

**THIS IS NOT A VERBATIM TRANSCRIPTION
CITY OF CLEBURNE
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE APRIL 12, 2021 MEETING**

The Planning and Zoning Commission (P&Z) of the City of Cleburne held a Public Hearing on Monday, April 12, 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

Danielle Castillo, Planning Manager
David Jellen, Planner
Laura Melton, Asst. Director of Public Works
Bradley Anderle, City Attorney
Colt Friedrich, Project Engineer
Aaron Dobson, Parks and Recreation
Director

CITY STAFF PRESENT:

MEETING FORMAT:

Mr. Anderle, Mrs. Castillo and Ms. Melton were present at the meeting in the Council Chambers. Mr. Jellen, Mr. Dobson and Mr. Friedrich tuned into the meeting remotely. Chairwoman Day, Vice-Chairman Archer, Commissioner Walker, Commissioner Saunders, Commissioner Castles and Commissioner Albertson were present at the meeting in the Council Chambers. Commissioner Sherlock tuned into the meeting remotely.

CALL TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order by Chairwoman Day at 6:30 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 March 22, 2021 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting were considered.

Commissioner Castles made a motion to approve the minutes of the March 22, 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: ZONING:

CONSIDER A REQUEST TO REZONE ±146.83 ACRES FROM SF-4 (SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING DISTRICT), C2 (GENERAL BUSINESS DISTRICT) AND D (DUPLEX OR TWO-FAMILY DWELLING DISTRICT) TO PD (PLANNED DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT), 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 ZC21-004**

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

Vice-Chairman Archer questioned staff regarding the presence of floodplain on the property.

Colt Friedrich, Project Engineer, responded that there is no floodplain on the property per the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) map. He stated that staff would work closely with the developer to mitigate any flooding risk.

Chairwoman Day questioned staff regarding the capacity of the proposed detention ponds.

Mr. Friedrich responded that staff would be working with the developer to ensure that the proposed detention ponds would be able to handle the runoff impact of the proposed development.

Chairwoman Day questioned staff whether the sizes of the proposed detention ponds could be changed if the flood study determined that larger detention ponds were necessary.

Mr. Friedrich confirmed that the proposed detention ponds could be changed and that they would only be approved if they had the capacity to mitigate the runoff impact of the proposed development.

Vice-Chairman Archer questioned staff regarding access to the development from Henderson Street.

Mr. Friedrich responded that the developer would be responsible for completing a traffic impact analysis (TIA) and that any changes to Henderson Street would require approval from the Texas Department of Transportation (TXDOT).

Commissioner Walker questioned staff regarding the utilization of the proposed open space outside of the proposed detention ponds.

Mrs. Castillo responded that there would be trails throughout the proposed open space areas that would be usable by the residents and stated that the applicant would be able to elaborate.

Commissioner Sherlock questioned staff regarding the requirements associated with the existing gas well on the subject property.

Mr. Friedrich responded that the Gas Company would be responsible for building a soundproof wall surrounding the existing gas well.

Chairwoman Day asked for clarification regarding the responsibility of the Gas Company to build a soundproof wall.

Mr. Friedrich responded that each of the gas wells across the City had a similar agreement that placed the responsibility on the Gas Company to build soundproof walls based on adjacency of development.

The applicant, Mark Allen, was present to brief the Commission on the request. Present with the applicant was his Engineer, Landon King.

Commissioner Albertson questioned the applicant if there would be fountains in the detention ponds.

Mr. Allen responded that all of the detention ponds that would hold water throughout the entire year would include a fountain.

Commissioner Albertson questioned the applicant if the detention ponds would maintain a consistent water level throughout the year.

Mr. King responded that most of the ponds would maintain a consistent water level throughout the year.

Commissioner Albertson questioned the applicant whether they had considered utilizing the existing zoning of the property to develop larger lots.

Mr. Allen responded that the proposed development would be better suited to meet housing demand in the City. He stated that the proposed development would meet the demand for larger houses on smaller lots.

Commissioner Albertson stated the opinion that the area for the proposed development would be suitable to build large houses on large lots given the proximity to the lake.

Mr. Allen responded that the market did not show a demand for large houses on large lots.

Vice-Chairman Archer questioned the applicant regarding where his business was located.

Mr. Allen responded that it was located in the City of Cleburne.

Commissioner Castles questioned the applicant if he had worked on other subdivisions within the City.

Mr. Allen responded that he had worked on the Chisholm Hills subdivision and several others.

Vice-Chairman Archer stated that the area surrounding the proposed development had a lot of amenities to offer future residents.

Chairwoman Day stated that it would make sense to include larger lots within the proposed development given the existing character of the area. She questioned the applicant if he would consider adding larger lots to the proposed development.

Mr. Allen responded that changing lots within the proposed development would require significant changes to his plans.

Commissioner Castles expressed his concern that the proposed lot sizes would negatively impact the surrounding area.

Chairwoman Day stated that the proposed masonry requirement of 60 percent was too low. She also stated that the homes should be required to include more of the proposed housing amenities.

Mr. Allen responded that he would be willing to commit to raising the proposed masonry requirement to 80 percent and that he would be willing to make more of the proposed housing amenities required.

Chairwoman Day questioned the applicant if it would be required that University Drive would be developed as a four (4)-lane road.

Mr. Allen responded that the included concept plan showed it as a four (4)-lane road and that he would work with staff to ensure that it would be developed as shown on the concept plan and according to City regulations.

Laura Melton, Assistant Director of Public Works, explained that University Drive was included in the City's Master Thoroughfare Plan and designated as a four (4)-lane road.

Chairwoman Day questioned staff regarding the proposed materials to be used within the center medians of University Drive.

Aaron Dobson, Parks and Recreation Director, responded that he was working with the applicant and that a grass base within the center medians was preferred.

Chairwoman Day questioned the applicant regarding the size of the proposed amenity center and the number of parking spaces that were being proposed for the amenity center.

Mr. Allen responded that the size of the proposed amenity center had not yet been determined and that the proposed number of parking spaces would comply with the City's requirement.

Chairwoman Day responded that she wanted to know the proposed size of the amenity center before approval of the PD rezoning request.

Mr. Allen responded that he would calculate the proposed size of the amenity center and include it with the proposed concept plan.

Chairwoman Day questioned the applicant if each of the proposed exits/entrances to the subdivision would connect to existing roads.

Mr. Allen responded that four (4) of the five (5) proposed exits/entrances would be connect to existing roads by the time the proposed development would be completed.

Ms. Melton explained that University Drive was the only entrance/exit that did not exist and that the development of it had already been planned and coordinated with the adjacent developments.

Chairwoman Day questioned staff regarding the completion of University Drive.

Ms. Melton responded that the plans for the next portion of its development would be included with the next phase of the Belle Lagos subdivision.

Chairwoman Day questioned the applicant regarding the phasing of the roads within the proposed development.

Mr. Allen responded that there would be four (4) entrances into the proposed subdivision developed during the first phase.

Chairwoman Day questioned the applicant regarding the security and lighting within the development.

Mr. Allen responded that he had not considered the security and lighting of the walking paths and that he would be willing to make sure that there was adequate lighting along the walking paths to ensure the safety of the residents.

Commissioner Walker questioned the applicant regarding the proposed reduction to the front-yard setback.

Mr. Allen responded that it was industry-standard to have 20-foot front-yard setbacks.

Chairwoman Day stated that the reduced front-yard setback would lead to issues with street parking.

Commissioner Albertson stated that the proposed lot size needed to be larger in order to match the character of the existing communities.

Vice-Chairman Archer stated that the proposed development area represented prime property within the City and that it needed to be developed as such.

Chairwoman Day opened the public hearing.

Concerned citizens, Ron and Debbie Gravitt, stated their opposition to the request. They stated their concern that the proposed development would cause flooding for the adjacent communities.

Concerned citizen, Laney Smith, stated his opposition to the request. He questioned the Commission regarding access to the existing gas well.

Mr. King responded that the access road to the gas well would not be impacted by the proposed development.

Mr. Allen stated that the proposed development would be an enhancement to the existing zoning requirements for the property.

Commissioner Castles responded that the proposed lot size for the majority of the development would cause unnecessary crowding.

Mr. Allen responded that the proposed development would add amenities to the area that otherwise would not be developed.

Mr. King stated that the proposal to have decreased lot sizes was based on market-demand for housing in the area.

Chairwoman Day stated that the decreased size of the proposed lots would not fit in with the existing character of the area.

Concerned citizen, Kaylyn Warden, stated her opposition to the request. She expressed her concern that the proposed development would bring people to Cleburne but would not keep them in Cleburne.

Mrs. Castillo stated that a petition had been submitted just prior to the meeting and was signed by several neighbors stating their opposition to the proposed development. She stated that their opposition would be calculated to determine whether a supermajority vote by City Council would be required for approval of the PD rezoning request.

Chairwoman Day closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Saunders stated that the proposed lot sizes throughout the development would not fit the existing character of the surrounding neighborhoods.

Chairwoman Day stated that the proposed amenities would be important for the City, but noted that the proposed lots would be much smaller than those in the surrounding neighborhoods.

There being no other questions or items for discussion, Chairwoman Day made a motion to table the item to the April 26, 2021 Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting.

There being no second to the motion, the motion to table the item to the April 26, 2021 Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting died.

Commissioner Castles made a motion to deny the request. Commissioner Saunders seconded the motion. **The motion to deny carried by a vote of 6-1, with Chairwoman Day voting against the motion.**

SECTION II: OTHER BUSINESS:

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

- i. ZC20-029 – Vista Tower PD Rezone
- ii. GC21-003 – Special Event at Hulen Park

Mrs. Castillo briefed the Commission on actions taken by the City Council at the March 23, 2021 meeting on the above listed Planning and Zoning cases.

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