

STATE OF TEXAS

COUNTY OF BRAZORIA

CITY OF LAKE JACKSON

BE KNOWN that the Planning Commission of the City of Lake Jackson met in regular session on February 3, 2026, at 6:30 p.m. in Lake Jackson, Texas, with the following agenda:

Locke Sanders, Chair  
Harry Sargent, Vice-Chair  
Cotton Tyler  
Kay Aplin

Sal Aguirre, City Engineer  
Nicholle Wilson, Asst. City Engineer  
Eddie Herrera, Project Manager  
Anamaria Acuña, Asst. City Secretary  
Vinay Singhania, Council Liaison

**ABSENT:**

Jeffrey Gilbert, Secretary  
Matthew Bjune

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Sanders led the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – January 6, 2026

The minutes were approved as written.

VISITOR COMMENTS – None.

DISCUSS AND CONSIDER REQUEST FROM INTENTIONAL ACTIONS ABA FOR SPECIAL USE CONDITIONS FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION BUSINESS USE LOCATED AT 106 CIRCLE WAY

Tiffany Crow – 105 Portulaca

Ms. Crow explained that she had prepared slides to address any questions but understood that education is now a conditional use in the B-2 zone. She was requesting approval for that conditional use specifically for Intentional Actions Academy, which would be a separate business from her current company, Intentional Actions ABA. The school would operate in the same location, sharing space with her existing business.

*Mr. Aguirre stated this is a formality and briefed over the Engineer's Memo: The City received a request from Ms. Tiffany Crow to locate a school within the downtown area. The Downtown District zoned B-2 (Central Business) did not allow schools but only in the B-3 (Institutional) zone. The rezoning amendment to add this use was taken to the City Council for consideration and later referred to the Planning Commission for recommendation.*

*The independent consensus of both bodies was to include this as a special condition used to be applied on a case basis with the conditions as determined by the Planning Commission board. This zoning amendment went through the public hearing process of both bodies recently with their approval as a result. The council at their last meetings passed the ordinance on first and second readings and the amended zoning ordinance is now being finalized.*

*This is the last step that Ms. Crow is required to have her individual business special use permit request*

approved.

Mr. Sargent motioned to approve Intentional Actions ABA for special use conditions for special education business use located at 106 Circle Way, seconded by Mr. Tyler, with all present members voting, “aye”, the motion passed.

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW AND ACTION OF SITE PLAN AMENDMENT OF NEW TDECU (SPACE CITY FINANCIAL) BANKING FACILITY AT 80 OAK DRIVE

Ms. Wilson went over the *Engineer’s Memo: This site plan amendment comes before you as another update to the site plan approved by the Planning Commission in April 2024 and amended in November 2024. TDECU opened to customers in 2025, and the owner almost immediately noticed the need for additional parking and revised parking stall striping for the 6,115 sq. ft. office building facility, 6 drive-thru teller lanes, and two (2) ATM lanes.*

*The three access drives and overall site layout from the Oak Drive driveway through to the Azalea Street driveway and north towards H-E-B is proposed to remain as it is currently constructed. The southern portion of the parking lot is proposed to be reworked to accommodate an additional 26 parking spaces. This will bring the parking total to 82 spaces, which far exceeds the ordinance minimum of 19 parking spaces. A plat amendment came before the Planning Commission last month to shift the southern property line further south to provide for required square footage for this parking expansion. As such, the sidewalk fronting Azalea Street will need to be extended south to the new property line. In addition, TDECU noticed some difficulty with the 90-degree parking along the southern drive aisle, and they are now proposing angled parking.*

Site Summary:

	<i>Original (April 2024)</i>	<i>First Amendment (November 2024)</i>	<i>Second Amendment (February 2026)</i>
<i>Building Area (sq. ft.)</i>	6,115	6,115	6,115
<i>Parking Required (3 per 1,000 sq. ft.)</i>	19	19	19
<i>Parking Provided</i>	28	56	82
<i>Required Handicap Spaces</i>	2	3	4
<i>Handicap Spaces Provided</i>	2	3	TBD

*All original underground utilities are to remain as installed aside from two minor adjustments: 1) the southern parking lot lighting conduit will be extended to allow for the lights to be shifted further south, and 2) the two most southern inlets are being changed from curb inlets to area inlets. No new underground drainage infrastructure is proposed, and the stormwater conveyance calculations have been updated to include the new impervious area draining to these two inlets. There will be deeper parking lot ponding at the locations of these two inlets than the previous site plan amendment, and a note and hatch is included in the site plan amendment to acknowledge this condition. Detention is still not required for this property since it remains under the impervious acreage of the 2014 Impact Analysis for Redevelopment of the 38.9 acres of the Oak Woods PUD.*

*Staff recommends your consideration for administrative approval as presented.*

Mr. Sargent asked about the differences between the old and new plans besides the angled parking. Ms. Wilson explained the parking had been extended, with two additional rows of parking along with a tractor-trailer truck parking area.

Mr. Sargent questioned how large trucks would navigate the tractor-trailer parking area, expressing concern about how they would enter and exit. Ms. Wilson indicated that trucks would likely enter from one direction and curve around to exit. Mr. Sargent noted it could be a logistical challenge.

Mr. Sargent also inquired whether the length of parking spots had been adapted to accommodate the larger diesel dually trucks or if they remained the same standard length. Ms. Wilson responded that they had not changed their standard but believed the spaces were actually slightly larger than typical requirements. Ms. Wilson confirmed that the tractor-trailer spaces measured 10 feet by 23 feet, while their standard parking spaces were 9 feet by 18 feet, making these spaces both wider and longer.

Mr. Sargent raised concerns about trucks sticking out into traffic lanes, noting that in various places around downtown, he had to navigate around protruding trucks while driving his car. He wondered if the parking space length had been adjusted for this development. Ms. Wilson confirmed these spaces were longer than standard.

Mr. Sanders asked what action was needed on the item. Ms. Wilson clarified that administrative review and approval were being sought.

Mr. Tyler inquired about whether parking at the building itself still has straight-in parking, which was confirmed. Mr. Singhania requested that they make a stipulation of “front” parking only. Mr. Sanders stated that they would leave that to the credit union.

Mr. Tyler motioned to approve the administrative review of site plan amendment of new TDECU (Space City Financial) Banking Facility at 80 Oak Drive, seconded by Ms. Aplin with all present members voting, “aye” the motion passed.

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW AND ACTION ON LANDSCAPE PLAN AMENDMENT OF THE NEW TDECU (SPACE CITY FINANCIAL) BANKING FACILITY AT 80 OAK DRIVE

Ms. Wilson went over *the Engineer’s Memo: This landscape plan amendment will be updated to include the necessary adjustments triggered by the larger site area for the proposed parking expansion.*

*Below is a summary of landscape requirements:*

	<i>Original (April 2024)</i>	<i>First Amendment (November 2024)</i>	<i>Second Amendment (February 2026)</i>
<i>Site Area (ac.)</i>	<i>1.92</i>	<i>2.33</i>	<i>2.88</i>
<i>Required Landscape Area (sq. ft.)</i>	<i>7,771</i>	<i>9,527</i>	<i>11,954</i>
<i>Provided Landscape Area (sq. ft.)</i>	<i>20,665</i>	<i>29,365</i>	<i>TBD</i>
<i>Required Site Trees (§90-73)</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>Provided Site Trees (§90-73)</i>	<i>23</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>TBD</i>
<i>Required Screening Trees (§90-81)</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>18</i>

<i>Provided Screening Trees (\$90-81)</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>TBD</i>
<i>Required Preservation Trees (cal. in.)</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>50</i>	<i>50</i>
<i>Provided Preservation Trees (cal. in.)</i>	<i>26</i>	<i>48</i>	<i>TBD</i>

*Landscape Summary:*

*The updated plan indicates little, if any, changes to the current plan work site area and mainly targets those in the new plan for the expansion area. The staff is working through tabulation and accounting clarifications of trees and areas included in the new plan and flagging these for rules compliance and addressing.*

*Staff recommends your consideration for preliminary administrative landscape plan amendment approval.*

Mr. Sanders asked about the status of existing trees on the site.

Ms. Wilson stated they would update the table to ensure accurate accounting. She mentioned that during the second revision, an arborist had conducted a review with a blanket statement about the trees, but they wanted specific numbers documented on the plan to ensure proper accounting.

Mr. Tyler motioned to approve the administrative review on the landscape plan amendment of the new TDECU ( Space City Financial) Banking Facility at 80 Oak Drive with the stipulation of the plans and paperwork being updated, with Ms. Aplin seconding and all present members voting, “aye” the motion passed.

DISCUSS AND CONSIDER REQUEST FOR A PROPOSED ATM DRIVE THRU INSTALLATION AT THE FOUR CORNERS SHOPPING CENTER SITE AT 120 CIRCLE WAY ON US HWY 288 FRONTAGE BETWEEN THIS WAY AND WEST WAY

Rob Naggar – 3411 Richmond Ave., Houston, TX.

Mr. Naggar was approached to add a drive-thru ATM near the Pizza Hut at his shopping center. He stated that they will lose approximately 5 parking spaces. He explained that they had owned the Four Corners Shopping Center for a little over nine years and had recently been approached by a different credit union wanting to install a drive-up ATM.

Mr. Sargent mentioned he had recently used First National Bank's ATM and noted how the bank had handled an ATM theft. He stated that they installed protective posts and bollards after their machine was robbed by someone using a truck to pull it out. He suggested Mr. Naggar consider similar security measures.

Mr. Aguirre went over the *Engineer’s Memo: This request comes from Rob Naggar, one of center’s managing owners, attempting to generate some business in their existing developed site. Years back in September 2018, he made a similar request to you that was given conditioned approval by the board but was never followed through by the developer.*

*Because of zoning changes that have occurred to parking and drive-thru requirements since then, staff believes the previous ruling had run its course and its inactivity voided it and needing to be reassessed by you again.*

*To bring this item back in focus attached are the recorded minutes of the previous meeting.*

September 2018 Minutes

*This seemingly minor request would normally not have been issue for planners' agenda and determination were it not for the existing site plan going back to 1977 having had recent modifications that have left the parking space count short of the ordinance requirements.*

*Recently the Taco Cabana redevelopment of the old theater on This Way was processed as an independent site less than two acres on account of a past replat of the original overall tract. At the time of this tract subdivision, this did not raise the overall site change implication of this action and the need to have the original Four Corners site plan updated to the changed conditions. it was during the Taco Cabana review that a review of the overall site led to parking space counts 32 short of the ordinance requirements (i.e. 291 versus 323).*

*Given the confusing events leading to this finding, allowed the Four Corners site plan to stand as it is in its current nonconforming condition and outdated state waiting for a future more extensive modification that would bring all these issues back in line.*

*This new modification did not come in as the extensive modification we anticipated, but as one consisting of erecting a free-standing walk up ATM kiosk within a shopping center parking field. Installing this structure will require the loss of 3 spaces to an already short nonconforming site condition. The board will have to consider permitting this addition under the current parking or as otherwise recommended.*

*Staff urges that if permitted it be conditioned with a site plan amendment update to be prepared and submitted to the planning commission at a future meeting as soon as possible.*

***Mr. Aguirre stated that he does not see a problem with giving up three (3) parking spaces since most of the time there is ample parking. Mr. Sargent and Mr. Fey felt there was not a problem with the parking. A new revised site plan would need to be brought in for approval.***

*Nothing came about from the decision made then as no new revised site plan nor development plan was submitted since. This resuscitated request comes in a schematic exhibit indicating roughly where the proposed location is within the site and what we assume to be the displacement of eight (8) parking spaces.*

*Staff would like for the board to reassess this again considering the changing viewpoints since the previous time regarding parking demands, drive-thru stacking lanes, and other site-specific conditions such as downtown parking and near parking sharing accessibility. No drainage or landscape issues are anticipated by this proposed use so your reapproval for this use would be reinstated with any changes in the conditions you may see fit along with that of the previous one that an updated site plan be prepared with all current conditions accounted.*

Mr. Sargent suggested that this request would also trigger an update to their landscape plan requirements again, which could result in additional expenses for the developer. Staff confirmed this was correct and acknowledged that meeting modern landscape requirements could be challenging and costly for the property.

The commission asked about potential parking impacts, noting that the area was used for parade assembly, though Mr. Naggar acknowledged that occasional use would not create ongoing parking issues.

Mr. Naggar stated he had been at Pizza Hut at 5:00 p.m. and observed only two cars in the parking lot. He had never seen anyone park along Highway 288 between Pizza Hut and Mattress Firm or on the southern end of the property. He added that originally the credit union group had wanted to place the ATM in the front area, facing Highway 288 near Dollar General, but he quickly rejected that idea, wanting to keep the ATM as far from the buildings as possible so traffic would flow through the parking lot without issues.

Mr. Sanders asked Ms. Wilson to clarify the location shown on the aerial image. Ms. Wilson indicated it would be located near their pylon sign. Mr. Naggar confirmed the ATM would be to the left of the sign, and Mr. Aguirre verified this was the same location proposed seven years earlier.

Mr. Naggar explained the building/machine would be on the driver's left-hand side, with traffic coming in, and the passenger side of the car positioned at the ATM, located where a parking stall ended.

Mr. Sanders asked whether traffic would flow around the sign, loop next to the curb, and then exit either toward Highway 288 or toward Pizza Hut. Mr. Naggar confirmed the traffic route.

Mr. Sargent asked about the green area shown on the plans and whether landscaping would be added. Mr. Naggar explained the challenge with this property had always been that no irrigation system was installed when it was developed, leaving just a grassy patch. Mr. Sargent noted that the planning commission had recently emphasized tree requirements at 30-foot spacing in recent approvals.

Mr. Aguirre commented that if the commission felt this particular development and site amendment warranted bringing the entire property up to current landscape code, that discussion could occur, though it would potentially create significant additional costs for the property owner.

Mr. Sargent suggested this would also bring up landscape requirements again. Staff confirmed that a formal site plan review would trigger full code compliance, including landscape requirements that did not exist or were not enforced when the center was originally built.

Mr. Aguirre asked about potential future uses for the restaurant. Mr. Naggar responded that he did not see them ever changing the two main buildings. One restaurant group had approached them about taking space next to Goodwill, but nothing came of it. They had not had many food service users express interest in the property.

Mr. Sanders noted there appeared to be parking shown on the plans that was not on Naggar's property (near the Mattress Firm). Mr. Sargent agreed, suggesting that parking contributed to their parking count calculations.

Mr. Sargent observed the commission now had two key members absent and suggested Mr. Naggar return with more detailed information. Staff indicated that Naggar would need to work with his engineer to provide stacking calculations and address other technical requirements if the commission decided to move forward.

Mr. Tyler expressed concern that approving this request as proposed would require alternate approval due to the property lacking approximately 40 parking spaces compared to code requirements and lacking compliant landscaping in accordance with current ordinances.

Mr. Tyler stated he was inclined to grant alternate approval simply because there was no room for required landscaping on the site. Staff indicated that the commission would also need to carefully examine the drive-through design, particularly regarding the ordinance's requirements for queuing space.

Mr. Tyler noted that providing adequate queueing would push the parking deficiency beyond 40 spaces, requiring the elimination of most of that section of parking. Mr. Sargent agreed that the queueing would

effectively take up space to the left of the sign.

Mr. Sargent observed he had never seen anyone queue up at the First National Bank ATM, so actual queuing demand might not be significant.

Mr. Sanders summarized that the commission could either approve the request to proceed or require it to meet full code requirements. Staff confirmed this was correct.

Mr. Sargent thought the absent commissioner, Mr. Bjune, would likely be concerned about landscape compliance, and other members agreed. Mr. Tyler suggested the ATM might work better if located in the green space at the southern end of the property.

Mr. Naggar explained the proposed tenant/credit union had always wanted visibility from HWY 288, so they would likely push back against a less visible location. However, he mentioned that he had discussed adding 5 to 8 parking spaces behind the building to help address the parking deficiency.

Mr. Sargent noted they could gain additional spaces by converting to straight-in parking rather than angled parking. However, he also acknowledged they did not currently have a parking problem at the site, so this might not be critical.

Mr. Sanders asked if Mr. Naggar would be willing to relocate the monument sign. Mr. Naggar noted that he believes that it would be expensive, but he would be willing to get a price estimate for moving it.

Mr. Sargent suggested an alternate location in placing the ATM near the curb on the northern end, which would provide a straighter access route without the sign being in the way. Mr. Naggar expressed concern that moving the ATM to the northern section would mean losing parking spaces closer to the buildings, which he had been trying to avoid.

Mr. Tyler asked about the green area visible on the aerial, and staff confirmed that it did not belong to him and was part of the right-of-way. Mr. Naggar explained that when the shopping center was built, no monument sign existed initially, and he believed power to the sign came from a nearby utility pole. He noted he was facing \$15,000-\$16,000 in costs to get power to the Pizza Hut area, making a location near Mattress Firm potentially cost-prohibitive unless there was another power source.

Mr. Sargent asked where Naggar's other businesses in the center received power. Mr. Naggar indicated everything ran to the back of the buildings. Mr. Naggar said he would inquire if there was a power source closer to the Mattress Firm end of the property.

Mr. Sanders asked whether the ATM would require telecommunications or hardwired connections. Naggar stated he would find out. Mr. Sargent pointed to another area and asked if that location would provide power access advantages. Mr. Naggar said he had not asked the electrician about alternative locations or whether another utility pole existed near the old Luby's location that could provide power.

Mr. Naggar indicated he was willing to investigate power availability at the northern end of the property and return to the next meeting with that information and potentially photographs.

Staff confirmed the parking and landscape issues would need to be addressed. The challenge was that this site predated requirements for formal site plans with detailed parking calculations. Staff had requested that Mr. Naggar return because the previous approval had expired without implementation, and circumstances had changed with the new proposal.

Mr. Sargent asked about stacking requirements for ATM drive-throughs. He estimated no more than two cars would be typical, noting that would be an extreme situation.

Mr. Naggar summarized he would investigate power availability at the northern end of the property. If power were unavailable there, he would return with a specific site plan showing the originally proposed southern location. He indicated he had drawings showing the unit but did not have them with him at this meeting. He then thanked the Commission for their time and stated he would do more homework before returning.

UPDATE ON APPROVED PROJECTS BY PLANNERS

Mr. Herrera gave updates on the following:

*Shivam Subdivision/ Gas Station*

Mr. Sargent asked about the underground detention pond. Ms. Wilson stated that everything seemed to be working fine since the installation. There was discussion on the location of the underground detention pond and drainage.

*Plantation Village Shopping Center / Smaller Site Developments*

Mr. Aguirre reported that Hurricane Grill and Wings in the Plantation Village Shopping Center, located in the former Cafe Laredo space, was almost complete and had received their Certificate of Occupancy.

SIGNATURE OF DOCUMENTS – None.

SET NEXT MEETING DATE

The next regularly scheduled meeting is set for Tuesday, March 3, 2026.

ADJOURN

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:26 p.m.

These minutes were read and approved on March 3, 2026.

---

Jeff Gilbert, Secretary

---

Locke Sanders, Chair