

CITY OF WEST LAKE HILLS, TEXAS  
MINUTES OF A CITY COUNCIL WORKSHOP  
Wednesday, February 11, 2026 at 7:00 PM

1. Call to Order

**With a quorum present, Mayor Vaughan called the meeting to order at 7:01pm**

**CITY COUNCIL PRESENT:**

Mayor James Vaughan  
Mayor Pro Tem Gordon Bowman  
Dana Harmon  
Brian Plunkett  
Beth South  
Darin Walker

**CITY STAFF PRESENT:**

City Administrator Trey Fletcher  
Development Coordinator Joel Sherrouse  
Director of BDS Jennifer Bills  
Chief of Police Scott Gerdes  
Assistant Planner Elizabeth McNamara  
City Attorney Charlie Zech

*The meeting was suspended at 7:01pm to convene the Board of Adjustments*

*The meeting was reconvened at 7:36pm*

2. Citizen Communications The City Council welcomes public comments at this point on any issue. If the issue is listed on the agenda, the speaker may choose to comment during the Public Comment period or when the specific agenda item is taken up by the Council later in the meeting. The Council cannot respond to or discuss matters not listed on the agenda. The Council may provide factual information, refer the item to a staff member, or request the item be added to a future meeting agenda. Speakers shall limit their comments to five (5) minutes each.

**Mayor Vaughan opened the meeting for public comments. Hearing none, the public comment section was closed.**

3. Consent Agenda All Consent Agenda items listed are considered to be routine by the City Council and will be enacted by one (1) motion. No separate discussion or action on any of the items is necessary unless requested by a Council Member.
- a. Approval of the January 28, 2026 Regular Meeting Minutes.
  - b. Approval of the February 4, 2026 Workshop Minutes.
  - c. Approval of contracts with Travis County for an Election Services Agreement and a Joint Election Agreement for the May 2, 2026 General Election

**MOTION: Upon a motion made by Councilmember Walker and a second by Councilmember Harmon, the council voted 5-0 to approve the Consent Agenda.**

1. **Land Use 4904 Old Bee Cave Road** - Discuss and consider action on recommendations from ZAPCO on the following variances for a fence:
  1. To allow for a fence encroachment into the 30-foot front-yard fence setback (Section 22.03.173(d)(6)(B)(ii)).
  2. To allow for the installation of a fence that does not allow 80% visibility through the fence (Section 22.03.173(d)(6)(A)(i)).
  3. To allow for a fence without the required minimum 80% landscaping screening (Section 22.03.173(d)(6)(A)(i)).
  4. To allow for the installation of a fence with a height of 7 feet above natural grade (Section 22.03.173(d)(9)(A)).

Applicant: Dylan Freytag, Property Owner.

**A. Staff Report:**

- a. Director Bills briefed council on the request for variances for height, location, transparency, and screening requirements related to a fence built without a permit at 4904 Old Bee Cave.

**B. Public Comments:**

- a. None

**C. Discussion:**

- a. Mayor Vaughan expressed belief that the site does have unique circumstances related to nearby commercial properties, and that they would support allowing height variance if the fence were moved far enough back to allow for screening.
- b. Councilmember South expressed that the fence should be moved entirely out of the front setback, not just far enough back for screening.

**MOTION: Upon a motion made by Councilmember Walker and a second by Councilmember Bowman, the council voted 5-0 to:**

- **Deny** the variances related to front-yard fence setback encroachment, screening and transparency.
- **Conditionally approve** a height variance to allow the fence to be 7 feet tall only along the portion of the property abutting the commercial property to the West.

5. **Land Use 116 Skyline Drive** - Discuss and consider a recommendation from ZAPCO on the following variances for a fence:
  1. To allow for the installation of a fence without required landscaping visibly screening a minimum of 80% of the fence between the street and fence (Section 22.03.173 (d)(6)(A)(i)).
  2. To allow for the installation of a fence that does not allow 80% visibility through the

fence (Section 22.03.173 (d)(6)(A)(i)).

Applicant: Brian Sharples, Property Owner.

**A. Staff Report:**

- a. Director Bills briefed council on the request for variances for screening and transparency for a louvered fence at 116 Skyline Drive. The property had received a previous variance in 2011 to allow the fence to be allowed at the property line that had limited the fence to 54". The installed portions of the louvered fence are 72", but the variance application did not include a request related to fence height.

**B. Public Comments:**

- a. Brian Sharples – Applicant
  - i. Described the history of the fence and reasons for the variance request related to headlights and road noise. Mr. Sharples expressed that he understood that the portion of the fence that is installed is higher than allowed by the previous variance, and that he would need to come back with an additional variance request to keep that portion of the fence at 72".
- b. Jeffrey Dochen – Neighbor
  - i. Spoke in favor of the variance request.

**C. Discussion:**

- a. The Council discussed several Texas native vines that could be used for screening, and discussed the need to clarify how 80% transparency is calculated in a future code update.

**MOTION: Upon a motion made by Councilmember Walker and a second by Councilmember Plunket, the council voted 5-0 to:**

- **Conditionally approve** the variances as requested, according to the design presented to Council at a height of 54 inches
6. **Land Use 1100 Block of Kennan Road** - Discuss and consider action on a recommendation from ZAPCO on a variance request to reduce the extent of the tree survey requirement for the entirety of a property for a new construction on an undeveloped lot (Section 22.03.304(b)(1)).

Applicant: Paula Ables, Designer/Owner Representative.

**A. Staff Report:**

- a. Director Bills briefed council on the request for a variance to limit the requirement to provide a tree survey of the entire site for construction on an undeveloped lot.

**B. Public Comments:**

- a. None

**MOTION: Upon a motion made by Councilmember Harmon and a second by Councilmember South, the council voted 5-0 to deny the variance request**

7. Land Use 701 S Capital of Texas Highway Suite A050 (Sweetgreen) - Discuss and consider action on a recommendation from ZAPCO on the following variances:

- a. For the installation of a wall sign exceeding the maximum 10-foot length (Section 32.03.009 (2) West Lake Hills Code).  
b. For the installation of a second sign for a restaurant with square footage of less than 5,000 square feet (Section II.B.1, Village at Westlake Uniform Signage Criteria)

Applicant: Jesus Sanchez, Santech Signs, LLC.

**A. Staff Report:**

- a. Director Bills briefed council on the request for a variance to allow a second sign where one would not be permitted for a business ("Sweetgreen") according to the Village at Westlake Uniform Sign Agreement, and for that sign to exceed the maximum width of a sign according to the West Lake Hills Code of Ordinances

**B. Public Comments:**

- a. Jesus Sanchez – Santech Signs  
i. Described the sign and explained the reasoning for the request. When asked by Council why the sign needed to be wider than allowed by Code in addition to having a second sign, Mr. Sanchez expressed that the sign as presented was the smallest Sweetgreen corporate would support

**C. Discussion:**

- a. In discussing the variance, Council asked staff why the variance for width was necessary. It was explained that staff's interpretation was that since the second sign would not be allowed by the Uniform Sign Agreement, that a second sign would need to meet the criteria for a sign according to the Code of Ordinances instead of the USA.

**MOTION: Upon a motion made by Councilmember Harmon and a second by Councilmember Bowman, the council voted 5-0 to:**

- **Deny** the variance for the sign to be greater than 10 feet in width.
- **Approve** the variance to allow for a second sign at the location.

*The meeting was recessed at 8:58 pm*

*The meeting was reconvened at 9:05 pm*

8. Administration Discuss and consider approval of additional service request (ASR) #1 associated with development review services.

*Note: This item was tabled until after item 9 to allow for the consultant for item 9 to be heard ahead of remaining administrative items.*

**A. Staff Report:**

- a. Staff briefed council on the request for \$75,000 of additional funding for Colliers Engineering development review-related funding, which would generally be offset in the form of application fees.

**B. Public Comments:**

- a. None

**MOTION: Upon a motion made by Councilmember Bowman and a second by Councilmember Harmon, the council voted 5-0 to approve the additional service request.**

9. Administration Discuss and consider AI Traffic Detection in the RM 2244/Bee Cave Road corridor.

**A. Staff Report:**

- a. City Administrator Fletcher briefed council on NoTraffic AI Traffic detection for traffic signal improvements on 9 intersections. The system is available for purchase through the Buy Board Purchasing Cooperative. The cost of the system requires a budget amendment or placement in a future budget.
- b. Jason Ore from Texas Highway products provided a presentation on the NoTraffic Mobility platform. The system would be integrated into the existing TxDOT signals.

**B. Public Comments:**

- a. None

**C. Discussion:**

- a. Discussion focused on the cost of the system, deployment times, performance and support guarantees for a system in which all the money is paid up front for a long-

term contract, and whether or not TxDOT would grant access to city staff for analytics and metrics related to the system. No action was taken.

**No action was taken for this item.**

10. Public Works Discuss and consider public works facilities and staffing.

**A. Staff Report:**

- a. City Administrator Fletcher briefed council on the present division of labor related to public works, which is currently spread between multiple departments and third parties.

For six months in 2025, the City employed a Public Works Superintendent who left the City in August 2025. The City has not been able to find a qualified candidate to fill the role, and staff believe the availability of a new facility has presented an opportunity to explore establishing an in-house Public Works department.

The request at this time is for Council to provide guidance on exploring this opportunity, with an initial request to replace the Public Works Superintendent position with a Public Works Director. The new director could relieve existing staff of many duties related to management of public works and third parties, and could work with the City Administrator to develop a plan for a future department with in-house staff.

**B. Public Comments:**

- a. None

**C. Discussion:**

- a. Council expressed interest and general support for the idea of establishing an in-house public works department, depending on the details related to cost, facilities, and services. Administrator Fletcher indicated that he would like Council's blessing on a future budget amendment to accommodate the new director position and a direction to explore the options for developing an in-house public works department.

Council indicated confidence in hiring a director, but requested a more detailed proposal before committing to hiring a public works crew to report to the director.

**MOTION: Upon a motion made by Councilmember Harmon and a second by Councilmember Bowman, the council voted 5-0 to approve the hiring of a Public Works Director and to explore a strategy to develop an in-city Public Works department.**


12. Adjournment –

**Mayor Vaughan Adjourned the meeting at 10:08pm.**

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
James Vaughan, MAYOR

ATTEST:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Makayla Rodriguez  
City Secretary

These minutes were approved on February 25, 2026.