



City of Farmers Branch

Action Meeting Minutes

Planning and Zoning Commission

City Hall
13000 Wm. Dodson Pkwy
Farmers Branch, TX 75234

Monday, August 10, 2026

7:00 PM

City Hall

The full video of this meeting is available on the City website here: <https://farmersbranch.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>

No Study Session Meeting held.

Commissioners Present (9): Chair Amber Raley, Vice-Chair Marcus Miller, Commissioner Alden Sultzbaugh, Commissioner Colin Kirby, Commissioner Scott Noris, Commissioner Breeanna Banks, Alternate Commissioner David Moore and

Commissioners Present (2): Commissioner Pat Trapp and Alternate Commissioner David Merritt

City Staff Present: City Manager Ben Williamson, Police Chief Kevin McCoy, Director of Community Services Derek Hull, Planning Manager Tara Bradley; Lead Planner Brett Mangum AICP; Planner Brian Campbell AICP; and City Attorney Chris Metcalf

A. CITIZEN COMMENTS

Chair Raley opened the Regular Meeting at 7:00 PM.

Chair Raley thanked the Commissioners for their service.

Chair Raley asked if anyone would like to address the Commission on an item not posted on the agenda.

No one came forward to address the Commission and Chair Raley closed the Citizen Comments portion of the agenda.

B. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

B.1 [26-500](#) Nomination And Election of Chair and Vice-Chair Of The Planning and Zoning Commission; and take appropriate action.

A motion was made by Vice-Chair Miller, seconded by Commissioner Kirby, that Amber Raley be reelected Chair. The motion carried unanimously.

Aye: 7 – Chair Raley, Vice-Chair Miller, Commissioner Kirby, Commissioner Sultzbaugh, Commissioner Noris, Commissioner Banks and Alternate Commissioner Moore

A motion was made by Commissioner Kirby, seconded by Commissioner Banks, that Marcus Miller be reelected Vice-Chair. The motion carried unanimously.

Aye: 7 – Chair Raley, Vice-Chair Miller, Commissioner Kirby, Commissioner Sultzbaugh, Commissioner Noris, Commissioner Banks and Alternate Commissioner Moore

B.2 [26-501](#)

Consider approval of the July 27, 2026 Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes; and take appropriate action.

A motion was made by Commissioner Kirby, seconded by Commissioner Sultzbaugh, that the Minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

Aye: 7 – Chair Raley, Vice-Chair Miller, Commissioner Kirby, Commissioner Sultzbaugh, Commissioner Noris, Commissioner Banks and Alternate Commissioner Moore

D. PUBLIC HEARING

D.1 [26-502](#)

Conduct a public hearing and consider a request to amend Planned Development District No. 18 (PD-18) to remove the age-restriction requirement in Subdistrict B on approximately 6.1 acres described as Lots 1, 2 and 3 North Medical Parkway; and take appropriate action.

Ms. Bradley gave a presentation regarding the proposed amendment. Mr. Jamal Veri, the applicant, 5202 Ivystone Court, Sugarland, was available to answer questions.

Regarding Ordinance No. 3556, Commissioner Kirby asked whether it was appropriate to address the project's density now or during review of the Detailed Site Plan, pointing out that the density of the applicant's proposed development was larger than that associated with Ordinance No. 3556. *Ms. Bradley stated that maximum number of multifamily residential units was 306 and that the final density of the project would confirmed with the Detailed Site Plan.*

Commissioner Kirby then asked, pending approval of this amendment by City Council, whether this would change Ordinance No. 3556, stating that in his opinion the conceptual site plan associated with this amendment violated Ordinance No. 3556 with respect to density. *Ms. Bradley stated that, pending approval, the ordinance associated with this proposed amendment would persist and hence no violation regarding density. Ms. Bradley further stated that density and the other development standards would be finalized later in the process and that any substantial deviations from the concept plan would require the applicant to repeat the Zoning Amendment process. Ms. Bradley clarified that the request of this proposed amendment was to remove the age restriction.*

Vice-Chair Miller why the subject property as depicted in the aerial map included with the agenda packet materials included the road located west running parallel to Myra Lane. *Ms. Bradley clarified that this was a drainage easement that part of the subject property.*

Vice-Chair Miller then asked which subdistricts in PD-18 this easement was a part of. *Ms. Bradley stated Subdistricts B and C.*

Vice-Chair Miller then asked whether the subject property had access to any existing trails. *Ms. Bradley stated that she would check and bring this information back to the Commissioners.*

Chair Raley asked for clarification regarding Texas state law on the receipt of written protest from 20 percent or more of landowners within 200 feet of the subject property for Zoning Amendment requests. *Mr. Metcalf stated that this would trigger the required supermajority vote by City Council for approval of the request.*

Chair Raley then asked whether this percentage was based on land area. *Mr. Metcalf said yes.*

Alternate Commissioner Moore asked about ingress and egress of the subject property. *Ms. Bradley stated that this would be finalized during review of the Detailed Site Plan, and currently both would occur from Myra Lane.*

Commissioner Noris asked about potential light and noise pollution from the proposed development. *Ms. Bradley stated that any light would not exceed property boundaries, and that the Code of Ordinances addressed noise. Ms. Bradley further stated that both potential light and noise pollution would be reviewed during the Detailed Site Plan phase.*

Alternate Commissioner Moore asked whether there was any feedback from the townhall meeting regarding this project of which the Commission should be aware. *Ms. Bradley deferred this question to the applicant.*

Vice-Chair Miller asked whether the existing parking garage located at the subject property was leftover following the bankruptcy of the company behind the original development proposed for this site. *Ms. Bradley deferred this question to the applicant and confirmed that the original project was never completed.*

Commissioner Kirby asked the applicant whether the single-family residential homes would be developed. *Mr. Veri stated that it was desired to do so, but that this would be the secondary component of the development and that priority would be given to the multifamily development.*

Commissioner Kirby then asked about the applicant's plans should the proposed amendment be denied by City Council. *Mr. Veri stated that the subject property would remain in its current form until such time as it can be developed.*

Vice-Chair Miller asked about the letters received by the applicant from two separate lenders confirming that an age restricted residential community for the subject property was not economically viable. *Mr. Veri stated that his company was possession of the letters and that copies were provided to the City Council. Mr. Veri further stated that copies could be provided to the Commissioners as well.*

Alternate Commissioner Moore asked about any relevant feedback from the townhall meeting. *Mr. Veri stated that important points discussed included the addition of a gate to help calm traffic on Myra Lane, the addition of a larger tax base for the area, and the diversification of this area through removing the age restriction which he believed would provide the opportunity for more working class families to move in.*

Chair Raley asked the applicant whether he believed their proposed development differed from that of the originally proposed development. *Mr. Veri stated that both developments were in essence the same as they were*

both multifamily residential developments. Mr. Veri stated that the only difference would be a better-quality product resulting from the removal of the age restriction.

Commissioner Sultzbaugh asked why the age restriction affected the quality of the product. *Mr. Veri stated that the age restricted community would result in a lower revenue stream which would then result in a lower amount of capital for investment into the project. Mr. Veri further stated that removing that age restriction would result in a higher revenue stream and thus more capital available to invest into the development, including various amenities.*

Alternate Commissioner Moore asked about the applicant's experience in developing multifamily residential communities. *Mr. Veri stated that his company was experienced with this product as well as several other development types.*

Alternate Commissioner Moore then asked whether the applicant previously sold any of the multifamily residential communities developed by his company. *Mr. Veri stated that of all such developments completed, his company sold only one of them.*

Alternate Commissioner Moore then asked whether it was the applicant's intent to keep and operate this proposed development pending approval. *Mr. Veri said yes.*

Hearing no further questions or comments from the Commissioners, Chair Raley opened the public hearing.

Ms. Mary Beth Dimijan, 3277 Brincrest Drive, Farmers Branch yielded her time to Mr. David Koch.

Mr. JK Barber, 3171 Brincrest Drive, Farmers Branch yielded his time to Mr. David Koch.

Ms. Norma Carlson, 12238 Eunice Street, Farmers Branch yielded her time to Mr. David Koch.

Mr. Jsoeph Yakamavich, 12242 Brisbane Avenue, Farmers Branch yielded his time to Mr. David Koch.

Ms. Mary Yakamavich, 12242 Brisbane Avenue, Farmers Branch yielded her time to Mr. David Koch.

Mr. David Koch, 3243 Brincrest Drive, Farmers Branch spoke in opposition to this case.

Mr. Arturo Huerera 3268Brincrest Drive, Farmers Branch yielded his time to Ms. Lucy Gore.

Ms. Lucy Gore, 12254 Brisbane Avenue, Farmers Branch spoke in opposition to this case.

Mr. Joe Dingman, 13223 Glad Acres Drive, Farmers Branch spoke in opposition to this case.

Ms. Yadira Cerda, 3205 Damascus Way, Farmers Branch, spoke in opposition

to this case.

Mr. Fernando Gonzalez, 3205 Damascus Way, Farmers Branch, spoke in opposition to this case.

Ms. Cheryl Arenitt, 3422 Ridgeoak Way, Farmers Branch, spoke in opposition to this case.

Mr. Sean Arenitt, 3422 Ridgeoak Way, Farmers Branch, spoke in opposition to this case.

Ms. Cheryl Howerton, 3567 Morningstar Circle, Farmers Branch, spoke in opposition to this case.

Mr. William Glancy, 3808 Wooded Creek Drive, Farmers Branch, spoke in opposition to this case.

Ms. Carol Roberts, 3243 Brincrest Drive, Farmers Branch, spoke in opposition to this case.

Mr. Mason Priest, 3434 Rockmartin Drive, Farmers Branch, spoke in opposition to this case.

Mr. Evan Clarner, 12220 Brisbane Avenue, Farmers Branch, spoke in opposition to this case.

Mr. Daniel Buenger, 3283 Brincrest Drive, Farmers Branch, spoke in opposition to this case.

Mr. Matt Gore, 12254 Brisbane Avenue, Farmers Branch, spoke in opposition to this case.

Ms. Schalee Sanchez, 121117 Brisbane Avenue, Farmers Branch, spoke in opposition to the proposed development.

Mr. David Grijdva, 3246 Myra Lane, Farmers Branch, spoke in opposition to the proposed development.

Ms. Jessica Knowles, 12322 Amsterdam Road, Farmers Branch, spoke in opposition to the proposed development.

Ms. Susie Brown, 3405 Highland Meadow Drive, Farmers Branch, spoke in opposition to the proposed development.

Mr. Caroline Buenger, 3283 Brincrest Drive, Farmers Branch, spoke in opposition to the proposed development.

Mr. Art Ortiz, 12123 Brisbane Avenue, Farmers Branch, spoke in opposition to the proposed development.

No one else came forward to address this agenda item.

Commissioner Banks asked for clarification on whether the subject property had two different owners, and whether both were required to be in attendance at this meeting. *Chair Raley stated that the provided had been subdivided, and hence why there were two property owners. Mr. Metcalf added that both*

property owners were not required to be present at this meeting.

Vice-Chair Miller asked whether the Commissioners could have further discussion following the closing of the public hearing. *Chair Raley said yes.*

A motion was made by Vice-Chair Miller, seconded by Commissioner Noris, that the public hearing be closed. The motion carried unanimously.

Aye: 7 – Chair Raley, Vice-Chair Miller, Commissioner Kirby, Commissioner Sultzbaugh, Commissioner Noris, Commissioner Banks and Alternate Commissioner Moore

Vice-Chair Miller asked for clarification regarding the proposed Zoning Amendment request, noting earlier discussion regarding density. *Mr. Metcalf clarified that the request was to remove the age restriction and that density as well as any other development standards would be addressed during review of the Detailed Site Plan.*

Alternate Commissioner Moore asked whether staff received the letters from the financial institutions previously mentioned by the applicant. *Ms. Bradley stated no as staff did not request this information given the focus of the applicant's request was to remove the age restriction.*

Commissioner Sultzbaugh asked whether the applicant would be required to bring the Detailed Site Plan before the Commission for consideration. *Ms. Bradley said yes, following review by the Development Review Committee, and added that PD-18 required the Detailed Site Plan to be considered by both the Commission and City Council.*

Vice-Chair Miller and Commissioner Kirby provided feedback regarding the applicant's request.

In response to Alternate Commissioner Moore's question regarding the letters, Mr. Metcalf stated that staff did not request to receive those as they are not relevant to the applicant's request.

Vice-Chair Miller asked whether the applicant's request was to amend the entirety of PD-18 to remove the age restriction for Subdistrict B and not create an entirely new zoning district. *Ms. Bradley said yes.*

Commissioner Sultzbaugh asked whether all affected property owners were notified of the applicant's request. *Ms. Bradley said yes.*

Commissioner Sultzbaugh then asked whether there was any correspondence in support of the request. *Ms. Bradley said no and stated all correspondence received were in opposition to the request.*

Vice-Chair Miller asked whether the second property owner of the subject property was notified. *Ms. Bradley said yes.*

Commissioner Noris and Alternate Commissioner Moore provided feedback regarding the applicant's request.

Commissioner Sultzbaugh asked Mr. Metcalf whether he believed his conclusion that no discussion was had during this meeting regarding the

difference with respect to land use regarding an age restricted multifamily development and a standard multifamily development was correct, noting that this was the issue on which the Commission tabled this agenda item during the previous meeting. *Mr. Metcalf stated that Commissioner Sultzbaugh could take that in however he felt and that Mr. Metcalf's previous comments on this pertained more so to the overall request.*

Chair Raley asked for a motion regarding the agenda item.

A motion was made by Alternate Commissioner Moore, seconded by Commissioner Banks, that this Zoning Amendment be recommended for denial. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 – Vice-Chair Miller, Commissioner Sultzbaugh, Commissioner Noris, Commissioner Banks and Alternate Commissioner Moore

Nay: 2- Chair Raley and Commissioner Kirby

Chair Raley asked when this case would be considered by City Council. *Ms. Bradley stated it would be at their August 18th meeting.*

D. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Amber Raley adjourned the meeting at 8:57 PM.

Chair

City Administration