



CITY OF IOWA COLONY

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION WORKSESSION MINUTES

Wednesday, April 01, 2026
6:00 PM

Iowa Colony City Council Chambers, 3144 Meridiana Parkway Iowa Colony, Texas 77583

Phone: 281-369-2471 • Fax: 281-369-0005 • www.iowacolonytx.gov

Members present: Les Hosey, Terry Hayes, Brenda Dillon, Demond Woods and Robert Wall

Members absent: David Hurst

Others present: Dinh Ho

CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair Brenda Dillon called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M.

CITIZEN COMMENTS

There were no comments from the public.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

1. Discussion on potential revisions to the sign ordinance related to commercial and residential signage requirements.

City Engineer Dinh Ho presented an overview of the city's current regulations regarding nonresidential signage, as well as sign regulations from nearby communities. For nonresidential areas, the regulations distinguish between the SH 288 corridor and other areas, including Highway 6 and major thoroughfares. In non-288 areas, monument signs are limited to a maximum effective area of 60 square feet and a maximum height of 6 feet. Along the SH 288 corridor, monument signs may have a maximum effective area of 96 square feet and a maximum height of 8 feet. There are currently no setback requirements from the right-of-way. For nonresidential properties, one sign is permitted for the first 250 feet of frontage. Along SH 288, one sign is permitted for the first 250 feet, with one additional sign allowed for every additional 500 feet of frontage. The sign ordinance also applies within the ETJ.

The city reviewed sign regulations from neighboring communities, including Pearland, Manvel, and Lake Jackson. Along major roadways, Pearland allows monument signs up to 8 feet in height, while Manvel allows heights ranging from 6 to 12 feet along Highway 6 and 6 feet in other areas. Lake Jackson bases allowable sign height on speed limits, with heights ranging from 14 to 18 feet. Regarding sign area along major roadways, Pearland permits between 35 and 100 square feet depending on zoning districts, Manvel allows 50 square feet on Highway 6 and 24 square feet in other areas, and Lake Jackson bases sign area on speed limits, ranging from 21 to 100 square feet. For the SH 288 corridor, Pearland allows monument signs up to 8 feet in height with a maximum area of 100 square feet, Manvel allows 12-foot monument signs with a maximum area of 50 square feet, and Lake Jackson bases monument sign size on speed limits, allowing heights between 18 and 35 feet and areas ranging from 61 to 92 square feet.

Planning Commission Member Les Hosey provided sign regulation information from the City of Sugar Land to the Planning Commission and City Council. After reviewing the information, members agreed that Sugar Land's regulations were similar to Iowa Colony's.

Dinh Ho stated that the city does not allow billboard signage except in cases where it has been specifically negotiated and approved through an agreement. He also noted that pole signs are not currently permitted.

Councilmember Hargroder thanked Les Hosey for providing the information regarding Sugar Land. She noted that Sugar Land addresses abandoned freestanding signs in its ordinance and asked whether Iowa Colony has any provisions regarding abandoned freestanding signs and what actions the city can take. She suggested that if no such regulations exist, the city should consider addressing the issue.

Dinh Ho stated that the sign ordinance is available on the city's website through Municode, as all ordinances have been codified. City Secretary Kayleen Rosser added that the ordinance can also be found under the Community Development tab on the city's website. Dinh Ho also thanked former City Planner Kent Marsh for his work on the sign ordinance.

Mayor Pro Tem Greene-Scott asked whether there were any additional recommendations beyond the subdivision code updates previously discussed at recent council meetings. Discussion followed regarding the use of a master sign ordinance to allow signage standards to be approved comprehensively as part of a Planned Unit Development (PUD).

Councilmember Varlack asked whether the intent was for commercial signs along SH 288 to have the same size, structure, and appearance as signs within master-planned subdivisions. Dinh Ho stated that this was the recommendation. He provided the Kia dealership as an example and noted that the comprehensive plan reflected residents' desire to maintain a more rural character along the corridor. He stated that nonresidential signs should be somewhat smaller than signs within master-planned developments. He further stated that the city should address signage standards both along the SH 288 corridor and on major thoroughfares.

Councilmember Brooks asked what the abbreviations "MF" and "OP" represented, and Dinh Ho replied that they stood for "Multi-Family" and "Office Park." She also asked whether the city was working toward a particular aesthetic vision for the corridor and whether the community had been engaged regarding that vision. Dinh Ho responded that such issues are generally addressed through the comprehensive planning process, which includes community engagement.

Councilmember Brooks asked whether the proposed changes were intended to address the Kia dealership specifically or future development in general. Councilmembers responded that the ordinance had originally been adopted before SH 288 was expanded to four lanes. She further asked what the city envisions Iowa Colony looking like in the future and stated that she was struggling to understand the long-term vision for the corridor. She also asked about involving a city planner to help address the corridor's aesthetics.

Staff's recommendation for the Iowa Colony sign ordinance included a maximum monument sign height of 6 feet and a maximum area of 60 square feet along major roadways, as well as a maximum monument sign height of 16 feet and a maximum area of 100 square feet along the SH 288 corridor.

Brenda Dillon stated that she did not want the city to have "sign after sign" similar to Sugar Land. She noted that Iowa Colony's spacing is different from Sugar Land's and specifically referenced County Road 48 as the entrance into Iowa Colony, stating that the city does not want a cluster of signs at that location. Councilmember Hargroder asked whether capping the number of signs could help address that concern.

Dinh Ho stated that landowners may opt out of the city's ETJ regulations, at which point the city would no longer have control over signage in those areas.

Robert Wall stated that the city previously had a planner on staff.

The Mayor stated that he was uncertain about allowing a maximum sign height of 16 feet along the SH 288 corridor, but he believed the proposal provided a good starting point for further discussion.

2. Discussion of development ordinances, including but not limited to the zoning ordinance and subdivision ordinance.

Dinh Ho asked for feedback regarding any ordinances the Council would like staff to further review or evaluate.

Councilmember Brooks asked whether there were any ordinances that frequently resulted in impacts to businesses or repeated requests for variances. Dinh Ho responded that staff has addressed many of the recurring issues, including regulations related to fencing, transparency requirements, setbacks, and signage.

Councilmember Hargroder stated that this was the reason she had requested the discussion.

Councilmember Varlack asked about property owners within the ETJ being able to opt out of the city's regulations. He also mentioned the possibility of lowering the minimum acreage requirement for Planned Unit Developments (PUDs), noting that smaller acreage thresholds could help address "pockets" or undeveloped gaps within the city limits.

The Mayor asked about the rationale behind establishing a 20-acre minimum requirement for a PUD and discussed the importance of encouraging areas to become part of the city.

Discussion also took place regarding the city's comprehensive plan, including how the plan was developed in the past, the role of community engagement in the process, and the city's ongoing efforts to update the comprehensive plan.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:56 P.M.

APPROVED THIS 2nd DAY OF JUNE 2026





Kayleen Rosser, City Secretary



David Hurst, Chairman