



Legislation Details (With Text)

**File #:** MIN-93:1654    **Version:** 1    **Name:**  
**Type:** Minutes    **Status:** Passed  
**File created:** 11/9/1993    **In control:** Metropolitan Area Planning Commission  
**On agenda:**    **Final action:** 12/14/1993  
**Title:** METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION  
NOVEMBER 9, 1993

**Sponsors:**

**Indexes:**

**Code sections:**

**Attachments:**

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
12/14/1993	1	Metropolitan Area Planning Commission	Passed	Pass

METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION  
NOVEMBER 9, 1993

MEMBERS PRESENT: Little, Damron, McCracken, Finley, Alston, Shaw

MEMBERS ABSENT: Coleman, Baker

The minutes of the 10-12-93 meeting were approved as prepared.

At Ms. Finley’s suggestion the Commissioners entered into discussion about possible amendments to the R-2 and R-3 zoning ordinances. Preliminary changes were made in the draft of the ordinance. A public hearing will be held at the 12-14-93 meeting to discuss the ordinance further.

#1 RZ93-46 Herbert Spence, Jr. requested approval of a rezoning from R-1 to C-3 for 15.26 acres located on the south side of Parker Road, east of Caraway Road.

This property is currently an open field with a car lot on one corner. The property was brought in by annexation as R-1. A Sunny Meadow Cove resident stated opposition to the rezoning, stating that Sunny Meadow Cove is a private drive and until it is dedicated, should not be used as access to the property.

Ms. Shaw made a motion to approve the rezoning subject to the dedication of sunny Meadow Cove and subject to street improvements be required at the time of development. The motion was seconded by Ms. Finley. Voting was 5 in favor, 0 opposed. REQUEST APPROVED WITH STIPULATIONS.

#2 RZ93-47 Herbert Spence, Jr. requested approval of a rezoning from R-1 to C-3 for .23 acre located on the southeast corner of Caraway Road and Sunny Meadow Cove.

This property is usual in that it is 30.5’ wide and 298.3’ deep off Caraway Road. The land is unusable unless additional properties are purchased to combine with this lot.

A motion to deny the request was made by Mr. Damron and seconded by Mr. Alston. Voting was 5 in favor, 0 opposed. REQUEST DISAPPROVED.

#3 FP93-22 Tom Reagan requests final approval of subdivision plans for Reagan's Richardson Road Addition containing 5 lots on 2.02 acres and 1 lot on 1.35 acres. The property is located on the east side of Richardson Road, north and south of Kristal Drive.

The commission decided that the ordinance requiring 120' right-of-way on section lines does not apply to the small piece of Richardson Road in question. Regarding improvements to Richardson Road, it was stated that there is a section of street between the existing pavement and this property that is currently gravel but should be improved. Mr. Regan stated that the 100 feet of road he was asked to pave did not belong to him and therefore he felt that he should not have to pave it.

Mr. McCracken made the motion to grant final approval subject to the right-of-way currently shown being accepted and with the statement that MATA plan requirements for section lines would not apply. Approval is also subject to the owner entering into a street improvement agreement for Lot 1, Block 1 on Richardson Road, and subject to granting of a drainage easement as included in the engineering comments. It was further stipulated that the owner provide detailed drawings of the street improvements to be made on Richardson Road, which include paving being extended the full distance of Richardson Road across the front of this property to connect with the existing asphalt paving. The owner is given the option of fully improving one half of the street or 24' of paving without curb and gutter on both sides of the street. The motion was seconded by Mr. Alston. Voting was 5 in favor, 0 opposed. REQUEST APPROVED WITH STIPULATIONS.

#4 SP93-30 Tom Reagan requests approval of site plans for an apartment complex containing sixteen (16) units in two buildings to be located on Lot 1, Block 1 of Reagan's Richardson Road Addition.

Also included in the request are street improvement plans for Richardson Road Adjacent to Block 2 of the Addition. The property is located on the east side of Richardson Road, north and south of Kristal Drive.

Mr. Reagan stated that he intends to put a 6 foot chain link fence around the property for security purposes.

Mr. McCracken made a motion to approve the site plans subject to a 6 foot wooden fence being required along the north property line. The motion was seconded by Mr. Alston. Voting was 5 in favor, 0 opposed. REQUEST APPROVED WITH STIPULATIONS.

Mr. McCracken made a motion to approve the site plans subject to a 6 foot wooden fence being required along the north property line. The motion was seconded by Mr. Alston. Voting was 5 in favor, 0 opposed. REQUEST APPROVED WITH STIPULATIONS.

#5 FP93-23 Bob and Joann Haun requested final approval of subdivision plans for Tower Park Estates, Phase II containing 35 lots on 19.68 acres. The property is located on the north side of Neely Road, west of High Meadow Subdivision.

Preliminary approval of the whole subdivision was granted in August of 1991.

There was considerable discussion about problems with the present street improvements on Neely Road. Dan Mulhollen stated that the road was not well designed and should be four laned but only after an overall plan for the whole road is designed rather than just this section. He suggested that the Haun's would like to enter into a street improvement agreement.

Mr. McCracken asked City Engineer Guy Lows if there would be any problems with the commission granting final approval subject to stipulations and not rehearing the item due to the fact that it is consistent with the preliminary plans. Mr. Lowes stated that he had no objections.

Mr. McCracken made a motion to approve the subdivision plans subject to acceptance of the 41 foot right-of-way shown in the subdivision plans on Neely Road, subject to curb and gutter improvements being installed on Neely Road, based on a fur lane width, leaving the final decision up to the city engineer. Approval is also subject to granting drainage easements and utility easements as requested in the staff report, subject to the details on box culverts being revised to be more legible as noted in the staff report, subject to revisions being made as to the steepness of the streets being approved by the City Engineer. The motion was seconded by Ms. Findley. Voting was 5 in favor, 0 opposed. REQUEST APPROVED WITH STIPULATIONS.

#6 SP93- 31 Lee Helman requested approval of site plans for an apartment complex containing four (4) units in one building. The property is located on the north side of Cherry Avenue, east of Walnut Street.

Ms. Finley made a motion to approve the site plans subject to curb and drainage plans being transferred from previous reviewed plans to the new development plans. The motion was seconded by Mr. Damron. Voting was 5 in favor, 0 opposed. REQUEST APPROVED WITH STIPULATIONS.

#7 PUD93-1 The Lindsey Family Trust, c/o of Lindsey Management Company requested approval of preliminary plans for a Residential Planned Unit Development. The development covers 19.30 acres and contains 264 units in 22 buildings. The property is located south of Gladiolus Drive, west of Harrisburg Road and north of the Shadow Ridge Subdivision.

This is the second phase of Park Lake Addition which is located immediately east of the first phase that was final approved in November of 1991.

There was much opposition to this request. Those opposing were mainly Shadow Ridge residents. They stated that there was quite a bit of noise coming from the existing Park Lake apartments, they were finding trash in their back yards, and they expressed concerns that another even larger group of apartments would make the noise and pollution worse and they were afraid that the entire area would be turned into another “Apartment City”. Some of the opposition stated they knew they would have neighbors some day but had strong objections to so many. One resident asked the Planning Commission to look strongly at greatly reducing the density stating that the PUD ordinance granted them the authority to approve lesser densities than are allowed.

Other residents stated the present development had the look of army barracks and they felt they have being suffocated by dense development.

Those in favor of this request were primarily current Park Lake residents who say there is no noise, no trash, and no crime problems. The further stated that if any tenant caused trouble in the apartments, they were promptly evicted.

Potential traffic problems with a single entrance to Harrisburg Road, was another concern. Residents of the Medallion Acres Subdivision located east of Harrisburg Road stated that until connecting roads were built to open access to other traffic routes that dense developments of this nature should not be allowed to occur.

Mr. Alston made a motion for preliminary approval subject to buffering, subject to the City Engineer’s comments from the staff report being addressed. Approval is also subject to drainage and street improvements

being approved by the City Engineer. It was requested that he City Engineer or other city staff review the traffic situation presently and make a report on the effects this proposed development would have. Mr. Alston further asked the developer to consider reducing the density of the development. The motion was seconded by Mr. Damron. Voting was 4 in favor, 2 opposed. REQUEST APPROVED WITH STIPULATIONS.