



**CITY OF BELLAIRE TEXAS**  
**AD HOC MUNICIPAL FACILITIES COMMITTEE**  
**DECEMBER 8, 2014**

**CenterPoint Energy  
Community Center**

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

**6:00 PM**

**REGULAR SESSION - 6:01 P.M.**

**A. Call to Order – Gus E. Pappas, Councilman.**

Gus E. Pappas, Councilman, called the Regular Session of the Ad Hoc Municipal Facilities Committee ("Committee") to order at 6:01 p.m. on Monday, December 8, 2014. He advised that a quorum of members were present as set forth below.

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Dolores Avioli	Member	Present	
Christopher Butler	Member	Present	
John Gabriel	Member	Present	
Chris Kaitson	Member	Absent	
Kristin Schuster	Member	Present	
Suzanne Shelby	Member	Absent	
Gus E. Pappas	Council Liaison	Present	

**B. Public Comments.**

Lynn McBee addressed the Committee on several matters. She finds the location of the back door and parking lot along S. Rice insulting to the traveling public. Her opinion is to have the building front S. Rice. She also suggested positioning the building to maintain the parking lot already there.

**C. Approval of Minutes.**

The committee reviewed and approved the minutes from the November 24 Regular meeting, with the following amendments.

**D. Review of Blocking Plans Regarding Big Idea Discussions.**

Mr. Jeff Gerber stated that at this meeting they would be presenting strategies and building schemes for the committee to react to.

Mr. Gerber outlined that the committee would be reviewing five (5) options for the layout of the City Hall/Municipal Courts building, and two (2) options for the layout of the Police Station.

Mr. Gerber discussed the blocking diagrams of the facilities, noting that they were not floor plans. In each option, Council Chambers, the municipal court, customer service area (including finance clerks and building permits), and the City Clerk will be located on the first floor. Community Development, Organizational Services, Finance, Human Resources, and IT will be located on the second floor.

Option 1 – This option has the primary entrance off of S. Rice Avenue, creating a large public lobby zone. There is an access point from Loftin Park.

Option 2 – There is a public lobby which is perpendicular to S. Rice, creating a better orientation to S. Rice, the parking lot, and the Great Lawn.

Option 3 – This option's internal lobby space has a linear organization which subdivides the building. The option ties together the site differently than the previous two options.

Option 4 – The building has been turned internally, with the lobby turned towards the interior of the site.

Option 5 – The building has been turned 90°. The lobby is oriented towards the Great Lawn. This creates a tighter connection to Loftin Park, but opens the sight up to the Great Lawn.

The following questions and comments were offered by the Committee members in response to the five (5) options shown.

Member Christopher Butler: Where would the parking be located in option 5?

Mr. Gerber: There are multiple parking options.

Member Butler: I like the exposed park (as shown in Option 5).

Member Kristin Schuster: Are we planning to keep parallel parking on S. Rice/

Mr. Gerber: With the median proposed on S. Rice, there would be no parking on the street.

Member Dolores Avioli: Rice need to be the most important entrance, with entrances and exits on all sides of the building.

Mr. Gerber: Option 3 is meant to have people flow through it.

Member Schuster: If there is no parking on S. Rice, then fronting the building along the street and not the parking lot may not be as effective. The building should have a strong connection to the park space. Why do Council Chambers front S. Rice?

Mr. Gerber: The layout could go either way. Chambers has an opportunity to be transparent, where it would not make sense for the court room.

Member John Gabriel: IS it a given that Courts would go in the park area? The library and the Civic Center are much more park friendly.

Mr. Gerber: City Council chose to locate the Court in the City Hall building. There are complementary uses in these two spaces.

Council Liaison Gus E Pappas: If it does not work to have the Court in the City Hall building, then there may be an opportunity for Council to re-review the location.

Member Schuster: Was the Police Chief a part of the Courts location conversation?



Chief Byron Holloway, who was in the audience indicated, stated that in his opinion the Municipal Courts should not be located in the Police Station.

Mr. Gerber: There are numerous communities who feel strongly either way. It's really about what Bellaire wants to be.

Member Avioli: If Council has stated a preference, is that an absolute? Once Council said which way it was to be, that was it.

Council Liaison Pappas: The campus approach was the direction given. The absolutes are we are going to build on this block, we are going to have a campus approach, with the police station on the other side, and the Civic center in the location it's proposed. If we think this just won't work, we will need to kick that back to Council.

Mr. Gerber: This can be a fabulous series of buildings, no matter what the City decides. It's just a matter of how the City wants to compose it.

Member Gabriel: I keep looking for a site zoning diagram. Has a site zoning study been done?

Mr. Gerber: We presented Council with a number of options; narrowing them down is how we got to where we are today.

Member Aviloi: We need to have a clarification, because we can go on, and on, and on. Where are the service areas and utilities, which will impact the site?

Mr. Gerber: We are not showing that level yet. We don't need to pick a big idea based on where the dumpsters go. That is the next series of big ideas.

Council Liaison Pappas: I don't like the chambers right next to the Court, they are two completely different types of uses and should have more separation.

Member Schuster: I do not like the public lobby along S. Rice. I think it should have a face to S. Rice, but functionally it doesn't work. If the parking along S Rice isn't there anymore, it doesn't make sense.

Member Butler: I didn't strongly react to S. Rice entrance.

Member Avioli: I really like the main entrance on S. Rice.

Member Schuster: I like that the connection to the park in Option 2. I like the outdoor space between the building and the aquatic center. It creates a connection between the park and Loftin Park. Options 4 & 5 are a no.

Mr. Gerber: Option 4, turns its back to S. Rice. Option 5 also picks a side.

Member Schuster: Option 5 is the more "green" option, is that important?

Mr. Gerber: To summarize-

Option 1 – Not excited about turning back to S. Rice

Option 2 – Like the primary access

Option 3 – Too many entrances, there is no face.

Option 4 – Don't turn back to S. Rice

Option 5 – Idea make sense, but not so one sided.

Mr. Gerber discussed the blocking option for the design of the Police Station.

Option 1 – The first floor contains the public lobby, dispatch, records, the jail, and the sally port. Administration, detectives, patrol units, and the evidence area are located on the second floor. The main entrance off of Jessamine would lead to the public lobby and dispatch. This is the diagram that PD preferred.

Option 2 – Patrol officer function would be on the first floor, with dispatch on the second floor.

#### **E. Continued Discussion on Branding Effort.**

City Manager Paul A. Hofmann discussed the opportunity this project provides to create a look and feel which can radiate through the rest of the City. Mr. Hofmann provided information on what "branding" effort decisions have taken place to date.

#### **F. Review of Current Schedule.**

Mr. Gerber discussed changes to the org. plan previously presented to the Committee. As part of the State of the City event in February, we would like to have the next meeting on January 12, followed by a meeting on Tuesday, January 20. This would give the Committee the opportunity to review the planned elevations. An update schedule will be sent to the members, with the new meeting dates shown.

Council Liaison Pappas: What do you envision for February 2<sup>nd</sup>?

Mr. Gerber: We will be evolving the diagrams into some floor plan scenarios. We wanted the Committee to see and comment before we complete the designs. What we'll show the public is elevation with different architectural concepts, strategies, shown.

Member Schuster: Will we be talking about the site planning?

Mr. Gerber: We weren't planning to. The plan may continue to change, even after the February 2 meeting.

Council Liaison Pappas: Do we need to schedule a meeting sooner?

A meeting for Wednesday, January 7 was established.

Member Schuster: I still have a lot of questions. I need to see the larger site diagram.

#### **G. New Business.**

No new business was discussed.

#### **H. Review of Consensus from Meeting.**

Mr. Gerber provided a summary of consensus decisions reached by Committee Members throughout the evening as follows: I think we've focused on a couple of the diagrams. Option 1, less favored

Option 2, good idea that can be further developed  
Option 3, orientation of the building north to south not ideal  
Option 4 & 5, were not looked at favorably

In terms of the Police Department, the committee reacted favorable to the direction in which the Police Department wanted to head.

**I. Discussion Regarding Next Meeting.**

PGAL will continue to develop the diagrams and seek feedback.

**J. Adjournment.**

Councilman Gus E. Pappas advised that the Regular Session of the Ad Hoc Municipal Facilities Meeting was adjourned at 7:45 p.m. on Monday, December 8, 2014.

Approved:



Gus E. Pappas, Council Liaison



# CITY HALL BLOCKING

---

①

- 5 options
- NOT FLOOR PLANS
- ABOUT ADOLESCENCY  
AND LEVEL RELATIONSHIPS
- RELATIVELY LOW IN SCALE
- ABOUT BUILDING ACCESS  
AND SITE RELATIONSHIPS
- PROGRAM IS (OWN LINES)

(2)

- PLANNING ON KEEPING PARKING ON SOUTH RILE??
- LOBBY SHOULD BE ADJACENT TO PARKING
- SHOULD COURTS BE A PART OF CITY HALL? - SUGGESTION -  
COULD IT BE A PART OF ANOTHER BUILDING?
- CHIEF OF POLICE PREFERENCES  
TO SEPARATE COURTS FROM  
POLICE
- IS COUNCIL FINAL SAY GO?  
YES.
- BACK OF HOUSE FUNCTION IS  
A CONCERN

- Prefer to separate council from courts. separate uses and security requirements
- OBJECTIONS TO PLAN OP. 1
- ✓ OP. 2 - TRANSPARENT CORNER, h-line and park still connected
- Flip flop council chambers and service counter
- OBJECTIONS TO OP. 3 & 4
- ✓ OP. 5 ORIENTATION GOOD FOR GREEN.  
NEED TO REWORK PLAN  
FEELS 1 SIDED

(3)



④

- ARE WE THINKING ABOUT PARK USE? YES
- ~~OR~~ NO BUDGET CURRENTLY

## POLICE FOLLOWING

- OP.1 DISPATCH ON LEVEL 1
- OP.2 DISPATCH ON LEVEL 2
- CURRENTLY EXISTING PD HAS UNDERGROUND PORTION
- WE WILL ALL BE ABOVE GROUND