COI HERE	
YOUR NAME: Marole CONS	PHONE NUMBER: 634-6456
CURRENT ADDRESS: 8500 W. Tremuna &	
ADDRESS OF PROPERTY OWNED: SAB	
COMMENTS: Curvaint Zaning R-1 address	"A" to PUD w/"SR-1"
Daysond we of property at 1826 Stoge	coal yet the
request is few SR-1. Due to en	innova Zonia
request We con not Support 11	
and proper "Zoning" idetified as	R-1 we then.
Can support the Zouring. also bes	a concern a/ perhan
lot from force and type of long	marting wind
in the Plate	EGEI VI.
SIGNATURE: Molecus Jack	UN 18 2010spo #Z18-01/09

PO BOX 1329 KILLEEN TEXAS 76540-1329 254-541 1 501.7628 FAX WWW CI.KILLEEN TX US

CUI RERE	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
YOUR NAME: Majcola Coats	PHONE NUMBER: 254-634-6456
CURRENT ADDRESS: 8590 W. Termusea Rd.	
ADDRESS OF PROPERTY OWNED: SAB	
COMMENTS: Current Zowing R-1 adds	"A" to PUD w/"SR-1"
supposed use of march at 1836 &	Layecoul yet the
reguest is for SR-1. Due	to improper zoning
report we can not support this report.	
byon proper "Zouras" identified as R-1 we	
Hen cun support the >out	ag. Olas have concern
about distance of the parlin	Cot Vion James
and trace of fevering pressoned in the plate. HECEIVED	
SIGNATURE: Harry March	SPO #Z18\014 682108

PO BOX 1329 KILLEEN TEXAS 76540-1329 254 501 7630 254 501 7638 WWW.CLKILLEEN TX US

A point of concern is that once the church receives either R1 or SR1 zoning with a PUD overlay, they will, according to the ordinances be able to develop the property in whatever way they deem appropriate without the need to present the said development before the owners of adjacent properties, the Planning and Zoning Commission, or City Council for consideration.

Lastly, in December of 2017, we received an invitation from the church and Gary Wilson and his wife accepted the invitation and attended the meeting with representatives of the church. At that time, church representatives indicated that the owners of adjoining properties would be afforded a choice of 3 types of fencing to be constructed around the property being considered in this case. It has since been suggested that the fence is to be chain link and no options have been afforded to the owners of adjoining properties.

While a chain link fence does provide a separation of properties, it provides absolutely no privacy between adjacent properties. Since any number of people will be taking advantage of this property to exercise, play, and worship, it is reasonable to assume that there will, from time to time, be considerable noise from the property. Just because we welcome a church on this property does not mean that we want to lose the privacy we currently have. The natural vegetation that currently exist on the property screens our properties providing privacy.

If the offer of fencing choice is not extended to the owners of surrounding properties as promised in December 2017, how can we, as neighbors, trust that the land will be developed in the way set forth once the PUD overlay is granted?

Adjoining Property Owners

Printed Name

GARY + Elizabeth

6809 SHAMMON CIRCLE Jun Nolwar, Colyabeth White

The Ly & Dovell Conts 85 80 W. Tamming Rd Office at Land

"(Ay MONE I. Senainings 6607 WELLS FARGODA Kannel I. Senainings 6907 Thanson Circle of Italy

Felicita Frieury

""

Talista Ty

2018/06/17

City of Killeen Planning and Development Services 200 E. Avenue D, Suite 6 Killeen, TX 76541

cc:

Killeen City Council PO BOX 1329 Killeen, TX 76540

RE: Case #Z18-01 – Rezoning of 17.018 acres, Lot 1 Block 1, Faith Point Church Addition from Aggricultural to SR-1 with a PUD Overlay

In reviewing the Zoning and Land Use Ordinances for the City of Killeen, Chapter 31, Section 31-186 seems to encompass most public buildings including churches and places of worship, parks, libraries, schools, etc.

Section 31-188, subparagraph 2 specifically states, "No side yard for allowable nonresidential uses shall be less than twenty-five (25) feet. " The drawing the adjoining residents received from the city has not scale on it. Is the 25 feet requirement going to be enforced as it appears that parking areas are as close as possible to adjoining properties. This also raises the concern of trash from the new development finding its way onto our properties increasing our maintenance efforts.

Section 31-178 describes SR-1 as "The "SR-1" suburban residential district is created to provide for single family detached residences and other uses at densities that are compatible with the Comprehensive Plan's goals for larger baseline minimum lot size and increased setbacks. The "SR-1" district may be applied to both undeveloped tracts and existing stable neighborhoods in appropriate locations recognized by the Comprehensive Plan. The intent of the district shall be to preserve existing natural features and vegetation, promote excellence in site planning and landscape design, facilitate the efficient layout and orientation of public utilities and community infrastructure, and encourage housing with compatible scale and character of architecture. "

Section 31-179 – Use regulations stipulates that:

A building or premises in a "SR-1" suburban residential single-family district shall be used only for the following purpose:

- (1) Single-family detached dwellings.
- (2) Any use permitted in section 31-186 paragraphs 1-13b.

The proposed development includes a book store and cafe which would, on the surface, appear to be commercial in nature. Since residential properties may not be used for commercial enterprises and there are substantial restrictions on home based businesses, is this appropriate?

Additionally, how can the city consider, places of worship, schools, libraries, and other public facilities to be residential in nature since, by definition, people do not reside in such places. It would seem that new zoning classifications are needed and necessary to provide for these types of facilities in residential areas. A church is not a residence.