



**CITY OF FARMERSVILLE
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MINUTES
REGULAR SESSION MEETING
December 15, 2020, 7:30 P.M.**

I. PRELIMINARY MATTERS

- Chairman Joe Helmberger presided over the meeting which was called to order at 7:33 p.m. Commissioners Lance Hudson, Adam White, Rachel Crist (via teleconference), Michael Hesse (via teleconference), and John Klostermann were in attendance. Leaca Caspari was not in attendance. Also, in attendance were staff liaison, Sandra Green; City Manager, Ben White; and City Attorney, Alan Lathrom.
- Joe Helmberger led the prayer and the pledges to the United States and Texas flags.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS (FOR NON-PUBLIC HEARING AGENDA ITEMS)

- None came forward to speak in person or via teleconference.

III. PUBLIC HEARING

- A. Public hearing to consider, discuss and act upon a recommendation to City Council regarding a request to amend Ordinance #2015-1027-001 that established the zoning on approximately 100.81 acres of land in the W. B. Williams Survey, Abstract No. 952, which land is now known as the Camden Park Subdivision (the "Property") to rezone approximately 18.003± acres situated between County Road 611 (South Collin Parkway) on its eastern boundary and Harvard Boulevard on its western boundary in an area north of U.S. Highway 380 (W. Audie Murphy Parkway) from PD - Planned Development for Commercial uses to PD – Planned Development for SF-3 – Single Family Dwelling – 3 district uses for detached single-family dwellings, adopt certain development standards

therefor, and modify the requirements of the base zoning district set out in subparagraph (3), "Area, Yard and Bulk Requirements," of Section 77-52(e), "SF-3 — Single Family Dwelling-3," and amend any conflicting provisions of Sections 77-61(a) and (c), 77-62(a) and (b)(8), 77-63(a), 77-64(a) and (b)(1), and 77-65(a) of the Farmersville Code as follows:

- (a) reducing the minimum lot area from 5,000 square feet to 4,000 square feet;
 - (b) reducing the minimum lot width from 50 feet to 40 feet;
 - (c) reducing the minimum front yard from 25 feet to 10 feet and including a 10' wide public utility easement in each front yard;
 - (d) reducing the minimum side yard on corner lots from 15 feet to 10 feet;
 - (e) increasing the minimum lot depth from 90 feet to 100 feet;
 - (f) increasing the minimum rear yard from 10 feet to 20 feet;
 - (g) increasing the maximum lot coverage from 50 percent to 60 percent (including the main dwelling unit, garage, and all accessory buildings);
 - (h) increasing the minimum floor area from 750 square feet to 1,200 square feet; and
 - (i) modifying the maximum height from 2 stories and 40 feet to 2.5 stories and 35 feet.
- Chairman Helmberger opened the public hearing at 7:34 p.m.
 - Jeff Crannell, the engineer on the project, stated they are asking for residential uses instead of commercial. He said they have the same product in multiple cities throughout the metroplex. He stated the minimum house size is 1,200 square feet and the front yard is smaller and the back yard is bigger with a rear garage off of an alley. He indicated they are maintenance free lots.
 - He explained the Homeowner's Association would maintain the yards for the owners. They originally were buffering with commercial from the land to the south which is industrial, but they now feel the smaller lot homes would be a smoother transition to the homes that are currently built.
 - Robert Lyerly, who lives at 1713 Princeton Avenue, stated his objections to the rezoning request. He explained they moved here 16 months ago and they were told houses would never be built on the land that is being requested. He said they would have not bought the house if that was the case. He stated the size of the lots and parking is a concern. They are wanting to make these lots 20% smaller than what is in Camden Park currently and he feels it takes away his privacy. He explained the intersection of U.S. Highway 380 and Harvard is dangerous and adding cars

will cause more problems. He said they wanted a small town lifestyle and he feels that adding more homes would take the small town appeal away.

- Jerry Holder, who resides at 1715 Princeton Avenue, explained they were told the area they are proposing to rezone would be green space. He is concerned because he wants to know what will be on the back side of his fence and whether an alley would be there.
- Chairman Helmberger asked if anyone else wanted to speak for or against the rezoning request.
- No one came forward so he closed the public hearing at 7:52 p.m.
- Jeff Crannell answered the questions asked by the concerned citizens. He stated there would be 106 lots and six streets. He stated they would want to start building as soon as possible, so late 2021 possibly. He explained that using the land as commercial right now would not be feasible.
- John Klostermann asked if they would rent or sell the homes. He also stated that he likes the idea of the larger homes and someone taking care of the lots.
- Chairman Helmberger stated he believes there are people today that do not like to take care of their lawns, so it is a good concept. He believes there is a need for this type of development.
- Michael Hesse stated he met with the developer and they rented out the houses in their other neighborhoods and he explained there was some indication that this development would be the same.
- Adam White asked if they sell off the whole community years down the road.
- Jeff Crannell stated he believes the developer maintains the properties and does not sell the whole community.
- Michael Hesse indicated that he has looked at an aerial view of other communities they own and he did not see any issues with the way it was designed. He asked if the community would be gated.
- Jeff Crannell said they did not plan to have it gated. If parking on the street was a concern for the Planning & Zoning Commission and City Council he indicated they could place wording in the Homeowner's Association documents that parking on streets would not be allowed.
 - Motion to approve made by John Klostermann
 - 2nd to approve made by Lance Hudson
 - All members voted in favor

B. Public hearing to consider, discuss and act regarding an amendment to the Sign Ordinance pertaining to painted signs on walls.

- Ben White stated this item was sent down from City Council to the Planning & Zoning Commission to decide if painting signs directly on the walls of a building can be placed on the buildings in the CA – Central Area district. Some of the owners of the buildings wanted this to come before the city because they felt that it is more historically accurate to have the sign painted

directly on the wall. He explained the sign, even if it were painted on the building, would have to fit within the perimeters of the sign ordinance for size and other features.

- Adam White stated he felt the signs should be approved on a case by case basis, maybe even by the Historic Committee.
- Ben White stated city staff reviews the signs according to the sign ordinance.
- Lance Hudson asked if the painted wall signs were not allowed because of maintenance issues.
- Ben White said that was probably part of the reason it was not allowed in the sign ordinance.
- Chairman Helmberger wanted to know why other zoning areas would not be allowed to have painted signs as well as the CA district.
- Alan Lathrom explained he remembered it was the 2005 City Council who approved the current sign ordinance. He stated we do need to look at the sign ordinance overall to make it conform to the current state law.
- Chairman Helmberger stated he was not against someone painting the sign on the building and asked why the city would only limit it to the CA district.
- Alan Lathrom stated that some of the concerns at the time relating to painting signs on the walls of buildings was because of dilapidation.
- Chairman Helmberger stated if he owned a business downtown he would not let his sign look bad if he was trying to advertise his business.
- Ben White stated that other signs would hold up better than paint on the building.
- Rachel Crist stated she felt it would be okay if they keep it appropriate and maintained well. She said t other cities allow signs that are painted on walls.
- Michael Hesse stated there are materials that would make the paint hold on the walls and the value of the property would play a lot into the maintenance of the sign.
- Lance Hudson, Adam White and John Klostermann all stated they had no issues with the change in the ordinance.
- Chairman Helmberger opened the public hearing at 8:21 p.m. and asked if anyone wanted to speak for or against the item.
- No one came forward so he closed the public hearing at 8:22 p.m.
- Michael Hesse asked if we are going to leave it up to the city staff to approve the signs on a case by case basis because of content.
- Alan Lathrom explained state law has made it to where cities cannot look at the content of signs.
 - Motion to approve painting on wall in the CA district and to recommend to Council made by Lance Hudson
 - 2nd to approve made by Adam White
 - All members voted in favor

IV. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION

A. Consider, discuss and act upon minutes from November 16, 2020.

- Motion to approve made by John Klostermann
- 2nd to approve made by Michael Hesse
- All members voted in favor

B. Consider, discuss and act upon the final plat of Collin College, Phase 1.

- Ben White stated staff recommends conditional approval with two items that need to be addressed. He explained the city needed the as-builts to make sure the easements align with what is showing on the final plat. He said that one item, the document number for the land that was conveyed to the College, was already fixed and added to the plat. He indicated that Sandra Green pointed out one more item that needed to be corrected on the plat. He said that the signature block needed to be corrected as well.

- Motion to conditionally approve based on staff recommendations made by Lance Hudson
- 2nd to approve made by Michael Hesse
- All members voted in favor

C. Discussion regarding the proposed Thoroughfare Plan Map, Future Land Use Map and the Hike & Bike Trail Map.

- Ben White stated the city held two public workshops that were well attended at Tatum Elementary. He said there were over 75 attendees and he indicated Kimley-Horn reviewed the comments from those meetings. He said a lot of the representation came from residents that lived on the east side of town, outside of the city limits. They indicated they did not want an industrial zone area there. He said staff is recommending to hold one last public hearing at the January Planning & Zoning meeting and then move forward with approval.
- Chairman Helmberger stated he is on board with the public hearing in January and moving forward.
- Rachel Crist stated that she feels like she should be at the meeting in person to hear concerns of the citizens, but she believes that we will still be shut down due to Covid.
- Michael Hesse stated he is ok with another public hearing and moving forward.

V. WORKSHOP

- A. Discussion regarding possible changes to the land uses allowed by right or specific use permit together with the appropriate development standards applicable to those land uses within the Light Industrial, Heavy Industrial, and High Impact Industrial Zoning Districts set out in Sections 77-53(e) – (g) of the Farmersville Code together with any related amendments to the use chart set out in Section 77-46, “Schedule of Permitted Uses,” and any necessary additions, changes or deletions to Section 77-29, “Definitions,” of the Farmersville Code applicable to one or more of the land uses identified in Sections 77-53(e) - (g).
- Ben White stated this item has come up because we have annexed some property where batch plants have been built or will be built. He said he recommends they change the name from high impact to something different. He stated he thinks they should break it up into Heavy Industrial – 1 and Heavy Industrial – 2. He explained the second district would contain the heavier uses, such as concrete batch plants and sand and gravel yards. He pointed out that if it has its own zoning classification the city could limit the places where these uses go. He explained that some felt the high impact ordinance did not list all the prohibited uses. They would align the definitions of high impact with the prohibited uses or delete the high impact definition all together. He would also get rid of high impact line in the schedule of uses.
 - Chairman Helmberger stated if a use is not stated in the ordinance it is not allowed.
 - Adam White stated he worries about wordplay. He suggests a Specific Use Permit process and that would allow the city to have some control.
 - Ben White stated the batch plants took a leap of faith to come in to the city limits. He would recommend a Specific Use Permit for concrete asphalt batching plants, temporary asphalt batching plants and sand and gravel if they could have long term limits. He has learned over time that if an SUP is granted for long term use then it still gives the city a way to control the area in the future. He would also recommend the ordinance place a 20 year term up front and then an additional 10 year period where they are preapproved. Then, the city can communicate with them at the end of that 10 year period whether they can continue to operate. He said that would allow them 10 years to find a new location to conduct business if the city ended their SUP.
 - Adam White likes the ideas, but he wants the businesses with the SUP to have an understanding that their property has to be maintained during that time frame.
 - Chairman Helmberger, Lance Hudson and John Klostermann all stated they were okay with what Ben White suggested.
 - Chairman Helmberger summarized what Ben White stated. He said we are going to take Heavy Industrial and change it to Heavy Industrial – 1. We are going to eliminate High Impact completely and replace with Heavy Industrial – 2. He indicated they would remove the definition of High Impact and redefine the acceptable uses in the zoning categories.
 - Ben White stated he would add to the prohibited list as well.

- Chairman Helmberger went on to summarize that concrete asphalt batching plants, temporary asphalt batching plants and sand and gravel would only be allowed by SUP in Heavy Industrial – 2. He stated the initial term would be 20 years, preapproved term of an additional 10 years, and then every 10 years after that they would have to come before the city again for approval.
- Adam White asked if the SUP would stay with the land or if it would go to the owner.
- Alan Lathrom stated it would depend on how it was worded.
- Adam White stated he would like it to run with the owner of the business and not the land.
- Rachel Crist stated she received a lot of calls from people concerning the high impact zoning. She does not want to vote on anything until she can see the changes made to the ordinance.
- Chairman Helmberger stated the uses in the Heavy Industrial – 2 would be very limited.
- Michael Hesse expressed his thanks to the batch plants for coming in to the city and wanting to be part of the community. He stated his only fear was if the high impact stayed as a zoning category for the land what future uses could potentially try to come in the city.
- Ben White stated he wanted to bring out a viewpoint from one of the batch plant owners. He said they are concerned that when they get to the point of selling the property to someone else an SUP may complicate the sale of the property. He said he would work with Alan Lathrom regarding the wording because there is no guarantee that an SUP would be granted to a new business upon selling the property.
- Joe Helmberger stated he believed if we have an SUP on the land and they sell it to another batch plant then the SUP and terms should stand.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 9:06 p.m.



ATTEST:


 Sandra Green, TRMC, City Secretary

APPROVE:


 Joe Helmberger, Chairman