



The City of West University Place

A Neighborhood City

CITY COUNCIL

Susan Sample, Mayor
John Montgomery, Mayor Pro Tem
John P. Barnes, Councilmember
Melanie Bell, Councilmember
Shannon Carroll, Councilmember

STAFF

David J. Beach, City Manager
Scott Bounds, Olson and Olson, City Attorney
Thelma Gilliam, City Secretary

CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

The City Council of the City of West University Place, Texas, met in a regular meeting on **Monday, February 28, 2022**, at **6:30 p.m.**, in the Municipal Building at 3800 University Boulevard, to consider the agenda of items listed. The meeting was in person and via Zoom.

Agenda of Items:

1. Call Meeting to Order

Mayor Sample called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. In attendance were Mayor Pro Tem Montgomery and Councilmembers Barnes, Bell, and Carroll. Staff in attendance were City Manager Beach, City Secretary Gilliam, Assistant to the City Manager Thompson, Parks and Recreation Director White, Public Works Director Barrera, Building Official Acosta, and Police Chief Walker

The following were also present: Jeff Gerber with PGAL, Nick Rogles with Terralab, Zoning and Planning Commission Chair John Cutrer, and Zoning Administrative Evan DuVall (BBG Consulting)

2. Pledge of Allegiance – Councilmember Barnes led the Pledge.

3. Public Comments

This is an opportunity for citizens to speak to the Council relating to agenda and non-agenda items.

Kenneth Gullett, 3701 Albans, spoke regarding the Edloe Pathway project and recommended that Council (1) end the project at Sunset and have a smaller walkway continue north from Sunset to Albans, (2) have the proposed 6-foot aluminum fence as opposed to any wood fence alternative, (3) have honeysuckles as the major plant of choice, (4) include a 6-foot metal fence at the end of the pathway with future matured honeysuckle that would provide additional privacy for those that live along the pathway, (5) have a six-to-twelve inch stone boarder on top of the curb, and (6) use an earth tone top layer in lieu of the proposed black rubber trail surface.

Clay Brett, 3720 Albans, spoke in favor of the Edloe Pathway project. He said it is a wonderful project and solves a very serious safety issue in the neighborhood. He asked Council to advance the project.

David Polyansky, 3748 Wroxton, spoke in support of the Edloe Pathway. He said the project in its entirety is great for the community and his preference is to have a pathway for his and his neighbor's children to be able to walk safely around that corner. He also said some of the arguments made are false, such as the project increasing foot and vehicle traffic.

Jennifer Weitzel, 3708 Albans, deferred her comments until after discussion of the agenda item.

Bob Kelly, 3720 Plumb, spoke in favor of the Edloe Pathway project. He said sidewalks have been important to prior Councils since 1990 in order to get people from walking in the streets and to walking

on the sidewalks. He said he and his wife loved the oleanders, but they are not there anymore so this is an ideal time to make West U a little bit safer.

Henry Weitzel, 3708 Plumb, deferred his comment until after discussion of the agenda item.

Will Bertron, 4105 Byron, submitted an email in support of the Edloe Pathway project as presented and asked that City Secretary Gilliam read it into record, which she did.

Alida Drewes, 6112 Fordham, spoke regarding several topics, including asking the City not to have plants around the City that are poisonous to pets, people walking in the streets, and not having a dog park or drinking fountains for dogs.

Lauri Lankford, 3742 Wroxton, spoke against the Edloe Pathway going north from Sunset up to Albans, because she is still unsure of the purpose of having the pathway go north of Sunset. She said it is a road to nowhere and does not seem to make sense because there is no real parking nor a beginning or end of a trail.

David Cole, 4104 Cason, deferred his comment until after discussion of the agenda item.

David Marks, 3737 Albans, spoke to say that he has had some experience with parks not being thought out as well as they should have been. He said there is a tendency to put more things in a space not big enough to accommodate them and he sees that happening in a good portion of the trail, particularly north of Sunset so even a few more cars would make it a lot worse. He said he would like Council to hold off on the northern piece and see what happens with the southern piece in terms of how people use it.

Dick Yehle, 6401 Rutgers, spoke on two topics. Regarding the Edloe Pathway project, he said it is a good project as defined and as designed. He said it is a reminder of the sidewalk issue back in 2000 when the sidewalk project was underway. He said some people did not want a sidewalk in front of their house and some people thought it would be detrimental to their cul-de-sac with sidewalks bringing more people in, but in the end, the City decided that it was everybody's sidewalk. Mr. Yehle also talked about the goals of the ZPC and the BSC. He said he likes ordinances that are crafted well, but sometimes things are missed and, if something is missed and there are repeated problems, then it should be looked at again to rectify the issue. He said he does not believe the City should add layers of bureaucracy to issues if they are not prevalent and/or cost effective.

Gregg Thompson, 3748 Plumb, spoke in favor of the Edloe Pathway project and suggested that the path have a surface that can take the summer heat. He also suggested that the landscape architect put as much green buffer along Edloe as possible for visual and aesthetics as well as for those residents on the other side.

Beverly Olmstead, 3711 Wroxton, spoke to say she loved the oleanders and was sad to see them die. She said she is concerned about the extension north of Sunset. She said if most of the people living in that area do not want the sidewalk to go north of Sunset, she thinks their voices speak loud and clear and believes that the majority of the people do not want it, herself included, and hopes Council will listen to those people who signed the petition.

Dan Reid, 3716 Wroxton, spoke to say he loves the Edloe project up to Sunset. He said he, his family and his neighbors are concerned about the safety situation. He said the continuation through that stop and the turn-around into that blind corner exacerbates the problem by having a sidewalk on that side.

David Piwnica-Worms, 3707 Albans, spoke in favor of the project, but against it north of Sunset. He said there are two issues – one is safety, which would be more under Zoning and Planning, not Parks

and Recreation. He said Parks should not engage in a safety assessment at that intersection. He said a super majority of the neighbors do not want that extension north of Sunset because of the safety and traffic issues on the blind corner.

4. Edloe Pathway Project

Matters related to the Edloe Pathway Project. *Recommended Action: Approve and provide direction. Ms. Susan White, Parks and Recreation Director*

Parks and Recreation Director White presented and acknowledged that Nick Robles with Terralab was also present.

Ms. White noted that tonight's presentation is a follow up to the Edloe improvements concept presented to Council on January 10, 2022. She said if there is a consensus tonight, the design development will be complete and the construction and design phases can begin.

Ms. White said staff submitted an application to Texas Parks and Wildlife for a recreational trails grant and, if received, the construction expenses is an 80/20 split, with the City paying 20 percent. She said reimbursement for professional services (i.e. design services) is only 12 percent, which equates to approximately \$4,000. Ms. White said if the City does receive funding, Texas Parks and Wildlife will notify staff towards the end of May and the City would be required to go through an environmental review, which can take several months.

At this time, Ms. White introduced Nick Rogles who went over the updates to the Edloe Pathway project, which include:

- A concrete sidewalk from that existing driveway around the corner to where they are proposing a new curb ramp.
- Some more trees and benches
- More plantings at the corner
- At the terminus of all the intersecting roads, included low ground cover plantings
- Showing both an aluminum ornamental fence and a composite wood fence in horizontal pattern
- Dog waste station and multi-use water fountain for dogs and people
- Plant palette to produce the height of some of the plants while taking safety into account

Ms. White asked for feedback, particularly on the fencing. She noted that the wood composite material will cost approximately \$30,000 more than the aluminum fence.

Mayor Sample called on the speakers that deferred their public comments until discussion of this agenda item.

Jennifer Weitzel, 3708 Albans, spoke to say that she and her family oppose this project.

Henry Weitzel, 3708 Albans, spoke to say since the January 10 meeting they have done a lot of investigating, talked to people, and conducted a survey. He discussed the findings of the survey and said he is not sure of what the confusion is because it is indisputably an overwhelming number of citizens in the community who do not want the project going north of Sunset. In regards to the safety issue, he said the City cannot justify building the path on the east side of Albans. He said either Council believes it is safe, which in that case you do not need one on the east side or you believe it is unsafe in which case the City is legally and morally obligated to make it safe. Mr. Weitzel said the most interesting thing he knows is that the one traffic accident along the whole path (noted on a recent traffic study done for the entire City), is at Sunset and Edloe, right where the proposal is to convince people to cross. Mr. Weitzel said he is against this project and respectfully asked that Council stop it at Sunset because the citizens overwhelmingly do not want it and it does not make it safer.

David Cole, 4104 Cason, spoke to say that he was at the previous review meeting and have similar comments, because he is looking at this as the go-ahead from Council to go the next step and he is worried about how many commas are going to be in the final price tag. He pointed out some elements in the drawings that he thinks need some more fine-tuning and said that Council should give direction to staff that there is not a bottomless pit of money, because eventually the residents have to pay for it, whether it is grant money or not.

Steven Damiani, 3746 Georgetown, spoke to say he thinks this project is a great use of public work and thinks it is a good idea. He discussed some safety points and finished by saying every person in the City would benefit from higher property values. He asked that this Council have the foresight and courage to go forward with the project because it is a beautiful piece of work.

After the last speaker, Councilmember Barnes asked to move into discussion of the revisions to the concept design for comment and to make a motion on. He said he is on record as being very much in favor of the Edloe Street pathway in general, because the span from Sunset to Rice will improve the safety and the aesthetic beauty of the neighborhood, however, like his colleagues, he has heard the comments of various folks who live north of Sunset and their concerns about this project. He said it seems to him that there is sufficient information that says there is a clear majority of the households north of Sunset that do not want to see the project span north of Sunset.

Councilmember Barnes moved to bifurcate the process and table (action) with respect to the north section to address appropriately at another time and move forward with all due haste and deliberateness with respect to the southern portion, about which the merits seem reasonably clear and which there seems to be broad based community agreement.

Motion failed due to lack of a second.

Councilmember Carroll spoke to say she thinks the project is great and that she has talked to people who live north of Sunset and has heard their concerns.

Councilmember Carroll said there is a sidewalk along Alban's currently that dead-ends into a driveway, so she does not see a sidewalk on the other side of that being a dead end into a driveway, but rather a continuation of the current sidewalk that is there. She said she is not sure why one would consider it a dead end into a driveway when there is quite literally a sidewalk that dead-ends into the driveway now. She said she has made it a point over the past few weeks to drive that section regularly and drove it again before the meeting tonight and it took anywhere from 30 seconds to two minutes to drive north on Edloe, make a left on the Albans, and turn around and come back. Councilmember Carroll said in the time it took her to do that, she saw two kids riding their bikes in the street on the east side of Edloe and one walking; so, if she is seeing that in that short amount of time, she can only imagine how many people are actually walking in the streets there. She said a pathway may not prevent people from walking in the street and kids from riding their bikes, but it gives them an option. She also said she spoke with a friend that lives on that street, who mentioned the bicycle incident with a child and logic says that the child was in the street, so this is an alternative to being in the street. She said she has young kids and cannot see why a pathway there is a bad idea.

Before giving his thoughts, Mayor Pro Tem Montgomery asked Ms. White if staff received more information from CenterPoint regarding the poles. Ms. White said if CenterPoint is unable to relocate the poles or it is cost prohibitive, the path will just be pushed out, which will not align as nicely.

City Manager Beach said staff met with CenterPoint's Services Director last week and she is committed to attending one of the Council meetings in April to talk about the Buffalo Speedway project and the Edloe Street project.

Mayor Pro Tem Montgomery said he has listened to everybody tonight and those who spoke in the last few council meetings and parks meetings and it occurs to him that there is a lot of community input into this project and he is very encouraged by that. He said whether you agree on everything related to this project or not, the community involvement is very inspiring.

Mayor Pro Tem Montgomery said he is for the project as drawn. He said he knows that this has created a schism in the neighborhood, which is unfortunate. He said he has a hard time voting against one, two or seven parents who want a safer way out of the neighborhood for their kids and it is hard for him to imagine why there is so much objection to this. He said he understands that people are nervous about change, that nobody wants to see things in their neighborhood different from the way they like them already, but he thinks there is a larger community impact and thinks this is an opportunity to provide a safer outlet for children and everyone should be for that.

Due to a comment from a citizen, Mayor Pro Tem Montgomery asked Ms. White to look into a way to draw a pedestrian's attention so that they are aware that they are approaching Sunset. He said, however, that this is a problem at every intersection and the City cannot provide notification to every pedestrian that a path or sidewalk ends and a street starts. He said, however, because this is an exercise trail, and there might be people using it for jogging that would not normally jog in this particular area, he would be for a sign, a series of bumps, or something that disrupts the flow.

Mayor Pro Tem Montgomery said he is also for the color of the path being any color other than black. He said he would encourage a more dirt-like color tone.

Mayor Pro Tem Montgomery apologized to anybody who does not agree with what he said tonight. He said he has been elected to vote his conscience on this and if it comes to a motion, he is going to feel good about voting for it, because it is a beautiful project and he thinks people in the community will come to like it over time. He said the thing that matters a lot to him is that the Weitzel family is hurt, but a change was made to the plans so that it is seen as a continuation of a sidewalk not as an exercise path to the Weitzel's driveway and it was because of the Weitzel family input that the change was made.

Mayor Pro Tem Montgomery said the Parks Board has done its best to accommodate as many people as it can in this project. He reiterated that he thinks it is going to be good for the City of West University Place and he supports it as drawn.

Councilmember Bell said she thinks it is a nice design and said she likes the black aluminum fence, but asked if the Harris County Flood Control District (HCFCD) has any preference since they own that ditch and need access. Ms. White said the fence is on the City's property and when staff met with HCFCD, they did request that the City have access points and work with them in the placement of those access points. She said staff informed them that the fencing would be typical of what Town Center fencing looks like, and they did not object.

With that said, Councilmember Bell reiterated her preference for the aluminum style fencing, which she feels is a bit more open and that green screen would look better on that type fencing should the City decide to add some in the future.

Councilmember Bell said she supports the path north of Sunset as well as south of Sunset. She said she has heard the concerns of the people that live in that neighborhood, but said she is also very cognizant of the fact that there are people that do not live in that neighborhood who have a voice in the City. She said she has run in that neighborhood even though she does not live there, because it is a nice little cut-through to add extra space to your run and to be able to do it on a sidewalk is even nicer in some cases, so she supports it north as well.

Councilmember Bell said she also has concerns. She said even though she is the one that asked for more trees on the pathway where possible, the ones near the street may need to be reviewed because of some of the concerns that were stated by other residents that they came and spoke. She said she is just trying to balance the need for shade and the visibility requirements.

With a question from Mayor Pro Tem Montgomery about the traffic study discussed at the January 10 Council meeting as to whether there has been an update or progress, City Manager Beach responded that staff should have a report sometime within the next two weeks and will finalize it shortly thereafter.

City Manager Beach said the report would include specifics about related concerns of this project as well as review of the plantings at the crossings along three of the bridges.

Mayor Pro Tem Montgomery asked if in the future there is a concern or input from residents about parking or congestion in the area, could Council revisit this. City Manager Beach said Council could always revisit this.

Councilmember Barnes stated that Mr. Weitzel referred to a traffic study commissioned by the prior Council in February last year, which analyzed the entire city from the standpoint of traffic safety. He said there are in fact maps in the study in which they compiled a seven-year timeframe of historical data of crashes and incidents including cars, pedestrians and bicyclists and there were precisely zero incidents at the intersection of Edloe and Albans. He said the only incident in the Sunset Terrace area was a bicyclist at the intersection of Wroxton and Albans.

At this time, Councilmember Barnes requested that staff upload the Traffic Study and proceed to Page 10, which shows the information related to the incident in the Sunset Terrace area that he previously mentioned.

Mayor Pro Tem Montgomery asked Councilmember Barnes to what side does the data point – to the side of the people who are saying it is too much congestion and it is unsafe or to the side of the people who are saying it is unsafe because they do not have a safe way out. He said the lack of accidents does not seem to support either side .

Councilmember Barnes responded that the data points to the fact that there is no present danger based on the objective data.

Mayor Pro Tem Montgomery asked Councilmember Barnes does he want to wait until somebody gets hit before the City puts in a sidewalk.

Councilmember Barnes said if the City builds one on that kind of measure, it would be putting proactive measures anywhere and everywhere anybody walks in the streets in West U, which would be almost all of Sewanee, Mercer, Rutgers and where the City already has sidewalks.

Councilmember Carroll noted the fact that this project is a continuous pathway where there are no driveways, which she said to her is a real benefit because it is a continuous pathway without the possibility of a car backing out onto a child, or anyone for that matter.

Councilmember Carroll said regarding the parking and the objection to the potential or possibility of increased traffic, she is curious where that came from, because she does not see a sidewalk being a destination for people to drive to. She said it seems like the majority of people who would use this trail either live north of Sunset and/or they would park at Tiny's to get onto the trail there.

Resident Lauri Lankford, 3742 Wroxton, spoke to say that a pathway is different from a sidewalk. She said a pathway is a destination where people would come to and run as Councilmember Bell said.

Councilmember Bell said she would not drive to the pathway. She clarified that she would use that pathway if already walking or running in the neighborhood.

Ms. Lankford said that when she would go to Tiny's there was a lot of congestion with the parking and she would see people come and park on their end and take the trail. She said it seems to her like the beginning point of a trail and the endpoint of a trail are the attractions. She said you do not go to that trail and park to go to the middle.

Councilmember Barnes said he would like to see more information with respect to how the City can go about green screening more along the fencing. He said he agrees with Councilmember Bell's comment that the aluminum fencing is a much more aesthetically attractive choice. He said, however, there are still very large sections where there is no screening, and given the degree to which residents do miss the oleanders, he thinks the City needs to make more of an effort to find creative ways to screen those sections.

Councilmember Barnes said he would also like more clarity on the benches as to what the choices are and how those choices were made in terms of where they would be placed along the pathway. He said he noted that between Sunset and Georgetown, if he is counting correctly, there are roughly three benches and then in a relatively short space from Georgetown to the end of the path there are four benches and asked if there is some reason for that kind of disparity in terms of density. Mayor Sample said because that area is wider.

Ms. White answered Councilmember Barnes' questions. Regarding the green screen, Ms. White said if a green screen is something the consensus of Council wants, staff could add it. She said staff prefers not to do sections so it would be all or nothing. Councilmember Barnes said he would like to see more information on it, because he feels there is clearly a community interest in having the green screening.

Regarding the benches, Ms. White said staff originally had benches where all of the pedestrian bridges crossed over, but because of how narrow some of the trail lines are, staff added them where there was a capability to do so.

In regards to the trail surface, Mayor Sample asked about using concrete. Ms. White said over in the Tiny's area, concrete would be more problematic because there are many Cypress trees. She said, in fact, staff has already worked with Mr. Thompson and identified a couple of trees that are already going to have to go because of the concrete. She said porous has flexibility and gives a lot more than concrete and is easier to patch if it becomes necessary.

Mayor said she likes the idea of porous surface because of flooding, but she wanted to take into consideration that some people might be thinking that concrete will not attract as many people to run there.

Councilmember Barnes asked in regards to the surface, does it make a difference with respect to the grant funding from Texas Parks and Wildlife. Ms. White responded that that they love seeing either the decomposed granite or the porous surfaces, so yes. She said staff submitted the application with the porous surface, because from what she has heard from other cities, Texas Parks and Wildlife scores very low for concrete and they might even disqualify the City.

Mayor Pro Tem Montgomery asked Public Works Director Barrera if staff has plans to schedule repairs to the path on the west side of the Edloe where it meets Albans and has some depression in the existing gravel. Mr. Barrera said if that area is in need of repair and is noncompliant, staff will get it corrected per the agreement.

Councilmember Carroll asked Ms. White to clarify whether concreting the portion north of Sunset would preclude the City from receiving grant funding. Ms. White said it might be that they will not fund just that portion, but she would have to check for clarification.

Councilmember Carroll asked if it was the Parks Board decision to use the porous material. Ms. White said staff did not actually present the concrete idea to them, because staff liked the idea of being able to do something that is better for the joints. She said there was no “either/or” as the porous was very well received by the Parks Board from the beginning.

Councilmember Carroll asked what do those residents who vehemently oppose the path being north of Sunset think about the materials.

David Piwnica-Worms, 3707 Albans, spoke to say that he and his neighbors are looking for a safe way around the corner. He said he and his neighbors are not against the project as a whole, just the 50 feet on Edloe, north of Sunset. He said these new course materials offer an opportunity that they did not get a chance to explore earlier and maybe it is the solution that everybody can find the sweet spot of a good compromise.

Mayor Sample said she proposes safety with the sidewalk on both sides of the street. She said when the sidewalk stops somewhere, and people have to cross the street or get in the street, it is dangerous.

Kenneth Gullett, 3701 Albans, spoke regarding history of the gravel area there, which he said was originally concrete. He said it was a beautiful area but has now falling into a state of neglect the last few years and does need some attention.

Mayor Pro Tem Montgomery moved that Council vote on the parks project as drawn. Councilmember Bell seconded the motion. **MOTION PASSED.**

Ayes: Sample, Montgomery, Bell, Carroll
Noes: Barnes
Absent: None

Audio of the full recording of this topic is on the City's website. If no longer on the website, contact the City Secretary's office for a copy.

5. Zoning and Planning and Building and Standards Commissions Project Goals

Matters related to Zoning and Planning Commission and the Building and Standards Commission project goals. *Recommended Action: Discuss, provide feedback, and approve project goals. Mr. Gerardo Barrera, Public Works Director*

Public Works Director Barrera presented and stated that Zoning Administrative Evan DuVall, Chair of the Zoning and Planning Commission, John Cutrer are present, but Building and Standard Commission Chair Bruce Beneke is not able to make it tonight but has no objections to the BSC project list.

Mr. Barrera reviewed the project lists recommended by staff and both the ZPC and BSC (as outlined in the agenda memo).

Zoning and Planning Commission Recommendations

- Two (2) Curb Cuts
 - Clarify whether two (2) curb cuts can be Administratively Approved rather than bringing matter before Zoning Board of Adjustment for variance.
- Side Garage Setbacks

- Review and make recommendations under Chapter 70 and Appendix A for side loading garage setbacks to ensure consistency with the 18-foot setback requirement.
- Sound Attenuating Enclosures for Generators
 - Review recommendations for increasing the sound attenuating requirements for generator enclosures installed on private property.
- Sports Courts Setbacks
 - Review requirements for sports courts (e.g. tennis, basketball, batting cages, pickleball, etc...) and make recommendation to the ordinance to ensure that requirements are equally applied to all types of courts.
- Commercial Uses Definition Review
 - Review, update and define applicable commercial use based upon the type of business. (Appendix A, Sec. 2-102)
- Review of Zoning Ordinance
 - Review of Zoning Ordinance – Appendix A
 - Create individual articles for the different zoning requirements (e.g. single-family residential, commercial districts, PDD, etc. and revise or minimize use of summary table and notes) and simplify the Zoning Ordinance for understanding by residents, builders and contractors.
 - Circular Driveways / Garage Doors / Off-Street Parking
 - Review the rules (Chapter 40, Chapter 70 and Zoning Ordinance – Appendix A) related to circular driveways, garage doors and off-street parking for update and consistency within the Code of Ordinances.
 - This item will also be review by the Building and Standards Commission.

Mayor Sample confirmed that this would be to reformat the zoning ordinance, not re-write it.

Councilmember Bell confirmed with City Attorney Bounds that staff will use the most stringent when clarifying between the provisions of the appendix and the standards.

Councilmember Barnes said because he has heard from so many residents, he would like to add one thing regarding being able to opt-out receiving non-subscription items that are distributed by the way of depositing in the City's right-of-way. He said as a matter of controlling solid waste and being a sustainability community, he thinks the City should look at what residents can do to opt out of receiving those items. Mayor Sample this comes up a lot and the City has looked into this before. City Attorney Bounds said this would not be in the jurisdiction of the BSC or the ZPC. City Manager Beach said this topic can be discussed at a later date after finalizing the goals of the ZPC.

Councilmember Bell asked is there anything the City can do to preserve old stock houses (homes built before 1984) within the community or at least have incentives to preserve them. Councilmember Barnes seconded that and said it may be worth looking at it from the standpoint of the BSC in terms of having ways to make it more cost effective to renovate an existing old stock house as opposed to tearing it down and rebuilding. City Attorney Bounds said people can get relief through the BSC, but it is something ZPC can look at if that is Council's desire. He said old stock houses have a lot of nonconformity when it comes to setbacks and those type of things.

Mayor Pro Tem Montgomery said his concern would be that it would open a loophole for someone unhappy with the current code for conformity for new housing and trying to get around it. He said the Code would have to be very specific about what the City allows.

More discussion on old stock housing ensued and City Manager Beach said to let staff know if there is a desire from Council to look at how the City can encourage retaining old stock houses. Mayor Sample said staff and ZPC can review it and bring it back to Council later.

Building and Standards Commission Recommendations

- **Review of a Site Drainage Plan**
 - Review requirements under Chapter 18, Sec. 18-56, when a site drainage plan is required, as well, any changes to limitations on fill and dirt being brought onto a site to prevent impacts to neighboring properties.
- **“Low Impact” Definition**
 - Define “low impact” as it relates to site development under Chapter 18, Sec. 18-56, which provides criteria to the Chief Building Official in determining exceptions to the development requirements.
- **Property Survey Requirements**
 - Review current survey requirements under Chapter 18, Sec. 18-54 and provide recommendations as it relates to the age of surveys accepted by the City for permitting.
- **Floodplain Ordinance Review**
 - Review the Floodplain Ordinance – Chapter 18, Article IX as compared to the requirements for Harris County Flood Protection Measures and recommend any changes to the City’s ordinance.
- **Circular Driveways / Garage Doors / Off-Street Parking**
 - Review the rules (Chapter 40, Chapter 70 and Zoning Ordinance – Appendix A) related to circular driveways, garage doors and off-street parking for update and consistency within the Code of Ordinances.
 - This item will also be review by the Zoning and Planning Commission.

Councilmember Barnes said he would like, based on comments he has heard from residents, to find out what the City can do to encourage or require more sustainable practices with respect to storage and disposables of construction waste. All of Council agreed that staff and/or the BSC should look into this to see what is feasible.

A consensus of Council approved the project goals and recommendations by the respective boards and City staff, with the additional recommendations from Council.

Mayor Pro Tem Montgomery also asked that it be clearly defined what “low impact” is.

6. Consent Agenda

All Consent Agenda items listed are considered to be routine by the City Council and will be enacted by one motion. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless a Council member requests in which event the item will be removed from the Consent Agenda and considered in its normal sequence on the agenda.

A. City Council Meeting Minutes

Approve City Council Minutes of February 14, 2022. *Recommended Action: Approve City Council Minutes of February 14, 2022. Ms. Thelma Gilliam, City Secretary*

B. Vehicle Purchase and Budget Amendment

Matters related to vehicle purchases and budget amendment. *Recommended Action: Approve ordinance amending the 2022 Budget to purchase vehicles. Mr. Gerardo Barrera, Public Works Director*

C. Approval of Parks and Recreation Board Project Goals

Review summary of goals for the Parks and Recreation Board. *Recommended Action: Review and confirm goals for Parks and Recreation Board. Ms. Susan White, Parks and Recreation Director*

D. Senior Services Board and Senior Services Division Mission Statements

Matters related to a resolution adopting the Senior Services Board and Senior Services Department mission statements. *Recommended Action: Approve resolution adopting the Mission Statements for the Senior Services Board and Senior Services Division of the Parks and Recreation Department. Ms. Susan White, Parks and Recreation Director*

Councilmember Bell removed Item 6C for discussion. Councilmember Barnes moved to approve Items 6A, 6B, and 6D as presented. Councilmember Carroll seconded the motion. **MOTION PASSED.**

Ayes: Sample, Montgomery, Barnes, Bell, Carroll
Noes: None
Absent: None

Councilmember Bell said regarding the Parks and Recreation Board project goals, one of the things she thought there was Council consensus on was adding multi-generational events. She said it is included in the Minutes, but she did not see it on the Parks goals on this Consent Agenda.

Ms. White said staff mentioned to the Parks Programming Subcommittee that Council discussed this and multi-generational programming is a topic for discussion on the agenda for their next meeting.

City Manager Beach said the list included with this agenda item will also be updated to add this as Goal #7 for the Parks Board.

Councilmember Barnes moved to approve Item 6C as amended. Councilmember Bell seconded the motion. **MOTION PASSED.**

Ayes: Sample, Montgomery, Barnes, Bell, Carroll
Noes: None
Absent: None

7. Facilities Master Plan Update

Matters related to the City's Facilities Master Plan. *Recommended Action: Discuss and take any desired action. Mr. Will Thompson, assistant to the City Manager and Jeff Gerber, President PGAL Architects*

Assistant to the City Manager Thompson and the City's architectural consultant, Jeff Gerber with PGAL, presented. Mr. Thompson said the consultant and staff have incorporated feedback from the previous meetings held by Council on December 13, 2021 and January 31, 2022 into tonight's presentation. He said it is been recommended that tonight Council discuss and provide feedback on the preferred options for the master plan, which will determine the variations staff will further evaluate and present to the public for input at Town Hall meetings tentatively scheduled for the first week April.

Mr. Gerber then walked Council through the presentation:

OBJECTIVES

- Consider long term facility needs and locations to satisfy the long term (next 50 years) needs of the City of West University Place
- Long-term decisions will inform the near term and short-term facility decisions that will need to be made to facilitate staff and program growth as well as maintenance decisions.
- Factors for facility decisions:
 - Security deficiencies and requirements
 - Facility vulnerabilities
 - Age of and expected life cycle of structures
 - Program needs

- Location verses service requirements
- Cost of improvements
- Confirm long-term location strategies and options for the following facilities:
 - City Hall (Admin, Finance, Human Resources, EOC, IT)
 - Fire Department
 - Police Department
 - Public Works Administration and Community Development
 - Public Works Operations, Water, Sewer, Solid Waste, Facilities Maintenance and Fleet Maintenance
 - Animal Services
 - Community Building
 - Senior Center
 - Library
 - Recreation Facilities

FEEDBACK FROM PREVIOUS WORKSHOPS

- Desire to Keep Key Functions within City Center:
 - EOC
 - Fire Department
 - Police Department
 - IT
 - Library/Community Building/Senior's Center
- Desire to Have Facilities and Operations Connected and Work for the Benefit of Residents
- Desire to have City Hall remain at 3800 University (Existing Building)
- Desire to consider a new stand-alone Library and/or a combined with Community Building
- Desire to replace the Fire Station rather than reconstructing at 3800 University
- Desire to Consider Options for Relocation of Public Works Functions out of City Center:
 - Public Works Operations, Water, Sewer, Solid Waste, Facilities Maintenance and Fleet Maintenance to Westpark/Dincans
 - Consider including Recycle Center in new Public Works Campus

Mr. Gerber reviewed the options for each of the facilities and noted the pros and cons of each option.

Public Works Option 1:

Pros:

- Allows for New Public Works Campus to be constructed while the existing remains functional
- Uses City owned property

Cons:

- Requires underground detention
- Does not accommodate Recycle Center
- Does not provide for future expansion

Public Works Option 2:

Pros:

- Allows for New Public Works Campus to be constructed while the existing remains functional
- Uses open detention
- Provides for future expansion
- Can accommodate Recycle Center in future

Cons:

- Requires additional property purchase

Public Works Option 3:

Pros:

- Allows for New Public Works Campus to be constructed while the existing remains functional
- Provides for future expansion
- Can accommodate Recycle Center

Cons:

- Requires additional property purchase
- Uses underground detention

CITY CENTER OPTION 1:

Pros:

- Allows for New Fire Station to be constructed while the existing remains functional
- Additional City owned parking is provided at Library and Community Building/Senior's Center
- Maximizes City owned parking

Cons:

- Library will not be available during rebuild
- Requires use of shared parking

CITY CENTER OPTION 2:

Pros:

- Allows for New Fire Station and Community Building to be constructed while the existing facilities remain functional
- Additional City owned parking is provided at Library

Cons:

- Library will not be available during rebuild
- Requires use of shared parking

CITY CENTER OPTION 3:

Pros:

- Library and Community Building could be constructed while the existing one remains operational
- Fire station could be constructed while the additional one remains operational
- Maximizes city-owned parking

Cons:

- Fire station will likely be constructed later in the solution assuming Council wants the library to remain in place until the new one is built, which means the Fire station will happen later in this sequence
- Still requires use of shared property

Councilmember Barnes confirmed with Mr. Gerber that Option 3 of the City Center does not include a drive-through fire bay because the property is not large enough. Mr. Gerber said after meeting with Fire Chief Drake, that it was not a big priority for her. He said getting the trucks out of the station and to a mobility connector was more important to her.

City Manager Beach said staff has discussed locations for the fire station and they are (1) where it currently exists, (2) where the Community Building is currently, and (3) where the Public Works Building is currently. He said from a building standpoint, either the current Community Building site or the Public Works site is preferred over the retrofit of the existing building, because it is easier to accomplish the desired goal of the design and functionality in the most efficient manner.

Chief Drake spoke to say that the site at Rice and Auden would be more beneficial because accessibility to that main artery is viable to their service. She said the drive-through fire bay would be great, but staff is cognizant that real estate is a key factor.

After discussions, Mayor Pro Tem Montgomery stated his preferences are PW Option #2, with the idea that if the Recycling Center is something the City can pursue, the City could put the underground detention in place of the pond or it can put under the parking lot to make room for a Recycling Center later. He said after hearing comments from Chief Drakes, Option 3 for the City Center seems to be the right option for the City.

Mayor Sample agreed with Mayor Pro Tem Montgomery.

Councilmember Bell said she agrees with Option 3 for the City Center and is between Options 1 and 2 for Public Works. She said it will come down to costs for underground detention versus land acquisition.

Councilmember Barnes dittoed what Councilmember Bell said.

Councilmember Carroll echoed the choices of Councilmember Bell and Councilmember Barnes and the reasons behind their options.

City Manager Beach said staff will bring back costs related to land acquisition versus detention and the numbers will speak for themselves.

Mayor Pro Tem Montgomery asked Fire Chief Drake if the fire station design could possibly incorporate a fire department dog. Chief Drake said her vote and half of the fire department would be yes. Mayor Pro Tem Montgomery said he would vote yes, too. He said it would be great for community relations.

Councilmember Barnes asked if there is anything in the plans for secured parking for police vehicles. Mr. Gerber said they have looked at it, but have not really hashed out a solid plan. City Manager Beach said that is something that staff will review during preliminary design.

City Manager Beach confirmed that Option 3 for the City Center is a consensus with Council and PW Option 2, possibly Option 1, depending on the cost of land versus costs of detention.

Assistant City Manager Thompson said going forward staff and Mr. Gerber will take what was heard tonight and incorporate it into a presentation for the public's viewing at two Town Hall meetings tentatively scheduled for the first week of April – one in the morning and one in the evening. He said staff is putting out communications in all social media platforms, postcards, etc.

Mr. Thompson said after the Town Hall meetings, the goal is to take the feedback and bring back a draft Facilities Master Plan report for Council to review at its April 25 meeting. He said pending the approval of those, staff will also be bringing forward a possible design contract for the Public Works facility at the May 9 meeting to keep to the schedule.

In response to Councilmember Bell's question, Mr. Thompson said staff would have cost estimates for the project for discussion at the Town Hall meetings.

8. Recess Regular Meeting and Convene into Executive Session

City Council will recess the regular session and convene an executive session in accordance with Sections 551.071 and 551.072 of the Texas Government Code to seek the advice of its attorney about pending or contemplated litigation and to deliberate regarding real property, respectively.

At approximately 9:45 p.m., Mayor Sample recessed the regular meeting and convened into executive session per Sections 551.071 and 551.072 of the Texas Government Code.

9. Adjourn Executive Session and Reconvene Regular Meeting

Matters related to any desired direction or action resulting from executive session.

At approximately 10:05 p.m., Mayor Sample adjourned the executive session and reconvened into regular session.

10. Adjourn Regular Meeting

With no other business before the Council, the meeting adjourned.

Prepared by: Thelma A. Gilliam, TRMC, City Secretary

Council Approved: March 28, 2022

Note: Audio of the regular meeting in its entirety is on the City's website. If for any reason you are unable to download the audio from the website, contact the City Secretary's office to obtain a copy, as well as a copy of any presentation.