



**CITY OF FRIENDSWOOD
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
THURSDAY, MARCH 11, 2021 - 7:00 PM**

Minutes

MINUTES OF A FRIENDSWOOD REGULAR MEETING HELD AT 910 S. FRIENDSWOOD DRIVE, FRIENDSWOOD, TEXAS, FRIENDSWOOD CITY HALL, COUNCIL CHAMBERS

DRAFT

STATE OF TEXAS
CITY OF FRIENDSWOOD
COUNTIES OF GALVESTON/HARRIS
MARCH 11, 2021

1. Call to order

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE FRIENDSWOOD PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION THAT WAS HELD ON THURSDAY, MARCH 11, 2021, AT 07:07 PM 910 S. FRIENDSWOOD DRIVE, FRIENDSWOOD, TEXAS

CHAIRMAN JOSEPH MATRANGA
VICE-CHAIRMAN RICHARD SASSON
COMMISSIONER TOM HINCKLEY
COMMISSIONER RICHARD CLARK
COMMISSIONER TRAVIS MANN
COUNCIL LIAISON TRISH HANKS
CITY ATTORNEY MARY KAY FISCHER
DIRECTOR OF CDD/PLANNER AUBREY HARBIN
DEVELOPMENT COORDINATOR BECKY BENNETT

COMMISSIONER LISA LUNDQUIST, COMMISSIONER MARCUS PERRY, COUNCIL LIAISON GRIFFON WERE ABSENT FROM THE MEETING.

2. Communication from the public/committee liaisons

(To comply with provisions of the Open Meetings Act, the Commission may not deliberate on subjects discussed under this agenda item. However, the Commission may direct such subjects be placed on a later regular Commission agenda for discussion and/or possible action)

None.

3. Public Hearing

- A. To receive comments, both oral and written, regarding:
A zone classification change located along FM 2351 and Beamer Road (Friendswood, Harris County), consisting of 159.8029 acres to change from Community Shopping Center (CSC) and Industrial (I) to Planned Unit Development (PUD), the 159.8029 acres being described fully in three phases as follows: PH-1 – 14.9959 acres (5.414 acres and 9.5819 acres); PH-2 – 34.3288 acres (9.5455 acres, 15.0371 acres and 9.742 acres); and PH-3 – 110.4782 acres as more fully described in the backup materials.

Harbin said the proposed Planned Unit Development (PUD) is known as the Panhandle PUD and consists of 159 acres. She said the PUD is conceptual in nature but is to establish development guidelines for the three phase development. She said the individual sites or buildings would require further site plan approval by the Commission. Harbin said elevations were included for Phase 2 of the project but not for the other two phases. She further stated the developer included an amended Permitted Use Table, parking calculations, landscape requirements, and regulation matrix for the proposed development. Harbin said a side-by-side comparison of the proposed regulations versus the city regulations was included in the back-up material.

Dan Rucker/Coastal Bend Property provided history of and plans for the area in regards to TxDOT, Army Corps of Engineers, Harris County Flood Control District, and Denbury projects. He said Phase 2 is the main focal point of the PUD and they are ready to begin construction. Rucker said Phase 1 is an area to consider for a residential component but that the multi-family aspect has been withdrawn from the PUD.

4. Consent Agenda

These items are considered routine or ministerial in nature and will be enacted with one motion. There will be no separate discussion of items unless a commissioner so requests in which case the item would be removed from the consent agenda and considered separately.

****Commissioner Tom Hinckley moved to approve Consent Agenda. Seconded by Commissioner Travis Mann. The motion was approved unanimously.**

- A. Minutes for the regular meeting held Thursday, February 25, 2021

5. Action Items

According to the Planning and Zoning Rules of Procedure (R2019-15), all action of the Commission shall be made by an affirmative vote of four (4) or more members of the Commission present at such Commission meetings.

- A. Consideration and possible action regarding the site plan for Friendswood Shopping Center to be located at 106 Whispering Pines Ave.

****Vice-Chairman Richard Sasson moved to approve the Consideration and possible action regarding the site plan for Friendswood Shopping Center to be located at 106 Whispering Pines Ave. Seconded by Commissioner Tom Hinckley.**

Harbin explained this is a project at 106 Whispering Pines Ave that includes a former church next door. She said TBH Holdings purchased the property and replatted it into two lots with one lot containing the old church building and the second lot to be for the proposed strip center.

Sasson asked if the parking provided was for both buildings. Bennett stated the parking calculations cover both buildings. He asked after the sidewalk and dumpster to which Bennett answered the sidewalk is a 6-foot concrete sidewalk and the developer was proposing a screened, double dumpster.

Sasson mentioned the landscape plan identifies using all holly trees and said he personally prefers shade trees. He asked staff to appeal to the developer for a variety of trees instead. Sasson said it is sad the owner is taking out a large tree in the parking lot. Bennett stated the owner is providing two mitigation trees onsite to replace the ones being removed.

Mann said he is concerned with the placement of the new building. He said the front rendering looks nice but the rear is the entry into the Downtown District and drivers will be looking at a large, blank wall. He said the building will be blocking development next door and shared parking would not be an option. Mann also said the dumpster location is causing the removal of a large tree and the dumpster could be relocated to the open space area between the two buildings instead. Harbin explained the developer is required to screen the electrical equipment on the rear of the building so they are proposing a laser cut metal wall with landscaping. Mann said he is also concerned that the area is really tight. Sasson mentioned part of the appeal of the Downtown District zoning is zero foot setbacks. Sasson said the next building could back up to this property.

Bennett explained the building is situated this way to allow for a drive thru on the end suite. She said the owner also wants to leave the green space open at the back to allow for future development. She said they plan to replace the old church building at some point. She said staff can remind the developer to attend the next meeting if the Commission would prefer to table the item for now.

****Vice-Chairman Richard Sasson moved to amend his motion and table the Consideration and possible action regarding the site plan for Friendswood Shopping Center to be located at 106 Whispering Pines Ave. Seconded by Commissioner Travis Mann. The motion was approved unanimously.**

B. Consideration and possible action regarding a recommendation to City Council regarding a request for a zone classification change located along FM 2351 and Beamer Road, consisting of 159.8029 acres to change from Community Shopping Center (CSC) and Industrial (I) to Planned Unit Development (PUD), the 159.8029 acres being described fully in three phases as follows: PH-1 – 14.9959 acres (5.414 acres and 9.5819 acres); PH-2 – 34.3288 acres (9.5455 acres, 15.0371 acres and 9.742 acres); and PH-3 – 110.4782 acres as more fully described in the backup materials.

****Vice-Chairman Richard Sasson moved to approve the Consideration and possible action regarding a recommendation to City Council regarding a request for a zone classification change located along FM 2351 and Beamer Road, consisting of 159.8029 acres to change from Community Shopping Center (CSC) and Industrial (I) to Planned Unit Development (PUD), the 159.8029 acres being described fully in three phases as follows: PH-1 – 14.9959 acres (5.414 acres and 9.5819 acres); PH-2 – 34.3288 acres (9.5455 acres, 15.0371 acres and 9.742 acres); and PH-3 – 110.4782 acres as more fully described in the backup materials. Seconded by Commissioner Tom Hinckley.**

Dan Rucker said to imagine dramatic points of entry and perimeter landscaping creating a very attractive wrapping. He said the private interior would be a mix of users who would all participate in a Property Owner Association. Rucker said he wants to present a comprehensive plan and not be bothering the commission for a variance with each circumstance.

Sasson said he appreciates the previous developments by Rucker. Sasson said the PUD does not have any detail on the proposed development but asks to relax all of the city ordinances for development including setbacks, building height, screening, landscaping, parking, oil well setbacks, uses, etc. He said the PUD is basically asking for free reign and is too broad.

Rucker explained the 100-foot building height was for a possible mid to high rise apartment complex on Phase 1. He said the multi-family use has since been removed from the PUD request and he would be willing to revise the building height, as well. Rucker also said the PUD would allow for future development to be cohesive and that it is premature to have plans for the future development, at this time. Sasson said he cannot support a PUD that is asking purely for relief from the city codes without a plan for the future development.

Hinckley stated the city puts a lot of effort into creating ordinances. He said the commission needs to apply those ordinances consistently across the city. Hinckley said the developer asking for one or two exceptions for specific reasons would be a more reasonable request. Hinckley said the three phase development that is not contiguous, and without plans for two of the phases, is just awkward.

Rucker stated Phase 2 would consist of Type A office buildings being attractive on the front and allowing for roll-up doors on the rear. Rucker showed a rendering of a similar product. Sasson stated this PUD is conceptual and the renderings being shown are not binding. Sasson said the only binding part of the PUD is to relax and lower development standards.

Clark described the proposed PUD as audacious. He said the properties are not even contiguous. Clark stated Phase 2 is closer to being passable but the PUD is premature.

Matranga said he agrees that the area needs development and that Mr. Rucker has developed nice things in the past. Matranga further stated the PUD zone change will run with the land regardless of who owns or develops the property and things could change in an instant. Matranga explained the commission is there to look after the best interest of the community and not the "highest and best use" of an individual developer. He said Mr. Rucker is asking for a lot of exceptions, even writing his own Permitted Use Table. Matranga said there is not enough detail. Matranga said the zoning ordinance also has specific criteria for when a Planned Unit Development is appropriate and this proposal does not meet the threshold.

Matranga asked Harbin to explain some of the differences between the city ordinances and the proposed PUD. Harbin said the setbacks have been decreased and the building height has been increased from a maximum of 40-feet tall to 100-feet tall. She said the lots have no minimum depths or widths. Harbin stated the Community Overlay District (COD) normally extends to within 300-feet of a major thoroughfare and the PUD is requesting 150-foot depth instead.

Rucker said an industrial park should not have to screen against commercial buildings or industrial uses. He mentioned underground power lines are cumbersome. Matranga stated the COD requirements extend to much more than screening and that removing the requirement defeats the goal of the COD.

Rucker stated he could revise the PUD but would not be ready by the next commission meeting. Harbin said the commission must make a recommendation to city council at the next meeting if the item is tabled at this meeting. Harbin stated since Industry Park 2 is the immediate concern for the developer, it would be faster to process a commercial site plan for that portion of the development. She said the commission has the leeway and authority to consider alternate landscaping,

screening, and parking requirements. Sasson asked if the property was zoned properly already. Rucker replied the zoning for Industry Park 2 is not the issue but the required setbacks does not work for this plan.

****Vice-Chairman Sasson moved to amend his motion and table the item. Commissioner Hinckley seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

6. Consideration and possible action regarding future Planning and Zoning Commission meeting dates

- A. Regular Meeting - Thursday, March 25, 2021
Regular Meeting - Thursday, April 8, 2021

7. Communications

- A. From Commissioners - suggestions for future agenda items, general comments and/or updates from liaison assignments

Clark said he attended the Galveston County Consolidated Drainage District meeting where they approved the plans for Avalon Section 1.

- B. From Planning Subcommittee – update on tasks

- C. From Ordinance Subcommittee – update on tasks

- D. From City Council Liaison, Robert Griffon - general comments and communication from City Council

Councilperson Hanks announced city council approved a resolution to waive permit fees for ice storm repairs. She said Spring Sparkle would be coming up after Easter. Hanks said the city has several classes being offered including building fairy houses. She also mentioned a new fairy house was being dedicated tomorrow in Stevenson Park. Hanks told the commission Coach Harris passed away over the weekend and that he will be missed. She said he is the first teacher she met when joining Fisd.

- E. From Staff - DRC Report for February 2021, commercial and residential project updates, City Council action and ordinance updates

Harbin said the February DRC report was sent out and that development meetings are starting to pick back up. Harbin said she and Commissioner Perry presented the draft Future Land Use Map to both CEDC and GCCDD.

8. Adjournment

This meeting was adjourned at 09:05 PM.