



City of Benbrook

CITY COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

DATE: 01/15/2026	REFERENCE NUMBER: PZ-2026-01	SUBJECT: Rowan Ranch: A request to rezone 80 acres of land from “C-PD” Multiple-Family District to “B” One-Family District and “C-PD” Multiple-Family Planned Development District [PUBLIC HEARING]	PAGE: 1 of 8
--------------------------------	--	--	----------------------------

Staff Report
Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting
December 11, 2025

Request Type: Rezoning

Site Description: Approximately 80 acres situated in the T.G. Zachary Survey, Abstract No. 1759

Location: East of IH-820, near Mary’s Creek; Approx. 1,050ft north of Veterans Pkwy, along the frontage road east of IH-820 (4501 W Loop 820 S)

Current Zoning District: “C-PD” Multiple-Family Planned Development District (Ord. 1490)

Proposed Zoning District: “C-PD” Multiple-Family District (~18.6 acres) and “B” One-Family District (~61.3 acres)

Property Owner(s): Chapin Holdings LLC, Fort Worth, TX

Applicant: Ron Ramirez, Evolving Texas, Fort Worth, TX

Summary

The applicant requests to rezone approximately 80 acres of land located east of IH-820, near Mary’s Creek, from the existing “C-PD” Multiple-Family Planned Development District to two separate zoning districts. Under the proposal, approximately 18.6 acres of developable land (designated Area 1 in Ord. 1490) will remain as “C-PD” Multiple-Family District, generally consistent with the original Planned Development (PD), while approximately 61.3 acres of undeveloped open space (designated Area 2 in Ord. 1490) will be rezoned to the “B” One-Family District. (see Attachment 2 for a depiction of Areas 1 and 2).

The request seeks to formalize the zoning of Area 2 while maintaining the previously approved development framework for Area 1. To review the entirety of the applicant’s proposal, including all submitted documents, plans, and supplemental materials, please refer to Attachment 8.

Historical Background

In June 2023, the City Council adopted Ord. 1490, establishing a planned development (PD) using the “C” Multiple-Family District as the base zoning district. The ordinance:

- Limited primary building types to two-family dwellings only;

SUBMITTED BY:	DISPOSITION BY COUNCIL: <input type="checkbox"/> APPROVED <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER (DESCRIBE)	PROCESSED BY: CITY SECRETARY
CITY MANAGER		DATE:

DATE: 01/15/2026	REFERENCE NUMBER: PZ-2026-01	SUBJECT: Rowan Ranch: A request to rezone 80 acres of land from “C-PD” Multiple-Family District to “B” One-Family District and “C-PD” Multiple-Family Planned Development District [PUBLIC HEARING]	PAGE: 2 of 8
--------------------------------	--	---	----------------------------

- Restricted residential development to property located outside the 100-year FEMA floodplain and within the boundary designated as Area 1 (approximately 18.6 acres);
- Preserved more than 60 acres of land as undeveloped open space (Area 2), with limited exceptions outlined in Ord. 1490;
- Set a maximum density of 12.5 dwelling units per acre (DU/AC) for the developable area, with an overall district density of approximately 2.8 DU/AC; and
- Established enhanced landscaping standards, set tree preservation and mitigation standards, increased required front, side, and rear building setbacks, and reduced maximum height standards for the development.

In June 2024, one year after the adoption of Ord. 1490, a deed was recorded transferring ownership from Altgelt Laughlin Group LTD to Chapin Holdings LLC (D224101727 and D224098067).

In September 2024, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted to recommend that the City Council deny a rezoning request (City File #Z-24-01) for this property. The request sought to divide the property into 3 regulatory areas; “D-PD” Multiple-Family Development (Area 1: 16.4 acres), Open Space attached to the “D-PD” (Area 2: 36.9 acres), and “BR-PD” One-Family Reduced Development (Area 3: 26.5 acres). In response, the applicant withdrew the rezoning application and, in November 2024, requested the Commission’s authorization to allow the City to accept a new rezoning application for further consideration. The Commission voted to deny that request.

In August 2025, the City Council denied with prejudice a rezoning request involving two components: a request to rezone a portion of the site to the “D” Multiple-Family District, and a request that would have allowed a “BR” One-Family Reduced District development within Area 2, as identified in Ord. 1490. Because the denial was issued with prejudice, the City may not accept another rezoning application requesting either of the same zoning classifications (“D” or “BR”) for a period of 12 months.

Adjacent Properties

Adjacent zoning districts and property information are primarily as follows:

North: The northern boundary includes three distinct areas near Mary’s Creek:

1. The western portion is zoned “SD” Suburban District and consists of unplatted, mostly vacant land.
2. Moving eastward along the northern property line is the Pecan Valley subdivision, zoned “A” One-Family District. This is a typical single-family residential subdivision with an average density of approximately 2.84 dwelling units per acre (DU/AC).
3. Further east along the northern property line are large unplatted tracts of land zoned “A” One-Family District, containing several single-family homes built in the 1940s and 1950s.

East: The eastern boundary includes two distinct areas:

1. Near the northeastern end this boundary line is the Russ Lo Valley subdivision, zoned “A” One-Family District, characterized by larger single-family lots with an average density of approximately 2.6 DU/AC.

DATE: 01/15/2026	REFERENCE NUMBER: PZ-2026-01	SUBJECT: Rowan Ranch: A request to rezone 80 acres of land from "C-PD" Multiple-Family District to "B" One-Family District and "C-PD" Multiple-Family Planned Development District [PUBLIC HEARING]	PAGE: 3 of 8
--------------------------------	--	---	----------------------------

2. Directly adjacent to the eastern boundary is a large lot of approximately 35-acres, zoned "B" One-Family District, which is preliminarily approved for a 5-lot subdivision, which equates to a very low density of approximately 0.14 DU/AC. This lot is part of the La Cantera subdivision, which is a multi-phased neighborhood featuring a variety of lot sizes. The nearest phase (PH 1), aside from the 35-acre lot, has a density of 0.61 DU/AC.

South: The southern boundary includes two distinct areas:

1. Along the IH-820 frontage is a property zoned "CF" Community Facilities, which is occupied by Capstone Church.
2. To the east of the church site is the Reata Place subdivision, zoned "B-PD" One-Family Planned Development, with an average residential density of approximately 2.25 DU/AC.

West: The western boundary of the site is defined by the IH-820 frontage road, which also marks the City of Fort Worth city limits.

Floodplain Consideration

Portions of the subject site lie within a FEMA-designated floodplain; however, the presence of the floodplain does not prevent the property from being assigned a zoning district. Zoning is the first step in a multi-layered regulatory process that grants certain development rights, but it does not guarantee that a project can proceed without meeting all applicable development standards.

These technical and regulatory requirements are reviewed during later stages of the development process by the appropriate agencies, which may include the City of Benbrook, FEMA, the City of Fort Worth, and, if necessary, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Staff Analysis

The applicant requests to rezone approximately 80 acres east of IH-820, near Mary's Creek, from the existing "C-PD" Multiple-Family Planned Development District to two separate zoning districts. As requested, approximately 18.6 acres of developable land (Area 1) proposed to remain "C-PD," and about 61.3 acres of undeveloped open space (Area 2) will be rezoned to the "B" One-Family District (See Attachment 4). The submitted conceptual plan illustrates the proposed lot layout for the single-family development (See Attachment 8 pg. 29).

The concept plan illustrates that the current proposal shares similar general characteristics with the prior request, though minor changes in lot dimensions and layout are reflected. Compared to the previously requested "BR" One-Family Reduced District, the proposed "B" One-Family District provides larger lots and wider building sites. The "B" District requires a minimum lot width of 70 feet (compared to 60 feet in "BR") and a minimum lot size of 8,400 square feet (compared to 7,000 square feet in "BR"). The rear-yard setback is also increased from 15 feet ("BR") to 20 feet ("B") (See Attachment 6 pg. 2). On the submitted conceptual plans, the applicant shows a slight reduction in lot count, approximately 178 lots under the prior "BR" concept compared to 176 lots under the current "B" concept. Staff did not evaluate the accuracy of the conceptual plan, as it is illustrative only and would not be regulatory if the rezoning were approved.

When reviewing City policy and guidelines for future development, recent City Council action and policy direction carry the greatest weight for city staff, as they represent the most current expression of how the City expects land to develop. Staff also considers the Comprehensive Plan, which functions as a broad, long-range guidance document, which can be both informative and influential, but not regulatory. While the plan

DATE: 01/15/2026	REFERENCE NUMBER: PZ-2026-01	SUBJECT: Rowan Ranch: A request to rezone 80 acres of land from “C-PD” Multiple-Family District to “B” One-Family District and “C-PD” Multiple-Family Planned Development District [PUBLIC HEARING]	PAGE: 4 of 8
--------------------------------	--	---	----------------------------

provides general direction on land-use patterns, appropriate zoning classifications, and preservation priorities, it does not mandate specific outcomes.

It is also important to understand how the zoning framework under Ord. 1490 was established. The preservation of Area 2 was not imposed by the City; it was proposed by the prior applicant under the previous property owner as part of a development concept that clustered all improvements within the 18.6-acre Area 1 while leaving more than 60 acres of land, within the FEMA designated floodplain in Area 2, as privately retained open space (see Attachment 2). This voluntary private preservation directly advanced Comprehensive Plan Principle 3.32, which encourages the private retention of steep slopes, natural vegetation, drainageways, and other sensitive areas to reduce erosion and flooding risks and protect natural features. To reinforce and encourage the private retention of the environmentally sensitive land within Area 2, the City agreed to the requested relief from some of its tree preservation and mitigation requirements within Area 1.

This history reflects the policy balance City Council supported in 2023 and reaffirmed through its 2025 denial with prejudice. Together, these actions demonstrate that the zoning established by Ord. 1490 is the appropriate zoning district for the property and reflects the City’s expectations for how the site should develop; a limited clustered development in Area 1 and long-term private preservation of Area 2.

The City Council’s questions, comments, discussion, and formal action during the City Council Meeting held on August 21st, 2025, communicated the following policy expectations for the property:

1. The timing for a zone change was not appropriate, and Council did not wish to abandon the recently approved PD, as just over two years had passed since Ord. 1490 was adopted.
2. The Council’s adoption of Ord. 1490 reflects their desire to protect Area 2 from development, which advances an important element of the Comprehensive Plan (Principle 3.32), which encourages the private retention of environmentally sensitive areas to reduce erosion and flooding risks and protect natural features.
3. The Council was satisfied with the existing zoning in place (“C-PD” under Ord. 1490).

While the Comprehensive Plan provides valuable long-range guidance, its role is fundamentally different from adopted zoning regulations. The Plan generally helps inform decisions about appropriate land use decisions where entitlements are not yet established; however, once the City Council adopts a zoning district for a property, in addition to adopting regulatory standards for the district, that zoning decision can reset the land use policy for the area. In adopting Ord. 1490 and later reaffirming it through the 2025 denial with prejudice, the Council effectively approved a land-use policy direction for how this property is expected to develop and staff views the current PD framework as consistent with the City’s long-term goals for the area and represents the appropriate zoning for the site. Although other zoning configurations might also align with some elements of the Comprehensive Plan (See Attachments 5 and 7), the zoning classification that best implements the City’s vision is decided through the Council’s decision-making authority. Until such time as the Council adopts a different policy direction or provides an updated vision for this area by amending the Comprehensive Plan, the existing zoning district, as proposed and approved under the previous ownership, remains the controlling and most specific expression of City policy and vision for this property.

As the existing zoning district reflects both the Council’s most recent policy direction and the development expectations for this area, staff does not support a rezoning that expands development within Area 2, as established under the current PD. Through their recent action, the Council indicated the existing zoning is

DATE: 01/15/2026	REFERENCE NUMBER: PZ-2026-01	SUBJECT: Rowan Ranch: A request to rezone 80 acres of land from “C-PD” Multiple-Family District to “B” One-Family District and “C-PD” Multiple-Family Planned Development District [PUBLIC HEARING]	PAGE: 5 of 8
--------------------------------	--	---	----------------------------

appropriate for this area and consistent with the City’s long-range goals. Until the Council adopts a policy shift or approves a different vision for this area, staff finds no basis to support the requested zoning change and recommends maintaining the current zoning designation.

Staff Recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission

Following the applicant’s presentation, staff’s report, and public testimony, the Planning and Zoning Commission should engage in discussion, ask any relevant questions, and carefully consider all information presented. While the Commission is not responsible for making a final determination on rezoning requests, the Commission votes to recommend the City Council either approve or deny an applicant’s request. The City Council ultimately makes the final decision on rezoning applications.

Based on the analysis provided in this report, staff recommends the following motion:

“Move to recommend that the City Council deny the rezoning request.”

Planning and Zoning Commission Recommendation to the City Council

At the December 11, 2025 public hearing, the Planning and Zoning Commission considered the request and, following discussion, voted 6–0 to recommend denial of the proposed zoning change.

The Zoning Ordinance states that *“The affirmative vote of at least three-fourths of all members of the City Council is required to overrule a recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission that a proposed change to a regulation or boundary be denied.”* (Section 17.12.010.A)

In accordance with the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission, the City Council could consider the following motion:

“Move to deny the request to change the zoning designation of the subject property.”

Attachments

1. Aerial Map
2. Existing Zoning Map
3. Zoning Map – Panel 3
4. Proposed Zoning Map
5. Future Land Use Map – Panel 3
6. Single Family Zoning Districts and Tables
7. Comprehensive Plan Principles – Chapter 3
8. Applicant’s Submittal Documents
9. Applicant’s P&Z Presentation Materials
10. Written Public Input

DATE: 01/15/2026	REFERENCE NUMBER: PZ-2026-01	SUBJECT: Rowan Ranch: A request to rezone 80 acres of land from “C-PD” Multiple-Family District to “B” One-Family District and “C-PD” Multiple-Family Planned Development District [PUBLIC HEARING]	PAGE: 6 of 8
--------------------------------	--	---	----------------------------

**EXCERPT MINUTES
OF THE MEETING OF THE CITY OF BENBROOK
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
THURSDAY, DECEMBER 11, 2025**

III. REPORTS OF CITY STAFF

A. Rezoning [PUBLIC HEARING]

1. PZ-2026-01 – A request to rezone approximately 80 acres of land, situated in the Thomas G. Zachary Survey, Abstract No. 1759, from “C-PD” Multiple-Family Planned Development District to “C-PD” Multiple-Family Planned Development District (18.6 acres) and “B” One-Family District (61.3 acres). The property is generally located on the east side of I.H. 820 between Veterans Pkwy and Chapin Rd (4501 W Loop 820 S).

Applicant Ron Ramirez, PE – Evolving Texas (3000 Race St, Suite 108, Fort Worth, TX) presented and addressed the Commission.

Commissioner Wallis sought clarification regarding whether the rezoning request included areas extending into the floodplain and floodway, specifically questioning whether zoning was proposed up to the creek, which forms the property boundary.

Mr. Ramirez and property owner Corey Waldrop of Chapin Holdings (6712 Kirkwood Rd, Fort Worth, TX) clarified that the proposed zoning boundaries extend beyond the initially highlighted area and may include portions depicted within the floodplain/floodway, as shown on the presentation exhibits.

Commissioner Ellison asked the applicant to clarify their reference to Texas Local Government Code 211.004(a) requiring zoning to be adopted in accordance with a comprehensive plan.

Mr. Ramirez cited the statute and explained his interpretation.

Doug Howard, City Planner, presented the staff report. He outlined floodplain considerations, noting that while portions of the site lie within the FEMA-designated floodplain, zoning may still be assigned and does not guarantee development without compliance with all applicable regulations.

The presentation described the surrounding zoning context, existing neighborhoods, and detailed the property’s zoning history, including adoption of Ordinance 1490 in 2023, subsequent ownership changes, and prior rezoning requests. Mr. Howard explained that the current application proposes different zoning classifications than those previously denied and the submittal includes non-regulatory conceptual plans showing potential development. Key differences from prior proposals include larger lot sizes, wider lot widths, and increased setbacks under the proposed “B” One-Family zoning. He emphasized that Ordinance 1490 established a policy framework favoring clustered development in Area 1 and long-term private preservation of Area 2, a balance voluntarily proposed by a prior applicant and supported by City Council actions. Mr. Howard reiterated that the comprehensive plan serves as non-regulatory guidance, while adopted zoning reflects the City Council’s controlling policy direction. Based on recent Council actions reaffirming the existing Planned Development and its private preservation intent, staff found no basis to support rezoning that would expand development into Area 2 and recommended denial of the request.

DATE: 01/15/2026	REFERENCE NUMBER: PZ-2026-01	SUBJECT: Rowan Ranch: A request to rezone 80 acres of land from "C-PD" Multiple-Family District to "B" One-Family District and "C-PD" Multiple-Family Planned Development District [PUBLIC HEARING]	PAGE: 7 of 8
--------------------------------	--	---	----------------------------

Commissioner Ellison asked about the previous applicant's conservation instrument and whether it was ever recorded.

Mr. Howard responded that no conservation easement or preservation instrument had been recorded and that the area is currently protected only by existing zoning restrictions.

Commissioner Harville asked whether Ordinance 1490 conflicted with state law regarding comprehensive plan compliance.

Mr. Howard stated that no conflict exists and that zoning regulations are evaluated for general consistency with the comprehensive plan, noting that Ordinance 1490 was previously deemed compliant.

Commissioner Wallis asked about zoning and development within floodplain and floodway areas.

Mr. Howard clarified that the floodplain and floodway are FEMA designations regulated separately from zoning and that zoning may be assigned in these areas subject to floodplain regulations. He further noted that the applicant's concept plan could include floodway areas but emphasized that the plan is non-regulatory and does not mandate development in that configuration.

Commissioner Ramsey asked whether Ordinance 1490 generally restricted building within the floodplain.

Mr. Howard confirmed.

The Chair opened the public hearing portion of the meeting.

Carolyn Campbell (8117 Wendy Ln), Dustin Bell (4513 Charles Ct), Derrick Varnell (8604 Elmwood Dr), Cynthia Wayland (8204 Saddlebrook Dr), Amberlee Mullins (4225 Dawn Dr), Justin Mullins (4225 Dawn Dr), Jack Schoemperlen (9008 Ranch Bluff Ct), Brenda Lester (8604 Marys Creek Dr), Shelly Ward (3904 Sunnydale Dr), Mike Thomas (4812 Williams Rd), Mary Poulsen (8413 Leo Ct), Audra Andrews (8457 Marys Creek Dr), Greg Clem (1236 Timberline Dr), Stephanie Reed (4513 Charles Ct), and Tammera Hollerich (4920 Jordan Tr; on behalf of the Reata Place Homeowners Association) spoke in opposition of the item. Questions and comments included the following topics: Local Government Code Chapter 211.004, flooding danger, not promoting general welfare, the request being similar to the previously denied request, Ordinance 1490 preventing development in Area 2, disrespectful application materials and terminology, the increased likelihood of flooding downstream, urban heat islands, keeping natural areas, gratitude to the Commission, changes in floodplain since 1942, the proposed subdivision layout not matching the surrounding low-density residential areas, the difference compared to the applicants previous request being only a decrease in 2 residential lots, satisfaction with the existing zoning designation established by Ordinance 1490, due diligence prior to purchasing the property, coordination with outside agencies such as FEMA, the Army Corps of Engineers, or the City of Fort Worth, bond requirements to protect damaged homes, obtaining zoning entitlements prior to purchasing the property, flooding tributaries, principles of the Benbrook Comprehensive Plan, taking City Council's denial seriously, Marys Creek being under studies, Trinity Estates Phase 3, and the reality of the project being worse than the proposed concept plan.

The Chair closed the public comment period for the item.

Mr. Ramirez acknowledged public comments by stating that the subject property is privately owned and not designated as public or community open space on the Future Land Use Map, and that maintaining it as undevelopable private open space would be inconsistent with its Low-Density Residential designation and

DATE: 01/15/2026	REFERENCE NUMBER: PZ-2026-01	SUBJECT: Rowan Ranch: A request to rezone 80 acres of land from “C-PD” Multiple-Family District to “B” One-Family District and “C-PD” Multiple-Family Planned Development District [PUBLIC HEARING]	PAGE: 8 of 8
--------------------------------	--	---	----------------------------

leave the property without a viable use. He acknowledged that the proposal is similar to prior applications due to zoning and comprehensive plan constraints, but noted key changes including reduced density, revised lot sizes, and modified setbacks, which would also lessen stormwater impacts. He emphasized that the request is a zoning action representing the first step in the development process and that any future development would be subject to floodplain regulations, engineering standards, and public safety requirements. Mr. Ramirez further stated that development would be coordinated with city staff and governing bodies and that stormwater runoff would be mitigated through standard detention and engineering practices to ensure no increase in runoff to Mary’s Creek.

Commissioner Ramsey initiated discussion by describing the advisory nature of the comprehensive plan, emphasizing that it serves as a long-range guide and is not regulatory.

Commissioner Wallis referenced the City Council’s prior denial with prejudice and highlighted staff’s position that Ordinance 1490 represents the City’s current and controlling land use policy for the property unless amended by Council action.

Commissioner Ramsey asked staff to address a public comment question regarding bond requirements for new development.

Mr. Howard explained that development typically requires performance and maintenance bonds for public infrastructure and that certain floodplain-related developments may also require bonding, subject to applicable regulations.

The Chair called for a motion for a recommendation to City Council.

Motion by Commissioner Craver to recommend City Council deny rezoning request number PZ-2026-01. Seconded by Commissioner Harville.

The Chair called the question.

Vote on the motion:

Ayes: Mr. Ramsey, Mr. Ellison, Mr. Wallis, Mr. Craver, Mr. Harville, and Ms. Rodriguez.

Noes: None

Abstain: None

Motion carried: 6 – 0 – 0