



MINUTES
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
CITY OF MISSOURI CITY, TEXAS
May 10, 2017

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Notice of Meeting and Agenda having been duly posted in accordance with legal requirements and a quorum being present, the meeting was called to order by Chairman Brown-Marshall, at 7:00 PM.

2. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present:

Sonya Brown-Marshall
John O'Malley
Len Goff
Reginald Pearson
Courtney Johnson Rose
Doug Parker
Ramesh Anand

Commissioners Absent: Commissioners Haney, Brightwell

Councilmembers Present: None

Staff Present:

Otis T. Spriggs, Director of Development Services
Shashi Kumar, City Engineer/Director of Public Works
Jennifer Thomas Gomez, Interim Assistant Director of Development Services
Evelyn Kimeu, Assistant City Attorney
Jennifer Hobbs, Assistant City Engineer
Nancy Desobry, Office Manager

Others Present:

Geoff Freeman

Kathryn Edwards

3. READING OF MINUTES:

- (1) Chairman Brown-Marshall called for any corrections or additions to the April 12, 2017, regular Planning and Zoning Commission meeting minutes.

Motion: Approval of the April 12, 2017, meeting minutes

Made By: Commissioner Goff

Second: Commissioner Pearson

AYES: Commissioner O'Malley, Chairman Brown-Marshall, Commissioner Goff, Commissioner Pearson, Commissioner Rose, Commissioner Parker, Commissioner Anand

NAYS: None

The motion passed.

- (2) Chairman Brown-Marshall called for any corrections or additions to the April 25, 2017, special Planning and Zoning Commission meeting minutes.

Motion: Approval of the April 25, 2017, meeting minutes

Made By: Commissioner Rose

Second: Commissioner Pearson

AYES: Commissioner O'Malley, Chairman Brown-Marshall, Commissioner Goff, Commissioner Pearson, Commissioner Rose, Commissioner Parker

NAYS: None

ABSTENTIONS: Commissioner Anand

The motion passed.

4. REPORTS

A. COMMISSION REPORTS

- (1) Chairman of the Planning and Zoning Commission

None

- (2) Planning and Zoning Commissioners

None

B. STAFF REPORTS

- (1) Development Services

a. Director – Mr. Otis Spriggs introduced Eboni Fleming who is assisting with the Strategic Plan. Mr. Thomas White will be joining us shortly as a Planner II.

- (2) City Engineer
 - a. City Engineer/Director of Public Works – Mr. Shashi Kumar introduced Ms. Jennifer Hobbs, the new Assistant City Engineer, joining us from Lake Charles, Louisiana.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

6. PLATS

A. CONSENT AGENDA

- (1) Consider approval of a preliminary plat for Mustang Trails Section 2
- (2) Consider approval of a preliminary plat for Sienna Plantation Section 14
- (3) Consider approval of a preliminary plat for Sienna Plantation Section 16
- (4) Consider approval of a preliminary plat for Plantation River – Street Dedication

Chairman Brown-Marshall requested that item 6.A(1) be pulled for discussion.

Motion: The Planning and Zoning Commission grant conditional approval of the consent agenda items 6.A(2), (3), and (4).

Made By: Commissioner Goff
Second: Commissioner Anand

AYES: Commissioner O'Malley, Chairman Brown-Marshall, Commissioner Goff, Commissioner Pearson, Commissioner Rose, Commissioner Parker, Commissioner Anand

NAYS: None

The motion passed.

A Drainage Impact Analysis has been submitted and is currently under review. To date, the analysis has not yet addressed comments from the City and the MUD. The analysis is required to be approved prior to approval of this preliminary plat. Additionally, infrastructure plans will not be reviewed nor approved until this analysis has been approved

Motion: The Planning and Zoning Commission grant conditional approval of the consent agenda items 6.A(1)

Made By: Commissioner O'Malley
Second: Commissioner Rose

AYES: Commissioner O'Malley, Chairman Brown-Marshall, Commissioner Goff, Commissioner Pearson, Commissioner Rose, Commissioner Parker, Commissioner Anand

NAYS: None

The motion passed.

B. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF A FINAL PLAT OF SIENNA PLANTATION SECTIONS 13A AND 13B

- (1) Consider approval of Partial Replat No. 1 for Sienna Plantation Sections 13A and 13B
- (2) Consider approval of a Partial Replat No. 2 for Sienna Plantation Sections 13A and 13B
- (3) Consider approval of Partial Replat No. 3 for Sienna Plantation Sections 13A and 13B

Ms. Jennifer Thomas Gomez, Interim Assistant Director of Development Services, stated that the Commission should note that the purpose of this replat(s) is to reconfigure boundary lines to create three new sections due to timing of finalization of infrastructure, acceptance of that by the various public entities and timing for the home construction. There are no other proposed changes to the previously recorded subdivisions.

Motion: To close the public hearing

Made By: Commissioner Rose

Second: Commissioner Goff

AYES: Commissioner O'Malley, Chairman Brown-Marshall, Commissioner Goff, Commissioner Pearson, Commissioner Rose, Commissioner Parker, Commissioner Anand

NAYS: None

The motion passed.

Motion: The Planning and Zoning Commission grant conditional approval of Partial Replat No. 1 for Sienna Plantation Sections 13A and 13B, Partial Replat No. 2 for Sienna Plantation Sections 13A and 13B, and Partial Replat No. 3 for Sienna Plantation Sections 13A and 13B

Made By: Commissioner Rose

Second: Commissioner Goff

AYES: Commissioner O'Malley, Chairman Brown-Marshall, Commissioner Goff, Commissioner Pearson, Commissioner Rose, Commissioner Parker, Commissioner Anand

NAYS: None

The motion passed.

C. PARKS EDGE

- (1) Consider approval of a concept plan for Parks Edge

Ms. Gomez presented this item stating this is a concept plan the Commission previously considered in the Fall of 2015. There is a new builder, new developer that has acquired this property. This is what we know as PD 95. This is north of Lake Olympia, north of where Vicksburg Boulevard terminates at Lake Olympia today and west of the Fort Bend Parkway. The proposal is very similar to what the Commission has seen when PD 95 was created. In addition to the previously approved conceptual plan, there are some slight modifications on this plan and some more refinement in terms of engineering standards in regards to drainage, traffic layout and things of that nature. They are still proposing 1040 lots within the total buildout of this subdivision. Various sections are shown with a slight minor modification from the Land Plan that was approved with PD 95; however, there is language that modifications can be made within certain percentages. The report for the conceptual plan reflects acknowledging the changes that were made. They are slight, not anything substantive to what was approved with the PD. They are land planning for everything that would be considered south of the Mustang Bayou Diversion Channel. That is where you see the actual lot layout in the first sections to be included within this development. There are comments included in the staff report, but overall staff does recommend approval of this revised concept based on the comments that are provided.

Commissioner Rose requested clarification of the specific change. Ms. Gomez stated that there are minor changes in terms of where you see the recreation located. It was previously flipped with where the lot section is located, a little closer to the diversion channel. There are also some modifications in terms of where the 60' and 50' lots are located going down towards Lake Olympia. Again, it was allowed within the parameters, just a shift to a few of the locations.

Ms. Gomez stated this does require a parkland dedication. A lot of green space and trails, the connection to Community Park will still be considered by the Parks Board and will be submitted to the Commission at a later time through a parkland dedication proposal.

Mr. Kumar stated there are two major issues here and one is the drainage. They are working on the drainage analysis and there would be improvements along the Mustang Bayou Division Channel. The major thoroughfare that would serve this development would be the extension of Vicksburg Boulevard to the north. There is a TIA being developed for transportation needs to support the development as well.

In response to access questions from Commissioner Rose, Ms. Gomez stated the roads all connect to the main spine that is the extension of Vicksburg, so it is a similar suburban layout with the cul-de-sacs all winding back to the main spine.

Mr. Kumar stated this is Phase I, the connection point is to the extension of Vicksburg. As the other phases come into place other points of connection are being looked at. The Phase I, the connection is to the extension of Vicksburg Boulevard, approximate lot number is 1,040 in total.

Ms. Gomez stated that currently the second entrance is an emergency entrance, on the north end of the property. In the single family 7, the yellow area at the top of the subdivision, there is an arrow that is pointing down, the original design of the second entrance/exit, but it would be limited to emergency vehicles.

In response to Commissioner Pearson, Ms. Gomez commented on a potential pedestrian bridge to connect to Community Park. Ms. Gomez responded to Chairman Brown-Marshall's question about the hard corner at Vicksburg stating based on the Land Plan that approximate 2 acres is

commercial. It is not part of the conceptual plan, but it is part of PD 95. The commercial would still be at all four corners of that intersection. The Land Plan did anticipate single family residential wrapping around that commercial acreage. Chairman Brown-Marshall requested the Land Plan, stating this appeared to be a lot of residential, giving up prime property. She is not in disagreement with more lots, she's just trying to make sure they aren't giving up everything that we thought we were going to get in this.

Commissioner O'Malley stated at the initial presentation he was excited about the view all of the way along Lake Olympia and now he's looking at the fact that when this originally was discussed, the roundabout at that intersection with a light and continuing down Lake Olympia Parkway away from the tollway. Now they are looking at what is probably going to be a wooden fence going all of the way along, curb appeal, a wooden fence. The last time this was discussed the common area or the parks and the open space were going to be in view of that roundabout, now it looks like fences.

Ms. Gomez stated keeping in mind with PD 95 that there are enhanced design standards, so it is not the same as single family residential outside of the PD. There are improved design standards that have to be applied. There may be a fence, privacy fencing or community fencing along Lake Olympia, but the design standards are worded so that it should be enhanced over what would traditionally be placed there. This does follow the PD that was approved. Ms. Gomez stated the shifts in the plan consist of four or five lots, the frontage along Lake Olympia was previously designated for residential. What they did, within that residential some of the 50' lots have been replaced with 60' lots, but is only a matter of four or five, not that entire section. Those phases are as shown.

Commissioner Rose asked if Kerry Gilbert represents a particular builder and was told they do.

Kathryn Edwards, Kerry Gilbert & Associates, stated they are the land planner for the project. The owner and developer for the property is D. R. Horton and they will be doing the entire project. At this time that is the intent and for phase I, especially that is who will be doing it. The first phase is 50' and 60' lots.

Chairman Brown-Marshall asked Ms. Edwards about the recreation center. Ms. Edwards stated it is going to be a full recreation center, they are anticipating having a pool, playground that type of facility will be available for the community. It is the same plan as originally proposed, just shifted locations so that it can be part of the initial phases going in and be there for amenities right from the start.

Chairman Brown-Marshall asked about the elementary school site and was told that was all proposed and would be decided by the FBISD. Ms. Brown-Marshall asked about connectivity and walking. Ms. Edwards stated there are trails planned and they are shown on the concept plan. The intent is to connect it all through the detention areas and also to the surrounding trails, the park to the west, and connect to any other trail systems in the surrounding developments. A parkland dedication proposal has been submitted for review. Chairman Brown-Marshall inquired if they were going to do all parkland instead of some cash or is it going to be a mix. Ms. Edwards stated they were anticipating to be able to meet the parkland dedication requirements.

Commissioner Rose asked about the land between the subdivision going towards the Ft. Bend Tollway, is that going to be commercial or just drainage (Memorial Town Center concept)? Ms. Gomez stated that is PD 96, the mixed use PD component that came in around the same time

as this PD, and so it does include opportunities for mixed use commercial, higher density residential within the boundaries. The regulations within that PD coincide with the regulations for this development. There should be some uniformity in terms of design and character.

Commissioner Rose asked if the fencing along Lake Olympia would be a brick wall? Ms. Edwards stated the PD did address screening and landscaping requirements. The homes themselves there are enhanced architectural elements.

Ms. Gomez displayed the site layout plan adopted with PD #95. Commissioner O'Malley pointed out that the greenspace is wide open. The new plan shows more lots and a cul-de-sac, some of the green is gone. Ms. Edwards stated once it was lotted out there were areas that were able to be developed differently; however, there are still openings to that pipeline. There are going to be trails all connecting through the cul-de-sacs. They are still trying to bring that greenspace in, but just with the layout it shifted the boundary line and what area was developable once looking a little bit more in-depth into the project.

Commissioner O'Malley asked the overall greenspace was changed by about how much? Ms. Edwards stated she did not have the exact numbers, but it is comparable and still meets the requirements for parkland dedication. The rec center is the same and they are still providing trails and everything through the detention areas and along the bayou.

Chairman Brown-Marshall asked what was expected of the Commission. Ms. Edwards stated they had met minimum requirements, but Chairman Brown-Marshall expected more. Commissioner O'Malley has clearly pointed out that there is a loss of a lot of greenspace.

Ms. Gomez stated the staff recommendation after the staff review are the conditions placed in the report. Staff is recommending approval conditioned upon those items being changed.

Commissioner O'Malley stated they have talked about the curb appeal, sense of arrival, the impact of starting a subdivision, whether it is going to be this huge, "you have arrived at this new development". Are these lots going to be built and then they are going to do that at the corner that is called the roundabout? The Commission was very protective of that four-way stop. They are still having this concept that he was so excited when this was talked about for many hours. Now he is thinking there is less greenspace, more lots, and a brown fence.

Ms. Edwards stated she did not have the exact numbers in front of her, but she didn't think the greenspace has really changed, it has shifted. Overall connectivity in that intent is going to continue and as they move through the other sections, the other areas where they are able to open cul-de-sacs up to the detention areas and that type of thing. As it continues to proceed through the future phases there will be other elements that will be drawn in. As far as the entrance and that, that is still the intent of D. R. Horton in doing this. The roundabout that is shown toward the right as you get off of Lake Olympia, that is something that has been added since the original concept plan and a lot of that has to do with the traffic impact analysis, but also it is an opportunity to create an entrance that will work for both the residential element and the commercial element providing, the roundabout, there are ways for monumentation and additional landscaping and that type of thing which will really help to create an entrance specific to this project. A lot of those things are still the intent of the developer for this project and when she talks about meeting the minimum, she is referring to all of the standards that were put in place with the PD, not the base requirements for the City ordinance. That already requires additional regulations and design standards. Their intent is to make this a big beautiful community with as many amenities as they can provide. That is why the rec center is going in

with the first phase, they want to be sure to amenitize right from the start and not wait until the future.

Commissioner O'Malley stated now that the lots are on paper there is less greenspace. The first impression of when the lots are done is there is less greenspace. He stated she says in the future they will try to expand those, and he totally trusts her. Except the first one presented is less. Ms. Edwards stated it has just been readjusted. Commissioner O'Malley stated he knew it had been readjusted, but when he looks at the big green spot that is really what he focuses on and now it is a little spot. Ms. Edwards stated it has been tried to be pulled into the community. If you notice in section 3 there is open space right there in front of the lots that is providing an area right in front of the homes that can be utilized. It has just been reallocated in different areas as it was developed. Putting it in places where it would be more beneficial to residents.

Ms. Gomez stated in response to Commissioner Rose that the developer could construct a wood fence based on the regulations.

Chairman Brown-Marshall stated that confuses her, if there are already existing subdivisions that are there that have already set standards, why do we come forward with newer subdivisions and lower the standards?

Ms. Gomez stated in this case it might not be lowered, there are different standards. Our community fencing standards are wood with brick pilasters every 300 feet. That is the baseline. There are certain subdivisions that have enhanced that, but it is based on, just like our master planned communities, it is based on design standards that are applicable within those boundaries.

Ms. Edwards stated she can pass the comment on to the developer, she does not know what their intent is because she is not working on that element of the project, but she can let them know that that is something that is being looked for and they may already be planning that, she is not involved in that element. In the conversations she has had with them, they are excited to do a really high quality development. It is just as important to them to have aesthetics and be inviting and look different.

Commissioner O'Malley stated that was the impression he remembered leaving the meeting with. This is just more lots less greenspace. But he trusts her and he knows she put a lot of work into this. He was excited and he will be excited again, it's going to take him a while to get over the fact that there is a lot of yellow and not a lot of green.

Ms. Gomez stated on the parkland dedication, there is an option to weigh in. Entering into parkland dedication there is public maintenance versus private maintenance and the amount of land in terms of that. But there is still the opportunity for the Commission to weigh in. If you conditionally approve the conceptual plan and the parkland dedication makes changes to the land plan, those changes still have to be reflected in the conceptual, preliminary, and final plats. If the dedication is cash in lieu of, then they would develop based on City standards. In that case there may not be open space unless there are drainage or detention areas. Of, if the developer wants to put that into their land plan. If it is open space that is required as part of parkland, then that is either public or private dedication and that would be identified on the plat.

Commissioner Rose asked if it could be specific that the fencing has to be brick? Ms. Gomez stated not at this stage. This is a conceptual plan. Fencing would be part of the PD regulations. We do not have the ability to impose that on the conceptual plan because the conceptual plan

has to be in conformance with the Planned Development District that has been previously adopted. However, we hear the comments and will need to come back to the Commission, not necessarily impacting this particular project, but in thinking about the City's fence regulations as a whole, that might be an item to revisit with the Commission in terms of architectural standards and what to apply. The developer has certain expectations in terms of when they purchase or invest in the property as to what the regulations that would be applicable to them. In this case we have already adopted the PD, so unless the developer is impressed to make recommended changes, the regulations that are in place today would apply to this property.

Chairman Brown-Marshall stated what they adopted and what is being presented looks a little different.

Commissioner O'Malley stated he understands it is not subjective. They have spent so many hours on this and he loves the concept, that's why he put so much time into it. He went to HOAs and was excited, and the first one we are going to cut the greenspace so the cul-de-sacs can be bigger. It is not subjective, that is why he is making the motion. There is a reason why Sienna is all consent agenda because the standards are so high and we know they are going to meet them. This is the first time we have looked at this and they are not. It is disappointing. Of course it meets the guidelines, these are professionals, they talk to City staff. Everything fits in the box. Yes, maybe it is small, but we were even defending the concept with other projected projects along that road. We were talking about how beautiful this is going to be and the impact of it, and the first impression is, I'm not sure if they are as committed as we are. It's not our money.

Mr. Kumar stated the traffic has not been approved, it is being reviewed.

Motion: The Planning and Zoning Commission grant conditional approval of a concept plan for Parks Edge

Made By: Commissioner O'Malley
Second: Commissioner Anand

AYES: Commissioner O'Malley, Chairman Brown-Marshall, Commissioner Goff, Commissioner Pearson, Commissioner Rose, Commissioner Parker, Commissioner Anand

NAYS: None

The motion passed.

Motion: The Planning and Zoning Commission consider item 6C(3) before item 6C(2).

Made By: Commissioner Rose
Second: Commissioner Goff

AYES: Commissioner O'Malley, Chairman Brown-Marshall, Commissioner Goff, Commissioner Pearson, Commissioner Rose, Commissioner Parker, Commissioner Anand

NAYS: None

The motion passed.

- (3) Consider approval of a preliminary plat for Parks Edge Boulevard-Street Dedication

Ms. Gomez presented this item stating it does continue to allow for a roundabout and Engineering is working with the applicant and the developer on the details of that design. It generally follows what was conceptualized for the main spine access for the subdivision. This is just a street dedication. The conditions are outlined in the staff report.

Motion: The Planning and Zoning Commission grant conditional approval of a preliminary plat for Parks Edge Boulevard-Street dedication

Made By: Commissioner O'Malley
Second: Commissioner Rose

AYES: Commissioner O'Malley, Chairman Brown-Marshall, Commissioner Goff, Commissioner Pearson, Commissioner Rose, Commissioner Parker, Commissioner Anand

NAYS: None

The motion passed.

- (2) Consider approval of a preliminary plat for Parks Edge Recreation Center

Ms. Gomez presented this item stating this also contains a street dedication for the continuation of the main road and the boundary lines for the recreation center. It moved locations in terms of what was shown on the land use plan adopted with the PD, but is still within the general vicinity and they are proposing this to go along with Phase I development.

Ms. Gomez stated we would provide updates to the Commission on the progress of this development once further along in the platting process.

Motion: The Planning and Zoning Commission grant conditional approval of a preliminary plat for Parks Edge Recreation Center

Made By: Commissioner Rose
Second: Commissioner Goff

AYES: Commissioner O'Malley, Chairman Brown-Marshall, Commissioner Goff, Commissioner Pearson, Commissioner Rose, Commissioner Parker, Commissioner Anand

NAYS: None

The motion passed.

D. AVALON AT SIENNA PLANTATION SECTION 6

- (1) Consider a variance request from Section 82-161.(a) if the City's Subdivision Ordinance pertaining to the general arrangement and layout of alleys.

Ms. Gomez presented this item stating the applicant is seeking a variance from Section 82-161.(a) of the City's Subdivision Ordinance pertaining to the general arrangement and layout of alleys. Several lots, as described in the attached letter, have been designed to allow for their primary and sole access from an adjoining alley. The other side of the lots would front a landscape reserve at the entry to the proposed subdivision. As provided in the attachment and as shown in the proposed subdivision plat, the streets contained within the subdivision are being dedicated as private rights-of-way. The proposed alleys would be dedicated as reserves. As with the private streets, the alleys would be privately maintained; however, they are required to be designed in accordance with the City's design manual including provisions for right-of-way and pavement width.

Staff considers the alley system consistent with the overall subdivision character due to the provision and maintenance of private streets. Staff does not find that the granting of this variance request would cause a substantial harm in the provision of adequate vehicular access. However, a notation should be required to be placed on the subdivision plat to ensure that the subject lots maintain adequate access through by way of the alleys.

Geoff Freeman, LJA Engineering, stated this is a private gated section with a boulevard entry with a set of gates. The eight lots at the entry, the front of the lots will face the entry street with the garages in the back with the alleys behind them. Along with these lots and all of the other townhome or patio lots they will all have a rear garage. Vehicular access will be only from the rear garage. All of the other lots minus these eight meet the subdivision standards where the alley cannot be the only point of connectivity. Mr. Freeman stated this will allow the HOA to maintain this area.

Motion: The Planning and Zoning Commission grant approval of a variance request pertaining to the general arrangement and layout of alleys for Avalon at Sienna Plantation Section 6.

Made By: Commissioner Goff
Second: Commissioner Rose

AYES: Commissioner O'Malley, Chairman Brown-Marshall, Commissioner Goff, Commissioner Pearson, Commissioner Rose, Commissioner Parker, Commissioner Anand

NAYS: None

The motion passed.

- (2) Consider approval of final plat for Avalon at Sienna Plantation Section 6.

Motion: The Planning and Zoning Commission grant conditional approval of a final plat for Avalon at Sienna Plantation Section 6.

Made By: Commissioner Pearson
Second: Commissioner O'Malley

AYES: Commissioner O'Malley, Chairman Brown-Marshall, Commissioner Goff, Commissioner Pearson, Commissioner Rose, Commissioner Parker, Commissioner Anand

NAYS: None

The motion passed.

E. SIENNA VILLAGE OF DESTREHAN SECTION B

(1) Consider an extension of the approval of a final plat for Sienna Village of Destrehan Section 6B

Ms. Gomez presented this item stating the property owner is requesting a twelve (12) month approval for this final plat. This plat received final approval from the City of Missouri City on June 6, 2016, and is due to expire on June 6, 2017. The purpose of this extension is to allow additional time for the market to absorb the existing inventory of lots of the same size before proceeding with development of this section. Staff recommends the Planning and Zoning Commission should extend the final plat approval for the Sienna Village of Destrehan Section 6B subdivision for a period of twelve months to expire on May 10, 2018.

Motion: The Planning and Zoning Commission grant an extension of the approval of a final Plat for Sienna Village of Destrehan Section 6B.

Made By: Commissioner Parker
Second: Commissioner O'Malley

AYES: Commissioner O'Malley, Chairman Brown-Marshall, Commissioner Goff, Commissioner Pearson, Commissioner Rose, Commissioner Parker, Commissioner Anand

NAYS: None

The motion passed.

7. ZONING MAP AMENDMENTS

None.

8. ZONING TEXT AMENDMENTS

None

9. OTHER MATTERS WITHIN THE JURISDICTION OF THE COMMISSION OR THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

A. IMPACT FEES

- (1) Consideration of an updated report on the land use assumptions and capital improvements plan for the Northeast Oyster Creek Subwatershed, Lake Olympia Parkway Extension and Mustang Bayou Service Area.

Mr. Kumar presented this item stating when there is a new development coming in or plan, the developer pays an impact fee for necessary improvements. Typically, the impact fee update is done every five years which is required and adopted by ordinance. City ordinance states that every six months this is reviewed. If there are any changes they be brought before the Commission. The Lake Olympia Parkway extension was last updated in 2016. The Mustang Bayou was updated in 2015. And the North Oyster Creek Subwatershed was updated in August 2012. This project will be studied this year. At this point there are no changes to the impact fees. After the study for the Oyster Creek Subwatershed at the next six months update it will be determined if there needs to be any revision to the impact fees. At this point there are no revision recommendations.

- (2) Consideration of the approval of a Semi-Annual report to City Council.

Motion: The Planning and Zoning Commission submit this report to City Council with a positive recommendation.

Made By: Commissioner Anand
Second: Commissioner O'Malley

AYES: Commissioner O'Malley, Chairman Brown-Marshall, Commissioner Goff, Commissioner Pearson, Commissioner Rose, Commissioner Parker, Commissioner Anand

The motion passed.

B. AMENDMENT OF THE CITY'S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

- (1) Consideration of the approval of a Comprehensive Plan amendment to forward to the City Manager for submission to the Council.

Ms. Jennifer Thomas Gomez appeared before the Commission to summarize comments and feedback given thus far on the draft Comprehensive Plan. Recommended changes submitted by administrative staff and the Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee were categorized as substantive changes, minor changes (including grammatical items, legislative changes, timelines, map revisions, reference page numbers, titles, references etc.), and clarifications, all of which will be modified prior to the final consideration on June 5, 2017 by City Council.

Ms. Jennifer Thomas Gomez also identified changes in the formatting located in the Implementation Chapter. She also described captured items from the 2009 Comprehensive Plan, which illustrates an ideal layout for the current recommendations.

Substantive changes include language updates to our mission and vision statements, which are formerly established as part of the 2014 City Council's Strategic Plan, and later amended and adopted at the beginning of 2017. The plan will reflect the new Vision Statement: "To be known and recognized as a superior municipal organization"; and, the new Mission Statement: "To deliver outstanding customer service to all members of our diverse community".

Regarding the Future Land Use Plan, the base will be the most up-to-date version, which will reflect all recent land use amendments, including a number of Planned District (PD) changes, as well as the four major corridor recommendations as identified in the draft plan: Texas Parkway, Cartwright Road, FM 1092 and Fort Bend Parkway corridors. Recommendations, policies and goals related to development in those areas are included in those substantive changes noted.

Ms. Jennifer Thomas Gomez informed the Commission that the character district descriptions will be corrected based on the version currently shown in the draft, which are a carryover from the 2009 Comprehensive Plan. Rural character references will be removed which might encourage private utilities/sewers within areas that include our large acreage estates, typically located around the perimeter of Missouri City, not having access to public utilities.

Another related change noted by Ms. Jennifer Thomas Gomez includes the chart that distinguishes the Land Use Map from the Zoning Map. The "Suburban Character" and "Estate Character" terminology is further clarified in the Land Use Plan and the Suburban (SD) district on the Zoning Map. Disclaimer language has been incorporated into that chart which further signifies what's in the Land Use Plan does not constitute Zoning, and it does not establish the Zoning districts; it only provides guidance on what is to be considered.

Ms. Jennifer Thomas Gomez added that another proposed change to identify the multifamily designation as higher density residential, which would include types such as patio homes, detached townhomes, condominiums or apartments. Mr. Otis Spriggs interjected that in the proposed recommendations and draft language, there is a reference to "the accommodation of other housing choices," such as assisted living and other residential products including smaller lot uses.

Ms. Jennifer Thomas Gomez continued noting that additional changes include refinement of the 2009 Implementation Plan formatting. The action types, responsible entities, public/private partners, and the budget financial impacts will also be incorporated into this chapter. The 2009 ongoing action items that are still pending were called out and will be carried over into the amendment. Chair Sonya Brown-Marshall observed that the responsible implementing parties or departments will be the driving factor.

Mr. Reginald Pearson asked regarding the corridor action committees, will there be any opportunities for progress updates to be presented to the Commission? He added that the four corridors need to be put on a fast-track, in order for us see what we should be doing. Ms. Jennifer Thomas Gomez responded that the annual progress reports and the implementation process will allow for committee status reports. If the Commission wants to do that more frequently updates, it can accommodate. The consensus of the Commission is to require quarterly reports to accommodate a sense of urgency, as well as economic development updates.

Ms. Jennifer Thomas Gomez concluded with a suggestion that the Commission recommends clarification on the chart that clarifies the authority granted to cities, and limits what they cannot control. Reference is made that a city cannot control or influence architectural appeal or aesthetics. Confusion with our architectural design standards is possible, and staff is suggesting that we place a disclaimer in that section to further clarify with a definition of the two.

Motion: The Planning and Zoning Commission forward this report to the City Manager for submission to the Council with a positive recommendation.

Made By: Commissioner
Second: Commissioner

AYES: Commissioner O'Malley, Chairman Brown-Marshall, Commissioner Goff, Commissioner Pearson, Commissioner Rose, Commissioner Parker, Commissioner Anand

NAYS: None

The motion passed.

10. CLOSED EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Planning and Zoning Commission may go into Executive Session regarding any item posted on the Agenda as authorized by Chapter 551 of the Texas Government Code.

11. RECONVENE

Reconvene into Regular Session and Consider Action, if any, on items discussed in Executive Session.

12. ADJOURN

Nancy Desobry