennel</td>
<td>Sarah Hornall, Texas Wesleyan University</td>
<td>Polytechnic/Wesleyan Urban Village Master Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Meeting Notes - July 19, 2007

SOUTHEAST CLUSTER URBAN VILLAGES

MEETING NOTES

Public Meeting #2
July 19, 2007
6:30 p.m.
Dunbar High School
5700 Ramey Avenue

Prepared by: Open Channels Group, LLC and Frease and Nichols, Inc.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Patricia Newton
Senior Planner
City of Fort Worth
817-392-3800
patricia.newton@fortworth.gov

Wendy Slayton
Project Manager
Frease and Nichols
817-733-7209
info@frease.com

Tanya Venero
Public Involvement
Open Channels Group
817-332-8945
openchannelsgroup@liveglobal.net

Opening Session

The July 10 public meeting was the second of three public meetings or workshops for the southeast cluster urban villages. At the July 10 public meeting, the consultant team presented their findings and preliminary recommendations for the five urban villages.

The meeting opened with welcome and other remarks by City Councilmembers Frank Mona, District 5, and Kathleen Hicks, District 8. Following the opening remarks, Wendy Slayton of Frease and Nichols provided an overview of the City’s Urban Village Development program and the master plan development process.

The opening session closed with no questions from attendees. Attendees were directed to the five breakout sessions to discuss the existing conditions, consultant analysis and findings, transportation issues, development opportunities, and preliminary recommendations for each urban village.
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 breakout session: Berry/Riverside Facilitator: Wendy Shabaz, Freese & Nichols

Current Condition:
Current progress: Neighborhood Empowerment Zone (NEZ) and a T-IIF District designation. The T-IIF will fund public infrastructure improvements along the East Berry Street corridor including water, sewer, drainage, sidewalk, and streetscape improvements. The Berry Vista residential development includes 250 single-family affordable homes built by History Maker Homes.

Transportation issues:
- Too many light poles.
- Overgrowth on Spruce Creek Bridge.
- Question: What is the status of the paved trail?
  Answer: Streetscape improvement on Berry Street.
- Streetscape should reflect the character of the neighborhood.
- Question: How much will this cost?
  Answer: The consultants have secured preliminary cost estimates which include enough funds to possibly fund new pedestrian sidewalks, streetlights, and a gateway at the bridge.

Development opportunities:
- The Berry Vista development will likely become a pedestrian-friendly neighborhood.
- Berry Vista is being developed using the T-IIF funding.

Berry/Riverside Breakout Session Attendance:
- Carol Finnemore: United Neighborhood Association of South FW
- Deanne Bice: Riverside Community Development
- Tamika Thompson: Smith Brothers
- Terry Chatton: Southeast Fort Worth, Inc.
- Tom Amos: Greater FW Metromoninsula Chamber
- Linda Harris: Monticello, N.A.
- Sarah Henderson: City of Fort Worth
- Andrew Mclaughlin: Greater FW Tourism Council
- James Brooks: City of Fort Worth
- Roni Williams: Step Six Sunrise Edition NA
- Maria Cisneros: Step Six Sunrise Edition NA
- Karen & Ann-Maria Westfall: Clear Creek, Bank, coffee place, apparel store
- Entertainment: movies, bowling, family-oriented, Blockbuster, Jazz place

Berry/Riverside Breakout Session Attendance:
- Based on the break-out session sign-in sheet.
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Breakout Session: Near East Side
Facilitator: Chris Basco, Foshee & Merklin, and Ahmet Vizman, Foshee & Merklin

Current Conditions
- The urban village was rezoned to MU-2 a few years ago.
- Challenges: Parking on the streets, need crosswalks, traffic safety, proposed bike trails.
- Street and gateway improvements are needed.

Transportation Issues
- Improvements to E. Lancaster.
- Traffic control.
- Better lighting.
- Use of median design to direct pedestrian traffic.
- 2-lane traffic.
- HOV1 approval needed for street changes.
- Additional lighting, landscaping, sidewalk improvements.
- Additional lighting especially on side streets, sidewalk improvements.

Recommended Improvements
- Streetscape parallel along E. Lancaster corridor.
- Alley spaces could be used for retail (long range possibilities).
- Gateways need to define the area.
- Question: What are the priorities for the Foshee/Merklin funds?
  - Parking is important.
  - Parking is important for people coming in from the outside.
  - Combine E. Lancaster improvements with downtown development.

Breakout Session: Oakland Corridors
Facilitator: Scott Fisher, Foshee & Merklin

General Questions/Comments
- Question: What is a mixed-use zone?
  Answer: A combination of residential, commercial, institutional, and light industrial that provides a range of goods and services near a major transit stop. People can get all their needs in one environment. Environmentally friendly, less traffic because everything is close by, and jobs created for residents.
- The two transfer stations support the area by bringing shoppers to E. Lancaster.
- Question: Is it true that the bike lanes are planned on Ayers, Sargent, and Rand?
  Answer: Foshee & Merklin will detail the the bike lanes plan to city staff.
- Question: Oakland is too busy for a bike lane.
  Answer: Foshee & Merklin will detail the bike lanes plan to city staff.
- Question: Is there a height restriction on landscaping in the median?
  Answer: Foshee & Merklin will detail the bike lanes plan to city staff.
- Question: Are there any written cases regarding structures on medians in other areas and districts?
  Answer: Foshee & Merklin will detail the bike lanes plan to city staff.
- Question: Where is the best location for a gateway that would announce entrance to the urban village? Would it be Rand Street and E. Lancaster or Sargent Street and Oakland?
  Answer: Ayers and Lancaster.
- Question: Intersection improvements are needed at Oakland and E. Lancaster.
  Answer: Public input is proposed for Sargent Street. No input is known at this time. Approximately $100,000 exists for public input in that area.
- Question: Residents feel that area is not safe.
  - A MU2 Economic Development Initiative grant of $750,000 has been approved to redevelop a retail business.
  - Question: Cost a percentage of the zoning be residential? Answer: Most uses are considered commercial.
  - Question: Is there too much business on E. Lancaster and Oakland? They want to prioritize commercial uses without any businesses.
  - Question: When does the plan to start implementing the recommended improvements?
    Answer: In September (schedule updated to December) if the master plan is to be presented to the City Council for action. The City will work on implementing the recommendations in partnership with other organizations and based on availability of funds.

Transportation Issues
- Fixed bike lanes, traffic signal and intersection improvements, address drainage problems, crosswalk improvements, ADA compliance.
- Roadway in the streets like Camp Bowie.
- Develop designed crosswalks.
- Residents would like the numerous curb cuts to be addressed.
- Implement crosswalks and landscaping to discourage crossing in the middle of the block.
- New development in the area should support the urban village.
- Residents would like a grocery store and Starbucks.
- A lot of positive feedback was received from attendees.

Oakland Corridors Breakfast Session Attendees*

\[\text{Table data not visible from the image.}\]
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Southeast Cluster Urban Villages, Public Meeting #3
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Breakout Session: Polytechnic/Wesleyan
Facilitators: Gordon Marchant, Kevin Skura, and Chris Briggs, Burton

General Questions/Comments:
- The village boundary was extended to the I-30 area.
- The initial Polytechnic/Wesleyan village was rezoned M-1; some parcels along the newly added area along I-30 were rezoned MU-1 and MU-1 is recommended for the expanded area.
- A gasoline from the first public meeting responses and discussions, residents and users want to see more retail.
- Texas Wesleyan University (TWU) is perceived as an economic engine for the village.
- A mixed-use district is a combination of residential and commercial in order to create a desirable mix of uses in a more compact area.
  - MU-1 - Low intensity.
  - MU-2 - High intensity.
- Discussion of a holistic view:
  - Holistic - primary arterial (vehicular); mostly perceived as the main roadway for ingress and egress.
  - Vicinity has role of secondary arterial route.
- Collect has role of secondary arterial.
- Introduce a gateway at both Roosevelt and Victory at Beach Street.
- Parcels adjacent to U.S. Hwy 287.

Question: Will notification of these meetings be improved? Did not hear about the meeting (many others indicated that they had heard about it from several sources).
Answer: The City, Finesse & Nallaso, and Open Channels will continue to seek ways to improve the meeting notification.

Transportation Issues:
- Gordon Marchant stated the recommended transportation improvements center on pedestrian-oriented improvements that include:
  - Landscaping
  - Signal upgrades with pedestrian usage.
  - Parking spaces
  - ADA compliance with ramps, etc.
- There were questions about the status of TWU's development plans and when those plans would be presented to the neighborhood. The consultants are aware that TWU is developing their expansion plans but are not privy to any updated information to report.

Development Opportunities:
- The initial documents are recommended to be preserved and are for neighborhood serving retail and commercial uses.
- Question: Have you bided at streetlevel in terms of safety?
  Answer: Street safety has been examined and the recommended sidewalk width would improve pedestrian safety.

Market Analysis:
- Chris Briggs presented information on the market analysis.
  - Burton uses psychographic analysis to find the right retailer for an area. Psychographic analysis: sixty-five categories for every household and grouped together to build a profile to determine the target area.
  - Question: Is Burton providing a market analysis for all urban villages? Answer: Burton is providing market analyses for only the Benavides and Polytechnic/Wesleyan villages.
  - Question: How does the analysis overlap on this village and another and would this be detrimental to Polytechnic/Wesleyan village?
  Answer: There will be some overlap with the Bass/Starup village.
  - Question: How does the analysis dovetail with the objectives for the Polytechnic/Wesleyan village?
  Answer: The analysis takes into account the type of village that the MU-1 and current urban village concept seems to achieve. The goal is to analyze the overall demographics of the neighborhood, housing income, and buying patterns. This information will be used to market to retailers that currently do not exist in the neighborhood and ones that a market demand exist.
  - Burton will identify retailers that have consistently made location decisions to areas similar to the Polytechnic/Wesleyan neighborhood.
  - The analysis indicates there is an opportunity for grocers. The issue is finding retailers that are a right fit for the area.
  - Question: Regarding retailers that are already in the area, will they be forced out? Answer: No.
  - Question: Explain the marketing of the village.
  Answer: Burton is partnering with village stakeholders would educate prospective retailers about the attributes of this village and the potential return on investment to this land market analysis to help them make location decisions.

Question: What happened to the retailers that were previously in the neighborhood?

Answer: Some relocated and some discontinued their business due in part to past consumer trends that favored shopping at regional malls. However, current trends include consumers are shopping at neighborhood-scale retailers to find goods and services.
- Question: Why not seek to get a mail in the area? There are petals of land available that could support this. Answer: The current trend is toward the neighborhood scale approach.
- Comments: TWU is a small school with less than 3,000 students most of whom commute. Less than 500 students live on campus. The students and faculty don't live in the area so they really don't care. Students and faculty may not even housing but they do need food and other services. More retailers are needed to serve the needs of both TWU and the neighborhood.
- At the next meeting Burton will provide a list of retailers determined to be a good fit for the neighborhood.
- Question: Have you made a survey of the people living in this area?

Answer: Yes, we have this information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poltehnicon/Wesleyan Breakout</th>
<th>Session/Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Lyden</td>
<td>RealRide Land Holding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert McVoy-Scott</td>
<td>The Petribium Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Comfort</td>
<td>Diamond Draft AC The company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Cidler</td>
<td>Leo's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth G. Santner</td>
<td>Corkey's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katrina Kaye</td>
<td>K Strategies Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Escobar</td>
<td>N&amp;M Imports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard Warby</td>
<td>Tenney Estates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracié Immerle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK Joseph</td>
<td>Polytechnic CDC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on breakout session sign-in sheet*
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Appendix

Participants & Organizations

Participants & Organizations

Daniel Colon
Kimberly Clark, TITSEP
Benjamin Walters, Quorum Commercial
Don Boren, East Fort Worth Business Assoc.
Wanda Cordis, East Fort Worth Business Assoc.
Aaron & Anamul Vlakap
Camille (last name illegible), Fort Worth ISD
Robert & Danielle Haney, Central Meadebrook, NA
Louis Melby, Eastern Hills Home Owner Assoc.
Regina Duncan, Blossom Village Inc., NA
Sandra Baker, New East Side NA
Sandy Jolly, Lakeview Terrace
Valerie Hill, DCCG Advertising
Kenneth Sanders
Joyce Simmons, Diamond Hill Plaza
Lisa Ross
Kathryn Boyles, K Strategies
Leatrice Myles, Jim Austin Community
Dorsey Delos, West Meadebrook NA
Mary Daris, West Meadebrook NA
Peter Lydon, Main Street Latin Polytechnic
Tonya Ferguson, West Meadebrook NA
James Brooks, Lockheed Martin
David Edwards, Tarleton County College
Theron Blackburn, Greater Ft. Teller Church
Greg Fox, Star Telegram
Robert McDaniel-Smith, The Palladium Group
Donna Corey, City of Fort Worth, Housing Dept.
Charlotte (last name illegible)
Rebecca Thompson
Don Johnson
Sarah Hermanew, City of Fort Worth
Fran Bonner, AT&L Corp.
Rox & Jessica Cech, New East Side NA
Alexandra Tirz, Iglesia San Miguel
Donna Croft, Actio Co.
Deanna Boaz, Sierra Vista
Terry O'Leary, Southwest Fort Worth, Inc.
Jim Austin, Austin Co.
Carl Farmer, United Fox of South FW
Paula Washington
Don Simpson, Poly
Carmen Tercero, Police District 8 Neighborhood Group
Michelle Hamilton
Lori Thompson, Firehouse Gallery
Tameka Thomas-Smalls-Cypress
Zella & Johnson Taylor, Sunrise
Kay Brooks, Think Green Homes
Hugh Slocum, Think Green Homes Meadebrook
Edward Stitt, West Meadebrook NA
Michael Hupes, Eastside Sector Association/MAMRA
Don Halsey
nell Caceres, Swindon NA
Christine Pangrassou, City of Fort Worth
Carmen Hawkins, Thel T
Tammy Guarino
Timbrell McNeal
Andrew Mckinney, Greater Fort Worth Metropolitan Black Chamber
Mindy Joppy, PCDC
Linda Marron, South Edgewood NA
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SOUTHEAST CLUSTER URBAN VILLAGES

MEETING NOTES

Public Meeting #3
September 27, 2007
6:30 p.m.
Morningside Middle School
2751 Mississippi Avenue, Fort Worth

Prepared by: Open Channels Group, LLC and Freese and Nichols, Inc.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Patricia Niesemer
Senior Planner
City of Fort Worth
817-394-8068
patricia.niesemer@fortworthtx.gov

Wendy Shahey
Project Manager
Freese and Nichols
817-735-7259
wsahe@freese.com

Tanya Vestrey
Public Involvement
Open Channels Group
817-332-5404
tvestrey@openchannels.com

Opening Session

The September 27th public meeting was the third and final public meeting for the southeast cluster urban village planning process.

Following opening remarks by District 8 Councilmember Kathleen Hicks, Wendy Shahey of Freese and Nichols provided an overview of the City’s Urban Village Development Program and explained the process the consultant team used to develop the final recommendations. That process included: 1) mobilization, 2) data gathering, 3) analysis, 4) review, and 5) recommendations. In addition, information on the market analysis for the Berry-Balktop and Polytechnic/Wesleyan urban villages were presented.

Feedback received from stakeholders at the two previous public meetings was used to develop the final recommendations presented at the September 27th meeting.

The opening session concluded with an open questions from attendees. Attendees were directed to the five breakout sessions to discuss the recommendations for each urban village.
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- Question: What are the plans for retail development?  
  Answer: Denise Bosic, a representative from the Mallick Company, stated that there has been a lot of interest from retailers to locate to the Berry/Riverside area; however, no deals have been finalized. Over the next few months, the old Montgomery Ward and Tyme Place buildings are scheduled to be torn down.

- Question: Who will be responsible for the streetscape improvements?  
  Answer: No response provided.

The breakout session for the Berry/Riverside area includes the following:

- Bella...
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• Comment: The nearby duplexes aren’t in bad shape and they are being used to sell drugs.
Response: Commissioner Mosby is aware of this situation. As the urban village develops, the improvements will trickle outward and positively impact surrounding land uses which could result in undesirable land uses like the duplexes being replaced.

• Comment: The businesses that are located in the Berry Street strip shopping center are a problem (poor service, etc.). Please recommend changing the current owners.
Response: An effective way to address this issue is to work with the property owners if the business owner is a tenant. The property owner can exert pressure on the business to correct problems. However, if the business owner is also the property owner, it is more difficult to resolve issues.

• Question: Would the recommended open space area (walkways, bike and trail) extend to H407?
Answer: Yes, the green belt is included in the extension.

• Question: If the recommended zoning designation is MU-1, could MU-2 also be designated?
Answer: Yes, MU-2 includes all uses under MU-1 plus light industrial and is recommended for the freeway frontage properties.

Market Analysis
The results of the market analysis indicated the following retailers were the best matches for the Berry/Slapup.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retail Type</th>
<th>Best Match 1</th>
<th>Best Match 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apparel</td>
<td>Bella Bella</td>
<td>Bella Bella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>H-E-B</td>
<td>H-E-B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>CVS</td>
<td>CVS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Planet Fitness</td>
<td>Planet Fitness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attendees had the following questions and comments about the market analysis:

• Question: What will happen on upper level buildings?
Answer: This will be worked out in the future (during development and feasibility analysis).

• Comments: Development bottom line input will be sought to help prioritize what retailers to target. The market analysis and retail match information will be available for public view on the City’s website.

• Question: What was the best retail match?
Answer: All the relationships identified are considered good matches. There is a demand for shuttle restaurants, entertainment uses and fashion retailers.

Attendees were informed that the draft plans are scheduled to be presented to the City Council in November (subject to change). The session went well. Attendees seemed excited and ready to move forward on the village recommendations.

Berry/Slapup Urban Village Master Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linda Moran</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Southwestern NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thaner Beamer</td>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Salk</td>
<td>Andy's Market</td>
<td>Southwestern NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on the break-out session sign-in sheet
Public Meeting Notes - September 27, 2007

Breakout Session: Near East Side
Facilitators: Chris Bosco and Aftab Umarji, Freese and Nichols

Existing Conditions
The current zoning and land use were presented.

The current zoning in the Village is mostly commercial (E). The Village is scheduled to be re-zoned to B by the end of 2007. The current land use in the Village is mostly commercial retail use. A bus transfer center is also located in the Village.

Recommended Street Improvements and Gateway
New sidewalks and street improvements (street and pedestrian lighting, signing, pedestrian crossing improvements, traffic calming devices, improved medians, and continuous sidewalks) are recommended along E. Lancaster throughout the Village. New sidewalks and street improvements (street and pedestrian lighting, additional crosswalks, signage, traffic calming devices, improved medians and continuous sidewalks) are recommended along E. Lancaster throughout the Village.

Gateway Features
The attendees agreed that the limited Phase Two budget may only allow for improvements on one side.

Development Opportunities
The site within the Village was evaluated to determine which parcels were suited for redevelopment and to develop the concept plan. The parcels that are in use for the homes, stores, and services are recommended. The remaining parcels are recommended for redevelopment or open space.

The proposed concept plan recommends mixed-use buildings that are oriented to the street with minimal building setbacks. Parking would be located in the center of the buildings.

The proposed plans are not final, and a public meeting is recommended.

Near Eastside Breakout Session Attendance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irma Broder-Porter</td>
<td>Fredericks-DeLAprix</td>
<td>Mike Zalta</td>
<td>Urban Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Quickler</td>
<td>The T</td>
<td>Cato Thorton</td>
<td>Urban Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiona Brewer</td>
<td>Near Eastside VRA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on the breakout session sign-in sheet
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- Question/Comment: Will Free and Nichols continue on this project after the master plan recommendations are presented to the City Council? Residents would like for the recommendations to be available online.
- Answer/Response: Free and Nichols will be retained to work on the Phase Two projects for BerryRiverside and the Near East Side villages. For Oakland Corners, City staff will work with stakeholders on implementing the master plan recommendations based on available resources. The final master plan report will be available on the City's website.

- Question: Is the City enthusiastic about the plan?
- Response: Yes, an example is the recent City assistance to rehab a strip shopping store in the Oakland Corners Urban Village.

Oakland Corners Breakout Session Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Devon Alley</td>
<td>City of Fort Worth</td>
<td>Richard &amp; Linda Leake</td>
<td>Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrie Ferguson</td>
<td>West Meadowbrook N.A.</td>
<td>Michael Phillips</td>
<td>West Meadowbrook N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Hardy</td>
<td>Central Meadowbrook</td>
<td>Loni Stinson &amp; Doris Lomax</td>
<td>West Meadowbrook N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Bartow</td>
<td>Think Green Builders</td>
<td>Lisa Favers</td>
<td>West Meadowbrook N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Brooks</td>
<td></td>
<td>Loni Thomson</td>
<td>Meadowbrook Gallery, West Meadowbrook N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey &amp; Delores Robbins</td>
<td>Central Meadowbrook N.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on the break-out session sign-in sheet

Existing Conditions

The current zoning (by land use, and traffic circulation were presented.

The zoning in the original village is low intensity mixed use (ML-1). For the recently expanded village area, the zoning is a combination of medium-density multifamily, low-density residential, commercial, and industrial districts. ML-1 zoning is recommended for the expanded area. Outside the Texas Wesleyan University (TBU) campus, the land use in the village consists of single-family residential homes, commercial, and institutional uses.

Within the urban village, the major circulation patterns is along Rosedale Street. The secondary circulation pattern is along Collin, Wesleyan, Nashville, Votey, and Votey streets.

Recommended Street Improvements and Gateways

Street improvements, gateway, ADA compliance, medians, islands, street furniture, and sidewalks are recommended along Rosedale and Nashville streets. These improvements will encourage pedestrian activity by increasing safety. Gateway features are proposed along Rosedale Street at Beach, Conner, and Bisbee, and along Votey Boulevard at Beach, Conner, and Collin.

The current street width of Nashville is to be pedestrian-scale and is recommended for the village. Attendees were informed that the TBU assigned to the west end of the TBU campus as part of Rosedale is not on the state’s highway system.

Development Opportunities

The village is envisioned to determine which parcels were suitable for redevelopment and to develop the concept plan. The parcels with institutional uses, i.e., TWU, FWUSD middle school, Boys & Girls Club, churches, etc., are recommended to remain in their current state. The remaining parcels are recommended for redevelopment or open space.

Under the proposed concept plan, preservation of historic structures is recommended. New infill buildings are recommended to be developed with a focus on historic elements to support both the neighborhood and college atmosphere.

Attendees had questions about the Rosedale Historic structures and were informed that there was renewed interest in removing the stormwater for neighborhood retail and commercial use.

Attendees were informed of the new police station that is being built on Nashville street.

Market Analysis

Based on the market analysis, the following retailers were determined to be the best retail matches for the Polytechnic/Wesleyan urban village and surrounding areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ace Hardware</th>
<th>Dairy Queen</th>
<th>Golden Corral</th>
<th>Broadleaf California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advance Auto Parts</td>
<td>Dairy Queen</td>
<td>Golden Corral</td>
<td>Broadleaf California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autozone</td>
<td>Dishpack</td>
<td>Dinner Tavern</td>
<td>Ralph’s Hamburgers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Buy</td>
<td>Dr. Pepper</td>
<td>Dog &amp; Bone</td>
<td>Shoe Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookshire’s Food Store</td>
<td>Dollar Discount</td>
<td>Hungry Harry’s Pizza</td>
<td>Sherry’s Restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burger King</td>
<td>El Chico Mexican</td>
<td>MWP</td>
<td>Siron’s Steakhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain’s Seafood</td>
<td>Texas Center for America</td>
<td>Jimmy John’s</td>
<td>Texas John’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl’s Jr. Restaurant</td>
<td>Lee Brothers</td>
<td>Midget Auto Supply</td>
<td>Thru-Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casa De Rey</td>
<td>Meijer</td>
<td>Modern Auto Supply</td>
<td>Thru-Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheesecake Factory</td>
<td>Meijer</td>
<td>Modern Auto Supply</td>
<td>Thru-Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen’s Asian Auto Parts</td>
<td>Pal’s Pets</td>
<td>Mosaic Pizza</td>
<td>Thru-Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chevrolet Dealership</td>
<td>Pal’s Pets</td>
<td>Mosaic Pizza</td>
<td>Thru-Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checkers/Delicats</td>
<td>Pal’s Pets</td>
<td>Mosaic Pizza</td>
<td>Thru-Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checkers Deli</td>
<td>Pal’s Pets</td>
<td>Mosaic Pizza</td>
<td>Thru-Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checkers Deli</td>
<td>Pal’s Pets</td>
<td>Mosaic Pizza</td>
<td>Thru-Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinemark Theater</td>
<td>Fashion Bug</td>
<td>M.G. Halls Pizza</td>
<td>Wilkins Chophouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compudrive</td>
<td>Fashion Bug</td>
<td>M.G. Halls Pizza</td>
<td>Wilkins Chophouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant Health</td>
<td>Fashion Bug</td>
<td>M.G. Halls Pizza</td>
<td>Wilkins Chophouse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# Public Meeting Notes - September 27, 2007

## Stakeholder Participants

### Participants & Organizations

- Ron Abrams, National Bank/MBA Assoc.
- Deanna Bean, Mattie Co. (Birma Vista Dev.)
- Emily Bonar, Notes, Historic Landmark
- Don Berger and Wanda Carlin, West Meadowbrook NA
- Patricia Bostick, Congressman Mike Burgess' Office
- Therion Smithman, Greater Mt. Tabor Church
- Florin Ghever, Near Eastside NA
- Debra Belet, Morningside NA
- Hugh Brooks, Think Green Builders
- Monnette Brooks
- Fayre Brown, Historic Polytechnic NA
- Phil Duper, The T
- Lillian Bush
- Tim Cotes, Statham NA
- Helen Clammar
- Rev. A. J. Ellerbe, Mt. Rose Baptist Church
- Mary & Randy Della, West Meadowbrook NA
- Amparo Esparils, South Polytechnic
- Tonya Ferguson, West Meadowbrook NA
- Glenn Fickes, Southeast Fort Worth Inc. and JPMorgan Chase
- Serna Johnson Hadley, International House of Stars
- Val Harris
- Cuner Hawkins, Tutor NA

### Participants & Organizations

- Clete and Erma Later
- Opal Lee, CCSDC/IRC Inc.
- Richard and Linda Lerner
- Johanna McCully-Boswell, Corner Real Estate Agency
- Andre McEwen, Fort Worth Metropolitan Black Chamber of Commerce
- Linda Monroe, South Edgewood NA
- Terry Olley, Southeast Fort Worth Inc.
- Mike Peeples, West Meadowbrook NA
- Deborah Ross, TAF
- Harvey & Delores Roberts, Oakland Corners
- John Bamu
- Ramaon Beleise, Poly-Pyramid
- Eddie Sekania, West Meadowbrook NA
- Chris Selma
- Edward Simms, East Meadowbrook NA
- Lon Thomas, Frontier Gallery
- Martha Toccoli
- Bernard Walker, Corner Commercial
- Mike Zelinski, V.A
- Larry Hemphill, Asoka Properties LLC
- Linda Hicks
- David Howard, EmpowerMe Inc.
- Dr. A.R. Jefferson, TCU
- Larry Johnson, Hillside NA