

Planning and Zoning Commission
City of Blanco
Minutes of the Meeting
April 4, 2022

Members: Susan Moore, Loris Perkins, Brandon Carlson, Heinz Roesch, Marissa Mensik, Lynn DeVincenzo, Laura Swinson

REGULAR MEETING

1. The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m.

2. A quorum was established.

Commissioners: Moore, Perkins, Marissa Mensik, Lynn DeVincenzo, (Carlson & Roesch Absent)

4. Announcements (No Action May be Taken)

None

5. Public Comments

None

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING:

1. Discussion on Re-Zoning Property Located at 1725 S Hwy 281 from R2 to C1.

Warren spoke: Do not need to rezone > This property is already a C1 property.

2. Discussion Re-Zoning Property Located at 301 4th Street from R5 to C1.

No one offered to speak.

3. Discussion on Following Variances: 301 4th Street> Variance 1-Lot Width, Variance 2-Parking Requirements, Variance 3-Front Yard Setback, Variance 4-Side Yard Setback, Variance 5-Back Yard Set Back.

No one offered to speak.

CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING

OPEN REGULAR MEETING: 6:30pm

OLD BUSINESS:

1. Discussion, Consideration and Take Action on Approval of Variance Request for REZONING to Commercial at 413 9th Street & US 281 (Owner: Rio Biton)

Applicant didn't appear. Warren spoke regarding this property: This person is wanting to have a rezone. Basically they are one block off Hwy 281 which is an area becoming commercialized – which is R5 zone which is both residential and commercial. Specifically, if it is something that can be done as a special use, I would advise commission to approve this as a specific use and not necessarily to rezone his property.

Questions by commissioners:

We are looking at this property as R5 as shown on 2021 map. Warren responded -Correct.

What exactly is he wanting to do with this property? Warren responded – I spoke with him 3 weeks ago and mentioned how important it was to appear at this meeting. He wasn't very clear about what he wanted. I can't answer those questions about what he wants because when I ask him, he didn't know.

What do you recommend we do about this property? Warren responded – I would recommend that you recommend disapproval to the City Council. This is the 3rd time he has not shown up for the meeting.

Commissioner Perkins made a motion to disapprove item No.1. Commissioner DeVincenzo 2nd the motion. Passed Unanimously

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Approve the Minutes of the March 7, 2022, Regular Meeting.

Commissioner Perkins moved to approve the minutes. Commissioner DeVincenzo 2nd the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

2. Discussion, consideration and Take Action on Rezoning a property located at 1725 So, Hwy 281 from R2 to C1.

(Owner: John Sone)

Warren spoke: Go ahead and table that as that property is already zoned as C1. This applicant will come before you for a SUP next month.

Tabled

3. Discussion, Consideration and Take Action on Rezoning a property located at 301 4th Street from R5 to C1.

(Owner: Alfred Shacklett) BOTH 3 AND 4 ARE TOGETHER

4. 301 4th Street -Discussion, Consideration and Take Action on the Following Variances: Variance 1-Lot With, Variance 2-Parking Requirements, variance 3-Front Yard Setback, Variance 4-Side Yard Setback, variance 5-Back Yard Set Bank.

Warren spoke: I talked to Mr. & Mrs. Shacklett. We talked about that property which is right next to Texas Cannon after discussion the C1 is un-necessary, so skip that and I will explain to city council.

I will explain this property is basically on 4th street, East of Texas Cannon. This area is starting to change, use to be a single-family home and they repurposed it to a Real Estate Office. What they are looking to do is putting in a small building next to it and doing a restaurant and possible putting a small shop on the bottom and later possibly an air B&B, they will explain that more.

All of those fit within the R5 zone but what doesn't fit is the actual building.

Sticking with the land for a minute. They are zoned R5. (chpt 5 Sect 5.4 Table)

Min Lot Width = 60' Min Front Yard = 20' Min Back Yard = 10' Min Side Yard = 10'

The print is very small but it looks like they meet those requirements. Is that correct?

Warren responded: **You would have to look at both the existing building and the proposed building. The existing building is grandfathered and you would approve those variances. With the proposed building they have met most of those. We have established the front yard and the back yard has been met, no variances necessary.** You would need to grant variances for the two side yards. The property next door is agreeable to the new building. **I would recommend you approve those variances also.** The building code, fire codes and how close to the next property etc. will be handled by other authorities. Speaking to the number of parking spaces needed. The restaurant in R5 must be 50% or less, alcohol sales. Based on restaurant use, shop use, and various types of their described use, it appears that they need about 20 parking spaces. Looking at it from the standpoint of the area and the lack of parking spaces and see what is reasonable. **What I'll say about all these variances is this, if you like the project and you think it is a good thing for the city then it is justifiable.**

Property Owners: This will enhance 301 4th street and bring another option to the tourism for Blanco and the downtown revitalization plan. The property is currently a vacant lot. It is not providing substantial income for Blanco and is an eyesore to 4th street and from the park, which backs up to this property. It could be a beautiful structure which keeps within the old-style Blanco Historic build and provide revenue for the city. Set a tone for develop for new construction in the city.

Parking: Space where we could create parking. Possible **3 spaces in front.** (Work with TxDot) **2 spaces at side of lot.**

Work with the city owned property for 5 spaces in back. We would have to redo the culvert in back due to drainage.

Quite a bit of expensive work that we are willing to invest that would help not only our property but others too. Also, suggest employees not be allowed to take up prime parking in front of businesses. Additional parking is available around the square for walkability parking for business around the square.

Commissioners: Perkins>Believe this is what we are looking for downtown. I wish we could get more of this, especially spaces on the south side of the square. Laura>Like the project a lot and am not concerned at all about the parking. I have never gone to the square and not been able to find a parking spot. Parking also available on Life Oak, Pecan. Lynn>The proposed property is fantastic but I do have concerns about the parking. Parking along 4th street is already a somewhat dangerous situation for pedestrians that will probably get worse with more parking along there. Moore> I think what they have proposed is a big plus for Blanco. As far as the parking, I don't think we should punish a business for the failure of the city to address parking. There are places around that the city could develop parking. I would appreciate you do everything you can to alleviate the parking problem and continue with your interest and your energy to try to get some additional pedestrian protection.

Commissioner Perkins made a motion to approve the variances on the building, the two side setbacks that are required, and give them a variance on the parking as long as they have a minimum of the 3 spaces in front and 2 spaces on side of the building. Commissioner DeVincenzo 2nd the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Discussion, Consideration and Take Action on Approval of Greenlawn Place Subdivision Plat. (Owner: Tejas Heritage Homes)

Warren Spoke: This plat is for 8 lots of the Greenlawn Subdivision between 13th and 15th streets. Back in October 2021 the applicant submitted a request for this plat application. Between October 27, 2021 and March 11, 2022 when I put it on the agenda. The 2014 map showed MX and R but the new map is R2 and R3. We accept they have a vested right in the old zoning map. Current zoning, they only have 7.4 lots allowed. Old zoning, I am not sure of where we sit on that. Would the commission chair explain about the old zoning?

Commissioner Moore: Just to clarify. The 2014 map, Lots 1-5 were R (Residential) Back then, R was any R, so that R would have been designated by the surrounding properties. Lots 6-8 were MX and the problem is it must have a 70' lot width. If we are going the old map for part of it, we would have to use it for all of it; don't think we can mix and match maps and lots.

On the 2014 map, Lots 1-5 would either be an R2 = 80' min width or R3=60' min width. Lots 6-8 were MX=70' min width.

On the 2021 map Lots 1-5 would be an R2=80' min width. Lots 6-8 would be R3=60' min width.

Warren Spoke: Having said that, not talking about the width, just talking about what's allowed it looks like they would need to lose a lot. But I would like to have them explain what they would like to do.

John Deucet: The project we are attempting to do is build single family homes probably in the 1,600 to 2,400 sq ft range. Will try to save every one of the Oak Trees. Our desire is to have 8 lots but I think we can live with 7 lots but we can't go below that.

Warren Spoke: The commission could recommend 7 to the city council and we could plat before the next meeting.

John Deucet: Is this for the preliminary and final plat? **Warren:** It is for preliminary and final Greenlawn Subdivision.

John Deucet: One other thing, the actual final plat has the 8 lots that we are showing but also the other part of the property that Jason Wheeler owns as we had to plat the entire property so it will become a legal lot but we are not developing it as it will remain in the ownership of Mr. Wheeler. The property drains towards Greenlawn, but it also drains to the south toward 13th street. At the very southern edge of the 8 lots there is currently a drainage swale that Mr. Wheeler cut in. We will maintain that drainage swale to get the water out onto the ditch. When Mr. Wheeler develops his property, he will have to put in a detention pond that will release the water slowly into the swale. This is required in your code. If the plat is approved by City Council, the plat can't be recorded until either the improvements are in or we have some sort of financial surety set up. Still need to come in for a building permit.

Warren Spoke: Sheet flow can't increase with the development of the property. Tonight, only approving the plat and make sure it fits with the zoning.

Commissioner Perkins> Saving the trees are a very important part. The grade on that is really something else. How is it going to affect some of these slabs or structures? **John Deucet:** Some of the slabs will be higher in the front than in the back or vice-a-

verse. **Commissioner Perkins>**Think that is important as how is that going to look. **John Deucet:** How the homes fit on the lot and all the improvements on that lot don't get reviewed until we get to the building permit stage. **Commissioner DeVincenzo:**

Will there be swales in between each home or are you planning on putting a gutter system out to the road. **John Deucet:** These

are not zero lot homes so there will swales or ditches between the homes that will run out to the ditch. **Commissioner Perkins>**

Will the city make improvements to the ditch? **Warren Spoke:** There will be more studies on drainage before they begin

building. This won't come back before you. The engineering on the drainage is just a staff review.

Commissioner Moore: When they come back with the subdivision it won't come back before P&Z? **Warren Spoke:** No, because

you are approving the subdivision now. **Commissioner Moore:** So P&Z will not have any input in the concept the homes are

going to be. It will only be with the administration. **Warren:** Yes. **Commissioner Moore:** Are we to approve these plats without

knowing what the drainage is going to be and what type houses are to be built? Is that what you are asking us? **Warren Spoke:**

You have a right to table it if you feel your questions have not been answered sufficiently. It has been reviewed with Bureau

Veritas and they have approved the concept. **Commissioner Moore:** I am not comfortable with approving the plats when we

don't even know what they are going to put on the plats. There is no concept plan, no drawings of the homes, I just think we are

blindly going to approve plats tonight and I'm not sure that I am happy with that. **UDC Sec 3.6 Subdivision related Applications**

(1)b i. and (2) Concept Plan has not been followed. A concept plan is required for all land being divided into separate parcels;

all plats with six or more lots. (2) (d) i. The P&Z commission shall make recommendations regarding the Concept Plan approvals

and forward to the City Council.

Commissioner Perkins> I make a motion that we table this for future meeting after we get plans and concept plan.

Commissioner Moore 2nd the motion. ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION: **Warren:** So, you want to see a footprint and see actual

concept, if it is a zero-lot line or whatever it is. You want to see the homes with the driveways etc. **Commissioner Moore:** And

the engineer report on the drainage. I am really concerned about drainage in Blanco. When we take drainage off these homes

and it is not coming across these fields, we have more hard surfaces and it going to go in that ditch. I am not concerned only

about that property right there, that is going to increase that downstream flow and why would we approve this and let someone downstream be flooded. I would like to see the engineer advise on how it will affect the whole area – not just this one block.

Warren Spoke: My understanding of the planning director, is that the planning director does not usually get involved in drainage. Maybe that is different here, if so, that is okay. If that is something you need to see from staff, we will do it. Other than the ditch, the rest of this subdivision has been reviewed. I am having our engineer look at the ditch because I think we will need to have some improvement there. Some of that responsibility lies on the developer not just the city. The planning commission could recommend approval for seven lots.

Commissioner Moore: All motions have been withdrawn at this time. We could recommend approval for seven lots pending additional information from the engineer regarding the drainage and the concept plan.

Commissioner DeVincenzo made a motion to approve the Subdivision Plat with seven lots. Commissioner Mensik 2nd the motion. The motion passed with four votes – Commissioner Moore opposed.

Meeting Adjourned 8:31pm