

CITY OF GAINESVILLE
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

2:00 p.m.

February 8, 1989

Members Present: Van Knight, Don Hawkins, Chris Kaden, Luann Shortnacy, and Allen Fleitman

Members Absent: Russell Duncan and John Schmitz.

Staff Present: Lyle Dresher (City Manager), Pat Payne, and Gilbert Villa. (Mr. Gene Cravens was called away.)

Visitors Present: Shirley Lusk (LWU).

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Van Knight at 2:05 p.m.

The second item on the agenda was consideration of and approval of the minutes from the January 12, 1989 meeting. A motion was made by Chris Kaden and seconded by Luann Shortnacy to approve the minutes as presented. Motion carried by the following votes: Ayes: Knight, Hawkins, Fleitman, Shortnacy, and Kaden. Nays: None. Absent: Schmitz and Duncan.

The third item on the agenda was discussion of the proposed Sign Ordinance. Mr. Knight asked Mr. Dresher to present any information he might have in Mr. Cravens absence concerning the proposed ordinance. Mr. Dresher said that one thing in particular he and Mr. Cravens had discussed was the need for control and regulation of temporary signs; another would be the signs hanging over a public right-of-way. Also, a time limit is needed for signs after businesses are no longer open and in business. Another item of concentrated discussion was the placement of billboards, or pole signs, and a time limit (phasing out) for those that are currently in place within the City limits. Another line of discussion was sizes of signs in reference to real estate signs (both residential and commercial), construction signs and campaign signs. Mr. Dresher suggested that measurements be taken on what is generally used now and use that as a guideline for those type of signs. He explained that the idea is not to go in and overhaul everything, putting such restrictions on signs that it causes a hardship on businesses and services.

Temporary signs and/or banners, such as for fairs, circuses; overhead banners were addressed and the times limits for their display. Also, campaign signs that are left too long after elections were discussed and who would be responsible for removing them. Another type of sign discussed were the garage sale signs which are stapled onto utility poles. and who is responsible for removing them since the poles are in a right-of-way. Mr. Knight said the utility companies have their own

regulations and rules governing the placement of placards and signs on their poles. Therefore, can the City control what goes on those poles if they don't own them, and especially if the right-of-ways where the poles are located are not City owned, but State owned, as in the case of Grand Avenue and California Street.

Mr. Villa asked if a variance procedure should be inserted into the proposed Sign Ordinance. Mr. Fleitman said he felt that issue is not an unforeseen or hardship situation which would precipitate a variance request; however, there could be certain cases when a variance would be befitting of certain events such as a blood drive or cholesterol check.

Another item of discussion was the prohibiting of signs which are permanently affixed to a registered motor vehicle, not painted on. The number of on-site signs per business was discussed.

Mr. Hawkins asked if there would be a clause indicating a "grandfather" situation. Pat Payne informed the Planning and Zoning members that the ordinance as it is presented at the present time is only in a rough draft stage and that portion of the ordinance was not developed. The P & Z members agreed that there should be a "grandfather" clause with an amortization plan of 3-5 years for all non-conforming signs.

Some discussion ensued as to allowing any billboards on either I-35 or Highway 82. Various sizes and heights were discussed also. Mr. Drescher explained that new billboard spaces cannot be obtained along the Interstate; billboards can only be put on existing billboard space.

Any further discussion was tabled until the next meeting until Mr. Cravens could hear further comments and answer questions regarding the proposed Sign Ordinance.

The fourth item of business was discussion and consideration of the Master Plan/Target 2000 update. Mr. Knight said he felt that updating the Master Plan, which was Priority Item #17 on the prioritization list some two years ago, was a matter of top concern at this time. He also said that extending the City limits to the south was important also, according to comments from citizens of the City. Discussion ensued as to any possible development and hesitancy of doing same due to the amount of flood plain within that area. The area between Old Highway 77 and Interstate 35 was discussed as a possible area for future annexation and development. Another area for possible future development was the area east of Joy Acres, the extension of Harris Street, east to F.M. 3092. The Old Denton Road area was also considered.

The Planning and Zoning members discussed having another workshop to further the development of the Master Plan/Target 2000 and utilize the priorities set forth in those documents as already approved and adopted. Mr. Drescher said he and Mr. Cravens had discussed this previously and believed that having a broad based community committee to devise an initial list of items which could be presented to the

Planning and Zoning Commission for consideration would be feasible. Mr. Fleitman said he thought it would be a good idea to get outside direction. The other members agreed. Mr. Dresher asked the members to give further thought to persons representing a cross section of the community whom they felt would be competent to be on such a committee. Mrs. Lusk asked if it would be feasible to consider retaining a planner such as the one hired by the City several years ago to redevelop the Master Plan. Mr. Dresher answered by saying he felt that with Mr. Cravens' experience in planning, he would be more than able to do most of it.

Mr. Kaden asked if the Grand Avenue Study would be considered again. Mr. Knight said he thought it should be, considering the changes that have occurred in the last ten years, with most of it being a major commercial zone. Mr. Kaden said one thing that bothers him the most is the width of the street with no turn lanes at busy intersections.

Mr. Dresher explained that the City will be participating with the State in widening Anthony Street out to the City limits to the south, with the State expanding the extension past the City limits.

The fifth item on the agenda was discussion and consideration of the proposed Recycling Ordinance for regulating recyclable material within the City. One item of discussion mentioned were the Goodwill drop boxes. Mr. Fleitman said a matter of concern he has is there is no time period stated for operation of mobile recycling units. Mr. Fleitman said he felt a five-day time limit would be sufficient with the vehicle, or unit, being licensed. A grandfather clause was also discussed. Mr. Dresher recommended that discussion and consideration be tabled until the next meeting.

The sixth item on the agenda was discussion and consideration of the proposed Site Plan Review Ordinance (an amendment to the Site Plan Ordinance), for the three Single Family Four Residential districts and the Interstate 35 Corridor. Mr. Dresher reviewed the checklist, incorporated as a part of the proposed ordinance, which would be used by the inspection department in order to ascertain if people are complying with the rules and regulations of the ordinance. A motion was made by Don Hawkins and seconded by Chris Kaden to accept the ordinance and present it for public hearing at the March 8, 1989, Planning and Zoning Commission meeting, at which time it will be considered fully in its entirety and recommended to City Council. Motion carried by the following votes: Ayes: Shortnacy, Kaden, Knight, Hawkins and Fleitman. Nays: None. Absent: Duncan and Schmitz.

After no further business the meeting was adjourned at 3:16 p.m.