

**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 18, 2026
CITY HALL'S COUNCIL CHAMBERS @ 5:30 P.M.**

P&Z PRESENT

Irene Thompson
Diana Izaguirre
David Villarreal
Kevin Sanchez

P&Z ABSENT

Raquenel Austin
Connie Garza
Steven Alaniz

STAFF PRESENT

Xavier Cervantes
Alex Hernandez
Elisa Zurita
Gabriel Ramirez
Jessica Munoz
Susie De Luna
Ana G. Bazaldua

GUEST PRESENT

Gerardo Chapa
Ulises Chapa

CALL TO ORDER

Chairwoman Izaguirre called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

DISCLOSURE OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

There was none.

CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

There was none.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 4, 2026

Chairwoman Izaguirre asked if there were any corrections to the minutes for February 4, 2026. Ms. Thompson moved to approve the minutes as presented. Mr. Sanchez seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Started: 5:30 p.m.

Ended: 5:31 p.m.

Item #2

Site Plan Approval:

**Construction of a Therapy Clinic
named GR&E Mind Evolution All Purpose Center, PLLC
being on Lot 1, Replat of Expressway Business Park
Phase XII Subdivision
This property is located at 1015 Business Park Drive
I-I
Gina Rhea Ramirez**

Mr. Ramirez stated that he property is located at the Northeast corner of Business Park Drive and St. Claire Boulevard. This project will have access from St. Claire Boulevard, a public street. The facility will be built in an L-1 (Light Industrial) zoned property where the structure is allowed by right as stipulated within the City's zoning ordinance to include permitted signs and dumpster specifications and locations. The site will be retrofitted and prepped with thru traffic lanes, curb and gutters, drainage, and utilities. The proposed building will have a maximum height of 12' and meets all the setback requirements set forth on this plan. The site will have 26 parking spaces (5 being handclapped) available to faculty and visitors, complying with the minimum number of paved, off-street parking spaces for this project. The center will have future building additions per site plan. Code restrictions and regulations will be imposed for future projects to comply with Site Plan

Approval requirements. A master landscaping plan shall be applied to all green spaces to comply with the subdivision ordinance Ch. 98 Subdivision – Landscaping regulations; and a Lighting plan will be reviewed as to not affect nearby neighborhoods. Staff recommends approval of the Site Plan as submitted.

Chairwoman Izaguirre asked if the board had any questions.

There was none.

There being no discussion, Chairwoman Izaguirre entertained a motion. Ms. Thompson moved to approve the site plan approval request. Mr. Sanchez seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Started: 5:31 p.m.

Ended: 5:32 p.m.

Item #3

Site Plan Approval:

**Construction of a chain restaurant
named McDonald's
being on the unrecorded Lot 1,
McDonald's 42-3671 Mission Subdivision
This property is located approximately
1000 feet East of Holland Avenue along the
South side of W. Griffin Parkway
C-3
AEC Engineering, LLC**

Mr. Ramirez stated that the site is located approximately 1000 feet East of Holland Avenue along the South side of W. Griffin Parkway. This site will be developed to include all the infrastructure needed to operate this business to include a fire hydrant and fire lanes noted at restricted locations throughout. The building will be 86 feet from the W. Griffin Parkway frontage exceeding the minimum building setback requirements for commercial developments. Proposed is a free-standing structure with a main entrance from W. Griffin Pkwy and a shared access driveway running East to West extending the lane from the existing El Pato's Restaurant on the East side of this lot. A total of 44 parking spaces (2 being designated for handicapped) are allocated for public use which exceeds the minimum number of stalls required for this business. An extra serving lane may serve as addition stacking and queuing, if necessary. Landscaping is to comply with the City's regulations and code ordinances and a lighting plan has been reviewed so that nearby residential properties will not be affected. There will be one enclosed dumpster located within the site to be screened with a solid buffer and opaque gates. No more than two permanent signs shall be allowed on one lot, except those lots with double frontage, in which case a maximum of three permanent signs will be permitted with at least one sign on each frontage. Staff recommends approval of the Site Plan.

Chairwoman Izaguirre asked if the board had any questions.

There was none.

There being no discussion, Chairwoman Izaguirre entertained a motion. Ms. Thompson moved to approve the site plan approval request. Mr. Sanchez seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Started: 5:32 p.m.

Ended: 5:33 p.m.

Item #4

Site Plan Approval:

**Construction of a storage warehouse facility named Trinity Warehouse being on Lot 2A, AN-VAR Subdivision, This property is located at 606 Trinity Street I-1
Francisco Gomez**

Mr. Ramirez stated that the site is located between S. Conway Ave. and Mayberry Road along the south side of Trinity Street. Proposed is the construction of a privately-owned and operated storage warehouse facility within a developed L-1 (Light Industrial District). The site will be compliant to its zoning requirements including setbacks and allowable uses. This project will be a 1-story building measuring a grand total of 26,563 square feet. The first floor will measure 9,934 square feet housing 6 units and will include a lobby, office, restroom, and a bay/loading dock. There will be 29 parking stalls (2 designated as handicapped) allocated to this development. The storage units will be accessible by drive access lanes. Landscaping is to comply with the City's regulations and code ordinances and a lighting plan has been reviewed so that nearby residential properties will not be affected. There will be one enclosed dumpster located within the site to be screened with a solid buffer and opaque gates. No more than two permanent signs shall be allowed on one lot, except those lots with double frontage, in which case a maximum of three permanent signs will be permitted with at least one sign on each frontage. Staff recommends approval of the Site Plan.

Chairwoman Izaguirre asked if the board had any questions.

There was none.

There being no discussion, Chairwoman Izaguirre entertained a motion. Ms. Thompson moved to approve the site plan approval request. Mr. Sanchez seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Started: 5:33 p.m.

Ended: 5:34 p.m.

Item #5

Rezoning:

**Being Lot 1, Laguna Oaks Subdivision Phase I
This property is located at the Southeast corner of Mile One South and S. Inspiration Roads
R-1 to C-2
Jorge De Zenea**

Mr. Cervantes stated that the applicant is requesting to rezone the subject property from Single-family Residential District ("R-1") to Neighborhood Commercial District ("C-2") to build a commercial establishment at the site. The code of ordinances states that the main purpose of the neighborhood commercial zoning is to provide space and off-street parking in appropriate locations in proximity to residential areas, for commercial development catering to the convenience shopping and service needs of the occupants of nearby residences. The property is located at the Southeast corner of Mile One South Road and S. Inspiration Road and measures 150.25 feet along Mile One South Road and 192.63 feet along S. Inspiration Road for a total net area of 0.939 acres. The surrounding zones

are Multi-family Residential District (R-3) to the North, Single-family Residential District to the East, Planned Unit Development District (PUD) to the South and Agricultural Open Interim (AO-I) to the West. The property is vacant. The surrounding land uses include the Vida Que Canta apartment complex to the North, Single-family homes to the East and South and vacant to the West. To the Northwest is a Dollar General store. The Future Land Use Map shows the property designated as Planned Unit Development. The requested rezoning is in line with the comprehensive plan designation and staff feels that Neighborhood Commercial zoning will complement the area. There are hundreds of dwelling units in all directions. Notices were mailed to twenty-three (23) surrounding property owners. Planning staff has not received any phone calls from the notice. Staff recommends approval to C-2 zoning.

Chairwoman Izaguirre asked if there was any input in favor or against the request.

There was none.

Chairwoman Izaguirre entertained a motion to close the public hearing. Ms. Thompson moved to close the public hearing. Mr. Sanchez seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Chairwoman Izaguirre asked if the board had any questions.

There was none.

There being no further discussion, Chairwoman Izaguirre entertained a motion. Ms. Thompson moved to approve the rezoning request. Mr. Sanchez seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Started: 5:34 p.m.

Ended: 5:38 p.m.

Item #6

Rezoning:

**Being Lot 12, Las Cumbres Terrace Subdivision
This property is located at 801 Mountain Road
R-2 to R-3
M2 Engineering, PLLC
c/o Emigdio Salinas**

Mr. Cervantes stated the applicant is requesting to rezone the subject property from Duplex-Fourplex Residential District ("R-2") to Multi-family Residential District ("R-3") to develop a 6-unit apartment complex at the site. The lot of record is located at the Southwest corner of N. Troser and Mountain Roads. The property measures 110 feet along N. Troser Road and measures 105 feet along Mountain road and it has an area of 0.396 acres or 17,238 square feet. The Las Cumbres Terrace Subdivision is a gated recorded subdivision designed to have a fourplex apartment complex in each lot. The property was zoned R-2 on August 26, 2024. The surrounding zones are Duplex-Fourplex Residential District (R-2) to the North and West, Agricultural Open Interim (A-OI) and Duplex-Fourplex Residential (R-2) to the East and Single family Residential (R-1) to the South. The surrounding land uses are single-family homes to the East, North and South. The land uses to the West are vacant properties. The subject property is vacant. The Future Land Use Map shows the property designated for low density residential uses. The requested rezoning is not in line with the comprehensive plan, but staff feels that the area is in transition to multi-family residential uses.

Notices were mailed to 20 surrounding property owners. Planning staff received no phone calls in opposition to the rezoning. Staff recommends approval to the rezoning request.

Chairwoman Izaguirre asked if there was any input in favor or against the request.

There was none.

Chairwoman Izaguirre entertained a motion to close the public hearing. Ms. Thompson moved to close the public hearing. Mr. Sanchez seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Chairwoman Izaguirre asked if the board had any other questions.

There was none.

There being no discussion, Chairwoman Izaguirre entertained a motion. Ms. Thompson moved to approve the rezoning request. Mr. Sanchez seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Started: 5:38 p.m.

Ended: 5:44 p.m.

Item #7

Conduct a public hearing and consideration of the adoption of an ordinance amending the Code of Ordinances Appendix A - Zoning, Article XII. Commercial and Industrial Area Requirements, Section 1.58 General; By Adding Subsection 4, Smoke Shops and Tobacco Stores by Establishing a 1,000 feet Minimum Radius and Distance Requirement from a School, Family Daycare Home, Child-Care Facility, Youth Center, Community Center, Recreational Facility, Park, Church, or Religious Institutions, Hospitals or from other Smoke Shops or Tobacco Stores Applicant: City of Mission

Mr. Cervantes stated the ordinance is due to the belief that the expansion of smoke shops and tobacco stores in the city would result in undesirable impacts to the community with the impacts being increased potential for tobacco sales to minors. The Police Chief has indicated that smoke shops and tobacco stores are increasing the potential for sales to minors with a greater opportunity for the sale of illegal drug paraphernalia that is marketed as tobacco paraphernalia. The ordinance will establish minimum radius and distance requirements for new smoke shops and tobacco stores. The ordinance establishes a minimum 1,000 feet separation from schools, family day-care homes, Childcare facilities, youth centers, community centers, recreational facilities, parks, churches or religious institutions, hospitals or from other smoke shops or tobacco stores for new smoke shops or tobacco stores. Staff have identified all the above establishments. The map enclosed shows them geographically with a 1,000-foot radius around each one. Staff recommends the adoption of the ordinance. Mr. Cervantes noted that a representative from the Police Department was present to testify in support of the ordinance. Staff completed an extensive mapping project to support the "youth conservation" initiative. Using established definitions, staff identified all locations within the city where youth congregate. This data was used to create the 1,000-foot buffer zones presented in the provided map. Mr. Cervantes commended the significant effort of city staff in accurately identifying these facilities and preparing the geographic data for the board members. Mr. Cervantes presented the corresponding map, noting that staff will update it continuously as new permits are issued for churches and daycare facilities. He explained that, should the ordinance be adopted, any

new application for a tobacco or smoke shop will be cross-referenced against this map. Furthermore, he emphasized that staff will perform a thorough secondary review of each application to ensure full compliance with the ordinance and to account for any facilities not yet captured on the map.

Chairwoman Izaguirre asked about the impact of the ordinance on existing businesses, specifically asking what the procedure would be when an established shop applies for a permit renewal.

Mr. Cervantes clarified that because existing smoke and tobacco shops do not currently operate under Conditional Use Permits (CUP), they are permitted to continue their operations as established. However, he noted that if a business were to close and a new business sought to take over the location, the new application would be subject to the updated regulatory requirements.

Chairwoman Izaguirre further inquired whether the ordinance's requirements would be triggered by a change of ownership for an existing establishment.

Mr. Cervantes confirmed that a change of ownership would indeed trigger the new requirements, meaning the ordinance would apply to the new owners.

Ms. Thompson inquired whether a specific version of the map existed that isolated or overlapped the locations of schools and churches. She noted that she had not yet reviewed that particular data set.

Mr. Cervantes confirmed that the map displays significant overlapping of the regulated zones, particularly along Conway, due to the high density of identified facilities.

Ms. Thompson requested clarification regarding the map's legend, specifically inquiring if the blue dots represented the specific locations of the establishments in question.

Mr. Cervantes confirmed that the blue dots represent existing locations situated within the 1,000 foot radius of the different facilities.

Ms. Thompson sought clarification on the map's details, questioning whether it specifically identified the locations of schools or churches.

Mr. Cervantes explained that all identified facilities were grouped onto a single map. He noted that while staff considered using different colors for categorization, they ultimately decided to provide a consolidated list of the specific locations instead.

Chairwoman Izaguirre questioned the distinction between a smoke shop and a tobacco store, suggesting that the two types of businesses are essentially the same.

Mr. Cervantes clarified that the proposed ordinance contains specific definitions to distinguish between the different types of establishments.

Ms. Thompson inquired whether the ordinance considered the proximity of smoke shops to one another, similar to regulations used for other business types like car washes.

Chairwoman Izaguirre expressed her opinion that there is no functional difference between the two types of businesses, stating that she believes they are the same thing.

Ms. Thompson pointed out that while the ordinance mandates a 1,000-foot distance from schools, it does not explicitly state that a smoke shop is prohibited from being located within that same distance of another smoke shop.

Chairwoman Izaguirre noted that she recalled seeing a provision in the ordinance requiring a minimum separation distance from other existing smoke shops as well.

Mr. Cervantes confirmed that the 1,000 foot separation requirement applies between shops, noting that existing tobacco and smoke stores were included on the map to account for this distance

Mr. Sanchez acknowledged the clarification, noting that he had previously overlooked the provision requiring a minimum separation distance from other schools.

Chairwoman Izaguirre requested a clarification on the specific distinction between the two, asking for a formal definition of a tobacco store.

Mr. Sanchez noted that he had reviewed the provided definitions but sought further clarification on their application. He specifically inquired whether a business such as Walgreens, which sells cigarettes as part of a broader inventory, would be classified as a tobacco store under the proposed ordinance.

Mr. Cervantes clarified that the ordinance includes specific provisions exempting certain businesses from being classified as tobacco shops. He stated that facilities such as gas stations are not considered tobacco shops under these regulations.

Chairwoman Izaguirre sought further clarification, noting that the ordinance specifically mentions vape shops.

Mr. Cervantes confirmed that vape shops are classified as smoke shops under the ordinance. He observed that these businesses typically occupy small suites within various commercial plazas and noted a recent trend of their rapid proliferation throughout the city.

Chairwoman Izaguirre requested a precise definition of a tobacco store, seeking to understand how it is distinguished from other retail establishments under the proposed ordinance.

Mr. Cervantes explained that the ordinance uses a combined definition for smoke shops and tobacco stores. He defined these as any premises dedicated to the display, sale, distribution, or marketing of tobacco products and paraphernalia. However, he clarified that grocery stores, supermarkets, and convenience stores are exempt from this definition and the resulting restrictions if their tobacco sales are strictly ancillary to their primary retail operations Law Insider.

Chairwoman Izaguirre asked if there was any input in favor or against the request.

Lieutenant David Besson, representing the Mission Police Department, spoke on behalf of the Chief of Police in support of the ordinance. He stated that the department favors the measure because it is designed to limit youth accessibility to tobacco products by restricting their proximity to schools. Regarding the distinction between the establishments, Lieutenant Besson shared his understanding that tobacco stores primarily sell cigarettes, cigars, and related paraphernalia, while smoke shops are more specifically geared toward vaping products.

Chairwoman Izaguirre entertained a motion to close the public hearing. Ms. Thompson moved to close the public hearing. Mr. Sanchez seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Chairwoman Izaguirre asked if the board had any questions.

There was none.

There being no further discussion, Chairwoman Izaguirre entertained a motion. Ms. Thompson moved to approve the ordinance amendment. Mr. Sanchez seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Started: 5:44 p.m.

Ended: 5:56 p.m.

Item #8

Conduct a public hearing and consideration of the adoption of an ordinance amending the Code of Ordinances Appendix A - Zoning, Article X. Conditional Use Permits, Section 1.56 Conditions of Conditional Use; Subsection 3, Bars, Cocktail Lounges, Taverns, Cantinas, Saloons, Dancehalls, Discotheques, Discos or Nightclubs, by Adding Subsection H, Establishing License Security Officers Requirements Based on the Maximum Occupancy of the Venue. Applicant: City of Mission

Mr. Cervantes stated this ordinance will establish requirements for licensed security requirements in certain entertainment venues. The ordinance established a requirement of one licensed security officer for every 60 patrons. Chairwoman Izaguirre asked if there was any input in favor or against the request. Staff recommends the adoption of the ordinance.

Mr. Cervantes presented an ordinance amendment designed to establish clear guidelines for security personnel in bars and clubs. He explained that the City Council raised concerns regarding a previous case where only one licensed security officer was required. Under the new proposal, the number of security officers will be determined by maximum occupancy, requiring one licensed security officer for every 60 patrons. For instance, an establishment with a maximum occupancy of 65 people would be required to staff two licensed officers. Mr. Cervantes noted that, upon adoption, these requirements will be implemented during the processing of new Conditional Use Permits (CUP) for bars and clubs.

Ms. Thompson inquired about the justification for the 60-to-1 ratio, specifically asking if the figure was based on standards from another jurisdiction or established guidelines.

Mr. Cervantes explained that his research indicated McAllen is currently the only nearby city with similar guidelines, requiring one security officer for every 75 patrons. He noted that the proposed ordinance would be stricter than McAllen's by requiring one officer for every 60 patrons.

Mr. Cervantes stated that this higher standard is intended to prevent the types of issues experienced by bars in McAllen and Brownsville. He reiterated that the City Council requested these clear, specific guidelines for licensed security requirements when issuing permits for bars and lounges.

Ms. Thompson inquired about the scope of the amendment, asking for an estimate of the total number of bars and lounges that would be affected by the new security regulations.

Mr. Cervantes reported that staff had processed five applications within the past year involving licensed security requirements, consisting of four bars and one event center. He noted that the new regulations would be applied to these establishments as they come forward for their permit renewals.

Ms. Thompson sought clarification on whether the new security requirements would be applied retroactively, asking if the ordinance only applied to future applications and if existing establishments would be exempt from these changes.

Mr. Cervantes explained that existing establishments, such as Taboo and others, are required to apply for permit renewals. He clarified that as these businesses submit their renewal applications, staff will apply the updated security guidelines to ensure they meet the new standards.

Ms. Thompson inquired about the frequency of the renewal process for Conditional Use Permits (CUPs) or business licenses.

Mr. Cervantes clarified that the renewal process for Conditional Use Permits (CUP) for bars typically occurs on a one-year basis.

Ms. Thompson expressed her reservations regarding the proposed 60-to-1 ratio, stating that a 75-to-1 ratio appeared more reasonable to her. While she acknowledged that the 60-to-1 requirement is intentionally more stringent, she suggested the lower threshold felt somewhat excessive.

Mr. Cervantes maintained that the 60-to-1 ratio was selected to ensure the city remains on the safer side regarding public security and order.

Mr. Sanchez inquired whether the City Council had provided any specific guidance or reasoning for selecting the 60-patron threshold for security requirements.

Mr. Cervantes explained that the 60-patron threshold was a figure he developed and presented to the City Council, who expressed their agreement with the stricter standard compared to McAllen. He noted that while Brownsville is considering similar measures, he believes 60 serves as an effective "cutoff" for requiring additional security. Furthermore, he clarified that smaller establishments with a maximum occupancy of 50 or 55 would only require one officer. He also emphasized that this requirement is specifically targeted for the hours of 8:00 p.m. to 2:00 a.m., rather than being an all-day mandate.

Chairwoman Izaguirre sought clarification on the adequacy of the proposed staffing levels, inquiring whether the board members believed the requirement of one officer per 60 patrons might be excessive.

Ms. Thompson expressed her concern that the proposed ratio was too strict, indicating that the requirement for one officer per 60 patrons appeared to be an overly stringent regulation for the establishments.

Chairwoman Izaguirre inquired about the previous standards, seeking clarification on the specific security requirements that were in place prior to the proposed amendment City of Mission Planning.

Ms. Thompson remarked that there was effectively no specific standard in place previously, suggesting that the prior requirements were either non-existent or lacked a formal, codified ratio City of Mission Planning.

Chairwoman Izaguirre proposed an alternative threshold for the security requirement, suggesting that the mandate for multiple licensed officers should perhaps only begin once an establishment reaches a maximum occupancy of 100 patrons.

Ms. Thompson expressed her agreement, noting that the measure appears to be excessively strict. She inquired about the enactment date of McAllen Ordinance 75-1.

Mr. Cervantes clarified that the regulation has actually been in effect for a significant period.

Ms. Thompson further noted that the city has not increased certain ratio following the McAllen incidents.

Chairwoman Izaguirre asked if they could first to start with 200 and then see what City Council will decide.

Mr. Sanchez inquired whether any stakeholders had provided input regarding the matter and specifically questioned if they had been given official notice. He further noted that they had not been notified and asked for confirmation on whether the city had reached out to them at all.

Mr. Cervantes admitted that the city did not proactively reach out to stakeholders. He noted, however, that the owner of Taboo a local establishment mentioned having four security guards since the business owners are often already aware of these requirements due to previous interactions with the city.

Ms. Thompson noted that some individuals may feel a need for assistance based on the specific requirements of their clientele.

Chairwoman Izaguirre pointed out that the establishment in question had closed down.

Ms. Thompson argued that the level of strictness required often depends on the clientele. She observed that while some groups consist of children who might require more discipline, others are composed of older individuals or professionals.

Mr. Cervantes suggested that a recommendation could be made to adjust the ratio to one for every 75, rather than the current every 60.

Chairwoman Izaguirre expressed her concern that a ratio of 75 would be too strict, suggesting instead that a limit of 100 might be more appropriate.

Mr. Sanchez stated that while he did not personally have an issue with the ratio of 60, he preferred to hear directly from the stakeholders first. He suggested that bar owners might either welcome the regulation or find it too restrictive, noting that a ratio of 100 could potentially be a better alternative based on their feedback.

Mr. Cervantes proposed that the board table the item to allow staff the opportunity to contact the five businesses currently subject to the requirement and gather their feedback.

Ms. Thompson clarified that the active businesses would be the ones primarily affected by the regulation. She expressed concern that these establishments, rather than those pending renewal, would feel "blindsided" by the sudden implementation of the new requirements.

Mr. Cervantes confirmed that because businesses only report for renewal once a year, that specific interaction would be the designated time to inform them of the new security officer requirements.

Chairwoman Izaguirre expressed her agreement, stating that businesses should be properly informed of the new requirements.

Mr. Sanchez expressed his desire to hear public comments from the stakeholders regarding the matter.

Ms. Thompson argued that the outreach should extend beyond the five current applicants to include all businesses facing future renewals. She emphasized that failing to include them would be unfair, as they would eventually be subject to the same requirements.

Mr. Cervantes clarified that the requirement currently applies to only five businesses.

Ms. Thompson questioned the figure, asking for clarification on whether only five establishments would be affected by the requirement.

Mr. Cervantes clarified that the five establishments consist of four bars and one event center.

Ms. Thompson sought confirmation that only those five specific establishments would be subject to the proposed regulation.

Mr. Cervantes explained that the requirement would apply to new establishments, such as brand-new bars or lounges, as they enter the system.

Mr. Sanchez inquired whether the requirement would also apply to existing bars reapplying for their Conditional Use Permit (CUP).

Mr. Cervantes clarified that the requirement currently applies only to the five establishments mentioned as they return for renewal. However, he noted that the rules would also apply to any brand-new businesses, such as a bar or lounge, seeking to open within a commercial plaza.

Ms. Thompson clarified that there are currently only five existing Conditional Use Permits (CUPs) subject to the rule, consisting specifically of four bars and one event center.

Ms. Jessica Munoz pointed out that there are additional businesses that have not yet returned for their renewal process.

Ms. Thompson confirmed that the regulation would ultimately apply to all establishments currently operating under a Conditional Use Permit (CUP).

Chairwoman Izaguirre expressed her agreement with Ms. Thompson, citing the current economic challenges facing local businesses. She shared an example of a local restaurant owner whose sales have decreased by 40%, arguing that smaller event centers would struggle to remain viable if burdened with the cost of a security officer for as few as 60 guests. The Chairwoman further noted that individuals hosting small events often choose such venues because they cannot host them at home; requiring a security officer for such a small group would make these events unaffordable. She concluded that imposing a 60-person threshold would make it increasingly difficult for businesses to operate during a period of declining sales across the board.

Ms. Thompson observed that many business owners understand their own demographics and will proactively hire additional security based on their specific clientele. She expressed her personal opinion that a requirement for every 60 people is too restrictive.

Chairwoman Izaguirre questioned whether the alternative would be to eliminate the requirement entirely.

Ms. Thompson suggested that the board would have no basis for comparison if they implemented a strict requirement without first "testing the waters." She cautioned that once a standard is established, it becomes difficult to justify increasing or adjusting it without historical data to support such a change.

Mr. Cervantes explained that the board has previously only required such measures in a limited capacity.

Ms. Thompson suggested establishing a higher initial threshold as a baseline. She argued that if that starting point proves ineffective, the board could then adjust the ratio downward, but emphasized the need for a starting point that allows for evaluation.

Chairwoman Izaguirre expressed her agreement with Mr. Sanchez, reiterating the need to hear directly from the stakeholders. She indicated that her perspective was informed by the potential impact on other businesses that have yet to weigh in.

Mr. Sanchez emphasized his desire to hear from the stakeholders, noting that the regulation affects various parties in different ways. He illustrated the practical impact of the different ratios, pointing out that a requirement for one officer per 60 guests would necessitate five officers for a crowd of 300, whereas a ratio of one per 100 would only require three. Mr. Sanchez noted that the stakeholders could provide specific insight into the actual costs and financial implications they are currently facing.

Chairwoman Izaguirre expressed her astonishment at the reported figures, specifically referencing a 40% decrease in sales over a six-hour period. She noted that if an establishment designed to operate at full capacity is experiencing such a significant decline, then bars are likely being impacted just as severely.

Mr. Cervantes suggested that the board table the item and organize a workshop, inviting all relevant business owners to gather their feedback.

Ms. Thompson expressed her support for the proposal, noting that organizing a workshop would be a beneficial approach.

Chairwoman Izaguirre clarified that rather than a workshop, the board should notify stakeholders of an upcoming public hearing. She emphasized the importance of ensuring the business owners are fully informed about the specific topics under discussion beforehand.

Ms. Thompson acknowledged that while the meeting agenda is made public, business owners are often too busy to monitor every specific item. She emphasized that simply posting the agenda may not be sufficient, as these stakeholders might miss the notification due to the demands of running their businesses.

Mr. Cervantes expressed his support for the updated approach and offered to personally reach out to the business owners since the board maintains their contact information. He proposed scheduling a follow-up public hearing in one month covering two meetings to ensure all bar owners are directly informed about the potential changes.

Chairwoman Izaguirre agreed, noting that the business owners might have various questions once they are present at the hearing. She emphasized the importance of providing them with the opportunity to seek clarification in person.

Mr. Sanchez stated that he would encourage the stakeholders to provide public comments. He added that if they are unable to attend in person, they should at least be given the opportunity to submit their feedback in writing.

Chairwoman Izaguirre expressed her agreement, confirming that providing stakeholders with an opportunity for written or verbal input was necessary.

Mr. Cervantes confirmed the plan to reschedule the public hearing for two meetings from the current date. He stated that, in the interim, he will personally contact each bar owner to inform them of the proposal and solicit their feedback. He further noted that he will invite them to attend the upcoming meeting or, if they are unable to attend, to submit their comments directly to him for the board's consideration.

There being no further discussion, Chairwoman Izaguirre entertained a motion. Ms. Thompson moved table the ordinance amendment request. Mr. Sanchez seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

ITEM#10
ADJOURNMENT

There being no discussion, Chairwoman Izaguirre entertained a motion. Ms. Thompson moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Sanchez seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion to adjourn passed unanimously at 5:56 p.m.

Diana Izaguirre, Chairwoman
Planning and Zoning Commission