
PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
March 7, 2011
Minutes

Members Present: Bruce Bixby
 Ovelia Campos
 Gary Glenn
 Tim McClarty
 Clint Rosenbaum
 David Todd

Members Absent: Fred Famble

Staff Present: Jon James, Director of Planning and Development Services
 Ed McRoy, Assistant Director of Planning and Development Services
 Dan Santee, City Attorney
 Ben Bryner, Planning Services Manager (Recording)
 Matt Jones, Planner II
 Zack Rainbow, Planner II
 Megan Santee, Interim Director for Public Works
 James Condry, Traffic and Transportation

Others Present: Lloyd and Brenda Hawthorne
 Aaron Vannoy
 Tracie Martin
 R. J. Collins
 Debra Westbrook
 Judy Lanman
 Tal Fillingim

Item One: Call to Order

Mr. McClarty called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. and declared a quorum present.

Item Two: Invocation

Mr. McClarty gave the Invocation.

Item Three: Approval of Minutes

Mr. Rosenbaum moved to approve the minutes of the February 7, 2011 and February 14, 2011 meetings. Mr. Bixby seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. McClarty read the opening statement for the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Item Four: Plats

Mr. Rainbow presented the staff report for this case.

MRP-0310

A public hearing to consider a plat of Lots 303 & 304, Block D, A Replat of Lot 201, Block D, Section 1, Curry Park Addition to the City of Abilene, Taylor County, Texas as Shown By Plat of Record in Cabinet 3, Slide 162, Plat Records of Taylor County, Texas

Planning staff recommends approval of the requests.

Mr. McClarty opened the public hearing. No one came forward and the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Bixby moved to approve MRP-0310. Ms. Campos seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of six (6) in favor (Bixby, Campos, Glenn, Rosenbaum, Todd, and McClarty) and none (0) opposed.

Item Five: Zoning

a. Z-2011-04

Public hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on a request from Aaron Waldrop to rezone property from AO (Agricultural Open Space) to PH (Patio Home) zoning, located at the southwest corner of Innisbrook Dr. and Memorial Dr., being approximately 15.4 acres.

Mr. Jones presented the staff report for this case. The subject parcel is approximately 15 acres and is currently zoned AO (Agricultural Open Space). The 15-acre property is undeveloped. The adjacent properties have AO zoning to the south, PD (Planned Development) zoning to the east and west, and RS-12 (Single Family Residential) zoning to the north.

Currently the property is zoned AO and is undeveloped. The applicant has future plans to subdivide the property for single family residential uses. The properties to the north and west are developed with single family residential dwelling units. The properties to the east are mostly undeveloped, but allow for heavy commercial uses. The properties to the south are undeveloped.

The Future Land Use section of the Comprehensive Plan designates this general area as low-density residential. The applicant is requesting the zone change in order to develop a single family residential subdivision. The requested zoning would be compatible with the surrounding land uses. The subject property is adjacent to single family developments to the north and west. The PD to the east allows for HC (Heavy Commercial) zoning uses, but it requires that all outside storage be screened with an opaque fence or wall, that and the future extension of Memorial Dr. will provide sufficient buffering to the proposed PH zoning.

Property owners within 200 feet of the rezoning request were notified. Three (3) comment forms were received in favor and Five (5) in opposition of the request. Planning staff recommends approval of the request.

Mr. McClarty asked if Memorial Dr would extend to Antilley Rd. Mr. Jones stated that in the future it would extend to Antilley Rd.

Mr. McClarty questioned if there were another entrance or exit to the property other than Memorial Dr. Mr. Jones stated that at this time there was not.

Mr. James stated that the Land Development Code states a limitation of the number of lots at which there can only be one exit or entrance. Once the development has reached its limitations of twenty five lots, they would need to create that second access before they could go beyond the twenty five lots.

Mr. McClarty opened the public hearing.

Mr. Tal Fillingim (agent for Mr. Waldrop) spoke in favor of the request. He added clarification to the Land Development Code, stating that the number of lots for a Cul-de-sac would be twenty five and one hundred lots for a one point of entry for a whole sub-division. Mr. Fillingim added that in the past a Proportionality appeal was presented to the City Council regarding improvements or construction of Memorial Dr to the south and was approved by the council. Within that appeal was a stipulation of similarity to the Concept Plan which this development would follow. Mr. Fillingim expressed concerns with the traffic increasing on Memorial Dr. and Covenant back to HWY 83/84. He stated there would be multiple routes to Antilley from this development also.

Mr. Lloyd Hawthorne asked clarification on the nature of the new development of homes. Mr. James stated that the Patio home zoning only allows single family homes, so it would only be one home on one individual lot. Mr. Hawthorne stated he would be in favor of the single family homes.

Mr. McClarty closed the public hearing.

Ms. Campos moved to approve Z-2011-04. Mr. Glenn seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of six (6) in favor (Bixby, Campos, Glenn, Rosenbaum, McClarty and Todd), and none (0) opposed.

b. Z-2011-05

Public hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on a request from The Charter Corporation to rezone property from AO (Agricultural Open Space) to MF (Multi Family Residential) zoning, located at 2802 Old Anson Rd.

Mr. Jones presented the staff report for the case. The subject property is approximately 10 acres and is currently zoned AO (Agricultural Open Space). The 10-acre property has been developed with a residential dwelling unit. The adjacent properties have AO zoning to the west and north, MF (Multi Family Residential) zoning to the north, RS-6 (Single Family Residential) zoning to the east, and MD (Medium Density Residential) zoning to the south.

Currently the property is zoned AO and has been developed with a residential dwelling unit. The applicant has future plans to extend their multi family residential development from the adjacent property to the north. The property to the north is developed with apartments and is owned by the applicant. The properties to the east have been developed as single family residential dwellings. There is an assisted living facility on the property to the south

The Future Land Use section of the Comprehensive Plan designates this general area as low-density residential. The applicant is requesting the zone change in order to extend their existing development from the north. The requested zoning would be compatible with the surrounding land uses. The subject property is adjacent to multi family zoning to the north and south. The requested zoning would be compatible with the single family residences across Old Anson Rd. to the east.

Property owners within 200 feet of the rezoning request were notified. Zero (0) comment forms were received in favor and one (1) in opposition of the request. Planning staff recommends approval of the request.

Mr. McClarty questioned if this multi family residence is going to be similar to the current property. Mr. Jones stated that yes it would be an extension of the property from the north.

Mr. McClarty opened the public hearing.

Mr. R. J. Collins (owner of The Charter Corporation) spoke in favor of this request. He explained the development of this property consisting of at least eighty units.

Mr. McClarty closed the public hearing.

Ms. Campos moved to approve Z-2011-05. Mr. Bixby seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of six (6) in favor (Bixby, Campos, Glenn, Rosenbaum, McClarty and Todd), and none (0) opposed

- c. Z-2011-06
Public hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on a request from Aaron Vannoy to rezone property from MD (Medium Density Residential) to MD/H (Medium Density Residential/Historic Overlay) zoning, located at 741 Vine St.

Mr. Jones presented the staff report for this case. The subject property is approximately 0.14 acres and is currently zoned MD (Medium Density Residential). The property has been developed with a residential dwelling unit. The adjacent properties have MD zoning to the north, south, east, and west.

Currently the property is zoned MD and has been developed with a residential dwelling unit. Referred to as the Cathey/Mayfield/Vannoy House, it is an Arts & Crafts Bungalow and was built in 1926. The owner has requested Historic Overlay Zoning for his property because he feels that the historic integrity of the house has been well preserved over the years. He has owned the house since 2009. The surrounding properties have all been developed with residential dwelling units.

The Future Land Use section of the Comprehensive Plan designates this general area as low-density residential. The requested zoning is an overlay zoning that would not affect the underlying residential zoning and would be compatible with the surrounding land uses. There are several properties in the surrounding neighborhood to the west that have Historic Overlay zoning. This would be the first property on Vine Street to receive the overlay which could encourage other properties to seek the Historic Overlay zoning.

Property owners within 200 feet of the rezoning request were notified. Zero (0) comment forms were received in favor and one (1) in opposition of the request. Planning staff recommends approval of the request. The Landmarks Commission approved this request.

Mr. Todd asked clarification on the definition of Historic Overlay. Mr. James explained a property with Historic Overlay Zoning is protected from major change to the exterior of that property. The benefits to the owner are property tax reduction, Historic project tax incentive and a plaque provided by the City of Abilene.

Mr. McClarty opened the public hearing.

Mr. Aaron Vannoy (owner) spoke in favor of this request. He stated he and his wife purchased this home two years prior with the intent to restore it back to its original state. Mr. Vannoy added he is working with the Neighborhood Association to increase the appearance and value of the homes in this area. He stated that a historical fact about the property is the original tenant of this property opened McLemore Bass which is located on Pine street.

Mr. Bixby questioned the purchase of this property. Mr. Vannoy stated he and his wife are in favor of renovating Historical homes and enjoy the process, and during this process learned of the Historical Overlay Zoning through a presentation by the City of Abilene.

Mr. McClarty closed the public hearing.

Mr. Glenn moved to approve Z-2011-06. Mr. Bixby seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of six (6) in favor (Bixby, Campos, Glenn, Rosenbaum, McClarty and Todd), and none (0) opposed

- d. Z-2011-07
Public hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on a request from Sheldon Bray to rezone property from RS-6 (Single Family Residential) to RS-6/H (Single Family Residential/Historic Overlay) zoning, located at 742 Amarillo St.

Mr. Jones presented the staff report for this case. The subject property is approximately .32 acres and is currently zoned RS-6 (Single Family Residential). The property has been developed with a residential dwelling unit. The adjacent properties have MD (Medium Density) zoning to the east, RS-6 zoning to the north and south, and RS-12 (Single Family Residential) zoning to the west.

Currently the property is zoned RS-6 and has been developed with a residential dwelling unit. Referred to as the Williamson House, it is an Arts & Crafts Bungalow that was built in 1917. The owner has requested Historic Overlay Zoning for this property, because he feels that the historic integrity of the house is intact. The surrounding properties have all been developed with residential dwelling units.

The Future Land Use section of the Comprehensive Plan designates this general area as low-density residential. The requested zoning is an overlay zoning and would not affect the underlying residential zoning, and would be compatible with the surrounding land uses. There are several properties in the surrounding neighborhood that have Historic Overlay zoning including the adjacent properties to the north, south, and west.

Property owners within 200 feet of the rezoning request were notified. One (1) comment forms were received in favor and zero (0) in opposition of the request. Planning staff recommends approval of the request. The Landmarks Commission approved this request.

Mr. McClarty opened the public hearing. No one came forward and the public hearing was closed.

Ms. Campos moved to approve Z-2011-07. Mr. Glenn seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of six (6) in favor (Bixby, Campos, Glenn, Rosenbaum, McClarty and Todd), and none (0) opposed

Item Six: Thoroughfare Closure

Public hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on an amendment to the Master Thoroughfare Plan regarding the reclassification of certain streets to Minor Arterials.

Mr. James presented the staff report for this case. He explained the following reclassifications:

⇒ Arterial

Streets shall be designed to accommodate cross-city traffic movement, distributing traffic to and from collector streets. Unless otherwise specified, this definition shall be inclusive of minor arterial streets.

⇒ Minor Arterial

Streets shall be designed to accommodate cross-city traffic movement at moderate volumes and speeds, distributing traffic to and from collector streets.

⇒ Collector

Streets shall be designed to collect traffic from local streets (i.e., sub collector and minor) and connect with arterial streets and freeways.

Mr. James discussed affected streets on the north side of Abilene, such as, Pine, Grape, N 10th on the west side of the freeway, N 6th, N 5th as is splits into a one way pair and Leggett would then change from a Collector to a Minor Arterial as is passes through the downtown area then continue on as a Collector street in that area. He added the south side affected streets were S 7th, Pioneer Dr, Butternut, and farther south Texas Ave, and Catclaw Dr. as well as Memorial Dr.

Mr. James discussed N 1st to the west is agreed to be a collector street, then from the east side from Treadaway through the downtown area was agreed to remain a Collector street. Mr. James states the question is the rest of N 1st from Grape or Sayles Blvd back to the freeway, if this should remain a Arterial street or convert to a Minor Arterial.

Mr. Glenn questioned if the traffic decreases from Sayles Blvd to Pioneer Dr. Mr. James explained it does not decrease. Changing a street from Arterial to Minor Arterial means it does not serve cross-city traffic or through traffic.

Mr. Glenn asked the effects to that area if the streets are changed from Arterial to a Minor Arterial. Mr. James explained a new Arterial Right of Way (ROW) width in an undeveloped area would be 120 feet and with the in town ROW where there are existing limitations the width could be reduced to 80 feet. He added that with a Minor Arterial the ROW width is 100 and could be reduced to 60 feet.

Mr. Bixby asked the existing ROW width for this area. Mr. Condry answered the ROW is approximately 80 feet.

Mr. James addressed the updates to the City's bicycle plan that could be affected by the reclassification of streets. He added that some recommendation for the bicycle plan may be different for each classification.

Mr. Todd asked if most of the streets were downgraded to Minor Arterial or upgraded to Minor Arterial. Mr. James stated that with the existing streets there are eight going from Arterial to Minor Arterial and three going from Collector to Minor Arterial.

Mr. Bixby asked what would be an example of a Minor Arterial street. Mr. James stated that Grape would be a good example of a Minor Arterial street, based on the length, width and the traffic. He added that it also does not have the distance or the amount of traffic to be considered an Arterial but more traffic than to be considered a Collector street.

Mr. Bixby asked the difference between the Arterial and Minor Arterial. Mr. Condry stated the difference would be distance, traffic, parallel routes and the potential for development.

Mr. Rosenbaum asked the standard road width. Mr. James stated there is a standard width and that information could be accessed from Public Works by the next meeting.

Mr. Glenn asked if this would affect the width of N. 1st. Mr. James answered that this would not affect the width of a street unless new conditions could warrant a change.

Mr. McClarty opened the public hearing. No one came forward and the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Bixby motioned to table the Thoroughfare Plan Amendment until the next meeting in April. Ms. Campos seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of six (6) in favor (Glenn, Rosenbaum, Todd, Campos, Bixby, Glenn and McClarty) and none (0) opposed.

Item Seven: Election of Officers:

Recommendation from the Commission members is as follows:

Chairman:	Tim McClarty
Vice Chairman:	Fred Famble
Secretary:	Clint Rosenbaum
Sergeant of Arms:	Bruce Bixby

Mr. Todd motioned to accept the current Officers for nomination by acclamation. Mr. Rosenbaum seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of six (6) in favor (Rosenbaum, Todd, Campos, Bixby, Glenn and McClarty) and none (0) opposed.

Item Eight: Director’s Report:

Recent City Council decisions regarding items recommended by the Planning & Zoning Commission.

Mr. James stated the only action to go to City Council in February was the Accessory Dwelling amendment to the Land Development code. The City Council approved the Commission’s recommendation. Mr. James added he would have a list of outstanding projects available for the next meeting in April.

Mr. Bixby inquired on the status of the signage ordinance. Mr. James stated the signage ordinance is in process.

Mr. Glenn asked when the City Council would be reviewing the Capital Improvement Program (CIP). Mr. James stated the City Council would be reviewing this on Thursday, March 10th and the final action would be the following meeting, March 24th. He added the City Manager’s recommendation to the City Council, pertaining to the Fire apparatus, was to leave it in this year’s CIP but to remove it from the program in 2015.

Item Nine: Adjourn

The Planning and Zoning Commission meeting was adjourned at approximately 2:35 P.M.

<p>Approved: _____, Chairman</p>
