

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 June 7, 2022 at 6:30 p.m. in Lake Jackson, Texas with the following agenda:

Locke Sanders, Chair
Harry Sargent
Jeff Gilbert, Secretary
Matthew Bjune

Modesto Mundo, City Manager
Milford John-Williams, Asst. to City Manager
Sal Aguirre, City Engineer
Athelstan Sanchez, Asst. City Engineer
Eddie Herrera, Project Manager
Anamaria Acuña, Asst. City Secretary

ABSENT:

Joe Rinehart
John Fey, Vice- Chair

Vinay Singhanian, Council Liaison

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Sargent led the pledge of allegiance.

SWEAR IN MEMBERS

Ms. Acuña administered the oath of office to Mr. Sargent, Mr. Gilbert, and Mr. Bjune.

REORGANIZE BOARD

Locke Sanders was re-nominated as chair.

On motion by Mr. Gilbert second by Mr. Bjune with all present members voting “aye, Mr. Sanders was voted in as chair.

Mr. Sanders appointed Mr. Gilbert as secretary and Mr. Fey as vice-chair.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – May 3, 2022

Minutes were approved as presented.

VISITOR COMMENTS

No comments.

DISCUSS AND CONSIDER ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW OF PRELIMINARY REPLAT OF PARKWAY PLAZA SUBDIVISION IN PLANTATION VILLAGE SUBDIVISION, SECTION 4 (LOCATED AT THIS WAY).

Mr. Doug Roesler (engineer at Baker & Lawson) shared that (his client) Mr. Clark requested to subdivide the Parkway Plaza. He brought and placed copies of Parkway Plaza head lots 1, 2 and 3.

The engineering department confirmed that they were submitted to them as well, but they did not have the chance to review the lots yet.

Mr. Roesler shared that he could help explain the entire Parkway Plaza property and what Mr. Clark has requested for a replat because he plans on selling the old Rickochet's building.

Mr. Aguirre advised Mr. Roesler to create both a site development plan along with a landscape plan for all of Parkway Plaza since they are dividing it.

Mr. Aguirre went over the Engineer's memo below:

This is a resubdivision of an existing commercial subdivision that was last partitioned on September 9, 2004, into 3 lots under one site and landscape plan. The request now comes to further divide Lot 3 into two individual properties Lot 3A and 3B to allow the sale of the separate properties. The Parkway Plaza Subdivision was the previous Clark Commercial Parks that contain Brazos Billiard, and the office building are now being separated to their individual lots.

Because the current subdivision is subject to one site and landscape plan supporting the parking and Landscaping requirement of the whole, these documents will have to be amended to reflect the changes caused by and to the proposed partitions. These amendments are missing from this submittal, so staff is presenting this only for information, discussion, and consideration for preliminary and final review when filed at the next meeting subject to completeness.

Subdivision specifies:

All lots to remain served by the existing infrastructure shared through a common private agreement officially recorded and indicated in the plat. To include all water, sewer, drainage, and travel way access. No civil supporting documentation other than the existing ones will be required. The current 3 lot subdivision has frontage to a public right-of-way while the proposed one will cutoff frontage access to Lot 3A. This condition occurs in other commercial subdivisions that have been allowed to maintain access through a private cross access agreement such as Walmart, Target, and others.

Mr. Roesler advised the commission that they recently submitted the plans that Mr. Aguirre requested but they have not had the chance to review but he is willing to discuss with Mr. Aguirre to work out any issues. Mr. Roesler advised that the parking has stayed the same, but they may add to their landscape plan.

Mr. Clark has a potential buyer, so Mr. Roesler has requested to have a special meeting in a week or two to approve a final replat along with administrative approval of the site and landscape plans. Mr. Roesler is aware that he did not get his request sent in time for tonight's agenda.

Mr. Roesler advised that nothing has changed regarding the Parkway Plaza plans since 2004, so they are hoping to have administrative approval before the next scheduled planning commission meeting in July. Mr. Roesler commented that he is aware that he is requesting this last minute from the commissioners and asked if they would be able to make a quorum for a special meeting.

Mr. Aguirre mentioned that the approved 2004 Parkway Plaza site plans had a limit on the path of business due to the number of parking spaces. Mr. Roesler confirmed that the Parkway Plaza still has the same use as 2004 and will continue to. Mr. Aguirre stated that if the plaza would continue to be used for the same business that he does not see any problem. The 2004 plans had a shared area which allowed a cross access parking area. Mr. Roesler commented that he was advised by Mr. Herrera that the plat needs to show an access to the lots. Mr. Aguirre shared that the particular area was considered the common shared parking area. Mr. Aguirre further explained that it will continue to be a common shared parking area that can help provide extra parking spaces.

Mr. Aguirre recommends the "administrative review of preliminary replat," because he believes that the only

concern of not having sufficient parking for whatever use of the building will be made up by the common shared parking area. Mr. Roesler asked Mr. Aguirre for a special meeting, and he explained to him that it would be up to the planning commission to approve as they are available.

Mr. Roesler reiterated that he is willing to work with engineering and staff should there be any issues, but he is hoping to have special meeting within the next two weeks.

The commission discussed scheduling a special session for June 28, 2022, or possibly having to wait until their regular scheduled meeting which would be held on July 6, 2022. The commission would not be able to make a quorum sooner than June 28, 2022 and set the date as their tentative special meeting.

Mr. Roesler stated that he would discuss with Mr. Clark to see if he could just wait until the scheduled July 6, 2022 meeting.

The commission had a discussion with Mr. Aguirre, and he shared that they did not have to make a motion and could wait until the next meeting to motion to approve both the preliminary and final replat at the next meeting.

Mr. Sanders motioned to reopen for discussion after discussing items of community interest.

Council Liaison Singhania explained to the planning commission that they can take an action on approving the preliminary to help signal to the potential buyer that Mr. Clark is attempting to replat.

Mr. Aguirre agreed that the planning commission could have made a motion, but they decided to wait. Mr. Singhania shared that he discussed with Ms. Russell and confirmed that it did not have to notate "take action" and they could still make a motion because of the wording "discuss" and "consider," if beneficial to Mr. Clark.

After discussion with the planning commission deciding whether it would be beneficial to Mr. Clark, they agreed to make a motion.

On motion by Mr. Gilbert seconded by Mr. Sargent with all present members voting "aye," the preliminary replat of Parkway Plaza subdivision in Plantation Village Subdivision Section 4 (located at This Way) was approved.

DISCUSS, CONSIDER, AND TAKE ACTION ON ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW OF SITE PLAN AMENDMENT OF REGAL STORAGE EXPANSION PHASE 2 AT 125 FM 2004.

Joe McManus – 125 FM 2004

Mr. McManus shared that he plans on adding four additional buildings behind the existing facility he has now. The new buildings will be used for 14 RV / boat spaces. He shared that they would not be visible from the road. Mr. McManus asked if Mr. Aguirre has received any updates from his architect.

Mr. Aguirre went over the Engineer's memo below:

This is an amendment to the existing site plan of the existing Regal Storage units at FM 2004 that was approved in December of 2014. The request now comes for an expansion of the site to accommodate additional 3-climate controlled storage buildings and 1-RV / Boat and storage building.

Site Plan specifies:

The site modification calls for an addition of 3.36-acres to the existing 4.00-acres. This will require an amendment of the

existing plat to encompass the site expansion and will come at a future meeting prior to release for construction permit. There remain an approximate 4-acres of land yet to be developed in the event of a future expansion. The expansion adds 170 storage units to the 595 others in place an additional 32,053 sq. ft. to the current 73,400 sq. ft.

The site expands to the rear of the existing development and wraps east along a designated city flood control easement that borders the old slave ditch abandoned channel. The site is being elevated to the existing site finished floor as established by the administrator and proven worth by past flooding events. This proposed plan calls for this other limit to serve as the detaining basin for the expansion and purports to be sized to service this Phase 2 and an eventual Phase 3. The drainage hydraulics and design capacities are under review of the Floodplain Administrator who will add to the review his findings.

This proposed detention basin seems to be beneficial to the city as the bounding berms will serve as part of our planned and ongoing Bastrop Bayou flood protection projects by closing a big gap of the segment.

Utilities for this expansion are private extensions as necessary to connect the sanitary sewer of the ac vents and the waterline necessary for fire hydrant projection reaches. Engineering and the Fire Marshal have provided minor comments to address with no issues expected.

The parking count is to remain the same as approved in the original unless the board determines otherwise. The site plan as presented is limited to the confines of Phase 2 and has been flagged for revision into an integrated site plan amendment that incorporates both Phase 1 and Phase 2.

Staff does not anticipate major issues and recommends amended site plan administrative review approval.

Mr. Aguirre stated that this site plan should have come in with the entire site plan not just a portion because that is how it was approved. He informed the commission that the plan should include the Phase 1 (the existing building) and any future plans (other expansions of his 4-acre property). Mr. Aguirre stated that they were advised to include a detention basin.

Mr. Aguirre noted that how the site plan is now, he can recommend an administrative approval. He noted that the parking has not changed since Phase 1 and the only thing engineering flagged was the fire hydrant. Mr. Aguirre suggested Mr. McManus's engineer discuss the minor issues with the fire marshal.

Mr. Sargent asked for more information about the sanitary sewer of the AC vents and the waterline. Mr. McManus stated that he believes the AC vents only have some condensation drip. There was discussion regarding to why the building code used to require a sanitary sewer as the older AC systems used to use freon and leak. Building official, Mr. Walton stated he will investigate TCEQ regulations to find an answer regarding the possible outdated use of freon for AC.

Mr. Bjune asked why the detention pond is shallower than the existing. He followed up by asking what changed in 8 years. Mr. Sanchez explained there is more surface area and less volume. After some discussion, Mr. Sanchez stated that the drawings were sent as a proposal and clarified that they have not been officially approved.

Mr. Sanchez shared that there has been a lot of change since Phase 1. He explained that Phase 1 was not initially in the hazard flood zone, so the only requirements were to mitigate excess runoff. As of December 2020, the area is now considered to be a hazard flood zone. Now they must mitigate (1) the excess run off due to the development along with one detention pond (2) now they are losing storage due to the flood plain and (3) to ensure they have proper movement of the water.

Mr. Sanchez summarized as far as administrative approval he doesn't believe to have received enough information. But the dimensions of the detention pond seem to be more than adequate for the next phase as an excessive runoff. He ended his discussion by stating that if not careful this can adversely impact the city and them or vice versa and all parties are well served with the proposed detention basins.

On motion by Mr. Sargent seconded by Mr. Bjune with all present members voting "aye", the administrative review of site plan amendment of Regal Storage expansion Phase 2 at 125 FM 2004 was approved.

Mr. Aguirre stated that when they file the site plan, engineering will notate or make recommendations if any.

DISCUSS, CONSIDER, AND TAKE ACTION ON ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW OF ALTERNATE LANDSCAPE PLAN AMENDMENT OF REGAL STORAGE EXPANSION PHASE 2 AT 125 FM 2004.

Mr. Aguirre stated that they will also need an updated landscape plan that include all phases, following with the Engineer's memo below:

This is an alternate amendment to the existing landscaping plan of the existing Regal Storage units at FM 2004 that was approved in December 2014.

Landscape Plan specifics:

The plan modification calls for an addition of 3.36-acres to the existing 4.00-acres. This will require an amendment of the existing plan to encompass the landscape requirements of open area and tree count caused by the area land expansion. There remain an approximate 4-acres of land yet to be developed in the event of a future expansion which are not part of this plan.

The plan expands to the rear of the existing development and wraps east along a designated city flood control easement that borders the old slave ditch abandoned channel. The land is being elevated to the existing site and finished floor with landscape islands added to the pavement access of the buildings and the exposed fence perimeter to the west and rear to the site. The detention basin will also serve in the open area count in the plan.

The landscape plan as presented is limited to the confines of Phase 2 and has been flagged for revision into an integrated alternate plan amendment that incorporates both Phase 1 and Phase 2. The plan as submitted complies with the requirements of Phase 2 as to tree count and area but will have to be reevaluated as an overall plan once the Phase 1 are assessed with updated conditions and combined into the single amended plan. In keeping with the alternate designation approved for Phase 1 plan for hose bib irrigation system, this amendment will carry forward with the same condition and be designated as such.

Staff has provided various comments to address and do not anticipate major issues to compliance and recommends amended landscape plan administrative review approval.

Mr. Aguirre mentioned that because the additions will also be elevated everything will have to go, so they will have to do without a presurvey for the area. They are proposing to add the required number of trees and open landscape areas. He also noted the detention basin itself is identified as an open area. He summarized that they would meet all required conditions for a landscape plan.

Mr. Aguirre explained the reason this is coming forth as an alternate plan is due to the missing irrigation.

Mr. Sargent shared that he appreciated the landscape. Mr. Aguirre shared that they will also be providing perimeter landscaping trees.

On motion by Mr. Sargent seconded by Mr. Gilbert with all present members voting “aye,” the administrative review of alternate landscape amendment specifying the lack of built-in irrigation of Regal Storage Expansion Phase 2 at 125 FM 2004 was approved.

SIGNATURE OF DOCUMENTS

- None

ITEMS OF COMMUNITY INTEREST

- Mr. Gilbert shared that he was pleased with the recent voting turnout. He also expressed that he was very appreciative for the chance to reserve.
- Mr. Sargent asked about a sign on the chamber of commerce property.
 - Mr. Aguirre stated that it is a private easement.
 - Mr. Walton stated it is a flagged lot with conditions.
- Mr. Sanders asked about updates Harbor Freight.
 - Mr. Walton confirmed that they have permits and that it will be located at the old Arlan’s.
 - Mr. Sargent shared that they fixed the parking lots for that area.
- Mr. Bjune mentioned that he noticed that there are a lot of signs down near the highway.
 - Ms. England has reached out to TxDOT’s maintenance department and are still pending an update.
- Mr. Herrera gave updates on:
 - Downtown project and North Parking Place Canopy removal
 - Huisache / New Lakewood Manor Development
 - Water lines are in after some unforeseen issues, but they are starting on drainage work and are pending a redesign.
 - Mr. Walton informed engineering that the city has not received any construction drawings for the residential buildings. Mr. Walton stated that they are only allowed to do groundwork and if they decide to go vertical, they will need to submit plans and permits.
- Mr. Walton gave updates on The Villas.
 - The apartments are six to seven months behind due to delays on material. There is no structural diaphragm in case a windstorm happens and a timeframe for the roof structure was requested.
- Gateway apartments
 - They have new owners and due to recent upgrades to the apartment, they may come forth to the planning commission for discussion.

SET NEXT MEETING DATE

Tentative special meeting set for June 28, 2022, otherwise will meet on regular scheduled meeting set for Wednesday, July 6, 2022, at 6:30 p.m.

ADJOURN

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 7:44 p.m.

These minutes read and approved this 6th day of July 2022.

Locke Sanders, Chairman

Jeff Gilbert, Secretary