

MINUTES

CITY OF GAINESVILLE
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

July 15, 1987

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

Members Absent: Jim Purcell

Staff Present: Barry LeBaron, Pat Payne

Visitors Present: Martha Davis (Council Representative), Shirley Lusk, (LWV) and Dee Fisk (Representative from Chamber of Commerce)

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Van Knight, Jr. at approximately 2:00 P.M.

The **second item on the agenda** was approval of the Minutes from the May 13, 1987 meeting. Russell Duncan made a motion to approve the Minutes as presented with Don Hawkins seconding the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

The **third item on the agenda** was the discussion of proposed annexations to the City with Mr. LeBaron leading the discussion and explaining plans for the proposed annexations. He began by explaining the areas of proposed annexation which include the area East of the Wheeler Creek Addition along Farm Road 3092 (Wilson area), East of the Joy Acres Addition (Bodusky area), also along Farm Road 3092, and the area Southwest of the City along Interstate 35. The main tracts for discussion and consideration were the Wilson and Bodusky Tracts. The Wilson, or Tract 1, consists of 457.62 acres. The proposed annexation, as presented, of both tracts will take in 200 feet East of F.M. Road 3092. Mr. LeBaron told the Planning and Zoning Commission members that the contracts have been awarded and construction will soon begin for major water and sewer lines East of the City on Highway 82, which will eventually service the proposed areas to be annexed. He further explained that the need for the 200 feet designation of annexation East of F.M. Road 3092 would be to discourage anyone from going across the highway and tying on to City services and then proceeding to build whatever and however they want to without considering City codes.

The Bodusky land (Tract 2) consists of 208.48 acres with 200 feet being proposed for annexation East of F.M. Road 3092

also. Mr. LeBaron elaborated on the area which is already in the City limits bordering on the proposed area of annexation and bounded on the West and North by California Street, being a corner consisting of approximately 22 acres. Some discussion ensued among the Commission members as to the zoning capabilities of that area, with the area being zoned Agricultural at the present time. Discussion was presented concerning the present development of that area. Mr. LeBaron said the developers which are considering Commercial development of the 22 acres, are also considering development of the Bodusky area for patio homes, two-acre tracts, one-acre tracts, and the remainder for general SF zoning. He stated that with the possibility of the proposed annexations, a new thoroughfare running parallel with Aspen Road might enhance all the developments on that side of the City, leaving Aspen Road free from thru traffic.

Mr. LeBaron then explained to the P & Z members that if they agreed on the configuration of the proposed annexations by voting to present them to the City Council, it will entail passing resolutions, having a public hearing process, with notices being run in the newspaper, with the process of annexation not being completed until sometime in October. Mr. LeBaron explained that one advantage of accepting the area of the proposed annexations as they are presented is the fact that no one lives in the areas and utilities will not be a problem nor an issue for the present time.

Chris Kaden presented a question as to the flooding issue of the Wilson Tract and asked how it could be addressed. Mr. LeBaron explained that it would be addressed as it is developed, with the developer taking the preliminary plat and comparing it against the flood map. Mr. LeBaron further explained that an idea has been put forth with the possibility of creating a public park along the creek with homes backing up to it having two-acre back yards.

Mr. Hawkins submitted discussion as to the proposed 200 foot depth on the East side of F.M. Road 3092 for the boundary line. He asked if that depth would be better utilized if it were 300 or even 400 feet, providing it would not cause service problems. Mr. Fleitman then suggested that 400 feet would be a better alternative to assure controlled development. A motion was made by Russell Duncan and seconded by Chris Kaden to recommend approval of the proposed annexations of Tract 1 and Tract 2, being the Wilson and Bodusky lands, to the City Council for approval with the 200 foot width on the East side of F.M. Road 3092 being widened to 400 feet from Highway 82 to California Street. Motion carried unanimously.

The fourth item on the agenda was the discussion of the major thoroughfare plan for the City. Mr. LeBaron presented discussion as to the implementation of yield signs and stop

signs to instigate a better plan for thoroughfares in the City and to precede the City Council's establishment of ordinances to implement the traffic devices that can be used for a future thoroughfare plan which had been presented several years ago in 1974. If the plan is still valid, it can be used as a guide to start putting stop signs and yield signs on the routes which are adjacent and parallel to the thoroughfares proposed in the 1974 plan. Mr. LeBaron indicated that putting up the signs will constitute several thousands of dollars, with each sign probably averaging about \$150.00 to install.

He then explained the theory of the "super block" plan, in which case a large area of city blocks are enclosed, or surrounded, by a network of mainstream thoroughfares which shuttle the majority of the vehicular traffic in the City. Within these blocks are residential neighborhoods, with businesses being on the edges of the "super blocks" and industries being located elsewhere in the scheme of the planning, except in very large cities. Mr. LeBaron suggested that in the near future he and the Planning and Zoning Commission might develop a configuration of the City and divide it into as many of the "blocks" as they can, using the thoroughfares that have already been established and also look at the zoning in each "block" to determine if it should be different.

Discussion was presented by Mr. Duncan and Mr. Kaden as to the advantages and disadvantages of Anthony Street being utilized as a thoroughfare, with Mr. Duncan expressing concern as to the "dumping" of traffic into nowhere, being Rice Avenue, and maybe eventually extending it on to Lindsay Street. He said he felt the planning was bad in that case, due to the fact that Lindsay Street cannot hold enough traffic to be deemed as a thoroughfare and also due to the fact that Lindsay Street has two schools. Mr. Kaden, however, stated he felt that Anthony Street will eventually be extended on to Interstate 35, making a distinct entrance into the Southeastern part of Gainesville from Interstate 35. The only drawback, he stated, would be the crossing of the railroad track, unless a grade crossing could be constructed. He said he feels that Anthony Street is definitely a very good beginning in re-routing traffic from Lake Kiowa, Burns City Road, and various areas from the Southeastern part of the City and County into the schools and the City.

After further discussion of the thoroughfare plans, Mr. LeBaron asked the Planning and Zoning members to suggest a listing of streets which need to have traffic control signs at intersections to thru streets in order to instigate the thoroughfare plan for the best advantage of traffic control

in the City. Some discussion was presented as to the lack of traffic control at the four-way stops throughout the City.

The fifth item on the agenda on the agenda was discussion of the revised Sign Ordinance, with the moratorium on sign permits for billboards expiring on September 12, 1987. The original Sign Ordinance was passed in 1957, the main features of which say that if a sign is less than sixty square feet, painted or placed on the side of a building, a sign permit is not applicable. It also states that signs cannot be built over the curb or right-of-way-of-way, with the maximum size in the Fire Zone (Central Business District), is sixty square feet if constructed of combustible material. The permit fee was established at \$3.00 for all signs. The other sign ordinances were established within the Zoning Ordinance, which is identified in a Use table. The Zoning Ordinance states that there are no restrictions on maximum area of signs in the business areas, which statement preceded the problem with the billboards which were constructed on Grand Avenue in the spring of 1987, causing the moratorium to be passed by the City Council for six months for construction of any billboards on Grand Avenue and California Street. Mr. LeBaron presented several alternatives concerning ways of amending the present Zoning Ordinance or establishing a new Sign Ordinance. He then introduced Dee Fisk who represents the Chamber of Commerce Beautification Committee who expressed her concern with the erection of billboards throughout the City. Another question, along with the billboard problem, that Mr. LeBaron says he has encountered, is the portable signs and the regulation of them. Discussion ensued among the Planning and Zoning members who agreed that the main problem is off-premise advertising. Mr. Hawkins asked Mr. LeBaron if the Sign Permits had a time limit on them and Mr. LeBaron indicated they do not. He went to further state that one way to eventually rid the City of unwanted billboards or signs, is that if signs don't meet the new regulations and are non-conforming, they have to be torn down within a specified amount of time. Another way to permits for signs would be to issue a Special Use Permit, which could be regulated. Mr. Kaden presented a point of discussion as to the billboards creating a safety hazard as well as being esthetically unattractive. Mrs. Fisk brought up a point in question by questioning the sound construction of the newer billboard signs which have been constructed within the past several months or so, and several of them having already blown over, while most all of the older signs seem sturdy. She also made a point that the fee charged for signs isn't sufficient to supplement the costs of inspecting and regulating the sign structures during and after construction. Another question raised in the discussion was whether or not the signs are on the tax rolls, when in fact they should be. At this point in the

discussion, Mr. Knight asked Mr. LeBaron to draw up a new ordinance regulating the signs within the city limits and also to eventually eliminate the billboards which have been constructed on Grand Avenue and California Street, beginning the present day of July 15, 1987, and which signs do not relate to the business on which they are located. Mr. LeBaron then suggested that someone go out on Grand Avenue and California Street and measure the larger on-premise signs presently in place to determine a maximum scale of how large any new sign should be before it would be allowed. The question was then raised concerning the issuance of permits for signs installed on the side or front of buildings. Mr. Hawkins said that he felt the control should be concentrated on the signs which are erected on poles, separately, and away from any buildings. Mr. Hawkins said he believed that set-back regulations should definitely be considered.

The next question submitted regarding sign regulations was raised by Mr. LeBaron regarding fees for erection of signs by permit. He suggested that a moderate fee to cover inspections and paper work should be anywhere from \$7.50 to \$12.50. He also stated that to be very sure of not abusing anyone's rights, the First Amendment (Freedom of Speech) should be considered.

After no further discussion of the sign regulations, Mr. LeBaron said he would have a draft ordinance ready for the August 12, 1987 Planning and Zoning meeting. He asked the Commission members to observe the signs on Grand Avenue and California Street to help each one determine what they feel should be a moderate size for signs for those particular thoroughfares.

Some discussion followed concerning the City Council's Priority Issue Rankings which the Planning and Zoning Commission members had time to review.

Mr. LeBaron also suggested that new zoning which the Planning and Zoning Commission might consider for the future is the area North on Interstate 35, up to the new Tourist Bureau. He stated that another area of discussion which has been requested for review is manufactured housing.

After no further items of business the meeting was adjourned by Mr. Knight at approximately 3:50.