



College Station ~
Embracing the Past, Exploring the Future

MINUTES
Regular Meeting
Planning and Zoning Commission
Thursday, September 2, 2004, at 7:00 p.m.
Council Chambers, College Station City Hall
1101 Texas Avenue
College Station, Texas

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Shafer, Fedora, Nichols, and Davis.

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: White, Hooton, and Reynolds.

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Maloney and Lancaster.

CITY STAFF PRESENT: Development Services Director Dunn, City Planner Kee, Development Manager Ruiz, Assistant Development Manager George, Senior Planner Fletcher, Staff Planners Prochazka, Boyer, and Hitchcock, Assistant City Engineer Gibbs, Graduate Civil Engineers Thompson and Cotter, Transportation Planner Fogle, City Attorney Cargill and Assistant City Attorney Nemcik, Assistant City Manager Brown, Action Center Representative Wolf, and Staff Assistant Hazlett.

8. Public hearing, discussion, and possible action on the annual review of the City's UDO (Unified Development Ordinance) and Comprehensive Plan. The Commission will consider amendments to Articles 1 – 11 of the UDO including but not limited to development regulations, parking requirements, specific use standards, and platting procedures. (04-187)

City Planner Kee's presented the Staff Report regarding the Annual Review of the Comprehensive Plan. In her opening reports, Ms. Kee explained that when the UDO was adopted in 2003, the City committed to making the development ordinance a living document. To honor that commitment, a stipulation was added that provides for the annual review of the City's Comprehensive Plan and UDO. She pointed out the major categories of land use, examining what is planned versus zoned, whether there is compliance with the Comprehensive Plan and what is zoned and vacant, and thus available for development. She stated that the analysis would serve as a starting point for a future discussion of possible City initiated rezonings.

Development Manager Ruiz presented the Staff report regarding the Annual Review of the UDO (Unified Development Ordinance), honoring the commitment made to keeping the UDO a living document.

Ms. Ruiz stated that many of the proposed amendments are clerical in nature and that over the last year, Staff has identified several editing discrepancies and minor clarifications or corrections. She added that Staff has solicited input from the community for several months and pointed out that once a revised draft of the UDO was prepared, it was posted on the City's website for public input, where staff received several comments. In addition, Staff hosted a UDO Community Work Session on July 27, 2004 to review the proposed changes and solicit further input. Ms. Ruiz briefly summarized the amendments approved throughout the past year as well as those being considered for future amendments.

Following her report, a discussion regarding SOB's (Sexually Oriented Businesses) ensued. Ms. Ruiz pointed out the current regulations and how and where the alternative sites were determined in order to comply with federal case law. Also, the buffering requirements were explained.

City Attorney Cargill explained that the requirement is protected by the 1st Amendment of the Constitution and is very restrictive. He stated that the recommendation is Constitutionally survivable.

Ms. Ruiz interjected that it is a painstaking process that will be reviewed on a regular basis as the city continues to develop and annex areas.

Chairman Shafer opened the public hearing.

Jessica Jimmerson, Westwood Main, commended the staff on the update. She suggested having an open discussion at a future community development meeting. She stated that having these areas pointed out adds to additional concerns of property adjacent to these sites. City Attorney Cargill stated that this can be handled by deed restrictions.

Chairman Shafer closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Nichols motioned to recommend to the City Council their approval of the proposed amendments to UDO, including the development regulations and platting procedures. Commissioner Fedora seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-0.

FOR: Shafer, Davis, Nichols, and Fedora.

AGAINST: None.

ABSENT: White, Hooton, and Reynolds