

---

**PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**  
**April 4, 2011**  
**Minutes**

---

Members Present:           Bruce Bixby  
                                  Pam Yungblut  
                                  Gary Glenn  
                                  Tim McClarty  
                                  David Todd

Members Absent:           Fred Famble  
                                  Clint Rosenbaum

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  
                                  Matt Jones, Planner II  
                                  Zack Rainbow, Planner II  
                                  Megan Santee, Interim Director for Public Works  
                                  James Condry, Traffic and Transportation  
                                  Debra Hill, Secretary II (Recording)

Others Present:            Charlie Black  
                                  Scott Kemp  
                                  Lydia Long  
                                  Dan Symond  
                                  Dave Boyll

**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. Bixby moved to approve the minutes of the March 7, 2011 meeting. Mr. Glenn 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.

FP-0911

A public hearing to consider a plat of Section 3, Bella Vista Addition, City of Abilene, Taylor County, Texas.

PP-1311

A public hearing to consider a plat of Preliminary Plat Lots 1, 2, & 3, Block A and Lot 1, Block B, Subdivision Plat of East Abilene Substation

FP-0611

A public hearing to consider a plat of Lots 1 and 2, Block A, and Lot 1, Block B, East Abilene Substation, City of Abilene, 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 FP-0911, PP-1311, FP-0611. Mr. Glenn seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of five (5) in favor (Bixby, Yungblut, Glenn, Todd, and McClarty) and none (0) opposed. (Mr. Todd abstained from FP-0911)**

**Item Five:                  Zoning**

Z-2011-08

Public hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on a request from Lydia Long to rezone property from MD (Medium Density Residential) to MD/H (Medium Density Residential/Historic Overlay) zoning, located at 782 Palm St.

Mr. Jones presented the staff report for this case. The subject property is approximately 0.22 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. In 1909 Wesley E. Hargrove built this 1 1/2 story Queen Anne Victorian Cottage. The owner has requested Historic Overlay Zoning for this property, because she feels that the historic integrity of the house is intact in spite of the abuse it has suffered. The surrounding properties have all been developed with residential dwelling units except for a church across the street to the east.

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. This would be the first property in the immediate area 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 Zero (0) in opposition of the request. Planning staff recommends approval of the request. The Landmarks Commission approved this request.

Ms. Yungblut asked if this property at 782 Palm is currently under condemnation. Mr. Jones stated that yes it was a condemned property.

Mr. Todd asked if the applicant owns this property. Mr. Jones answered yes the applicant is the owner.

Mr. Bixby asked to explain the effects of the Historic Overlay on a condemned property. Mr. James answered by saying it would prevent the home owner from seeking a demolition permit for the property for twelve months.

Ms. Yungblut asked if the Preservation League supported this property. Mr. Jones stated that they did along with the Landmarks Commission. Ms. Yungblut questioned if funds were available from the Preservation League. Mr. Jones answered the property owner was funding the restoration.

Mr. McClarty opened the public hearing.

Ms. Lydia Long (applicant 782 Palm) spoke in favor of this request. She stated that she was the previous owner and the original applicant for this request. She had purchased this property the previous year from the County tax auction. The property was already condemned. Ms. Long sold the property to an individual who is currently in the process of restoring it. Ms. Long explained the history of the property and the importance of saving homes of this age. Ms. Long stated the current owner is aware of the process of the Historic Overlay and is supportive of this action.

Mr. Todd asked if there were any documentation from the current owner. Mr. Bixby stated he believed that typically this would be something the Landmarks Commission or the Board of Building Standards would have seen. Mr. Todd stated he would like to see documentation from the current owner stating that he is in favor of this request.

Mr. McClarty closed the public hearing.

Mr. Bixby agreed with Mr. Todd and asked clarification on the amendment to the Historic Overlay procedures that was implemented last year. Mr. James stated that the Landmarks Commission could delay demolition on a property for twelve months and the property owner could then return and seek a Certificate of Appropriateness. This would mean the property owner would then need to obtain the approval from the Landmarks Commission again.

Mr. Bixby questioned if the Historic Overlay could protect the property even if the property would become a danger to the community. Mr. Santee answered that this could be a possibility. He added that this process does take time and there could be other circumstances involved, such as a fire that could require the demolition of a property with the Historic Overlay.

Mr. Santee agreed that the P & Z Commission would need to have documentation from the current owner stating he is in favor of this request.

**Mr. Bixby moved to table Z-2011-08 until the May meeting. Mr. Todd seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of five (5) in favor (Bixby, Yungblut, Glenn, 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. With approval of the Land Development Code (LDC) last year, a new classification was created for streets with the City of Abilene. The new classification is Minor Arterial which falls between Arterial and Collector level streets. The primary factors for classification include: length, width and traffic volume. Additional factors include parallel routes and the potential for development.

⇒ 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.

Staff has identified 13 roads for designation to the Minor Arterial classification:

From Arterial to Minor Arterial:

Grape Street (south of Ambler)  
Pine Street (north of intersection with N. Treadaway Blvd)  
N. 10<sup>th</sup> Street  
Pioneer Drive  
S. 7<sup>th</sup> Street  
N. Judge Ely Boulevard (north of Ambler)  
N. 1<sup>st</sup> Street  
Butternut Street  
Texas Avenue

From Collector to Minor Arterial:

Grape Street (north of Ambler)  
Pine Street (south of intersection with N. Treadaway Blvd)  
N. 6<sup>th</sup> Street  
Catclaw Drive  
Sharon Road  
Memorial Drive

Mr. James discussed North 1<sup>st</sup>, which to the west of the Winters Freeway is classified as a Collector street and will remain a Collector. Also, North 1<sup>st</sup> east of Treadaway is classified as an Arterial and will continue to be an Arterial. The only segment of North 1<sup>st</sup> that would change from an Arterial to a Minor Arterial would be from Treadaway to Winters Freeway. Mr. James explained that South 1<sup>st</sup> is considered to be the primary Arterial street within this corridor and given the role of North 1<sup>st</sup>, it makes sense for it to be a Minor Arterial.

Mr. James discussed the Right of Way (ROW) standards. He added the current ROW width for North 1<sup>st</sup> varies from seventy to eighty feet which makes it more consistent with the classification of a Minor Arterial street. Mr. James stated that as properties develop adjacent to a street, if the current street ROW is not wide enough, based on the current ROW standards, the City would ask the property owners to dedicate the necessary ROW to meet those standards. He added that making this segment a Minor Arterial would lessen the burden on the property owners.

Mr. Bixby questioned the classification of North Judge Ely to I-20. Mr. Condry stated part of the consideration for North Judge Ely to I-20 to reclassify to a Minor Arterial is that the frontage roads of I-20 will soon be converted to one-way access. He added the heavier movement would be south bound and the north bound movement will decrease. Mr. Condry stated the function of this area will change to local access only and would be more consistent with a Collector or a Minor Arterial street.

Mr. Todd asked the pavement width considerations for the reclassifications. Mr. James stated the Minor Arterial would probably be between the Collector and the Arterial standards. Mr. Todd asked who decides the pavement widths at this time. Mr. James stated the decision goes through the plat review process and the plat review committee, including input from the Public Works department, makes the

recommendation and the Planning Director has the final approval. He added that each department involved would make their recommendations for the final approval of the width recommendations.

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

**Mr. Bixby motioned to accept the recommendations for the Thoroughfare Plan. Mr. Todd seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of five (5) in favor (Glenn, Yungblut, Todd, Bixby, and McClarty) and none (0) opposed.**

Mr. James introduced Ms. Yungblut, Commissioner newly appointed. Ms. Yungblut is a realtor and served recently on the Board of Building Standards.

**Item Seven: Director's Report:**

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

Mr. James stated the recommendations from the Planning & Zoning Commission that went before the City Council were approved. He discussed the various projects the staff is involved with and the highest priority would be the monthly case processing, notifications, zoning reports, and various other projects.

Mr. Glenn asked about the CIP recommendations from the Planning & Zoning Commissioners regarding the Fire apparatus. Mr. James stated Mr. Gilley recommended funding the Fire apparatus in the current year and removing it from the 2015 budget and replacing it with other projects as recommended. He added Mr. Gilley committed to the City Council to find alternative funding for future replacement of Fire apparatus, both recurring and accidental.

Mr. James also updated the Commission on the status of ongoing projects in the Planning and Development Services Department.

**Item Eight: Adjourn**

The Planning and Zoning Commission meeting was adjourned at approximately 2:15 P.M.

Approved: _____, Chairman
---------------------------