

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

On this the 16th day of July 2014, the Planning Commission of the City of Rosenberg, Fort Bend County, Texas, met in a regular meeting at the Rosenberg City Hall Council Chamber, 2110 4th Street, Rosenberg, Texas 77471.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Pete Pavlovsky	Planning Commission Chairperson
Wayne Poldrack	Planning Commission Secretary
Alicia Casias	Planning Commissioner
Mike Parsons	Planning Commissioner

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT

Lester Phipps, Jr.	Planning Commission Vice Chairperson
James Urbish	Planning Commissioner

STAFF PRESENT

Cynthia McConathy	Councilor, At Large Position Two
Travis Tanner	Executive Director of Community Development
Charles Kalkomey	City Engineer
Scott Tschirhart	City Attorney
Renée LeLaurin	Secretary II

GUESTS PRESENT

Leila Siqueiros	Texas Masonry Council
Tony Topping	Texas Masonry Council
Carol Redd	EHRA, Inc. (Summer Lakes)
Jackie Overton	EHRA, Inc. (Summer Lakes)

CALL TO ORDER:

Chairperson Pavlovsky called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m.

AGENDA

1. CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON MINUTES OF THE JUNE 18, 2014 REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING.

Action Taken: Commissioner Poldrack moved, seconded by Chairperson Pavlovsky, to approve the minutes of the June 18, 2014 Regular Planning Commission Meeting as written. The motion failed by a vote of two "ayes" and two abstentions by those present. **Ayes:** *Chairperson Pavlovsky and Commissioner Poldrack.* **Abstentions:** *Commissioners Casias and Parsons.*

Key Discussion:

- Brief discussion was held with Mr. Tschirhart regarding the number of votes needed to approve minutes. Abstention from voting is considered a vote of "no," therefore the minutes for the June 18, 2014 Regular Planning Commission Meeting were not approved since two affirmative votes did not constitute a majority of the Commissioners present.

Additional Action Taken: Commissioner Parsons moved, seconded by Commissioner Poldrack, to table the minutes of the June 18, 2014 Regular Planning Commission Meeting until the next regular meeting. The motion carried unanimously by those present.

2. CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON A FINAL PLAT OF SUMMER LAKES SECTION SIX, BEING A SUBDIVISION OF 17.16 ACRES OUT OF THE JANE H. LONG LEAGUE, A-55 AND THE WM. LUSK SURVEY, A-276, IN THE CITY OF ROSENBERG, IN FORT BEND COUNTY, TEXAS (FORT BEND COUNTY MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT NO. 144); 80 LOTS, 6 BLOCKS, 3 RESERVES (0.4624 AC.).

Executive Summary: Summer Lakes Section Six Final Plat contains 17.16 acres and 80 single-family residential lots. It

is located within the City Limits and in Fort Bend County MUD No. 144. Specifically, the proposed Plat is located off of Round Lake Drive in the northeast part of Summer Lakes. It consists of the following lot sizes:

- 52, or 65 percent, 50-foot lots
- 28, or 35 percent, 60-foot or greater lots

The above lot sizes are in accordance with the MUD No. 144 Planned Unit Development (PUD) Agreement (see attached Exhibit B, Land Use & Parcel Plan). The Land Use & Parcel Plan simply identifies single-family residential as the proposed use for the areas of the Plat. The Agreement calls for the lots to be a minimum of fifty (50) feet in width and 6,000 square feet. The average lot size is over 8,000 square feet and no lots are less than fifty (50) feet in width or 6,000 square feet.

The proposed Final Plat is consistent with the Preliminary Plat, which was approved by the Planning Commission on May 21, 2014. The Plat also conforms to the MUD No. 144 Planned Unit Development (PUD) Agreement. There being no further issues, staff recommends that the Commission recommend approval to City Council of the Final Plat of Summer Lakes Section Six.

Key Discussion:

- Mr. Tanner presented the item and reviewed the executive summary.

Action Taken: Commissioner Parsons moved, seconded by Commissioner Casias, to recommend approval to City Council for the Final Plat of Summer Lakes Section Six, being a subdivision of 17.16 acres out of the Jane H. Long League, A-55, and the Wm. Lusk Survey, A-276, in the City of Rosenberg, Fort Bend County, Texas (Fort Bend County Municipal Utility District No. 144); 80 lots, 6 blocks, 3 reserves (0.4624 ac.).

Additional Discussion:

- Commissioner Parsons inquired if Mr. Tanner had prepared a report showing the number of 50-55 foot lots that have been approved on previous plats so the Commission knows how many of these small lots have yet to be platted. Staff once had a report by subdivision that showed what had been approved in the development agreement and how much of that had been platted and how many lots still remain to be platted by lot size.
- Mr. Tanner replied that he would need to review past reports but that he does track lot sizes by year. As for previous reports, staff would need to research.
- Commissioner Parsons replied that he would like to get an idea how many of those small lots are still available and an estimate of how many years it may take to plat those lots.
- Mr. Tanner replied that data could be extrapolated but is not something that is currently tracked. It would take some time to pull that information together.
- Chairperson Pavlovsky inquired if Mr. Tanner has an idea what the percentage of Summer Lakes is built out and platted.
- Mr. Tanner replied that he would need to review the Land Plan but the sections north of Reading Road is more than halfway platted. The sections south of Reading Road, now being referred to as Summer Park is just getting started. One plat for Summer Park has been recorded and the next section will be coming to the Commission in the near future. There are a few sections left to the east but the other part of MUD No. 144 south of Reading Road is just starting to develop and will have a number of residences there.
- Commissioner Parsons replied that he would also like to know the number of homes being built.
- Mr. Tanner replied that information is tracked in the Planning Department's monthly reports and he can provide a copy to the Commission. The standing quarterly development report was deferred but staff should include it on the next Agenda. This development in particular differs from some of the other land plans in that the others have a projected number of lots and lot sizes. The MUD No. 144 Land Plan is more open ended and does not show a final number of lots for the development. It only specifies areas as single family residential.
- Commissioner Parsons inquired if staff knows how many 50-foot lots have been platted.
- Mr. Tanner replied that information can be compiled but the Land Plan for this subdivision does allow for 50-foot lots.
- Commissioner Parsons replied that the entire development could be 50-foot lots. When was this Land Plan approved?
- Mr. Tanner replied that the Land Plan was revised in 2011. The original development agreement was about 2005 but he would need to verify that. This is a Planned Unit Development and they had some flexibility due to having higher development standards than the City overall for commercial lots and other requirements but do have some smaller lots sizes in consideration for some of the other higher standards.
- Commissioner Poldrack inquired how much trouble it would be to add the number of platted lot sizes by development in a database and then maintained by month to give the Commission a running list of lot

sizes.

- Mr. Kalkomey replied that no one is currently tracking lot sizes along with house starts. It would be easy if the whole development is a single lot size and all lots had built out. But in subdivisions with multiple lot sizes and ongoing development, that number is not readily available but can be generated after some research.
- Commissioner Parsons replied that information is important for this Commission's long range plan for what this City will look like in 20-25 years.
- Mr. Tanner replied that is something that the Comprehensive Plan Update will look at. In house, there is not adequate staff for additional reporting.
- Commissioner Parsons stated that as part of the master plan, it is a good exercise to see where the City is and where it is going. Has the Comprehensive Plan Update been approved?
- Councilor McConathy replied no.
- Commissioner Poldrack stated that 50-foot lots do not necessarily indicate a starter home. The Reserve at Brazos Town Center has smaller lot sizes but have 200K homes.
- Commissioner Parsons agreed and stated that he does not take issue with a smaller lot size if a quality home is going on it. The City does not need any more starter homes.

Action Taken: Upon voting, the motion carried unanimously by those present.

3. HEAR AND DISCUSS A PRESENTATION BY THE TEXAS MASONRY COUNCIL, AND TAKE ACTION AS NECESSARY TO DIRECT STAFF.

Executive Summary: As part of a request to discuss possible masonry requirements for single-family homes, the Planning Commission requested staff to extend an invitation to the Texas Masonry Council for a representative to make a presentation to the Commission on possible masonry standards.

Presentation Summary:

- Ms. Leila Sequeiros, Austin/San Antonio Area Government Relations Specialist, introduced herself and Mr. Tony Topping, Houston Area Government Relations Specialist with the Texas Masonry Council, to the Commissioners and made the following PowerPoint presentation:
 - **Presentation Overview**
 - Introduction to Texas Masonry Council
 - Overview of Masonry Planning Policies
 - Rosenberg's Opportunities
 - How We Can Help
 - Questions and Discussion
 - **Texas Masonry Council**
 - The Texas Masonry Council is a non-profit organization that promotes the long standing tradition of building in Texas with beautiful, durable and sustainable masonry materials.
 - We are the only organization in Texas specializing specifically in assisting communities with the development of Masonry Planning Policies.
 - We have worked with over 200 cities across Texas assisting with the development of Masonry Planning Policies.
 - Best of all, ALL OUR SERVICES ARE FREE.
 - **Masonry Planning Policies**
 - In Texas, municipalities such as Rosenberg have the lawful right to adopt local legislation to protect the health, safety and welfare of their citizens.
 - One such form of legislation is a Masonry Planning Policy.
 - Some Masonry Planning Policies come in the form of:
 - New zoning ordinances or an amendment to an existing zoning ordinance.
 - New building codes or an amendment to an existing building code.
 - Residential construction design guidelines (can include multi-family).
 - Non-residential construction guidelines (commercial construction).
 - An overlay or designated district, such as a Historical Downtown District.
 - Architectural guidelines.
 - **What is Masonry?**
 - According to the International Building Code (IBC) and International Residential Building Code (IRC), the state mandated building codes of Texas, masonry is, "a form of construction composed of brick, stone, concrete block or other materials of equal characteristics laid up unit by unit and set in mortar."
 - Although these codes define masonry, they do not require it.

- By definition, masonry does not include other inferior building materials such as fiber cement siding, stucco or synthetic stucco.
- **A Local Planning Tool**
 - **Local Decision**
 - The percentage of masonry required by the policy, and the materials that will be considered acceptable, are determined by the needs and desires of the community.
 - With a library of over 200 masonry policies in Texas, we can help guide the process and assist in crafting the details of a new policy.
- **Benefits of Masonry Policies**
 - **FACT: Masonry Products are Low Maintenance**
 - True masonry products require little to no maintenance at all.
 - Here is a picture of a Rosenberg home that is less than three years old.
 - Note the growth of mildew on the fiber cement siding.
 - Homes in this neighborhood were 25% or less true masonry.
 - **Increases the Tax Base and Home Value**
 - Masonry homes appreciate in value faster than non-brick homes. Some research shows they appreciate up to 6% in the first year alone. That means a bigger tax base and increased revenue available for cities to provide essential city services. Services that are even increasing in cost. Masonry homes very rarely depreciate in value, unlike some homes built with inferior materials such as fiber cement siding.
 - **Lower Cost of Ownership and Faster Resale**
 - Masonry homes are more energy efficient – up to 7% lower energy costs
 - Masonry homes have lower insurance premiums.
 - Lower maintenance costs:
 - No painting needed.
 - No need to replace decaying siding.
 - Looks great for decades.
 - **More Predictable Development Creating a “Sense of Place”**
 - More predictable development. Brick, stone and masonry products are such classic and traditional building materials that they lend themselves to more classic architecture styles. City leaders don’t have to worry as much about some oddball development popping up in the middle of a neighborhood. It certainly happens. Who in here wants this home built next to yours? (photo example shown of snail-shaped stucco structure painted in rainbow colors.)
 - **Brick Homes are Safer**
 - Texas Tech University built two wall systems according to the state mandated residential building code. One was built with a brick exterior and the other with fiber cement. They fired a 2x4 at the wind speed of a category 3 tornado into the walls. The 2x4 shattered upon impact with the brick wall. But the 2x4 fired at the fiber cement wall went straight through it. Imagine if a child were sleeping there when that 2x4 came flying through the wall.
- **University of Michigan Research**
 - “Found that the adoption of a masonry ordinance not only enhances the durability and aesthetic value of local properties, but it also increases the property value, tax base, and overall fiscal health of the community. In addition, the research indicates that the adoption of a masonry ordinance promotes population growth and does not significantly affect the affordability of housing or rental costs.”
- **Rosenberg’s Opportunities**
 - West Fort Bend Management District already incorporates many of these ideas into their design guidelines.
 - “Growth is coming and Rosenberg is about to grow exponentially. The question is what kind of people are going to come.” - Commissioner Mike Parsons
- **How Can We Help?**
 - Recommendations
 - Recommend that Rosenberg begin to look at creating a residential masonry ordinance.
 - Research
 - Other ordinances adopted throughout Texas
 - Connect you with communities that have them in place

- Lead workshops to help leaders make decisions
 - Draft the ordinance
 - All services are FREE
- **Questions and Discussion**
 - Commissioner Parsons stated that this is not the first time this presentation has been made to the Planning Commission. There was a previous presentation in the last tenure with another group regarding the development of masonry requirements. Masonry requirements are integral to the successful growth of Rosenberg in the long run. It would be interesting to know which Texas cities have endorsed masonry guidelines. Our City is not zoned but it is important to add to our building codes what we foresee as the Rosenberg we want to see 25-30 years from now. We need to be progressive and ahead of the curve with what we want to see in this City.
 - Ms. Sequeiros replied that a few years ago, Cedar Park was not that attractive of a city. They have put in strong masonry standards over the past few years and the difference is dramatic. Cities that did not do what was needed before growth came to their areas are now struggling. If masonry standards are not established, it will mean lower quality development.
 - Commissioner Poldrack stated that he agrees with Commissioner Parsons but also feels it needs to be taken a step further and look at building standards overall and what can be done to enhance the quality of future development. Masonry is one part of that. There are other things that can be done to enhance quality of construction down the road.
 - Ms. Sequeiros replied that the Texas Masonry Council has also assisted with the whole design guidelines that are not just masonry but also landscaping, setbacks, etc. We can provide some samples if you want to start working on it.
 - Chairperson Pavlovsky inquired if the Texas Masonry Council had ever made a presentation to the West Fort Bend Management District (WFBMD).
 - Mr. Topping replied that it was likely in the past.
 - Mr. Tanner stated that the WFBMD already has stringent masonry standards – they require 80% masonry.
 - Chairperson Pavlovsky stated that the more successful cities are doing things like this and thanked the representatives for coming out.
 - Commissioner Parsons stated that some action is needed so we can move in this direction. He would like the Commission to make a motion to endorse this idea of masonry enhancement for the City as well as other enhancements in the building code.
 - Commissioner Poldrack inquired of Councilor McConathy if City Council would be receptive to amending the design standards.
 - Councilor McConathy replied that she is only one Councilor and cannot speak for the rest. She would support it.
 - Mr. Tschirhart commented that the Agenda is not worded to allow specific action on this item but the Commission may direct staff to bring back an item on the next Agenda.
 - Chairperson Pavlovsky thanked Ms. Sequeiros and Mr. Topping for their presentation.

No action taken.

4. CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON THE STAFF REPORT OF CURRENT ACTIVITIES AND REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS.

Executive Summary: The Staff Report of Current Activities consists of projects that staff is currently working on as well as other updates that are relevant to the Planning Commission. This item also allows the Planning Commission the opportunity to request that items be placed on future agendas.

After being tabled on May 6, 2014, the scope of the Comprehensive Plan update was discussed at the June 24, 2014 City Council Workshop Meeting. The consensus of City Council was to move forward with the project.

Additionally, given that the “Sign” Ordinance amendments pertaining to the West Fort Bend Management District (WFBMD) corridors have been completed and approved by City Council, staff is coordinating with the WFBMD for them to formally recognize the City’s regulations for freestanding sign height and size. This was discussed at the June 17, 2014 WFBMD Board Meeting. The Board directed their staff to move forward and an item will be on the July 15, 2014 WFBMD Agenda to accept the City standards for height and size.

Key Discussion:

- Mr. Tanner presented the item and reviewed the executive summary. The quarterly report that is typically presented on this Agenda will be on the next regular Agenda.

- Commissioner Parsons inquired if Mr. Tanner knew when the "Sign" Ordinance amendments began.
- Councilor McConathy replied that the Sign Review Task Force met in 2009.
- Commissioner Parsons replied that it takes an extraordinary amount of time to get to things. The delay in this process is putting the City further behind. Some methodology is needed to help move these changes along. How many signs were erected between 2009 and 2014 while these standards were being considered?
- Councilor McConathy replied that a factor in that was the City Council itself had changed as well as the WFBMD request that the two cities of Richmond and Rosenberg standardize the signage requirements for both cities. That took time to accomplish.
- Commissioner Parsons stated that he is not pointing fingers but it should not take six years to establish sign regulations.
- Commissioner Parsons requested an Agenda item in support of establishing masonry requirements in the City's design standards.
- Commissioner Poldrack requested an Agenda item to review residential street widths in new developments again. A study of our design standards should include a study of our streets.
- Mr. Tanner replied that should be part of the Comprehensive Plan Update once it moves forward.
- Commissioner Poldrack inquired when that would be.
- Councilor McConathy replied that the reason it was tabled at last night's meeting is that three Council members were out.
- Commissioner Parsons inquired what the current street width requirement is.
- Mr. Tanner replied 28 feet.
- Commissioner Parsons replied that when the Commission discussed this previously, the consensus was for street widths of 32-36 feet wide. The idea was that cars would be able to park on both sides of the street yet not obstruct emergency vehicle access.
- Councilor McConathy suggested that longer driveways would also help alleviate some on-street parking.
- Commissioner Poldrack replied that is part of the overall issues that this Commission would like to address in order to enhance the overall quality of building in our community. If wider streets, longer driveways, and more masonry will accomplish that, it needs to be considered.
- Commissioner Parsons stated that there are some areas in the City where on-street parking is only allowed on one side of the street. For subdivisions with narrow street widths, restricting on-street parking to one side of the street to allow for emergency access may be a consideration.
- A general consensus was reached to include discussion items on the next regular Agenda for the City's design standards regarding masonry requirements and residential street widths, and an item regarding on-street parking regulations.

No action taken.

5. ANNOUNCEMENTS.

- Chairperson Pavlovsky welcomed Scott Tschirhart, new City Attorney with Denton Navarro Rocha Bernal Hyde & Zech, P.C.

6. ADJOURNMENT.

There being no further business, Chairperson Pavlovsky adjourned the Rosenberg Planning Commission Meeting at 4:44 p.m.


 Renée LeLaurin
 Secretary II