
PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION

November 7, 2005

Minutes

Members Present:

Neomia Banks
Eddie Boykin
Ovelia Campos
Jack Harkins
Jeff Luther
Tim McClarty
Floyd Miller

Staff Present:

Jon James, Director, Planning and Development Services
Sharon Hicks, City Attorney
Jeff Armstrong, Development Services Manager
Dan Santee, First Assistant City Attorney
Gloria Brownell, Planner I
Justin Fortney, Planner I
JoAnn Szech, Executive Secretary (Recording)

Others Present:

Quirico & Cindy Torres
Danny Dobbs
Sheila Jones
Mendy Abney
John Hill
Sara Wikman
Levi Harris
Terrance Poindexter
Sherry Foster
Lydia Long
Amy Smith
Morgan Green
Andy McCall
William Dominy
Bruce Davis
Bob Hammond

Media Present:

Sarah Kleiner, Abilene Reporter-News

Item One: Call to Order

Mr. Harkins called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. and declared a quorum present.

Item Two: Invocation

Mr. Floyd Miller gave the invocation.

Item Three: Approval of Minutes:

Mr. Eddie Boykin moved that the minutes of the October 3, 2005, meeting be approved as submitted. Ms. Banks seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Harkins read the opening statement for the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Item Four: Plats

Ms. Gloria Brownell, Planner I, stated that six (6) plats (identified as items a., b., c., d., e., and f.) were complete and provided information for each plat. Staff recommends approval of these plats as all meet the requirements of the Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Harkins opened the public hearing and asked if anyone wished to speak regarding any of the plats being considered for approval. There was no response and Mr. Harkins closed the public hearing.

Mr. McClarty moved to approve plats a., b., c., d., e., and f., as submitted. Mr. Miller seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of seven (7) in favor (Banks, Boykin, Campos, Harkins, Luther, McClarty and Miller) to none (0) opposed.

Item Five: Thoroughfare Closures:

a. TC-2005-8

Public Hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on a request from Morgan D. Green to abandon the 10' x 125' north-south alley located between Pine and Cypress Streets and extending north from North 17th Street. Legal Description being Block 12, Central Park Addition, Abilene, Taylor County, Texas.

Mr. Justin Fortney provided the staff report for this item. This alley is located between RM-3 and General Commercial zoning districts and although there are curb cuts for the alley, the area is overgrown with vegetation and trees. The Plat Review Committee has reviewed this request and recommends approval of the abandonment with the condition that the full 10-foot right-of-way be maintained as a utility easement (sewer line located in this area). Staff also recommends approval of the request. Property owners within 200 feet of this request were notified and two (2) comment forms were received in opposition and none (0) in favor of the request.

Mr. Harkins opened the public hearing. No one spoke either in favor or in opposition of the request and the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Boykin moved to approve TC-2005-8. Ms. Campos seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of seven (7) in favor (Banks, Boykin, Campos, Harkins, Luther, McClarty, and Miller) to none (0) opposed.

b. TC-2005-9

Public Hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on a request from Mesquite Square LLC, agent John Hill, to abandon the north 2 feet of Milford Street right-of-way and the south 2 feet of Piedmont Drive right-of-way adjacent to property located at 750 North Judge Ely Boulevard. Legal Description being Block 101, Continuation 1, Section 5, Radford Hills Addition, Abilene, Taylor County, Texas.

Mr. Fortney provided the staff report for this item. This entire block is occupied by an apartment complex and surrounded by RS-6 zoning. This request is to allow the applicant to construct covered parking for the complex. The Plat Review Committee reviewed this request and recommended approval with the exception of the Traffic and Transportation Division. This Division is of the belief that the building code allows for canopies to extend into the right-of-way. The Zoning Ordinance does not allow for canopies to project into the right-of-way. A street use license is not a good option for the applicant as this license is

not a permanent instrument and construction of a canopy would be a long-term use. The Board of Adjustment conditioned approval of a variance based on the abandonment of the two (2) feet encroaching into the right-of-way. Staff recommends approval of the request. Property owners within 200 feet of this request were notified and one (1) comment form was received in favor and none (0) in opposition of the request.

Mr. Harkins opened the public hearing.

Mr. John Hill, proponent, provided information regarding the advantages of granting this request (both from an economic standpoint and in keeping with infill development as recommended in the Comprehensive Plan).

Mr. Harkins closed the public hearing.

Mr. Boykin moved to approve TC-2005-9. Mr. McClarty seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of seven (7) in favor (Banks, Boykin, Campos, Harkins, Luther, McClarty, and Miller) to none (0) opposed.

a. Z-2005-36

Public hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on a request from Jack Wasson to amend existing PDD #95, located at 402 Arnold Boulevard. The legal description being Block 10, Western Hills Addition, Abilene, Taylor County, Texas.

Ms. Gloria Brownell provided the staff report for this item. Ms. Brownell stated that the applicant recently acquired this property and is redesigning the park. The applicant is requesting to reduce the minimum lot size and setbacks to accommodate the new design. The applicant is also proposing to eliminate RV spaces in this park. Included within this PDD amendment are the following:

- Reduce minimum lot size and setbacks
- Eliminate RV use by January 1, 2007
- Increased screening to surround entire PDD (see handout for proposed language)
- Other minor changes to accommodate new layout

Ms. Brownell stated that the applicant is proposing a patio home type development, i.e., the mobile homes will be placed along one lot line and have at least ten (10) feet of space to provide fire separation between the mobile homes and provide the largest yards possible.

Staff recommends approval of the request including the additional language provided to the Commissioners at today's meeting. Property owners within 200 feet of this request were notified and staff spoke with many of the adjoining property owners; however, no comments forms were returned either in favor or in opposition of the request.

Mr. Harkins stated that in reviewing the site plan, it appears that a couple of the interior streets could be eliminated and the depth of the lots could be increased.

Ms. Brownell stated that originally the applicant's plan was to make this a mobile home subdivision and to sell the lots individually. However, the preliminary development plan submitted by the applicant did not meet the minimum requirements for a mobile home subdivision through the City's Subdivision Regulations. After discussions with staff, it was determined that the property would remain under a single ownership, the property would not have to be platted into separate lots, and street dedication would

not be required. If the applicant chooses to pursue the mobile home subdivision option, he will be required to complete the platting process (which means all Subdivision Regulations will have to be met).

Mr. Harkins opened the public hearing.

Mr. Jack Wasson, applicant for this PDD amendment, stated that what is being proposed is a redevelopment of an existing property. Mr. Wasson stated that the targeted homeowner for this development would be a first-time homeowner (or starter homes). Mr. Wasson stated that the current street layout takes into consideration the existing utilities. Mr. Wasson stated that he is a licensed in the State of Texas as a manufactured housing dealer and his intention is to purchase 2006 model homes.

Mr. Harkins closed the public hearing.

Mr. McClarty moved to approve Z-2005-36. Ms. Banks seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of seven (7) in favor (Banks, Boykin, Campos, Harkins, Luther, McClarty, and Miller) to none (0) opposed.

b. Z-2005-32

Public hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on a request from William Steven West, agent Andrew K. McCall, to rezone property located at the northwest corner of Oldham and Hardison Lanes from AO (Agricultural Open Space) to RS-6 (Residential Single-family). The legal description being 21.53 acres out of the east half of the southeast quarter of Survey 67, Blind Asylum Land, Abilene, Taylor County, Texas.

Mr. Justin Fortney provided the staff report for this rezoning request. Mr. Fortney stated that this area was annexed into the City in 1980 and has remained AO (Agricultural Open Space) since that time. The applicant is proposing to rezone the entire property from AO (Agricultural Open Space) to RS-6 (Residential Single-Family). The size of the area is 21.53 acres. The maximum number of homes that can be placed on this property is up to 120 homes if built to the minimum standards of RS-6 zoning. The Comprehensive Plan designates this area as low-density residential use. Staff recommends approval of the rezoning request. Property owners within 200 feet of this request were notified and no comments forms were returned either in favor or in opposition of the request.

Mr. Harkins stated that there have been a number of rezoning cases in the last few months for RS-6 zoning and asked staff if there is a concern that perhaps too many requests fall within this small lot category.

Mr. James stated over-saturation of a particular lot size is of concern; however, he stated that he did not feel that this is the case at this time. Mr. James stated that another consideration is the type of zoning surrounding this area – are the zoning categories compatible or appropriate. Staff will monitor this.

Mr. Harkins opened the public hearing.

Mr. Andy McCall, agent for the proponent, stated that the demand received by Mr. West (developer) for RS-6 lots has prompted this rezoning request. Mr. McCall stated that in regard to having RS-6 lots in the vicinity of larger lots, the type of home to be constructed will quality construction and high standards and will not be out of place with houses on larger lots in this area.

Mr. Harkins closed the public hearing.

Ms. Campos moved to approve Z-2005-32. Mr. Miller seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of seven (7) in favor (Banks, Boykin, Campos, Harkins, Luther, McClarty, and Miller) to none (0) opposed.

c. Z-2005-33

Public hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on a request from 1465 Beltway South-04, agents Tom Niblo and Terry Franklin, to rezone property located on the south side of Beltway South (FM 707) approximately 700 feet east of Highway 83-84 from LC (Limited Commercial) to PDD. The legal description being 7.2 acres out of the north half of the southwest quarter of Survey 22, Lunatic Asylum Lands, Abilene, Taylor County, Texas.

Mr. Fortney provided the staff report for this case. This request is to rezone property from LC (Limited Commercial) to PDD (Planned Development District). The Limited Commercial zoning district has a size limit of 2-1/2 acres or less. The size of this area is 7.2 acres. The Comprehensive Plan recommendation for this area is as a mixed-use gateway. Examples of uses allowed in this proposed PDD include:

- Multi-Family Dwellings
- Single-Family Homes
- Kindergarten or Child Care Center
- Medical and Dental Clinic or Office
- Fire Station
- Restaurants, Standard and Fast Food
- Office Space
- Banking Services
- Storage (self-service units)
- Automobile Parts and Supplies (new merchandise only)
- Farm and Garden Supplies
- Liquor Store

Setbacks for this property would be:

- 30' from Beltway South
- South (rear) property line: 25 Feet
- East property line: 25 Feet
- West property line: 10 Feet
- Exceptions
 - Side and rear setbacks are 10 feet and must be screened from neighboring properties by a 6' opaque fence

Pavement Setbacks

- 10' from all property lines that are not fenced
- The area within the pavement setback shall be maintained with grass or other vegetative ground cover

Screening and Fencing

- Fencing materials such as chain link, razor wire, or barbed wire are prohibited
- Refuse containers, HVAC equipment, and other utility or mechanical equipment shall be screened from view from the public right-of-way

Lighting:

- All site lighting shall comply with the City of Abilene Zoning Ordinance

- Lighting shall be shielded and directed away from adjacent residential areas

Signage

- Signage shall be to the standards of the LC zoning district:
 - 1 per business
 - 36' tall
 - 100 Square foot
- The following signs shall not be permitted: banners, balloons, pennants, or portable signs

Storage and Display

- No freight containers
- Storage of materials and equipment must be screened by an opaque fence and cannot be visible from the public right-of-way or adjacent properties

Building Design

- Front façades- 70% masonry, brick, stone, stucco, or a combination
- Any façades other than the front visible from any public-right-of-way shall be at least 50% masonry, brick, stone, stucco, or a combination

Staff recommends approval of this request. Property owners within a 200-foot radius of this property were notified. No comment forms were received in favor of the request and three (3) comment forms were returned in opposition.

Mr. Harkins stated that the PDD allows for one (1) 36-foot pole sign per business. There could be as many as 10 businesses on this site – each with a pole sign.

Mr. Fortney stated that under the current zoning, one 36-foot pole sign per business is allowed. Mr. Fortney stated that staff is currently reviewing the Sign Ordinance and signage allowance in this zoning category could change. Changes in the Sign Ordinance would affect this PDD because the language in the PDD states “to the standards of LC zoning.”

Mr. James stated that in preparing this PDD, staff’s objective was to obtain a PDD that would address issues of fencing, screening, landscaping, lighting, and a number of other issues.

Mr. Harkins stated that his expectations for the PDD would be one pole sign and monument signs (perhaps one per business).

Mr. Luther stated that regarding the issue of screening, the houses behind the property are two-story homes and to the west is an overpass, a fence will not do much.

Mr. Fortney stated that the PDD states that outdoor storage must be screened from public view – this will limit the amount of outdoor storage.

Mr. Boykin stated that he is going to have a difficult approving this request in good conscience as adamantly opposed as he has been and as vocal as he has been regarding signs and then turn around and approve something that is totally contradictory to the sentiment of this Commission.

Mr. Luther asked the reason for requesting a PDD – what can be done in the PDD that cannot be done in LC.

Mr. Fortney responded that there is a list of usages added into the PDD that are not allowed in LC zoning, i.e., self-storage uses, banks, etc. More uses would make the property more marketable.

Mr. Harkins opened the public hearing.

Mr. Terry Franklin, proponent for this zone change, stated the initial zoning request for this property was GC zoning. Mr. Franklin stated that he also has ownership of the adjacent tract of land. Mr. Franklin stated that a request could have been made for only a portion of this tract of land; however, the entire parcel is included in the rezoning request and tradeoffs were made in the areas of usage, screening and masonry exteriors. Mr. Franklin stated that he requested that seven (7) very compatible uses be included in the PDD that would be allowed in GC zoning.

Mr. Harkins stated that the proposed PDD states one sign per business and asked Mr. Franklin if he would consider one pole sign per business fronting on FM 707.

Mr. Franklin stated that he might if one sign was added for the business in the rear of the property (total four (4) signs). Mr. Franklin stated that he is receptive to the decision of this Commission regarding signage restrictions. Mr. Franklin stated that he would certainly consider any proposal provided by this Commission regarding signage.

Mr. Boykin stated that his recommendation regarding signage would be a tall monument sign listing all tenants. This would eliminate sign clutter in the area.

Ms. Campos stated that she is not comfortable placing Mr. Franklin in the position of overseeing the maintenance of a monument sign (as Shops at Abilene).

Mr. Harkins asked Mr. Franklin if he was concerned with the issue of changes to the sign regulations that could affect this property.

Mr. Franklin stated that he senses that the city is headed toward monument signage. Mr. Franklin stated that his contention is that the signage is legal currently and he is not requesting anything within this zone change that would affect signage.

Mr. Harkins closed the public hearing.

Mr. Santee suggested that if it is the intention of the Commission for sign restrictions to apply to whatever LC zoning is in place at a later date, the PDD language should be clarified: Signage shall be to the standards of the LC zoning district regulations in place at the time the sign permit is applied for, or something to this effect so that it is specified that a vested rights issue does not occur (eliminate the possibility of reverting to the time the PDD was granted rather than the regulations in place at the time a sign permit application is submitted).

Mr. Harkins agreed and stated that if this Commission goes in this direction, this language should be included.

Mr. McClarty stated that the Commission cannot shutdown development anytime because the Commission is waiting on a revision to the Sign Ordinance. Mr. Franklin is allowed the number of signs requested at the present time, it is not his fault that the Sign Ordinance has not been revised. Mr. Franklin has compromised on many of the requirements in the PDD and the PDD should be approved with inclusion of the wording provided by Mr. Santee (regarding sign regulations in place at time of sign

permit application). Mr. McClarty stated that perhaps this would encourage staff and the Commission to complete the Sign Ordinance revisions.

Mr. Harkins recommended that the number of signs be limited to the number of lots fronting on 707 plus one for the business located at the rear of the property.

Mr. McClarty moved to approve Z-2005-33 with the condition that the number of signs be limited to the number of lots developed along 707 plus one (1) and insert the wording provided by the legal staff (LC zoning district regulations at the time of sign permit application). Ms. Banks seconded the motion.

Mr. Harkins reopened the public hearing and asked Mr. Franklin if he was amenable to the Commission's suggestions regarding signage.

Mr. Franklin stated that if his understanding is correct that this would allow one (1) sign for each of the lots fronting 707 plus one (1) additional sign, he is OK with this.

Mr. Harkins closed the public hearing

The motion carried by a vote of seven (7) in favor (Banks, Boykin, Campos, Harkins, Luther, McClarty, and Miller) to none (0) opposed.

d. Z-2005-34

Public hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on a request from Quirico U. Torres to rezone property located on the north side of East South 21st Street between Lakeside Drive and Oldham Lane from AO (Agricultural Open-space) to RS-12 (Residential Single-family). The legal description being 0.38 acres out of a portion of Tracts 6, 7, 8, and 9, Lakeland Farm, Abilene, Taylor County, Texas.

Mr. Armstrong provided the staff report for this case. This request is to rezone property from AO (Agricultural Open-space) to RS-12 (Residential Single-family). The size of the rezoning area is 0.38 acres (2 tracts) to be utilized are residential lots. Property owners within 200 feet of the rezoning request were notified and one (1) comment form was returned in favor (not including the applicant who owns several area parcels) and none (0) were received in opposition. Staff recommends denial of this request.

Mr. Armstrong stated that when the subdivision was created, the applicant submitted a preliminary development plan extending to a portion of land 120 feet back from the street right-of-way. The infrastructure for the development was installed and the lots have been platted individually. If the rezoning request is granted, the applicant is proposing to development land that was not originally zoned for the subdivision and was not a part of the preliminary development plan. If the Commission approves the rezoning request, staff will require a new preliminary development to include the area outside the area of the existing preliminary development plan and require the developer to submit a financial guarantee for the portion of ES 21st street that encroaches into the required 100 foot right of way depth. The appropriate action would be to rezone the entire 120 foot strip of land to RS-12 zoning and submit a new preliminary development plan. The preliminary development plan does not commit the applicant to making the improvements. When the plats have been finalized, then the applicant must deal with the improvements on the street frontages. This information has been conveyed to the applicant and the applicant has stated no interest in rezoning this entire strip of land to residential single family.

Mr. Harkins opened the public hearing.

Dr. Quirico Torres stated that he is appearing on behalf of his wife, Cindy, the developer of the Oldham-Forbes Subdivision. Dr. Torres stated that when he purchased the property, he was asked by the City if he could install a drainage system for the Bent Tree Neighborhood. Dr. Torres stated that he asked the City to allow him an opportunity to check into this as long as his liability (flooding) was not increased. Dr. Torres stated that he installed and paid for a road. Dr. Torres stated that he gave one acre of his land for drainage and paid an engineering firm to install a drainage system beneath the street that would drain water to Lytle Lake. Dr. Torres stated that he is the property owner of 20 acres across from Lakeside Drive and has not platted the area because a development plan has not been developed. Once these 20 acres are developed, the road will be installed.

Mr. Harkins closed the public hearing.

Mr. Luther asked about the drainage along ES 21st Street.

Mr. Armstrong stated that as with every multi-lot subdivision, a drainage plan must be submitted. The drainage can be dealt with however the engineer chooses to design it within the parameters of the development being proposed. Mr. Armstrong stated that if the drainage issue and structures are of significant importance to the Commission's decision-making, the item can be tabled and staff can invite someone for the City's engineering staff to study the plans prior to the Commission's next meeting and provide information at the next meeting.

Ms. Campos asked about the document mentioned by Dr. Torres regarding financial guarantee for the street.

Mr. Armstrong stated that the document that Dr. Torres possesses is an engineer's estimate of the cost of the proponent's share for property along ES 21st Street if the zoning is approved and the property was platted as proposed. The document in question is a "sealed" document from Adams Engineering containing the engineer's estimates for the cost of the improvements for which a financial guarantee would be based – it is not a financial guarantee – it is an engineer's estimate.

Mr. Armstrong stated that he has copies of the preliminary development plan and preliminary utility plan if the Commission's wished to review these documents for clarification purposes.

Mr. McClarty asked to see the preliminary development plan.

Mr. Armstrong stated that during the preliminary development plan review, a comment form was received from the Engineering Division calling for a drainage plan to be approved prior to a plat being submitted to the Planning and Zoning Commission. Mr. Armstrong stated that this indicated to him that this layout was in place prior to a drainage plan being completed for the subdivision.

Mr. McClarty moved to deny Z-2005-34. Mr. Luther seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of seven (7) in favor (Banks, Boykin, Campos, Harkins, Luther, McClarty, and Miller) to none (0) opposed.

e. Z-2005-35

Public hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on a request to rezone PDD #65 to AO (Agricultural Open Space), RS-6 (Residential Single-family) and PH (Patio Home Overlay) located at the southeast corner of Griffith and Scottish Roads and along the south side of I-20. The legal description being a portion of Survey 33, Blind Asylum Lands, Abilene, Taylor County, Texas.

Mr. Armstrong provided the staff report for this case. This is a proposal to rezone a Planned Development District, for the most part, back to its previous zoning. Nearly every PDD submitted to this Commission contains a development schedule timetable. If the PDD is not developed, it is probably most appropriate for the property to revert back to the previous zoning. The development schedule does not automatically trigger the rezoning process – it simply directs the Planning Director to bring this item to the Commission and allow this Commission and the City Council to determine if the PDD should continue or the previous zoning or some other zoning should be placed on the property. The request is to rezone property from PDD to AO, RS-6, and PH for 400 acres (approximately 380 acres to AO, 20 acres to RS-6, approximately 4 acres of which would be PH overlay). Future uses include residential and agricultural. Property owners within a 200-foot radius of this property were notified. Two (2) comment forms were received in favor of the request and two (2) comment forms were returned in opposition. Staff recommends approval of this request.

Mr. Harkins opened the public hearing. No one commented regarding this rezoning request and the public hearing was closed.

Mr. McClarty moved to approve Z-2005-35. Mr. Miller seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of seven in favor (Banks, Boykin, Campos, Harkins, Luther, McClarty, and Miller) to none (0) opposed.

Item Seven: Ordinance Amendment

a. Public hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on proposed amendments to Sections 23-161 and 23-128 of the Code of the City of Abilene regarding monument signage.

Mr. Armstrong provided the staff report for this item. Mr. Armstrong stated this it appears that monument signage is gaining momentum in the business community and staff is attempting to assist with monument signage with this ordinance amendment. The current regulations limit monument signs to a maximum of 42 inches in height, unless the sign is set back 25 feet from the property line along a street. Most businesses do not want their sign that far back. The ordinance amendment being presented at this meeting would allow monument signs to be up to eight (8) feet in height with a five (5) foot setback from street side property lines as long as this is at least 15 feet from the edge of the curb. This would ensure visibility from driveways and street corners. Mr. Armstrong stated that the five-foot property line setback was included to account for sidewalks.

Mr. McClarty asked how this amendment would affect those areas of town where there is a very large parkway (20 to 25 feet). Mr. McClarty stated that it seems this amendment would make it more difficult for those areas with a large parkway. These areas should be allowed to place a sign directly on the property line rather than setting the sign back an additional five (5) feet.

Mr. James stated that in this instance (or instances) a variance could be requested.

Mr. McClarty stated that the exception to this amendment would be those areas that have excessive right-of-way issues - excessive being 20 to 25 foot parkway, then the placement of the sign should be allowed on the property line.

Mr. James stated that another concern is that in many cases the extra-wide parkway is for planned future roadway expansion. Signs may be too close to the street if the measurement is taken from the back of the curb if and when the road is expanded from two to four lanes.

Mr. Armstrong stated that the current Sign Regulations created a “clear space” in which no signage is allowed (42 inches from top of monument sign and 8 feet from bottom of pole sign). With the proposed setback, staff is addressing visibility issues (by addressing this issue with setbacks, the clear space is not required). If a monument sign is allowed to be 8 feet in height, then the face of a pole sign could come below 8 feet, except for those areas where a pole sign is over a paved surface (8 feet of clearance under a pole sign will still be required on a paved surface).

Mr. Harkins opened the public. No one spoke either in favor or in opposition of this amendment and Mr. Harkins closed the public hearing.

Mr. Boykin moved to approve the proposed amendments to Sections 23-161 and 23-128 of the Code of the City of Abilene regarding monument signage. Mr. McClarty seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of six (6) in favor (Boykin, Campos, Harkins, Luther, McClarty and Miller) to none (0) opposed.

Item Eight: Director’s Report

Mr. James provided the Commissioners with a summary of Council actions on items submitted from the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Mr. James asked that earlier in the meeting there was a question from a Commissioner regarding the status of the Sign Ordinance. Mr. James stated that staff is prepared to proceed. Staff is waiting for a date from the Council for a joint meeting between the City Council and the Planning and Zoning Commission to discuss this issue. Staff will contact the Commissioners regarding the date and time for this meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Approved: _____, Chairman