

STATE OF TEXAS §

October 20, 2020

COUNTY OF GRAYSON §

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT A Regular Meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission and Board of Adjustments of the City of Sherman, was begun and held on October 20, 2020.

MEMBERS PRESENT: VICE-CHAIRMAN DOWNTAIN  
COMMISSION MEMBERS: WOOD, SIMS, MANLEY AND  
WHITAKER

ALTERNATE: VANDERVEER

MEMBERS ABSENT: CHAIRMAN MAHONE AND COMMISSION MEMBER DAVIS

CALL TO ORDER

Vice-Chairman Downtain called the meeting to order at 5:03 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

APPROVE MINUTES

The Planning and Zoning Commission reviewed the minutes of the September 22, 2020 regular meeting. Motion by Commission Member Wood to approve the Minutes as written. Second by Commission Member Whitaker. All present voted AYE.  
MOTION CARRIED.

APPROVE MINUTES

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Rob Rae, Director of Development Services informed the board "the City has retained a new City Attorney, the firm of Abernathy, Roeder, Boyd & Hullett, P.C. Bob Roeder is here as our Legal Counsel and City Attorney, representing the firm tonight. If we have any legal questions, we will be able to address those to Mr. Roeder. Future meetings will have someone representing the firm, it may not be Bob, it may be someone else."

CITY ATTORNEY

APPOINT BOARD OF ADJUSTMENTS

Vice-Chairman Downtain appointed the members of the Board of Adjustments: DOWNTAIN, WOOD, MANLEY, WHITAKER AND SIMS.

BOARD OF  
ADJUSTMENTS

CONSENT AGENDA (ITEMS 8, 9, 10 & 12)

Consent Agenda items are considered routine and non-controversial items.

CONSENT AGENDA

The Commission reviewed the Consent Agenda. Commission Member Manley moved to approve the Consent Agenda Items as presented subject to the Staff Review Letters. Second by Commission Member Wood. All present voted AYE. All present voted AYE.

THE COMMISSION FOUND THE REQUEST CONFORMS TO THE INTENT OF THE ORDINANCE.

**FINAL PLAT – CONSENT AGENDA ITEM**

THE REQUEST OF RHONDA GARLAND (OWNER) AND UNDERWOOD DRAFTING AND SURVEYING (SURVEYOR) CONCERNING THE PROPERTY AT 186 JIM LAMB ROAD, BEING 1.219 ACRES IN THE GARRETT PANGBURN SURVEY, ABSTRACT NO. 945, AS FOLLOWS;

***PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION***

FINAL PLAT APPROVAL OF GARLAND ADDITION IN THE CITY OF SHERMAN'S EXTRA TERRITORIAL JURISDICTION (ETJ)

FINAL PLAT –  
GARLAND ADDITION  
(ETJ)  
186 JIM LAMB RD.  
(RHONDA GARLAND)

The property is located at 186 Jim Lamb Road, northeast of Sherman off Whitney Road in the City of Sherman's Extra Territorial Jurisdiction. The owner would like to plat the property into one lot for residential development. They had seen the Staff Review Letter and would abide by the Recommendations.

THE COMMISSION FOUND THE REQUEST CONFORMS TO THE INTENT OF THE ORDINANCE.

**REPLAT – CONSENT AGENDA ITEM**

THE REQUEST OF FRHP LINCOLNSHIRE, LLC (OWNERS), CAMPING WORLD AND GOOD SAM (TENANTS) AND CEI ENGINEERING ASSOCIATES, INC. (CIVIL ENGINEER AND SURVEYOR) CONCERNING THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 2005 SOUTH SAM RAYBURN FREEWAY, BEING A 14.08 TRACT IN THE PRESTON KITCHEN SURVEY, ABSTRACT NO. 667, ALSO BEING MULTIPLE TRACTS: TRACT 1, BEING A 7.036 ACRE TRACT; TRACT 3, BEING ALL OF BLOCKS 38, 39 AND A PORTION OF BLOCK 37 OF THE REPLAT OF BLOCKS 4, 5, 6, 15, 16, 17, 29, 31, 40 AND 41 OF SOUTH SIDE ADDITION; AND TRACT 4, BEING A 0.888 ACRE TRACT, EXCEPT A CALLED 0.487 ACRE PORTION OF LOTS 7-12, BLOCK 39, AS FOLLOWS:

***PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION***

REPLAT APPROVAL OF BLOCK 43R, LOT 1, SOUTH SIDE ADDITION, BEING A REPLAT OF THE FINAL PLAT OF BLOCK 43R, LOT 1, SOUTH SIDE ADDITION

REPLAT BLOCK 43R,  
LOT 1 SOUTH SIDE  
ADDITION, A  
REPLAT OF THE  
FINAL PLAT OF  
BLOCK 43R, LOT 1,  
SOUTH SIDE ADDN.  
2005 S. SAM  
RAYBURN FRWY.  
(FRHP  
LINCOLNSHIRE, LLC)

The property is located at 2005 South Sam Rayburn Freeway between Wilson Avenue and FM 1417; Camping World and Good Sam are the tenants. The property is zoned a C-1 (Retail Business) District and M-1 (Light Manufacturing) District and located in the O-1.2 (Sam Rayburn) Overlay District. The owner would like to Replat the property into one lot for commercial development. They had seen the Staff Review Letter and would abide by the Recommendations.

THE COMMISSION FOUND THE REQUEST CONFORMS TO THE INTENT OF THE ORDINANCE.

**SITE PLAN – CONSENT AGENDA ITEM**

**THE REQUEST OF SHREE SANTOSHIMA LLC (OWNERS) AND DAVID BACA STUDIO (ARCHITECT) CONCERNING THE PROPERTY AT 1104 SOUTH FM 1417 (HERITAGE PARKWAY), BEING LOT 1, BLOCK 6, HERITAGE FARMS ESTATES, REPLAT LOT 2, BLOCK A, COUNTRY RIDGE ESTATES #10, AS FOLLOWS:**

***PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION***

**SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR A CONVENIENCE STORE @ COUNTRY RIDGE, A CONVENIENCE STORE WITH DRIVE – THRU AND FUELING STATIONS.**

**SITE PLAN  
CONVENIENCE  
STORE @ COUNTRY  
RIDGE  
1104 S. FM 1417  
(HERITAGE  
PARKWAY)  
(SHREE  
SANTOSHIMA)**

The property is located at 1104 South FM 1417 (Heritage Parkway), the southwest corner of Quail Run Road and FM 1417 (Heritage Parkway). The property is zoned a C-1 (Retail Business) District and located in the O-1.1 (FM 1417) Overlay District.

The owner would like to construct a 5,000 square foot, single-story convenience store with drive-thru and fueling stations. The exterior facade will be architectural block, brick and stucco. The fueling stations include four (4) double-sided fuel pumps for a total of eight (8). The drive-thru lane is designed with appropriate width and turning space and will accommodate eight (8) stacking spaces. Parking will be provided for twenty-five (25) spaces. They had seen the Staff Review Letter and would abide by the Recommendations.

**THE COMMISSION FOUND THE REQUEST CONFORMS TO THE INTENT OF THE ORDINANCE.**

**PRELIMINARY PLAT – CONSENT AGENDA ITEM**

**THE REQUEST OF HERITAGE DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS, LLC (OWNERS), BROCKETT DAVIS DRAKE, INC. (REPRESENTATIVE) AND VOTEX SURVEYING COMPANY (SURVEYOR) CONCERNING THE PROPERTY AT 221 WEST TRAVIS STREET, BEING 1.005 ACRES IN THE PRESTON KITCHEN SURVEY ABSTRACT NO. 667, IN TRACT 4 OF THE BLALOCK INDUSTRIAL PARK, AS FOLLOWS;**

***PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION***

**PRELIMINARY PLAT APPROVAL OF SHERMAN CROSSROADS MEDICAL NO. 3**

**PRELIMINARY PLAT  
– SHERMAN  
CROSSROADS  
MEDICAL NO. 3  
221 W. TRAVIS ST.  
(HERITAGE  
DEVELOPMENT  
PARTNERS, LLC)**

The property is located at 221 West Travis Street between West FM 1417 and Stone Creek Drive. The property is zoned Blalock Industrial Park and Blalock Commercial Overlay District. The owner would like to plat the property into one lot for commercial development of a medical office. They had seen the Staff Review Letter and would abide by the Recommendations.

**THE COMMISSION FOUND THE REQUEST CONFORMS TO THE INTENT OF THE ORDINANCE.**

**EXCEPTION & VARIANCE**

THE REQUEST OF QUIKTRIP CORPORATION (OWNERS), JOHN PIMENTEL (REPRESENTATIVE) AND KIRKMAN ENGINEERING (ENGINEER) CONCERNING THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 3624 SOUTH U.S. HIGHWAY 75, BEING LOT 4, BLOCK 2, SHERMAN CROSSROADS, PHASE II, LOTS 1R, 4 & 5, A REPLAT OF AMENDING PLAT LOT 1, BLOCK 2, SHERMAN CROSSROADS, PHASE II, AS FOLLOWS:

***PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION***

EXCEPTION AND VARIANCE UNDER ORDINANCE NO. 2280, SECTION 6.8.4, SUBSECTION (8) AND ORDINANCE NO. 2252, SECTION 410 (2)(N) TO ALLOW AN ADDITIONAL 58.6 SQUARE FOOT, 12' TALL FREESTANDING SIGN, 32.92' FROM THE SOUTH HIGHWAY 75 PROPERTY LINE FOR QUIKTRIP IN THE BLALOCK INDUSTRIAL PARK/BLALOCK COMMERCIAL OVERLAY DISTRICT.

EXCEPTION &  
VARIANCE - SIGN  
3624 S. HIGHWAY 75  
(QUIKTRIP  
CORPORATION)

(DENIED)

**John Pimental, 1120 N. Industrial Blvd., Euless, TX**

Mr. Pimental appeared to represent the request and answer any questions. The property is located at 3624 South U.S. Highway 75, the southwest corner of South Highway 75 and West FM 1417; QuikTrip is the tenant. The property is in the Blalock Industrial Park and Blalock Commercial Overlay District.

Mr. Pimental explained, “we have been here two previous times. One time to seek approval for a 60-foot multi-tenant pylon sign, it was denied and another time for a 50-foot multi-tenant pylon sign which was also denied. The first one was 1,200 square feet and the second time was 800 square feet. What we are seeking now is a 58.6 square foot, 12' tall additional freestanding sign along Highway 75. We do have a sign on FM 1417 (Heritage Parkway); we feel we are unable to affectively advertise on the service road currently. We have a sign going southbound on our gas canopy but it is hindered by the McDonald’s building, so we are unable to effectively advertise our gas prices.”

Commission Member Vanderveer asked if 32.92 feet is the setback the sign is supposed to be from the property line.

Mr. Rae explained, “that is actually greater than it is supposed to be, the setback is actually 25’; they exceed that setback.”

Commission Member Manley asked if the additional sign that is requested is to advertise along the Highway 75 service road and you had put a sign on the gas canopy to serve that purpose, but the McDonald’s building to the north blocks that sign.

Mr. Pimental explained, “that is correct; you cannot really see the canopy sign until you are almost passing it; it defeats the purpose of advertising our gas prices.”

Commission Member Manley asked, “did you have some knowledge of what the development to the north was going to look like when you put the sign on the canopy.”

Mr. Pimental responded, “yes and at the time, I think we were planning to have a pylon sign, unfortunately that did not work out.”

Commission Member Vanderveer stated, “this sign is to advertise on Highway 75, correct.”

Mr. Pimental responded, “yes.”

Commission Member Vanderveer stated, “this is highly unlikely this sign will be seen from the north because of the terrain.”

Mr. Pimental explained, “it would be seen more southbound as you are passing the store.”

Commission Member Vanderveer asked Rob Rae, “if this is approved, it will be for a sign that specific size because that is what they are requesting, if we give them a variance and exception, they can’t put something bigger up.”

Mr. Rae responded, “it would be based on this plan.”

Vice-Chairman Downtain asked, “in the Blalock District, is the variance only for the footage requested or is a monument sign even allowed.”

Mr. Rae explained, “currently the exception is to have an additional sign, everything else, the size of the sign, the height of the sign, the setbacks are all within the regulations for the monument sign. The difference is they have a corner lot, so they are requesting to have two signs.”

Commission Member Manley asked about the sign that exists. “What is it intended to advertise; it is facing the frontage road, which means you probably can’t see it until you are driving past it; what is its function.”

Mr. Pimental responded, “that is correct. The function is to advertise gas prices. We are not a destination type business, so we are predicated on advertising the gas prices.”

Commission Member Manley asked, “the existing sign, what is its function.”

Mr. Pimental explained, “the sign that is currently there was a Band-Aid fix until we come up with a solution, it is something that is defeating the purpose. We would be willing to take that sign down if we could get this sign, which we feel is more important.”

Commission Member Manley asked if a modification to the existing sign would be acceptable.

Mr. Pimental responded, “I don’t think so, because it still is not visible because of the McDonald’s building.”

Commission Member Manley explained, “the sign I was referring to is the FM 1417 (Heritage Parkway) monument sign.”

Mr. Pimental explained, “we are on a corner lot and that sign is not visible and even if it was, we are below the requirement, I believe that sign is 6’ tall as opposed to 12’ tall and we did it to make sure we are not over the allowed signs. There is already a visibility issue with the sign on FM 1417 (Heritage Parkway).”

Commission Member Manley explained, “I am seeing three signs on the drawing, one that is bubbled in red that I assume is the request; there is a monument sign facing the frontage road and another at the corner of Highway 75 and FM 1417 (Heritage Parkway); I’m not sure what is existing and what is requested.”

Mr. Pimental responded, “there should not be one on the hard corner. Right now, the only existing sign is on FM 1417 (Heritage Parkway) and we are requesting another sign on the Highway 75 frontage.”

Commission Member Vanderveer asked if were possible to have a ninety degree type sign on the hard corner where it would be visible from both sides.

Mr. Pimental explained, “we have tried that before in Allen and we are going through the same process. We removed it from the hard corner and are seeking variances because it did not work out very well; it would if we were able to have a taller sign.”

Commission Member Wood stated, “all four corners are gas stations; do any of the other four gas stations have more than one sign.”

Mr. Rae explained, “currently two of the four have pole signs that predated this ordinance, the Blalock Overlay District. The gas station across, kitty corner, does not have any signs because it is the same situation; it is after the Blalock Commercial Overlay District was established.”

Mr. Pimental stated, “they do not have a permanent structure, they do have a portable structure that they can change; I do not think that looks good for the Blalock Overlay District and it could blow away.”

Mr. Rae asked if he is referring to the sandwich boards.

Mr. Pimental responded, “yes. I do not think that works for that area.”

Commission Member Vanderveer asked if those signs were governed by the Blalock Overlay.

Mr. Rae responded, “those are probably not permitted.”

Vice-Chairman Downtain asked if any exceptions have been made in the Blalock Commercial Overlay District for signs.

Mr. Rae responded, “there have not been any exceptions approved.”

Appearing from the audience:

Bill Douglass, 2301 San Miguel, Sherman, TX

Mr. Douglass explained, “we would like QuikTrip to operate under the Blalock Commercial Overlay District rules. The sign that you are talking about is my carwash sign that has to do with a discount that you get for our tunnel carwash. We have lived by the code, the code says you can only have one sign, we have not put a sign on either side of the street; we put them on the canopy. They could change the position of the sign on their canopy and get what they need, but they choose to want another sign. We play by the rules, we did not put up signs, and we put the price on the canopy. This is the third time QuikTrip has requested an exception. We play by the rules and we have been here thirty-nine years, we are playing by the rules and QuikTrip comes from Tulsa and they want new rules; we object to that.”

Commission Member Vanderveer asked Mr. Rae “if this is approved, would that set a precedent for this Blalock Overlay District and could other people reference this approval and request another variance.”

Mr. Rae responded, “I believe it would.”

No other citizens appeared before the Planning and Zoning Commission to discuss the exception and variance.

A letter was received from Bill Douglass, Douglass Distributing, 325 E. Forest Ave., Sherman, TX

“We are the property owners in the Blalock Industrial Park along with QuikTrip Corporation of Tulsa, OK.”

“For the third time since acquiring this property two years ago, QuikTrip is asking for an exception to the Blalock Industrial Park/Blalock Commercial Overlay District's sign ordinances.”

“We all bought & developed our properties knowing and adhering to these requirements and ordinances, yet QuikTrip continues to ask for additional signs for their

property, even though the ordinance clearly states that only one freestanding sign per lot is allowed.”

“The Blalock ordinances are there for a reason, to insure the quality and visual appeal of the development, and we strenuously object to QuikTrip's repeated attempts to skirt them.”

“We developed and built our property in accordance with the Blalock and City of Sherman codes and ordinances, and have not requested, nor received, any exceptions or deviations from these rules.”

“Our company has a 39 year history of partnership with the City of Sherman, and we have always "played by the rules". We are only asking that you require QuikTrip to play by these same rules.”

**ACTION TAKEN.**

Motion by Commission Member Wood to deny the exception and variance to allow an additional 58.6 square foot, 12' tall freestanding sign, 32.92' from the South Highway 75 property line for QuikTrip in the Blalock Industrial Park/Blalock Commercial Overlay District at 3624 South U.S. Highway 75. Second by Commission Member Vanderveer.

**VOTING AYE: DOWNTAIN, MANLEY, WOOD, SIMS AND WHITAKER.**

**VOTING NAY: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED**

**THE COMMISSION FOUND THE REQUEST DID NOT CONFORM TO THE INTENT OF THE ORDINANCE.**

**VARIANCE**

THE REQUEST OF THE CITY OF SHERMAN (OWNERS), CLINT PHILPOTT, ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER (REPRESENTATIVE) AND STRAND (ARCHITECT/CIVIL ENGINEER) CONCERNING THE PROPERTY AT 1200 SOUTH DEWEY AVENUE, BEING 125.09 ACRES IN THE G.B. PILANT SURVEY, ABSTRACT NO. 963, AS FOLLOWS;

***BOARD OF ADJUSTMENTS***

VARIANCE APPROVAL UNDER ORDINANCE NO. 2280, SECTION 6.2, SUBSECTION (1) TO ALLOW A 15' FRONT SETBACK FOR THREE AIRPLANE HANGARS (#1, #9 & #18) IN LIEU OF THE REQUIRED 25' IN AN R-1 (ONE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT.

***PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION***

SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR THREE AIRPORT HANGARS (#1, #9 & #18)

**VARIANCE – FRONT SETBACK**

**SITE PLAN – AIRPORT HANGARS #1, #9 & #18  
1200 S. DEWEY AVE.  
(CITY OF SHERMAN)**



**Clint Philpott, 220 W. Mulberry St., Sherman, TX**

Mr. Philpott appeared to represent the request and answer any questions. The property is located at 1200 South Dewey Avenue, the City of Sherman Municipal Airport. The property is zoned an R-1 (One Family Residential) District.

Mr. Philpott explained, “part of the Airport Masterplan includes several additions and improvements to the Municipal Airport; one of those is hangar space. When we started looking at this, there was a waiting list of about twenty-five names that wanted to lease hangars at the Municipal Airport.”

“We started looking at grant opportunities about a year ago; we do have a grant with TXDOT Aviation to help provide funding for this project. There were two pad sites in 2005 that were constructed for T-hangars; each one of these hangars will house seven airplanes. The pad sites constructed the asphalt apron and the taxiway, but did not construct the hangar itself. Plans were done in 2007 to construct the hangars, but for whatever reason those were not done and so we are coming back in 2020 with funding to construct three hangars. When we bid the project, the contractor came in and offered to build a third hangar at his cost as long as we would do a leasing agreement with him, so currently we are getting three hangars for the price of one and at the end of the lease term, we will get all those hangars back. About fifty percent are already spoken for leasing so it is definitely a need out there.”

“When we started looking at this project, we discovered it did not meet our setback ordinance, so that is one of the requests we are making that we are allowed a variance for a fifteen-foot setback in lieu of the twenty-five foot setback. It is partly because of the existing pad sites and partly because of the building restriction zone that requires a building to be setback a certain number of feet off the runway.”

Commission Member Vanderveer stated, “because of the distance between the airport hangar and the safety of the runway is why you have to push it back; is that correct.”

Mr. Philpott responded, “yes. The hangars are designed to meet the standards of the runway.”

Vice-Chairman Downtain explained, “it is calling for the front setback variance but that is not the front of the hangar facing Dewey Avenue.”

Mr. Philpott explained, “the hangars open to the north and south and Dewey is on the east side of the hangar, which will be the side portion of the hangar. The hangars will be R-panel exterior; they will be much nicer than the current hangars.”

Commission Member Manley explained, “the runway is where the runway is and to have enough clearance to get out of the hangar and to get on the runway, you have to go closer to Dewey Avenue; is that correct.”

Mr. Philpott explained, “if you can imagine where the runways are, there is a horizontal line that goes out a certain number of feet and then it increases at 7/1 slope out and so your building has to be underneath that imaginary line, so when a plane is coming in and the wind hits and they get blown off, it is safe and that is where that building restriction zone is set up so the hangars are just tall enough to fit. I think the maximum is about 17’ tall; they are not overly tall but they do have to be scooted back.”

Appearing from the audience:

Anita Mims, 1406 McCall, Sherman, TX

Mrs. Mims explained, “the airport is in her back yard. I am trying to figure out if there are going to be houses back there behind the hangars and where the new hangars will be located.”

Vice-Chairman Downtain explained, “they are proposing hangars for aircraft. The buildings will be along Dewey Avenue. There are no houses proposed at this time.”

Mr. Philpott provided a site plan to Mrs. Mims showing the location of the new hangars.

No other citizens appeared before the Planning and Zoning Commission to discuss the variance or the site plan.

*Board of Adjustments*

**ACTION TAKEN.**

Motion by Commission Member Wood to approve the variance to allow a 15’ front setback for three airplane hangars (#1, #9 & #18) at 1200 South Dewey Avenue. Second by Commission Member Manley.

**VOTING AYE: DOWNTAIN, MANLEY, WHITAKER, WOOD AND SIMS.**

**VOTING NAY: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED**

*Planning and Zoning Commission*

**ACTION TAKEN.**

Motion by Commission Member Wood to approve the site plan for three airport hangars (#1, #9 & #18) at 1200 South Dewey Avenue. Second by Commission Member Vanderveer.

**VOTING AYE: DOWNTAIN, MANLEY, WHITAKER, WOOD, SIMS AND VANDERVEER.**

**VOTING NAY: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED**

THE COMMISSION FOUND THE REQUEST CONFORMS TO THE INTENT OF THE ORDINANCE.

**SPECIFIC USE PERMIT**

THE REQUEST OF DEAN GILBERT, JR. LLC (OWNERS) AND MARIA JEFFREY (APPLICANT) CONCERNING THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 2001 SKYLINE DRIVE, SUITE B-210, BEING LOT 3, BLOCK 1, SKYLINE BUSINESS PARK REPLAT, AS FOLLOWS;

***PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION***

SPECIFIC USE PERMIT AND SITE PLAN APPROVAL UNDER ORDINANCE NO. 2280, SECTION 8, SUBSECTION (5)(A) TO ALLOW MICRO-BLADING/PERMANENT MAKEUP IN A C-1 (RETAIL BUSINESS) DISTRICT/O-1.1 (FM HIGHWAY 1417) OVERLAY DISTRICT.

SUP – MICRO-BLADING/  
PERMANENT  
MAKEUP  
2001 SKYLINE, STE.  
B-210  
(MARIA JEFFREY)

**Maria Jeffrey, 2001 Skyline Dr., Ste. B-210, Sherman, TX**

Ms. Jeffrey appeared to represent the request and answer any questions. The property is located at 2001 Skyline Drive, Suite B210 between North FM 1417 (Heritage Parkway) and Monte Cristo Way. The property is zoned a C-1 (Retail Business) District and located in the 0-1.1 (FM 1417) Overlay District.

Ms. Jeffrey explained, I work at Salon West as a nail tech and skin care associate and I would like to bring micro-blading to our salon.” She had seen the Staff Review Letter and would abide by the Recommendations.

Vice-Chairman Downtain asked if this requires a State License.

Ms. Jeffrey responded, I need the Specific Use Permit approval to get the State License. They use to accept the Certificate of Occupancy Permit for the license but they changed that.”

Vice-Chairman Downtain asked if this was a cosmetic micro-blading process; not tattoos.

Ms. Jeffrey responded, “yes.”

Commission Member Vanderveer stated, “on the Staff Review Letter, it limits it to Maria Jeffrey. Does that mean she is the only one that can do the micro-blading or if she moves, she can take it with her?”

Mr. Rae responded, “she is the applicant and she is the only one that run the business to do micro-blading.”

No other citizens appeared before the Planning and Zoning Commission to discuss the Specific Use Permit.

**ACTION TAKEN.**

Motion by Commission Member Manley to approve the Specific Use Permit to allow micro-

blading/permanent makeup in a C-1 (Retail Business) District subject to the Staff Review Letter. Second by Commission Member Wood.

VOTING AYE: DOWNTAIN, MANLEY, WOOD, SIMS, WHITAKER AND VANDERVEER.

VOTING NAY: NONE

MOTION CARRIED

THE COMMISSION FOUND THE REQUEST CONFORMS TO THE INTENT OF THE ORDINANCE.

**SITE PLAN**

THE REQUEST OF HERITAGE DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS, LLC (OWNERS), BROCKETT DAVIS DRAKE, INC.(REPRESENTATIVE), VOTEX SURVEYING COMPANY (SURVEYOR), COVENANT ARCHITECTURE (ARCHITECT) AND SMR LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS, INC. (LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT) CONCERNING THE PROPERTY AT 221 WEST TRAVIS STREET, BEING 1.005 ACRES IN THE PRESTON KITCHEN SURVEY ABSTRACT NO. 667 AND BEING THE PROPOSED LOT 1, BLOCK 1 OF SHERMAN CROSSROADS MEDICAL NO. 3 AND IN TRACT 4 OF THE BLALOCK INDUSTRIAL PARK, AS FOLLOWS;

***PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION***

SITE PLAN APPROVAL UNDER ORDINANCE NO. 2252 ARTICLE IV, SECTION 410 (2) (J) FOR CROSSROADS MEDICAL OFFICE BUILDING IN THE BLALOCK INDUSTRIAL PARK.

SITE PLAN –  
CROSSROADS  
MEDICAL OFFICE  
BUILDING  
221 W. TRAVIS  
(HERITAGE  
DEVELOPMENT  
PARTNERS, LLC)

Jim Riley, 4144 North Central Expwy., Ste. 1100, Dallas, TX  
Mr. Riley appeared to represent the request and answer any questions. The property is located at 221 West Travis Street between West FM 1417 and Stone Creek Drive. The property is zoned Blalock Industrial Park and Blalock Commercial Overlay District.

Mr. Riley explained, “we would like to construct a one-story, 5,334 square foot medical office building adjacent to the Davita and behind the three-story medical office building that is there now. The exterior facade will be brick veneer, stone and EIFS (Exterior Insulation Finishing System). Parking will be provided for 37 spaces.” He had seen the Staff Review Letter and would abide by the Recommendations.

No other citizens appeared before the Planning and Zoning Commission to discuss the site plan.

**ACTION TAKEN.**

Motion by Commission Member Vanderveer to approve the request for a site plan for Crossroads Medical Office Building in the Blalock Industrial Park at 221 West Travis Street subject to the Staff Review Letter. Second by Commission Member Whitaker

VOTING AYE: DOWNTAIN, WOOD, SIMS, MANLEY,  
WHITAKER AND VANDERVEER.  
VOTING NAY: NONE  
MOTION CARRIED.

THE COMMISSION FOUND THE REQUEST CONFORMS TO  
THE INTENT OF THE ORDINANCE.

**EXCEPTION**

THE REQUEST OF PAUL & ANNE MARTINEZ (OWNERS)  
CONCERNING THE PROPERTY AT 301 WEST MCGEE  
STREET, BEING PART OF LOT 16, BLOCK 4, W.M.  
SHANNON SUPPLEMENT, AS FOLLOWS;

**BOARD OF ADJUSTMENTS**

EXCEPTION AND SITE PLAN APPROVAL UNDER  
ORDINANCE NO. 2280, SECTION 7, SUBSECTION (13)(H)(2)  
TO ALLOW AN 8' PRIVACY FENCE, 5' FROM THE SIDE  
STREET PROPERTY LINE IN LIEU OF THE PERMITTED 4' IN  
HEIGHT EXTENDING CLOSER THAN 25' TO A FRONT LINE  
STREET IN AN R-1 (ONE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT.

EXCEPTION - FENCE  
301 W. MCGEE ST.  
(PAUL & ANNE  
MARTINEZ)

**Anne Martinez, 301 West McGee St., Sherman, TX**

Mrs. Martinez appeared to represent the request and answer  
any questions. The property is located at 301 West McGee  
Street, the northwest corner of McGee and Shannon Streets.  
The property is zoned an R-1 (One Family Residential)  
District.

Mrs. Martinez explained, "I spoke with my neighbor and he  
really did not want the fence to be eight foot tall, so I am  
willing to go down to a six-foot tall cedar privacy fence, 5'  
from the side-street property line. I would like to provide a  
safe place for my children and pets to play. I walked off the  
location of the fence and we thought we had more space in  
the backyard, so I decided to try for the variance. She had  
seen the Staff Review Letter and would abide by the  
Recommendations.

Vice-Chairman Downtain explained, "the neighbor behind  
you has a six-foot fence, is that correct."

Mrs. Martinez responded, "the neighbor has a six-foot fence  
and a four-foot fence on the side street. He told me he did  
not care if it goes on the property line as long as it is only  
six-foot tall."

Commission Member Manley explained, "it looks like the  
fence will be eighty-feet from the corner of Shannon Street  
and McGee Street."

**Appearing from the audience:**

**Peter Tracy, 705 S. Valentine, Sherman, TX**

Mr. Tracy wanted some clarity. "Is the setback going to be  
five feet from Shannon Street and will it be from the street  
edge?"

Mr. Rae explained, “it would be five-foot from the Shannon Street property line.”

Mr. Tracy wanted to know where the property line was, compared to the curb. “The reason I am asking is for people coming down Shannon Street or McGee Street, is it going to block your visibility of being able to see and how far the fence is going to be setback from the street.”

Mr. Rae explained, “it is about eighty-feet from McGee Street and roughly twenty-feet from Shannon Street.”

No other citizens appeared before the Planning and Zoning Commission to discuss the exception.

Letters received:

James Cantrell, 300 W. McGee, Sherman, TX

“I have no issues with the fence height nor its location from the side street (Shannon Street). The above description as to how far the fence will extend to the front line street is ambiguous. The description reads as if the fence can be built anywhere from the 25 feet setback line to the McGee Street right-of-way line. If the privacy fence extends too close to McGee Street, cars facing south at the stop sign on Shannon Street will not be able to see cars approaching from the west on McGee Street.”

**ACTION TAKEN.**

Motion by Commission Member Manley to approve the request for an exception to allow a 6’ privacy fence, 5’ from the side-street property line in lieu of the permitted 4’ in height extending closer than 25’ to a front line street in an R-1 (One Family Residential) District at 301 West McGee Street subject to the Staff Review Letter. Second by Commission Member Sims.

**VOTING AYE: DOWNTAIN, WOOD, SIMS, MANLEY AND WHITAKER.**

**VOTING NAY: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED**

**THE COMMISSION FOUND THE REQUEST CONFORMS TO THE INTENT OF THE ORDINANCE.**

**SPECIFIC USE PERMIT**

**THE REQUEST OF JAROD DUTTON (OWNER) AND HELVEY-WAGNER SURVEYING, INC. (SURVEYOR) CONCERNING THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 2005 NORTH CROCKETT STREET, BEING LOT 5, BLOCK 15, SHANNON HEIGHTS ADDITION REPLAT, AS FOLLOWS;**

***PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION***

**SPECIFIC USE PERMIT AND SITE PLAN APPROVAL UNDER ORDINANCE NO. 2280, SECTION 8, SUBSECTION (5)(A) TO**

**SUP - DUPLEX  
2005 N. CROCKETT  
ST.  
(JAROD DUTTON)**

**(DENIED)**

**ALLOW A DUPLEX IN AN R-1 (ONE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT.**

**Kennis Blankenship, 12 Wiship Rd., Sherman, TX**

Mr. Blankenship appeared to represent the request and answer any questions. The property is located at 2005 North Crockett Street between Dexter and Burton Streets. The property is zoned an R-1 (One Family Residential) District.

Mr. Blankenship explained, “the owner would like to construct a 2,374 square foot, two-story duplex at this location. The duplex will have three bedrooms per unit and parking will be provided for six spaces. He had seen the Staff Review Letter and would abide by the Recommendations.

Vice-Chairman Downtain asked if this was a fifty-foot wide lot.

Mr. Blankenship responded, “yes.”

Vice-Chairman Downtain asked, “how many bedrooms.”

Mr. Blankenship responded, “three bedrooms, two baths per unit.”

Vice-Chairman Downtain stated, “it looks like you will be using the alley to access some of your parking. You would have to pave the alley and the driveway to your parking area. The City does not maintain those alleys, so if you were going to use it for access for your off-street parking, it would be your requirement to improve the alley.”

Commission Member Vanderveer asked if there were any other duplexes in the area.

Mr. Blankenship responded, “none that I have seen.”

Vice-Chairman Downtain explained, “the closest duplexes are probably at Taylor Street.”

Mr. Rae stated, “one block south, there is a duplex that faces Dexter Street. There is a four-plex on the corner of Crockett and Taylor Streets.”

Commission Member Manley stated, “the letter from Mr. Dutton states there are similar properties further south on Crockett, closer to Taylor Street.”

Vice-Chairman Downtain stated, “all those structures are single-story, is that correct.”

Mr. Rae responded, “they are all single-story.”

Vice-Chairman Downtain asked if there were any two-story structures at all in the area.

Mr. Rae responded, “none that I am aware of.”

Vice-Chairman Downtain asked about the parking spaces; “are they all the way up against the building.”

Mr. Blankenship responded, “yes, but it may change in order to get a sidewalk or something like that.”

Vice-Chairman Downtain stated, “it is a lot of density for a fifty-foot lot.”

Commission Member Vanderveer asked if they plan to finish the exterior to be consistent with the neighborhood.

Mr. Blankenship explained, “the houses in the neighborhood are pretty old. The exterior will be hardy board siding and we may put a rock wainscot on the bottom.”

Appearing from the audience:

Chris Snipes, 2001 N. Crockett, Sherman, TX

Mr. Snipes explained, “I live at the corner right next door. My concerns would be parking because they will be parking in the street in front of my house and you are putting two homes on one spot in a small space. Noise is another concern, instead of having a single-family home, now there will be two homes in one spot. The area is very nice, people rarely park in the street.”

Commission Member Vanderveer asked Mr. Snipes, “how busy is the street at that intersection.”

Mr. Snipes explained, “you might as well be on the freeway; it is really busy because you have Fairview School at the end of the street. There are buses that go through there in the morning and afternoon and cars that pick up kids.”

Conya Knight, 5718 Reynolds Rd., Austin, TX

Ms. Knight explained, “I own the property at 2009 N. Crockett Street adjacent to this property. I have owned this house for twenty-two years. It is a very lovely neighborhood and I am concerned about the density on the small lot with three-bedrooms on each side. I have looked at this to see how they are going to put the driveways in. Years ago, I think there was a house there that burnt so there is one concrete driveway already existing. There is only one neighbor that uses the alleyway. It is a quiet neighborhood; we have a few cars that drive through with boom boxes and such. I am thinking if there are three-bedrooms on each side of the duplex, you are looking at least six people on one small lot. I am concerned what this opens up later in the future because it is a nice quiet neighborhood.”

Commission Member Vanderveer explained, “to the south at Taylor Street there are some duplexes or some sort of



multi-family, even though it is a block away, would this be consistent with your neighborhood.”

Ms. Knight explained, “I was not aware there were any duplexes there, only on Dexter Street.”

Stewart Liss, unknown address

Mr. Liss explained, “I am one of the builders for the proposed duplex. This will not be a low-income facility; this will be a \$1,400-\$1,500 a month unit. It will be built with all new products, heavily insulated; it will probably be better than most of the houses, everything will be up to code and up to standards, driveways, parking, etc.”

Ms. Knight stated, “the gentleman stated all the houses in the neighborhood were old, they are in years but they are in good condition.”

No other citizens appeared before the Planning and Zoning Commission to discuss the Specific Use Permit.

Commission Member Wood stated, “on the Staff Review Letter it states they have to pave the alley and the driveway all the way to the alley, I just want to make sure they understand that.”

Mr. Blankenship responded, “yes, we understand.”

Letters received:

James & Sandra Utley, PO Box 1335, Sherman, TX

“I do not approve. The property should remain single family.”

Jarod Dutton, 2221 Post Oak Dr., Sherman, TX

“First, thank you for taking time to review my request. I recently purchased a lot in Sherman located at 2005 North Crockett Street and currently it is zoned as R-1 (One-Family Residential) District. I am requesting a zoning change to allow a duplex to be built on this lot. I am requesting this change due to similar properties being on the same street one block north and one block south of this property. There are several duplexes further south on Crockett, closer to Taylor Street.”

“My plan to no build something that would dimmish nor lessen the neighborhood but rather update and increase the area in value and appearance. I will construct a building that will match the area in outside veneer; wood/siding along with brick/stone accent pieces.”

“I do not anticipate additional traffic in the neighborhood since it is a mature/complete neighborhood. This is one of only a handful of lots still available in the area.”

“I also am very familiar with the neighborhood due to owning three (3) other single family residential

investment/rental properties; one on Taylor Street, one on Dexter Street and one on Burton Street.”

**ACTION TAKEN.**

Motion by Commission Member Vanderveer to deny the request for a Specific Use Permit to allow a duplex in an R-1 (One-Family Residential) District at 2005 North Crockett Street. Second by Commission Member Wood.

**VOTING AYE: DOWNTAIN, WOOD, SIMS, VANDERVEER AND WHITAKER**

**VOTING NAY: MANLEY**

**MOTION CARRIED**

**THE COMMISSION FOUND THE REQUEST CONFORMS TO THE INTENT OF THE ORDINANCE.**

**EXCEPTION**

**THE REQUEST OF LOS HERMANOS PARTNERSHIP, LLC (OWNERS), THE WRECK ROOM (PROPOSED TENANT) AND CHARLES WHITE (APPLICANT) CONCERNING THE PROPERTY AT 700 EAST HOUSTON STREET, BEING LOTS 19-24, BLOCK 10, CHAFFIN’S 1<sup>ST</sup> ADDITION, AS FOLLOWS:**

***BOARD OF ADJUSTMENTS***

**EXCEPTION AND SITE PLAN APPROVAL UNDER ORDINANCE NO. 2280, SECTION 7, SUBSECTION (10)(H) AND SECTION 8, SUBSECTION (5)(A) TO ALLOW AN EXISTING GRAVEL PARKING LOT FOR A PERIOD OF ONE YEAR IN LIEU OF THE REQUIRED DUST FREE SURFACE AND OFF-PREMISE OVERFLOW PARKING IN LIEU OF THE REQUIRED 1 SPACE PER 200 SQUARE FOOT FOR AN COMMERCIAL AMUSEMENT CENTER (THE WRECK ROOM) IN A C-1 (RETAIL BUSINESS) DISTRICT.**

**EXCEPTION –  
PARKING &  
PARKING LOT  
700 E. HOUSTON ST.  
(LOS HERMANOS  
PARTNERSHIP, LLC)**

**Charles White, 700 E. Houston, Sherman, TX**

**Mr. White appeared to represent the request and answer any questions. The property is located at 700 East Houston Street; the southeast corner of Houston and Throckmorton Streets. The property is zoned a C-1 (Retail Business) District. The applicant was approved for a Specific Use Permit to allow a commercial amusement center for The Wreck Room at the October 19, 2020, City Council Meeting.**

**Mr. White explained, “I am requesting an exception to allow an existing gravel parking lot for a period of one year in lieu of the required dust free surface and to allow overflow parking across the street in lieu of the required (30) parking spaces; one space per 200 square foot. I would like to pave a portion of the parking each quarter to do a section at a time to break the price of it down into a year. I am seeking approval from the Soup Kitchen for off-street parking; they are looking at the legalities for approval. The parking lot is across Houston Street; we do not have an agreement in place yet. I do not feel like we will ever use that parking lot;**

we are a private function, which means you have to book the party to come in and do it.”

Vice-Chairman Downtain asked, “how large a party?”

Mr. White responded, “I honestly do not have that answer; it could be a three-hundred-person party. Through my research, most parties are around fifteen people; that is all you really have room for in the Wreck Room, the rest will be waiting.”

Commission Member Manley asked, “how many parking spaces do you need.”

Mr. Rae responded, “we calculated thirty parking spaces required based on their square footage.”

Commission Member Vanderveer explained, “the site plan shows parking with a six-foot aisle between the parking spaces. How will cars get out of the parking spaces?”

Mr. White explained, “when I drew it out and looked at the measurements, I get between twelve to thirteen parking spaces in a row in the very front and I have an area on the side as well; right now, I can get twenty-eight spaces.”

Commission Member Manley asked if he has time to wait for the overflow parking agreement before you would like to open.

Mr. White explained, “unfortunately you never know how long an attorney is going to take to view the parking agreement; it may be January. I have everything invested at this point and was shooting for a November 1<sup>st</sup> opening.”

Commission Member Sims asked, “why is he asking for that parking lot instead of the one that is closer to the building. I am concerned with people crossing Houston Street.”

Mr. White explained, “I do not know what is going to happen to the current building directly across the street, I did not approach them about that parking lot. I know there is a church right behind me that I could probably speak to and maybe come up with a parking agreement. We are not a facility that you are going to spend four hours, you will probably only spend thirty to forty-five minutes at our facility. It is not a continuous flow, you would come in, have your twelve minutes in the Wreck Room and the next person would come in. Every ten to fifteen minutes people will come out, the next group will come in and so on. I feel the parking will be adequate.”

Vice-Chairman Downtain asked the City Attorney, “if we are going to consider off-premise overflow parking in lieu of the required parking and he does not have something formal for off-street parking; is that a concern.”

Mr. Roeder explained, “I do not see that as part of the request. You have a notice issue of what is on your agenda versus what you want to expand it to consider.”

Vice-Chairman Downtain explained, “if he does not have off-premise overflow parking available to him, I guess that is my question.”

Mr. Roeder explained, “the overflow parking is really a Certificate of Occupancy Permit issue. Your Building Official should not issue the Certificate of Occupancy Permit until that overflow parking agreement is in force. As long as you agree to that, he can supplement his parking with overflow and I think that is part of your motion or part of the item here. He still has to abide by the rules of the Certificate of Occupancy. I think without even addressing it in your motion, just incorporate it into your Staff Review Letter.”

Mr. White stated he had seen the Staff Review Letter and would abide by the Recommendations.

No other citizens appeared before the Planning and Zoning Commission to discuss the exception.

**ACTION TAKEN.**

Motion by Commission Member Manley to approve the request for an exception to allow an existing gravel parking lot for a period of one year in lieu of the required dust free surface and off-premise overflow parking in lieu of the required 1 space per 200 square foot for an commercial amusement center (The Wreck Room) in a C-1 (Retail Business) District at 700 East Houston Street subject to the Staff Review Letter. Second by Commission Member Sims.

**VOTING AYE: DOWNTAIN, WOOD, SIMS, MANLEY AND WHITAKER**

**VOTING NAY: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED**

**THE COMMISSION FOUND THE REQUEST CONFORMS TO THE INTENT OF THE ORDINANCE.**

**EXCEPTION & REPLAT**

**THE REQUEST OF JUANA & JESSICA ALVARDO (OWNERS), MORAN CONSTRUCTION (PROSPECTIVE BUYER), LUIS MORAN (REPRESENTATIVE), HELVEY-WAGNER SURVEYING (SURVEYOR) AND JEREMY W. BULLARD DESIGN STUDIO, LLC (ARCHITECT) CONCERNING THE PROPERTY AT 623 SOUTH MAXEY STREET AND 809 EAST WELLS AVENUE, BEING A PART OF THE G. B. PILANT SURVEY, ABSTRACT NO. 963, ALSO BEING ALL OF LOTS 10, 11, 12 AND PART OF LOT 9, BLOCK 7, W. ELLIOTT’S ADDITION, AS FOLLOWS:**

**EXCEPTION – LOT WIDTH**

**REPLAT MORAN ADDITION, A REPLAT OF ALL OF LOTS 10, 11 & 12 AND A PART OF LOT 9, BLK. 7, W. ELLIOTT’S ADDN.**

**BOARD OF ADJUSTMENTS**

EXCEPTION UNDER ORDINANCE NO. 2280, SECTION 6.2, SUBSECTION (1) TO ALLOW A 58' LOT WIDTH, 5,370 SQUARE FOOT LOT AREA IN LIEU OF THE REQUIRED 60' LOT WIDTH, 6,000 SQUARE FOOT FOR A RESIDENTIAL DWELLING ON THE PROPOSED LOT 11R, MORAN ADDITION, BEING A REPLAT OF ALL OF LOTS 10, 11 & 12 AND A PART OF LOT 9, BLOCK 7, W. ELLIOTT'S ADDITION IN AN R-1 (ONE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT.

**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

REPLAT APPROVAL OF MORAN ADDITION, A REPLAT OF ALL OF LOTS 10, 11 AND 12 AND A PART OF LOT 9, BLOCK 7, W. ELLIOTT'S ADDITION.

623 S. MAXEY & 809  
E. WELLS  
(JUANA & JESSICA  
ALVARADO)

**Luis Moran, 910 S. Travis, Sherman, TX**

Mr. Moran appeared to represent the request and answer any questions. The property is located at 623 South Maxey Street and 809 East Wells Avenue, the northeast corner of Wells Avenue and Maxey Street. The property is zoned an R-1 (One Family Residential) District.

Mr. Moran explained, "I would like to Replat the property into two lots for residential development. We are requesting an exception to allow a 58' lot width, 5,370 square foot lot area on the proposed Lot 11R of Moran Addition, a Replat of all of Lots 10, 11 & 12 and a part of Lot 9, Block 7, W. Elliott's Addition. We would like to building two single-family homes on the lots." He had seen the Staff Review Letter and would abide by the Recommendations.

Commission Member Manley stated, "according to the original plat, it looks like there are several narrow lots on that block."

Mr. Rae explained, "the platted neighborhood is several narrow lots but the houses are wider. They are platted as 25' lots, but the homes were built over multiple lines."

No other citizens appeared before the Planning and Zoning Commission to discuss the exception or Replat.

***Board of Adjustments***

**ACTION TAKEN.**

Motion by Commission Member Manley to approve the request for an exception to allow a 58' lot width, 5,370 square foot lot area in lieu of the required 60' lot width, 6,000 square foot for a residential dwelling on the proposed Lot 11R, Moran Addition, being a Replat of all of Lots 10, 11 & 12 and a part of Lot 9, Block 7, W. Elliott's Addition in an R-1 (One-Family Residential) District at 623 South Maxey Street and 809 East Wells Avenue subject to the Staff Review Letter. Second by Commission Member Whitaker.

**VOTING AYE: DOWNTAIN, WOOD, SIMS, MANLEY AND WHITAKER**

VOTING NAY: NONE  
MOTION CARRIED

*Planning and Zoning Commission*  
ACTION TAKEN.

Motion by Commission Member Vanderveer to approve the request for a Replat approval of Moran Addition, a Replat of all of Lots 10, 11 and 12 and a part of Lot 9, Block 7, W. Elliott's Addition at 623 South Maxey Street and 809 East Wells Avenue subject to the Staff Review Letter. Second by Commission Member Sims.

VOTING AYE: DOWNTAIN, WOOD, SIMS, MANLEY,  
WHITAKER AND VANDERVEER  
VOTING NAY: NONE  
MOTION CARRIED

THE COMMISSION FOUND THE REQUEST CONFORMS TO  
THE INTENT OF THE ORDINANCE.

ADJOURNMENT

On Motion duly made and carried, the meeting adjourned at  
6:23 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

---

CHAIRMAN

---

SECRETARY