



**CITY OF FRIENDSWOOD
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
THURSDAY, MARCH 25, 2021 - 7:00 PM**

Minutes

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

STATE OF TEXAS
CITY OF FRIENDSWOOD
COUNTIES OF GALVESTON/HARRIS
MARCH 25, 2021

REGULAR MEETING

1. Call to order

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE FRIENDSWOOD PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION THAT WAS HELD ON THURSDAY, MARCH 25, 2021, AT 07:03 PM 910 S. FRIENDSWOOD DRIVE, FRIENDSWOOD, TEXAS, FRIENDSWOOD CITY HALL, COUNCIL CHAMBERS

CHAIRMAN JOSEPH MATRANGA
VICE-CHAIRMAN RICHARD SASSON
COMMISSIONER MARCUS PERRY
COMMISSIONER RICHARD CLARK
COMMISSIONER TOM HINCKLEY
COMMISSIONER TRAVIS MANN
COMMISSIONER LISA LUNDQUIST
COUNCIL LIAISON ROBERT GRIFFON
CITY ATTORNEY MARY KAY FISCHER
DIRECTOR OF CDD/PLANNER AUBREY HARBIN
DEVELOPMENT COORDINATOR BECKY BENNETT

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.)

No comments.

3. 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 or citizen so requests in which case the item would be removed from the consent agenda and considered separately.

a. Minutes for the regular meeting held Thursday, March 11, 2021

**Vice-Chairman Richard Sasson moved to approve Minutes for the regular meeting held Thursday, March 11, 2021. Seconded by Commissioner Richard Clark. The motion was approved unanimously.

4. Action Items

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 or citizen so requests in which case the item would be removed from the consent agenda and considered separately.

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

*Item Tabled on March 11, 2021

**Commissioner Tom Hinckley moved to remove the site plan for Friendswood Shopping Center to be located at 106 Whispering Pines Ave from the table.

Seconded by Vice-Chairman Richard Sasson. The motion was approved unanimously.

Harbin said the applicant emailed a rendering of the rear of the building and is here to answer any questions.

Hinckley asked if consideration was given to saving the large tree in the parking lot. Smile

Bathla/TBH Holding Group said because of the layout of the property, the tree could not be kept.

Hinckley asked what type of trees the applicant is proposing. Sasson said it gets hot and shade trees would be preferable.

Hinckley asked if the existing building would be upgraded. Bathla said not at this time and there is a business in that building that is doing very well.

AJ/LED Design Builders explained the rear elevation would have two-toned towers in contrasting color plus a screening wall with climbing plants. Sasson said this will be the view coming into Friendswood and was pleased there will be trees on that side of the building.

Sasson asked if there are any proposed tenants for the new building. Bathla answered they are targeting medical and retail but do have a contract for Dear Donut Man to take the end cap with the drive thru. Bathla said this will be his fourth location.

b. Consideration and possible action regarding a recommendation to City Council regarding an AMENDED request for a zone classification change located along FM

2351 consisting of 34.3288 acres to change from Community Shopping Center (CSC) and Industrial (I) to Planned Unit Development (PUD), the 34.3288 acres consisting of three tracts (9.5455 acres, 15.0371 acres and 9.742 acres) as more fully described in the backup materials. (Original Request was to change zoning 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)

*Item Tabled on March 11, 2021

**Commissioner Marcus Perry moved to remove the AMENDED request for a zone classification change located along FM 2351 consisting of 34.3288 acres to change from Community Shopping Center (CSC) and Industrial (I) to Planned Unit Development (PUD) from the table. Seconded by Vice-Chairman Richard Sasson. The motion was approved unanimously.

Harbin stated the application has been amended and reduced down to 34 acres, removing phase 1 and phase 3 from the application. She said the applicant amended the permitted uses and narrowed the project down to three phases within Panhandle 2. One phase is for The Commons at Timber Creek to allow CSC and LI uses. Phases two and three are for Industry Park Sections 1, 2, 3 that would allow LI and I uses. If the City amends the Permitted Use Table (PUT), the PUD uses would change with the PUT. She said they also removed the previous parking amendments but added two new categories for warehousing/storage parking. Harbin concluded the applicant included the rest of the site plan and additional building elevations with this amended PUD.

Stephanie Canady/Coastal Bend Engineering said they made changes to the PUD following comments received from the last commission meeting. She said they began discussing platting towards the end of 2020 which started revealing development issues that could not be addressed with variances. She said the desired development standards grew into a PUD for the Panhandle project. Canady explained they tried to incorporate their neighbors into the plan but the neighbors are not far enough along with their own plans at this time.

Canaday stated the PUD is designed to create a comprehensive plan of mixed uses with Industry Park in the rear of the property. She said one issue the developer is having is that professional offices are not allowed uses in an Industrial zoning district. She said there is an existing business, PE Squared, that cannot lease their extra space to a lawyer, etc. because of the zoning classification. Matranga asked if there is another way to handle the permitted uses. Harbin said if it is a recurring issue, the city can vote to change the zoning ordinance to allow different uses in different zoning districts. Canady said they also want to allow Industrial uses and Light Industrial uses, not just one or the other. She stated the area that is being called The Commons is meant to blend commercial and industrial uses. She said the Type A concept building elevation would be used to tie retail and industrial uses, having an engaging front and simplistic back.

Canady said the site plan, as presented, is a worst case scenario with limited retail up front. Canady said they would prefer more retail tenants but, in a post covid environment, they are unsure of tenants.

Canady explained they are trying to be proactive by establishing lower parking requirements (covid, self driving cars) for type A development. She said they will have a Property Owner's Association and would like the POA to be in charge of their own parking.

Canady stated they asked for a reduction in the limits of the Community Overlay District from 300' to 150'. She said the current COD would impact Industry Park 2 and makes it difficult for industrial activity to be efficient. She said the businesses in front of the development are a gas station and an auto repair shop that do not have COD landscaping. She further explained they want to avoid screening between commercial and industrial uses.

Canady said they used the zero foot setbacks from the Downtown District as a limit to what is acceptable by the city. She said they liked the flexibility, as typical setbacks have lost their purpose for the developer. She said the increase in the lighting requirement is necessary for security.

Perry commented that a POA dictating parking would be a nightmare. He suggested targeting areas in the PUD instead of using a broad brush for setbacks and COD reductions. Perry said the major hurdle for him is the PUD could allow the entire area to be industrial with little or no retail users. Perry asked why they removed the screening requirement since they do not need to be protected from themselves; screening is for the adjacent properties.

Sasson said he wanted to reiterate his previous comments that he likes the developer but to approve a PUD that relaxes all the city standards is risky. He said the PUD is pretty egregious and he understands the lower standards would be better economics for the developer but a PUD cannot be used to circumvent city ordinances. Sasson repeated that lots of smart people put a lot of work into the city standards. He said uses are separated for a reason and that zoning goes with the land, not the developer.

Lundquist stated she loves what the PUD is trying to do and is in favor of making this plan realized.

Mann said he understands this area is different. He said the plan looks great but it is conceptual and the parking minimum requirements being established by a POA concerns him.

Hinckley said he likes the vision and that focusing on just the one tract is a better plan than before. Hinckley said with that being said, a lot of exceptions are still being asked for. He stated the developer is trying to override a lot of city codes that have been well thought out over the years. He said the Timber Creek Golf Course road already gets backed up and that is without new development. Canady said it only backs up during golf tournaments.

Clark commented the amended PUD has more meat on the bones than last time. Clark said he is still concerned about giving away things that have been put into code for various reasons, including to protect the city against development gone awry.

Matranga told the engineer that she can probably tell the commission is struggling. He said the city wants development to move forward, and he is appreciative of narrowing the plan down. Matranga summarized the developer ran into a couple road blocks, which added up, and the solution was to use a very broad brush to fix all the things they did not want to comply with. Matranga said the project could be better addressed one issue at a time, if or when they arise. Harbin said staff can help the developer work through solutions.

**Commissioner Marcus Perry moved to approve the AMENDED request for a zone classification change located along FM 2351 consisting of 34.3288 acres to change from Community Shopping Center (CSC) and Industrial (I) to Planned Unit Development (PUD) from the table. Seconded by Vice-Chairman Richard Sasson. The motion failed 2 for (Lundquist, Mann) and 5 against.

- c. Consideration and possible action regarding the Preliminary Plat of Georgetown Section 1, a subdivision of 15.071 acres located in the I&GN RR CO Survey, Block 1, Section 23, Abstract 624 Friendswood, Galveston County, Texas

**Vice-Chairman Richard Sasson moved to approve Consideration and possible action regarding the Preliminary Plat of Georgetown Section 1, a subdivision of 15.071 acres located in the I&GN RR CO Survey, Block 1, Section 23, Abstract 624 Friendswood, Galveston County, Texas. Seconded by Commissioner Tom Hinckley. The motion was approved unanimously.

- d. Consideration and possible action regarding the Preliminary Plat of Georgetown Boulevard Street Dedication Phase II being a subdivision of 2.139 acres located in the I&GN RR Co Survey, Block 1, Section 23, Abstract 624 and Hooper & Wade Survey, Section 22, Abstract 491, Friendswood, Galveston County, Texas

**Commissioner Tom Hinckley moved to approve Consideration and possible action regarding the Preliminary Plat of Georgetown Boulevard Street Dedication Phase II being a subdivision of 2.139 acres located in the I&GN RR Co Survey, Block 1, Section 23, Abstract 624 and Hooper & Wade Survey, Section 22, Abstract 491, Friendswood, Galveston County, Texas. Seconded by Commissioner Travis Mann. The motion was approved unanimously.

- e. Consideration and possible action regarding the Preliminary Plat of Georgetown Detention Basin Phase 1 a subdivision of 32.662 acres located in the I&GN RR Co Survey, Block 1, Section 23, Abstract 624 Friendswood, Galveston County, Texas

**Commissioner Tom Hinckley moved to approve Consideration and possible action regarding the Preliminary Plat of Georgetown Detention Basin Phase 1 a subdivision of 32.662 acres located in the I&GN RR Co Survey, Block 1, Section 23, Abstract 624 Friendswood, Galveston County, Texas. Seconded by Commissioner Marcus Perry. The motion was approved unanimously.

5. Communications

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

Hinckley mentioned the site plan recently approved, GC Orthodontist, has started on their foundation on North Friendswood Drive.

Sasson said Galveston County Consolidated Drainage District has moved enough dirt from Imperial Estates to account for 531 miles of trucks.

Lundquist said the Keep Friendswood Beautiful Spring Sparkle is coming up and they will be providing an electronics pick up. Lundquist announced she will be moving to Denver at the end of May. Matranga said if anyone is interested in volunteering, please fill out a form for the commission.

- b. From Planning Subcommittee – update on tasks

None.

- c. From Ordinance Subcommittee – update on tasks

None.

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

None.

- e. From Staff - commercial and residential project updates, City Council action and ordinance updates

Harbin said the next regular meetings would be held on April 8th and April 22nd.

6. Adjournment

This meeting was adjourned at 09:35 PM.