



# CITY OF BELLAIRE TEXAS

## PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MARCH 11, 2014

---

**Council Chamber**

**Regular Session**

**6:00 PM**

---

**7008 S. RICE AVENUE  
BELLAIRE, TX 77401**

### **I. CALL TO ORDER AND ANNOUNCEMENT OF QUORUM**

Chairman Frazier called the meeting to order at 6:12 PM. He announced that a quorum was present, consisting of the following members:

**Chairman Win Frazier  
Vice Chairman Bill Thorogood  
Commissioner Wayne Alderman  
Commissioner Paul Simmons  
Commissioner Dirk Stiggins**

**Commissioners Skinner and Steinberg** were absent from the proceedings.

The following staff members were also present:

**Director of Community Development, John McDonald  
Development Services Manager, Shawn Cox  
Planning & Zoning Secretary, Ashley Parcus**

### **II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM PAST MEETINGS**

- a. Planning and Zoning Commission - Regular Session - Feb 11, 2014 6:00 PM

Vice Chairman Thorogood provided the Commissioners with a handout listing all his suggested changes to the minutes.

Chairman Frazier suggested that the Commission postpone approval of the minutes until the next meeting due to the substantive changes that Vice Chairman Thorogood was proposing and the absence of two commission members.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>TABLED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Paul Simmons, Commissioner
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Bill Thorogood, Vice Chairman
<b>AYES:</b>	Frazier, Thorogood, Simmons, Alderman, Stiggins
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Steinberg, Skinner

### **III. REMINDER TO CITIZENS DESIRING TO ADDRESS THE COMMISSION**

Chairman Frazier reminded any member of the public who wished to address the Commission to fill out a sign in sheet.

### **IV. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Persons at the meeting who have indicated their desire to be heard on matters of general interest to the Commission by submitting the form provided shall have three minutes to present their comments. The**

**Commission is not permitted to fully discuss, debate, or consider items that are not on the agenda. Questions presented to the Commission may be referred to staff.**

**Ann Wallace**-Ms. Wallace read her comment to the Commission:

"The proposed parking lot is a horrible idea-Laurel will become inundated with traffic-Why not retain the parking lot on South Rice? Having worked for HISD, I am not surprised that it would propose something unreasonable!"

**Leslie Little**-Ms. Little voiced her concerns regarding the proposed site plan for the new Condit Elementary School. She stated that she has been a part of Condit and the school's evolution since 1999 and has been on various boards and committees, including the construction of the current Condit park. Ms. Little added that the planning committee did not solicit input from the neighbors that live near the school, and not until a resident walked around with a petition did the neighbors learn of the progress of the project and the site plan proposal. She pointed out that during the construction of Condit park, the decision was made to have the parking on South Rice so that all parties connected to the site could use the parking lot without disruption to homes. Ms. Little was concerned with an increase in safety issues, and asked the Planning & Zoning Commission to pay careful attention to the site plan for Condit Elementary.

**Lynn McBee**-Ms. McBee stated that she has been able to obtain, with little or no difficulty, information concerning the HISD bond program, and that there is a separate website through which the public can see when the community hearings are being held. She added that it is the job of the city to explain to residents the process through which specific use permits are reviewed/considered. She assured the residents that there will potentially be two public hearings, one in front of the Planning & Zoning Commission, and if approved, another with City Council. Ms. McBee stated that information is readily available and encouraged any interested residents to become familiar with the facts. Finally, Ms. McBee mentioned the proposed changes to the parking requirements and that she did not see the information that the Commission had requested included in the agenda packet.

**Mark Sass**-Mr. Sass informed the Commission that he and his wife moved to Bellaire in 1990 and are proud citizens of the community. He added that in his opinion, the proposed plans for the school seem very anti neighborhood. Mr. Sass mentioned the current Condit parking lot and explained that he and his wife were upset when it went in because they lost their access through to South Rice. He stated that they eventually learned to like the green space that it provided, but in this instance he would be looking at a parking lot instead. Mr. Sass wanted to make sure that the Commission realizes that putting a parking lot on 3rd Street is going to funnel traffic into the neighborhood. He also asked where the churchgoers are going to park when construction begins. Mr. Sass stated that it is great that the school is there, but that he doesn't like the traffic that comes with it.

**Molly McGee**-Ms. McGee read her comment:

"I'm here to address a 66 space parking lot that is proposed on 3rd Street and its negative affect on traffic flow, the safety of our children and residents, and the aesthetics of a campus at the edge of a residential community that shares joint-use parking with the city. In my opinion, I believe the current proposed parking on 3rd Street will increase traffic within the residential areas between Jessamine and Linden during school days and with any community event. Children that play on our sidewalks and streets and residents may be at an increased risk of a traffic event with this

increase. HISD has suggested that getting the carpool line off of 3rd Street and into the parking lot will make crossing surrounding streets safer for the children and decrease the number of cars parked along Jessamine, Willow, Laurel, and Linden at pickup/drop off. In my opinion, parking on 3rd Street will not enhance the safety of Condit children. Children will still need to cross the street and will still need to pass in front of cars in the carpool line and cars accessing the parking. Decreased traffic and parking along Jessamine and Linden at school pickup and drop off times will not be taken care of either. Please look at page 2 and consider three points regarding the current proposed plan and communicate any changes to HISD, or consider them before the HISD plan is proposed:

1. Leave the current parking at the corner of Linden and S. Rice
2. Leave the proposed parking at the corner of Jessamine and S. Rice
3. Delete the proposed parking lot along 3rd St. and have only minimal parking by the main entrance to the administrative building.

I received a call from Dan Bankhead, from HISD last week because he had heard that there was community concern over the site plan. Condit Elementary's "Guiding Principles," which they presented at the last community meeting, include "Community Based-Condit is a neighborhood school in which our community is invested. Our new school will demonstrate this community connection." His understanding was that there had been community involvement along the way, and in my opinion, not effectively. Few residents have known, or had the opportunity to learn about the involvement of the process. Over the past two weeks, the residences that I have talked to have just become aware of the proposed parking lot on 3rd Street and are considerably concerned about the negative affects on traffic, safety, and aesthetics. Our neighbor, who is a Condit mom and on the HISD Community Committee still feels that the safety of the children has not been addressed successfully. I would like to address the joint-use agreement and Ordinance 03-095, which defines the property in the joint-use agreement as South Rice Avenue on the west, Linden on the north, 3rd Street on the east, and Laurel on the south. "HISD agrees to construct a playground and surface parking facility on the property and in general accordance to the plan attached as Exhibit A." Modifying this plan will require an agreement between the city and HISD. With collaboration between the city, HISD, and the community as HISD intended, modification can be avoided. Has HISD considered options? HISD stated reasoning for the current site plan, hence necessitating modification of the agreement, is to maintain the students on the campus during construction. This is a paramount concern by all, but it can be done. HISD may have considered options in the community if the community had been made aware of the plans and been allowed to offer feedback over the last one and half years instead of the past two weeks. How can HISD do this with keeping the agreement active as it is? An aerial view shows that the campus cafeteria sits entirely on the proposed parking lot. This structure could be maintained during construction, with a phase approach to construction, and students would utilize temporary classrooms for possibly as little as one semester. This would also allow use of the current parking lot on South Rice and Linden by the city and school to keep the parking off of the residential streets. Changing the proposed parking along 3rd Street is very important to the community, so is the possibility of maintaining Condit's footprint as is. I would like to present this option to HISD for consideration without jeopardizing the joint-use agreement between HISD and the city, and ask for the support of the Planning & Zoning Board and other city entities during this process."

**Karin Diaz**-Ms. Diaz stated that she has lived on Laurel Street for the past 18 years. She informed the Commission that when she moved in, prior to the construction of the park, she could turn left out of her driveway and go straight through to South Rice. She added that she felt as though a park was a nice option, and thought that it might even

cut down on traffic. She said that the traffic has not decreased at all. Ms. Diaz pointed out that putting a parking lot there will automatically make Laurel a shortcut to 610. She added that she works at a private school in the Galleria area and that they just built a new school. She explained that they have two parking lots that bump up to the residential street, and that one of those lots has a gate going out to the street, but is kept closed and is for emergency use only. She stated that the school did this in order to be good neighbors to the surrounding residential community, and is asking that HISD be good neighbors as well. She ended by saying that she feels cheated by the city that she was not informed of HISD's plans, and that the children's safety should be the top priority.

**Pat McHugh**-Mrs. McHugh informed the Commission that she has lived at 4916 Laurel since 1975 and over the years has seen a great number of changes. She added that the most recent change was the develop of the park on the north side of the school. Mrs. McHugh explained that during the week her street is flooded with cars that use it as a parking lot in order to drop their children off. She stated that they park over the driveways, making it very difficult to get out of their house. Mrs. McHugh also mentioned that the facilities are used on the weekends and if the parking lot is moved to the 3rd Street side those individuals will have no other way to access the lot other than using Linden, Laurel, Willow and Jessamine. She felt that HISD has other options that would be more neighborhood friendly, and that residents were not given enough information by HISD. Mrs. McHugh asked that the commission consider asking them to reconsider the location of the parking lot for the benefit of the residents that live on those streets.

#### **V. CURRENT BUSINESS (ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND/OR POSSIBLE ACTION)**

- a. Discussion, consideration, and possible action on proposed amendments to the Code of Ordinances of the City of Bellaire; Chapter 24; Planning & Zoning Regulations, Section 24-501, Districts Established, to delete references to old zoning districts and include newly created districts; Section 24-514a, Parking in Commercial and Mixed-Use Districts, to include references to new zoning districts and to amend parking requirements in commercial/mixed-use area; 24-531, R-1 Residential District, D (2) a) churches and b) schools; 24-532, R-3 Residential District, C (2) a) churches and b) schools; 24-533, R-4 Residential District, C (2) a) churches and b) schools; 24-534, R-5 Residential District, C (2) a) churches and b) schools; and 24-535, R-MF Residential Multi-Family District, F (2) a) churches and b) schools, to delete standard regulations for churches and schools, and to include a new section within Article V. Zoning Regulations, Division 1, Zoning Districts and Regulations of General Applicability, to identify consistent standard regulations for churches and schools for all residential districts.

Chairman Frazier introduced the item.

Mr. McDonald stated that the Commission held a public hearing on this matter on February 11, 2014. He added that the consensus was fine on deleting the old districts from Section 24-501 and replacing them with the new districts, but that there were some questions regarding the parking. Specifically, the Commission asked to look at a side by side comparison of the schools' current parking numbers versus the proposed numbers, which had been provided for the Commission prior to the meeting. Mr. McDonald pointed out that Condit and Bellaire High School will be rebuilt in the near future, and that Pin Oak was completed around 2004. He stated that it will be another 25-30 years before HISD comes in to rebuild a school. Mr. McDonald mentioned that the Mandarin School is being relocated to Houston and that he doesn't feel that a new school will be built there based on the limitations involved with that property. He explained that the biggest difference in the current

versus proposed numbers is with Bellaire High School. Where they are currently required to have 445 spaces, 1000 spaces will be required under the proposed rules. Mr. McDonald pointed out that another big change was with Pin Oak Middle School, which jumped from the current requirement of 151 spaces to the proposed requirement of 223 spaces. He stated that currently their lot is 80% full with everyday usage, and in his opinion could use some additional parking, however, he felt that 223 spaces is too high of a requirement. He suggested taking out the provision requiring 1 space for each classroom and simply going with the strict 1 to 7, which would require 171 spaces instead of the 223. Mr. McDonald pointed out that Horn Elementary currently has quite a bit of parking, and that their requirement would be reduced with the proposed changes. He explained that the additional parking spaces help with the baseball field and park traffic, but that providing parking spaces for those venues is not really the school district's responsibility. Mr. McDonald then informed the Commission that Condit Elementary's current requirement is 81 spaces, and that they only have approximately 54 onsite parking spaces at this time. He added that the proposal would require the school to provide 97 parking spaces. Mr. McDonald then stated that a discussion had come up during the public hearing with regards to grocery stores and grand fathering. He reiterated that any current store, or store who sold out to another grocery chain but left the building intact would be grand fathered, and no additional parking would be required. He explained that a change in occupancy or a rebuilding would cause the proposed rules to kick in. Mr. McDonald added that the proposed 1 to 5 requirement for grocery stores is the same as in Houston and he feels that it is a more appropriate number. He stated that grand fathering the use would defeat the purpose of raising the requirement.

Vice Chairman Thorogood asked what Horn and Condit's expected populations would be.

Mr. McDonald stated that Horn was built to hold 750 students and Condit will be built to hold the same number.

Vice Chairman Thorogood asked why their required parking numbers were different if the population will be the same.

Mr. McDonald explained that the calculation is also based on the number of classrooms, of which Horn has 7 more.

**Motion:** A motion was made by Vice Chairman Thorogood and seconded by Commissioner Alderman to approve the proposed parking changes.

Vice Chairman Thorogood asked about the joint-use of schools and parks.

Mr. McDonald explained that the entire site of Horn Elementary is owned by HISD and that they have an agreement with the city, who then has an agreement with Bellaire Little League. He added that the facilities have been built predominately by the little league. Mr. McDonald informed the Commission that during school hours those facilities are reserved to be used by the school only, and can be used by other groups after school hours and on the weekends.

Vice Chairman Thorogood mentioned Feld Park.

Mr. McDonald explained that Feld Park is owned by the city and is treated differently than the joint-use agreement at Horn.

Vice Chairman Thorogood asked Mr. McDonald if he knew the size of the parks in terms of coverage or volume that are in the joint-use agreements. He added that the size would determine the weekend traffic.

Mr. McDonald pointed out that government related activities are not included in the chart, and staff cannot require HISD to put in additional parking spaces for uses that are not theirs.

Commissioner Stiggins mentioned all of the public comments regarding Condit Elementary's parking situation and that only 16 parking spaces are being added to the requirement.

Mr. McDonald explained that 16 spaces are being added to what is needed, but that's still 43 more spaces than what they currently have onsite.

Commissioner Stiggins asked if city staff had gotten any complaints from residents that about shopping centers about employees or customers parking in their neighborhood.

Mr. McDonald stated that it is hard to pin point the business that is creating the parking problem in a shopping center with multiple uses present. He mentioned that the idea behind the proposal is to set a standard requirement, that will control what types of uses are allowable in each shopping center based on how many parking spaces are available. He added that applicants always have the option of coming before the Board of Adjustment to request a special exception to reduce the number of required parking spaces.

Commissioner Stiggins asked if there is a difference between a strip center in the middle of the city versus a strip center located on the edge of the city.

Mr. McDonald explained that in the more central business areas the overflow is unnoticeable because the parking overflows into other commercial areas. He added that there is more of a concern with shopping centers located on the edges of the city where the overflow parking tends to occur in the surrounding neighborhoods.

Chairman Frazier asked what would be considered a "norm" for general office use.

Commissioner Alderman stated that most lenders and developers would consider 3 spaces per 1000 square feet as a minimum standard, but most will provide more parking than that in order to accommodate their tenants.

Mr. McDonald pointed out that most of Bellaire's commercial properties are already built out, and that these proposals are really dealing with renovations and remodeling. He added that the parking requirement for office is not one that the city has ever seen a problem with.

Commissioner Alderman felt that the 5 spaces per 1000 square feet for grocery stores is appropriate, but asked for clarification on when grand fathering would come into play.

Mr. McDonald explained that as long as a grocery store comes into an existing building they would be grand fathered under the current regulations and will not require more parking. It is only with the demolition of the current building and construction of a new one that the proposed requirements would kick in.

Commissioner Alderman agreed with that proposal.

Mr. McDonald stated that no current business owner within the City of Bellaire will be affected by the change, unless an expansion is done.

Commissioner Alderman mentioned the side by side comparison chart that the Commission had received with regards to the current versus proposed parking requirements for schools and asked Mr. McDonald to explain what the "Assembly" numbers were referring to.

Mr. McDonald stated that those are the number of parking spaces that would be required under the current code, based on the size of the assembly areas.

Commissioner Simmons asked Mr. McDonald if he was comfortable with the proposed numbers as they apply to his experience.

Mr. McDonald felt that the numbers were appropriate.

Vice Chairman Thorogood questioned whether the City of Bellaire would run the grocery stores out by increasing the required number of parking spaces. He wondered if Bellaire should offer an incentive to keep grocery stores in town.

Commissioner Alderman stated that if the rules in Houston are the same as what is being proposed in Bellaire then it should not impact the location of the store.

Mr. McDonald explained that the Commission could change the number to 4 per 1000 square feet and include grocery stores in with general retail if they wished to do so. However, he added that grocery stores are going to build to what they need to accommodate their customers. He cautioned the Commission on changing the proposal to 4 per 1000 and allowing a grocery store to come in without sufficient parking. He reminded the Commission that applicants are always welcome to go before the Board of Adjustment to ask for a reduction in the number of required spaces.

Vice Chairman Thorogood asked if Starbucks is under the current parking requirements.

Mr. McDonald stated that he was not employed by the City of Bellaire when the Starbucks went in and is not sure why it was allowed to be located where it is. He added that although it is a crowded area, the Starbucks is very successful and there have been no complaints.

Vice Chairman Thorogood mentioned that the requirement for community colleges is 1 per every 5 students plus 1 for every 3 employees and the high school requirement is simply 1 per every 3 students. He asked why there is a difference in those requirements.

Mr. McDonald stated that the requirement for colleges is taking into account all employees as well as students. He added that community colleges typically have smaller classrooms than high schools.

Vice Chairman Thorogood disagreed and stated that he doesn't see any difference.

Mr. McDonald pointed out that the City of Bellaire has not had this use on the books at all, and stated that the Commission could change it to 1 per every 3 students if they wished to do so.

**Amended Motion:** an amended motion was made by Vice Chairman Thorogood and seconded by Commissioner Simmons to change the requirement for colleges, universities, and trade schools from 1 per every 3 employees plus 1 for every 5 students to 1 per every 3 students.

**Vote on the Amended Motion:** the amended motion carried on a unanimous vote of 5-0.

The vote on the original motion to approve the proposed parking requirements is as follows:

(Requested by John McDonald, Community Development)

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>ADOPTED AS AMENDED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Bill Thorogood, Vice Chairman
<b>SECONDER:</b>	E. Wayne Alderman, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Frazier, Thorogood, Simmons, Alderman, Stiggins
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Steinberg, Skinner

- b. Discussion with the City Attorney regarding Specific Use Permits and Planned Developments in the City of Bellaire.

Attorney Barner began the presentation by giving the definitions of a planned development and a specific use permit found in Section 24-202 of the City of Bellaire Code of Ordinances. He explained that planned developments are not a question of use, but of regulations defined by the code. Attorney Barner stated that specific use permits deal with uses that are not necessarily incompatible, but could cause harm if not watched, and gave the example of a drive-thru at a bank. He mentioned that the more common examples of a specific use permit are schools and churches within residential districts. Attorney Barner added that if someone wanted to come in and apply for a permit for a use in an area that is completely unallowable they would still have the right to do so, however, the Commission would at that point have the authority to deny the permit. Mr. McDonald explained that a specific use permit is basically a special exception but for uses; the use would work within a residential area, but because of their type, size, etc. the city needs to take a look at them in greater detail. He added that there is a section of the code on planned developments that gives a reason for their existence: to give greater flexibility and opportunity in the planning and development of residential projects that serve to upgrade and enhance existing residential neighborhoods while responding to current market trends in housing. Mr. McDonald stated that it allows someone to come in and pitch an idea that would otherwise not be approved under the city's regulations. He used a box as an example of what zoning does to a property and stated that a planned development provides the applicant with a larger box to work within. Mr. McDonald pointed out that a planned development is essentially the rezoning of a property, which gives flexibility to the developer while all of the control still lies with the city. Attorney Barner pointed the Commission towards Section 24-504, and urged the members to review the revisions of the ordinance ahead of time when preparing to vote on a planned development application. He noted that whether it be a planned development or a specific use permit there are certain criteria that must be included within the application that is submitted to the city. The application for a planned development must include:



1. Applicant information
2. Legal property description
3. Statement of ownership/title report
4. Detailed description of proposed development
5. Site plan (Sec. 24-524)
6. Other information as may be needed

Mr. McDonald added that the site plan has always been a requirement, but the required detail level was greatly enhanced through the UV-T process.

The application for a specific use permit must include:

1. Section authorizing specific use
2. Legal property description
3. Statement of ownership/title report
4. Detailed description of proposed use
5. Environmental assessment (impact)
6. Other information as may be needed

Attorney Barner explained that the application will first be reviewed by staff, who will then bring it before the Commission in the form of a public hearing. He added that consideration of the application will happen either at the same meeting, or at the next month's meeting, and if approved, will be sent, with the recommendation from the Commission, to the City Council where they will hold a public hearing as well. Attorney Barner mentioned that the Commission and the Council's standards for review and approval of both a planned development and a specific use permit are the same. These include:

1. Consistent with Comprehensive Plan
2. Minimize adverse effects on nearby properties
3. Will not negatively affect neighboring property values
4. Will not burden city facilities and services
5. Applicant has the financial and technical capacity to complete the project

Mr. McDonald informed the Commission that when staff receives an application the first thing that they look at are the pertinent sections in the code to ensure that the minimum information required is included. He added that after staff's review, the application will typically be sent to other departments, such as, public works, the police department, and maybe the fire marshal to review the drainage and security aspects of the proposal.

Chairman Frazier asked if the applicant is made aware that the commissioners may ask additional questions regarding the project.

Mr. McDonald confirmed that the applicant is aware of this, and that staff does their best to break down and address certain issues that are always present with those types of applications. He added that the application is sent to the city's attorneys as well. Mr. McDonald informed the Commission that signs are also posted by the applicant, which list the details of the public hearing, and where residents can get more information regarding the application.

Commissioner Stiggins asked if it possible for a specific use permit to have a time limitation.

Mr. McDonald explained that the Commission could technically put a time limit on a project if they wished to so do, but would have to be careful with state entities like schools. He stated that parameters can be set to require an applicant to come back and amend the SUP if certain changes/expansions are made. Mr. McDonald added that specific use permits granted for commercial uses tend to include more conditions, but he doesn't recall any that were assigned a time limit.

Attorney Barner pointed out that over the years, the Commission has considered a variety of conditions to place on permits. He simply asked that the conditions be reasonable, rational, and pertain to the actual specific use rather than the allowable use.

Chairman Frazier mentioned that the time frame of the project always seems to be one of the questions asked of the applicant, but in reality the Community Development Department is who follows up on that. He added that it is irrelevant unless, for some reason, the Commission has specified a certain time frame that the project must be completed in.

Attorney Barner agreed that in some instances it takes a significant amount of time to complete a project, especially with the standards that they are required to operate under.

Vice Chairman Thorogood asked if there were any specific use permits that would expire due to the adoption of the new UV-D and CMU zoning districts.

Mr. McDonald stated that there should not be any that expire, and added that any uses that were considered specific before will still be considered specific, even with the adoption of the new zoning regulations.

Vice Chairman Thorogood mentioned that some of the specific use permits have been granted with a condition stating that a change in ownership would cause the permit to expire. He asked how the city validates the conditions of specific use permits.

Mr. McDonald explained that the city started including, as a condition, a requirement for an annual statement from the SUP holders saying that the conditions have been met. He added that staff follows up on the recent specific use permits, but that there are several older permits that staff is not as familiar with. Mr. McDonald informed the Commission that there are about 30 active specific use permits within the city, and staff deals with them as they can.

Vice Chairman Thorogood asked if a survey is required to be submitted for a specific use permit.

Mr. McDonald stated that a survey is typically something that staff requires under "other information as may be needed." He and Attorney Barner pointed out that it may be included within the title report, and sometimes the legal description will include somewhat of a survey.

Vice Chairman Thorogood felt that a survey should always be requested of the applicant.

(Requested by John McDonald, Community Development)

## **VI. COMMITTEE REPORTS**

There were no committee reports.

**VII. CORRESPONDENCE**

Vice Chairman Thorogood informed the Commission that he had the opportunity to meet with the City Manager of Southside Place regarding the redevelopment of the Shell site on Bellaire Boulevard. He stated that they are presently building 35-40 new single family residences on that site, 5 unit attached town homes in groups of 5 along Bellaire Boulevard, with single family homes on the back side. Vice Chairman Thorogood added that the developer involved with this project is the same one that is working on Alder Circle in Bellaire. He stated that they are also expecting some mixed-use developments to be included and have set a cap on the size of the first floor retail of those developments. Vice Chairman Thorogood told the Commission that he would try to get a copy of the set of rules that are in place for the project.

**VIII. REQUESTS FOR NEW BUSINESS, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMENTS****A. Staff liaison report on the status of projects previously addressed by the commission as well as projects for future meetings.**

Mr. McDonald told the Commission that the zoning package for the UV-D and CMU was passed by Council with a 5-2 vote. He informed them of two changes that were made to the proposal:

- The 15% of allowable multi-family in the CMU was reduced to 10%.
- On properties that have alleys, the setback slope does not start until after that alley.

He added that the only street with an active alley behind it is the 5800 block of Linden.

Mr. McDonald also told the Commission that the public hearing for the Condit Elementary SUP will be on the April 8th agenda. He added that signage is required to be up on March 24th and notices will be mailed out later that week to every resident within 200 feet of the property, as well as posted on the city's website.

Commissioner Alderman asked if there was any way for the Commission to get those plans earlier than normal.

Mr. McDonald stated that as soon as the other departments are finished reviewing the materials staff will get the packet together and provide that to the Commission.

Chairman Frazier asked if there were any joint public hearings in the near future.

Mr. McDonald stated that it is typically the mayor's preference not to have joint public hearings in order to allow the public two chances to speak. He added that this only occurs in instances where there is a time constraint involved with the project.

Vice Chairman Thorogood thanked City Council and Mr. McDonald on all the work done regarding the zoning changes to Downtown and the Bissonnet Corridor.

Chairman Frazier agreed, and thanked Mr. Mitchell from Kendig Keast Collaborative as well.

**B. The Chairman shall recognize any Commissioner who wishes to bring New Business to the attention of the Commission. Consideration of New Business shall be for the limited purpose of determining whether the matter is appropriate for inclusion of a future Agenda of the Commission or for the referral to staff for investigation**

Commissioner Simmons asked if the schedule for Larch Lane had been looked at again.

Mr. McDonald explained that it is on staff's to-do list, but that parking was the first priority due to the fact that it is tied to the zoning regulations that were just passed. He pointed out that there has already been one lot replatted on Larch Lane, and another will be brought to the Commission at the April meeting, meaning that development is occurring as is. Mr. McDonald stated that this is something that staff has to take into consideration in order to decide if the proposal still fits in with what is currently happening on Larch.

**IX. ADJOURNMENT**

**Motion:** a motion was made by Vice Chairman Thorogood and seconded by Commissioner Simmons to adjourn the regular meeting.

**Vote:** the motion carried on a unanimous vote of 5-0.

**The meeting was adjourned at 8:06 PM.**