STATE OF TEXAS

COUNTY OF BRAZORIA

CITY OF LAKE JACKSON

BE KNOWN that the Planning Commission of the City of Lake Jackson met in regular session on Tuesday, July 7, 2026, at 6:30 p.m. in Lake Jackson, Texas, with the following agenda:

Locke Sanders, Chair
Cotton Tyler, Vice-Chair
Kay Aplin, Secretary
Doug Smith
Harry Sargent
Vinay Singhania

Modesto Mundo, City Manager
Sal Aguirre, City Engineer
Nicholle Wilson, Asst. City Engineer
Eddie Herrera, Project Manager
Anamaria Acuña, Asst. City Secretary

Rhonda Seth, Mayor

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
Mr. Sargent led the Pledge of Allegiance.

SWEAR IN NEW MEMBERS
Ms. Acuña administered the oath of office to Doug Smith and Vinay Singhania.

REORGANIZE THE BOARD
Mr. Singhania motioned to renominate Mr. Sanders as the chair, Mr. Sargent seconded with all present members voting, “aye,” the motion passed.

Mr. Sanders appointed Mr. Tyler as the vice-chair and Ms. Aplin as secretary.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – May 5, 2026
The May minutes were approved as written.

VISITOR COMMENTS
Mayor Seth came forward to introduce herself and address the Commission. She expressed her gratitude to the commission members for their service. She thanked members for being willing to step up and serve.

Mayor Seth informed the Commission that Councilmember Baker would serve as their City Council liaison, and she encouraged them to contact either herself or Councilmember Baker if they needed anything.

<u>PRESENTATION FOR DISCUSSION AND FEEDBACK ONLY ON A PROPOSED SITE AND LANDSCAPE PLAN AMENDMENT TO LOT RESERVE H OF THE LAKE JACKSON TOWN CENTER AT 220 GRAPEVINE TURN (PREVIOUS YAKLIN TIRE AND SERVICE SHOP) FOR THE REPURPOSING OF IT TO A KELSEY-SEYBOLD MEDICAL OFFICE CLINIC</u>

Kelsey-Seybold Representatives: Faith Butts, Kristen Stepper and Stuart Cayer

Ms. Butts explained the proposal to convert the existing Quick Lane/former tire and service shop at 220 Grapevine Turn into a Kelsey-Seybold medical clinic. She noted this was a presentation for discussion and feedback only, and not yet a formal action item.

Ms. Stepper explained that the core issue was parking: the existing development met approximately 4 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet, while the City's criteria require 5 spaces per 1,000 square feet. She acknowledged that the proposed clinic would technically be under-parked by the City's standards but presented data from comparable Kelsey-Seybold locations to demonstrate that the reduced parking ratio had proven sufficient at similar facilities.

Mr. Cayer elaborated on the operational model of the clinic. He explained that Kelsey-Seybold operates various locations in and around the Houston area, and that the clinic schedules patients throughout the day from 7:30 AM to 5:30 PM, effectively spreading out patient volume to avoid peak congestion. He estimated that the total number of vehicles on-site at any peak time would be approximately 30–35, including staff.

Mr. Sargent questioned what type of services this facility would have available.

Mr. Cayer described the services as adult medicine, laboratory services, and basic imaging. He noted that the new clinic would consolidate the two existing Kelsey-Seybold locations in Lake Jackson (currently at Circle Way and an adjacent building), which would then become vacant. He stated there would be 4 providers (2 physicians and 2 Advanced Practice Clinicians) and 16 support staff, including a phlebotomist and a radiology technician. He emphasized the clinic would operate Monday through Friday and possibly on Saturday mornings.

Mr. Cayer also noted that Kelsey-Seybold had acquired the 2 acres directly behind the current site, with plans to replat the parcels into a single unified lot to allow for future expansion. He confirmed that parking would be expanded as needed with any future growth of the clinic.

Mr. Singhania asked for confirmation on whether the property had been purchased and whether there would be available room for additional parking on that site. Mr. Cayer confirmed the lot had been acquired and that expansion (including additional parking) was planned as the clinic grows. Mr. Singhania clarified that his concern relates to the potential implementation of a shared parking agreement across Grapevine Turn, given the high volume of traffic on that street.

Mr. Sargent raised concern that the proposed clinic site is adjacent to a micro-hospital facility being built nearby. Mr. Cayer acknowledged this, stating that Kelsey-Seybold's outpatient primary care model is complementary to, rather than competitive with, a hospital, and that there may even be a beneficial synergy given the proximity.

Ms. Aplin stated she had no concerns with slightly reduced parking, unless the commission collectively decided additional spaces were needed in the future.

Mr. Tyler noted that the proposed parking arrangement was consistent with broader discussions the commission was already having regarding parking ordinance reassessment.

Mr. Sargent asked if they had discussed landscaping. Ms. Butts explained that because the two parcels would be replatted into one lot, the trees from the adjacent site could be counted toward the combined development's landscaping requirements. She acknowledged that some trees on the current site had died during a prior freeze event and were damaged by Hurricane Beryl. Still, she confirmed that the existing trees on the new combined lot would meet the City's ordinance. She indicated a willingness to add additional trees if the commission desired.

The commission expressed general openness to the concept and indicated support for a future formal parking variance request from Kelsey-Seybold.

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW AND ACTION ON REPLAT OF LOT 1A2 OF REPLAT NO. 2 OF LOT 1A, AT 104 AND 106 STANFORD ROAD, U. U. STANFORD SUBDIVISION

Mr. Herrera went over the *Engineer's Memo: In 2018, the replat of Lot 1A came before you to create a 0.66-acre Lot 1A1 as B-1 (Neighborhood Business) and a 0.45-acre Lot 1A2 as R-2 (Single Family Residence).*

This proposed replat comes before you as a request to subdivide the 0.45-acre Lot 1A2 along Stanford Road into two lots, Lot 1A2A and Lot 1A2B. The zoning is proposed to remain R-2 (Single Family Residence). The lots are not the typical rectangular 70-ft x 120-ft lots seen in R-2 zones, however, the minimum lot areas, widths, depths, and setbacks from Chapter 110 of the Code of Ordinances are in compliance.

Since the plat format and content have adhered to the development standards of the City, staff recommends your preliminary approval of this replat.

Mr. Sargent asked for clarification on the location, and Mr. Herrera confirmed that all four resulting lots would have access to Stanford Road. No additional concerns were raised.

Mr. Sargent motioned to approve the administrative review and action on the replat of Lot 1A2 of replat No. 2 of Lot 1A, at 104 and 106 Stanford Road, U.U. Stanford Subdivision, seconded by Mr. Tyler with all present members voting "aye," the motion passed.

DISCUSS AND CONSIDER THE PARKING VARIANCES OF OTHER CITIES AS REQUESTED BY THE COMMISSION FOR REASSESSMENT OF THE CURRENT ZONING ORDINANCE ALTERNATE SITE PLAN CONSIDERATION

Mr. Herrera presented findings from his research into parking variance approaches used by other cities, as previously requested by the commission. He distributed a supplemental packet containing highlights from several cities' ordinances.

Mr. Herrera outlined the following tools being used by other municipalities:

1. Parking Studies — The most common tool. Most cities allow a parking study to justify a reduction in required parking spaces. Mr. Herrera noted that the commission had allowed parking studies in the past and that Georgetown was used as a reference example for ordinance language.

2. Parking Agreements — Also widely used and something the commission had employed before in various forms.

3. Parking Count Percentage Reductions for Compact/Alternative Vehicles — A less commonly used approach allowing developers to designate a portion of parking spaces for compact cars, motorcycles, or bicycles. These smaller spaces allow more vehicles to be accommodated in a smaller footprint and encourage alternative modes of transportation.

4. Transportation Management Plans — Mr. Herrera described this as a more complex tool in which a developer outlines how their business operates and demonstrates that peak traffic from different uses within a development does not overlap, reducing the effective parking demand. He used the example of a shopping center with staggered peak hours and compared it to how a college campus manages parking by spreading class schedules throughout the day. Georgetown was cited as a strong example. Elements can include incentives for employees to carpool or use public transportation and staggered shift schedules.

5. Public Parking Credits — Cities with metered or public downtown parking allow businesses to receive credits for nearby public spaces, sometimes distributing passes to employees or customers instead of providing on-site parking.

6. Future Parking Reserve — The most uncommon of the tools reviewed. Galveston was cited as a reference. This approach allows a developer to designate a portion of their property as reserved green space for future parking expansion if parking is ever determined to be insufficient. The planning commission would retain authority to require the developer to activate that reserved area. Mr. Herrera noted the added benefit for the city would be increased green space. For the developer, if they can demonstrate their business operates successfully at

reduced parking levels over a defined period, they may be allowed to expand the building or develop the reserved area for a different use.

Mr. Herrera summarized that the commission was already employing most of these tools in practice, and that the existing ordinance does not necessarily prohibit any of them. He suggested that the main question is whether any of these tools should be formally codified in the ordinance.

Mr. Tyler asked whether cities were generally trending away from parking requirements. Mr. Herrera indicated that there was no clear trend based on his research. Mr. Sanders affirmed that the City's current ordinance already provides flexibility.

Mr. Sargent questioned how parking regulation benefits the city, to which Mr. Herrera responded that regulating parking protects the long-term value and reusability of buildings. He noted that (Houston) buildings without adequate parking have lost value and become difficult to repurpose, resulting in reduced tax revenue and economic stagnation for the city.

Mr. Mundo clarified that the city council's interest in this topic originated from concerns about the Brazos Mall, which has an abundance of surface parking, and the question of whether future redevelopment of portions of the mall property could be accommodated with more flexibility. The council wanted the planning commission's input on whether the current ordinance needed amendment or whether other mechanisms for flexibility existed.

Mr. Sanders directed Mr. Sargent to work with Mr. Herrera between now and the next meeting to distill the research into a concise, developer-facing handbook.

The concept would be to leave the existing ordinance intact while providing a reference guide that outlines available alternative approaches developers can explore when they face parking challenges. Mr. Herrera agreed and noted he would bring the document back at the next meeting for Commission review and feedback.

Mr. Sargent and Mr. Herrera asked whether the stacking/queuing lane should be in the ordinance changes or if it should be incorporated into the handbook. It was determined that the queuing change would require a formal ordinance amendment, while the handbook was a separate informational document. Chair Sanders suggested considering both over the next month.

<u>UPDATE ON APPROVED PROJECTS BY PLANNERS:</u>

Mr. Herrera noted that there is a slowdown in all projects.

- **Staybridge Suites:** Mr. Sargent asked for an update on the Staybridge 18-wheeler / truck parking. Mr. Herrera noted that arranged cross parking with the mall so there was no current need to construct its own truck parking facility.

- **SPCA Addition:** Mr. Sanders asked about updates on the SPCA. Mr. Herrera noted that the addition had not made any progress. Specially manufactured materials have not been delivered, so construction has not begun. He noted that no updates had been received from the SPCA regarding timelines.
- **Lake Jackson Animal Control Facility:** The adjacent Lake Jackson Animal Control Facility was progressing. The interior work, including electrical, plumbing, and HVAC, was underway.
- **Hospitality Health Medical Center:** Mr. Herrera reported that the micro-hospital has stalled. He stated that while the City had sent back permit markups, the applicant had not returned the documents, paid the required fees, or picked up their permits. The project remained inactive.
- **Smaller site developments:** Mr. Tyler questioned the fiber installation on easements. Mr. Herrera provided an extended discussion of fiber-optic installation activities occurring throughout the city. He clarified that AT&T and Lyte Fiber were actively installing fiber optic conduit and cabling throughout various neighborhoods.

Mr. Sargent, Mr. Tyler, and Mr. Sanders all raised a concern that residents in their affected neighborhoods had not been notified in advance about the work. Mr. Herrera stated that the city had required both AT&T and Lyte Fiber to place door hangers on all homes in affected neighborhoods to begin work, including contractor contact information and QR codes linking to the provider's website. He acknowledged that the requirement may not have been followed in all instances and stated that staff would follow up with AT&T, noting that AT&T had been previously cited for similar compliance lapses.

<u>SIGNATURE OF DOCUMENTS</u> – none.

<u>SET NEXT MEETING DATE</u>
The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, August 4, 2026.

<u>ADJOURN</u>
There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:25 p.m.

These minutes were read and approved on August 4, 2026.

Locke Sanders, Chair

Kay Aplin, Secretary