

MINUTES

CITY OF GAINESVILLE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING DECEMBER 10, 1986

Members Present: Van Knight, Jr., Russell Duncan, Allen Fleitman, Luann Shortnacy, and Don Hawkins.

Staff Members Present: Barry LeBaron and Pat Payne

Visitors Present: List Attached.

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 November 12, 1986 meeting. Motion was made by Mr. Russell Duncan to accept the minutes as presented with Mrs. Luann Shortnacy seconding the Motion. Motion carried unanimously.

The third item of business on the Agenda was a request by Mr. Richard Klement and Mr. Billy Reed to rezone 3.70 acres in the M. Gross Survey, A-401 and the G. D. Hill Survey, A-462, from SF-3 to MF-1. Mr. Reed spoke first in favor of the request. Mr. Klement spoke next stating that he needed the 100 foot strip rezoned to accommodate a proposed Multi-Family development. There was discussion as to the detrimental effect the proposed rezoning would have on the residential neighborhood West of that area. A problem of runoff water was discussed with Mr. Klement stating that they had already thought of that and there was a sufficient area of 200 feet between the areas for the runoff. Mr. Duncan spoke next stating that when the Arkansas Drive area went through a rezone process approximately 4-5 months ago. The neighborhood was comfortable with the 300 foot strip of property zoned SF-3 to be used as future Single Family development. He further stated that the proposed 100 foot area is outside the required 200 feet of notification of adjacent property owners and there was no way of knowing if those residents on Arkansas Drive were aware that this proposed zoning was taking place so close to them. Mr. Fleitman asked Mr. Klement and Mr. Reed if they had a site plan available for the area and they indicated that they did not have a plan available. Mr. Knight asked Mr. LeBaron if he had any comment on the proposed rezoning and he said that he felt that there was not sufficient information to work with to justify changing the zoning. He said that when the 310 feet was allotted to the East of the Arkansas Drive area, it was left as a buffer zone. He indicated he would have problems approving the request due to lack of

information and planning on the part of Mr. Klement and Mr. Reed. He said that when the Planning and Zoning Commission and the City Council first looked at this area there was some very sound and logical reasoning why they established the 300 foot wide buffer area, which was to leave room for development, not to take 100 feet off of it. He said that idea would destroy all they had originally planned to accomplish. He also said that if the 100 foot strip had been extended another ten feet to the West, the people of Arkansas Drive would have received notification of the Public Hearing and would have attended the Public Hearing. Mr. Reed said he felt that a development of some kind would be more attractive than just a field located in the proposed area. Mr. Knight told Mr. Klement and Mr. Reed that he felt that if the Planning and Zoning Commission had a plan presented to them for development of the area, there would be more information to base a decision on as to the proposed request for rezone of the area. After no further discussion of the matter, Mr. Knight suggested that Mr. Klement and Mr. Reed draw up some type of site plan for development of the area so there will be more information to base a rezoning request on. Mr. Klement and Mr. Reed agreed to make a presentation at a later date. A motion was made by Mr. Duncan and seconded by Mr. Fleitman to table the request. Motion carried unanimously.

The fourth item on the Agenda was consideration of a request by Mr. Larry Stewart, Jerry Wimmer, Monte Wimmer, and Merlin Wimmer to rezone the West 65 feet of Lot 2, Block D, Ernwood Addition, and also being 1303 North Clements Street, from SF-2 to Commercial. Mr. Knight asked for any discussion in favor of the request and Mr. Jerry Wimmer spoke first stating that their request for the rezoning was for placement of a commercial building for a car repair business. That is what they intend to do with the West end of the lot if the request is approved. Mr. Knight then asked if anyone else was present to speak in favor of the request and there was no response. He then asked if there was anyone to speak in opposition of the proposed rezone of the lot. Mrs. Labecah Tucker spoke first stating she felt the proposed Commercial zoning of the West end of the lot would be a terrible noise and trash factor to their neighborhood. Mrs. Ima Jean Wallace, speaking for her mother, Mrs. Leonard Zwinggi, Mrs. Joann Hermes, Mrs. Marcella Zimmerer, Mrs. Carlton Moss and Mrs. O. S. Turner all spoke in opposition of the proposed rezone, with all stating that they felt that it would be detrimental to the pride they have in their neighborhood to add that type of business in their back yards. Mrs. Turner also stated that she felt that because of the narrowness of the street and because of several small school children that have to walk to school, that a business of that type would be hazardous to the neighborhood. Mr. Turner spoke also, stating his opposition for the same reasons as previously given. Mr. Knight asked Mr. LeBaron to give any comment he might have at that time. He felt, as

stated in his memo to the Planning and Zoning Commission, that the residential part of the lot, which consists of the East end, will still be considerably too small for the SF-2 zoning, which is typical for that neighborhood. He also stated that some of the lots to the South of that particular lot also fall below the required 7500 square foot minimum for the SF-2 zoning. The point was then raised that a lot to the South of the lot in question has an existing commercial type car repair building in the rear of the lot which fronts on Grand Avenue. However, several of the adjacent lot owners said this particular lot had not been used for commercial usage for some time and the man who owns it is converting it into a room by closing it in. Discussion then followed among the Commission members with Mr. Duncan stating that he felt that Mr. Wimmer and Mr. Stewart should have the same opportunity as the gentlemen who had previously had a garage-type repair business. Mr. Fleitman stated he had no problem with request with that point in view. Mrs. Moss then brought up a point concerning a fire hazard to the neighborhood due to the proposed repair business being so close to their houses. However, the P & Z members stated that was not a factor. Mr. Duncan then made a motion that the request be approved with a second by Mr. Fleitman. The request was denied by the Planning and Zoning Commission with Mr. Duncan and Mr. Fleitman voting in favor; Mr. Knight, Mr. Hawkins, and Mrs. Shortnacy voting in opposition. The request will be presented to the City Council for consideration on January 6, 1987.

The fifth item on the Agenda was a Public Hearing on the proposed rezoning plan for West Highway 82. Mr Knight asked Mr. LeBaron to reiterate on the zoning proposal. He explained that when the area was annexed approximately two years ago, the area was automatically zoned Agricultural, but due to the need of better utilization of the area, the proposed zoning has been established. He then pointed out some changes that had been made on the proposed zoning map since the November 12, 1986 Public Hearing after renotification of all adjoining property owners. Mr. Knight asked if anyone had any comment on the matter. Mr. M. I. Clark spoke stating that he felt if the random residential area next to the highway was zoned Commercial, his taxes would double, according to the District Tax Appraiser. He said he felt that was his main concern. Mr. Sam Enderby spoke next stating his concern for the area West of the Floral Drive area, which he owns, which has been the main point of discussion among the adjoining property owners. Because the area had been proposed to be zoned to SF-3, he stated his opposition saying he wanted the area to remain Commercial. He also stated that he has no immediate plans for development of the area; he just does not want it Single Family. It was pointed out that the asphalt plant on the North end of his property has not been leased to anyone, but the Highway Department only takes the contents from the ground for reconstruction of Highway 35. He stated that his

property at the present time is being used for a commercial use because of the storage of his propane and butane tanks in that area. He said Agricultural zoning would be fine with him; he did not ask for the rezone in the first place. Mr. Duncan spoke stating the reasoning behind zoning that particular area to Single Family rather than Commercial was for a buffer zone between the Floral Drive Area and the Light Industrial, which consists of the Fair Ground property. Mr. Fleitman affirmed that stand. Mr. Clark spoke next asking the various uses of the Commercial, Light Industry and Heavy Industry. Ms. Electa Taylor spoke next stating she felt that the adjoining neighbors, after presenting a petition in opposition to Multi-Family zoning of the area in question at the November 12, 1986 meeting, were relieved and felt that the change to Single Family zoning was in their best interest and they still want it to remain that way, not Commercial because of the ugliness of the tank storage area. She also stated that if the area was zoned Commercial, the Floral Drive area will not grow any further. She suggested that the area on the extreme North end of the proposed Commercial area be zoned Multi-Family. She stated she also questions the Single Family General North of the Floral Drive area, because she does not want any more trailer homes in that area. Mr. Knight clarified that if the area was zoned Single Family, Mr. Enderby is not obligated to remove his tanks as long as he is storing them there. Discussion further ensued as to a configuration of a street on the West side of Floral Drive and how the area could be developed if it were zoned Single Family. Mrs. Marynel Patterson spoke, stating that she did not want commercialism in her back door, as she is located on one of the cul-de-sacs on Floral Drive, but she would not be opposed to another back yard next to hers. Mr. Knight asked Mr. Enderby to consider some uses for the property for consideration of rezoning. A motion was made by Mr. Russell Duncan and seconded by Mrs. Luann Shortnacy to recommend approval to the City Council for rezone of the West Highway 82 area, with the exception of the area West of the Floral Drive area, which will be considered at a later date. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Knight discussed going out to the area in question on West Highway 82 as a group and doing research as to the best usage of the tract of land.

The next item brought before the Commission was discussion by Mr. LeBaron of a workshop on Sub-Divisions to be held in February.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at approximately 3:40 p.m.