

CITY OF ROSENBERG COUNCIL WORKSHOP MEETING MINUTES

On this the 22nd day of April, 2014, the City Council of the City of Rosenberg, Fort Bend County, Texas, met in a Special Workshop Session, in the Rosenberg City Hall Council Chamber, located at 2110 4th Street, Rosenberg, Texas.

PRESENT

Vincent M. Morales, Jr.	Mayor
William Benton	Councilor at Large, Position 1
Cynthia McConathy	Councilor at Large, Position 2
Jimmie J. Pena	Councilor, District 1
Susan Euton	Councilor, District 2
Dwayne Grigar	Councilor, District 3
Amanda Bolf	Councilor, District 4

STAFF PRESENT

Robert Gracia	City Manager
Lora Lenzsch	City Attorney
Linda Cernosek	City Secretary
John Maresh	Assistant City Manager for Public Services
Jeff Trinker	Executive Director of Support Services
Joyce Vasut	Executive Director of Administrative Services
Travis Tanner	Executive Director of Community Development
Angela Fritz	Communications Director
Wade Goates	Fire Chief
Rachelle Kanak	Assistant Economic Development Director
Lisa Olmeda	Human Resources Director
Darren McCarthy	Parks and Recreation Director
Lydia Acosta	Recreation Programs Coordinator
Kaye Supak	Executive Assistant
Tommy Havelka	Police Officer

During a City Council Workshop, the City Council does not take final action on the agenda items and any consideration of final action will be scheduled at a Regular or Special City Council Meeting. Public comments are welcomed at Regular or Special City Council Meetings. No public comments will be received at a Workshop Meeting.

The City Council reserves the right to adjourn into Executive Session at any time during the course of this meeting to discuss any of the matters listed below, as authorized by Title 5, Chapter 551, of the Texas Government Code.

CALL TO ORDER.

Mayor Morales called the meeting to order at 6:58 p.m.

AGENDA

- 1. REVIEW AND DISCUSS PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 2014-08, AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE CODE OF ORDINANCES BY AMENDING SUBSECTIONS (A)(4) AND (A)(7) AND BY ADDING NEW SUBSECTIONS (A)(8), (A)(9) AND (A)(10) TO SECTION 6-362.2 OF ARTICLE XIII OF CHAPTER 6 THEREOF, PROVIDING FOR EXPANDED BOUNDARIES OF SIGN DISTRICT "B"; BY ADDING A NEW SECTION 6-362.3 OF ARTICLE XIII OF CHAPTER 6 THEREOF, ESTABLISHING SIGN DISTRICT "C" AND REGULATIONS FOR SIGN DISTRICT "C"; BY**

ADDING A NEW SECTION 6-362.4 OF ARTICLE XIII OF CHAPTER 6 THEREOF, ESTABLISHING A SIGN DISTRICT MAP; PROVIDING A PENALTY IN AN AMOUNT AS PROVIDED IN SECTION 1-13 OF THIS CODE FOR VIOLATION OF ANY PROVISION HEREOF; REPEALING ALL ORDINANCES OR PARTS OF ORDINANCES INCONSISTENT OR IN CONFLICT HEREWITH; AND PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY.

Executive Summary: This Ordinance was brought to City Council on February 18, 2014. City Council directed staff to put the Ordinance on a future Workshop Agenda for further discussion. The CCC executive summary report that was provided to City Council on February 18th is included in its entirety as follows:

Freestanding sign regulations for height and area for Avenues H and I and State Highway 36 (between I-69/U.S. 59 and Avenue H) have been discussed in two (2) previous City Council Workshop meetings: once on September 24, 2013, and again on November 26, 2013. In the most recent discussion on November 26, 2013, staff presented options for sign regulations for these corridors to City Council. The most agreed-upon option involved designating the eastern parts of Avenues H and I as being included in previously-approved Sign District "B." These parts of the corridors have larger properties that could accommodate the larger signage allowed in District "B" (maximum of 16-foot/120 square foot single-tenant signs and 24-foot/320 square foot multi-tenant signs). Staff recommended that should City Council choose this option, the dividing lines for larger signage would be Miles and Mahlmann Streets. This was due to the larger properties and shopping centers mostly being located to the east of these streets. There was subsequent discussion and potential agreement on the dividing line being moved to the west to 8th Street with the exception properties located on the south side of Avenue I, which should have smaller signage due to more residences being located in the area.

Staff has prepared an Ordinance amendment that we believe most reflects the discussion and consensus of City Council on November 26, 2013. It can be summarized as follows:

State Highway 36 between I-69/U.S. 59 and Avenue H (not including Downtown); Avenue H between Spur 529 and 8th Street (not including Downtown); Avenue I between Spur 529 and 8th Street (not including Downtown); and the south side of Avenue I between 8th and Mahlmann:

- Single-tenant:
 - Maximum height: twelve (12) feet
 - Maximum size: sixty (60) square feet
- Multi-tenant:
 - Maximum height: twelve (12) feet
 - Maximum size: ninety-six (96) square feet
 - Maximum of sixty (60) square feet per tenant

Avenue H east of 8th Street; Avenue I east of Mahlmann; and the north side of Avenue I between 8th and Mahlmann:

- Single-tenant:
 - Maximum height: sixteen (16) feet
 - Maximum size: one-hundred twenty (120) square feet
- Multi-tenant:
 - Maximum height: twenty-four (24) feet
 - Maximum size: three-hundred twenty (320) square feet
 - Maximum of one-hundred twenty (120) square feet per tenant

You will notice that the Downtown Area is not included in these recommendations. This is because Downtown already has its own standards that do not allow freestanding signs. This is due to the buildings mostly adjoining the right-of-way; thus the sites do not have yards for freestanding signs to be located in. No changes are recommended to the Downtown Area's existing sign regulations. In fact, Downtown has been discussed in previous meetings as potentially being Sign District "C" and

Avenues H, I, and State Highway 36 as District "D"; however, because no changes are recommended to Downtown, staff does not see the need to create another sign district for it and therefore Avenues H, I & 36 are being designated as District "C."

Finally, due to the complexity of the Ordinance, staff has created a Sign District Map to make the Ordinance more user-friendly for staff and sign permit applicants. The map is attached as Exhibit "A" to the Ordinance. Staff recommends approval of Ordinance No. 2014-08 in order to move forward with establishing permanent freestanding sign regulations for the corridors, as opposed to the current maximum height of nine (9) feet and maximum area of 36 square feet.

At this time, staff is requesting direction from Council on any changes to the Ordinance before it is adopted.

Key discussion points:

- Travis Tanner reviewed the item as outlined in the Executive Summary.
- Staff's recommendation to move forward with the Ordinance as is.
- Staff met with Mr. Mellon who owns several properties on Avenue H and addressed his concerns.

Questions/Comments:

- Councilor McConathy referenced Sign District C – all of Highway 36 in District C – recommendation made for Highway 36 from City Hall Drive up to US 90A be District C and from City Hall Drive back to US 59 be District B.
- US 90A on the east where railroad trellis is – property at Lane Drive that spans a portion of US 90A and other portion becomes a residential street. Keep entire property with District B standard and clarify in Ordinance.
- Mayor Morales asked for clarification for the recommendation.
- Councilor McConathy clarified speed limit changes and a 12' maximum height from City Hall Drive to US 90A would be appropriate. As speed increases toward the far end there are larger properties that could benefit from the District B maximum height.
- This does not affect existing non-conforming signs.
- Councilor Pena suggested putting all of Highway 36 into District B since it is a major thoroughfare.
- Councilor Euton agreed that Highway 36 should be 16' for all businesses and in District B.
- Task Force recommendation on Highway 36 was the same as on US 59.
- Concern with push back from residents in areas where signs are too tall and visible in the neighborhoods.
- Philosophy of Ordinance being presented is that signage is smaller in areas that have smaller pieces of property and adjacent to residences.
- Councilor Benton and Bolf were fine with the 36 split.
- Mayor Morales agreed with the heights suggested in the ordinance but agreed with the split from City Hall to US 59.
- Businesses are waiting for this to pass to do something with their signs.
- Direction was given to Travis Tanner to change the map and clarify in the ordinance the split in the property as discussed.
- No action was taken on the item.

2. **REVIEW AND DISCUSS THE FY2014 STREET OVERLAY AND RECONSTRUCTION PROJECT LIST, AND TAKE ACTION AS NECESSARY TO DIRECT STAFF.**

Executive Summary: In past years, the Public Works Department has submitted the list of streets to be overlaid and rebuilt to City Council for approval. The list of streets for this fiscal year was included in the agenda packet for your review. The Public Works Department has compiled a list of twenty-one (21) street sections. The list includes two (2) streets to be rebuilt and nineteen (19) to be patched, leveled up and overlaid with hot-mix pavement. The cost estimate for the recommended streets included on the Project List is \$863,923.11. The FY2014 Budget includes

\$300,000.00, plus an additional \$79,410.00 remains from the FY2011 Street Paving Program which was previously approved for Homestead Road in the Suburban Estates Subdivision. The streets located in the Suburban Estates Subdivision were deferred until such time the FM 2218 construction project was completed and a final determination was made regarding the traffic control measures that would be implemented.

Staff presented a request to the Rosenberg Economic Development Corporation (RDC) to provide funding in the estimated amount of \$133,865.00 (the cost estimate has since been revised to \$140,673.61) for the reconstruction of Koeblen Road, which was annexed in 2013. More recently, a dirt mining operation was developed on property that is only accessible from Koeblen Road and the heavy truck traffic has caused considerable damage to the road. The RDC did take action to fund approximately one-third of the initial cost estimate (\$44,621.00), leaving a balance of \$96,052.61. RDC staff has also attempted to contact the operator of the dirt pit to discuss the opportunity for the business to partner with the City and RDC by providing a financial contribution toward the road reconstruction cost. As of the date of this report, staff has not had the opportunity to have this discussion.

Due to the large amount of street repair and repaving work the City will have to address in future years. Staff recommends additional funding in the amount of \$439,892.11 which will provide a total of \$863,923.11. If City Council concurs, a budget adjustment will be presented at the May 06, 2014 meeting for approval.

Staff recommends approval of the FY2014 Street Overlay and Reconstruction Project List as presented.

Key discussion points:

- John Maresh, Assistant City Manager for Public Services read the Executive Summary regarding the FY2014 Street Overlay and Reconstruction Project List.

Questions/Comments:

- Councilor Euton asked where the additional \$439,000 will come from.
- Joyce Vasut, Executive Director of Administrative Services explained staff is looking at taking it from sales tax.
- Koeblen Road will be asphalt and will have to be completely reconstructed.
- Street has been posted for "No Thru Trucks" and as long as the posting stays in place and trucks stay off the road it should last a significant time.
- Gravel trucks were going to FM 2218 for a short cut. Now when they enter and exit they have to go directly to FM 2977.
- Councilor Euton asked if the signage on Cottonwood Road helped.
- That has to be directed to the Police Department.
- Councilor Pena asked if Koeblen was annexed and what other properties. Will the County do the work on these?
- Yes, that was annexed. Cottonwood Road has been in the City for awhile. Blackwood, J. Meyer and Koeblen Roads were in the recent annexations. Work will be done by the County based on the concept of the City providing the material and use the interlocal agreement to get the assistance from the County for labor and equipment.
- Councilor Grigar asked if any roads are scheduled to be widened.
- These will stay as they currently exist.
- Cottonwood and Koeblen Roads will be rebuilt the others are 2" overlays.
- Councilor Bolf asked if all of J. Meyer Road in the City limits.
- Yes. There is a separate proposal before Council regarding the MUD located next to the school and part of that agreement requires that development to do some of those road improvements. That is why it was left off this time. If it does not happen then that section would need to be looked at for the list next year.
- Councilor Bolf asked about the four streets in Bridlewood Subdivision and are in the City

limits.

- Yes, Cartwright, Heritage Haven, Little Haven and Grand Gables Streets are in Bridlewood Subdivision. Some cracks and patching has been done since they were annexed. Grand Gables has been in the City for a while.
- Councilor Benton stated recurring complaints regarding Cottonwood School Road and Mulcahy Street. Will you partner with the sand pit on Koeblen Road?
- Randall Malik, Economic Development Director contacted them and will setup a meeting with them to start discussions.
- For access to the sand pit on FM 2218 they have to go on a section. The sand pit is on FM 2977 behind Sunrise Meadows and they cannot come up Koeblen Road to FM 2218.
- Councilor Benton asked about Old Richmond Road.
- That was on the list with the County and will be done this summer for reconstruction.
- Councilor McConathy asked about Koeblen and Cottonwood School Roads regarding the addition of the signage that was added for the trucks. Was the truck company on Koeblen Road notified that we now have signs restricting their access to Koeblen Road? How are we enforcing the new signage for those streets?
- Yes the Police Department contacted them.
- Dallis Warren, Police Chief explained that our traffic officers are there periodically and we follow up on any complaints regarding the truck traffic on those roads.
- Mayor Morales stated that since the signs have gone up on Bryan Road there are not as many gravel trucks.
- The general consensus was to move forward with the list as presented.
- No action was taken on the item.

3. **REVIEW AND DISCUSS PROPOSED "SEX OFFENDER" ORDINANCE, AND TAKE ACTION AS NECESSARY TO DIRECT STAFF.**

Executive Summary: City staff has seen an increase in the number of sex offenders currently registered in the City of Rosenberg. Currently there are minimal regulations pertaining to the residency of registered sex offenders.

Staff is recommending the City consider an Ordinance that provides for greater oversight of registered sex offenders and restriction on residence locations for these offenders. Should City Council direct staff to move forward, an Ordinance will be presented at a future City Council meeting for consideration and adoption.

Key discussion points:

- Dallis Warren, Police Chief read the Executive Summary regarding the item.
- Tracie Dunn, Assistant Police Chief presented a PowerPoint outlining the item regarding the proposed "Sex Offender" Ordinance and provided the options available.
- A current map was shown pointing out the drug free zone which is 1,000 feet from schools. The dark green on the map is 2,000 feet from the school and shown as the "child safety zone" on the map. The parks and any child activity or recreation area were included in the map.
- A map was shown pinpointing where the sex offenders are living within the City, and as outlined in the Ordinance.
- A regional map was provided showing other cities in the area by population. Rosenberg has a large number of this population relative to size. The numbers are rarely below 60. Presently there are 59 and the lowest seen is 56.
- The ordinance is talking to only the child sex offenders and habitual offenders. Out of the total of 59 – 40 are child sex offenders and 10 habitual offenders. That is the majority of the sex offender population living in Rosenberg and would be affected by this ordinance.
- Chapter 62 of the Criminal Code of Procedure is what we have now. Chapter 62 has no residency location restrictions.
- The State form number CR35 is the form they fill out when they move to Rosenberg. Page 2 lists all the conditions they must comply to. There is no residency distance in the conditions.

This ordinance is important and is the only recourse we have.

- State definitions of offenders were outlined.
- Most surrounding cities have ordinances restricting residency and Rosenberg does not, so that restricts probation areas to place them. Some are natives and move back. Chapter 62 does not restrict any residency and it is left to us to bridge that gap.
- Other agencies are doing yard signs and some are doing bumper stickers. Almost all have the location restriction from 1,000 to 2,000 feet. Currently, probation is the only one for us that makes the condition 1,000 feet and that is only while on probation.
- No agencies in Fort Bend County use signage. Bay City is the only one using signage requirement and our language is based on theirs.
- The offender has seven days once they move here to notify us. After the seventh day we have basis for compliance.
- Homeless offenders are supposed to call us each day (24 hours) to notify us and they have to give a geographical location of where they are at.
- The ordinance pertains to habitual offenders and child sex offenders only. These individuals will not be grandfathered in. It would apply to anyone new moving to Rosenberg or are currently living and then moved.
- Rules and verbiage regulating the signage was provided. The City will provide the required sign to the child sex offender or habitual sex offender. Cost of the sign is \$11.00.

Questions/Comments:

- Councilor McConathy stated since the Police Department will provide the signs a monetary amount will need to be established in the budget to support that. Which option do you favor?
- Dallis Warren, Police Chief stated yes if adopted by Council. Several options have been provided tonight and based on the discussion the Ordinance will be adjusted and brought back to Council with the budgetary impact. His preference would be the 2,000 feet that provides the greatest protection. Signage is not very common but is seen in some jurisdictions. He does not have a preference. It is also highly restrictive to what type of offender would receive that sign and does not apply to all offenders.
- Councilor Benton asked what brought this about. Have there been complaints?
- Dallis Warren referenced the chart with the numbers. Rosenberg numbers are so much higher than surrounding cities and we are the only city that does not have the restrictions that led us in that direction and made it obvious we need to do something.
- Councilor Benton expressed concern with the constitutionality when someone is required to put a sign in front of their home. He has concerns with the sign aspect of the Ordinance.
- Lora Lenzsch, City Attorney explained many of these ordinances throughout the United States are very similar and they have been brought into the courts and the courts have ruled that sex offenders are not a protected class of individuals under the fair housing acts or under any of the constitutional standards. The ordinances are based not on punishment but on the ability to protect the public and minors residing in the community. As to date she does not know of any signage ordinances that have been contested.
- Councilor Bolf agreed with the Ordinance. They do not deserve any courtesy and they could sleep in a tent. Does the state notify you when they come here or do you wait for them to come to you to register? She agrees with the signage. If the family takes them in they need to deal with it. She would like the 2,500 feet to apply in the Ordinance.
- Tracie Dunn explained if they are coming out of a commitment the papers are faxed to us. If they are moving from another jurisdiction they are bound by the seven day rule and we have to rely on them to show up. Most of the time agencies will call us and let us know. Our City restricts them from living in apartments. We try to do a minimum of three compliance checks per year and those are random.
- Councilor Grigar echoed what Councilor Bolf said. He expressed some concern with the map including daycares. How do we keep track of when daycares come and go and does the map change? Are HOA recreational centers considered to be private?
- Tracie Dunn stated maps are checked annually and updated. HOAs are considered private.
- Lora Lenzsch explained the Ordinance is meant to regulate areas that are open to the

public not private. The City does not regulate on HOA properties. From the map it covers the City. It wasn't until recently that Sugar Land went out to 2,500 feet so maybe we could consider that.

- Councilor Grigar stated he would like to see 2,500 feet. There is a small portion that is not in the map so they can live in our subdivision as well as other areas where there are HOAs. He has concern leaving the recreation center out. He would like to see a large sign but does not agree with the bumper sticker.
- Councilor Pena agreed with Councilors Bolf and Grigar. He does not think this type of crime can ever be paid back through an institution. Knowledge of where these people are at is one thing and earmarking them. These people will not be able to find housing and they will have to live with relatives and he does not think good tax paying people should have to be punished for this. Knowing where they are located is good. Due diligence was done with this Ordinance and he agrees with it and supports it.
- Councilor Euton asked if this will put an extra burden on the Police Department or will it help to aid them.
- Tracie Dunn stated it will be helpful because it will not pertain to only probation areas.
- Dallis Warren stated this is a long term affect and over a period of time with the mobility of population eventually when they move the Ordinance becomes effective.
- Councilor Euton stated the ones living here are grandfathered, but there is an exception that says they have complied with all the sex offender registration laws. They don't always comply and they could get kicked out of that exception when they don't comply. The sign is a little over the top. She agrees with identifying where they are and keeping them away from children. She always hopes there is rehabilitation for these people. She likes the idea of protecting the landlord. How is the landlord expected to handle it?
- Tracie Dunn explained that once we give the landlord notice we give them a reasonable amount of time to effectively get them out. We average 8 to 10 that are out of compliance on our checks out of the sixty we have.
- Dallis Warren stated the District Attorney's Office is very aggressive on the prosecution of violators.
- Mayor Morales stated the general consensus of Council is to have the maximum area that can be covered with the most restrictive to that defender. Signage is mixed, but in his opinion if that would lower those numbers he agrees with it.
- Dallis Warren stated the Ordinance will be brought back to the May 20th Council Meeting. The distance will be increased to 2,500 feet and the signage will be brought back at that time.
- Lora Lenzsch stated two versions can be brought back. One that includes the sign and one that doesn't. Council can decide at that time.
- No action was taken on the item.

4. **REVIEW AND DISCUSS PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE CHRISTMAS IN ROSENBERG EVENT, AND TAKE ACTION AS NECESSARY TO DIRECT STAFF.**

Executive Summary: Staff has placed this item on the Agenda to review and discuss, with City Council, proposed changes to the Christmas in Rosenberg event.

Key discussion points:

- Robert Gracia clarified to Council that the information being given is preliminary. We are in the planning stage and before staff moves forward we wanted to have a consensus from Council whether to proceed with the changes staff is recommending.
- Darren McCarthy stated staff is looking to doing something different with Christmas in Rosenberg and showcasing and highlighting our downtown area.
- We would like to bring a lot of lights to downtown. Examples of lighting were provided with the ideas of spreading out the event to three nights:
 - A Sip and Stroll through the downtown shops;
 - A Tree Lighting Ceremony and showing a family friendly holiday movie; and/or
 - Santa and Mrs. Claus and a holiday theater performance.

- A copy of an invitation to a reception we will be doing with the businesses May 1st was provided to Council. This will allow staff to solicit their feedback on a three day event downtown.

Questions/Comments:

- Councilor McConathy stated it sounds good and if Council approves this we would have to budget for it. It's a great idea and she would support it.
- Councilor Benton likes the idea but we need to see what the cost would be. Is the three day event on one weekend? He would support it.
- Darren McCarthy stated the event would be held on Thursday, Friday and Saturday.
- Councilor Bolf stated she likes the idea. Would it replace the gazebo tree lighting?
- Darren McCarthy stated yes.
- Councilor Grigar agreed with it and he likes the Thursday, Friday and Saturday.
- Councilor Pena likes the idea and replacing the one day event would be a good thing.
- Councilor Euton agreed and if the downtown merchants agree with it then it would be great.
- Mayor Morales stated he is in favor of Thursday, Friday and Saturday. We need the feedback from the downtown merchants. He likes the idea of bringing it together to attract people to Rosenberg. We need to get the cost and look at doing sponsorships as well.
- No action was taken on the item.

RECESS SESSION, RECONVENE SESSION.

Mayor Morales recessed the Session at 8:18 p.m. and reconvened the Session at 8:28 p.m.

5. REVIEW AND DISCUSS MERCHANDISE PROMINENTLY DISPLAYED AT THE SITE OF SALE, AND TAKE ACTION AS NECESSARY TO DIRECT STAFF.

Executive Summary: This item has been added to the Agenda to offer City Council the opportunity to discuss regulations that might govern merchandise prominently displayed at the site of sale on a regular or long term basis.

A copy of the current Code regarding garage sales was included in the agenda packet.

Additionally, it was requested that City staff research the City of Sugar Land's ordinance related to this issue. Sugar Land's Zoning Ordinance provides for merchandise to be temporarily displayed or stored outside the Building on the same premises if the merchandise:

- Is not located on public property or within a required Parking Space or Yard;
- Is not displayed or stored outside for more than 30 consecutive days or for more than 90 days within one calendar year;
- Is owned by the owner or lessee of the building; and
- Does not occupy a contiguous area in of excess of 10% of the ground Floor Area of the Building or tenant space of the business displaying or storing the merchandise. The 10% restriction does not apply to landscaping materials for retail nurseries or lawn and garden supply stores, if displayed within a fenced area.

Key discussion points:

- Councilor Benton stated he requested this item be placed on the agenda for discussion and input from Council. There are concerns with people selling merchandise at the road and suggested requiring a setback or buffer.

Questions/Comments:

- Councilor Euton cautioned on how Council would want to handle this. There are a lot of vendors that have outdoor merchandise displays. She knows what this is geared towards and she would like to see it addressed through an existing code. She does not want to limit people from displaying wares outside.
- Councilor Pena asked if this is referring to panhandling. What is the ordinance regarding trash cans? He agrees this needs to be looked at and the trash can standards might be a

good one to go with.

- Councilor Grigar stated he has some of the same concerns Councilor Euton has. What about car lots, farmers markets, etc? He thinks this needs to be looked at and there needs to be a setback. He has a concern regarding the type of merchandise.
- Councilor Bolf agreed with Councilor Grigar. The Avenue H area looks like a full time rummage sale. She would like staff to see what can be done to get it cleaned up.
- Councilor McConathy stated the Avenue H area is what we are talking about and the resale businesses. She suggested looking for a solution within those boundaries. We are not saying we don't want resale shops. We are saying we don't want items from inside now on the front lawn and looking cluttered and not representing Rosenberg businesses. We may need to look at setbacks. It is more of a safety issue than not liking this particular business.
- Travis Tanner stated there are some restrictions we could add such as setback, amount of outside storage and require screening that would discourage that type of thing. We need clarification on if we can actually do it based on the type of item such as a resale item. We would have to investigate that before staff could bring it back to Council.
- Councilor Euton asked if we could restrict them on parking with the existing ordinances.
- Travis Tanner stated we already do that and you are not allowed to take up any required parking for the business. There are situations where we have enforced that and we try to monitor it. We don't allow items in the right-of-way and are covered in our current Ordinance.
- Councilor Euton stated she would like to see a strengthening and Code Enforcement making a priority to show they are in violation and letting the owners know they are not in compliance with parking and easements to see if that helps before we do more ordinances.
- Councilor Grigar suggested that it be limited to only a certain percentage of the wares outside the business to display. He has a concern with utilizing parking spaces for merchandise.
- Mayor Morales stated the consensus from Council is to tighten up the highlighted items as stated in the Executive Summary without adding an ordinance.
- No action was taken on the item.

6. **REVIEW AND DISCUSS A COMPREHENSIVE STOP SIGN PLAN FOR THE CITY, AND TAKE ACTION AS NECESSARY TO DIRECT STAFF.**

Executive Summary: This item has been added to the Agenda to offer City Council the opportunity to discuss the potential of establishing a comprehensive stop sign plan. A copy of the applicable Code Section and examples of policies from several other cities was included in the agenda packet.

Key discussion points:

- Councilor Benton had the item placed on the agenda for discussion and input
- A brief discussion was held regarding the existing guidelines that are in place. The use of traffic calming devices in areas of the City could be beneficial.
- Staff will provide a list of types and pricing of traffic calming devices to be considered during the budget process.
- No action was taken on the item.

7. **REVIEW AND DISCUSS "LONG-TERM" PARKING OF VEHICLES IN FRONT YARDS OF AREA RESIDENCES, AND TAKE ACTION AS NECESSARY TO DIRECT STAFF.**

Executive Summary: This item has been added to the Agenda to offer City Council the opportunity to discuss "long-term" parking of vehicles in front yards of area residences, and the potential addition of guidelines regarding same.

It was requested that City staff research the City of Sugar Land's ordinance related to this issue. Sugar Land prohibits the parking of vehicles on unimproved surfaces in front and side yards in residential zoning districts. There is an exception to the ordinance for cases where the vehicle has been parked on an unimproved surface prior to the effective date of the ordinance.

Key discussion points:

- Councilor Benton had the item placed on the agenda for consideration and discussion.
- A brief discussion was held on the item.
- Councilor Grigar stated the item needs to be taken to the Planning Commission for discussion.
- Mayor Morales stated there is a concern with this but not to the degree of over restricting the neighborhood. He agrees the item needs to be taken to the Planning Commission.
- The general consensus of Council was to have the Planning Commission review.
- No action was taken on the item.

8. **REVIEW AND DISCUSS PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 6-367 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES PROVIDING RULES AND REGULATIONS GOVERNING THE PAINTING OF STREET NUMBERS ON CURBS, AND TAKE ACTION AS NECESSARY TO DIRECT STAFF.**

Executive Summary: On April 01, 2014, City Council held discussions regarding the potential of amending the City's curb-painting regulations to include the Texas flag.

This item has been added to the agenda to offer City Council the opportunity to discuss the potential amendment of the rules and regulations governing the painting of street numbers on curbs. A copy of the current Code Section 6-367 was attached in the agenda packet.

Key discussion points:

- Councilor Benton placed the item on the agenda for consideration and discussion.
- Discussion was held and concerns expressed regarding the size of lettering and restriction to only the Texas flag.
- Lora Lenzsch reiterated the fact that it is unconstitutional to restrict it to the Texas flag. You cannot hold people criminally liable for painting other flags. The County Attorney would have to seek an Attorney General opinion on this.
- Councilor Grigar stated his intention was for staff to research it to see what kind of situation we are looking at. He expressed concern that the item was brought back by a Council Member and no backup provided. He would like to leave the ordinance the way it is currently.
- Mayor Morales stated the general consensus of Council is for staff to bring the item back with the Austin ordinance criteria. We can review this potential ordinance again after the budget process.
- No action was taken on the item.

9. **ADJOURNMENT.**

There being no further business Mayor Morales adjourned the meeting at 9:40 p.m.


Linda Cernosek, TRMC, City Secretary