

Meeting Minutes
City of League City
Planning and Zoning Commission
Regular Meeting, Monday, February 17, 2025
Council Chambers, 200 W. Walker Street, League City, TX 77573

1. Call to Order and Roll Call of Members

Paul Maaz, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

...

4. Public Hearing and Action Items

A. Hold a public hearing and make a recommendation to City Council on a Special Use Permit Application, SUP-24-0006, (Onsite Concrete Solutions Office), to allow an office use on approximately 1.0 acre, zoned "RSF-10" (Single-Family Residential 10), generally located on the southwest corner of Lawrence Road and Delesandri Lane with the address of 2106 Lawrence Road.

Caitlin King, Planner, gave a presentation on behalf of the City of League City.

Mr. Maaz opened the public hearing at 6:07 p.m.

Bruce Henderson, Applicant, explained the nature of the request and expressed his support for the request.

Matt Bowman, 3570 Delesandri, voiced his opposition to the request.

Orlando Bueno, 3527 Delesandri Ln, voiced his opposition to the request.

Mr. Bloom, 3600 Delesandri Ln, voiced his opposition to the request.

Michael Petron, 2126 Lawrence Rd., 3612 Delesandri Ln., voiced his opposition to the request.

Mr. Maaz closed the public hearing at 6:20 p.m.

Ms. Morrison inquired about the 24-month requirement listed in the conditions.

Ms. King response that the applicant, if approved, would need to apply for building permits to convert the site to a commercial use.

Ms. Morrison asked for confirmation that the property was being serviced by WCID #12.

Ms. King confirmed.

Mr. Hyde asked the applicant if they purchased the property for commercial purposes.

Mr. Henderson responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Hyde asked if the applicant was aware that the property was zoned commercial.

Mr. Henderson responded that he was not aware of the zoning issue initially, and the employee who was in charge of ensuring that the facility met all city requirements was no longer with the company.

Mr. Maaz asked what's happening at the facility now.

Mr. Henderson indicated that several of the staff were working on the property now.

Mr. Hyde asked what portion of the property was being converted.

Mr. Henderson replied that the property was constructed as a barndominium and gave a brief summary of the spaces that were being altered for the office use.

Mr. Hyde asked if the site was being utilized for office space only.
Mr. Henderson responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Arnold asked if the applicant was unaware that an SUP was needed.
Mr. Henderson replied that they had originally requested a rezoning to Neighborhood Commercial and as a result of City Council ordinance change, they have amended their request to an SUP.

Ms. Arnold asked why the property was purchased prior to completing due diligence on the zoning issues.
Mr. Henderson responded that he did not know why.

Mr. Jung asked how the parking lot was paved.
Mr. Henderson replied that it the previous owner tried to develop the property as an event center and made some modifications to the parking area.

Mr. Jung ask who collects the sale tax for the concrete sales.
Ms. Villarreal responded that taxes were paid at point of sale.

Mr. Jung asked if the property can be developed without any variances.
Mr. Henderson replied that the property could not be developed without the variances.

Mr. Jung asked if the driveways could be widened.
Mr. Henderson indicated that he believed there were limitations due to existing drainage features on the property.
Ms. King added that the issue also arises with regards to the maximum impervious coverage of 55% of the entire area for residential properties.

Mr. Maaz asked if the request was passed without the variances, could the site operate.
Ms. King responded that there would be alternatives to some of the variances, however it is not possible in many instances given the current configuration and features on the site.
Mr. Henderson added that the variance for parking could not be met due to dimensional issues.

Mr. Maaz asked if it was not possible to operate the site then why is the request being made.
Ms. Villarreal responded that if an applicant could not meet a condition, then an SUP could not be granted.

Mr. Jung asked if other property owners had identified what would satisfy them to gain their support.
Mr. Henderson replied that the applicant met with the property owners more than once and that they had the right to agree and/or disagree.
Mr. Carpenter indicated that the Planning Department had received communications of concerns from the surrounding property owners, but nothing definitive that would satisfy the surrounding owners.

There was a discussion regarding the Commission's recommendation and City Council's requirement for a super majority and ultimate decision on the request.

Mr. Maaz made a motion to approve, subject to staff's recommendation, without the variances being granted.

Ms. Morrison seconded the motion.

Ms. Morrison made an amended motion to approve the SUP as presented with the conditions proposed by staff.

Ms. Arnold seconded the motion

The vote to amend approved 7-0-0

The amended motion passed, 4-3-0. Commissioners Arnold, Jung, Hyde voted in opposition.

...

7. Adjournment

Mr. Maaz adjourned the meeting at 7:05 p.m.