

**THIS IS NOT A VERBATIM TRANSCRIPTION
CITY OF CLEBURNE
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 23, 2021 MEETING**

The Planning and Zoning Commission (P&Z) of the City of Cleburne held a Public Hearing on Monday, August 23, 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
Summerly Sherlock
Vance Castles
Robert Walker
Sonny Albertson
Chris Saunders

CITY STAFF PRESENT:

Danielle Castillo, Planning Manager
David Jellen, Planner
Colt Friedrich, Project Engineer
Lindsey Hale, City Attorney

CITY STAFF ABSENT:

Laura Melton, Asst. Director of Public Works

MEETING FORMAT:

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

Chairwoman Day, Vice-Chairman Archer, Commissioner Walker, Commissioner Saunders, Commissioner Castles, Commissioner Sherlock 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 August 9, 2021 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting were considered.

Vice-Chairman Archer made a motion to approve the minutes of the August 9, 2021 meeting and the motion was seconded by Commissioner Walker. **The motion to approve the minutes carried by a vote of 7-0.**

SECTION I: PLATTING:

CONSIDER THE FINAL PLAT OF LOTS 1 AND 1X, BLOCK 1, OF GODLEY ISD SCHOOL SITE, AN ADDITION TO THE EXTRATERRITORIAL JURISDICTION (ETJ) OF THE CITY OF CLEBURNE, JOHNSON COUNTY, TEXAS, BEING ±15.996 ACRES, GENERALLY LOCATED NORTH OF COUNTY ROAD 905 AND EAST OF COUNTY ROAD 1010, AS REQUESTED BY SILO MILLS INVESTMENTS, LLC, REPRESENTED BY PELOTON LAND SOLUTIONS, **CASE PC21-032**

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

Vice-Chairman Archer questioned staff regarding the approval of the plat.

Mrs. Castillo explained that the City Council would approve the plat prior to the approval from the City of Burleson. She stated that the City of Cleburne would file the plat once it had been approved by both cities.

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

CONSIDER THE MINOR REPLAT OF LOT 1, BLOCK 2, OF HOMES MX2 ADDITION, AN ADDITION TO THE CITY OF CLEBURNE, JOHNSON COUNTY, TEXAS, BEING ±0.10 ACRES, LOCATED AT 728 AND 730 EAST BROWN STREET, AS REQUESTED BY MIRGON ENTERPRISES SERIES, LLC, MONICA MORENO, AND SARA MORENO, REPRESENTED BY MARTHA MIRANDA, **CASE PC21-030**

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

Vice-Chairman Archer questioned staff regarding the existing right-of-way (ROW) width on the adjacent property to the west.

Colt Friedrich, Project Engineer, responded that the existing ROW on the adjacent property to the west was 45 feet.

Chairwoman Day questioned staff regarding the variance request.

Mr. Friedrich explained that the variance request would maintain the existing ROW width and prevent the applicant from having to dedicate an additional 2.5 feet of ROW.

Commissioner Walker questioned staff regarding the minor replat.

Mr. Jellen responded that the subject property needed variances to the minimum lot area, minimum front-yard setback and minimum rear-yard setback in order to be platted. He explained that the plat was necessary for the subject property given that it was currently two (2) portions of existing lots.

Commissioner Saunders questioned staff regarding the variances that had been requested from the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA).

Mr. Jellen responded that the variances that had been granted by the ZBA were necessary in order for the applicant to be able to plat and build a single-family home on the property.

Chairwoman Day opened the public hearing.

There being no one present who wished to speak on the item, Chairwoman Day closed the public hearing.

There being no other questions or items for discussion, Chairwoman Day called for a motion. Commissioner Walker made a motion to approve the request as presented with the following variance:

1. The ROW dedication variance along East Brown Street be approved as presented.

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

SECTION II: ZONING:

CONSIDER A REQUEST TO REZONE ±0.096 ACRES FROM M1 (LIGHT INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT) TO SF-4 (SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING DISTRICT), LOCATED AT 608 EAST BROWN STREET, AS REQUESTED BY AMY ADARGO, REPRESENTED BY BERNARD AUGUSTUS KELLY, JR, **CASE ZC21-015**

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

Chairwoman Day questioned staff whether the subject property qualified as a substandard lot.

Mr. Jellen responded that the subject property did qualify as a substandard lot.

Chairwoman Day opened the public hearing.

There being no other questions or items for discussion, Chairwoman Day closed the public hearing and called for a motion. Commissioner Castles 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 A REQUEST TO REZONE ±35.95 ACRES FROM SF-4 (SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING DISTRICT), MF (MULTIPLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT), C2 (GENERAL BUSINESS DISTRICT) AND C3 (COMMERCIAL DISTRICT) TO PD (PLANNED DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT), GENERALLY LOCATED NEAR THE SOUTHEAST INTERSECTION OF WOODARD AVENUE AND HARLIN DRIVE, AS REQUESTED BY CLEMENTS A L LTD PARTNERSHIP, REPRESENTED BY MKP DEVELOPMENT, LLC, **CASE ZC21-013**

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

The applicant, Adlai Pennington, was present to brief the Commission on the request. Present with the applicant was Courtney Coates.

Chairwoman Day questioned the applicant regarding the number of parking spaces that would be provided with the proposed open space area.

Mr. Coates responded that there was a discrepancy between the concept plan and the letter of intent. He stated that seven (7) parking spaces would be provided with the proposed open space area.

Chairwoman Day questioned the applicant regarding the number of lots that would be exactly 5,000 square feet within the proposed development.

Mr. Coates responded that most of the 5,000 square-foot lots would range from 5,100 square feet to 5,200 square feet.

Chairwoman Day questioned the applicant whether he would be willing to increase the minimum lot size from 5,000 square feet to 5,500 square feet.

Mr. Coates responded that many of the lots would need to be adjusted in order to increase the minimum lot size.

Commissioner Albertson questioned the applicant whether the 50-foot wide lots would have a zero lot line.

Mr. Coates responded that none of the lots would have a zero lot line.

Commissioner Albertson questioned the applicant regarding the 80% masonry requirement for the proposed development.

Mr. Coates explained that the remaining 20% would be reserved for the use of siding material.

Commissioner Albertson questioned the applicant whether the siding material would be cementitious.

Mr. Coates responded that the siding material would be cementitious.

Commissioner Walker questioned the applicant regarding the difference between the homes that would be on the 50-foot wide lots and those that would be on the 60-foot wide lots.

Mr. Coates responded that the main difference would be that many of the 2-story homes would be on the 60-foot wide lots instead of the 50-foot wide lots.

Commissioner Walker questioned the applicant regarding the proposed front-yard setback of 20 feet.

Mr. Coates responded that front-yard setback of 20 feet had been proposed in order to provide more space for homes on each of the lots.

Commissioner Castles expressed his concern with the density of the proposed development.

Mr. Coates responded that the proposed density was meant to act as a buffer between the commercial development along Ridgeway Drive.

Commissioner Castles questioned the applicant regarding the estimated price of the homes in the proposed development.

Mr. Pennington responded that the estimate price range would be somewhere between \$260,000 and \$325,000.

Commissioner Castles questioned the applicant regarding the proposed home builder.

Mr. Pennington responded that the proposed home builder would be Pulte.

Commissioner Albertson questioned the applicant whether a single home builder would build all of the homes in the proposed development or if there would be multiple home builders.

Mr. Pennington responded that it was a possibility that there would be multiple home builders in the proposed development.

Commissioner Albertson questioned the applicant regarding the minimum home size.

Mr. Pennington responded that the minimum home size would be 1,400 square feet.

Commissioner Walker questioned the applicant regarding the proposed street stub-out at the south of the development.

Mr. Coates responded that the street stub-out would be for the future connection of the proposed development to Crestridge Drive.

Commissioner Walker questioned the applicant regarding pedestrian access to the surrounding commercial areas.

Mr. Coates responded that pedestrian access to the surrounding commercial areas would need to go out along Woodard Avenue until the future stub-out to Crestridge Drive had been completed.

Vice-Chairman Archer expressed his concern with the traffic impact that would be created by the development.

Mr. Coates responded that the stub-out to Crestridge Drive would provide future access to Ridgeway Drive to decrease the traffic impact along Woodard Avenue.

Mr. Pennington stated that the traffic impact of the proposed development would be less than that of a multi-family development.

Vice-Chairman Archer questioned staff regarding the existing zoning of the subject property.

Mrs. Castillo responded that the majority of the subject property is zoned C3.

Mr. Coates explained that the subject property provided a buffer zone for the commercial development that hypothetically could be utilized for multi-family development.

Commissioner Albertson questioned staff regarding the potential development of the adjacent property to the west of the subject property.

Mrs. Castillo responded that there had been no development plans submitted to staff for the adjacent property to the west of the subject property.

Commissioner Albertson questioned the applicant whether there would be 2-story homes along the perimeter of the proposed development.

Mr. Coates responded that it had not been determined whether 2-story homes would be along the perimeter of the proposed development.

Commissioner Saunders questioned the applicant whether the homes would be entry-level. Mr. Pennington responded that the homes would not be entry-level homes.

Commissioner Albertson questioned the applicant regarding the price of the land.

Mr. Pennington responded that he could not state the exact price of the land, but that it was more than \$60,000 a lot.

Chairwoman Day questioned the applicant whether each lot would be fully irrigated and sodded on all sides.

Mr. Coates responded that each lot would be fully irrigated and sodded on all sides.

Commissioner Walker questioned the applicant regarding the requirement for one (1) tree for each lot.

Mr. Pennington stated that he would be willing to add a second tree for each lot.

Commissioner Castles questioned the applicant regarding a potential access road to Ridgeway Drive.

Mr. Coates responded that the street stub-out to Crestridge Drive would be the only potential access road to Ridgeway Drive.

Commissioner Saunders questioned the applicant regarding the adjacent property to the south of the subject property.

Mr. Coates stated that the adjacent property to the south of the subject property had separate ownership.

Chairwoman Day questioned the applicant whether the “non-repetition” clause for homes in the proposed development would also include homes across the street.

Mr. Pennington stated that the Commission could stipulate that the “non-repetition” clause include homes adjacent to and across the street from each home.

Commissioner Castles questioned the applicant whether the HOA could include a clause that would prevent on-street parking.

Mr. Pennington responded that the Commission could stipulate that the HOA could include a “no on-street parking overnight” clause.

Commissioner Castles questioned the applicant regarding the proposed number of lots and the proposed minimum home size.

Mr. Pennington responded that the minimum home size of 1,400 square feet was due to demand from home building companies throughout the area.

Chairwoman Day questioned staff regarding the visibility on the corner lots within the proposed development.

Mr. Friedrich responded that the proposed street ROW would be built to the City's standards for each turning radius and that each corner would include a visibility triangle in order to maintain visibility along the corners.

Chairwoman Day opened the public hearing.

Concerned citizen, Doris West, 1014 Harlin Drive, expressed her support for the development. She expressed her concern that a traffic light would be needed at the intersection of Harlin Drive and Woodard Avenue in order to decrease the traffic impact.

Chairwoman Day questioned staff whether a traffic light would be required at the intersection of Harlin Drive and Woodard Avenue.

Mr. Friedrich explained that the traffic impact analysis (TIA) for the proposed development would determine whether or not a traffic light would be needed. He stated that a TIA for the proposed development had not yet been submitted to the City for review.

Chairwoman Day closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Albertson expressed his concern with the density of the proposed development and the traffic impact with the surrounding schools.

Commissioner Saunders stated that the subject property was better suited for the proposed development rather than multi-family development.

Chairwoman Day agreed and stated that the subject property was not suited for multi-family or commercial development.

Vice-Chairman Archer expressed his desire to have a street connection between the proposed development and Ridgeway Drive.

Commissioner Walker expressed his desire to have the proposed development constructed with high-quality materials.

Commissioner Saunders stated that the request should have the condition that the HOA include a "no on-street parking overnight" clause.

Commissioner Castles questioned the applicant whether additional auxiliary parking spaces could be provided within the proposed development.

Mr. Coates stated that additional auxiliary parking spaces could be provided along the proposed open space lot with the detention pond.

There being no other questions or items for discussion, Chairwoman Day made a motion to approve the request with the following conditions:

1. Cementitious siding be used for the non-masonry building material;
2. All lots to be fully irrigated and sodded in the front, sides and rear yards;
3. Two (2) 2-inch caliper trees required for each lot;
4. A non-monotony clause that states a building elevation cannot be repeated adjacent to or across the street from every three (3) consecutive homes;

5. For the 50-foot lots, all lots be a minimum of 5,300 square feet, with no more than 10% of the lots being 5,000 square feet;
6. For the 60-foot lots, all lots be a minimum of 6,300 square feet, with no more than 10% of the lots being 6,000 square feet;
7. A clause within the HOA that states there will be no overnight parking on the street; and
8. Off-street parking provided along the southern open space lot (detention pond).

Commissioner Saunders seconded the motion. **The motion to approve carried by a vote of 5-2, with Vice-Chairman Archer and Commissioner Sherlock voting against the motion.**

SECTION III: OTHER BUSINESS:

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

- i. PC21-025 – Fox Meadow Phase II Final Plat
- ii. PC21-026 – MW Landing Phase II Final Plat
- iii. ZC21-011 – Belclaire Extension Rezone – A and SF-4 to SF-4
- iv. ZC21-012 – 314 Elmo Street Rezone – M1 to SF-4

Mrs. Castillo briefed the Commission on actions taken by the City Council at the August 10, 2021 meeting on the above listed Planning and Zoning cases.

THERE BEING NO OTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 8:11 PM.