1. **Call to Order**
   a. City Council
   b. Planning and Zoning Commission

2. **Public Hearing**
   a. *Case No. 18:04.* Conduct a public hearing on a request from the City of Orange to re-zone the following properties: Lot 9, Blk 4, Starlight Addition also known as 3124 16th Street; Lot 10 remainder, Blk 4 Starlight Addition; Lot 11/12, Blk 4, Starlight Addition also known as 3117 15th Street; .4319 acres JM Spaulding Survey, Abstract #171 also known as 3130 16th Street; 1.8727 of 3.67 TxDOT remainder (Orig. 5.075 ac James Enner Survey Abst 74); .0833 portion of Lot 10, Blk 4 Starlight Addition; Lot 13, Blk 4, Starlight Addition also known as 3115 15th Street; Lot 14, Blk 4, Starlight Addition also known as 3113 15th Street; Lot 15, Blk 4 Starlight Addition also known as 3111 15th Street; and Lot 16, Blk 4 Starlight Addition also known as 3019 15th Street from C-S “Commercial Special” zoning district to MUZD “Mixed Use Zoning District”.

3. **Adjournment of City Council**

4. **Discussion/Action Items**
   a. *Case No. 18:04.* Consider making a recommendation to the City Council on a request from the City of Orange to re-zone the following properties: Lot 9, Blk 4, Starlight Addition also known as 3124 16th Street; Lot 10 remainder, Blk 4 Starlight Addition; Lot 11/12, Blk 4, Starlight Addition also known as 3117 15th Street; .4319 acres JM Spaulding Survey, Abstract #171 also known as 3130 16th Street; 1.8727 of 3.67 TxDOT remainder (Orig. 5.075 ac James Enner Survey Abst 74); .0833 portion of Lot 10, Blk 4 Starlight Addition; Lot 13, Blk 4, Starlight Addition also known as 3115 15th Street; Lot 14, Blk 4, Starlight Addition also known as 3113 15th Street; Lot 15, Blk 4 Starlight Addition also known as 3111 15th Street; and Lot 16, Blk 4 Starlight Addition also known as 3019 15th Street from C-S “Commercial Special” zoning district to MUZD “Mixed Use Zoning District”.

   b. Election of Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson (if necessary).
5. **Approval of Minutes**
   a. Approval of April 3, 2018 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting minutes

6. **Adjournment of Planning and Zoning Commission**

   **Texas Penal Code 30.06:**
   
   “Pursuant to Section 30.06, Penal Code (trespass by license holder with a concealed handgun), a person licensed under Subchapter H, Chapter 411, Government Code (handgun licensing law), may not enter this property with a concealed handgun”

   “De conformidad con la Sección 30.06 del código penal (entrada de persona con licencia de portar o llevar armas de mano oculta), una persona licenciada bajo el subcapítulo H, capítulo 411 del código de gobierno (ley de licenciación para portar o llevar armas de mano) no se permite entrar en esta propiedad con “ninguna armas de mano oculta”

   **Texas Penal Code 30.07:**
   
   “Pursuant to Section 30.07, Penal Code (trespass by license holder with an openly carried handgun), a person licensed under Subchapter H, Chapter 411, Government Code (handgun licensing law), may not enter this property with a handgun that is carried openly”

   “De conformidad con la Sección 30.07 del código penal (entrada de una persona con licencia de portar o llevar armas de mano visible), una persona licenciada bajo el subcapítulo H, capítulo 411 del código de gobierno (ley de licenciación para portar o llevar armas de mano visible) no se permite entrar en esta propiedad con ninguna “armas de mano visible”

   **No Firearms Allowed**

   **No se permite ninguna armas de fuego**

---

**Public Hearing Policy (adopted on August 3, 2004)**

- Public comment time limits
- The applicant’s presentation is limited to fifteen (15) minutes.
- All persons wishing to speak in favor of or against any item shall be limited to three (3) minutes
- If a unified group wished to forfeit their three minutes per person a spokesperson can be selected and comments will be limited to fifteen (15) minutes
- All comments should be directed to the Commission on the case being discussed and comments should focus on the facts of the case and all speakers should refrain from comments based on personalities.
MEMORANDUM

To: Planning and Zoning Commission
From: Kelvin Knauf, Director of Planning and Community Development
Subject: Conduct a public hearing on a request from the City of Orange to re-zone the following properties: Lot 9, Blk 4, Starlight Addition also known as 3124 16th Street; Lot 10 remainder, Blk 4 Starlight Addition; Lot 11/12, Blk 4, Starlight Addition also known as 3117 15th Street; .4319 acres JM Spaulding Survey, Abstract #171 also known as 3130 16th Street; 1.8727 of 3.67 TxDOT remainder (Orig. 5.075 ac James Enner Survey Abst 74); .0833 portion of Lot 10, Blk 4 Starlight Addition; Lot 13, Blk 4, Starlight Addition also known as 3115 15th Street; Lot 14, Blk 4, Starlight Addition also known as 3113 15th Street; Lot 15, Blk 4 Starlight Addition also known as 3111 15th Street; and Lot 16, Blk 4 Starlight addition also known as 3019 15th Street from C-S “Commercial Special” zoning district to MUZD “Mixed Use Zoning District”.

Date: March 28, 2018

City staff is requesting that the property described above be re-zoned from C-S Commercial Special zoning district to MUZD Mixed Use Zoning District. This is a highly visible property that at one time had the Two Amigos restaurant located on one of the properties being requested for re-zoning. The restaurant has since been demolished and the properties all being requested for re-zoning are vacant properties. City staff believes that re-zoning the property to MUZD will stimulate interest in developing the property. The MUZD zoning district requires that a development plan be created for the district. A proposed development plan is included in your agenda packet.

The Adjacent Uses and Zoning Districts are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjacent Zoning</th>
<th>Adjacent Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>C-S Commercial Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>C-S Commercial Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>IDC Interstate Development Corridor and R-3 High Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>C-S Commercial-Special</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A map showing the re-requested re-zoning is included in your agenda packet. The Planning and Zoning Commission will need to conduct a public hearing to receive comments on this re-zoning request.
City of Orange, Texas
APPLICATION TO THE
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

Please type or print (except for signature) and submit to: Department of Planning and Community Development, PO Box 520, 303 8th Street, Orange, Texas 77631 or fax to 409-988-7407.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant:</th>
<th>Type of Request:</th>
<th>Has request been made before?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: City of Orange</td>
<td>□ Alley Abandonment</td>
<td>□ Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address: 803 W. Green Avenue</td>
<td>□ Ordinance change</td>
<td>□ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, State, ZIP: Orange, Texas 77630</td>
<td>✔ Re-zoning</td>
<td>If yes, date of last request ____________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone: 409-883-1034</td>
<td>□ Preliminary plat</td>
<td>If yes, action from previous request:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:kknauf@orangetx.org">kknauf@orangetx.org</a></td>
<td>□ Final plat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Other (please state)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name and address of property owner (if different from applicant)
Name: ____________________
Mailing Address: ____________________
City, State, ZIP: ____________________
Telephone: ____________________
Email: ____________________

For properties not in a recorded subdivision, submit a copy of a current survey or a plat showing the properties proposed and a complete legal field note description.

Address: Lot 9, Blk 4, Starlight Addition also known as 3124 16th Street; Lot 10 remainder, Blk 4 Starlight Addition; Lot 11/12, Blk 4, Starlight Addition also known as 3117 15th Street; .4319 acres JM Spaulding Survey, Abstract #171 also known as 3130 16th Street; 1.8727 of 3.67 TxDOT remainder (Orig. 5.075 ac James Enner Survey Abst 74); .0833 portion of Lot 10, Blk 4 Starlight Addition; Lot 13, Blk 4, Starlight Addition also known as 3115 15th Street; Lot 14, Blk 4, Starlight Addition also known as 3113 15th Street; Lot 15, Blk 4 Starlight Addition also known as 3111 15th Street

List Attachments (if any):
Memo from Kelvin Nauf, Director of Planning and Community Development to the Planning and Zoning Commission. Map showing the area proposed for re-zoning.

Signature of Applicant: ____________________
Date: 3/23/18

Signature of Owner (if different from applicant): ____________________
Date: ____________________
Briefly describe the action you are requesting from the Planning and Zoning Commission (attach additional pages if necessary). If applicant or his/her representative is not present at a required public hearing, the application may not be considered and a new application must be filed.

In order to stimulate economic development, the City of Orange is requesting that the property described above be re-zoned from C-S Commercial Special zoning district to MUZD zoning district. Part of the property previously had the Two Amigos restaurant located on it; the restaurant has since been demolished. The MUZD zoning district allows flexibility for development that the C-S zoning district does not allow. City staff believes that this flexibility is necessary to stimulate the economic development of this highly visible property.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Received and Staff:</th>
<th>3/3/18 KEK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Receipt Number:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P and Z Meeting Date:</td>
<td>April 3, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P and Z Action:</td>
<td>□ Approved as requested □ Modified □ Denied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council Meeting date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council Action:</td>
<td>□ Approved as requested □ Modified □ Denied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Area proposed to be rezoned from C-S Commercial Special zoning district to MUZD zoning district.
Development Plan

This development plan is for property zoned Mixed Use Zoning District (“MUZD”) as shown on Attachment “A”.

Mixture of Uses: The mixture of uses planned within the MUZD shall be complimentary in function, encourage complimentary use, and pose minimal impact of adjacent land uses. Development within the MUZD shall be visually and functionally compatible with surrounding developed property. The following uses shall be allowed within the MUZD:

- All uses allowed in the C-S “Commercial-Special” zoning district.
- All uses allowed in the IDC “Interstate Development Corridor” zoning district

Setbacks for structures: Setback requirements shall be as follows:

- Front: 30 feet
- Rear: 10 feet
- Side: 7.5 feet
- Corner side: 15 feet

Height limitations: There shall be no height limitations in the MUZD.

Floor area ratio: There is no floor-to-area ratio.

Fencing and screening: A six-foot (6’) wooden or masonry fence shall enclose all dumpsters in the MUZD except for a gate to gain access to the dumpster(s). Fencing or landscaping may be used to screen mechanical equipment located on the ground and other materials located outside a building. Where the requirements of Chapter 12, Article 12.600 Section 12.611(6)(C) of the City Code of Ordinances pertaining to fences in commercial uses adjacent to a residential zone conflicts with this development plan, the requirements of this development plan shall prevail.

Landscaping: At least five percent (5%) of the developed area of the MUZD shall be landscaped. Development within the MUZD shall be functionally pleasing emphasizing professionally designed, construct, and maintained landscape areas using plants that are appropriate to the greater Orange area with shaded pedestrian gathering areas (if any), landscaping on the perimeter of parking lots, and landscaping which visually enhances all structures within the MUZD.

Pedestrian circulation. All development within the MUZD shall encourage pedestrian circulation between structures and open spaces.

Vehicular circulation. Vehicular circulation in the MUZD shall be pedestrian friendly, emphasize slow vehicular speeds and safe crosswalks.

Signage: Signage regulations shall be as follows. All signage shall be visually pleasing and not compete with view of buildings, does not impede pedestrian or vehicular flow, does not create a traffic hazard and uses natural products to the extent possible.

- One pole sign shall be allowed for each parcel in the MUZD and may be placed off-premises so long as the pole sign is within the MUZD boundaries and not to exceed one hundred feet (100’) in
height above grade and no more than four hundred square feet (400 s.f.) in size. A pole sign may be used along with a master sign.

- One master sign shall be allowed for the MUZD and may be placed off-premises so long as the master sign is within the MUZD boundaries and not to exceed one hundred feet (100’) in height above grade and six hundred square feet (600 s.f.) in size. A master sign is allowed whether or not a monument sign(s) are also located in compliance with this development plan.

- One monument sign shall be allowed for each parcel within the MUZD and each monument sign shall be located as the same parcel as the business it is advertising. Monument signs shall not be more than one hundred square feet (100 s.f.) in size.

- Electronic reader boards and digital signs shall be allowed so long as they do not exceed six hundred square feet (600 s.f.) in size and one hundred feet (100’) in height above grade and comply with the following:
  o The image or message shall be static or fixed and lasting no less than ten (10) seconds;
  o The image or message shall change to another image or message in a period of two (2) seconds or less;
  o The image or message shall not be animated, flashing, scrolling or contain video imagery;
  o The image or message shall adjust its brightness as ambient light levels change so as not to be visually distracting; and
  o The electronic or digital sign shall contain a default design that will freeze the sign’s image or message if a malfunction occurs.

- Where the requirements of Chapter 12, Article 12.1000 “Sign Regulations” of the Code of Ordinances conflicts with this development plan, the requirements of this development plan shall prevail.

Lighting. All lighting shall comply with the same regulations for lighting in the City’s Code of Ordinances.

Parking requirements. Parking requirements shall be the same as those in the Interstate Development Corridor zoning district.

Unless otherwise specified in this development plan, all other requirements of the City’s Code of Ordinances, as amended from time to time, shall apply to this MUZD.
MEMORANDUM

To: Planning and Zoning Commission
From: Kelvin Knauf, Director of Planning and Community Development
Subject: Consider a request from the City of Orange to re-zone the following properties:
Lot 9, Blk 4, Starlight Addition also known as 3124 16th Street; Lot 10 remainder, Blk 4 Starlight Addition; Lot 11/12, Blk 4, Starlight Addition also known as 3117 15th Street; .4319 acres JM Spaulding Survey, Abstract #171 also known as 3130 16th Street; 1.8727 of 3.67 TxDOT remainder (Orig. 5.075 ac James Enner Survey Abst 74); .0833 portion of Lot 10, Blk 4 Starlight Addition; Lot 13, Blk 4, Starlight Addition also known as 3115 15th Street; Lot 14, Blk 4, Starlight Addition also known as 3113 15th Street; Lot 15, Blk 4 Starlight Addition also known as 3111 15th Street; and Lot 16, Blk 4 Starlight Addition also known as 3019 15th Street from C-S “Commercial Special” zoning district to MUZD “Mixed Use Zoning District”.

Date: March 28, 2018

City staff is requesting that the property described above be re-zoned from C-S Commercial Special zoning district to MUZD Mixed Use Zoning District. This is a highly visible property that at one time had the Two Amigos restaurant located on one of the properties being requested for re-zoning. The restaurant has since been demolished and the properties all being requested for re-zoning are vacant properties. City staff believes that re-zoning the property to MUZD will stimulate interest in developing the property. The MUZD zoning district requires that a development plan be created for the district. A proposed development plan is included in your agenda packet.

The Adjacent Uses and Zoning Districts are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjacent Zoning</th>
<th>Adjacent Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>C-S Commercial Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>C-S Commercial Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>IDC Interstate Development Corridor and R-3 High Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>C-S Commercial-Special</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A map showing the requested re-zoning is included in your agenda packet. The Planning and Zoning Commission will need to vote on whether or not to recommend the property be re-zoned as requested.
MEMORANDUM

To: Planning and Zoning Commission

From: Kelvin Knauf, Director of Planning and Community Development

Subject: Election of Chairperson

Date: April 18, 2018

Cullin Smith has resigned from the Planning and Zoning Commission. The Planning and Zoning Commission rules state that the Chair shall be elected at the first meeting after October 1st of each calendar year and as the position becomes vacant. The P&Z will need to elect a Chair to fill the unexpired term of Cullin Smith (the Chair and the Vice-Chair will be up for election again in October). If Joe Love, the current Vice-Chair, is elected as Chair, then the Vice-Chair will need to be elected.

There are no limitations on the number of years a Chair or Vice-Chair can be elected.
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION & CITY COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES
TUESDAY, APRIL 3, 2018

The Orange Planning and Zoning Commission met on Tuesday, April 3, 2018, in the meeting room of the Orange Public Library with the following members present to-wit:

Commissioners Present:
Cullin Smith ....................................................................................................................... Chairman
MaQuettia Ledet ................................................. Commissioner
Mary McKenna ............................................................... Commissioner
George Mortimer ...................................................................................................... Commissioner
Weldon Smith ....................................................................................................... Commissioner

Commissioners Absent:
Joe Love ..................................................................................................................... Vice Chairman
Jamie Wilson ......................................................................................................... Commissioner

City Council Members Present:
Larry Spears, Jr.
Annette Pernell
Patrick Pullen
Brad Childs
Terrie Salter

City Council Members Absent:
Jimmy Sims
Bill Mello

Staff Present:
Dr. Shawn Oubre, City Manager
Jay Trahan, Assistant City Manager & Director of Economic Development
Kelvin Knauf, Director of Planning & Community Development
Wendy Lloyd, Planning Secretary

Mayor Pro Tem Spears called the City Council to order at 5:30 p.m.

Chairman Smith called the P & Z meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING

a. Case No. 18:04. Conduct a public hearing on a request from the City of Orange to re-zone the following properties: Lot 9, Blk 4, Starlight Addition also known as 3124 16th Street; Lot 10 remainder, Blk 4 Starlight Addition; Lot 11/12, Blk 4,
Starlight Addition also known as 3117 15th Street; .4319 acres JM Spaulding Survey, Abstract #171 also known as 3130 16th Street; 1.8727 of 3.67 TxDOT remainder (Orig. 5.075 ac James Enner Survey Abst 74); .0833 portion of Lot 10, Blk 4 Starlight Addition; Lot 13, Blk 4, Starlight Addition also known as 3115 15th Street; Lot 14, Blk 4, Starlight Addition also known as 3113 15th Street; Lot 15, Blk 4 Starlight Addition also known as 3111 15th Street; and Lot 16, Blk 4 Starlight Addition also known as 3019 15th Street from C-S “Commercial Special” zoning district to MUZD “Mixed Use Zoning District”.

Mr. Knauf stated that this is the proposed rezoning that the city has initiated for the property in the packet at 16th Street and I-10.

Chairman Smith asked if Mr. Knauf filled out the paperwork. Mr. Knauf stated yes. Chairman Smith asked where the rest of it was. Mr. Knauf asked the rest being what. Chairman Smith stated that in order for a piece of property to be brought for a zoning change, there is a list of things in section 12.401 that are required to have as he understands it. Mr. Knauf stated he is not familiar with what that is and have given what we have given in the past. Chairman Smith stated he would read it – that the City Council may amend the regulations of the zoning ordinance or the zoning map as described below – amendment initiation, an amendment may be initiated by the City Council, Planning and Zoning Commission or by one or more of the property owners and says that an application to the zoning amendment shall be submitted to the director of planning and community development, the director and should be accompanied by the following information: an application form which we have, the fee. Chairman Smith asked if a fee was paid. Mr. Knauf stated no that we would be paying ourselves. Chairman Smith asked if there was a site plan provided. Mr. Knauf stated there is no site plan at this point. Chairman Smith asked if there were any building plans such as floor plans or architectural elevations. Mr. Knauf stated there aren’t at this point. Chairman Smith asked if there was a written plan of the proposed use of the property. Mr. Knauf stated there is a development plan that is included in your agenda packet. Chairman Smith stated it doesn’t include the proposed use of the property other than just a broad zoning and stated that his question is without these things that are required, how are they to move forward. Mr. Knauf stated because that is if there is a proposed development but at this point we are talking about a rezoning and there is no specific development, this is a rezoning to address the land use, the eligible uses that will be allowed in that location. Chairman Smith asked if this was an application for a zoning amendment. Mr. Knauf stated it is an application for rezoning. Chairman Smith stated it would be an amendment to our current and existing zoning plan. Mr. Knauf stated it would be to amend the zoning map. Chairman Smith stated therefore it indicates to him that shall doesn’t leave them any room for discussion. Mr. Knauf stated that this is the way we have always done it. Chairman Smith stated he understands but is just going by the directions. Mr. Knauf stated it is the way the city has always done it, even before him and asked if he should continue with the public hearing. Chairman Smith stated but any action they take is going to be deemed inappropriate because they haven’t followed instructions. Mr. Knauf stated he would think if it was going to be contested, it would have been contested long before now in prior rezoning. He stated there is no site plan at this point and no building plan at this point and there won’t be if this rezoning doesn’t go through or it’s possible there won’t be ever if this rezoning doesn’t go through. Chairman Smith stated that he understands that they are supposed
to have these items so that they can make the best decision for the city and for the people of the city and it doesn’t appear that they have a whole lot of information other than an application when it clearly describes the things they are supposed to have before they review these things. Mr. Knauf stated that they have a rezoning application in front of them and they have a development plan in front of them that describes what the proposed land use would be as well as the regulations for the mixed use zoning district.

Chairman Smith asked Dr. Oubre if he had comments. Dr. Oubre stated they have the application before them and they can either table it, vote for it or vote it down and that’s the city’s request.

Chairman Smith stated that it might be the kind of thing where they go back and regroup as he has a lot of questions on the application and so it might be beneficial for them to go back and regroup and provide the things that are required in order for them to follow the instructions that are there. Mr. Knauf stated that he thinks that assumes that there is a specific developer that has a specific plan for a site and this is a rezoning, this is land use, this is not development and this is not a site plan review. Chairman Smith stated if you at the requests that are being made of them on the following application, it appears that there is some specific use or they wouldn’t have been specific in detail in their request for the changes they are asking and these aren’t just broad requests that are being made and so he is thinking that if they vote this down then he understands that it would be a year before they could come back and bring it to them but if they table it right now and get the things that they need to move forward, then there is no harm no foul.

Dr. Oubre stated that we are under a confidentiality agreement and have given all the information that they can and just advise to vote for it, vote it down or table it.

Commissioner Smith stated if they were to ask the actual reason why this was being rezoned and his question was if there was somebody specific that wanted to build there as the reason why this wants to be done or just doing it in case somebody wants to. Dr. Oubre stated we can’t answer that question.

Chairman Smith asked for any comments
No comments were made
Commissioner Smith motioned to table rezoning
Commissioner Mortimer 2nd
**Vote: 5 – 0**
**Motion Carries**

Mayor Pro Tem Spears asked for motion to adjourn City Council
Council Member Childs motioned
Council Member Pernell 2nd
City Council Adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

**DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS**

a. *Case No. 18:04. Conduct a public hearing on a request from the City of Orange to rezone the following properties: Lot 9, Blk 4, Starlight Addition also known as 3124*
Chairman Smith asked motion table rezoning
Commissioner Smith motioned
Commissioner Mortimer 2nd
Vote: 5 – 0
Motion Carries

b. Consider making a recommendation to the City Council on an ordinance amending Chapter 3 Article 3.1300 “Fence Construction and Alterations” pertaining to fence requirements for residentially zoned properties and amending Chapter 12 Article 12.600 “Zoning Districts and Other Regulations” pertaining to the fence requirements for commercially and residually zoned properties.

Mr. Knauf stated that at the last meeting they talked a little about the fence ordinance and the need to revise the fence ordinance because there is some inconsistencies and has given a multitude of information, the sections of the Code of Ordinances that apply to fences and in different sections are regulated – some require five foot in the front yard and some require four and the most recent ordinance requires four foot. He stated that in the packet they have those sections of the fence ordinance along with some suggested changes to those that he was asked to look and bring back to them and the ones underlined are proposed additions and those struck through are proposed deletions to try to make the ordinances more consistent and in addition to that he has given them information from other cities as far as what their fence ordinances are and also photographs both in Orange and also in Nederland and Port Neches. Mr. Knauf stated that he thinks it’s important to look at the fence ordinances comprehensively rather than piecemeal so that they get a good consistent comprehensive fence ordinance and he stated that they have his suggested changes but also needs some direction from them and ultimately city manager and city council on policy decisions and what we want the fence ordinance to be rather than just patching one piece of it here. He stated some are his questions and this is an opportunity to really get into some public policy discussions and really talk about basic policy on what we want people to do when it comes to fences as far as it is required, what it should look like as far as materials. Mr. Knauf stated he wanted to go over some of the questions that he had and then open it up to the commission for their responses. He asked should there be a different fence height for businesses along 16th Street south of the interstate than for businesses north of the interstate and the businesses south of the interstate on 16th Street are in the C-S Commercial Special zoning district which requires a commercial business that is next to a residential business to have an eight (8) foot opaque fence but if they are north of the interstate where it’s a C-2 zoning district are only
required a six (6) foot opaque fence if next to a residential and is that what we want or do we want to change that. He stated the second question is should all commercial businesses be treated the same which is the current zoning ordinance within the same zoning district – for instance south interstate in the C-S if a bank or a professional office or a drive-in restaurant are treated the same and have to put up an eight (8) foot fence between their property and an adjoining residential property and is that what we want to be or is there really a difference between banks, professional offices and drive-in restaurants and if so, where do we draw the line on who doesn’t have to and who does. He stated should commercial property that has a trash cart such as a professional office have the same fencing requirements as a drive-in or a restaurant that may have dumpster and should they be treated the same as they are under the current ordinance. He stated what happens if the property changes from one type of commercial use to another if the first use is not required to put up a fence but the second one requires a fence and do we want to make a provision that if the use changes and that use requires a fence is that okay and what you want. He stated that there is a picture of the $25 Optical business on 16th Street in the packet and there is an eight (8) foot fence on both the north property line and the south property line and the rear property line and personally think it looks terrible and maybe other people have an opinion and maybe that is what you want. He stated that we get very few complaints about fences in residential areas but the most frequent one is the four (4) foot non-opaque requirement in the front yard but in driving around the town thinks it has been pretty well implemented and would hate to see that change from the four (4) foot requirement but just make the rest of the code of ordinances consistent with the four (4) foot front yard non-opaque. He stated when we have a situation where a residential property cannot build a fence higher than four (4) feet and non-opaque in the front yard but if they have a commercial business next to them, they have to build an eight (8) foot opaque fence and what if the four (4) foot fence is there first and then they can’t build an eight (8) foot fence but they get this eight (8) foot fence because they are located next to a commercial business and so is that a fair and equitable situation or regulation. He stated that he thinks there are lots of opportunities for discussion and doesn’t anticipate answering all the questions tonight and may even want to schedule some workshops to get into the different areas and maybe take each one, one by one rather than trying to tackle the whole fence ordinances tonight.

Chairman Smith asked if they want to tackle it now or try and schedule a workshop. Commissioner Mortimer stated he thinks they should schedule a workshop. Chairman Smith stated he thinks they would serve this topic much better if they gave it a little more time.

Chairman Smith asked for a motion
Commissioner Mortimer motioned to table the fence issue for now and schedule a workshop
Commissioner Smith 2nd
Vote: 5 – 0
Motion Carries

Mr. Knauf stated he would come up with a schedule for each workshop and suggested that we have the workshop in the Neighborhood Facility building in the big room as we have some technology over there where we could pull up--Google Earth--and look at things and talk about things that is more conducive to communication and talking about regulations.
APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairman Smith made a request for the minutes of the July 6, 2017 meeting to be approved.
Commissioner Ledet motioned to approve
Commissioner McKenna 2nd
Vote: 3 – 0
Motion Carries

Chairman Smith made a request for the minutes of the March 6, 2018 meeting to be approved.
Commissioner Mortimer motioned to approve
Commissioner McKenna 2nd
Vote: 5 – 0
Motion Carries

Chairman Smith adjourned the meeting at 5:49 p.m.