

MINUTES
PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF UNIVERSAL CITY, TEXAS
Regular Meeting, Monday, October 6, 2025 @ 6:00 PM

1. **CALL TO ORDER:**

Chair Spurlock at 6:02 p.m.

2. **QUORUM CHECK:**

Michael Cassata, Development Services & EDC Director

Present:

Chair Cynthia Spurlock
Commissioner Scott Dagg
Commissioner Sheila Garcia
Commissioner John Hudson
Vice-Chair Linda Sefton
Commissioner Devona Trigilio
Secretary Diane Woods
Commissioner Roslyn McCumber

Staff Present:

Kim Turner, City Manager
Michael Cassata, Development Services & EDC Director
Maribel Garcia, City Clerk

Absent:

Commissioner Deborah Hernandez

Mr. Cassata noted a quorum was present.

3. **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING:**

a. **Regular Meeting - 4 August 2025**

Ms. Woods moved to approve the minutes as presented. Mr. Hudson seconded the motion. **The motion was approved unanimously.**

4. **NEW BUSINESS:**

ITEM 1

a. **Public Hearing: P.C. 627 (SU 031)—A request for a Specific Use Permit for Valvoline at 460 Kitty Hawk (CB 5053N BLK 1 LOT 9) to allow an Automotive Repair Services use in a C3-Commercial Services District, per zoning ordinance 581.**

Mr. Cassata clarified the location of the property. He noted the property was recently subdivided into three lots. He stated the request was for a Valvoline that would provide oil changes. Mr. Cassata added that the Zoning Code requires a SUP due to the auto-service repair use in the C3 District and that final consideration would take place at the October 21st City Council meeting. He showed architectural elevations and the site plan, as well as development details. He noted that JBSA has approved this use given the property was within the AICUZ zone.

Mr. Hudson moved to open the Public Hearing. Ms. Trigilio seconded the motion. **The motion was approved unanimously and Chair Spurlock opened the Public Hearing at 6:09 p.m.**

Bear Goolsby, resident and local business owner, noted that he had been advised on what he could and could not say since he is a City Councilmember. While he could not indicate whether he supported the SUP, he advised the Commission that they are able to use discretion in weighing decisions.

Mr. Cassata clarified that a SUP is to consider whether a use requires certain conditions for safety or to mitigate impacts to neighbors, such as light or noise. He stated that approval of a SUP should not be based on whether the Commission likes the use at that location or believes another use would be the highest and best use.

Ms. Sefton moved to close the Public Hearing. Ms. Garcia seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously and Chair Spurlock closed the Public Hearing at 6:12 p.m.

- b. **Consider: P.C. 627 (SU 031)—A request for a Specific Use Permit for Valvoline at 460 Kitty Hawk (CB 5053N BLK 1 LOT 9) to allow an Automotive Repair Services use in a C3-Commercial Services District, per zoning ordinance 581.**

Ms. Sefton requested a Point of Order. She asked if Councilmember Goolsby could provide his opinion and if the Commission could ask him questions. She also asked and gained clarification regarding permitted uses in the C3 Zoning District.

Mr. Cassata clarified that legal counsel had advised that because the item will go before Council and because his property is on an adjacent tract of land, it would be less complicated if he did not provide comment outside of City Council consideration and, further, he should consider recusing himself from any deliberation on the matter in his capacity as a councilmember.

Ms. Sefton asked Councilmember Goolsby about his concerns, which he clarified.

A discussion ensued regarding architectural materials and adaptive reuse of the property.

Mr. Cassata and Mrs. Turner clarified that another auto-service use that was either the same or more intense would need to be considered before the Commission if the owner decided to vacate.

Mrs. Turner noted JBSA constraints regarding building a restaurant or other retail businesses on that corner due to the AICUZ. She explained that the Air Force preferred lower occupancy uses.

Ms. Sefton and Mr. Cassata discussed other site plan details such as trees and sidewalk plans.

Ms. McCumber received clarification regarding potential ground contamination with automotive oils should another tenant wish to purchase the land. Mr. Cassata noted that the property owner is required to follow TCEQ standards for disposal of chemicals. He added that a potential property buyer would conduct their due diligence and test the soil for contamination.

The Commission discussed ingress/egress points.

Mr. Dagg moved to recommend approval. Ms. Garcia seconded the motion.

Vote: Yeas: Dagg, Garcia, Spurlock, Hudson, McCumber, Sefton, Trigilio, Woods
Nays: None
Motion to approve carried.

ITEM 2

- c. **Public Hearing: P.C. 628 (SU 032)—A request for a Specific Use Permit at 237 Park Lane (CB 5053A BLK 4 LOT 9) to allow a Duplex Residential use in an R3-Medium Density Residential District, per zoning ordinance 581.**

Mr. Cassata explained that the property is currently vacant and a dilapidated single-family home used to occupy the land but was torn down a number of years ago. He further explained that the property owner would like to build a duplex, which the Zoning Code allows with a SUP in the R3 District. He provided project specifics to include unit size, bulk zoning requirements and exterior building materials. He noted that required legal notices were sent out to neighbors with three responses: two against and one in support.

Ms. Garcia moved to open the Public Hearing. Ms. Woods seconded the motion. **The motion was approved unanimously and Chair Spurlock opened the Public Hearing at 6:35 p.m.**

The applicant noted that while the rest of the community only has one-car garages, his proposed duplex would comply with the current Zoning Code requirement of each unit having a two-car, enclosed garage. He shared that his desire is to build something nice in the community.

Upon inquiry from Ms. McCumber, Mr. Cassata explained that the subdivision was built back when the Zoning Code only required a one-car garage. However, the City subsequently updated this requirement for new builds and after a more recent City-wide analysis, provided a path forward for those homeowners wanting to convert existing one-car garages to living spaces by requiring a car port.

Ms. Sefton received confirmation that the duplex would meet the setback requirements. She also confirmed that the property owner could potentially add an ADU in the future so long as they meet zoning requirements.

Ms. Woods asked the owner about the mature trees on the property and whether they would be removed. She received clarification that the trees would most likely not be removed as long as they did not impact the building area.

After a few questions, Ms. Garcia offered translation services for the applicant.

Ms. Sefton received confirmation that the property had been owned by the applicant since 2021. Ms. Sefton and the applicant discussed an instance where a tree fell toward the back of the property impacting the neighbor and other code compliance-related instances.

The applicant responded through Ms. Garcia, stating that he had been the property owner when a tree fell on his property and he was unaware of code compliance complaints. He stated that he would occasionally receive emails from code compliance if the grass was too overgrown. Following questioning from Ms. Sefton, he clarified that he would occasionally not cut the grass until he was informed by code compliance that it was needed.

The applicant confirmed for Mr. Dagg that this was his first duplex property. The applicant answered other questions from the Commission concerning future ownership of the property and the construction company he planned to use to build the duplex. He confirmed that he would maintain the property and he was using a construction company with 9 years experience.

Ms. Olivia Cantu, who lives on Northview Drive, expressed concerns regarding traffic, child safety, street quality and privacy due to two-story buildings.

Mr. Cassata addressed her street concerns and reviewed the upcoming streets maintenance schedule provided by the Public Works Director.

Ms. Cantu expressed that she also felt this development could begin a trend of duplexes in an area that is mostly single-family residential. She had concerns for how density changes in the area could affect the neighborhood.

Ms. Maria Martinez, a nearby neighbor, shared her grievances with the code compliance issues pertaining to yard and brush maintenance. She was also concerned about increased renters in the area. She was specifically concerned that the property owner would accept Section 8 vouchers.

Ms. Vanessa Alvarado, the neighbor across the street, shared her concerns regarding street safety for kids

who play in the street. She felt that decreasing the size of the front yard by having two duplexes could decrease the safety of the kids in the area.

The Commission asked the applicant about rental prices and if he would accept Section 8 vouchers.

After clarification and translation from Ms. Garcia, the applicant stated that he did not plan to accept any Section 8 or Housing Authority assistance programs and planned to have market rate housing and rental prices.

Elidia Soto, 238 Northview Drive, echoed grievances stated by other residents regarding the maintenance of the property and whether the property owner lived in the community. She also expressed her discontent with other roads being repaired prior to their community.

Ms. Garcia moved to close the Public Hearing. Mr. Hudson seconded the motion. **The motion was approved unanimously and Chair Spurlock closed the Public Hearing at 7:05 p.m.**

- d. **Consider: P.C. 628 (SU 032)—A request for a Specific Use Permit at 237 Park Lane (CB 5053A BLK 4 LOT 9) to allow a Duplex Residential use in an R3-Medium Density Residential District, per zoning ordinance 581.**

Ms. Sefton noted that it seemed the neighbors do not want higher-density residential in their area. She stated that duplexes do not fit the neighborhood architecturally or otherwise. She cautioned about the possibility of putting an ADU on the property and then having three rental properties on that lot. She felt the history of the owner in maintaining the land was not favorable. Further, Ms. Sefton expressed that the Commission should consider whether approving the development was for the common good.

Mr. Dagg felt that in regards to the approval standards, the duplex would not be completely compatible with existing or permitted uses in the vicinity. He feared the precedent that may be set by approving the duplex in that it may change the landscape of the neighborhood.

Ms. Trigilio mentioned it looked like there would not be space for an ADU after the duplex was built.

Mr. Dagg noted that very few properties in Universal City qualify for Section 8 voucher use. He did not feel this was a concern for this property.

Ms. Sefton felt the neighborhood was rejuvenating and the trend seemed to favor renovation of existing properties.

Mr. Hudson and other members of the Commission commented on being cautious about changing the landscape of a neighborhood and approving something that did not fit the character of a neighborhood.

Mr. Hudson stated that per Section 4-5-54 of the Zoning Code, no specific use shall be recommended for approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission unless it has made findings, based upon the evidence presented at the public hearing, to support the conclusions identified in Section 4-5-54(4) of the Zoning Code. Having done so, he, therefore, moved to recommend approval of PC 628 (SU 032) and to grant a Specific Use Permit to allow a Duplex Residential use at 237 Park Lane. Ms. Trigilio seconded the motion.

Vote: Yeas: None

Nays: Hudson, Trigilio, Spurlock, Dagg, Garcia, McCumber, Sefton, Woods

Motion to approve Failed.

Mr. Cassata noted that this item would still be considered before City Council with Council being aware that the Planning & Zoning Commission did not recommend approval.

5. **CITY MANAGER'S REPORT:**

Mrs. Turner reported on upcoming events and developments in the city.

6. **ADJOURNMENT:**

Chair Spurlock adjourned the meeting at 7:23 p.m.

Cynthia M. Spurlock 11/03/2025

Cynthia Spurlock

Chair

