

CITY OF BELLAIRE TEXAS
AD HOC MUNICIPAL FACILITIES COMMITTEE
AUGUST 10, 2015

Council Chamber

Regular Session

6:00 PM

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



Council Liaison

Gus E. Pappas

Member

Dolores Avioli

Member

Michael Fife

Member

Todd Blitzler

Member

Chris Kaitson

Member

Suzanne Shelby

Member

Christopher Butler

Member

Kristin Schuster

Mission Statement:

The City of Bellaire is dedicated to outstanding quality service and facilities to ensure an open, progressive, and secure community.

REGULAR SESSION - 6:00 P.M.

A. Call to Order

B. Public Comments

C. Approval of Minutes

1. Ad Hoc Municipal Facilities Committee – Regular Session – June 29, 2015

D. Review of Final Evaluation Factors

E. Review of Final Pros and Cons of Site Plan Options

F. Discussion of City Council Presentation of Ad Hoc Committee Work

G. Preview of PGAL Council Presentation

H. New Business

I. Review of Consensus from Meeting

J. Discussion Regarding Next Meeting

K. Public Comments

L. Adjournment



CITY OF BELLAIRE TEXAS
AD HOC MUNICIPAL FACILITIES COMMITTEE
JUNE 29, 2015

Council Chambers	Regular Session	6:00 PM
7008 S. RICE AVENUE BELLAIRE, TX 77401		

REGULAR SESSION – 6:00 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 6:06 p.m. on Monday, June 29, 2015. He advised that a quorum of members were present as set forth below.

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Dolores Avioli	Member	Present	
Todd Blitzer	Member	Present	
Christopher Butler	Member	Present	
Michael Fife	Member	Present	
Chris Kaitson	Member	Present	6:11 p.m.
Kristin Schuster	Member	Present	
Suzanne Shelby	Member	Present	
Gus E. Pappas	Council Liaison	Present	

B. Public Comments

Lydia Caldwell thanked the Committee for their work. She asked that the Committee keep in mind that Alternative "A" has a total of three buildings, and that the Residents were willing to pay higher taxes for the project.

Lynn McBee has asked if anyone has clocked the amount of time spent on this project from the Architect and the Committee. Ms. McBee praised the Committee for their accomplishments. She asked that the signature corner be deferred until other projects are finished. She additionally mentioned that "podium" parking makes sense.

Susan McDonald spoke in favor of Alternative "A", noting that quality of life is important.

Salim Virani thanked the Committee for listening. He wanted to make sure that what the Committee presents to Council reflects their objectives. Mr. Virani noted that Alternate "C" was not in line with the objectives, and should not be presented to Council. He mentioned that moving the Library into the Park was not supported, and is happy with its current location.

Malcolm Rae asked that the Police building not be built on the South side of Jessamine.

Jeff Caldwell thanked the Committee. He has not heard a compelling reason to move the Police building to the South side of Aspen, noting the only reasons given were costs. He expressed his support for alternative "A" and asked that is preference be presented to Council.

C. Approval of Minutes

The Committee reviewed and approved the Minutes from the May 5, 2015 Regular Meeting. Members Michael Fife and Todd Blitzer abstained.

The Committee reviewed and approved the Minutes from the June 18, 2015 Regular Meeting with following changes:

Member Blitzer: My comment on Page four should read, "The conversation of whether the Police are on the North or South side of Jessamine is a good one."

Member Christopher Butler: On the same page, the third comment from him should read, "The changes to the future land use plan does not call for excessive or rapid growth".

Member Kristin Schuster: On page eight, it should read "The Committee discussed the following motion:".

D. Confirmation of Evaluation Factors

Mr. Jeff Gerber with PGAL provided the Committee with the updated site plans which included the updated objectives. One of the goals for the meeting was to review the definitions and ensure they didn't miss any.

Member Schuster: The difference between a "Project Objective" and a "Design Consideration" is still open.

Mr. Gerber: These are the criteria that evolved from several sources over several years. The project objectives were organized by topic, including site, buildings, etc... The Committee merged these lists together and prioritized them.

Member Blitzer: It seems that "Project Objectives" are more site related, and "Design Consideration" more building related.

Mr. Gerber: They merged over time and now are weighted differently. This is what the Committee uses to judge each option.

Member Schuster: I don't see that there is any real difference, and haven't heard a reason for there to be two categories. I think we should make one list.

Mr. Gerber: The Committee thought the Pros and Cons approach was a better way to present to Council.

Member Blitzer: Do you still think we should have two groups?

Mr. Gerber: It's not important that there be two separate groupings.

Member Michael Fife: I would include the word objective, it stronger than consideration.

Member Chris Kaitson: We spent time preparing two lists, I'm not ok with combining them.

Member Schuster: Can we be clear about what they [objective vs consideration] mean? If we can, then we should consolidate.

Member Butler: I think we considered objectives as our goals and considerations were how we were to accomplish them. The way the lists are now, they are our primary and secondary concerns.

Member Dolores Avioli: I don't see anything in design consideration that I don't consider a project objective. I'd like a combined title, they are all equally important.

Mr. Gerber: How do you want to reconcile the discussion?

Council Liaison Gus E. Pappas: Historically, there was more focus on objectives. To move away from that, we need a motion and a vote.

Member Butler: If we merge them, we'll have to talk about the order, and we'll spend hours on something we already agreed on.

Member Blitzer: There are so many objectives, that it's not real concise at to what the pure objectives are.

Mr. Gerber: Many things on this list don't have a lot to do with selecting a site plan.

Member Schuster: One reason we broke it into two lists, is because we said adhering to the bond budget was less important than programmatic compatibility. I'm ok leaving it in two, as long as we can explain how they're not the same.

Member Fife: Will we use this to present to Council? If so, is it too much?

Mr. Gerber: It's up to the Committee how to communicate to Council.

Member Schuster: I think we are using the Pros and Cons list and these lists are back up to the presentation.

Member Suzanne Shelby: I don't know that these lists are current for what we're trying to do.

Member Butler: Based on comments from Council, what these lists have evolved into is a primary and secondary level of consideration. Our primary objective is to provide Council with a site plan.

Council Liaison Pappas: [Member Schuster] Are you comfortable with how we're addressing this?

Member Schuster: Yes.

Member Blitzer: Gus, I think as long as you're ok, it will be understood.

Council Liaison Pappas: I don't think it will be confusing.

Member Butler: What's with the parking item?

Mr. Gerber: I think we can take that off the list.

E. Review of Evaluation Factor Definitions

The Committee was satisfied with the definitions presented by Mr. Gerber.

F. Review of New Site Plan Option D

Mr. Gerber presented the Option D and reviewed the other options with the Committee.

Member Butler: Was Option D viable from an infrastructure viewpoint?

Mr. Gerber: It's in the ballpark of the other options. The green space and parking numbers can evolve.

Council Liaison Pappas: Was there a formal decision to flip Police and Courts in Option A?

Mr. Gerber: I have a strong consideration to recommend it the way it's drawn. You're boxing in Police if you flip the buildings.

Member Schuster: I think I had been confused in previous discussions. The way its drawn now is how it's to be presented.

Member Butler: To me the Courts could be a more transparent building. I'm not convinced were boxing anything in.

Member Blitzer: The way it's presented, it's a nice tiering effect as you drive down Jessamine. It also makes Courts more visible, as you'll see it first. There are pros and cons for each orientation.

Mr. Gerber: This is a stronger orientation for the City for the long term.

Member Kaitson: Are we talking first floor or second floor, for future expansion?

Mr. Gerber: That depends on what's driving the need.

Member Kaitson: So we could expand over Courts in the future?

Mr. Gerber: That is a possibility. It creates some complications, but it's doable.

Council Liaison Pappas: Do we feel comfortable that our note on the plans address any concerns?

Member Fife: Are the mother of the little league players going to want the Police building next to the field?

Member Blitzer: Would it be possible to shade the existing buildings in one color and the proposed in another?

Mr. Gerber: Yes. And I will clarify the note.

Member Blitzer: Our pros and cons list will accompany the site plans?

Mr. Gerber: Yes, if that's what the Committee decides on.

G. Discussion of Parking Strategies

Member Butler: I think parking is site planning, and that's not what we're being asked to do. To decide on a type of parking is pre-mature. It doesn't impact the pros and cons.

Mr. Gerber: It does have an impact on the budget. It would be good for Council to understand what opportunities you may want them to consider later.

Member Schuster: The drivers are parking availability by City Hall and the Community Center.

Member Blitzer: I think Council needs to know we considered parking.

Member Schuster: Council needs to know how each option affects the budget.

Member Kaitson: Is that something we would include in the pros and cons list?

Mr. Gerber: I wanted to have this conversation because I'm not aware of how this will play into the presentation to Council.

Member Schuster: At what point after the workshop with Council do you need to know if podium parking is an option?

Mr. Gerber: I would at the workshop. It affects the design of the building.

Member Schuster: Are we saying podium parking is an option for all four alternatives?

Mr. Gerber: I think you could say that.

Member Butler: I don't think this is the time to decide.

Member Schuster: I think we need to decide today whether is worth recommending or not.

Member Blitzer: When was it decided that the corner would be greenspace?

Member Schuster: That was one of Council's first priorities. When they saw the site plan that was what they all liked.

Mr. Gerber: Part of my contract is to explore the opportunities for that corner.

Member Blitzer: I'm not a huge fan of podium parking, you're not getting a lot of bang for your buck.

Member Butler: We were looking for ways to remove gashes into the park.

Member Schuster: Buildings need to be of an appropriate scale in our community. Having a three story building is not in keeping with that.

Member Blitzer: It's more important that we make a recommendation on the site plan than it is to say we need or don't need podium parking.

Council Liaison Pappas: Jeff, do you need this Committee to take a preference?

Mr. Gerber: It would be difficult to advance the building design if we don't know what the plan is. In any of the scenarios, you're picking up more parking than you currently have.

Council Liaison Pappas: Is it fair to say that we discussed podium parking and the advantages and disadvantages that come with it?

Member Schuster: It's too important to not think through. If we think this is a viable consideration, we need to tell Council that they need to think about it, and what comes with it.

Member Avioli: Podium parking isn't compatible with the rest of the campus idea.

Member Shelby: It's unattractive.

Member Butler: It's an architectural choice. It can be designed however we want.

Member Avioli: I just think it's not aesthetically pleasing.

Member Butler: What's more appealing, a parking lot in a park, or podium parking?

Member Blitzer: Do you know what they are doing with the Condit site?

Mr. Gerber: They are completely redesigning the site.

Council Liaison Pappas: They are flipping it.

Mr. Gerber: Podium parking is what you do when you don't have any other choices, it's not your first choice.

Council Liaison Pappas: Jeff are you wanting a preference from the Committee?

Mr. Gerber: We can discuss that when we discuss the Council presentation.

H. Review of Pros and Cons of Four Remaining Sit Plans Options

The committee reviewed the pros and cons and amended them to read as follows:

Alternative A Option 4:

Pros

- 1) MC and PD on N. Jessamine (not south)
 - a. Reduce negative impacts to Residents on Aspen Street
 - i. Noise
 - ii. Light
 - iii. Aesthetic
 - iv. Property Values
 - b. Improve the perception of safety – due to distance of PD from existing residential
- 2) MC and PD are functionally separate.
- 3) MC and PD are a single building with some shared infrastructure
 - a. Single building cost savings
- 4) Leaves options for Library relocation (minimize relocation costs)
- 5) Programmatic compatibility consistent with public comments at town hall meeting
 - a. CC and CH together
 - b. CC adjacent to great lawn
 - c. PD and MC together
- 6) Fewest number of new buildings

Cons

- 1) Relocation costs for MC and PD
- 2) Excessive building SQFT in park
- 3) Requires future relocation costs for future LIB
- 4) Potential visibility limitations to GL from S. Jessamine
- 5) Limited option to place library close to the GL

Alternative C – Short Term:

Pros

- 1) Minimizes the amount of SQFT in PARK
- 2) Saves cost of relocating PD and MC (because you do not move MC now)
- 3) Defers the cost of building a new MC
- 4) Leaves options for Library relocation
- 5) Programmatic compatibility consistent with public comments at town hall meeting
 - a. CC and CH together
 - b. CC adjacent to great lawn
 - c. PD and MC are in close proximity
- 6) Obvious separation between MC and PD
- 7) Has the opportunity to open up great lawn to Jessamine

Cons

- 1) MC and PD on S. Jessamine
 - a. Negative impacts to Residents on Aspen Street
 - i. Noise
 - ii. Light
 - iii. Aesthetic
 - iv. Property Values
 - b. Does not meet project design objective to keep PD on N. Jessamine
- 2) Short term renovation costs

Alternative D:

Pros

- 1) PD on N. Jessamine (not south)
 - a. Reduce negative impacts to Residents on Aspen Street
 - i. Noise
 - ii. Light
 - iii. Aesthetic
 - iv. Property Values
 - b. Improve the perception of safety – due to distance of PD from existing residential
- 2) Improves accessibility and visibility to PARK from Jessamine
- 3) Minimize SQFT of building in the Park and maintains the character of the park.
- 4) MC acts as buffer to PD / PARKING to Aspen St.
- 5) No MC relocation costs
- 6) Programmatic compatibility consistent with public comments at town hall meeting
 - a. CC and CH together
 - b. CC adjacent to great lawn

- c. PD and MC are in close proximity
- 7) Obvious separation between MC and PD
- 8) Options for relocating library in future

Cons

- 1) Relocation costs associated with PD
- 2) No shared infrastructure cost between MC and PD (one additional standalone building)
- 3) Reduces street parking for MC and PD

March 27th Site Plan:

Pros

- 1) LI proximity to GL
 - a. Meaningful sharing of space between LI and CC
 - b. No relocation costs for PD or MC
- 2) Distinct separation between MC and PD
- 3) Efficiency of shared infrastructure

Cons

- 1) Not consistent with feedback from public at town hall meeting
- 2) PD on S. Jessamine
 - a. Negative impacts to Residents on Aspen Street
 - i. Noise
 - ii. Light
 - iii. Aesthetic
 - iv. Property Values
 - b. Does not meet project design objective to keep PD on N. Jessamine
- 3) Does not meet programmatic compatibility
 - a. CH and MC combined (CH and CC should be combined)
 - b. Questionable compatibility with LI and CC combined
- 4) Potential visibility limitations to GL from S. Jessamine
- 5) LI proximity to baseball field
- 6) Does not meet buildings in a park concept
 - a. CC isolated from great lawn

The Committee solicited the following public comments in relation to the pros and cons developed for Alternative D.

Cliff Morgan would prefer the Courts rather than the Police building behind the homes on Aspen. He did indicate that Alternative A is still the preferable site plan. Mr. Morgan stated that the concern would be any unintentional happenings, which are not currently being thought of.

Scott Wellington indicated that Alternative D has less parking than Alternative A. He added that Alternative A provided for more greenspace flexibility.

Salim Virani wanted to know what kind of people are brought to the Court. We can't say how the crime demographics will change over time, which could be a concern in the future.

Lynn McBee has a problem with the encroachment into a residentially zoned area. Would like to see a library and a museum or cultural center on that block. She want the block left alone to not impact the Aspen residents.

Lydia Caldwell noted that Alternate D is better, but that she still prefers Alternate A. It makes sense to keep the Courts adjacent to the Police. She would not want the Courts building behind her house either.

The Committee took a recess at 8:37 PM and returned at 8:47 PM.

I. Discussion of Site Plan Conclusions

Mr. Gerber: Is there anything related to the conclusions for the site plans?

Member Kaitson: We don't show the tree on the south side of Jessamine.

Member Butler: Do we need to rank these site plans?

Member Blitzer: When presented to Council we need to make it clear what we prefer.

Member Butler: Does that mean voting for a preferred, or ranking them?

Member Blitzer: I think we need to vote on a preferred option, but present all four.

Member Avioli: I think we need to present on preferred options and let Council know why we did or didn't consider other options.

Member Butler: I don't think we want to bring just one option, but we should have a preferred option.

Member Kaitson: I think we present all of them, but we should prioritized recommendations.

Council Liaison Pappas: Does the committee want to make a motion to present all four, then make a recommendation to rank them?

The Committee voted on the following motion:

To recommend to Council which option(s) the Committee prefers.

RESULT:	APPROVED (UNANIMOUS)
MOVER:	Tod Blitzer
SECONDER:	Suzanne Shelby
AYES:	Avioli, Blitzer, Butler, Fife, Schuster, Shelby, Kaitson

The Committee voted on the following motion:

For the Committee to choose its first and second options for site plan preference.

RESULT:	APPROVED (UNANIMOUS)
MOVER:	Chris Kaitson
SECONDER:	Kristen Schuster
AYES:	Avioli, Blitzer, Butler, Fife, Schuster, Shelby, Kaitson

The Committee member took the following poll outlining their first and second preferences:

Member Kaitson: Alternate A is my first choice, to maintain the separation of the north side of Jessamine from the south. Only library on the south side. Alternate D is my second choice.

Member Butler: Alternate A is my first choice, does what the public want us to do with regards to the location of the Civic Center. No harm from expanding our footprint. Alternate D is my second choice.

Member Shelby: Alternate A is my first choice. I like the option of using the space for something other than future parking. Alternate D is my second choice.

Member Blitzer: Alternate A is my first choice. Alternate D is my second choice.

Member Fife: Alternate A is my first choice. It addresses all of the major issues expressed by the residents as well as the Committee goals. Alternate D is my second choice.

Member Avioli: Alternate A is my first choice. It reflects the resident's input, specifically the Aspen Street residents. Precludes putting the library in the park. Alternate D is my second choice.

Member Schuster: Alternate D is my first choice. Alternate A is my second choice. I agree putting Police on the back side of Jessamine is a bad idea. Alternative A falls short of our objective to create a campus. It builds a wall separating functions from the Great Lawn. Alternative D gives us the option to leave the Library and the Great Lawn connected.

The Committee voted on the following motion:

To present to Council Alternate A as their first choice and Alternate D as second.

RESULT:	APPROVED
MOVER:	Chris Kaitson
SECONDER:	Christopher Butler
AYES:	Avioli, Blitzer, Butler, Fife, Shelby, Kaitson
NAYS:	Schuster

Member Blitzer: I don't have an issues with listing, with the pros and cons, why we recommend Alternate A and why our second choice is Alternate D. I think is valuable to include a brief synopsis of why we chose the way we did.

The Committee voted on the following motion:

To present to Council that the Committee considered, but does not recommend Alternate C or the March 27 Plan as an option.

RESULT:	APPROVED (UNANIMOUS)
MOVER:	Todd Blitzer
SECONDER:	Dolores Avioli
AYES:	Avioli, Blitzer, Butler, Fife, Schuster, Shelby, Kaitson

J. Discussion of City Council Presentation

The committee discussed the upcoming Council workshop and how they felt it should be conducted.

The Committee voted on the following motion:

The Ad Hoc Committee requests that the upcoming workshop be a joint workshop with City Council and the Ad Hoc Committee and that Council wave their rules to allow for public comments at the workshop

RESULT:	APPROVED (UNANIMOUS)
MOVER:	Todd Blitzer
SECONDER:	Kristen Schuster
AYES:	Avioli, Blitzer, Butler, Fife, Schuster, Shelby, Kaitson

The Committee selected Members Todd Blitzer and Kristen Schuster to draft executive summaries of why the Committee selected Alternates A and D.

The Committee indicated that they would like to see PGAL's presentation before it's presented to the City Council.

K. New Business**L. Review of Consensus from Meeting**

Mr. Gerber reviewed the consensus from the meeting, highlighting the committee's preference for Alternate A, with Alternate D coming second. He also noted that all four options would be presented to Council, with the Committee's indication not to recommend Alternate C or the March 27 option.

M. Discussion Regarding Next Meeting

The Committee discussed that a future meeting was needed to review the presentation to Council. That meeting would be scheduled at a later date depending on member's availability.

N. Public Comments

Lynn McBee outlined how previous committees had presented their findings to Council. She indicated that the Committee needs to prepare a recommendation packet for Council.

Lydia Caldwell read an email from Isabel Souchon, in which she did not recommend moving the Police building. Ms. Souchon indicated her preference for Alternate A.

O. Adjournment

Council Liaison Pappas advised that the Regular Session of the Ad Hoc Municipal Facilities Meeting was adjourned at 10:20 p.m. on Monday, June 29, 2015.

Approved:

Gus E. Pappas, Council Liaison