10/01/01 P&Z

~~Don Glenn~~
Rob. Scherrer } absent
Russ Selemon

I. Call to order: 6:30pm

II. app of min.

08/20/01
Todd not to app as presented; Chairman 2nd
Passed 4 to 0.

09/10/01
Todd not to app as; Kevin 2nd
Passed 4 to 0.

09/17/01
Todd not to app as pres.; Kevin 2nd.
Charles - was Randy legally authorized to act as P+Z.

Darrin - legally yes.
Todd - thought was missed over 3 mtgs.
Darrin - no written rule.
Glen entered 6:35.
Passed 5 to 0.

Welcomed K. McDonald & Don Sederdahl
allowed briefing as a non

III. Darrin Coker -
Q platting & requirements:
Chap 2:11 Platting governs
2:12 Zoning
introduction to Planning laws (APA conference)
one issue they will address - approval
law of platting.
plats go to P+Z - they have final say.

Once a plat complies w/ our regulations
we must approve it.

He read from Chap 2:12.

currently our Sub. Ordin does not require
a TIA. cannot turn down a
plat for those reasons.

here to address this situation - plat was
denied due to TIA study. should not
have been.

Todd - was one that voted against.
apologized to developer. pointed out
page 9 of the Land Use book. -- this is
related to use of the land. no reason to

deny the plat.

Darrin - when it talks about the safety & welfare of public ...
however,

Todd - as far as the health & safety.
if we had adequate water & sewer

Darrin - when we deal w/ platting issues your dealing w/ infrastructural, not land use ordinance.

Charles read page 9.

Darrin - not meant to chastise P+Z.
just being informative.

Don Sed. - somewhere
? this is not something that should be
tape debatable, was it approved

Todd - asked about previously turning down an issue at its preliminary stages down by CR59 because of the size of the road & the intersection (Charles corrected -- zoning application)

Todd: Glad to have cleared up that ~~S.D.~~ plats is related to S. Ord only.

Darr - encourage

Kevin — here as a citizen at the last meeting -- what if plat is approved w/out T/R ... will it be able to go through other stages after platting.

Harris — Staff will be ~~able to~~ there to tell you

Charles - pointed out that there is expertise around the ~~time~~ table w/ staff.

~~we are a civilian checks~~

Harris - excus

III. and Plat of Parks @ Walnut Bend
Richard - we rec approval as presented.

Todd - ques. regarding how much they built the house - - is there any kind of provision for the houses not to flood.

R. Keller - not here then, however my impression Walnut street act as a dam.

Todd mot to app; Glenn 2nd
Passed 5 to 0.

B. Calvot Cove
Richard - rec approval w/ corrections & they've submitted payment.

Todd mot to app; Glenn 2nd.

Todd - applogize for what happened at the last meeting.

Passed 5 to 0.

C. Old Choc. Bayou Sub. (Final)
Richard rec app

① 25' b. line along Old Choc. Bayou
Scales 35'
② miscommunic w/surveyor,

will put

Charles exp. what we've done in the past - w/ small corrections we will approve

Don - how do you know the errors?

Todd - rely on staff.

Charles - exp how mylars go back to engineer

Richard - by not reading them into record we cannot legally get them to do it.

Don - asked about drainage issues if their brought to P+Z.

Todd - asked about zoning on plat.
Richard - note #3. zoned "C".

Todd explained to new Com. about

Charles - the PEDC may go out & lure business/develop.
they did spec. say @ Silverlake they let them b/d at a 10' setback between

thats why we ask for this info to be placed on the plat.

Glenn mot to app; Todd 2nd.

Passed 5 to 0.

E. PUD Standards
Charles - this was brought
very structured guidelines

trend that is successful thats used in other guidelines

over last 4/5 months this has come up..

Todd - reason I brought this back up.
we
not here to hurt develop. tool that is abused
dev. can come in and get R-1 prop & build
houses like its R-3.
mislead people of Pearland.

Glenn - aren't density requir. being met?

Todd - look at info Robin put together.
looked at first paragraph.

PUD is a very good tool that can be
used as a ~~tool~~

PUD shld be PUD. PUD should be
removed out of our ordinances under
each classifi (ie; R-E, R-1, R-2, etc).
should be a separate entity. PUD
should be a unique situation...

pros & cons on page 156.

Don Glenn - things wld like to see added:
- Should have a min. size.
- If its R-1 / R-2 should be a set percentage of what is R-1 or R-2.
* should be for each designation.

Kevin - agreed. Stated that density could always

Todd - has to be a unique situation. idea of cluster bldg has come up.

Don - didnt Don G. address that situation

Charles - WDH / & staff were given the task for putting our words

One of reasons why they put PUD at end of each catg. is (ref. to page 43 (R-3))

how are you gonna record that to where the developer is going to follow it.

Don Glenn - things wld like to see added:
- Should have a min. size.
- If its R-1 / R-2 should be a set percentage of what is R-1 or R-2.
* should be for each designation.

Kevin - agreed. Stated that density could always

Todd - has to be a unique situation. idea of cluster bldg has come up.

Don - didnt Don G. address that situation

Charles - WDH / & staff were given the task for putting our words

One of reasons why they put PUD at end of each catg. is (ref. to page 43 (R-3))

how are you gonna record that to where the developer is going to follow it.

tape

Todd -

get rid of lot size issue.

read from page 1.55.

pud should be
unique situation w/ land ; prevent variance

PUD should be on density -- not lot size.

Donald Glenn pointed out on page 35 - last sent

Rich - asked if the Com. dont think that flood plain can't be counted ~~to~~ in the

tape

Todd - why shld detention be included in the calc. of density.

JDH - should be counted as an amenity. have seen subd. where its left wild. ~~or bac~~ in the subdivision.

Todd - what is concensus of this?
does staff suggest any changes?

JWH - not a planner.

Vice ch - for each catagory wld like to see a min. # of lots meet the true R-1 standards.

Charles - go back to case - if doing a went ~~a~~ aminity, but ~~yes~~ do real nice POD homes
wld that take away from flexibility?

~~Vice~~ =
Todd - if we get rid of R-1 stigmatism off R-1 PUD. wont have to worry

wld like Tobin to be here.
There is a concensus of doing something different.

Charles - what about R-1 "density" PUD?

JWH - key is ~~#~~. do you want to put a minimum lot size on a PUD.

refered to 250,000 plus.

Todd ~~Silverlake~~ townhomes.

~~very explained~~

HOH - should be

Don. - ~~ultimate decision~~
if

Charles - as we stand. no recommendations

Charles -
E. asked if any particular date.
preferred to do it on a regularly
scheduled.
asked how about 15th.

29th

No 6:30
(Charles - Robert Scherrer, Don Sed.)

IV. Adjourned 8:10.