

MINUTES OF THE JOINT WORK SESSION MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JERSEY VILLAGE, TEXAS, AND THE JERSEY VILLAGE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION HELD ON APRIL 29, 2013 AT 6:00 P.M. IN THE CIVIC CENTER, 16327 LAKEVIEW, JERSEY VILLAGE, TEXAS.

A. The meeting was called to order by Mayor Hamley at 6:00 p.m. with the following present:

Mayor, Russell Hamley	City Manager, Mike Castro, PhD
Council Member, Justin Ray	City Secretary, Lorri Coody
Council Member, Rod Erskine	Danny Segundo, Public Works Director
Council Member, Harry Beckwith III, PE	Christian Somers, Building Official
Council Member, Sheri Sheppard	

Council Member, Jill Klein was not present when the meeting was called to order but joined the meeting in progress at 6:18 p.m.

B. Open Meeting. Call to Order and the roll of appointed P&Z officers taken.

The following City of Jersey Village Planning and Zoning Commission members were present:

Chairman, Debra Mergel	Commissioner, Joyce Berube
Commissioner, Tom Eustace	Commissioner, Barbara Freeman
Commissioner, George Ohler	

Commissioners Rick Faircloth and Michael O'Neal were not present at this meeting.

After taking the roll of appointed officers, Chairman Mergel announced that a quorum of the Planning and Zoning Commission was present. Mayor Hamley called the meeting's agenda beginning with the following item:

C. Receive presentation from Kendig Keast Collaborative, highlighting the proposed strategic approach in preparing potential text amendments for the City's current Development Code regarding the management of anticipated residential teardown and rebuilding activities with the meeting purpose being confirmation of official consensus on the strategic direction of the project before initiating any work on the project.

Christian Somers, the City's Building Official, presented the item. Background information is as follows: In July 2012 Kendig Keast Collaborative (KKC) was hired to review the development code relating to the issue of teardowns and rebuilds within the City of Jersey Village.

The City of Jersey Village has a unique quality about it. Its parks are clean and properly cared for by its Parks Department, and it has its own Fire and Police Departments that provide outstanding service. For those who are looking for a secure place to live, Jersey Village is the ideal place for home owners and developers to look when searching for a place to rebuild. Seeing the potential of redevelopment within the city's residential district, Staff is looking to better manage anticipated residential teardown and rebuilding activity.

JOINT WORK SESSION MEETING – CITY COUNCIL & PLANNING AND
ZONING COMMISSION – CITY OF JERSEY VILLAGE, TEXAS – April 29, 2013

With the growth of the Jersey Village-Cy Fair area, there is the potential that teardowns and rebuilds will come to the city eventually.

Accordingly, KKC has been given the task of reviewing the City's Development Code and to provide assistance with any changes that may be identified during this process. The initial steps of the review process involved KCC holding listening sessions with residents in order to gather information and feedback related to potential issues as seen by the residents. Also, KCC met with members of the building community in Jersey Village to obtain their input into the teardown/rebuild issue.

This joint work session meeting is to provide KKC with input and feedback from City Council and the Planning and Zoning Commission related to this issue and on the information presented. A key question to be addressed is: What requirements do we want to see if and when teardowns occur?

The City currently has ordinances that do not allow infill (dirt) to be brought in that may raise the level of slabs and allow for the drainage of water unto another property. Recently, we have seen potential buyer/owners/builders object to the no-fill requirement. This is the perfect atmosphere to provide input to KKC regarding what residents would like to see moving forward as it relates to the teardown/rebuild issue.

Gary Mitchell with Kendig Keast Collaborative gave a presentation to both the City Council and the Planning and Zoning Commission. He began by introducing the members of his team who have worked on this "tear down" project. He stated that his focus for the evening was to present an update on the project and to seek direction on zoning amendment priorities.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the "tear down" issue is happening across the nation and it will eventually become an issue in Jersey Village. This project is to prepare the City for when "tear downs" occur so that the proper codes are in place to address issues that are associated with this process.

The "tear down" project's focus is for zoning district A – single family homes. Mr. Mitchell gave an overview of the current homes located in district A, stating there are vacant lots, large homes next to small homes, and one story homes located in and among two story homes.

He provided a list of typical concerns once the "tear down" process begins as follows:

- Relative size/scale
- Loss of openness
- Loss of trees, yard area
- Greater lot coverage
- Loss of privacy
- Different architectural styles
- Street "canyon" effect

JOINT WORK SESSION MEETING – CITY COUNCIL & PLANNING AND
ZONING COMMISSION – CITY OF JERSEY VILLAGE, TEXAS – April 29, 2013

- Change in “character”
- Water and wastewater impacts

He then outlined a list of objectives set by Staff that must be taken into consideration when finding solutions to the list of typical concerns:

- Community supported
- Customized to local situation
- Build on existing zoning
- Not overly burdensome
- Understandable
- Easy to administer
- Effective
- Not discourage desired reinvestment

Mr. Mitchell reviewed several slides of homes located in district A, depicting the typical concerns with “tear downs” listed earlier. He then showed a list of Regulatory Options for addressing the concerns, highlighting areas that Jersey Village already has in place and areas that need to be addressed. The list follows (no markings = City already has these regulations in place, underline = City needs these regulations, *italics* = City has these regulations but regulations require additional attention):

- Min/max/lot area
- Min/max lot dimensions
- Min yards/setbacks
- Max lot/yard coverage
- *Limits on variances*
- Min/max dwelling floor area
- Max Floor Area Ratio (FAR)
- Min separation of homes
- Max building height: height/setback linkage, step-back of upper floors
- Max size of primary façade
- Roof pitch/slope and styles
- Wall, roofline “articulation”
- Accessory structures: garages, carports - “*attached*” / “*detached*”
- Porch size, *projection*
- Additions (front, side, rear)
- *Consistent materials*
- Min open space – (min landscaping in setbacks vs. max lot coverage)
- Tree preservation/replace
- Driveway: Limits (yard landscaping), design (*previous materials*)
- Floodplain regulations: impervious cover limits, fill limits, slab/building elevation

Council Member Klein joined the meeting in progress at 6:18 p.m.

JOINT WORK SESSION MEETING – CITY COUNCIL & PLANNING AND
ZONING COMMISSION – CITY OF JERSEY VILLAGE, TEXAS – April 29, 2013

Mr. Mitchell reviewed the regulatory changes with City Council and the Planning and Zoning Commission by examining various examples of homes throughout the City, helping them understand what the changes in the code would mean and the impact these changes would have. There were questions, which Mr. Mitchell answered as the review took place.

In ending the presentation, discussion was had concerning the difference between a “tear down” to remodel and a “teardown” to rebuild due to a natural disaster such as a storm or a fire. There was concern that changes made to the city codes for the “teardown” process may create problems for those trying to rebuild after a natural disaster, and this would not be acceptable.

Discussion was then had concerning odd-sized lots. It was felt that there must be some leeway for building in the City. There should not be a mentality that one size fits all. It will be important to try to avoid any unintended consequences similar to those experienced with the no-fill ordinance.

Discussion was had about how the height of homes will be calculated when they are raised due to flood regulations. Mention was also made that code changes will apply to rebuilds as well as to those expanding.

Discussion was had concerning the anticipated “large and/or important type” code changes being considered versus the “small and/or less important type” code changes. Mr. Mitchell stated that code changes to the height and lot size would be categorized as “large and/or important type” changes while landscaping code changes and changing from stories to height requirements would be considered “small and/or less important type” code changes.

Discussion was then had concerning the setting of the home sizing requirements. An example was given that should a resident that currently lives in a 1200 square foot home desire to remodel and add a 300 square foot room, would this be an issue if there is a minimum house size? Mr. Mitchell stated that “yes” this would be a concern.

Discussion was had about how these code changes would differ from developing a new neighborhood. Mr. Mitchell stated “uniformity” as the main difference.

D. Adjourn

There being no further business on the Agenda and with no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 6:58 p.m.

Lorri Coody, City Secretary