



**CITY OF HEDWIG VILLAGE, TEXAS  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
REGULAR CALLED MEETING  
TUESDAY, JUNE 27, 2017  
6:30 P.M. - 955 PINEY POINT ROAD**

**MINUTES**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Member Mathews called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

Present:

Member Abrams  
Member Opalka  
Member Mathews  
Member Murphy  
Member Roth

Council Liaison Rouse  
Attorney Petrov

**2. RESIDENT/VISITOR COMMENTS**

None.

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – MAY 2, 2017 REGULAR PLANNING & ZONING MEETING**

Member Opalka motioned to approve the May 2, 2017 Minutes with corrections. Member Roth seconded. All in Favor.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

- a. REPORT ON CITY COUNCIL MEETING AND COMMENTS FROM CITY COUNCIL LIAISON. INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO: NEW BUSINESS, DISCUSSIONS AT THE PREVIOUS CITY COUNCIL MEETING, STATUS OF ACTIVITY FROM THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL RELATING TO THE MAY 8<sup>TH</sup> LETTER (REISSUANCE OF 4/30/2014 LETTER FROM P&Z) FROM P&Z SUGGESTING SIX ITEMS FOR ORDINANCE CHANGE THAT WOULD PROVIDE FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS TO THE CITY, ETC.**

Council Liaison Rouse stated that the feedback from Planning and Zoning working on items was generally supported. The council inquired was the amount of items that Planning and Zoning could reasonably achieve. To consider what is a reasonable progress

to items that are on their agenda. Her idea would be a three month period per topic as reasonable and achievable to move things through.

City council also discussed at the previous meeting that the public hearing had been scheduled, and was canceled due to lack of quorum due to Planning and Zoning. They requested to change the definitions to 'changing food to the public' on each restaurant description.

The last item that came up was also the question of why is it so difficult to make quorum at Planning and Zoning. City Council questioned whether the number of members be decreased in order to make quorum 20% more achievable. But city council is interested in Planning and Zoning working more effectively.

Member Opalka stated that he would like to state that many of the members on the list are items that have been previously been forwarded to city council without any action from city council. Many of the active items had previously been parking and the lighting initiative there are really only two items that have been going on, and the list itself is controlled by city council. And city council has failed to act on any of the items that have been previously forwarded to the council. He feels that Planning and Zoning had only really failed in keeping a proper log of all what has actually been sent to city council and when over the years.

Rouse would love to help with the logging and tracking of the feedback and correspondence between city council and planning and zoning. And that she will make sure there is a feedback loop between the two commissions and asks that she be copied on future correspondence in order to better assist. Would also request to see the tab in the city council binder that shows the monthly progress of planning and zoning.

Member Murphy and Member Mathews concurred with Member Opalka that there have been formal letters and drafts that have been sent to City Council without out any response from the council or feedback.

**4. REPORTS FROM SUBCOMMITTEES**

See below discussion.

**5. SURVEY FOR ATTENDANCE FOR UPCOMING POSSIBLE DATE JOINT PUBLIC HEARING JULY 13, 2017 AT 6:00 P.M.**

Member Opalka stated that he is no longer available to attend the Public hearing. Which leaves the joint public hearing possibly lacking quorum.

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

**a. A PROPOSAL TO MODIFY THE CITY REGULATIONS RELATED TO PARKING IN THE BUSINESS DISTRICTS. INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO OTHER USES PARKING RATIOS, SHARED PARKING, PARKING SPACE SIZING, ETC.**

There is a report from the parking ratio subcommittee, form the comments of Council Liaison Rouse, requested that the definition listed in the document to state 'to the public' for each restaurant definition.

Member Mathews went through to make sure that future developers would have proper parking for possibly condominiums, at obviously present properties would be grandfathered in and not subject to these changes. 2 bedroom 2 spaces, and one bedroom one space, in the event that a married couple would share a one bedroom.

Member Murphy stated that the spaces are located in the business district, and it appears that it would the ordinances do not currently allow for multi-home establishments. He felt that it was the consensus that most did not want more apartments or multi-purpose establishments. The spaces are being upped, but yet according to the ordinances there are currently no allowances for more multi-family homes.

Member Mathews stated there is currently in the ordinance two off street parking spaces for multi-family establishments.

Member Murphy stated that currently the ordinances do not allow for new multi-family dwellings by future developers. And he doesn't understand the purpose of changing the parking spaces for the few dwellings that are multi-family that currently exist.

Member Mathews stated that the general concept in addressing these spaces is to modernize, but she understands the point that Member Murphy is trying to say, so since the current multi-family spaces are grandfathered what is the real benefit of modernizing the spaces.

Attorney Petrov that these dwelling could possibly lose their grandfather if they were to change their parking spaces in the future and then would be required to conform to the current changes. He stated that it could be useful for possible changes that may arise should multi-family become an allowable usage within the city's ordinance.

Member Mathews asked if it was the consensus to remove multi-family dwelling from the parking ratio document and perhaps move it to the future PUD.

Member Roth stated that he felt it could be good to modernize and leave it in the parking ratio document for any possible usage.

Member Mathews stated that if the consensus among the present members to leave it for existing that she would make the necessary correction. She also suggested including language that is in existing ordinance regarding the parking spaces of motel and hotel. For medical plaza the proposed change to parking spaces to reduce as 5 per 1,000 square foot and previously had been 7 as a minimum. Places regarded as public assembly, or churches could be a separate category as they are all located in residential districts as stated by Member Murphy.

Member Mathews said one parking space per every three seats. She asked if it should be separated as religious assembly and cross the education off as that is itself a separate category.

Attorney Petrov suggested that they could allow for a category that would state non-education assembly or something of the like.

Member Mathews then moved to schools, stated that Liaison Rouse called the local schools to find out the numbers current for the middle school and the high school. Liaison Rouse asked if it would be necessary to add elementary schools to the parking ratio should there be one developed in the future. She stated that Houston had on space per every 12 for elementary and 7 for middle school and 3 for high school. The Middle school has 170, which would be about one per every 7 occupants of the students.

Member Mathews thought that it was determined by the staff and not the actual students of the school. She questioned how you define the word occupant, would that be staff, or students or part-time employees.

Council Liaison Rouse stated that there are currently 80 staff members and over twice the parking spaces for that number of occupants on the staff for the Middle school. The high school has 175 parking spaces and they utilize parking at the school across the street. The occupancy of staff comes up to 212 and 2540 students.

The city of Houston standard which is 1 space per 3 occupant they would then need over 900 spaces they have 895 currently.

Terry Vick had assessed the parking lot in memorial, they had drawn out a plan if they restriped the lot they would then be able to fit more spaces.

Liaison rouse stated she would encourage the commission to require more spaces as that could alleviate some of the parking congestion surrounding the school. She would recommend going with the 3 that matches the city of Houston to aid the parking at the school.

Member Mathews asked if it was logical to have more parking spaces per occupant at the middle school, level as opposed to less at the high school level. She would vote for doing maybe 5 spaces for the middle school as opposed to the suggestion of 7 spaces as she does not think that is necessary for that great amount. And also the suggestion is a minimum they can always do more if the space they have allows for more.

All present members agreed that 5 spaces for the Middle School was reasonable, 12 for the elementary school and 3 for the high school.

And that keeping elementary in the parking ratio, regardless of there not being an elementary currently in the city would be the better decision for any possible future development.

Member Mathews suggested removing the 5-10 acre parking area from the parking ratios documents as it was just not applicable to the city.

Member Murphy suggested keeping the one space per picnic table.

Member Mathews addressed general retail which they were inclined to go with 5 per every 1000 square foot of general retail occupancy.

Member murphy asked if there was a conflict between the larger and smaller retail locations, for instance free standing businesses, and those that are joined in a shopping plaza.

Member Mathews moved to other uses, she did not feel there needed to be a catch all at that point as they were all covered for the most part.

Attorney Petrov suggest putting 5 per 1000 square foot in the place of other uses to cover the category should a need arise.

Liaison Rouse stated that she would like to note, regarding the middle school spaces, if it was the commissions intent to decrease the spaces they would then need to raise the number of required spaces to do so.

Member Mathews stated that the commission would need to revisit the middle school parking spaces.

Member Mathews asked about the parking space measurements, the inclination of the commission of was to have 9ft. x 20 ft. 6 in. spaces to accommodate the larger vehicles.

Member Murphy stated that the wheel bases of cars and tires both are not going to get smaller but just the opposite. He said that 8 ft. is the typical standard sizing for parking spaces but he felt that 9 ft. would be a better choice for safety and preventing incidence of car damage, public safety and so on.

Member Mathews asked if all present members were in favor of the parking sizing.

All stated that they were in favor.

Member Mathews called for a motion to approve the parking ratios

Member Roth made a motion to approve the parking resolution and the definition resolution.

Member Abrams seconded.

All in favor.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**b. DESIGN GUIDE**

**c. BUSINESS USES IN THE BUSINESS DISTRICTS TAKING EITHER AN INCLUSIVE OR EXCLUSIVE APPROACH.**

Member Murphy addressed the topic of mandating a certain amount of retail sales. The cost of the city itself will only continue to increase, and in order to offset what would be work toward a greater generation of ad valorem and sales tax. The mayor at the time was only interested in generation sales tax.

Business district 2 was reduced down to 50% and also included the time single family homes on individual lots with medium density lots along a public street.

At the time no one wanted multi-family dwelling added, and there was no room to add any in business district 2, it was solely businesses.

Business district 3 member murphy stated to his knowledge was to consolidate district 3 to b1 and b4 to the new b3, with the intention of combining similar business districts, and to focus on retail sales.

Member Mathews suggested that Member Murphy take a look at his notes and then they could properly readdress the business districts at the next meeting.

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

Member Mathews called for a vote to approve moving items 302 and 303 from Planning and Zoning ordinances and codes to the City ordinances and codes.

Member Opalka voted against moving the mayors proposed items 302 and 303 from the planning and zoning ordinances and codes into the cities ordinances and codes.

Member Roth seconded.

All in favor.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**m. RESTRUCTURE OF PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERSHIP**

Member Opalka stated that he felt the commission had better chances of getting quorum having more member rather than decreasing the number.

Member Mathews thought that if Planning and Zoning moved the meeting to the last week of the month she felt that it would be a sufficient time for Council to pick it up.

Attorney Petrov stated that this could help getting Planning and Zoning items to the following City Council meeting as it would allow more time.

Member Murphy stated that the time change, from 7:00 p.m. - 6:30 p.m. could be an issue, and that is preventing obtaining quorum. And it is a matter of the commitment of the members, as he himself has been frustrated with the lack of progress and feedback from city council and he would not show up. He stated that the city has a motivated council liaison and mayor and that this should aid in encouraging member to show up. He stated that he felt decreasing the number would help considerably in reaching quorum as typically there are always four members that make meetings, and obtaining five seems to be the issue.

Attorney Petrov stated that the mayor proposed changing the planning zoning code and adding it to the regular ordinances, changing the members from 9-7 and create a disqualifying factor that if you miss three consecutive meetings that would disqualify you from the commission.

Member Mathews stated that she was not sure how it would suit the commission to lose its ability to control the number of members and putting it solely into the hands of the City Council. She also stated that she was not sure she liked the removal of cause from Planning and Zoning to City Council. She felt that it was quite the heavy handed proposal of changes.

Attorney Petrov stated that the first two pages would be moving planning and zoning procedures from the planning and zoning code and moving it entirely to the city code.

Member Opalka, Member Roth, Member Roth and Member Abrams all stated that they agreed with Member Mathews and that they did not feel that was the best choice.

Member Murphy stated that the commission should all decide what to change and make their recommendation regarding the Mayors proposal as it is just a proposal.

Member Mathews called for a motion to move the existing ordinance to restructure the group size and quorum size of the Planning and Zoning Commission without any disciplinary action.

Member Murphy motioned.

Member Abrams seconded.

All in favor.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

## **n. PLANNING AND ZONING OPERATING PROCEDURES**

### **7. ADJOURN**

Member Abrams made a motion to adjourn the Planning and Zoning Meeting at

Member Roth seconded.

All in favor.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

---

**Member Mathews**  
**Planning and Zoning Commission**

---

**Brandy Worthington, Secretary**  
**Planning and Zoning Commission**