



Appendix G

November 1, 2021

Update March 14, 2022

Angleton Streamlining Development Summary of Interviews with Staff, Consultants, and Developers

Identify most pressing issues in the current code of ordinances and how to resolve those issues.

- Current LDC has processes that are not being followed. Identify best processes by the City and incorporate. Comprehensive Unified LDC that do not require the applicants to refer multiple locations.
- Feedback from engineering firms is some requirements are above and beyond standard practices.
- Require more stringent regulations. Parkland dedication was used as a negotiating chip. Working on revising the ordinance and benefit the residences.
- Landscape requirements need to be stringent.
- Needs to add the option of planting trees in parks and other places – over a period of time; meet. with BDD to share recommendations; site plan requirements.
- Communication issues evident between developers, CC, and staff.
- Lengthy processing time for development applications.
- Current LDC lacks input from developers.
- Outdated regulations- 1962-65 ordinances- authorizes the Police Chief to do a lot of things.
- Parking issues –on street parking.
- Speed limits antiquated.
- Construction standards are not clear.
- Unworkable rules copied from Sugarland which has nothing in common with Angleton in 2021

Do you see any major/minor conflicts in the various city documents that you use?

- Confusion regarding Parkland Dedication. If one wants to defer parkland or public improvements there was a bond requirement. Confusing requirements and language within the LDC. Example - use as a Pecan Orchard (past use or current use – confusing)
- Fire Code- May incur additional costs to the developer and city to upgrade to 2019.
- Widen streets – no ordinances against parking on streets. Need better on-street parking regulations.
- Subdivision entrance requirements and boulevard entrances. No room for the boulevard in some of the new developments. No requirements on separation distances. Lack of options of allowing sprinklers in houses for one entrance/exit.
- Involved in very few standards. Do not know deeper standards. Code enforcement or inspectors would know better.
- One lane alleyway is a problem.
- Some information in LDC and construction manual is redundant.
- Drainage requirements in the LDC, for city systems refer to it as own code, but also use BDD manual. Add outline where applicable. Ex. Redevelopment/new development.



Any recommendations on measures to consolidate requirements/ simplify and streamline the development process (less cumbersome in general)

- Publish the flow charts.
- Comprehensive one-page graphic would be a better idea.
- Consider nationwide developers to one-time developers.
- Pre-development meetings should outline and respond to the questions.
- Time line for the process and how can it go faster.
- A measure to clear the confusion between developers and City Council.
- Computerized system to generate the application requirement packet for an address/type of development to prepare a complete application submittal.
- Such a checklist/software tool would help the staff to screen submittals. If the developer/applicant has not met the criteria (provided the documents), the staff can resend the packet.
- Consensus on opinions – what do we want the development to be – large lots vs. affordable housing.
- Need to streamline the processes with definite timelines and deadlines.
- Outlined process with a chart, different routes, streamlined in easily digestible manner, companion to the process. Developers are not clear of the exact process they need to follow. For ex. – 100 lots know that prelim and final plats are required, with construction plans in between. Identify the steps, performance bonds etc.
- DAWG meetings have helped. City team addressing questions has helped. Helped to follow the process. Giving developers the option of providing better development (amenities, appealing) with room to plan outside the City's documents such as the PDD. Round table discussion with other developers/engineers/contractors would be beneficial.
- Have streamlined meetings and provide clear information and opposed to just looking at the project. Application to request a meeting and a checklist. Ask for application ahead of time. Provide customized information.

Any conflicts with state statutes, codes, or best practices?

- No one would qualify for parkland dedication as it is written – refers to population. No methodology for the number as required by the statutes. Staff interprets the way it helps the developer. E.g. 1/2 acre for 100 persons in the City.
- Not attaching two neighborhoods/two dead end streets. Connect the neighborhoods and leave the road open.
- Putting fire box for fire entry only is a huge eyesore and defeats the purpose of multiple entrance and exits.
- Decision making authority giving exclusive right to one staff person (fire codes). Not requiring to seek Council's recommendation.
- Get rid of discrepancies with other manuals. Not appropriate to follow Sugarland's engineering manual. For ex. street improvements standards, street gradients, variance process for subdivision and engineering standards. (Fort Bend county is geographically different area with local drainage). Atlas 14 codification.
- Too many types of plats.
- Landscaping is confusing.
- Angled parking in the downtown area is a problem.



Any suggestions on written presentation and style. Format of the documents - is it user-friendly, or confusing and conflicting language

- The style needs to align with the flow of the process.
- Needs to move to a better and/or multiple locations. Current location on the website is difficult to access, it is under "Transparency in Government".
- The format should help users through the process.
- Current format missing parts and referenced exhibits (e.g., Exhibit A for plan check checklists)

Process improvements

- Review process better once started. Timing of filing the plat. 380 agreements and PIDs for reimbursements.
- Shot clock bill

Adherence to City of Angleton Comprehensive Plan/Vision (core principles and values espoused by the City of Angleton residents)

- Currently hyper focused on residential.
- Need to have an opportunity to revamp of what we are requiring of commercial properties and new development. Working with Keep Angleton Beautiful and conservation practices.
- Compared to other cities – need to elevate the standards such as signage, height restrictions, landscaping.
- Lot sizes-Most people want large lots and large houses. Not feasible. Desire for 60-70' lots. Not everyone is buying those. Need to evaluate medium income and what are people able to afford. Explore accessory DU, multi -generational, and multifamily/town homes.
- Lot sizes – does not matter. People welcome growth. Want other things that come with roof tops. Retain small town atmosphere. Accommodate all incomes.
- Lot sizes- Demand is high for small lots.
- Long term residents feel that the city is growing too quickly. Feel that traffic, crime increasing. New families are excited about parks, new Lakeside Park, quality of life. Not interested in large estates, but parks and schools. Controlled growth, responsible growth. Protect the City, not the developers.
- Needs more parks on the south.
- Amenities – The developers are working well to offer amenities. One development has walking trails.
- Traffic – not an issue at this point. City is doing traffic studies. We need red lights. City owns two, while state owns the rest. Need more traffic control than stop signs. Need to be proactive.
- Comp Plan needs to be refreshed and come up to speed. Development is dynamic, check for relevancy. Need discussion on vacant parcels and a dialogue between the developers and the City to see what is desired.

Innovative Planning Principles (facilitate sustainable growth and create a high quality of life)

- Need sustainability practices such as water conservation, green water collection, fiber, accessibility to wi-fi.



GUNDA CORPORATION

Engineers, Planners & Managers

- Want to adopt native non-invasive planting standards. Park standard manual that developers can use.
- Incorporate Gulf Coast native plant list.
- Cost of development vs. property taxes. Need to bridge the gap between required expenditures and revenue gap – the gap keeps getting bigger. Need growth businesses/industrial. Need to be more client friendly for industrial/businesses, not just residential. Density for residential matters but is not the primary issue. The City has undeveloped land. The community may not need density greater than 4 units /acre. Average 3 or 4 per acre is appropriate. As far as percentages of commercial/ industrial, need higher, right now zero for non-residential.
- PIDs, PUDs, etc. Mix of lots, encourage refined development plans, mixed uses, amenities, trails, etc.

Administrative Procedures Manual

- Include a good contact list.
- Links to Fire Codes and Standards.
- Ensure the stakeholders understand which group/review or decision-making authority – e.g., P & Z Development Group, City Council, and processing order. How to schedule the meetings, process, website.
- Executive summary of the process.
- Checklist on what the users need to do.
- List of forms.
- Need a process for TIRZ, PID process is in place.
- Flow charts.
- List of all applications and permits processed with related application forms, submittal checklists, and approval authority.
- Schedule of fees.
- Staff directory.
- Documents containing minimum standards and specifications.
- Other items identified by staff and specific to the City such as sample economic development tools for various policies including Section 380, TIRZ, and PID.

Others

- Need a land plan for the City to ensure permitted uses that are where the City want them to be. Need to review what are the needs and get a buy in from the community/stakeholders on where we want to go in terms of Parks/Multi-modal Trails Master Plan/Transportation Plan/ Land Use.
- Examples/models- Need utilities and capacity studies, water/sewer capacity, city wide impact fee. Look at the development impacts and needs. CIP projects not addressed. Impact fees only for two areas. CR___ between 288 and ___; another one in the industrial area – 288 and Henderson.

Annexation

- Need a standard City Services Agreement that developer could review and then make specific to their project
- Calendar with dates that shows the application deadline when hearing notice would run in the paper and dates for the P & Z and Council Meeting.



Zoning

- Calendar with dates that shows the application deadline when hearing notice would run in the paper and dates for the P & Z and Council Meeting.
- The zoning map needs two separate colors for SF-6.2 and SF-7.2
- Zone SF-5 requires a 20 ft building set with a 25 ft garage door setback. The building setback should be change to 25 ft to be consistent with the garage door setback and the other zonings.

Development Agreement

- Need a standard Development Agreement that can be given to developer at Pre-Development Meeting and then made project specific as the project progresses.
- The Developer's Agreements should be limited to large projects (greater than 20 acres), project to be zoned as PD, or tracts with multiple zonings.

Capacity Acquisition Fee

- Presently the developer pays \$4,000 for HOR to perform a study. This study comes up with a fee for the sewer CAF. The study usually takes around 4-8 weeks sometimes longer. Would like to see a set rate for the sewer like there is a set rate for water.

Standard Construction Details

- The city should draft their own standard details for Stormwater, Sanitary, Water, and Pavement. The City of Sugarland will not share a modifiable detail Set. Recommended using Lake Jackson's Standard Details as a starting point.
- Standard Construction Details should have a clause that allows for the sealing engineer to modify standard details are needed to meet specific design requirements

Land Development Code Comments by Sections

Sec.24-11

- I.1 Change from 30 lots to 50 lots for single entrance. Angleton has several over 75' lots with one entrance.
- I.2 Change from 50 lots to 80 lots
- I.3 Change raised median length from 150' to 120' which is a typical lot depth
- J.1.b This refers to street lengths in a block of houses. Has nothing to do with labeling lots and blocks on a plat.
- F.I.a Establish a minimum gutter grade at 0.30%. I would prefer 0.25%.
- E.1.a. Cul-de-sac surface to be 96' diameter to meet fire code. Right of way to be 120'.
 - 1.1 50 lots or 50 apartments. Why a difference
 - J.2 25 Year storm not 20-Year.

Sec 32-15

H&I Revise for dry utilities in the rear

Sec. 23-20

- A.5.d Include a list of amenities requirements for private parks.
The parkland dedication ordinance needs to be revised to priorities fees in lieu



GUNDA CORPORATION

Engineers, Planners & Managers

of parkland dedication. The recent practice by the city staff suggest that fees are preferred over land dedication. This revision would be consistent with the city's plan to have large regional parks.

Sec. 23-27

H Warranty bond should be for 1 year not 2 years.

Sec. 23-60

- C. Heritage trees are only Live Oak and Pecan. Need to establish a minimum diameter to qualify for a heritage tree. I would say at least 18" for a heritage tree.
- E.2. Define agricultural - Pecan Orchards would seem to qualify, Grazing land for beef production would seem to qualify, etc.
- E.4&5 Clarify in an arborist is required.
- H.4 Replacement at 1x instead of 3x. Other city ordinances except residential projects from tree preservation requirements.
Add a section that will allow developers to pay a fees in lieu of tree preservation.
As an example (\$250 per heritage tree removed, up to \$2,500 per acre, up to \$100,000 per development)
- J2 Reduce the tree requirement to one tree per residential lot. This is typical in other cities
- J.2.C. Provide the proposed tree list in the Code
- J. 3. This section is a repeat of section J.2

Sec. 23-27

A.1 This section should be revised to allow for clear cutting of trees that are not heritage trees. This would aid in preliminary study of the site for all engineering disciplines.

Sec 23-79

After 1st preliminary review by P&Z, allow 2nd submittal with requested changes be 2 weeks before next P&Z. Otherwise lose a month in time.

Sec. 23-117 Requirements place a lot of cost up front before developer knows if it is a go with the City

- A. 4 Delay submittal of TIA reports until after approval of Preliminary Submittal.
- A. 5 Delay submittal of utility and drainage reports until after approval of Preliminary Submittal.
- A. 6 Delay submittal of drainage report (as set out in Sec 1-15) s until after approval of Preliminary Submittal
- A. 7 Delay submittal of soils/geotechnical report until after approval of Preliminary Submittal.
- A. 11 Delay parkland statement, which is generally in negotiations, until after approval of Preliminary Submittal.
- A.12 Delay submittal of Heritage tree report until after approval of Preliminary Submittal.