

City of Piney Point Village  
Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting  
Minutes from  
July 28, 2016

**Members Present:** Vincent Marino-Chairman, Bill Burney, Charles Peterman, Diane Wege *left early*, Lennie Burke, and Sue Curtis.

**Members Absent:** Bernard Branca.

**City Staff:** Annette Arriaga, Director of Planning, Development, & Permits, Joe Moore with HDR Engineering Company, David Olson with Olson & Olson.

**Board of Adjustment Members:** Larry Chapman-Chairman, Michael Cooper, Roland Sauermann, and Scott Bender.

**City Council:** Brian Thompson, and Henry Kollenberg.

**Guests:** Gene Werlin, John Putman, Andy Martire, Don Jones, Johnathan Finger, Julie Goodall, Anne Heyburn, Jake Taylor, Terrie Lenert, Vinod Kaila, Mike Baker, Anne Barrett, Jim Johnson, Neil Wizel, Mary K. Burtner, David Collins, Michael Walker, Krishnamoorthy Vivekananthan and *several guests did not sign in.*

- 1.) **Call to order:** 7:03 P.M.
- 2.) **Meeting Minutes:** Meeting minutes tabled from the June 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2016.
- 3.) **Public hearing and discussion of the Zoning Ordinances:** Vincent Marino opened up the public hearing discussions of the City of Piney Point Village, Zoning Ordinances as it relates to Chapter 74-1. Definitions, Chapter 74-245. Supplementary district regulations, Chapter 74-212. Nonconforming Buildings. Chapter 74-244. Regulations. Chapter 74-280. Exceptions and exemptions.

**\*Discussion of 80 percent fence. Chapter 74-1. Definitions.**  
The latest suggested version of the ordinance is as follows:

*80% fence shall mean a fence constructed in such a manner that any portion of the fence that exceeds three feet in height contains at least 80 percent unobstructed, open views, comprised of uniformly spaced 7 foot see thru sections, separated by visually solid columns (maximum of 2 feet in width) and supports for such fence are of visually solid construction uniformly spaced, and such fence contains no wire or chain-link portions."*

***Public Hearing Opened on Chapter 74-1. Definitions.***

**David Collins** mentioned that he is concerned about the fence issues and about security.

**Anne Barnett** mentioned that she lived in Piney Point for 36 years, and she had a six foot cedar fence in her side yard adjacent to the street and that she needed to replace it because it was in such bad shape. She was grandfathered and was able to repair it but was not allowed to replace it. She went before the Board of Adjustment and was denied a variance. She still continues to repair it.

David Olson explained that they were just cleaning up the definition so that it would make it easier for staff to understand and to give a definition of what a wrought iron fence is.

*Vincent Marino closed the public hearing on Chapter 74-1. Definitions.*

#### **Discussion by the Planning & Zoning Commission**

Vincent Marino entertained a motion to approve the recommended changes to the definition of the 80 percent fence. Motion made first by Bill Burney and seconded by Diane Wege. The vote was five to zero, on the voting approval for the recommendation to city council.

#### **\*Discussion of fences Chapter 74-245. Supplementary district regulations.**

The latest suggested version of the ordinance is as follows:

(i) *Fences and walls in required yards.* No fence or freestanding fence-type wall shall be permitted in any required yard except as specifically authorized below:

(1) *Fences, front yard.* Fences and freestanding fence type walls may be constructed within a required front yard if not exceeding three feet in height; however, a fence not exceeding six feet in height above the natural grade of the lot at the lot line adjacent to such fence may be constructed within a required front yard if the front yard is adjacent to a four-lane, esplanade, curbed and guttered thoroughfare, the fence is set back at least three feet from the adjacent front lot line, and the fence is an 80 percent fence.

(2) *Fences, side and rear yard not adjacent to a street.* Fences and freestanding fence-type walls not exceeding eight feet in height are permitted in or along the edge of any required yard other than a front yard or a side or rear yard adjacent to a street.

(3) *Fences, side and rear yard adjacent to a street.* Fences may be constructed within a required side or rear yard adjacent to a street if such fence does not exceed six feet in height above the natural grade of the lot at the lot line adjacent to such fence, **and the fence is an 80 percent fence.** Any fence constructed between the main building and an adjacent street, but not within a required yard, shall have the finished exterior side facing the adjacent street, and shall have no posts or rails visible from such adjacent street, irrespective of the distance from the fence and the adjacent lot line or street. **If a fence is located in a rear yard, adjacent to a street, the fence can be up to six feet in height.**

#### *Public Hearing Opened on Chapter 74-245. Supplementary district regulations.*

**Anne Barnett** mentioned that she lived in Piney Point for 36 years, and she had a six foot cedar fence in her side yard adjacent to the street and that she needed to replace it because it was in such bad shape. She was grandfathered and was able to repair it but was not allowed to replace it. She went before the Board of Adjustment and was denied a variance. She still continues to repair it. **Mary K. Burtner** lived at her residence for eight years. She is concerned about security but more so she has been watching her fence rot and she continues to repair it but would much rather have it completely replaced. Plus she stated it has affected her property value. **Mike Baker** indicated that there is a lot of traffic in the area and they are not far from Westheimer. He has a pool in his back yard, he has grandchildren and he is concerned about privacy and security. There are a lot of people that walk dogs, jog and security is paramount and he doesn't want them to be exposed to all kinds of people and he can't believe we are talking about his. **Benot Kaila** lived in Piney Point for 20 years and built a house in 2008 and his house is off of Blalock Road and he has a side yard fence and he had to put up an iron fence. He stated that security is a big issue and there is a lot of trash that comes from Blalock Street. Everyone who drives on Blalock can see

into his back yard and there is a lot of traffic. He tried planting plants along the fence but people can still see through. He strongly wants the ordinance changed. **Jake Taylor** stated that he was on city council for several years. The ordinance was passed because a resident put up a tall solid brick wall next to the sidewalk along Blalock Road and it was on a corner lot. Residents did not approve of that at the time. The fence ordinance was reviewed and changed to only allow an 80 percent fence, on a corner lot adjacent to a street. He stated that he is for the current fence ordinance and he likes it the way it is. **Krishnamoorthy Vivekananthan** indicated that he built a new house a few years ago and his side yard backs up to Blalock Road. He had to put up an 80 percent fence. He has young children and he has a pool that he feels that he can't use in his back yard because people can see in. **Henry Kollenberg** stated that he is on city council and he was on city council several years ago when they passed this ordinance. He agrees with Jake Taylor in regards to the current fence ordinance. The ordinance was written because all of a sudden they were seeing solid brick wall being build all over Piney Point and a lot of residents didn't like that and there were a lot of residents who loved the rural nature of our village. Around that time is when the city starting having issues with development. And so as time went on, the tree ordinance was written because people didn't like the clear cutting of all the trees so the city created the tree ordinance in order to maintain the trees on the lot. We are lucky now to have a City Forester on staff that lives in the city. What we have done as a city is to promote greenery. We want to make a nice place for people to live. If it wasn't for the fence ordinance we would see a lot of brick walls. Right now you can have an iron fence and you can plant scrubs and screen the fence. If we take away the fence ordinance then you will see a completely different view and you would see a lot of solid fences and brick walls. We would see a completely different view of the city. When people have built new houses in the last 20 years they had to design knowing about the ordinance. It does not devalue the property and it does not affect the market value. **David Collins** discussed that nothing is wrong with people putting up brick walls and fences. He also stated that there is a high cost factor with the issues with planting and screening and trying to cover the iron fences that will just add to more water usage. **Resident not known**, if we require open fences on corner lots then we should require open fences for everyone on corner lots. **Scott Walker** he has a wood fence on the back of his entire back yard but if a storm comes along and takes his fence down he would have to come in and get a permit and he would have to put up an iron fence. Everyone has the right to their privacy. **Jake Taylor** talked about the non- conforming fences and indicated that you can replace your fence under the current ordinance if it is damaged or in need of repair. **Michael Cooper** indicated that he has been on the Board of Adjustments for eight years' he indicated that he moved out here several years ago to get away from the city. Unfortunately the city has grown up around us and there is too much traffic. But every month the Board hears issues in regards to fences on a monthly basis. As a member of the Board he would ask that the 80 percent fence be re-reviewed on the side and rear yards. **David Olson** updated the audience about the current fence ordinance that deals with fences and walls and that you can replace a non-conforming fence in its entirety with the same or like material but only when you lose your non- conforming status that you would have to comply with the current fence ordinance. **Vincent Marino** read e-mails from residents that could not make the meeting that were for changing the fence ordinance. **Larry Chapman** stated that he was the Chairman for the Board of Adjustments and he indicated that the Board only hears cases, when the city denies a building permit. Some cases are different and the applicant needs some relief. We don't get cases regarding replacement fences because the building department issues permits for replacement fences under our current ordinance. He agreed that many cases are fence cases. A lot of the cases are because they are on busy streets, for example Blalock, Piney Point, Hedwig, Smithdale, Claymore, Beinhorn Road and on Memorial. Most of the cases the applicants want to put up iron fences and they are willing to put up shrubs and greenery. They are requesting fences because they want

security. If they put up wooded fences than the wooden fences need care and over time the fences will be in need of repair. The question is do we want to change the look of the city or do we not want to change it. **Terrie Lenard**, discussed that she has elevation issues that the street is higher than her back yard. So, people passing by can look into her back yard. She is concerned about security and privacy. **Brian Thompson** stated that he is on city council and that he sent out the letters to the residents inviting them to the meeting. He indicated that there are 210 homes in Piney Point that have side yard or rear yards adjacent to streets. He lived on Cheska and then moved to Quail Hollow, the street is much higher than his back yard so people passing by could see into his back yard with the iron fence. Concerned for privacy for him and his family he went to the Board of Adjustments three times and the Board finally came up with a compromise. He lost 7 feet of his back yard so that he could put up a solid fence. Brian indicated that if you had an iron fence in your back yard that you don't enjoy it as much as someone who has a solid fence. Property values are affected by this. People check on issues such as flood plain, trees but, they don't check on if they can have a fence in their back yard. Brian stated that the fence ordinance is unfair, unjust and ridiculous. But, if we can install an eight foot solid fence on the property line that maybe planting lustrums or something like that it would help. He is for green space and security and security cameras. **Roland Sauermann** stated that he is on the Board of Adjustments and he indicated that he is against unfair ordinances. He is for more clarity. He likes the ordinances for the fence being built on a four lane esplanade street. It very clear and maybe we need to consider the busy streets and specify the streets. **Scott Bender** stated that he is on the Board of Adjustments and he indicated that it is never about market values but it is about safety, kids, pools and security. Safety is paramount. We need to have privacy for our citizens.

***Public Hearing Closed on Chapter 74-245. Supplementary district regulations.***

#### **Discussion by the Planning & Zoning Commission**

**Charles Peterman** that he for a much higher fence and he is for the proposed change in the fence ordinance.

**Bill Burney** likes having the finish side to the street. He likes that the fence have caps. People do not want to see a dilapidated fence. There are ways to build a fence at 20 bucks a foot and there is a way to build a fence at 30 bucks a foot. Over time the fence will need to be maintained.

**Sue Curtis** stated that she is for the 80 percent fence. She also stated that a public hearing needs to be at the city council level since this fence issue is so essential and impacts over 200 homes.

**Lenni Burke** stated that she is for the privacy fence. She could see the need for eight feet. She is not for specifying particular streets or where you can or where you can't. That would make it hard for the Board of Adjustments and she would rather have the ordinance changed.

**Vincent Marino** suggested to break the fence ordinance down into several issues.

- 1.) To have a non 80 percent fence
- 2.) Should the fence be six or eight
- 3.) Whether the fence is to be measured from the high point of the adjacent street

**Vincent Marino entertained a motion to approve the fence ordinance and to adopte and allow a non-80 percent fence.**

Vincent Marino made the motion to approve and seconded by Lenni Burke. The vote was four to one, on the voting approval for the recommendation to city council.

Vincent Marino entertained a motion to approve the fence height. If any wooded fence adjoins a street be no greater than eight feet in height must have a cap and a rot board and the finish side faces the street.

Vincent Marino made the motion to approve and seconded by Charles Peterman.

The vote was five to zero, on the voting approval for the recommendation to city council.

**\*Discussion of value; Chapter 74-212. Nonconforming Buildings.**

The latest suggested version of the ordinance is as follows:

(b) *Termination of nonconforming structures.* No construction of any building, or remodeling of any existing building where the estimated cost of such remodeling exceeds 50 percent of value on the improvements on the lot, shall be permitted on the lot unless all structures on the lot are made to conform to all of the regulations and ordinances of this city. For purposes of the foregoing, the value of improvements on a lot shall be the greater of ~~(i) \$300,000.00~~ **replacement cost as estimated by third party appraisal (or other appropriate evidence of value)** or (ii) **based on** the appraised value of all improvements on the lot for ad valorem tax purposes as determined by the county appraisal district, or its successor, for the year in question, except that if no value has been determined for such year, then it shall be the appraised value for the immediately preceding year. ~~Nothing in this paragraph however, will prohibit an owner from replacing an existing driveway so long as no portion of that driveway is located less than 18 feet from the edge of the traffic line in the intersection, and less than 30 feet from any existing intersection.~~

(c) *Damage or obsolescence of structures.* The right to occupy and maintain any nonconforming structure shall terminate and cease to exist whenever the nonconforming structure becomes obsolete or is totally destroyed, from any cause, or is damaged, in part, from any cause, where the estimated costs of restoring or repairing such damage exceeds 50 percent of the replacement cost of such nonconforming structure. In such cases, the structure may be restored, rebuilt or repaired only if all structures on the lot, including, without limitation, the structure which is obsolete or destroyed, are made to conform to all the regulations and ordinances of the city. For purposes of the foregoing, the value of improvements on a lot shall be the greater of (i) ~~\$300,000.00~~ **replacement cost as estimated by third party appraisal (or other appropriate evidence of value)** or (ii) **based on** the appraised value of all improvements on the lot for ad valorem tax purposes as determined by the Harris County Appraisal District, or its successor, for the year in question, except that if no value has been determined for such year, then it shall be the appraised value for the immediately preceding year.

**(d) Existing driveways, Replacing an existing driveway which was lawfully permitted by the City and existing at the time a building/structure was erected shall be permitted to be replaced and to remain nonconforming until such time as there is construction as defined in Section 74-212 (b) and (c). "**

*Public Hearing Opened on Chapter 74-212. Nonconforming Buildings.*

**David Olson** gave a brief update on the non- conforming building and said they basically removed the \$300,000.00 value rule. So, if a resident wanted to replace cabinets then they won't have to sprinkle their whole house. At least now the ordinance will give them an option. **Henry Kollenberg** stated that this was a great idea and the idea was to make it easier and to encourage residents to remodel.



*Public Hearing Closed on Chapter 74-212. Nonconforming Buildings.*

**Discussion by the Planning & Zoning Commission**

**Vincent Marino** stated that the way the ordinance is written now, will give the resident some more flexibility.

*Vincent Marino entertained a motion to approve the non-conforming buildings ordinances and the recommended changes.*

Motion made first by Vincent Marino and seconded by Bill Burney.

The vote was five to zero, on the voting approval for the recommendation to city council.

**\*Discussion of Generators; Chapter 74-244. Regulations.**

The latest suggested version of the ordinance is as follows:

- (4) Generator. ~~If not located in the existing building lines,~~ The generator may only be located:
- a.) On the ground;
  - b.) ~~In the rear third of the property; and No less than ten feet from the property line;~~ and
  - c.) ~~Ten~~ At least five feet from the ~~property line~~ building.

No generator shall be located in front of the main structure. The generator must be screened from the public view by shrubbery and be fueled only by natural gas. Sound shielding and screening is subject to city approval design.

*Public Hearing, Opened on Chapter 74-244. Regulations.*

**David Olson** stated that this would provide for more specific guidelines and flexibility from the structure itself. **Resident who lives on Tynewood (no name stated)** asked about the five foot setback requirements. **Annette Arriaga** stated that the five foot from the structure would provide for easier access and maintenance and would provide for more clearance from the house to the generator unit. The generators that people are installing are very large in size.

*Public Hearing, Closed on Chapter 74-244. Regulations.*

**Discussion by the Planning & Zoning Commission**

*Vincent Marino entertained a motion to approve the generator ordinance.*

Motion made first by Vincent Marino and seconded by Sue Curtis.

The vote was five to zero, on the voting approval for the recommendation to city council.

**\*Discussion of Signs Chapter 74-280. Exceptions and exemptions.**

The latest suggested version of the ordinance is as follows:

- (1) Traffic or other municipal signs, legal notices, or danger signs placed or required to be placed by federal, state or local governments, or as otherwise placed by the residents of a private street in private right-of-way for such purposes."

*Public Hearing Opened on Chapter 74-280. Exceptions and exemptions.*

**David Olson** stated that there is certain percentage of streets in the city that are private streets. Technically we have rules that preclude them from putting signs up in the right-of-way. The proposed ordinance gives the flexibility for residents on private streets to put up street signs in their public right of way. Like state authorized signs, traffic signs, noout let, speed limits. Staff would ensure that they comply.

*Public Hearing Closed on Chapter 74-280. Exceptions and exemptions. V*

**Vincent Marino entertained a motion to approve the sign ordinance.**

Motion made first by Vincent Marino and seconded by Sue Curtis.

The vote was five to zero, on the voting approval for the recommendation to city council.

- 3.) **Specific Use Permit Request from the Kinkaid School Drive:** The Kinkaid School is requesting a total of (14) separate specific use items from the Planning and Zoning Commission.

*Public Hearing Opened on the 14 Specific Use Permit Requests.*

*The items requested are:*

- 1.) Relocation of the permanent ravine within a structured underground pipe system into a detention/compensatory pond approximately 13.5 acre / FT in capacity. Will include the construction of a gravel service drive 14 FT. wide extending from the West Entry Drive to the detention/compensatory pond. Specific placement of the structured pipe, gravel service drive and easement to be between 52 FT and 82 FT of the Kinkaid/Stillforest property line in order to best preserve existing trees/landscaping.
- 2.) An outdoor artificial turf baseball field with 300 FT outfield boundary barrier wall, and 24 FT tall netting along the 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> base line.
- 3.) Eight (8) hardscape tennis courts with dimensions of approximately 115 FT by 480 FT with 24 FT netting.
- 4.) A landscape buffer/viewing hill 480 FT long and approximately 9 FT tall.
- 5.) A property line fence between Kinkaid and Stillforest, 6 FT black vinyl per the Stillforest/Kinkaid agreement.
- 6.) A multi-purpose artificial turf practice field approximately 290 FT by 180 FT.
- 7.) Relocation of the existing Security Kiosk/Guard House.
- 8.) Relocation of the existing digital sign.
- 9.) Realignment of the existing main entry drives to include four (4) 12 FT wide lanes.
- 10.) A new west entry and 24 FT wide concrete drive, including a wrought iron gate and fence on the San Felipe property line.
- 11.) A concrete right hand turn lane approximately 130 Ft in length along San Felipe.

- 12.) A detention pond approximately 3.5 acre FT in size situated on the northern end of the west campus adjacent to the west entry drive and main entry drive.
- 13.) Demolition of the existing "Milby House Structures and Swimming Pool" on the west campus property.
- 14.) Landscaping to include trees, shrubs, grass and irrigation in that area identified as the "62 FT landscape buffer" starting at the Stillforest/Kinkaid property line.

**Gene Werlin** went over all of the listed items for what the school is proposing, plus including the rerouting of the drainage. The drainage comes first and has to be approved before all of the work can start. Gene indicated that his drainage engineer can explain the drainage plans and they have very detailed engineered plans. They have provided a numbered site plan. The site plan shows all of the proposed work. The parking garage has a temporary certificate of occupancy and they need to complete the drainage in a significant time frame because it is mandated by city council.

**John Putman** stated they updated the site plan and numbered them as to all of the re-platted projects. The drainage plans have very detailed dimensions, they show the underground storage pipes, detention ponds, head walls and they show the fall to Buffalo Bayou. They have had several re-submissions on the drainage system and they are very close to completing that. They indicated that they hope to have the drainage approval before the next city council meeting. **Sue Curtis** asked if they were going to do all the projects at the same time and she suggested that they may need to separate them out. John Putman said they do have a time line associated with all of the projects but are requesting only one specific use permit from the city. **Henry Kollenberg** stated that Stillforest Association has generated a list of various issues for example it is not clear from the site drawing that the baseball fields will be permeable, or will have stands or dug outs that are subject to permits. These are issues that need to be spelled out in the specific use permit at some point. There are number of things that he is concerned about as it relates to item listed as number 11 as it relates to the driveway. It appears that the driveway entrance will be a third entrance. He is concerned on how that will work and has there been a traffic study done on this. It will be a significant change to the traffic pattern on San Felipe.

**Vincent Marino** asked if it was possible to defer a few of the items if they were controversial and didn't affect the drainage for example the West driveway. Joe Moore stated that there will be drainage that is addressed at that location but that it doesn't affect area that is being discussed for the Parking Garage. **David Olson** stated that the way it is being represented does take into account the overall drainage project. However each individual project does need to take in account drainage for the tennis courts for example and also take in account the impervious coverage that they will have to come back to do a drainage revision at some point to cover all of the various items. There should be special language in the specific use permit to allow for that. **John Putman** updated the issues as it related to the driveway entrance and how they are trying to manage traffic. They are working on how they will use that entrance. **Henry Kollenberg** asked when they would have a detailed plan because that information needs to be in the specific use permit. **John Putman** stated that they should have that done before the next city council meeting on the operational use of that road. **Gene Werlin** stated that they only use one entrance. The driveway entrance will be our third access point. Everything will be an exit. **Andy Marti** stated they want to make things better for the city as well as the Kinkaid facility and they were going to use that as a third exit point but they don't necessarily have to. **Johnathan Finger** wanted to make sure that the two Stillforest agreements are attached to the proposed specific use permits because of all of the setback requirements and details and all of the specifics are known. The agreement has been discussed with the Kinkaid School and they have agreed to the Stillforest agreement. He would like to see those as attachments.

*Public Hearing Closed on the 14 Specific Use Permit Requests.*

**Vincent Marino** stated that a lot of progress has been made since it was discussed at the last meeting and we did not have a draft ordinance at the last meeting. Planning and Zoning prefers to approve an ordinance with proper wording and exhibits. The main issue was drainage and drainage is subject to engineering and city council approval. **David Olson** suggested the some appropriate general language



be in the specific use ordinance; He suggested that the last sentence of the draft of the specific use permit be worded as follows; *A revised drainage plan for the Kinkaid Track and for any revised drainage plan as required by the city for the 14 stated individual projects listed; as well as all other stipulations as stated.*

**Vincent Marino** made a motion to add a reference to the *two Stillforest agreements* and to attach exhibits B & C to the draft specific use permit. That the revised drainage plan will have to be approved by city council and it will apply not only to the original drainage plan but also to the following 14 items. Motion seconded by Sue Curtis. Motion passed.

*The following items were discussed:*

- 1.) Relocation of the permanent ravine within a structured underground pipe system into a detention/compensatory pond approximately 13.5 acre / FT in capacity. Will include the construction of a gravel service drive 14 FT. wide extending from the West Entry Drive to the detention/compensatory pond. Specific placement of the structured pipe, gravel service drive and easement to be between 52 FT and 82 FT of the Kinkaid/Stillforest property line in order to best preserve existing trees/landscaping.

**Vincent Marino** stated that the drainage was subject to the approval of the city engineers and city council. **David Olson** discussed the issue of the easement. The easement will be dedicated along the gravel service drive so that access is available to the ditch, pond and the storm sewer system. David Olson has some suggested wording revision; *will include the construction of a gravel service drive 14 FT wide, extending from the West Entry Drive to the detention/compensatory pond, and the dedication the city access easement. The structured pipe, gravel service drive, and dedicated service easement will be specially placed between the 52 FT and 82 FT from the Kinkaid/Stillforest property.* **Joe Moore** suggested that we remove the 13.5 FT capacity from the language because the drainage plan had not yet been approved. He suggested not to specify a specific number. **David Olson** stated there has to be something specified. So, they referend the wording to be *a capacity as represented in the city approved drainage plan.* *Vincent Marino had no other comments.*

- 2.) An outdoor artificial turf baseball field with 300 FT outfield boundary barrier wall, and 24 FT tall netting along the 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> base line. *Vincent Marino had no other comments.*
- 3.) Eight (8) hardscape tennis courts with dimensions of approximately 115 FT by 480 FT with 24 FT netting. *Vincent Marino had no other comments.*
- 4.) A landscape buffer/viewing hill 480 FT long and approximately 9 FT tall. *Vincent Marino had no other comments.*
- 5.) A property line fence between Kinkaid and Stillforest, 6 FT black vinyl per the Stillforest/Kinkaid agreement. *Vincent Marino had no other comments.*
- 6.) A multi-purpose artificial turf practice field approximately 290 FT by 180 FT. *Vincent Marino had no other comments.*
- 7.) Relocation of the existing Security Kiosk/Guard House. *Vincent Marino had no other comments.*
- 8.) Relocation of the existing digital sign. *Vincent Marino had no other comments. David Olson wanted to make sure that the sign was still meeting the city's current sign ordinance. Annette*

Arriaga agreed that the sign that was being relocated was still in compliance, that they were just moving the sign further back on the property. Vincent Marino had no other comments.

9.) Realignment of the existing main entry drives to include four (4) 12 FT wide lanes. Vincent Marino had no other comments.

10.) A new west entry and 24 FT wide concrete drive, including a wrought iron gate and fence on the San Felipe property line. David Olson said that they will have to tell city council how they will be utilizing that 24 FT entry driveway. He stated that the city does not control that portion of the street. It's controlled by Harris County because it is in their right-of-way. City and staff can add to the conditions of the use. Vincent Marino had no other comments.

11.) A concrete right hand turn lane approximately 130 Ft in length along San Felipe. This would be conditional upon the city and engineers review. They will review the traffic study and make sure that it makes sense. This is in the Harris County right-of-way. Vincent Marino had no other comments.

12.) A detention pond approximately 3.5 acre FT in size situated on the northern end of the west campus adjacent to the west entry drive and main entry drive. This would have to have the same language as listed and stated in item number 1.) This would be tied into the city approved drainage plan. But this will be in a separate drainage plan when the project comes up for permitting. Vincent Marino had no other comments.

13.) Demolition of the existing "Milby House Structures and Swimming Pool" on the west campus property. Vincent Marino had no other comments.

14.) Landscaping to include trees, shrubs, grass and irrigation in that area identified as the "62 FT landscape buffer" starting at the Stillforest/Kinkaid property line. Vincent Marino had no other comments.

Vincent Marino entertained a motion to approve the 14 listed specific use permits subject to the approved modifications as discussed by the Commission. The Planning and Zoning Commission will send a formal recommendation to the Piney Point Village City Council.

4.) **ADJOURNMENT:** Motion to adjourn at 9:50 P.M. Motion made first by Vincent Marino and seconded by Lennie Burke. Motion to adjourn approved.

Date Approved on October 27<sup>th</sup>, 2016

Chairman Vincent Marino X



(Required Signature)

Official File Copy