

Item# Z-10
9/2/04

MEMORANDUM

TO: Betty Baker, Chair and Members of the Zoning and Platting Commission

FROM: Dora Anguiano, Zoning and Platting Commission Coordinator
Neighborhood Planning and Zoning Department

DATE: August 24, 2004

SUBJECT: Zoning and Platting Commission Summary

Attached is a Zoning and Platting Commission summary, which will be forwarded to the City Council.

CASE # C14-04-0099

13. C14-04-0099 – HAMID ZARAFSHANI, By: Sarah Crocker, 11108 Zimmerman Lane. (Bull Creek). **FROM DR TO SF-6. ALTERNATE RECOMMENDATION: SF-2. City Staff: Sherri Gager, 974-3057.**

SUMMARY

Sherri Gager, staff – “The staff recommends SF-2 zoning for the property because the proposed SF-2 zoning is consistent with the SF-2 zoning located to the south and northwest; and the existing single-family homes and residences located to the south and west of this site. The intensity of the residential development that is allowed by the SF-2 district is more appropriate for Zimmerman Lane; a roadway that has difficult access onto RM 620 and will never be improved to connect to another roadway to allow for additional access to the proposed site. The SF-2 zoning could allow for a maximum of 45 single-family residences to be developed on this site”.

Commissioner Baker – “I can only find one little SF-2 on the map; is that the only one there?”

Ms. Gager- “We zoned the property directly to the south of this to SF-2 a few months ago”.

Commissioner Baker – “Thank you, how many units are on this tract?”

Commissioner Jackson – “Wasn’t that the trade for the...”

Ms. Gager – “They used a portion of that land for watershed development rights for a property at 620 and 2222, which is currently the Jack Brown Cleaners site”.

Commissioner Jackson – “That was the proposed bank site?”

Ms. Gager – “Yes”.

Sarah Crocker, applicant – “We have filed this case and made a request for SF-6 for several reasons. Our intent here is not develop apartments or to develop a great deal of density. We feel that this particular site, because of its size is going to be more difficult to develop as a single-family subdivision because it is only 6-acres. If you do a development where you would maximize your density under SF-2, you would be required to submit a preliminary plan, construct a road, and do all the things that go along with building out a traditional subdivision. We’ll have to cluster its development away from the preserve land; what we’re asking for is to be able to do this development underneath the condominium regime where we could build a driveway. We are willing to limit our density to 25-units on the entire tract; and we will also limit our impervious cover that is proposed for single-family development, which is 30% or 40% with transfers. The issue here is that from a cost effective standpoint, it’s very difficult for a tract of this size to undergo the preliminary plan process and then the final plat process and meet any kind of proposal that makes sense. The tract behind Zimmerman Lane is

zoned LO, there's a bank, there's storage units, there's a warehouse, there's apartments, there are a number...they are 100% developed. This is not a country lane in that respect; it is a small road that has 30-foot of pavement, that is off of 620, the traffic analysis were fully developed conditions and the staff report is for 518 trips. If this is limited to 25 particular residences, that would cut that more than half. Zimmerman Lane is a cul-de-sac street and if this property is developed as staff has suggested, 46 single-family homes; what we're proposing basically half of that density. The SF-6 would give us the flexibility and the ability to be able to develop this particular property without having to cut it into small lots and to build streets. I do believe that because of the preserved land and some of the watershed requirements, we are going to have to cluster this development more to one side of the tract where we have 0 to 15 slope and we're further away from the preserve land. This tract would have to undergo subdivision, there are utilities to this tract; you have a letter from some of the neighbors who talk about the sewer line and that there aren't any sidewalks on this street. When we go through subdivision we will have to address boundary street improvements, we'll have to put in sidewalks; we will also have to upgrade the utilities on Zimmerman Road. Because of the preserve land in the end and because of this tract, this tract has been dedicated to the City for transfers, this tract will not be developed; and the adjacent property that's in yellow going up toward 620 will be developed. I don't believe that there will ever be any significant overloading of Zimmerman Lane".

FAVOR

No Speakers.

OPPOSITION

No Speakers.

Commissioner Martinez and Gohil moved to close the public hearing.

Sherri Gager, staff – "Can staff make a clarification? There are storage units located on this SF-2 tract and multi-family located on this tract; however, the storage units only access 620, they do not access Zimmerman Lane and the MF-2 do not access Zimmerman Lane either, it only accesses through the Four Points PUD to the south".

Commissioner Baker – "Mr. Martinez will you take the chair?"

Commissioner Martinez – "Yes, is there a motion?"

Commissioner Baker – "I'm going to make a motion to approve staff recommendation, limiting it to 25 living units".

Commissioner Rabago – "Second".

Commissioner Baker – “Oh, I want to add something.... And developed under the requirements or under the provisions of the SF-3 zoning regulations”.

Commissioner Martinez – “Does the seconder go along with that?”

Commissioner Rabago – “I do”.

Commissioner Baker – “I almost didn’t make the motion because the more I look at it, the more I talk myself out of it, so I’m not going to talk about my motion”.

Commissioner Jackson – “What was your motion again? SF-2?”

Commissioner Baker – “Oops, I’m sorry, I said staff recommendation, I meant SF-6; limited to 25 living unit equivalence; SF-3 development regulations. That’s what the applicant asked for”.

Commissioner Whaley – “No, that was the transfers...”

Commissioner Baker – “Could we get a clarification?”

Ms. Crocker – “What I suggested, we were willing to put on the table to limit our impervious cover to 30%, 40% with transfers, which is specified as being allowable for single-family development”.

Commissioner Martinez – “Does everyone understand the motion?”

Commissioner Rabago – “Can you please repeat the motion?”

Commissioner Baker – “I make a motion again and I’ll revise it a bit; I make a motion for SF-6, limited to 25 living units equivalence; 30% impervious coverage, 40% transfers”.

Commissioner Rabago – “I go along with that”.

No questions.

Sherri Gager – “Staff needs a clarification; was it SF-3 development regulations or did we remove that and stick with just impervious cover?”

Commissioner Baker – “We switched it out to the 30 and 40”.

Ms. Gager – “Okay”.

Motion carried.

**COMMISSION ACTION:
MOTION:**

**BAKER, RABAGO
APPROVED SF-6-CO ZONING;
MAXIMUM OF 25 LIVING UNITS, 30%
IMPERVIOUS COVER OR 40%
IMPERVIOUS COVER WITH
TRANSFERS.**

AYES:

**GOHIL, MARTINEZ, BAKER, DONISI,
HAMMOND, WHALEY, RABAGO,
JACKSON.**

ABSENT:

PINNELLI

MOTION CARRIED WITH VOTE: 8-0.