



CITY OF ANGLETON
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MINUTES
120 S. CHENANGO STREET, ANGLETON, TEXAS 77515
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 06, 2025 AT 12:00 PM

Members Names

Chair | William Garwood

Commission Members | Deborah Spoor, Jeff Roberson, Michelle Townsend,

Regina Bieri, Andrew Heston

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN PURSUANT TO V.T.C.A., GOVERNMENT CODE, CHAPTER 551, THAT THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION FOR THE CITY OF ANGLETON WILL CONDUCT A MEETING, OPEN TO THE PUBLIC, ON THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 2025, AT 12:00 P.M., AT THE CITY OF ANGLETON COUNCIL CHAMBERS LOCATED AT 120 S. CHENANGO STREET, ANGLETON, TEXAS 77515.

DECLARATION OF A QUORUM AND CALL TO ORDER

Roll Call: Present were: Chair William Garwood; **Commission Members:** Deborah Spoor, Michelle Townsend, Regina Bieri, and Andrew Heston; **Absent was:** Commission Member Jeff Roberson.

1. **Meeting Minutes:** Discussion and possible action on the minutes for the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting held on September 4, 2025.

Commission Action: The motion to approve the minutes as presented was made by Commission Member Regina Bieri; seconded by Commission Member Deborah Spoor. Motion carried unanimously. The minutes were approved (5-0).

PUBLIC HEARINGS AND ACTION ITEMS

2. **Conduct a public hearing, discussion, and possible action on an Ordinance Zoning approximately 26.084 acres out of 41.876 acres to Commercial General (C-G)/SUP Overlay, TNMP Company for property (White Oak Substations) located adjacent and north of 3343 E Mulberry St/ HWY 35, Angleton, TX 77515.**

D.S. Director Otis Spriggs introduced this Public Hearing item. Mr. Spriggs noted that the City Council voted to recently annex the rear ETJ property, as noted in the agenda summary report. As you recall, the TNMP/Centerpoint Substation site, located on Highway 35, came in for a SUP for the utility substations, which are currently under construction.

The annexation recently added the rear acreage (ORDINANCE NO. 20250826-009), which was previously within the City's ETJ, and later pulled it into the City limits. The original SUP overlay for the property frontage was approved by the City Council, subject to the applicants returning with the annexation petition. Today's public hearing is essentially a follow-up request to finalize the annexation process, during which we will assign the required zoning district for the annexation. That is all the Planning and Zoning Commission is asked to do today, and to make a final recommendation to the City Council accordingly.

Staff notified property owners within 200 feet of the property and posted the legal notice, as attached to the agenda, in the newspaper. We received one call from the neighboring property owner, the K.C. Hall, who had no issues.

Commission Action:

Commission Member Michelle Townsend made a motion to open the public hearing, which was seconded by Commission Member Andrew Heston. The Motion carried unanimously with a 5-0 vote; the public hearing was opened.

Public Input: None

Commission Member Michelle Townsend made a motion to close the public hearing, seconded by Commission Member Deborah Spoor; the Motion carried unanimously 5-0, and the public hearing was closed.

Commission Action:

Motion was made by Commission Member Michelle Townsend to recommend approval of an ordinance zoning 26.084 acres for the Texas New Mexico Power Center Point White Oak substation to C-G, Commercial General District with an SUP overlay for the substation for property located adjacent and north of 3343 East of Mulberry St. Highway 35, Angleton, TX.; The motion was seconded by Commission Member Regina Bieri.

Roll Call Vote: Commission Members: Deborah Spoor- Aye; Michelle Townsend-Aye; Regina Bieri-Aye; Andrew Heston-Aye; and **Chair** William Garwood-Aye. 5-0, the Item was approved unanimously.

REGULAR AGENDA

3. Discussion and Possible Action on an application for the Tree Mitigation Site Plan for the Windrose Green community, located at the intersection of FM 523 and Windrose Green Blvd, directly east of Angleton High School.

D.S. Director Otis Spriggs: Introduced this item, noting that the Windrose Green Development community is currently under construction. The developer has submitted the heritage tree preservation plan for consideration. The Planning and Zoning Commission is asked to review and make recommendations to the City Council, on

compliance with the tree mitigation ordinance, which is Section 23-6. Staff has attached the application and summary letter submitted by the applicants, in which they outlined the tree caliper was calculated per the requirements of the Heritage Tree ordinance, in terms of the replacement ratio at “3 to 1”.

The City Engineer and Staff have provided comments regarding the caliper of trees at the time of planting. There were some questions on the methodology in terms of the credits that are being requested. The trees were installed smaller, but as you know, some time has elapsed in terms of the tree growth. So, they're requesting a waiver of that requirement. I will now yield, so that the applicants can give comments and explanation of the request, as attached to the agenda.

Mr. Joe Grabinski with the Ember Group spoke before the Commission, representing the developer of Windrose Green, and he is the Director of Development.

Mr. Joe Grabinski continued: So my understanding of the ordinance is that there's a requirement of a “3 to 1” replacement ratio. So this is in fact a replacement. So, some of that replacement has already occurred. In looking at the numbers real quick, which are outlined here in the first 2 pages of the cover letter: A total of 24 trees were removed, which equated to the 198 caliper inches. So you take that and multiply it by three, that gets you to the 594 caliper inches.

Mr. Joe Grabinski added that if you look at phase one, phase two and then what's proposed in phase three, the reason it says proposed is because we have not planted what's in Phase 3 yet. Phase one and two already has been planted and you see the totals of all of those trees from phases 1, 2 and 3, which brings us to the 596 +/- caliper inches.

The trees were planted in different stages. So phase one landscaping happened around late 2022, early 2023 and in the phase two landscaping, we completed that project last summer, mid- 2024. We are currently working with our landscape contractor on phase three to proceed with the installation and related irrigation work.

Commission Member Michelle Townsend: Asked would it be fair to say that the trees in phase one, at the time they were measured had 18 to 24 months to grow?

Commission Member Andrew Heston: It looks like most of these are below 3 caliper inches for phase 1.

Mr. Joe Grabinski responded that they range in size from 2 to 4 inches in phase one and then Phase 2 is at the 3-inch mark.

Commission Member Andrew Heston: Why are you coming to us at this point, knowing that the replacement trees are supposed to either be Pecan or Live Oak, and you are still proposing a bunch of Bald Cypress, and Water Oak for types that haven't even been planted yet, and do not comply?

Mr. Joe Grabinski: That's a good question. So we went off of the ordinance, which in reading the ordinance, it states that you could do a replacement with either heritage trees, which are pecan trees or significant trees, and that's where the bald Cypress and Water Oak trees

species come in play. So we're not asking for a variance, we felt the ordinance seems to be pretty clear that significant trees are allowed as a replacement.

Commission Member Regina Bieri: Stated that the Water Oak has a faster rate of growth than a Live Oak.

Commission Member Michelle Townsend stated that she does not prefer the Water Oak. She is on board with the Bald Cypress, especially around the water features. Commission Member Michelle Townsend noted that she lives on property that has Water Oaks and they do not last as long as Live Oaks. And when they die, they tend to rot from the inside and can fall and cause significant damage. We have had one taken down so that it would not come through our living room.

Chair William Garwood: Asked why Ember's Team is here in the first place, and why did we miss this requirement in 2022.

Mr. Joe Grabinski: That's an excellent question that I'm not going to be able to give a very good answer to. My understanding is there were conversations with city staff at that time. They knew that we were moving forward with planting the troops. Specifically, as to why nobody was here doing this, what we're doing right now- I don't know. I was not with the Ember Team at that time.

Commission Member Townsend noted that her concern would be with how the measurements were taken, which she noted is mirrored in the staff report and comments. Maybe not necessarily how the measurements were taken, but the time at which they were taken.

DS Director Otis Spriggs: At the time that the trees were planted they did not comply with the planting requirements. So basically, they're requesting a credit of the requirements, as outlined in the report. Because at the time of planting, it should have been calculated. In terms of the amount in-between or in deficit, this is what we are considering in terms of the ordinance itself. Staff could not grant any waivers.

Commission Member Michelle Townsend: It seems to me that if we're going to comply with the spirit of the law, we need to give a nod to the fact that those measurements should have been taken at the time the trees were planted. And so now I think the City needs some sort of compensation for the fact that they weren't either because additional trees are going to be planted or fee-in-lieu-of, which I would love to know Otis Spriggs, if you know if Parks and Rec. has a preference?

DS Director Otis Spriggs responded, Yes, we would need to do a recalculation. Perhaps that is what the recommendation needs to be prior to City Council's consideration. Staff and Engineering would meet again with the Applicants.

Further discussion was had regarding the dates and time of planting and methodology in deriving a calculation of the replacement count.

Commission Action

Commission Andrew Heston made a motion (as amended by Commission Member Townsend) to recommend approval of the Windrose Green Tree Mitigation Plan, with the condition that we require the applicant to recalculate mitigation credits based on tree caliper measurements taken at the time of planting, with input from the Parks and Recreation Department and City Engineer, so that any deficit can be addressed through additional plantings or fee-in-lieu-of.

Commission Member Michelle Townsend seconded the motion. (5-0 Vote). The Item was approved.

4. Discussion and Possible Action on an application for Tree Mitigation Plan for the Freedom Park - Detention and Drainage Project, located south of FM 523 and north of Freedom Park.

Mr. Spriggs introduced this item regarding the Freedom Park Detention Tree Mitigation Plan.

Chair William Garwood: The question is why are we going from a “3 to 1” in the ordinance to a “1 to 1”?

Mr. Joe Grabinski spoke regarding the Freedom Park Detention Heritage Tree Preservation Plan:

Mr. Grabinski explained, that there are a couple of differences here: What we're talking about is not replacement of trees, but about preservation of trees in Freedom Park, which is a city-owned property. So that is the question, regarding this being “3 to 1” or “1 to 1” ratio. Why would we speak differently, is because it is on city-owned property. It is our understanding whether this would be treated as a public works’ project. I understand that was based on a lot of conversations between us, the developer, along with multiple former city staff.

Further discussion regarding the relationship of Freedom Park Detention and the Windrose Green Development was had.

Mr. Joe Grabinski explained background information of the conversations and past emails going back as far as 2021 with the former city manager Chris Whitaker and Walter Reeves regarding the talks of the “1 to 1”, specifically referencing Section 23-93.C3.

Mr. Spriggs requested that the former emails (Walter Reeves to Chris Whitaker) be copied to him.

Mr. Joe Grabinski: We are requesting preservation credit for the trees that we were able to keep on the berm. And that's the caliper that's listed in the letter was twice a little over 1000. So it's about it, a “2 to 1” ratio is actually preservation, not replacement.

Commission Member Townsend: What does Parks and Recs say about this? Mr. Spriggs responded that we do not find a formal one-to-one agreement; therefore current Staff cannot provide any requested waivers.

Mr. Joe Grabinski added that they removed 532 caliper inches, there was 1,041 caliper inches preserved (close to a “2-1”).

Commission Action:

Commission Member Townsend made a motion to recommend the City Council approve the Freedom Park Tree Mitigation Plan, with no mitigation needing to be performed, and we find that the “1 to 1” is reasonable for this very specific type of project and work.

Commission Deborah Spoor seconded the motion. Chair William Garwood-Aye; Commission Members: Deborah Spoor- Aye; Michelle Townsend- Aye; Regina Bieri-Aye; Commission Member Andrew Heston – Nay. Motion carried with a 4-1 Vote.

5. Discussion and Report Update on the Comprehensive Plan Update and Study

Mr. Otis Spriggs gave an update on the progress of the Comprehensive Plan Update currently led by the CPAC committee. He reminded the Planning and Zoning Commission and Public of the Questionnaire and Survey tool available (QR code was displayed) and the City Website, which are options for Community engagement and participation.



*Take the
Survey!*

ADJOURNMENT: ADJOURNMENT Chair Garwood adjourned the meeting at 12:42 P.M.

William Garwood
Chair