

# PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION

AGENDA – WORKSHOP OF THE PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF PEARLAND, TEXAS, TO BE HELD ON AUGUST 15, 2005, AT 6:00 P.M., IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CITY HALL, 3519 LIBERTY DRIVE, PEARLAND, TEXAS.

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. PURPOSE OF THE WORKSHOP:

A. **DISCUSSION ITEM:** Proposed Planned Unit Development District (PUD) for Texas Heritage Village Retirement Community, approximately 79 acres, generally located south of the intersection of McLean Road and Massey Ranch Road (County Road 100)

B. **DISCUSSION ITEM:** Proposed Planned Unit Development District (PUD) for Ameripak, approximately 3.2 acres, generally located on the south side of Beltway 8, and on the east side of Almeda School Road.

III. ADJOURNMENT

This site is accessible to disabled individuals. For special assistance, please call Young Lorfing at 281-652-1655 prior to the meeting so that appropriate arrangements can be made.

POSTED THIS _____ DAY OF _____, 2005
REMOVED THIS _____ DAY OF _____, 2005



## CITY OF PEARLAND PLANNING & ZONING

---

### JOINT WORKSHOP ITEM

**DATE:** August 2, 2005

**TO:** City Council and Planning and Zoning Commission

**FROM:** Lata Krishnarao, AICP, and Planning Director

**SUBJECT:** Joint workshop regarding a Planned Unit Development (PUD) proposed Retirement Community located south of the intersection of McLean Road and Massey Ranch Road (CR 100)

---

The attached document is a proposed Planned Unit Development (PUD) that is scheduled for a joint workshop of the City Council and Planning and Zoning Commission. This is in conformance with the PUD regulations in the Land Use and Urban Development Ordinance that requires that the PUD document be submitted to the Planning and Zoning Commission for discussion prior to the actual scheduling of the item for a joint public hearing. Staff has been including the City Council at this workshop to get their input as early as possible so that the applicant can address all the concerns before the joint public hearing.

The applicant will be available to make a presentation to the Council and the Commission at this workshop and address questions and concerns.

This PUD is proposed to be scheduled for a Joint Public Hearing at a later date.

#### **SUMMARY:**

- The subject property is located on the south side of Massey Ranch Road (CR 100) at its intersection with McLean Road.
- The subject property is approximately 79 acres.
- The subject property is currently zoned "R-E" – Estate Lot Single Family Dwelling District.

- This retirement community called the Texas Heritage Village Retirement Community will include a retail center with a total of 735 residential units.

Town Square Lifestyle Village with uses permitted per General Business (GB) zone	5.58 Acres	(12 units for guests)
Independent Living Congregate Housing for Elderly	8.84 Acres	(353 units)
Assisted Living Heightened Care	5.58 Acres	(115 units)
Town Homes	10.75 Acres	(102 units)
Single Family Estate Lots (Lot size - 60'X100')	20 Acres	(88 lots)
Garden Home Lots (Lot size - 50'X100')	12.13 Acres	(66 lots)
Detention area/lake with hiking trail	5.54 Acres	
Community area with community building, swimming pool and outdoor theater	2.14 Acres	
Tennis Courts	2.9 Acres	

- Zoning Designations

The applicant is proposing the following zoning designations:

Town Square Lifestyle Village	General Business (GB) zone
Independent Living Congregate Housing for Elderly	General Business (GB) zone
Assisted Living Heightened Care	General Business (GB) zone
Town Homes	Multi Family (MF) zone
Single Family Estate Lots	Single Family Residential (R-3)

Garden Home Lots

Single Family Residential (R-4)

- Densities – The PUD states that for the entire 79.19 acres with 735 units
  - gross density is 9.28 units per acre and
  - Net density in 9.55 units per acre
 It is not clear how these densities were calculated.

According to staff calculations the densities are as follows  
 Gross residential density in areas zoned MF, R-4 and R-3 (excludes all GB tracts)

(256 homes in 42.88 acres) = 6 units per acre

Net residential density in areas zoned for all residential in GB, MF, R-4 and R-3 (excludes the retail center with 12 units and detention)

(723 units in 66.76 acres) = 11.0 units per acre approx.

- PUD proposes a combination of 2-story and 4-story buildings for the Independent Living Congregate Housing for Elderly. The recently built 4-story building at Sunrise Lakes Plaza is 55 feet in height.

**SURROUNDING ZONING AND LAND USES:**

	<u>Zoning</u>		<u>Land Use</u>
North	ETJ		Single family residential
South	Estate Dwelling District (R-E) and ETJ	Lot Single Family	Predominantly vacant with some single family residential
East	Estate Dwelling District (R-E) and ETJ	Lot Single Family	Predominantly vacant with some single family residential
West	Estate Dwelling District (R-E) and ETJ	Lot Single Family	Predominantly vacant with some single family residential

**CONFORMANCE TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:**

The Comprehensive Plan has designated this area as Suburban Residential with a minimum of half-acre lot. Therefore the proposed Planned Unit Development does not conform to the Comprehensive Plan.

**CONFORMANCE TO THE LAND USE AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE:**

The property is zoned Estate Lot Single Family Dwelling District (R-E). R-E Zone permits single-family residential uses and requires a minimum lot size of one-half acre (21,780 sq. ft.) with the following requirements:

Minimum lot width	-	120 feet
Maximum coverage	-	50% (maximum) of total lot covered by a building structure
Front yard	-	40 feet
Rear yard	-	25 feet
Side yard	-	At least 15 feet or 30 feet between dwellings
Building height	-	35 feet maximum

Maximum Density in an R-E PUD is two (2) dwelling units per acre. R-E PUD does not specify any minimum lot size and width.

The proposed PUD is not in conformance with the Land Use and Urban Development Ordinance.

**EXISTING CHARACTER OF THE AREA:**

The area in general has a suburban/rural character. The area around the subject parcel is developed with single-family homes and trailer homes on large lots, predominantly along McLean Road and north side of CR 100. The area south of CR 100 has large tracts of vacant land. CR 100 / Massey Ranch Road is a two lane road with no sidewalks.

**PRELIMINARY STAFF REVIEW COMMENTS:**

Staff has conducted a preliminary review and has the following observations. At this time staff is not making recommendations. A comprehensive review will occur as usual in concert with Joint Public Hearing presentation. However, the following is a list of issues readily identified in the PUD document that staff would like some preliminary input from City Council and Planning & Zoning Commission. Additional comments may be forthcoming based on the discussion at the workshop and further review by staff.

- 1) Density: To be discussed. The Council has been leaning towards lower densities for PUD's in the past. The recently approved active adult retirement community of Villages of Towne Lake was approved with a gross density of 8.87 units per acre and a net of 9.13 units per acre.
- 2) Land Uses: As stated earlier the proposed use is not in conformance with zoning, existing uses or Comprehensive Plan. Is this a concern?
- 3) The PUD proposes up to 4-story buildings (55 feet high). The current zoning of R-E limits the height of buildings to 35 feet. Is this an issue?

- 4) Maintenance responsibility of all proposed open spaces and amenities has not been clarified in the PUD document. The PUD does not clarify if any open space is being dedicated to the City?
- 5) It is not clear if the tracts will conform to all the requirements of the stated zone, including permitted use, setbacks etc. If the two GB tracts are restricted to elderly housing should this be specified or would all uses allowed in GB zones be allowed in those two tracts?
- 6) A location map, would clarify the exact location of parcel.
- 7) Dedication will be required along CR 100 (shown as a major thoroughfare).
- 8) Traffic Impact Analysis will be required to support the layout as shown.
- 9) Open Space: Since the Congregate Housing for Elderly and Assisted Living Heightened Care are zoned GB, there are no requirements for open space. However the Ordinance for multi family requires 600 sq. ft. of common recreational area per unit for multifamily developments in MF zones. Should this be addressed in the PUD to provide more meaningful open spaces for the elderly residents?
- 10) Landscaping requirements have not been specified. Staff recommends that the requirements of the Ordinance be met.
- 11) Buffering around the site from adjoining RE zones. Should additional setbacks be required as a buffer between this developments and adjoining parcels that are zoned R-E?
- 12) Staff has not reviewed the proposal for conformance with the requirements of the Land Use Ordinance in terms of open space, lot coverage, parking etc. Additional parking may be required per the Ordinance. Detailed review will be done prior to the Joint Public Hearing. Staff recommends that all parking requirements in the Ordinance be met.
- 13) It is not clear if all internal streets are proposed to be private streets.

14) Street and sidewalk standards, widths, cross-sections etc. are not mentioned. If deviations are not proposed then they would need to conform to City standards.

15) The PUD does not discuss the building facades and elevations? The Ordinance would require that any façade of portions of façade visible from CR 100 be 100% masonry of glass. Is this a matter of concern?

16) The PUD need to add a statement that all the development, unless specifically stated in the PUD will be in compliance with the current codes.

**SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:**

- Proposed Planned Unit Development (PUD)



## CITY OF PEARLAND PLANNING & ZONING

---

### JOINT WORKSHOP ITEM

**DATE:** August 2, 2005

**TO:** City Council and Planning and Zoning Commission

**FROM:** Lata Krishnarao, AICP, and Planning Director

**SUBJECT:** Joint workshop regarding a Planned Unit Development (PUD) proposed Retirement Community located south of the intersection of McLean Road and Massey Ranch Road (CR 100)

---

The attached document is a proposed Planned Unit Development (PUD) that is scheduled for a joint workshop of the City Council and Planning and Zoning Commission. This is in conformance with the PUD regulations in the Land Use and Urban Development Ordinance that requires that the PUD document be submitted to the Planning and Zoning Commission for discussion prior to the actual scheduling of the item for a joint public hearing. Staff has been including the City Council at this workshop to get their input as early as possible so that the applicant can address all the concerns before the joint public hearing.

The applicant will be available to make a presentation to the Council and the Commission at this workshop and address questions and concerns.

This PUD is proposed to be scheduled for a Joint Public Hearing at a later date.

#### **SUMMARY:**

- The subject property is located on the south side of Massey Ranch Road (CR 100) at its intersection with McLean Road.
- The subject property is approximately 79 acres.
- The subject property is currently zoned "R-E" – Estate Lot Single Family Dwelling District.

- This retirement community called the Texas Heritage Village Retirement Community will include a retail center with a total of 735 residential units.

Town Square Lifestyle Village with uses permitted per General Business (GB) zone	5.58 Acres	(12 units for guests)
Independent Living Congregate Housing for Elderly	8.84 Acres	(353 units)
Assisted Living Heightened Care	5.58 Acres	(115 units)
Town Homes	10.75 Acres	(102 units)
Single Family Estate Lots (Lot size - 60'X100')	20 Acres	(88 lots)
Garden Home Lots (Lot size – 50'X100')	12.13 Acres	(66 lots)
Detention area/lake with hiking trail	5.54 Acres	
Community area with community building, swimming pool and outdoor theater	2.14 Acres	
Tennis Courts	2.9 Acres	

- Zoning Designations

The applicant is proposing the following zoning designations:

Town Square Lifestyle Village	General Business (GB) zone
Independent Living Congregate Housing for Elderly	General Business (GB) zone
Assisted Living Heightened Care	General Business (GB) zone
Town Homes	Multi Family (MF) zone
Single Family Estate Lots	Single Family Residential (R-3)

Garden Home Lots

Single Family Residential (R-4)

- Densities – The PUD states that for the entire 79.19 acres with 735 units
  - gross density is 9.28 units per acre and
  - Net density in 9.55 units per acre
 It is not clear how these densities were calculated.

According to staff calculations the densities are as follows  
 Gross residential density in areas zoned MF, R-4 and R-3 (excludes all GB tracts)

(256 homes in 42.88 acres) = 6 units per acre

Net residential density in areas zoned for all residential in GB, MF, R-4 and R-3 (excludes the retail center with 12 units and detention)

(723 units in 66.76 acres) = 11.0 units per acre approx.

- PUD proposes a combination of 2-story and 4-story buildings for the Independent Living Congregate Housing for Elderly. The recently built 4-story building at Sunrise Lakes Plaza is 55 feet in height.

**SURROUNDING ZONING AND LAND USES:**

	<u>Zoning</u>		<u>Land Use</u>
North	ETJ		Single family residential
South	Estate Dwelling District (R-E) and ETJ	Lot Single Family	Predominantly vacant with some single family residential
East	Estate Dwelling District (R-E) and ETJ	Lot Single Family	Predominantly vacant with some single family residential
West	Estate Dwelling District (R-E) and ETJ	Lot Single Family	Predominantly vacant with some single family residential

**CONFORMANCE TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:**

The Comprehensive Plan has designated this area as Suburban Residential with a minimum of half-acre lot. Therefore the proposed Planned Unit Development does not conform to the Comprehensive Plan.

**CONFORMANCE TO THE LAND USE AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE:**

The property is zoned Estate Lot Single Family Dwelling District (R-E). R-E Zone permits single-family residential uses and requires a minimum lot size of one-half acre (21,780 sq. ft.) with the following requirements:

Minimum lot width	-	120 feet
Maximum coverage	-	50% (maximum) of total lot covered by a building structure
Front yard	-	40 feet
Rear yard	-	25 feet
Side yard	-	At least 15 feet or 30 feet between dwellings
Building height	-	35 feet maximum

Maximum Density in an R-E PUD is two (2) dwelling units per acre. R-E PUD does not specify any minimum lot size and width.

The proposed PUD is not in conformance with the Land Use and Urban Development Ordinance.

**EXISTING CHARACTER OF THE AREA:**

The area in general has a suburban/rural character. The area around the subject parcel is developed with single-family homes and trailer homes on large lots, predominantly along McLean Road and north side of CR 100. The area south of CR 100 has large tracts of vacant land. CR 100 / Massey Ranch Road is a two lane road with no sidewalks.

**PRELIMINARY STAFF REVIEW COMMENTS:**

Staff has conducted a preliminary review and has the following observations. At this time staff is not making recommendations. A comprehensive review will occur as usual in concert with Joint Public Hearing presentation. However, the following is a list of issues readily identified in the PUD document that staff would like some preliminary input from City Council and Planning & Zoning Commission. Additional comments may be forthcoming based on the discussion at the workshop and further review by staff.

- 1) Density: To be discussed. The Council has been leaning towards lower densities for PUD's in the past. The recently approved active adult retirement community of Villages of Towne Lake was approved with a gross density of 8.87 units per acre and a net of 9.13 units per acre.
- 2) Land Uses: As stated earlier the proposed use is not in conformance with zoning, existing uses or Comprehensive Plan. Is this a concern?
- 3) The PUD proposes up to 4-story buildings (55 feet high). The current zoning of R-E limits the height of buildings to 35 feet. Is this an issue?

- 4) Maintenance responsibility of all proposed open spaces and amenities has not been clarified in the PUD document. The PUD does not clarify if any open space is being dedicated to the City?
- 5) It is not clear if the tracts will conform to all the requirements of the stated zone, including permitted use, setbacks etc. If the two GB tracts are restricted to elderly housing should this be specified or would all uses allowed in GB zones be allowed in those two tracts?
- 6) A location map, would clarify the exact location of parcel.
- 7) Dedication will be required along CR 100 (shown as a major thoroughfare).
- 8) Traffic Impact Analysis will be required to support the layout as shown.
- 9) Open Space: Since the Congregate Housing for Elderly and Assisted Living Heightened Care are zoned GB, there are no requirements for open space. However the Ordinance for multi family requires 600 sq. ft. of common recreational area per unit for multifamily developments in MF zones. Should this be addressed in the PUD to provide more meaningful open spaces for the elderly residents?
- 10) Landscaping requirements have not been specified. Staff recommends that the requirements of the Ordinance be met.
- 11) Buffering around the site from adjoining RE zones. Should additional setbacks be required as a buffer between this developments and adjoining parcels that are zoned R-E?
- 12) Staff has not reviewed the proposal for conformance with the requirements of the Land Use Ordinance in terms of open space, lot coverage, parking etc. Additional parking may be required per the Ordinance. Detailed review will be done prior to the Joint Public Hearing. Staff recommends that all parking requirements in the Ordinance be met.
- 13) It is not clear if all internal streets are proposed to be private streets.

14) Street and sidewalk standards, widths, cross-sections etc. are not mentioned. If deviations are not proposed then they would need to conform to City standards.

15) The PUD does not discuss the building facades and elevations? The Ordinance would require that any façade of portions of façade visible from CR 100 be 100% masonry or glass. Is this a matter of concern?

16) The PUD needs to add a statement that all the development, unless specifically stated in the PUD will be in compliance with the current codes.

**SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:**

- Proposed Planned Unit Development (PUD)



# CITY OF PEARLAND PLANNING & ZONING

---

## JOINT WORKSHOP ITEM

**DATE:** August 2, 2005

**TO:** City Council and Planning and Zoning Commission

**FROM:** Lata Krishnarao, AICP, and Planning Director

**SUBJECT:** Joint workshop regarding a Planned Unit Development (PUD) proposed at the intersection of Beltway 8 and Almeda School Road (14525 Almeda School Road, Houston).

---

The attached document is a proposed Planned Unit Development (PUD) that is scheduled for a joint workshop of the City Council and Planning and Zoning Commission. This is in conformance with the PUD regulations in the Land Use and Urban Development Ordinance (Ordinance) that requires that the PUD document be submitted to the Planning and Zoning Commission for discussion prior to the actual scheduling of the item for a joint public hearing. Staff has been including the City Council at this workshop to get their input as early as possible so that the applicant can address all the concerns before the joint public hearing.

The applicant will be available to make a presentation to the Council and the Commission at this workshop and address questions and concerns.

This PUD is proposed to be scheduled for a Joint Public Hearing at a later date.

### **SUMMARY:**

- The subject property is located on the south side of Beltway 8 and east side of Almeda School Road.
- The subject property is approximately 3.2 acres.
- The subject property is currently zoned "M-1" – Light Industrial District.

A 21,250 sq. ft. building exists on site and is being used by Ameripak, a packaging materials distribution company. The existing building is a pre-engineered structure constructed of a combination of 26 and 24 gauge vertical ribbed metal panels factory coated with siliconized polyester paint.

- The property was annexed into the City of Pearland in 2001 and the existing building was constructed prior to the annexation. The existing site and building do not conform to the requirements of the Land Use and Urban Development Ordinance and are therefore non-conforming. The non-conformities include facades, fencing, landscaping, parking, sidewalks, setbacks, etc.
- The applicant had applied to the Zoning Board of Adjustments for variances on façade requirements and was denied the variance request.
- The PUD application proposes variances from the Ordinance with respect to setbacks, sidewalks, building facades, fencing, and signage.
- Requirements of the Ordinance:

**Facades:** Based on the location of the building and site, the Ordinance requires that all four sides be 100% masonry or glass. The existing metal panels are not in conformance with this requirement.

**Fencing:** The Ordinance prohibits barbed wire fencing. As indicated in the applicant's report the site has barbed wire fencing (partially or wholly) on all sides.

**Landscaping:** The Ordinance requires basically three types of landscaping.

- a. Street trees (minimum 1" caliper for every 15 feet of frontage of site along Alameda School Road and Beltway 8 Frontage Road.
- b. Parking lot tree at a rate of 1 caliper inch per parking space.
- c. Shrubs to screen parking from streets.
- d. Three percent of gross site area or ten percent of net site area to be landscaped.

The existing site does not meet these requirements.

**Parking:** The Ordinance requires paved and striped parking spaces based on the use of the building. The existing site is not in compliance.

**Sidewalks:** Six-foot sidewalks are required along Alameda School Road and Frontage Road. There are no sidewalks at present.

- The applicant is proposing to relocate the ingress/egress 235 feet from the intersection of Frontage Road and Alameda School Road by using White Road ROW upon its abandonment by the City. This will be an improvement as the driveway separation distance required on Alameda School Road is 350'.

### **PROPOSED VARIATIONS FROM THE ORDINANCE:**

The applicant has proposed three options. These options are discussed below.

#### **Option 1**

The applicant is proposing to divide the parcel into two parcels, Parcel A facing Alameda School Road and Parcel B facing Beltway 8. Office addition is proposed on Parcel A facing Alameda School Road. Both the parcels will have access from White Road.

The following variations are proposed:

#### **Setbacks**

##### Parcel A

- East side – **Requested 0'**. Required – 25'
- North side – Variance approved already. Existing 6-12', Required 35'
- West side – Existing meets or exceeds the required 35'
- South side – Existing meets or exceeds the required 25'

##### Parcel B

- East side - Existing meets or exceeds the required 25'
- North side – **Requested 6-12'**. Required 35'.
- West side – **Requested 0'**. Required 25'
- South side – Existing meets or exceeds the required 25'

#### **Sidewalks**

Waive 6' sidewalk along Frontage Road

Defer requirement of 6' wide sidewalk along Alameda School Road until street improvements are initiated.

#### **Building Façade**

All four facades are currently non-conforming.

Proposed: EFIS on 8' of building on all sides. All new buildings to conform.

Required: Entire surfaces of all four sides need to be EFIS or similar material that meets the "masonry" requirements of the Ordinance.

OR

Proposed: EFIS on 100% of north façade only facing Frontage Road.  
All new buildings to conform.  
Required: Entire surfaces of all four sides need to be EFIS or similar material that meets the "masonry" requirements of the Ordinance.

**Fencing**

Proposed: Retain existing barbed wire fences and extend them to encompass the entire site.  
Permitted: Barbed wire/razor wire prohibited. No restrictions on other kind of fencing up to 8-foot height.

**Signage**

No variance proposed.  
Proposed: Allow 300 sq. ft. for each of the two parcels.  
Permitted: Maximum of 300 sq. ft. for each parcel.

**Option 2**

Single occupant on the entire site. Office addition proposed to existing building facing Alameda School Road.  
The following variations are proposed:

**Setbacks**

No variations proposed.

**Sidewalks (Same as Option 1)**

Waive 6' sidewalk along Frontage Road  
Defer requirement of 6' wide sidewalk along Alameda School Road until street improvements are initiated.

**Building Façade (Same as Option 1)**

All four facades are currently non-conforming.

Proposed: EFIS on 8' of building on all sides. All new buildings to conform.

Required: Entire surfaces of all four sides need to be EFIS or similar material that meets the "masonry" requirements of the Ordinance.

OR

Proposed: EFIS on 100% of north façade only facing Frontage Road.  
All new buildings to conform.

Required: Entire surfaces of all four sides need to be EFIS or similar material that meets the "masonry" requirements of the Ordinance.

**Fencing (Same as Option 1)**

Proposed: Retain existing barbed wire fences and extend them to encompass the entire site.

Permitted: Barbed wire razor wire prohibited. No restrictions on other kind of fencing up to 8-foot height.

**Signage**

Proposed: Allow 300 sq. ft. for each segment of the building, to a total of 600 sq. ft.

Permitted: Maximum total of 300 sq. ft.

**Option 3**

Single occupant on the entire site. No addition proposed.

The following variations are proposed:

**Setbacks**

No variations proposed.

**Sidewalks (Same as Option 1)**

Waive 6' sidewalk along Frontage Road

Defer requirement of 6' wide sidewalk along Alameda School Road until street improvements are initiated.

**Building Façade (Same as Option 1)**

All four facades are currently non-conforming.

Proposed: EFIS on 8' of building on all sides. All new buildings to conform.

Required: Entire surfaces of all four sides need to conform.

OR

Proposed: EFIS on 100% of north façade only facing Frontage Road. All new buildings to conform.

Required: Entire surfaces of all four sides need to conform.

**Fencing (Same as Option 1)**

Proposed: Retain existing barbed wire fences and extend them to encompass the entire site.

Permitted: Barbed wire razor wire prohibited. No restrictions on other kind of fencing up to 8-foot height.

**Signage**

No variance proposed.

Proposed: Allow 300 sq. ft. for each building segment. Total of 600 sq. ft.

Permitted: Maximum total of 300 sq. ft.

**SURROUNDING ZONING AND LAND USES:**

	<u>Zoning</u>	<u>Land Use</u>
North	N/A	Beltway 8
South	M-1 (Light Industrial)	Sand pit and predominantly vacant
East	M-1 (Light Industrial)	Predominantly vacant
West	ETJ	Predominantly vacant with some industrial uses

**CONFORMANCE TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:**

The Comprehensive Plan has designated this area as "Spectrum District" and recommends that this area "should be differentiated from the more general *Business Park* designation in order to identify it as a more unique area of the City." The Comprehensive Plan also recommends that this area be developed as a distinct gateway announcing the City of Pearland and include a comprehensive streetscape program with medians, street trees, cohesive lighting, pedestrian walkways, etc., with water features and view corridors. The site falls in the western boundary of the Spectrum District that is designated for Light and Heavy Industrial District.

**EXISTING CHARACTER OF THE AREA:**

The area in general is characterized by vacant land and some industrial uses. A sand pit exists to the south of the site. The site is highly visible from Beltway 8.

**PRELIMINARY STAFF REVIEW COMMENTS:**

Staff has conducted a preliminary review and has the following observations. At this time staff is not making recommendations. A comprehensive review will occur as usual in concert with Joint Public Hearing presentation. However, the following is a list of issues readily identified in the PUD document that staff would like some preliminary input from City Council and Planning & Zoning Commission. Additional comments may be forthcoming based on the discussion at the workshop and further review by staff.

- 1) The site is located on a Beltway 8 and Alameda School Road, both of which are designated as major thoroughfares in the Thoroughfare Plan. This area is highly visible and has been identified as a gateway into the City in the Comprehensive Plan. This location requires the facades to be 100 percent masonry or glass, despite the fact that the site has been designated as M-1 zone. This is an issue that has been identified in the recent past by other property owners and business in similar situations when dealing with an existing non-conforming building that do not meet the façade requirements. The Unified Development Code has mirrored the existing Ordinance in which the façade requirements are based on the classification of the street that the property is located on. However, staff has recommended that this be discussed by the Council in regards to existing buildings in industrial zones and encourage amelioration measures over a period of time to encourage use of such existing buildings. The LNR PUD that was recently approved in the Spectrum area has proposed a lesser percentage (80%) of masonry for buildings on Kirby and Spectrum Drives.
- 2) Landscaping requirements have not been specified. Staff recommends that the requirements of the Ordinance be met.
- 3) Staff has not reviewed the proposal for conformance with the requirements of the Land Use Ordinance in terms of lot coverage, parking etc. Additional parking may be required per the Ordinance. Detailed review will be done prior to the Joint Public Hearing. Staff recommends that all parking requirements in the Ordinance be met.
- 4) The PUD need to add a statement that all the development, unless specifically stated in the PUD will be in compliance with the current codes and ordinance.
- 5) Barbed wire fencing is specifically prohibited in the Ordinance. Staff is not sure if the PUD can allow variations of a prohibition.

**SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:**

- Proposed Planned Unit Development (PUD)

**AGENDA SUMMARY**  
**JOINT PUBLIC HEARING OF THE**  
**CITY COUNCIL AND THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**  
**OF THE CITY OF PEARLAND, TEXAS,**  
**AUGUST 15, 2005, AT 6:30 P.M.**  
**COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CITY HALL,**  
**3519 LIBERTY DRIVE, PEARLAND, TEXAS**

**1. Master Thoroughfare Plan Amendment**

A request by the City of Pearland, for an amendment to the Thoroughfare Plan (Figure 7.2), of the City of Pearland Comprehensive Plan.

**2. Specific Use Permit Application No. 151**

A request by Voice Stream Houston, Inc., applicant for Randy A. and Connie L. Lange, owners, for an amendment to the Land Use and Urban Development Ordinance of said City, for approval of a Specific Use Permit for "Radio or Television or Microwave Towers (Commercial)" in the Light Industrial District (M-1(S))

[Generally Located on the East Side of Harkey Road, and South of Figland Street]

**3. Specific Use Permit Application No. 152**

A request by Architectural Group International (AGI), applicant for The Home Depot, owner, for an amendment to the Land Use and Urban Development Ordinance of said City, for approval of a Specific Use Permit for "Outside Display, Storage, and Sale of Merchandise and Equipment" in the Commercial District (C)

[Generally Located on the South Side of FM 518 (Broadway Street), and on the East Side of Dixie Farm Road]

**4. Zone Change Application No. 1238**

A request by Kerry R. Gilbert and Associates, Inc., applicant for Pearland Lifestyle Center, L.P., owner, for an amendment to the Land Use and Urban Development Ordinance of said City, for approval of a change in zoning district from classification Suburban Development District (SD) to Planned Unit Development District (PUD)

[Generally Located at the Southwest Corner of State Highway 288 and Beltway 8]