

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

**P&Z PRESENT**

Irene Thompson  
Diana Izaguirre  
Kevin Sanchez  
Connie Garza  
David Villarreal

**P&Z ABSENT**

Raquenel Austin  
Steven Alaniz

**STAFF PRESENT**

Elisa Zurita  
Gabriel Ramirez  
Ana G. Bazaldua  
Xavier Cervantes  
Alex Hernandez

**GUEST PRESENT**

Lourdes Lerma  
Ramon Sotelo  
Maria E. Salinas  
Miguel Vargas  
Silvia Cantu  
Joaquin Diaz  
Jonathan Morales

**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 MARCH 4, 2026**

Chairwoman Izaguirre asked if there were any corrections to the minutes for March 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: 5:32 p.m.**

**Item #2**

**Rezoning:**

**Being Lots 5 and 6, Block 180,  
Mission Original Townsite Subdivision  
This property is located at 1000 and 1004 N. Holland Avenue  
R-1 to R-2  
Miguel Angel Vargas**

Mr. Cervantes stated that the applicant is requesting to rezone the subject properties from Single-family Residential District ("R-1") to Duplex-fourplex Residential District ("R-2") to develop a triplex apartment complex at each lot. The properties are located at the Northeast corner of N. Holland Avenue and W. 10th Street. The lots of record have a combined 15,000 square feet in area and measure 100 feet along Holland Avenue and 150 feet along W. 10th Street. The surrounding zoning is Single-family Residential (R-1) District to the North, East and South and Public (P) District to the West. The surrounding land uses include single-family homes to the North, a 6-unit apartment complex to the East, the Leo Marcel Elementary school to the West and the "La Fruteria" business to the South. There is a paved alley along the East side of the 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, however, staff feels that the properties with frontage on Holland Avenue are in transition to multifamily uses. Notices were mailed

to 17 surrounding property owners. Planning staff has not received any 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 questions.

Mr. Sanchez inquired about the location of the apartment complex.

Mr. Cervantes explained that although the aerial photo should have been zoomed out, the complex is located immediately to the east. He clarified that the development consists of three units on one lot and three units on another.

Mr. Cervantes confirmed that there is a triplex on Lot 7 and another triplex on Lot 8.

Mr. Sanchez inquired whether Lots 7 and 8 were Mr. Cervantes' other locations.

Mr. Cervantes confirmed the map's accuracy but expressed uncertainty about how to adjust the zoom for the apartment complex. He suggested that if the current proposal is approved, city-initiated rezoning should be pursued for Lots 7 and 8 to match with the structures he has already developed there.

Ms. Garza inquired whether the City Council had planned to place a hold on the construction of new apartments within the neighborhood.

Mr. Cervantes explained that city staff previously processed a case on the west side where the city had downzoned an entire neighborhood containing duplexes, triplexes, and apartments. He noted that despite the downzoning, an R-2 application was approved by the City Council because there was no opposition. He concluded that the Council appears receptive to apartment projects as long as surrounding property owners do not object.

Mr. Sanchez inquired whether the white building directly to the north was a single-family residence.

Mr. Cervantes confirmed that the building is a single-family home and noted that the entire area to the north consists of single-family residences.

Chairwoman Izaguirre noted that the schools were located on the left-hand side.

Mr. Cervantes confirmed that there are apartments located immediately behind the property, though he apologized that the aerial photo was not zoomed out enough to show them. He noted that Holland is a collector street, which he believes is suitable for higher-density use. Additionally, he pointed out that the school across the street makes the location particularly attractive to potential tenants.

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: 5:32 p.m.**

**Ended: 5:38 p.m.**

**Item #3**

**Rezoning:**

**Being Lot 25, Ala Blanca Subdivision Unit No. 2,  
This property is located at 2425 W. U.S. Expressway 83,  
R-1 to C-1  
JQ Holdings Corp. Inc.**

Mr. Cervantes stated that the applicant is requesting to rezone the subject property from Single-family Residential District ("R-1") to Office Building District ("C-1") to convert the existing house into an office building. The code of ordinances states that the main purpose of the office building zoning is to provide office uses, office sales uses and certain personal services of a nature that will not have a blighting effect on adjacent residential areas. The lot of record measures 50 feet in width and has a depth of 180 feet for a total area of 9,000 square feet. The surrounding zones are General Business (C-3) District to the Northwest and Northeast and Single-family Residential (R-1) District to the Southeast and Southwest. The property has a single-family residential home. The surrounding land uses include an office complex to the Northwest and single-family homes to the Southeast and Southwest. The Future Land Use Map shows the property designated for commercial uses. The requested rezoning is in line with the comprehensive plan designation. Notices were mailed to twenty-two (22) surrounding property owners. Planning staff received no phone calls from the surrounding property owners. 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 questions.

Ms. Garza inquired whether other zoning classifications, such as C-1 or C-3, exist in the area.

Mr. Cervantes noted that while the area contains some C-3 and C-2 zones, the current request is for C-1 zoning, which represents a less intense use. He further explained that because the comprehensive plan designates all those lots for commercial use, the proposal remains consistent with the plan's long-term goals.

Ms. Garza confirmed that the proposed classification represents a less intense zoning use.

Mr. Cervantes confirmed that C-1 zone is a less intense zone than C-2 zone or C-3 zone.

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: 5:38 p.m.**

**Ended: 5:44 p.m.**

**Item #4**

**Rezoning:**

**Being Tract 1: The North 7.19 acres of Lot 39,  
Tract 2: a 10-acre tract of land out of Lot 40,  
Tract 3: an 8.45-acre tract of land out of Lot 41,  
Tract 4: a 1.020-acre tract of land being all of the  
existing 70-foot strip of United Irrigation District Canal  
right-of way between lots 40 and 41,  
all out of the Bell-Woods Company's Subdivision "C",  
This property is located along the East side of N.  
Trospen Road approximately 100 feet North of Palmer Road,  
R-2 to R-1  
DS3 Development LLC**

Mr. Cervantes stated that due to changing market conditions, the applicant is requesting to rezone the subject property located along the East side of Trospen Road from Duplex-fourplex Residential District ("R-2") to Single-family Residential (R-1) District to sell the lots for single-family homes. The tract of land measures 634 feet along Trospen Road and has a depth of 1,320 feet for a total acreage of 26.79 acres. Tracts 1, 2 & 3 were zoned Duplex-fourplex Residential (R-2) District on May 22, 2023. Tract 4 was zoned R-2 on October 28, 2024. The proposed Bellwood Manor Phase 1 subdivision was approved with conditions by the City Council on September 23, 2025. The subdivision under construction will result in 30 lots measuring, on the average, 85 feet by 132 feet. The surrounding zones are Agricultural Open Interim (AO-I) District to the West, Duplex-fourplex Residential (R-2) District to the South, Agricultural Open Interim (AO-I) District and Townhouse Residential (R1-T) District to the East, and outside the city limits to the North. The surrounding land uses is a fourplex apartment subdivision to the South, a single-family home and agricultural land to the West and East. The Future Land Use Map shows the property designated for low-density residential uses. The requested rezoning is in line with the comprehensive plan designation. Notices were mailed to 36 surrounding property owners. Planning staff received no phone calls in opposition to the rezoning. Staff recommends approval of the rezoning request.

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

Ms. Ester Salinas, the owner of Lot 35 at 3318 Compton Drive, is presenting several serious concerns and violations regarding the current 36.8-acre development to the Planning & Zoning Commission. As the owner of a three-acre natural habitat, Ms. Salinas has recommended master planning and tree preservation since the project's inception.

Ms. Salinas previously collaborated with former City Manager Martin Garza to establish the 12-foot wide blacktop on Compton Drive. This public road was specifically designed to provide accessibility for her grandson, who uses a wheelchair, and her cousin, who has dementia. However, she reports that the developer's heavy truck traffic and continuous use of the road driven in part by the

commercial rental of the La Munequita Event Center has caused significant damage, resulting in potholes and structural breakage.

Furthermore, Ms. Salinas highlights a severe environmental and health hazard caused by excessive dust migrating from the development site to her property. This dust has negatively impacted her severe allergies and is burying the natural habitat on her land. She is particularly concerned for her colony of Texas Horned Toads; the dust and gravel are covering the ant mounds that serve as their primary food source.

Despite contacting city managers and inspectors, and despite the issue being featured on Channel 5 news, Ms. Salinas states that adequate dust control has not been implemented. She is requesting that the developer take responsibility for road improvements similar to the extensions required of previous developers and implement professional vacuum sweeping and fencing. Ms. Salinas has documented these issues with extensive photographic evidence and has consulted the Attorney General's office regarding these grievances, seeking a formal remedy to protect her property and health.

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

Chairwoman Izaguirre asked if the board had any questions.

Ms. Thompson inquired whether the developer intended to utilize the existing subdivision plat for the project.

Mr. Cervantes stated that, to his knowledge, the subdivision plat would remain unchanged. He noted that the developer intends to maintain the larger lot sizes currently planned, as there is an apparent market demand for bigger homes in that area.

Ms. Thompson inquired whether it was R1 or R1A.

Mr. Cervantes stated that it was R1.

Mr. Cervantes noted that while they could have applied for R1A, they ultimately applied for R1.

Ms. Thompson asked whether the lots would fit within the R1A classification.

Mr. Cervantes explained that while R1 allows for 50-by-100-foot lots and R1A requires 60-by-120-foot lots, the owner chose to apply for R1. He noted that the lots in question are actually larger than typical single-family subdivisions, averaging 85 by 130 feet.

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

**Started: 5:44 p.m.**

**Ended: 5:52 p.m.**

**Item #5**

**Conditional Use Permit:**

**A Mobile Food Unit – Café Allegro  
Being Lot 2, Walters Subdivision,  
This property is located at 200 E. Griffin Parkway,  
C-3  
Jonathan Morales**

Mr. Cervantes stated that the subject site is located at 200 E. Griffin Parkway. Per Code of Ordinance, Mobile Food Units require the approval of a Conditional Use Permit by the City Council. The applicant is leasing an area within the HEB to place Café Allegro Mobile Food Unit. He offers a variety of coffees and pastries. This operation is only for pick-up and go. The applicant did not consult with the planning staff before signing the lease agreement. Site access includes (3) access points: two 36-foot-wide access driveways off of Griffin Parkway and one 36-foot-wide access driveway off of Conway Avenue. The proposed days and hours of operation are Monday–Saturday from 7:00 am to 5:00 pm, closed on Sundays. Staff: 2 employees. Parking: HEB has a total of 251 parking spaces available that will be shared amongst several businesses. The last conditional use permit approved for this mobile food unit was at a different location and was approved for a period of two years. The application for this conditional use permit was submitted after the April 28, 2025, ordinance amendment, placing limitations for new mobile food units to be located with a one mile minimum distance separation from existing mobile food units. The proposed location is 1,276 feet from the existing mobile food unit located at 1931 N Conway. The Planning staff has not received any objections to the request from the surrounding property owners. Staff mailed out (20) legal notices to surrounding property owners. In accordance with the zoning ordinance, the P&Z and City Council may impose requirements and conditions of approval to ensure that a use requested by a Conditional Use Permit is compatible and complementary to adjacent properties. Staff recommends denial of the Conditional Use Permit since it does not comply with the new minimum distance requirement from other existing mobile food units. However, if the board or Council is inclined to approve the request, then staff recommends the following conditions: 1) 1-year re-evaluation in order to assess this new operation; 2) Must comply with all City Codes (Building, Fire, Health, Sign, etc.); 3) Restrooms must be accessible to the employees and patrons at all times; 4) Acquisition of a business license prior to occupancy; 5) CUP is not transferable to others; and 6) Hours of operation are Monday – Saturday from 7:00 am to 5:00 pm. Closed on Sundays.

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.

Ms. Thompson asked if they had one at that moment.

Mr. Cervantes confirmed that they had an approved mobile food unit located on Griffin Parkway and west of Bryan Road.

Chairwoman Izaguirre asked if the location was near number four.

Mr. Cervantes confirmed that it was listed as number four on the green table and He explained that while the individual had an approved mobile food unit at that location, the proposed relocation would violate the current ordinance.

Mr. Sanchez asked for clarification, noting that the request was for a relocation rather than an addition to the existing setup.

Mr. Cervantes clarified that the unit was not a new one.

Ms. Thompson inquired about the City Council's stance during previous discussions regarding scenarios where an existing unit sought to relocate.

Mr. Cervantes recalled a similar case from approximately six months prior involving a church property at the southwest corner of Conway and Griffin Parkway. He noted that staff and the Planning and Zoning Commission had recommended disapproval of the proposed mobile food unit due to be in violation of the ordinance. The City Council ultimately denied the request.

Ms. Thompson clarified that she was not referring to brand-new units, but rather to cases where an existing unit was already positioned very close to or nearly within the restricted area. She inquired whether the City Council had expressed an opinion or held discussions specifically regarding those existing units seeking to relocate.

Mr. Cervantes stated that this was the first time they had encountered this specific issue.

Ms. Thompson asked whether the individual would be approved for a renewal if they remained at their current location.

Mr. Cervantes confirmed that, under those circumstances, the renewal would be approved.

Ms. Thompson asked for clarification, noting that the only reason for the denial appeared to be the change in location, which happened to be within approximately a mile of existing mobile food units in the area.

Mr. Cervantes clarified that the proposed location was within less than a mile of existing local buildings.

Mr. Jonathan Morales residing at 2801 Woodrow Street introduced himself to the Commission.

Ms. Thompson inquired whether the new location was at H-E-B and asked if a contract lease agreement was already in place or how that process functioned.

Mr. Morales explained that he had a contract with H-E-B as part of a new rollout. He noted that after a catering event, the company invited him to operate on their property. He acknowledged that moving there violated the code but requested consideration for the situation.

Ms. Thompson asked whether the unit was already operating at the new site.

Mr. Morales clarified that they were not currently on the new site and had returned to their previous approved location.

Ms. Thompson asked if they had already been at the new site and then moved back.

Mr. Morales confirmed that they had been at the new site and moved back.

Ms. Thompson asked for clarification, inquiring if they had already moved over to the H-E-B location.

Mr. Morales confirmed that they had moved because H-E-B had invited them to the site. He explained that they were unaware they were violating the ordinance at the time.

Ms. Thompson asked for confirmation that the applicant believed their current permit would automatically transfer to the new location, only to find they had to restart the process. She also expressed interest in the H-E-B initiative, inquiring if it was a program being rolled out in other areas.

Mr. Morales stated that he was not entirely sure, but he understood it to be a new initiative they were testing in other stores to the North. He added that they were interested in doing similar work there.

Ms. Thompson asked if H-E-B had approached him.

Mr. Morales confirmed that after his business performed a catering event for H-E-B, the company offered them the opportunity to serve at their location.

Mr. Sanchez expressed that he felt more inclined to be forgiving, noting that the request was for a relocation rather than a new permit.

Ms. Thompson agreed, noting that the distance from the current location (number four on the green map) to the proposed spot in the H-E-B parking lot appeared to be very small perhaps only about 100 feet within the restricted area. She emphasized that the involvement of H-E-B was a significant factor, as the company is known for its efforts to improve the community and support such initiatives.

Mr. Cervantes acknowledged that because the request was for a relocation rather than a brand-new unit the board could recommend approval if desired.

Mr. Sanchez asked whether the applicants were required to abandon their old location or if they intended to move back and forth between the two sites.

Mr. Cervantes suggested that the City Council might grant approval on the condition that the applicant abandon their existing location for the new one.

Ms. Thompson noted that such cases would likely become more frequent and questioned what the standard should be for units already operating within a restricted area. While acknowledging that future cases might need to be handled on a case-by-case basis, she expressed her inclination to move for approval in this specific instance.

Ms. Garza cautioned that if H-E-B did not renew the lease and the City Council granted approval for the relocation, the applicant would be responsible for finding a new location that complied with the city ordinance.

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

**Started: 5:52 p.m.**

**Ended: 5:53 p.m.**

**Item #6**

**Conditional Use Permit:                    To Construct a Pool House  
Being Lot 8, Block 1, Golden Crest Manor Subdivision,  
This property is located at 1615 Heritage Lane,  
R-1  
Silvia Cantu**

Mr. Cervantes stated that the subject site is located 825 feet East of N. Stewart Road along the North side of Heritage Lane. Pursuant to Section 1.371 (3) (d) of the City of Mission Code of Ordinances, a guest house or separate servant's quarters must comply with regulations. The property has an area of 15,517 square feet. The code requires a 12,000-square-foot minimum lot. The pool house cannot be made available or used for lease, rent, hire, and the owner of such use may not receive remuneration for the use of one of the above, and must be clearly secondary to the primary residence. A pool house shall not have access to a public street (No shared/extended driveway) and shall not have a separate kitchen area or utilities. Proposed activities: The applicant is proposing to construct a pool house for the family. The applicant is proposing to construct a 427 square feet pool house that consists of a changing room, bathroom, and a game room. The Planning staff has not received any objections to the request from the surrounding property owners. Staff mailed out (16) legal notices to surrounding property owners. In accordance with the zoning ordinance, the P&Z and City Council may impose requirements and conditions of approval to ensure that a use requested by a Conditional Use Permit is compatible and complementary to adjacent properties. Staff recommends approval with the conditions below: 1) Life of use permit; 2) The unit may not have a kitchen or separate utilities and electrical connections; 3) Transferability to other future owners, imposing the same conditions imposed on this applicant, and 4) Not to be used for rental purposes.

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 conditional use permit request. Mr. Sanchez seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

**Started: 5:53 p.m.**

**Ended: 5:56 p.m.**

**Item #7**

**Conditional Use Permit:**

**A Bar and for the Sale & On-site Consumption of Alcoholic Beverages – Sidelines Bar & Grill  
Being Lot 1, Alba Plaza Subdivision,  
This property is located at 608 N. Shary Road,  
C-3  
Briella's Bistro, LLC  
c/o Martha Rivas**

Mr. Cervantes stated the subject site is located along the East side of Shary Road, approximately ¼ mile south of East Business Highway 83, within a commercial plaza. Access to the site is via a 34' driveway off Shary Road. Per Code of Ordinance, the Sale & On-site Consumption of Alcoholic Beverages requires the approval of a Conditional Use Permit by the City Council. The applicant is leasing a 2,251 square foot suite within a commercial plaza for a Bar & Grill. This item was previously approved by the City Council on December 9, 2025. However, the applicant has decided to change the name of the business; therefore, a new Conditional Use Permit is required. The suite includes a small stage for DJ or Karaoke, 1 VIP area, a photo area, a bar, a kitchen, and a storage area. Days & Hours of Operation: Tuesday – Thursday from 11:00 am to 12:00 am, Friday – Saturday from 11:00 am to 2:00 am, and Sunday from 11:00 am to 10:00 pm. Staff: 10 employees Parking: there is a total of 55 seating spaces proposed (10 tables, 1 VIP area, bar), which requires 18 parking spaces (55 seats/1 space for every 3 seats – 18.3 parking spaces). It is noted that the parking is held in common. There is a total of 136 existing parking spaces, shared with other businesses within the commercial plaza. Sale of Alcohol: Section 1.56(3)(a) of the Zoning Code requires a minimum separation of 300' from the property line of any church, school, publicly owned property, or residence. There is a residential subdivision within 300 feet; however, P&Z and City Council have waived this separation requirement in previous conditional use permits. The applicant proposes to have security on-site. The Planning staff has not received any objections to the request from the surrounding property owners. Staff mailed out (28) legal notices to surrounding property owners. In accordance with the zoning ordinance, the P&Z and City Council may impose requirements and conditions of approval to ensure that a use requested by a Conditional Use Permit is compatible and complementary to adjacent properties. Staff recommends approval of the request, subject to compliance with the following conditions: 1) Permit for one (1) year to continue to assess this new business; 2) Comply with all City Codes (Building, Fire, Health, etc.); 3) Waiver of the 300' separation requirement from the residential homes; 4) Compliance with TABC requirements; 5) CUP is not transferable to others; 6) Must have security cameras inside and outside with a minimum 30-day retention; 7) Hours of operation to be as follows: Tuesday – Thursday from 11:00 am to 12:00 am, Friday – Saturday from 11:00 am to 2:00 am, and Sunday from 11:00 am to 10:00 pm; 8) Must comply with the Noise Ordinance; 9) Maximum occupancy to be 82 at all times; and 10) Must have two (2) level two licensed security guards/officers from 8:00 pm to 2:00 am 11. The use of signage designating VIP or reserved parking is not permitted.

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.

Ms. Garza asked if the noise ordinance defined the decibel levels.

Mr. Cervantes stated that the decibel reader must be set to 65. He noted that while there had been valid complaints regarding the taboo nightclub, the issues had been addressed through remodeling to prevent noise from traveling to the neighborhood to the east.

Chairwoman Izaguirre expressed her belief that they are no longer there.

Mr. Cervantes noted that while noise complaints had previously been limited to that specific location no complaints had been received regarding Lux Lounge. He added that surrounding property owners reported no issues, suggesting that noise is not a concern there.

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

**Started: 5:56 p.m.**

**Ended: 5:57 p.m.**

**Item #8**

**Conditional Use Permit**

**Renewal:**

**To keep a Mobile Food unit - Pepe Noches  
Being Lot C, Girasol Estates Subdivision,  
This property is located at 1726 W. Griffin Parkway,  
C-3  
Joaquin Diaz**

Mr. Cervantes stated the subject site is located at the Northeast corner of W. Griffin Parkway and Salinas Drive. Per Code of Ordinance, a mobile food unit requires the approval of a Conditional Use Permit by the City Council. The applicant is requesting a conditional use permit renewal to keep an 8'x22' mobile food unit underneath the carport to sell Mexican food. His menu includes tacos, enchiladas, papas asadas, and menudo, among other items. The proposed hours of operation are as follows: Monday – Thursday from 5:00 pm to 12:00 am, and Friday & Saturday from 5:00 pm to 1:00 am. Staff: 3 employees. Parking: The applicant is proposing to have 2 tables with 6 chairs each for a total of 12 seating spaces. He will be required to have 4 parking spaces (1 parking space for every 3 seats =4). There is a total of 12 parking spaces available for this location to be shared with the existing carwash. The last conditional use permit approved for the mobile food unit for this location was on April 28, 2025 for a period of 1 year. Staff notes that this would be the first renewal. The Planning staff has not received any objections to the request from the surrounding property owners. Staff mailed out (16) legal notices to surrounding property owners. In accordance with the zoning ordinance, the P&Z and City Council may impose requirements and conditions of approval as are needed to ensure that a use requested by a Conditional Use Permit is compatible and complementary to adjacent properties. Staff recommends approval of the request, subject to compliance with the following conditions. 1) Permit for two (2) years to continue to assess this

business; 2) Continued compliance with all City Codes (Building, Fire, Health, Sign, etc.); 3) CUP is not transferable to others; and 4) Hours of operation are Monday – Thursday from 5:00 pm to 12:00 am, and Friday & Saturday from 5:00 pm to 1:00 am.

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 conditional use permit renewal request. Ms. Garza seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Chairwoman Izaguirre entertained a motion. Mr. Sanchez moved to untabled item # 9. Ms. Thompson seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

**Started: 5:57 p.m.**

**Ended: 6:05 p.m.**

**Item #9**

**Ordinance Amendment: TABLED: 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 Event Centers that sell alcoholic beverages and/or offer Bring your own beverages (BYOB) and Subsection H, Establishing Licensed Security Officers Requirements Based on the Maximum Occupancy of the Venue, Applicant: City of Mission**

Mr. Cervantes stated that this ordinance will establish requirements for licensed security guards/officers in certain entertainment venues. The ordinance would establish a requirement of one licensed security guard/officer for every 60 patrons based on the maximum occupancy of the establishment. The proposed licensed security guard/officer requirement would not apply to businesses classified as restaurants such as Chili's, Wings and Rings for example where more than 50 percent of the sales are made up of food or soft drinks. The licensed security guard/officer proposed requirements would not apply to event centers that do not propose to sell alcoholic beverages or are not Bring Your Own Beverage (BYOB) establishments. The Police Chief attended the Ordinance Review Committee meeting and expressed much support for the proposed ordinance. Staff recommends the adoption of the ordinance.

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

Mr. Chief Torres recommended a Level 2 security officers for these types of venues, noting that it aligns with current city ordinances. He referenced recent news reports from neighboring cities where alcohol consumption among young adults has led to lower inhibitions and incidents requiring police intervention. Torres argued that Level 2 guards possess a more appropriate level of training, expertise, and capacity for these situations compared to Level 3 guards, who may face limitations regarding personnel, equipment, or specialized capabilities.

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

Chairwoman Izaguirre asked if the board had any questions.

Ms. Thompson asked Mr. Cervantes whether the ratio presented previously was 1 to 60 or if it had changed.

Mr. Cervantes stated that the figure was based on the maximum occupancy of the establishment.

Ms. Thompson asked for clarification on whether the officer-to-patron ratio had previously been set at 1 to 60. She recalled past discussions suggesting a ratio of 1 to 100 and noted that a neighboring city, such as McAllen, might have a similar policy in place.

Mr. Cervantes confirmed that McAllen is the only city with a similar policy, though they use a ratio of 1 to 75. He added that Brownsville is considering following Mission's lead by adopting the 1 to 60 ratio for their bars and nightclubs.

Ms. Thompson expressed her support for the 1 to 60 ratio but questioned if they should consider 1 to 75 instead.

Mr. Sanchez stated that he had no issue with the 1 to 60 ratio. He noted that the public had been given the opportunity to provide feedback, and since no concerns were raised, he was comfortable proceeding with that standard.

Mr. Cervantes noted that some phone calls were even in support of the measure, as business owners recognized that increased security would be beneficial to their establishments.

Chairwoman Izaguirre stated that the Council could always modify the ratio in the future if stakeholders requested changes.

Ms. Thompson noted that business owners are free to hire as much security as they desire beyond the minimum requirements. She clarified that if an establishment with 40 patrons wanted to bring in two or even five officers, they have the discretion to do so.

Mr. Cervantes clarified that the proposed figures are the minimum requirements for bars, specifically between the hours of 8:00 p.m. and 2:00 a.m. He noted that law enforcement would conduct periodic checks to ensure compliance, including at the establishment that was recently approved.

Chairwoman Izaguirre questioned whether the minimum security requirement would apply even in instances where only three patrons were present.

Mr. Cervantes confirmed that the requirement would apply regardless of the current occupancy, as the security officer requirements is based on the venue's maximum capacity.

Ms. Thompson asked for the maximum occupancy of the specific establishment that had just been approved as an example.

Mr. Cervantes stated that the maximum occupancy for the approved establishment was 82.

Ms. Thompson clarified that, based on the maximum occupancy of 82, the establishment would be required to have two security officers on-site regardless of whether there were only two or five patrons present.

Mr. Cervantes confirmed that the requirement applies specifically from 8:00 p.m. to 2:00 a.m. He explained that while an establishment might only have five patrons at 8:30 p.m., that number could quickly increase to 20 or more by 9:00 p.m., necessitating the constant presence of security based on maximum occupancy.

Mr. Sanchez inquired whether a check had been conducted on the Sideline Bar & Grill or the specific area in question.

Ms. Thompson clarified that she was referring specifically to the previous establishment the board had just approved.

Mr. Cervantes confirmed that the requirement would be two (2) Level 2 licensed security officers on-site from 8:00 p.m. to 2:00 a.m.

Mr. Sanchez inquired as to which establishment was being discussed, questioning whether the venue in question was actually a restaurant.

Mr. Cervantes clarified that the establishment in question is a bar, not a restaurant. He explained that the establishment is officially classified as a bar because the alcohol sales will be 50% or more of its revenue. He clarified that even if the venue sells food, this classification remains, and noted that the applicant is in agreement with the 1 to 60 security ratio.

Ms. Garza expressed her confidence in the Police Department's review and supported the recommendations they presented.

Mr. Cervantes confirmed that they had met with the Police Chief, who expressed strong support for the proposed ordinance.

Ms. Thompson confirmed that the Police Chief is specifically in favor of the 1 to 60 ratio, noting that he would not be comfortable with a higher ratio and strongly prefers the safety provided by the 60-patron standard.

There being no further discussion, Chairwoman Izaguirre entertained a motion. Ms. Garza moved to approve the ordinance amendment request. Mr. Villarreal seconded the motion. Ms. Thompson voted nayed, Upon a vote 5-1, the motion passed unanimously.

**ITEM#10**

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no discussion, Chairwoman Izaguirre entertained a motion. Mr. Sanchez moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Thompson seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion to adjourn passed unanimously at 6:05 p.m.

---

Diana Izaguirre, Chairwoman  
Planning and Zoning Commission