

**THIS IS NOT A VERBATIM TRANSCRIPTION
CITY OF CLEBURNE
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE JUNE 14, 2021 MEETING**

The Planning and Zoning Commission (P&Z) of the City of Cleburne held a Public Hearing on Monday, June 14, 2021, at 6:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers of City Hall located at 10 N. Robinson. Planning and Zoning Commission meetings are open to the public with social distancing protocols in place.

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

Dena Day – Chairwoman
Albert Archer, Sr. – Vice-Chairman
Vance Castles
Robert Walker
Sonny Albertson
Chris Saunders
Summerly Sherlock

CITY STAFF PRESENT:

Danielle Castillo, Planning Manager
David Jellen, Planner
Laura Melton, Asst. Director of Public Works
Colt Friedrich, Project Engineer
Lindsey Hale, City Attorney

MEETING FORMAT:

Ms. Hale, Mrs. Castillo, Mr. Jellen and Ms. Melton were present at the meeting in the Council Chambers.

Mr. Friedrich tuned into the meeting remotely.

Chairwoman Day, Vice-Chairman Archer, Commissioner Walker, Commissioner Saunders, Commissioner Sherlock, Commissioner Castles and Commissioner Albertson were present at the meeting in the Council Chambers.

CALL TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order by Chairwoman Day at 6:31 p.m. It was established that a quorum was present.

CITIZEN COMMENTS:

There were no citizen comments at this meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The minutes of the May 24, 2021 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting were considered.

Commissioner Castles made a motion to approve the minutes of the May 24, 2021 meeting and the motion was seconded by Commissioner Albertson. **The motion to approve the minutes carried by a vote of 7-0.**

SECTION I: PLATTING:

CONSIDER THE PRELIMINARY PLAT OF MAYFIELD RANCH, BEING ±148.34 ACRES, GENERALLY LOCATED NEAR THE SOUTHEAST INTERSECTION OF WEST HENDERSON STREET AND MAYFIELD PARKWAY, AS REQUESTED BY MAYFIELD FAMILY, LP, REPRESENTED BY CLAIREMONT ACQUISITIONS, LLC, **CASE PC21-017**

Danielle Castillo, Planning Manager, presented the case and briefed the Commission on the request.

Commissioner Walker questioned staff regarding changes that had been made to the street layout of the development that differed from the conceptual development plan in the Planned Development (PD) ordinance.

Mrs. Castillo responded that the street layout revisions were reviewed by staff and were generally consistent with the PD ordinance.

Colt Friedrich, Project Engineer, stated that the revisions to the street layout were minor and would not impact drainage across the development.

Chairwoman Day questioned staff whether the proposed amenity center would be included within the first phase of the development.

Mrs. Castillo responded that the proposed amenity center would be included within the first phase of the development.

Vice-Chairman Archer questioned staff regarding the revisions that had been made to the PD prior to its approval at City Council.

Mrs. Castillo recapped the updates that had been made to the PD by the applicant based on P&Z and citizen feedback that was ultimately approved by City Council.

Vice-Chairman Archer questioned staff whether the development would have a masonry wall along University Drive.

Mrs. Castillo responded that the development would have a masonry wall along University Drive.

Commissioner Castles questioned staff whether the PD had been approved by a supermajority vote by the City Council.

Mrs. Castillo responded that the PD had been approved by a supermajority vote by the City Council.

Commissioner Castles stated that the proposed development did not fit the character of the City.

There being no requirement for a public hearing, Chairwoman Day called for a motion. Commissioner Albertson made a motion to approve the request as presented and Commissioner Walker seconded the motion. **The motion to approve carried by a vote of 6-1, with Commissioner Castles voting against the motion.**

CONSIDER THE MINOR REPLAT OF LOT 1, BLOCK 1 OF PRESCHER PARK ADDITION, BEING ±0.15 ACRES, LOCATED AT 202 HOLLINGSWORTH STREET AND 147 PEACOCK STREET, AS REQUESTED BY PRESCHER CUSTOM HOMES, REPRESENTED BY LISA PRESCHER, **CASE PC21-018**

David Jellen, Planner, presented the case and briefed the Commission on the request.

Chairwoman Day questioned staff if the proposed plat was for an infill lot.

Mr. Jellen responded that the proposed plat was for an infill lot.

There being no requirement for a public hearing, Chairwoman Day called for a motion. Commissioner Walker made a motion to approve the request as presented and Commissioner Albertson seconded the motion. **The motion to approve carried by a vote of 7-0.**

CONSIDER THE PRELIMINARY PLAT OF SADDLE CREEK, BEING ±219.49 ACRES, GENERALLY LOCATED EAST OF NORTH COLONIAL DRIVE (YELLOW JACKET DRIVE), BETWEEN NORTH NOLAN RIVER ROAD AND HARLIN DRIVE, AS REQUESTED BY MAYFIELD FAMILY LP, REPRESENTED BY D.R. HORTON, INC, **CASE PC21-019**

David Jellen, Planner, and Colt Friedrich, Project Engineer, presented the case and briefed the Commission on the request.

Vice-Chairman Archer questioned staff regarding the future development of Ridgeway Drive.

Mr. Friedrich responded that the future development of Ridgeway Drive would be addressed as part of an ongoing update to the City's Master Thoroughfare Plan (MTP).

Vice-Chairman Archer questioned staff regarding the original development plans for Ridgeway Drive.

Mr. Friedrich explained that the original development plans accepted in the 2008 MTP for Ridgeway Drive were similar to the proposed development.

There being no requirement for a public hearing, Chairwoman Day called for a motion. Commissioner Castles made a motion to approve the request as presented and Commissioner Sherlock seconded the motion. **The motion to approve carried by a vote of 7-0.**

CONSIDER THE PRELIMINARY REPLAT OF SILO MILLS ADDITION, BEING ±285.41 ACRES, AN ADDITION TO THE EXTRATERRITORIAL JURISDICTION (ETJ) OF THE CITY OF CLEBURNE, LOCATED AT 7940 COUNTY ROAD 1010, AS REQUESTED BY JOSHUA LAND FARMS, REPRESENTED BY PELOTON LAND SOLUTIONS, **CASE PC21-022**

Danielle Castillo, Planning Manager, presented the case and briefed the Commission on the request.

Commissioner Walker questioned staff whether the proposed school lot had replaced any existing residential lots.

Mrs. Castillo responded that residential lots had been replaced with the proposed school lot.

Vice-Chairman Archer questioned staff if the proposed school lot had been sold to Godley Independent School District (ISD).

Mrs. Castillo responded that she was unsure if the proposed lot had been sold to Godley ISD. She explained that the proposed lot currently had civil plans in review by the City and that a final plat would also be required.

There being no requirement for a public hearing, Chairwoman Day called for a motion. Commissioner Saunders made a motion to approve the request as presented and

Commissioner Albertson seconded the motion. **The motion to approve carried by a vote of 7-0.**

SECTION II: ZONING:

CONSIDER A REQUEST TO REZONE ±99.2 ACRES FROM IH (INTERIM HOLDING DISTRICT) TO PD (PLANNED DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT), GENERALLY LOCATED APPROXIMATELY 3,200 FEET EAST OF SOUTH NOLAN RIVER ROAD, BETWEEN BROWNING LANE AND OLD FOAMY ROAD, AS REQUESTED BY SAM KERBEL, REPRESENTED BY TEMPUS DEVELOPMENT, LLC, **CASE ZC21-008**

David Jellen, Planner, presented the case and briefed the Commission on the request.

Commissioner Castles questioned staff regarding the future development plans of Danbury Drive.

Laura Melton, Assistant Director of Public Works, briefed the Commission on the future development plans of Danbury Drive.

Commissioner Albertson questioned staff regarding the future extension of Park Boulevard.

Ms. Melton responded that the future extension of Park Boulevard to Danbury Drive would be determined by a traffic impact analysis (TIA) for the proposed development.

Commissioner Albertson questioned staff if the development of a bridge would be needed as part of the Park Boulevard extension.

Ms. Melton responded that the development of a bridge would possibly be needed as part of the Park Boulevard extension.

Commission Walker questioned staff regarding improvement plans for Park Boulevard.

Ms. Melton responded that Park Boulevard would need to be improved as part of the extension.

Chairwoman Day questioned staff regarding improvement plans for Old Foamy Road.

Ms. Melton responded that Old Foamy Road would likely need to be improved to be able to support more traffic.

Commissioner Albertson expressed his concern that the majority of the traffic from the proposed development would go through the existing neighborhoods to the north.

Mr. Friedrich responded that the TIA would be calculated based on the projected flow of traffic from the proposed development.

Chairwoman Day questioned staff if the impact fees generated by the proposed development could be used to extend Danbury Drive.

Ms. Melton responded that the impact fees generated by the proposed development could not be used to extend Danbury Drive, but that they could be used to make improvements to Old Foamy Road.

Chairwoman Day expressed her concern that Old Foamy Road and Hyde Park Boulevard would not be able to support an increased level of traffic without road improvements.

Ms. Melton responded that the Park Boulevard connection to Danbury Drive would alleviate some of the traffic impact.

Vice-Chairman Archer questioned staff regarding the size of the proposed detention pond.

Mr. Friedrich responded that a drainage study of the development area would determine the size requirement of the detention pond. He noted that the applicant would be required to meet all of the City's detention requirements if the size of the proposed detention pond was not sufficient for the development.

Chairwoman Day questioned staff regarding the TIA and how it would affect the proposed development.

Mr. Friedrich responded that the applicant would be required to meet all of the requirements set forth by the TIA.

Vice-Chairman Archer questioned staff regarding the existing lot sizes along the northern boundary in the existing subdivisions.

Mr. Jellen responded that the lot sizes along the northern boundary in the existing subdivisions averaged approximately 11,500 square feet and 12,500 square feet.

Vice-Chairman Archer questioned staff regarding the existing lot widths along the northern boundary in the existing subdivisions.

Mr. Jellen responded that the lot widths along the northern boundary in the existing subdivisions averaged approximately 100 feet.

Mrs. Castillo stated that the proposed lot widths within the proposed development for the lots along the northern boundary would be approximately 70 feet.

Commissioner Walker questioned staff regarding the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) requirements for the floodplain.

Mr. Friedrich explained the FEMA requirements for building within the floodplain.

Commissioner Walker questioned staff whether the proposed development would propose a floodplain line or if it would re-determine the floodplain line.

Mr. Friedrich explained that the applicant would make their decision following the completion of the floodplain study.

The applicants, Michael Martin and Adam Reeves, were present to brief the Commission on the request.

Mr. Reeves stated that the floodplain study for the proposed development was in progress and that he would review the size of the proposed retention/detention pond following its completion. He stated that the TIA had been completed and that he would submit the results to staff for

review. He explained that improvements would be made to Old Foamy Road and to the intersection of Hyde Park Boulevard and Country Club Road.

Commissioner Albertson questioned the applicant regarding the proposed building material that would be used on the rear elevation of each home.

Mr. Martin explained that cementitious siding would be used on the rear elevation of each home.

Commissioner Walker questioned the applicant regarding the use of j-swing garages within the proposed development.

Mr. Reeves responded that the use of j-swing garages were included as part of the proposal in order to provide greater diversity throughout the development.

Commissioner Walker questioned the applicant regarding the automatic irrigation systems that would be installed with each home.

Mr. Martin responded that the front, side and rear yards would each include an automatic irrigation system.

Commissioner Castles questioned the applicant regarding the proposed home builder.

Mr. Martin responded that Antares Homes would be the home builder for the proposed development.

Commissioner Albertson requested that the applicant include the requirement of cementitious siding along the rear elevation of each home as part of the proposed PD. He questioned the applicant whether there would be sidewalks throughout the proposed development.

Mr. Martin responded that each lot would have a sidewalk along the front of it and that sidewalks would be included throughout the proposed development.

Commissioner Castles questioned the applicant whether a management company would be utilized for the homeowners association (HOA).

Mr. Reeves responded that a management company would be utilized for the HOA, but that it had not yet been determined which company it would be.

Vice-Chairman Archer questioned the applicant regarding the proposed roof pitch and how it would compare to the roof pitches of the existing homes.

Chairwoman Day responded that the proposed roof pitch would be similar to the newer homes in the existing neighborhoods to the north.

Commissioner Albertson questioned the applicant if he would be willing to provide an 8:12 roof pitch for all single-story homes and a 6:12 roof pitch for all two-story homes.

Mr. Reeves responded that he would research the possibility of making modifications to the proposed roof pitch.

Commissioner Castles questioned the applicant regarding the proposed dwelling unit size.

Mr. Reeves responded that it would be likely that a majority of the homes would be between 2,200 square feet and 2,500 square feet.

Commissioner Saunders questioned the applicant regarding modifying the proposed development to match better with the existing subdivisions to the north.

Mr. Reeves responded that he would be comfortable increasing the minimum masonry requirement to 100%. He stated that he would revise the proposed development to increase lot widths for the lots along the common boundary of the existing subdivisions to the north.

Commissioner Castles expressed his concern regarding the traffic impact that the development would have on the existing roads.

Mr. Reeves responded that improvements to the existing roads would be incorporated with the construction of the proposed development, and that he would work with the City to connect the proposed development to Park Boulevard.

Vice-Chairman Archer stated that Nolan River Road would also need improvements in order to be able to support the proposed development.

Commissioner Albertson questioned the applicant if they had contacted the adjacent property owner to the west about connecting the proposed development to Nolan River Road.

Mr. Martin responded that the adjacent property owner did not have an interest in selling their land.

Chairwoman Day opened the public hearing.

Concerned citizen, Ryan Hoerner, 1604 Hyde Park Boulevard, submitted an Online Citizen Comment Card and stated his opposition to the request with the following comment that was read during the public hearing:

Please consider an alternative main entrance to this subdivision other than on Hyde Park Blvd. Having a main entrance on the Hyde Park will increase the risk of children playing, increase wear on the street which is already work and increase traffic during rush hours proximal to both Gerard and Smith schools. Mandating the construction and main entrance to Old Foamy would provide an easier route for trucks off of 174 as well as cause less traffic disturbances and sound nuisances. The current peacefulness of our neighborhood would be permanently disturbed by this subdivision, potentially leading to decreased property resale values. Having a main entrance to this new subdivision on Old Foamy would provide a sense of exclusiveness to these new homes while retaining easy and direct access to Nolan River Rd. from Old Foamy Rd.

Concerned citizen, Jan Greathouse, 1608 Browning Lane, submitted an Online Citizen Comment Card with the following comment that was read during the public hearing:

Interested in the plans for development between Browning Ln. and Old Foamy Rd. Routes builder will access to construction site/roads used and if they will be repair roads after site is developed? I have heard neighbors but would like to get information from meeting. I lived in Deerfield in Plano years ago (edge of town) and witnessed the power surge and water shortage issues of town expansion. The owner has rights to sell his property. Information gathering meeting for me.

Concerned citizen, Paula Christian, 1603 Browning Lane, stated her opposition to the request. She expressed her concern for the traffic impact that the proposed development would have on her neighborhood, and stated that there should be an alternative entrance to the proposed development. She also expressed her concern that property values in the existing neighborhoods would decrease if the proposed development did not include lots and homes of similar sizes as along the common boundary of the two developments.

Concerned citizen, Danielle Brannam, 1304 Hyde Park Boulevard, submitted an Online Citizen Comment Card and stated her opposition to the request with the following comment that was read during the public hearing:

We are in opposition of the new housing development using Hyde Park Boulevard as a main entrance for the new development. This is already an extremely busy street for a residential neighborhood with many small children playing outside and walking to and from school. School mornings and dismissal times already create a large amount a traffic flow. Many people using Hyde Park Blvd, coming from Country Club Rd, are greatly exceeding the speed limit, which creates a dangerous environment for children walking to and from school, residents walking the neighborhood and trying to back out of their driveways. This is already a very busy thoroughfare, and adding the volume of drivers and construction traffic that would come from a new neighborhood would greatly increase the risk of accident or possible death, especially for the children walking to and from school. In addition to resident and child safety concerns, there are major concerns about the impact of increased construction and resident traffic on the road surface. The road surface is already very worn out, with numerous potholes, etc... The road will surely get much worse at an exponential rate. Current residents and children of Hyde Park Blvd believe it would be best to use Nolan River Road as the new main entrance.

Concerned citizen, Gail McCool, 1508 Browning Lane, stated her opposition to the request. She expressed her concern for the traffic impact that the proposed development would have on the existing development. She expressed her concern that the lots and homes of the proposed development would not match the character of the existing developments.

Concerned citizen, Toie Harp, 1511 Browning Lane, stated that the proposed development should have larger lot sizes in order to match the character of the existing neighborhoods.

Concerned citizen, Joy McHargue, 1613 Browning Lane, stated her opposition to the request. She expressed her concern that the proposed development would have a negative impact on the existing floodplain within the area.

Mr. Reeves stated that the majority of the development would remain outside of the floodplain limits and that the developer would be responsible to do a floodplain study for any lots within the floodplain limits.

Chairwoman Day closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Albertson questioned staff regarding the future development plans for Browning Lane.

Ms. Melton responded that Danbury Drive would replace Browning Lane as the east-west connecting road to Nolan River Road.

Commission Castles stated that the proposed development lot standards and home standards did not match the character of the existing neighborhoods to the north.

Chairwoman Day stated the need for a better transition between the existing neighborhoods and the proposed development.

Mr. Reeves questioned the Commission if they would consider tabling the request in order to consult with the residents and propose a new development plan.

Vice-Chairman Archer stated that the City needed more developments with larger lots and larger homes.

Mrs. Castillo reviewed the dates of the upcoming Planning and Zoning Commission meetings.

Mr. Reeves stated that he felt comfortable being able to propose a new development plan at the July 12, 2021 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.

Commissioner Castles stated that the new plan proposal needed to address traffic concerns in and out of the new development.

Mr. Reeves responded that he would work with staff to address the traffic concerns.

Commissioner Saunders stated that the new plan proposal should have a greater diversity of proposed house sizes and lot sizes.

Chairwoman Day re-opened the public hearing.

Concerned citizen, Paula Christian, 1603 Browning Lane, expressed her concern that the proposed development would be built prior to the extension of Danbury Drive to Park Boulevard.

Concerned citizen, Gail McCool, 1508 Browning Lane, expressed her concern that the traffic from the proposed development would remain concentrated along Hyde Park Boulevard.

Concerned citizen, Joy McHargue, 1613 Browning Lane, expressed her concern that the proposed development would not match the character of the existing neighborhoods.

Chairwoman Day noted several items for the applicant to consider with their proposal, including the following: the institution of the HOA and its operation; matching lot widths along the common boundary of the existing developments; specifying that each lot will be fully irrigated on each side; specifying any improvements to Old Foamy Road; adding cementitious siding as the material to be used on the rear elevations of homes; 100% masonry; modifying the proposed roof pitch to match the roof pitch of the existing homes; specifying that construction vehicles are not to be routed through the existing developments; development within the floodplain; and, prioritizing the connection of Danbury Drive to Park Boulevard.

There being no other questions or items for discussion, Chairwoman Day made a motion to continue the public hearing and table the item to the July 12, 2021 Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting. Vice-Chairman Archer seconded the motion. **The motion to continue the public hearing and table the item to the July 12, 2021 Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting carried by a vote of 7-0.**

SECTION III: OTHER BUSINESS:

Update on actions taken by the City Council at their last meeting on Planning and Zoning Cases:

- i. PC21-011 – Custard Farms Addition Preliminary Plat
- ii. ZC21-006 – 815 N. Robinson Rezone – MF to SF-4
- iii. ZC21-007 – River Ridge Rezone – IH, C3 and M1 to SF-4, MF and C3
- iv. GC21-006 – Temporary Batch Plant Ordinance

Mrs. Castillo briefed the Commission on actions taken by the City Council at the May 25, 2021 and June 8, 2021 meetings on the above listed Planning and Zoning cases.

THERE BEING NO OTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 8:49 PM.