

**CITY OF HEDWIG VILLAGE, TEXAS  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
REGULAR CALLED MEETING  
TUESDAY, MAY 02, 2017  
6:30 P.M. - 955 PINEY POINT ROAD**

**AGENDA**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chairperson Bucci called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m.

Present:

Member Abrams

Member Mathews

Member Murphy

Member Opalka

Member Roth

Member Rouse

Attorney Petrov

**2. RESIDENT/VISITOR COMMENTS**

None.

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – APRIL 4, 2017 REGULAR PLANNING & ZONING MEETING**

Member Murphy stated only correction he thought was necessary was to correct they had discussed new proposed items referred to allowing single family homes within Business District ‘2.’

Member Searcy Motioned, Member Roth seconded to approve the April 4, 2017 Regular Planning and Zoning minutes with correction.

Member Abrams, Bucci, Mathews, Murphy, Opalka, Roth and Rouse voted all “Ayes” no “Noes.”

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**4. REPORT ON CITY COUNCIL MEETING AND COMMENTS FROM CITY COUNCIL LIAISON**

Member Mathews reiterated the excellent job that Member Murphy did in speaking at the April City Council meeting for Planning and Zoning and how he had stressed the importance of better and more frequent communication between the two commissions.

Attorney Petrov reminded about the upcoming Joint Public Hearing May 11<sup>th</sup> 2017 at 6 p.m.

Attorney Petrov stated that City Council had some questions about the occupancy of restaurants and questions about parking ratios.

Member Rouse stated that the chart of restaurants showed square footage, and the question from Council Member Johnson, was there a way to get the occupancy from the fire department. The Village Fire Department had replied to her inquiry that they do not have an electronic record of exact occupancy, but had an average occupancy for each location. She stated that there were only four restaurants listed with the average occupancy, which shows that doesn't really provide any value to the parking ratios

## **5. REPORTS FROM SUBCOMMITTEES**

### **PARKING RATIOS:**

Member Rouse stated that the parking ratio subcommittee wanted to review the different parking ratio categories. The committee began work and prepared a list similar to what has been made for the restaurants but for all of the commercial entities in Hedwig Village, 8-0 or so are on the list. She stated the key is assigning them to types and then parking by types of commercial establishment. Member Rouse noted five dry cleaners, three veterinarians and that it will be interesting to see where these would fall for types in reference to parking. To her knowledge what seemed to have some urgency would be drive-thru and any possible new restaurants, and the issues with the newer Starbucks. Member Rouse concluded by stated that reviewing and following up with the city engineer on the Starbucks parking and traffic study, P&Z could have an ordinance stating a drive-thru must have queuing for 12 cars and specific passing on the outside. Any deviation would then require an additional traffic study.

Member Mathews felt they had gotten fairly far such as sample references for the drive-thru ques and the ULI also recommends that perhaps double drive thru can be better and possibly more useful.

Chairperson Bucci asked if there had been any further discussion on adding a category for fine-dining.

Member Murphy stated that P&Z had briefly discussed the topic at the previous meeting but nothing that he heard at the City Council Meeting.

Member Murphy stated that he had found it possible that the square footage of the facilities may not be accurate one in particular was the Goode Co., BBQ restaurant. The parking at this location is 516 parking a spaces even with it modified to new ordinance its 387, he stated it simply was not possible for that lot or others to have that amount of parking spaces. He continued stating that the aerial shot from the Starbucks traffic study counted maybe 50 parking spaces in this shopping plaza but it does appear to work even with amount of shops located in the Goode Co., parking lot. He stated this was telling to him, and was unsure if they were even close to being accurate based on the current data they have and how that might affect their parking ratio study.

Member Rouse agreed that P&Z should consider if they want to continue to publish the data since it seems it may not be accurate.

Member Mathews stated that referencing fine dining she would like to say that council had approved the public hearing she did not know if that they were at liberty to add another category

to the restaurant phase one since it had already been addressed before council without that category.

Member Murphy stated that he thought it would be better to add that to the second phase if necessary.

Chairperson Bucci didn't want to negate the possibility for fine dining in Hedwig but was unsure if it served a purpose at the moment.

Member Rouse asked Attorney Petrov the sign discussion was the participants didn't have all the facts at the electronic sign public hearing, as her opinion, her thought was there may be an opportunity to provide an info sheet why it's being provided the amendment to parking ratios and the benefits.

Attorney Petrov have someone from P&Z make an initial presentation to go over the purpose of amending the parking ratios in the city. It helps not just residents but Council as well.

## **6. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON:**

### **a. A PROPOSAL TO MODIFY THE CITY REGULATIONS RELATED TO PARKING IN THE BUSINESS DISTRICTS**

See item 5.

### **b. REISSUANCE OF THE P&Z LETTER TO THE MAYOR DATED 4/30/2014 SUGGESTING SIX ITEMS FOR ORDINANCE CHANGE THAT WOULD PROVIDE FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS TO THE CITY**

Member Murphy provided a copy to the mayor, delivered it to the Planning and Zoning secretary Brandy Worthington. He stated that he had spoken to Mayor Muecke briefly and said that he had not been able to review it just yet. Wanted to show some data showing that subcommittees had voted, if they were able to review it one last time and that there were several ideas and topics which included landscaping, type of business, business uses, etc., what they decided was that the mayor at that nixed these topics. The six items in the list were thought to be beneficial to the future of the city and development. If there are any standing city ordinances developers have too much freedom to just do whatever they choose regardless of how it may or may not benefit the city.

Would like Planning and Zoning to review the six items on the list, and vote on it to officially present before City Council again.

Member Rouse asked in reference to the letter how does this list compare to what is seen at perhaps City Centre location in Houston? Is there a specific place Murphy sees these items being implemented?

### **c. DESIGN GUIDE**

Member Rouse is there a codified class a type of development definitions.

Member Murphy stated some locations would be market center in the Woodlands, and shopping locations in Sugarland were good examples, these cities have guidelines and some of those make sense for the city of Hedwig village i.e. class A building development.

Chairperson Bucci stated she believes it is a commercial organization called BOMA, there is an equivalent set definition of what is Class A, they are somewhat vague but there is a guideline, such as whether or not you're a LEED project, there is certain criterion that has to be met.

Member Mathews mentioned that there needs to be some set criteria and method of how best to make this kind and other future recommendations to City Council.

Member Murphy stated that he thought the same and had felt the following steps were important:

1. Vote twice
2. Prioritize and recommend that which could be easily enacted and so on.

Council Liaison Wiener asked to address P&Z as he had arrived late. He stated that there would be three members of council that were on P&Z member once Member Rouse transitioned to Council Member and that would be a majority more sensitive to P&Z issues. As far as class A development Rand Stevens a developer with Avison Young, had mentioned floor to floor windows 15-20' as part of what he thought was considered Class A development. He concluded by stating that on the topic of buried power lines And that he thought it would be pertinent to keep buried power lines in the commercial district a topic, although he was under the understanding that P&Z could not affect that decision.

Attorney Petrov stated that as long as they were not affecting TxDOT they still had some say as it was part of the city.

- d. BUSINESS USES AND BUSINESS DISTRICTS RECONFIGURATIONS**
- e. PUD**
- f. LIGHTING ORDINANCE/DARK SKIES INITIATIVE**
- g. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**
- h. LANDSCAPING**
- i. MINIMUM CONSTRUCTION STANDARDS/LEED SILVER, CLASS "A"**
- j. BURIED POWER LINES IN THE COMMERCIAL DISTRICT**
- k. LINE-OF-SIGHT BUILDING HEIGHT GUIDELINES FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT**
- l. MODERNIZE ORDINANCES AND CODES**

**7. ADJOURN**

Member Opalka motioned to adjourn the meeting at 7:50 p.m.; and Member Roth seconded.

Member Abrams, Bucci, Opalka Murphy, Roth and Rouse voted all "Ayes" no "Noes."

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

---

Sylvie Bucci  
Planning and Zoning Chairperson

---

Brandy Worthington  
Planning & Zoning Secretary