

**City of Piney Point Village  
Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting  
Minutes from November 8th, 2022**

**Members Present:** Bill Burney, Bill Ogden, Buck Ballas, Dana Gompers, Don Jones, and Margaret Rohde-Chairman.

**Members Absent:** None.

**City Staff:** Annette Arriaga, Director of Planning & Development, Bobby Pennington, City Administrator, Cary Moran, City Forester, Joe Moore P.E with HDR Engineering, David Olson with Olson & Olson.

**City Council:** Aliza Dutt, Dale Dodds and Joel Bender.

**Signed in Guests:** Boy Scout-Sam Cash, Gin Kappler-Peeler, Jennifer Hendrickson, Travis T. Stanford, Gary Dunn, David Valerius, Gary Y. Poole, Mariana Evans, Ryan Eurek, Jon Pippent, Kendra Nachtigal, Omar Longoria, Spencer Harvey and Joel Seybert.

1.) **Call to order:** 6:05 P.M.

2.) **Meeting Minutes:** Motion for approval of minutes from the October 27<sup>th</sup>, 2022, regular Planning and Zoning Commission meeting; Buck Ballas motioned first to approve, and it was seconded by Don Jones, minutes were unanimously approved.

3.) **DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION OF SPRING BRANCH ISD PROJECT/ NEW MEMORIAL DRIVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL:** Margaret Rohde formally opened the discussion with the Spring Branch ISD project team. **Gin Kappler-Peeler** introduced herself along with her design team associates and thanked the Commission for the additional meeting. She indicated that they did have a lengthy presentation back on October 27, 2022, and she indicated that this meeting would be shortened. **Gin Kappler-Peeler** stated that there were eight key topics of discussion from the last meeting. She also indicated that there had been some additional comments received back from city council and she mentioned that she would address those comments at the end. She mentioned that there were three different categories.

1. Ordinance Language
2. What needed an updated exhibit
3. Looking at the site conditions regarding the exterior lighting

**Gin Kappler-Peeler** indicated that one of the questions that was asked regarding the Tree Disposition, if they could guarantee the viability of those trees after that were planted for a period of time. She indicated that they looked at the standard projected completion dates and they rolled that out a year and they included the warranty for the trees and the district had no problem of the ordinances language as written.

**Gin Kappler-Peeler** discussed the generator on the campus and indicated that the generator is in compliant. She mentioned that the generator is at a DBA of 65 during the daytime and that level would be when the chillers are running. They consulted with their acoustical engineer to allow for a more restricted level, and they indicated that would be at a 55 DBA level and she mentioned the district also agreed. She also added that they are also putting a sound encasement around the

generator, and she mentioned that they are changing out the CMU block wall and they decided to replace the wall with a sound block that has sound absorption properties that would further mitigate the noise.

**Gin Kappler-Peeler** mentioned that they had received some written comments and verbal communication back regarding the security factors that they are investing in and implementing surrounding the campus. She mentioned that they are putting those safety factors and the list into the scope of work.

**Gin Kappler-Peeler** talked about future provisional items that may come up later. She indicated that three were areas were identified.

- 1.) Decking in the interior courtyard
- 2.) Outdoor classroom in the interior courtyard
- 3.) Playground equipment that was not fully documented

She indicated that these items were also included in the scope of work and mentioned that they would not be exceeding the height requirements and not exceeding the allowable lot coverages.

**Gin Kappler-Peeler** talked about lighting and that it did not have a defined paragraph in the scope of work so she stated that they had introduced that in the ordinance language. She added that they are vested in the security of its staff, students, and visitors. She added that they are adding exterior lighting to the campus. She mentioned the importance of site security to have adequate lighting on the campus and that the lighting would be code compliant, and the lights would have light code provisions built into the project.

**Gin Kappler-Peeler** discussed her exhibits. Items that were discussed in the previous questions and answers. She referred to the new exhibit.

- 1.) The vehicular and pedestrian light traffic.

She indicated that the exhibit would explain the flow and the difference between the distinct paths.

**Gin Kappler-Peeler** discussed the monument signs. She indicated that the monument sign had a lot of discussion at the last meeting, and she indicated that the proposed monument sign was too large and did not meet the ordinance. She stated that they went back and re viewed the design plan and came up a new design, that is as close as possible to what they are envisioning and still meets the ordinance as close as possible. The new designed sign does meet the height requirement but exceeds the square foot per side, our ordinance indicates 30 as a minimum and the proposed sign indicates 47. The sign height would be 5 ft under the standard requirements, and she also indicated that would be the appropriate size for the school so that the sign would be legible from the street. She also indicated that they added language about the scrolling, and its content and operational use of the sign. She also mentioned that they created a brand-new exhibit for the new sign.

**Gin Kappler-Peeler** spoke about the fencing. She discussed all the proposed fencing and explained that a portion of the fencing would be black ornamental steel and that it would be six foot tall. She indicated that the back sections of the yard would be secured with a black vinyl coated chain link fence and the fencing is pretty much what is on the campus currently and mentioned that it wasn't too much deviation from what is there today. She added that there would be two service gates. One gate would be for service entrance that is used for maintenance and emergency fire truck access and the other gate would be for pedestrian access. She also mentioned that they created a brand-new exhibit for the new fencing.

**Gin Kappler-Peeler** continued her discussion with the issue of lighting and mentioned that her team was charged with figuring out the lighting situation both on the proposed and what was existing on the campus. She referred to the foot candle study on the proposed lighting and compared it to what was currently on the campus. It showed where they were planning on putting the outdoor safety parking lights. She indicated that it would be canopy down lighting, pole mounted, .3-foot candle lighting, lights would shine directly onto the property, and they would also have light pollution shields and that the lights would meet all the current lighting standards. She stated that they are code compliant. She indicated that the pole lights on the Western edge are located not on the property line but 25 ft inside the property line. She reinstated that the proposed lighting would provide all the safety and security levels needed for the school. Also, stating that they would be removing existing landscape lighting and they would not be adding any new outdoor landscape lighting and that the proposed lighting would be mitigated and indicated that the proposed lighting would be less than what is on the campus today. She added that they created a brand-new exhibit for the exterior parking lot lighting.

**Bill Burney** had asked if Spring Branch had done a noise study. **Gin Kappler-Peeler** had indicated that they had, and they took a three-part approach as it related to the noise on the campus.

1. They did an evaluation of the existing condition of the acoustical equipment.
2. They modeled the projected equipment selections and compared the too.
3. Also, they will re evaluate the equipment with the consultant after the equipment is installed and they would test those conditions.

**Margaret Rohde** had stated that they were prosing less DBA than what the City of Houston requires.

**Gin Kappler-Peeler** discussed that the DBA levels would be 30 to 49 at the property line.

**Bill Burney** asked about the existing vegetation along the back side of the campus and wanted to know if it was going to stay. **Gin Kappler-Peeler** she indicated that on the East side along Oak Lane that they were going to leave that fence in because it creates a vegetated boundary that's between both properties and she mentioned that if they take that out it would just look like a wide-open area. **Bill Burney** indicated that he was concerned about the North side of the property and wanted to know what they were going to do because there were several different types of fencing in resident back yards. **Gin Kappler-Peeler** indicted that during the day that the district would enclose the yard. **Bill Burney** asked about a double fence and **Gin Kappler-Peeler** confirmed that they would have a double fence. **Bill Burney** stated that it would be hard for the school to maintain a double fence. **Jennifer Hendrickson** indicated that on previous projects they have raised the fence area at the bottom to allow for weeding by the lawn maintenance crews. **Bill Burney** indicated that they made since.

**Margaret Rohde** had referred to the SUP ordinance and she referred to section 2B of the draft and indicated that there were several issues raised by city council, one being additional traffic and if any increase enrollment. **Gin Kappler-Peeler** referred to her traffic control plan and indicated that the district is wanting to work with the Planning and Zoning Commission, and they will also reevaluate the traffic control plan in six months after the project has started to address any update any traffic related issues. **Ryan Eurek** discussed the traffic plan with the Commission, and he referred to his exhibit. **Margaret Rohde** had asked about the enrollment. **Gin Kappler-Peeler** stated that there are 400 students, and the enrollment would be up to 550. **Margaret Rohde** stated the traffic plan would be evaluated after six months post construction of the project starting and would be reevaluated if the enrollment increased after 500 students, she believed that the Commission would want to take a look at that and wok out any traffic issues. **Don Jones** wanted to know how many students rode the bus and he typically doesn't see the busses full. He hoped that if the enrollment increased that the students would ride the bus.

**Margaret Rohde** referenced 4G of the draft SUP ordinance and talked about the minimum number of trees on the property and she wanted to confirm that the current language in the draft was ok with the district. **Gin Kappler-Peeler** had agreed.

**Margaret Rohde** referenced page 8, section 10 of the draft SUP ordinance that discussed lighting and mentioned she was aware the need for staff to arrive early on campus. **Gin Kappler-Peeler** stated that the child nutrition team would arrive at 5:30 a.m. and the custodial staff arrives at 6:00 a.m. and then the custodial staff would leave at 11:15 p.m. Margaret Rohde mentioned that was a long time for the lights to be on and suggested that the blinds would be shut after school hours, and she would like to see a protocol on that. **Margaret Rohde** also suggested that the custodial lights would only stay on until 11:15 p.m. **Gin Kappler-Peeler** indicated that they could work that out and that was a matter of the controls and wanted to see that area zoned. **Gin Kappler-Peeler** had referred to lighting exhibit and indicated that could work with the district on the timing. **Margaret Rohde** had suggested 10:00 p.m. for the other operational hours. **Margaret Rohde** stated that residents are concerned about the lighting be brighter than it is today and the lighting would be increased and there would be probably be looking at additional discussion on lighting. The Commission wanted more wording to be added.

**Margaret Rohde** referenced page 11, E thru H that discussed decking. She also added that it had also referenced the decking, outdoor classroom, playground equipment and the shade structures and indicated that those had been separate PTA projects and mentioned that the decking, driveway and sidewalks discussions and **Gin Kappler-Peeler** just indicated that all the wording in the draft that they had no issues with that. She indicated that both the Dads Club and the PTA, that the district will work on a timeline with both groups and work out any issues and that the district will be fine with that.

**Margaret Rohde** entertained a motion to recommend approval of the draft Specific Use Ordinance as amended with the condition that Section 2.10 that deals with the lighting both exterior and interior that the Spring Branch ISD continues to work with staff on the language and restrictions that had been brought up in the meeting to finalize the language before it goes to city council. Don Jones was first to approve and seconded by Bill Burney.

- 4.) **ADJOURNMENT:** Motion to adjourn at 7:05 P.M. Motion made first by Don Jones and seconded by Bill Burney. Motion to adjourn approved.

Date Approved on January 26<sup>th</sup>, 2023.  
Chair of Meeting Margaret Rohde

*X MARGARET ROHDE*

(Required Signature)

Official File Copy