



City of Richmond

Where History Meets Opportunity

Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes

600 Morton Street

Richmond, Texas 77584

Monday, June 4, 2018 at 5:00 P.M.

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MINUTES

The Planning and Zoning Commission for the City of Richmond, Texas met in a regular meeting on Monday, June 4, 2018, at 5:00 p.m. Commissioner Hogue, called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. A quorum was present, with the following members in attendance:

Katherine M. Graeber – Kubelka
Ernest Hogue
Noell Myska
Larry Pittman

Staff in attendance: Jessica Duet, Planning Director; Gary Smith, City Attorney; Jose Abraham, Planner II; Duane Whitehead, Assistant City Engineer; and Jordan Adams, GIS Specialist.

Commissioner Hogue declared the meeting open.

Commissioner Hogue introduced agenda item A2., public comment. He asked if there were any public comments. Hearing no public comment the agenda item was closed.

Commissioner Hogue introduced agenda item B1., review and approval of the minutes from May 7, 2018. The motion was presented by Commissioner Pittman for approval of the minutes with an amendment to agenda item C3. to reflect Chairman Hogue did not vote and refrained from discussion. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Myska. The vote was unanimous for approval.

Commissioner Hogue introduced agenda item B2., stating the next Planning and Zoning Commission meeting will be Monday, July 2, 2018, at 5:00 p.m.

Commissioner Hogue introduced agenda item C1., review and recommendation of a final

report to City Commission for a final plat for Riverwood Village Section 5 – 46.98 acres of land – 173 Lots – 4 Blocks – 12 Reserves. City staff recommended approval of this final plat. Commissioner Pittman motioned to recommend approval with City staff's recommendation with one condition. The condition to add a note on the plat stating at the time of construction to follow current FEMA maps in place. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Myska. The vote was unanimous for approval.

Commissioner Hogue excused himself from the discussion of agenda item C2. Commissioner Pittman introduced agenda item C2., review and recommendation of a final report to City Commission for a preliminary plat for Veranda Section Twenty-Three/Twenty-Four – 28.9± acres of land – 114 Lots – 4 Blocks – 4 Reserve. City staff recommended approval of this preliminary plat with six conditions. Commissioner Graeber - Kubelka motioned to recommend approval with City staff's recommendation. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Myska. The vote was three "ayes" for approval. Commissioner Hogue abstained from the vote.

Commissioner Hogue excused himself from discussion of agenda item C3. Commissioner Pittman introduced agenda item C3., review and recommendation of a final report to City Commission for a preliminary plat for Veranda Section Twenty-Five/Twenty-Six – 53.6± acres of land – 120 Lots – 4 Blocks – 8 Blocks. City staff recommended approval of this preliminary plat with seven conditions. Commissioner Graeber – Kubelka motioned to recommend approval with City staff's recommendation. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Myska. The vote was three "ayes" for approval. Commissioner Hogue abstained from the vote.

Commissioner Hogue introduced agenda item C4., public hearing to receive comments for or against a request by Benoy V. Benny and Rose S. Benny to replat approximately 0.6248 acres of land in the Kuykendahl League Survey, Abstract No. 49; also being all of Lot 1, Block 2 of Lakes of Williams Ranch Section 1 and Lot 32A of Lakes of Williams Ranch Section 1 Partial Replat No. 2 to create 1 lot and 1 block. Commissioner Hogue asked if there were any public comments. Hearing no public comment the agenda item was closed.

Commissioner Hogue introduced agenda item C5., review and recommendation of a final report to City Commission for a replat for Lakes of Williams Ranch Section 1 Partial Replat No. 6 – 0.6248 acres of land – 1 Lot – 1 Block. City staff recommended approval of this replat. Commissioner Myska motioned to recommend approval with City staff's recommendation. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Pittman. The vote was unanimous for approval.

Commissioner Hogue introduced agenda item C6a., public hearing to receive comments for or against a text amendment to the Unified Development Code to revise certain regulations pertaining to signage, fences, building form and design, accessory buildings

and structures, landscaping, and administrative reviews. The proposed amendment includes the following sections: 1) Section 4.4.102, *Plans Required*; 2) Section 4.4.301, *Buffering*; 3) Section 4.4.401, *Development Landscaping*; 4) Section 4.7.302, *Nonresidential, Public/Institutional, and Mixed-Use District Signs*; 5) Section 5.1.201, *Building Form and Design*; 6) Section 5.2.101, *Fences and Walls*; 7) Section 5.2.102, *Accessory Buildings and Structures*; and 8) Section 6.3.205, *Administrative Review and Referral*. Commissioner Hogue asked if there were any public comments. Hearing no public comment the agenda item was closed.

Agenda item C6a., continued with a presentation to the Planning and Zoning Commission by Mr. Jose Abraham, Planner II. Mr. Abraham stated the various proposed text amendments were to enhance the existing regulations and minimum undue burden on business owners and developers. The proposed text amendments do not deviate from the intent of the Unified Development Code or goals and policies of the Comprehensive Master Plan. He gave a brief overview of the proposed text amendment list of sections. Mr. Abraham then went over each text amendment section by section beginning with Section 4.4.102, which requires a licensed Texas landscape architect for all landscape plans. The Planning Department recommended allowance for professional engineers and architects to stamp the plans for smaller projects on a case by case basis upon the Code Official's recommendation. The next item presented was Section 4.4.301, regarding bufferyards. Mr. Abraham stated the existing fence height in Option 2 for required bufferyards is inadequate at five feet. City staff is also recommending language for maintenance agreements between property owners where fencing is installed for bufferyards. Commissioner Pittman asked about the different bufferyard types and if it was only require for new development. Mr. Abraham explained bufferyards and in instances where a bufferyard is required. Commissioner Graeber – Kubelka asked a general question about rebuilding a fence and if the bufferyard would apply. Jessica Duet, Planning Director, responded the bufferyard regulations would not apply. The next section for discussion was Section 4.4.401. Mr. Abraham explained the requirement for trees was more intense for rear yards than the front, side, and interior side yard requirement. The proposed amendment would allow for a maximum spacing of trees in the rear yard of 20 to 45 feet. Mr. Abraham introduced the next proposed amendment with Section 4.7.302. He stated the UDC's allowance for wall signage in the all nonresidential districts except for the OT and DN zoning districts did not allow for enough square footage. He also stated in some instances the sign regulations for wall signs did not allow for signs on each leased space. The proposed text amendment would allow each leased spaced a sign, two square feet per linear feet per sign or 200 square feet whichever is less, and rear and side wall signs. However, rear and side wall signs would not be permitted when abutting a residential district or use. Commissioner Pittman questioned if the allowance of one wall sign per building allowance in

the OT and DN districts presented a problem. Staff suggested the OT and DN districts can be amended to allow each leased space a sign instead of one per building. The presentation continued with discussion on Section 5.1.201. Mr. Abraham discussed required building offsets for nonresidential buildings. The proposed text amendment would only require offsets on a building on the side and rear when facing a street or public use. He also stated this Section is silent regarding existing buildings converted from residential to commercial in the OT district. The proposed text amendment provides language to address this issue. The next item presented was Section 5.2.101, which addresses the height and material of fences in the front yard of residential uses. Staff recommends allowing fences up to six feet in height in a front yard when using steel tubular and wrought iron material. Also in this Section, staff recommends adding a requirement for masonry walls on regional and arterial streets for residential development. Commissioner Pittman asked if the masonry wall would only be required for new development. Mr. Abraham responded yes. The next item for discussion was Section 5.2.102. This Section addresses accessory structures and buildings. The Section does not mention the Olde Town (OT) zoning district. It was explained by Mr. Abraham as simply an omission when the UDC was adopted. Staff is recommending adding the OT zoning district to this Section to be included for the construction of accessory buildings and structures. The last Section of discussion was 6.3.205. This Section refers to site development plan submittals. Mr. Abraham explained the process defined in the UDC is not the policy used by staff, however, staff has not determined an appropriate policy to define in the UDC at this time for fee collection. Staff is recommending the removal of Subsection B.2. until at such time an appropriate process can be defined. This concluded the presentation by Mr. Abraham.

Commissioner Hogue introduced agenda item C6b., consideration of the approval of a final report to City Commission on agenda item C6a. Commissioner Graeber – Kubelka motioned to recommend approval with City staff's recommendations with one amendment. The amendment is the allowance of one wall sign per façade in the OT and DN zoning districts (Section 4.7.302). The motion was seconded by Commissioner Myska. The vote was unanimous of approval.

Commissioner Hogue introduced agenda item C7a., a public hearing to receive comments for or against a text amendment to the Unified Development Code to provide for the uses "nanobrewery", "microbrewery", and "custom assembly" in the Olde Town (OT), Downtown (DN), Suburban Commercial (SC), General Commercial (GC), Business Park (BP), and Mixed Use (MU) zoning districts. The sections include: 1) Section 2.2.104, *Commercial Uses*; 2) Section 2.2.105, *Agriculture, Industrial, Transportation, Utility, and Communication Uses*; 3) Section 2.2.203, *Commercial Limited and Conditional Use Standards*; 4) Section 2.2.204, *Industrial, Transportation, Utility, and Communication*


Limited and Conditional Use Standards; and 5) Division 7.1.300, *Definitions*. Commissioner Hogue asked if there were any public comments. Hearing no public comment the agenda item was closed.

Agenda item C7a., continued with a presentation to the Planning and Zoning Commission by Ms. Jessica Duet, Planning Director. Ms. Duet stated the terms “nanobrewery”, “microbrewery”, and “custom assembly” were new land use terms for the UDC. The new land use terms were going to be proposed as limited uses in the GC, OT, DN, and MU zoning districts, and conditional uses in the SC and BP zoning districts. She further explained uses such as breweries and large-scale assembly were allowed currently in the Industrial (IN) zoning district. The text amendment is proposing to bring smaller-scale operations to the core-area and downtown part of the City so residents and visitors alike have accessibility to these uses. Ms. Duet went over the proposed definitions for the new land use terms and specifically how “microbrewery” and “nanobrewery” are limited by their barrels of production in one year. The “custom assembly” is defined by use in hand-held tools and further limited in space of 2,000 square feet. This concluded the presentation.

Commissioner Hogue introduced agenda item C7b., consideration of the approval of a final report to City Commission on agenda item C7a. Commissioner Pittman motioned to recommend approval with City staff’s recommendation. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Myska. The vote was unanimous of approval.

There being no further business to be brought before the Planning and Zoning Commission, Commissioner Myska motioned for the meeting to be adjourned. Commissioner Graeber - Kubelka seconded and the Commissioner was adjourned at 6:38 p.m.

Approved:



Ernest Hogue, Planning and Zoning Commission Chair