

STATE OF TEXAS

COUNTY OF BRAZORIA

CITY OF LAKE JACKSON

BE IT KNOWN that the Planning Commission of the City of Lake Jackson met in Regular Session on Tuesday, February 4, 2020 at 6:30 p.m. in Lake Jackson, Texas with the following agenda:

Locke Sanders
John Fey
Brenda Colegrove
Joe Rinehart
Jeff Gilbert
Harry Sargent

William Yenne, City Manager
Sal Aguirre, City Engineer
Athelstan Sanchez, Asst. City Engineer
Sabrina England, PW Director
Eddie Herrera, Engineering Technician
Modesto Mundo, Asst. City Manager
Sally Villarreal, Asst. City Secretary
Vinay Singhania, Council Liaison
David Walton, Building Official

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Harry Sargent led the pledge of allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – December 2019

December minutes were approved as presented.

VISITOR COMMENTS

There were no visitor comments.

DISCUSS AND CONSIDER OAKS OF FLAGRIDGE LEASE OFFICE SITE PLAN AMENDMENT TO THE SITE PLAN AMENDMENT AT 604 E HIGHWAY 332 FILED ON FEBRUARY 4, 2020

Engineer's Memo:

The determination for final filing is made due to the “no issue” proposed modification to the recently approved site and landscape plan in August 2019. This amendment primarily consists of an addition of 8 parking spaces by striping of a previously paved unused area originally designated for truck access and delivery service.

- a. *The proposed restriping modification increases the tally to 318 from 310 in the most recent plan adding to the surplus to the 188-space requirement of the new office use of the facility.*
- b. *The existing drainage system serving the current impervious area remains unimpacted by the modification that has no changes to the impervious surface area.*
- c. *The fire protection lane location and geometric remain unchanged in the modification and deemed compliant.*
- d. *The proposed restriping is being done within the existing paved surface with no green space involved and the landscape plan remains as currently approved.*

Our completeness checklist is provided to you with all site content items indicated as complete.

There was no one present from Baker and Lawson for this item.

Mr. Aguirre went over the Engineer's notes listed above.

Mr. Sargent asked if there was any landscaping involved. Mr. Aguirre stated there was not any landscaping involved because the amendment is only for paved surfaces.

On motion by Mr. Sargent second by Mr. Fey with all present members voting "aye" the Oaks of Flagridge lease office site plan amendment to the site plan amendment at 604 E Highway 332 filed on February 4, 2020 was approved.

REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF A COMPLETE APPLICATION FOR PUD DEVELOPMENT OF THE ALDEN 987.2 ACRE TRACT ON US HWY 288 IN LAKE JACKSON

Engineer's Memo:

To follow up with the discussion from the combined public meeting held January 27, 2020. The recommendations made by the City Manager were the following:

- 1. Provide any and all revisions to the application as laid out in Article IV of the City's Code of Ordinance.*
- 2. Provide document showing deviations from the specific underlying zones proposed.*
- 3. In particular indicate comparison of the current standard with those being requested and reason for change.*
- 4. Last meeting was focused on PUD process and individual issues were curtailed, so issues will need to be thoroughly discussed and other specifics related to this project, to include workshops in short schedule (i.e. February 10 and / or 24, 2020).*

The planning commission will determine if the application submission is complete and consider the application at a public hearing on March 3, 2020 meeting.

Katherine Parker with Meta Planning

Ms. Parker went through the changes that were made on the report that was introduced at the Council/Planners workshop. Ms. Parker also asked planners for any feedback or comments and mentioned it would be taken into consideration moving forward.

On page 4, the proposed land use chart was amended. The single family and high density have been combined and are under one designation. There is also a maximum percentage for the smaller product that would be allowed for the townhomes. Also incorporated was a requirement for a certain percentage to be over 60 ft. lot size. At least 20% would have to be 60 ft. or larger.

On page 7, under permitted used there were a few changes. One of the items that had been requested was whether there would be commercial uses in the residential uses. To ensure that would stay limited, there are five specific requirements for that. One of those requirements is it be located by a collector or thoroughfare. Commercial uses cannot be located on streets that have homes fronting on it, this will keep large retail uses from going in residential areas. Also, maximum size would be 5-acres. There are screening requirements for solid fencing and a minimum 10 ft. landscape buffer.

Ms. Colegrove asked if the 5-acre limit would apply to the current area designated for an elementary school. Ms. Parker said no, that would be if there were an additional school.

Mr. Sargent thought it was specified that the hospital would be an outpatient hospital. Ms. Parker stated it was discussed, but it wasn't her understanding that it was to be changed. Mr. Sargent would like it to be addressed to the developer. Mr. Gilbert felt it should be flexible.

Councilmember Singhania felt it shouldn't matter if it's in the commercial zone.

Mr. Rinehart had a concern with the solid 6 ft. fence as a buffer zone. He felt an 8 ft. fence is needed for a buffer in addition to a landscape buffer. Ms. Parker made note of this request.

Ms. Parker stated Townhomes has been added under residential district.

On page 9. Most of these changes were just clarifications. Defined what HOA and PUD meant.

Ms. Colegrove recommended having a 6 ft. wide sidewalk on one side of all the collectors with a 4 ft. wide sidewalk on the opposite side. This is what is recommended through the rest of the city. This would allow a mixed use.

Ms. Colegrove asked if there were any accommodations for pedestrians along the major thoroughfares. Ms. Parker stated there wasn't anything specific in their plan. Mr. Rinehart thought sidewalks would be critical. Ms. Parker asked what size would be proposed. Ms. Colegrove said 8 ft.- 10 ft. would be preferred in the higher traffic areas. It depends on the space. Ms. Parker said they would look at that.

Mr. Sanders asked for clarification on the major thoroughfare where it says, "or other". Ms. Parker said in case it needed to be increased at all. Ms. Parker said they would take out "or other".

Ms. Parker went over the commercial development regulations.

Mr. Sargent asked about the parking requirements. Ms. Parker stated their calculations are intended to accommodate visitor parking as well. Ms. Russel said the requirement is one with up to two per units for a one bedroom. Mr. Sargent asked if there was anything allowed for visitor parking. Ms. Russell stated we do not have requirements in our ordinance for visitors.

Ms. Colegrove asked if there would be additional parking with multi-family. Ms. Parker said no it was included.

Mr. Sanders asked if the apartments would be gated. Ms. Parker said she wasn't sure.

Mr. Sanders asked the commission if they were fine with the parking. He didn't feel like there was enough parking allocated.

Residential Development Regulations – Ms. Parker went over the requirements and changes made below.

1) Lot Distribution Requirements

- a. Lots under the High Density (T-1) designation may not exceed fifteen (15) percent of the total number of residential lots within the PUD.
- b. Lots sixty (60) foot in width or larger shall account for a minimum of twenty (20) percent of the total number of residential lots within the PUD.

Also included was a notation of anything in T-1 would have a minimum of 1 space for every 5 units.

Mr. Sanders again stated his concern regarding the parking or lack of. He felt it could become an issue. Mr. Gilbert felt it was fine if there are enough designated spots for every 5 units.

Ms. Parker asked if there was something in the PUD regarding visitor parking for 40 ft. to 45 ft. lots, would that be better and ease some of the concerns?

Mr. Yenne suggested setting restrictions and not allowing garages to be enclosed into living spaces. This

way every space has a garage for parking.

Mr. Rinehart stated several times that he was not a fan of the 40' lots.

Mr. Fey asked Ms. Parker if that is becoming a trend. Ms. Parker said it is. People like them because they have lower yard maintenance.

Mr. Rinehart asked what Red Oak Circle lots are. Mr. Aguirre said they are 50 ft. lots.

Mr. Aguirre mentioned there are 40 ft. lots on Holly and Birch that can be seen.

Mr. Yenne mentioned to the commission that this is where they need to make their request. If they prefer to see a larger lot and a larger minimum square footage home, this would be the place to discuss it.

Mr. Rinehart and Mr. Gilbert thought 1200 sq. ft. minimum homes would be better than 1000 sq. ft. Also, Mr. Rinehart felt that the minimum size of lots should be 45 ft. and not 40 ft.

Mr. Sanders asked about the setbacks. Mr. Aguirre stated they are 20 ft. setbacks from the right of way. Ms. Parker stated they are proposing 25 ft. setbacks.

Mr. Aguirre stated these are zero lot lines. One side is zero setback the other side is a 6 ft. maintenance setback.

Mr. Rinehart stated he wants something attractive that works for the city and a quality subdivision. Mr. Fey agreed with Mr. Rinehart.

Ms. Parker stated the developer would set their standards to ensure the quality of the homes. Ms. Parker was not sure of the price point of the homes.

Mr. Aguirre asked Ms. Parker if they had any other developments that would be similar to what they are proposing. Ms. Parker said there is one in the Katy area. Ms. Parker said they could get photos together for the workshop.

Ms. Parker stated there would be a 10 ft. separation between homes.

The Billboard changes and open space/parkland dedication was added as well as the development will also provide connectivity to the overall City of Lake Jackson trail system adjacent to Oyster Creek. Below is an outline of what Ms. Parker discussed.

Signage

Signage within the PUD will conform to the City of Lake Jackson Sign Ordinance as of the effective date of the PUD, with the following exceptions:

- 1) Temporary signs used during construction of the development recognizing builders, architects, engineers, leasing representatives, lenders, etc. must all be tastefully displayed on 4' x 8' vertical signs. All temporary signs must be removed when the principal building on the applicable building site is occupied. Additional temporary builder signs directing potential home buyers to various neighborhood/model homes may be installed behind the public right of way. These temporary signs will remain until each platted section is 90% sold and closed.
- 2) Off Premise Signs

- a. Off premise signs/ billboards are permitted along Hwy 288. They are permitted for advertisement and marketing of this development only, not for commercial signage uses for businesses.
- 3) Neighborhood monumentation
 - a. Neighborhood monumentation is permitted at all entrances to each separate platted section within the development, individual sections and intersections. Signage must be in compliance with applicable sight triangle requirements.

Open Space/ Parkland Dedication

Lakes, detention, parks and open space areas account for approximately 40% of the gross acreage of the project. This calculation includes all parks, landscape reserves, landscaped right of ways, power easements, drainage easements, trails, tot lots, Oyster Creek, lakes, detention and drainage area, etc. A trail system connecting these areas will be incorporated throughout the development within the PUD. The development will also provide connectivity to the overall City of Lake Jackson trail system adjacent to Oyster Creek. See Exhibit F – Open Space/ Amenity Plan. The proposed open space amenities and the approximate acreages are as follows:

Open Space Amenity	Acreage*
Lakes/Detention	+/- 320.4
Oyster Creek	+/- 16.8
Rec Center and Parks	+/- 11.8
Landscape/Open Space	+/- 29.7
Easements	+/- 22.9
TOTAL	+/- 401.6

*All acreages are preliminary and subject to changes as development occurs. Because detention requirements may change, all acreages and locations of detention and open space within this category may shift without triggering a PUD amendment.

In addition to the recreation and open space areas listed above, the development will comply with all currently applicable City of Lake Jackson Parkland Dedication requirements and/or Parkland Fees. However, all parkland dedication calculations will be considered for the overall project, not on a section by section basis. Individual section plats will be reviewed for compliance with the approved parkland dedication plan and dedication of the applicable reserves.

Mr. Sanders asked about the Billboards. Mr. Yenne suggested specifying a maximum size and height. At this time, they are prohibited completely.

Ms. Colegrove noted on the open space, the parks and rec space is grouped together. Mr. Yenne stated we would need to find out what if any is being dedicated to the city. Is it a city park or is it a subdivision park that is restricted to the people in that subdivision? If it's a subdivision park, they would be accessed a parks fee and that money would be used for other parks in the community. Mr. Yenne was unsure of the direction as it had not been resolved yet. This would still need to be negotiated.

Mr. Sargent asked about the pipeline easement. Ms. Parker said there is an overhead power and pipeline easement that runs through the property. The power easement is on the upper Northeast side. Mr. Sargent asked that she mark this for the upcoming workshop.

Ms. Parker said when the streets are laid out, all the easements will be looked at and they will design around

them.

Ms. Parker stated they are presenting four phases of the development. They will be starting with residential, commercial and multi-family in the initial phase.

Mr. Rinehart asked if they were still intending egress and ingress on SH 288. Ms. Parker said yes.

Mr. Yenne stated he asked Ms. Parker to review the PUD manual and compare the manual to what has been submitted to see what is and what is not in compliance.

Mr. Sargent asked if an easement was needed for the sewer line. Mr. Aguirre stated there is an easement on it.

Mr. Yenne stated there are several components. One being the PUD. In order to close on the property, they must have the PUD finished by the end of March. Our timeline is close because the second reading is in April. There has already been a consultant hired and another will be hired to help look over it. The next thing that will be talked about is the Municipal Management District. Throughout the process the Master Plan Development agreement will be discussed where a lot of detail gets involved. The city has already spent some monies for future utilities that are being built. Discussion would also include how much the city would be reimbursed for what has been done. Sue Darcy has been hired to help look over the project along with LJA Engineering to help with the drainage. The city will also be working with Ardurra Group to help with the utilities. There will be a \$10,000 fee that will be submitted by Mr. Noteware up front and the professionals listed will also be paid by Mr. Noteware. The consultants that the city bring on board act on the behalf of the city.

Mr. Sanders noted the PUD said it had no expiration date.

Ms. Russell mentioned the PUD has a 15-year expiration. So long as there is progress being made then extensions can be granted.

There was discussion about the changes that would be allowed by Mr. Yenne. Ms. Russell stated changes that are above the percentages allowed would have to be approved by Planners and Council. Mr. Yenne asked that allowed changes be defined in the PUD. Mr. Yenne felt anything that is not contiguous would need to come back to Planners and City Council. If it's contiguous and comes up or down a little bit, then it would probably be fine.

DISCUSS AND CALL A PUBLIC HEARING FOR REZONING OF THE ALDEN 987.2 ACRE TRACT ON US HWY 288 IN LAKE JACKSON FROM R-1 TO PUD ON MARCH 3, 2020

Engineer's Memo:

At a public hearing to be held in accordance with Chapter 211, Local Govt. Code and Chapter 110 City Ordinance Code, the Planning Commission will prepare a final report and recommendation to the City Council or may request additional studies or information based on particular characteristics of the proposed development.

City Council would hold their public hearing on the PUD at their March 16, 2020 meeting and consider first rezoning ordinance. Second reading of the ordinance would be at the April 6, 2020 meeting.

On motion by Mr. Rinehart second by Ms. Colegrove with all present members voting "aye" a public hearing for rezoning of the Alden 987.2-acre tract on SH 288 in Lake Jackson from R-1 to PUD on March 3, 2020 was approved.

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF 2020 BOND PROGRAM PROJECTS

Mr. Mundo went over the 2020 Bond Program Projects. He wanted the commission to be aware of the projects in case people asked about them.

Under facilities there is approximately \$15.3 million.

- City Hall expansion is \$9.2 million – The initial design is going up and out towards Circle Way and Oak Drive. A floor plan has been pretty much nailed down, but there is not enough detail to know what the expansion would look like. The expansion is approximately 17,000 square feet.
- The Animal Control facility has gone from \$6.5 million to \$3.2 million and we feel confident a good quality facility can be built. It would be a metal building.
- Police renovation and expansion – This would be used for large evidence storage. We need a secure place for that. Patrol offices and CID offices would be moved around.
- Library flooring – This has been on the list for about 10 years and the price is increasing.

ADA curb replacements will be to repair to new standards.

Drainage projects

- Shady Oaks, Pin Oak & Forest Oaks, \$2.5 million – This project would be replacement of streets, sidewalks, drainage, water and sewer lines. Mr. Rinehart pointed out a small portion of Shady Oaks to Pin Oak needs to be replaced and should be considered with the current project. From Sycamore to Plantation is a bad portion of street. Mr. Mundo said it couldn't be changed now because the ordinance has already passed. Mr. Aguirre said it will be looked at and it can be funded somehow.
- Moss Chestnut, Wisteria and Palm Lane – This has a sizeable drainage component. The interest was doing the roads and we didn't want to come back and do more roads and not tackle the drainage.

SIGNATURE OF DOCUMENTS

ITEMS OF COMMUNITY INTEREST

Mr. Fey stated he hasn't been able to get into Olive Garden because it's been so busy. Use the takeout service. It is apparently doing very well.

Mr. Gilbert mentioned not to be afraid to correct people who are spreading garbage, especially on social media. There is a lot of misinformation that scares people that is simply not true.

Mr. Mundo wanted to add that the Bond Task Force Committee was a very diverse group that looked at every factor and represented a very broad opinion.

Mr. Rinehart asked if Chipotle was coming in. Mr. Yenne said they are looking for a place.

Mr. Yenne stated there will be a meeting coming up with Cavender's.

Councilmember Singhania wanted to make sure he stressed the city do their due diligence and handle the PUD correctly.

Mr. Ortiz mentioned as we look at the future development on the northside. There needs to be some consideration for emergency services such as police and fire. Just having a piece of property does not serve 3,000 people. When you have an officer that needs to use the facilities, they can't just go into a

convenient store with their gear. They need to be able to go into a locked building and feel protected without having to drive back to use the restroom. This is something to consider. Our officers are vulnerable, and something should be put in place for these officers.

SET NEXT MEETING DATE - February 10, 2020 – Workshop
February 24, 2020 – Workshop
March 3, 2020 – Planners meeting

ADJOURN

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

These minutes read and approved this _____ day of _____, 2020.

Locke Sanders, Chairman

Brenda Colegrove, Secretary