
PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION

March 5, 2007

Minutes

Members Present: Fred Famble
Jack Harkins
Lydia M. Long
Jeff Luther
Tim McClarty

Members Absent: Ovelia Campos

Staff Present: Jon James, Director of Planning and Development Services
Dan Santee, Interim City Attorney
Ed McRoy, Assistant Director of Planning and Development Services
Gloria Elder, Planner II
Justin Fortney, Planner II
Bob Lindley, City Engineer
JoAnn Szech, Executive Secretary (Recording)

Others Present: Rick Grant
Lydia Goodman
Kenneth L. Cleaver
James W. Richardson
Leona Fern Carter
Davey Deupree
H. Preston
Chris Olsen
Bob Hammond

Media Present: Sarah Kleiner-Varble, Abilene Reporter-News

Item One: Call to Order

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

Item Two: Invocation

Mr. McClarty gave the invocation

Item Three: Approval of Minutes

Mr. Harkins moved to approve the minutes of the February 5, 2007, meeting as submitted. Mr. Famble seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

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

Item Four: Plats

Gloria Elder provided information for completed plats (Agenda Items a., c., d, e., f., g., h., and i.). Ms. Brownell stated that staff is recommending approval of these plats as all meet Subdivision Regulation requirements.

Mr. McClarty opened the public hearing and asked if anyone wished to speak regarding any of the plats being presented for approval. No one came forward and the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Harkins moved to approve Plat Items a., c., d., e., f., g., h., and i. Mr. Luther seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of five (5) in favor (Famble, Harkins, Long, Luther and McClarty) to none (0) opposed.

Ms. Elder stated that Item b. was incomplete and staff recommends denial of this plat.

Mr. Luther moved to deny Plat Item b. Mr. Famble seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of five (5) in favor (Famble, Harkins, Long, Luther and McClarty) to none (0) opposed.

Item Five: Rezoning Requests

a. TC-2007-01

Public hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on a request from Hardin Simmons University, agent Harold Preston, to abandon the alley extending north from Vogel Avenue to Lowden Street, located between Grape and Beech Streets. Legal description being Block 14, North Park Addition, Abilene, Taylor County, Texas.

Justin Fortney presented the staff report for this request. The request is to abandon the 20' wide alley from Vogel Avenue to Lowden Street, located between Grape and Beech Streets. There are approximately 14 single family homes on this block. Hardin-Simmons owns and uses most of the additional property as soccer fields.

Hardin-Simmons plans to use 2 acres of vacant property on the northern end of this block for athletic fields. This proposed area is currently divided by the subject alley. Only the northern 315' of this alley would need to be closed for the development of the athletic fields.

Staff has no opposition to closing the entire alley subject to the recommendation of the Plat Review Committee. However, some citizens who are affected by this proposed closure are opposed to it. Approving the closure of only the northern 315' of the alley would not affect these property owners to the same degree. Regardless of the amount of alley closure, the Plat Review Committee has recommended the following conditions:

- (1) The northern end of the remaining alley (if any) must be replatted to connect to an existing right-of-way (either Beech or Grape Streets) with a 20' wide alley.
- (2) A 20' wide drainage and utility easement must be dedicated to accommodate existing utilities and drainage.
- (3) All parcels that are adjacent to the abandoned right-of-way and owned by the applicant must be replatted.

Property owners within 200 feet of this request were notified. One (1) response was received in favor of the request and three (3) responses were received in opposition. Staff recommends approval of a partial abandonment of the alley (north 315 feet) and that the remaining portion of the alley is replatted with access to either Grape or Beech Streets and with the recommendations of the Plat Review Committee.

Mr. McClarty opened the public hearing.

Ms. Leona Fern Carter stated that she has lived at 2591 Grape Street for 30 years and they have never had a problem with the alley. Ms. Carter stated that she did not understand why the request is to close the entire alley. Ms. Carter stated that the gas and sewer lines are in the alley and asked what would occur with these utilities if the alley was closed. Ms. Carter stated that she and her parents (who live next door to her) are opposed to the entire alley being closed.

Mr. McClarty stated that if the Commission votes as recommended by staff only the northern 315 feet of the alley will be abandoned and this will not affect the alley behind her residence. Mr. Luther stated that the utilities would remain in their current location.

Mr. Luther stated that at this point, the recommendation of the Commission could go three ways: the request could be denied; the northern 315 feet could be approved for abandonment; or, the Commission could approve abandonment of the entire alley. Mr. Luther stated that the Commission needed to hear from the proponent prior to voting on this item.

Mr. Harold Preston, representing Hardin Simmons University, stated that their proposal is to abandon the entire alley; however, the University could work with the City in abandoning only the northern 315 feet. In this case, alley exits would be onto Beech or Grape Streets. The property within the alley abandonment area is to be utilized for soccer fields and would be fenced. The University has no current plans to construct any buildings in this area.

Dr. Long asked about the recycling containers currently located in this area.

Mr. Preston stated that the recycling containers could be moved to Hohertz Street.

Mr. McClarty closed the public hearing.

Dr. Long moved to approve TC-2007-01 as recommended by staff (closing only the northern 315 feet of the alley and with the conditions recommended by the Plat Review Committee). Mr. Famble seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of four (4) in favor (Famble, Long, Luther and McClarty) to one (1) abstention (Harkins).

Item Six: Rezoning Requests:

a. Z-2007-07

Public hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on a request from Lydia Goodman to rezone property from RS-6 (Single-family Residential) to MU (Medical Use) zoning, located at 1818 Walnut Street. Legal description being the North 45 feet of Lot 18 and the South 30 feet of Lot 19, Block 2, Simmons Terrace Subdivision, Abilene, Taylor County, Texas.

Justin Fortney presented the staff report for this item. The request is to rezone a parcel from RS-6 (Residential Single-Family) to MU (Medical Use). This property has had a single family home on it since 1923. Homes in the area were built from the 1920's to the mid 1950's. This home backs-up to medical offices. This property was annexed in 1911 and zoned as follows:

- 1940's Residential Multi-Family
- 1950's Residential Single-Family
- 1960's Heavy Commercial
- 1980's Residential Single-Family

In October of last year the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council approved rezoning the parcel to the south (1802) from RS-6 to MU.

The applicant owns the subject lot but lives in the house just to the north (1826). She is interested in rezoning the property in order to sell it to the owners of the adjacent dental office (1809 Pine). The applicant states that they would like their proposed parking lot on 1802 Walnut to include the subject property.

Staff was opposed to the rezoning of 1802 Walnut from RS-6 to MU because it was believed to be an intrusion into a viable neighborhood. The City Council and many members of the Planning and Zoning Commission attested that this entire area will be transitioning to medical uses in due time. In addition, many property owners that were notified of that request were in favor of the rezoning.

Property owners within 200 feet of the rezoning request were notified and one (1) comment form was returned in favor of the request and none (0) opposed. Staff is recommending approval of the request.

Dr. Long stated that she is personally opposed to the demolition of a perfectly good house to construct a parking lot. Also, this lot cuts across a neighborhood and her recollection of the Comprehensive Plan is that older neighborhoods should not be divided or “chopped-up” in this manner.

Mr. McClarty opened the public hearing.

Ms. Lydia Goodman, owner of the property for which the zone change is being requested, stated that the home on this property requires major repairs. Ms. Goodman stated that she cannot afford maintenance requirements for this beautiful old home and eventually the entire area will be owned by Hendrick Medical Center.

Mr. McClarty stated that he, most of the Planning and Zoning Commissioners, and City Council members are in agreement that the entire area will eventually be utilized for medical uses.

Mr. McClarty closed the public hearing.

Mr. Luther moved to approve Z-2007-07. Mr. Harkins seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of five (5) in favor (Famble, Harkins, Long, Luther, and McClarty) to none (0) opposed.

b. Z-2007-08

Public hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on a request from Kenneth L. Cleaver to rezone property from AO (Agricultural Open Space) to GC (General Commercial) zoning, located at 6502 Highway 277 South. Legal description being 23.596 acres out of Samuel J. Ricker Survey No. 45, Abilene, Taylor County, Texas.

Gloria Elder presented the staff report for this item. The request is to rezone 23.6 acres from AO to GC. This property is primarily vacant except for a residential structure that was once used as a multi-room housing facility and rented out during hunting season. The subject property was annexed in 1986 and has remained AO since that time.

The applicant is requesting a very large area of General Commercial zoning, but has no definite plans for the property at this time. He has mentioned possible future uses including a medical office, electrical contracting office, or some mix of retail-type uses. However, none of these would require zoning to the intensity of General Commercial. Staff is concerned about the size of the tract and the possible types and density of uses located at the periphery of the city. Furthermore, the tract surrounds an existing home located on the north side of Autumn Sage Lane. The Zoning Ordinance states that “residential uses are not compatible with the environment created in the GC district, due to the character and high level of activity characterized by permitted use.”

Staff could possibly support rezoning a smaller area on the northeastern portion of the parcel to Office or Limited Commercial zoning, but feels that the applicant’s uncertainty of future plans makes even this recommendation premature.

The site is located approximately one quarter of a mile from the intersection of two arterials and is adjacent to a planned collector street as designated on the Thoroughfare Plan. The Southwest Area Land Use Plan Phase II, adopted in 1993, calls for transitional and low density residential uses for the general area around this tract. The recommendation for transitional zoning would encompass just a small fraction of the acreage at the northeast corner of the subject parcel to separate the existing General Commercial zoning centered on the intersection of Highway 277 and Dub Wright Boulevard from the surrounding residential and agricultural uses.

The Future Land Use portion of the Comprehensive Plan shows only low-density residential uses for this entire area.

Property owners within 200 feet of the rezoning request were notified. One (1) response was received in favor of the request and two (2) responses were received in opposition. Planning staff recommends denial of this request due to the fact that GC is considered a fairly intense commercial zoning district.

Dr. Long asked if GC zoning is generally permitted adjacent to residential zoning?

Ms. Elder responded, “No, the Zoning Ordinance states that General Commercial zoning is not considered compatible adjacent to residential given the types and intensity of uses that are permitted in that zoning district.”

Mr. Harkins asked if the land use for the area was speculative at this point.

Ms. Elder responded affirmatively. Ms. Elder stated that staff would support some type of transitional zoning along the northern or eastern portion of the tract; however, would need to work closely with the applicant to determine a specific area, the amount of acreage, the layout of the site, etc.

Mr. McClarty opened the public hearing.

Mr. Kenneth Cleaver, proponent, stated that he has placed both his home and electrical business (located in the Metroplex) up for sale. He plans to relocate both his residence and electrical business to Abilene. Mr. Cleaver stated that he selected GC zoning due to the current GC zoning in the area. Mr. Cleaver stated that he has tentative plans for a portion of the property but not the entire property. Mr. Cleaver stated that since submitting his request he has learned that Limited Commercial zoning is very similar to General Commercial (Limited Commercial does not allow some of the activities in General Commercial and would be more compatible with a residential neighborhood).

Mr. McClarty asked Mr. Cleaver if he would be interested in the Commission tabling this item to allow him to speak with the City staff to explore all options for this property.

Mr. Cleaver responded affirmatively to this question.

Mr. Rick Grant stated that he is the owner of the residence located on Autumn Sage. Mr. Grant stated that his concern at this point is the type of uses that would be allowed in General Commercial zoning. Mr. Grant provided the Commissioners with pictures of his property. Mr. Grant stated that they have made numerous improvements to this property, including a wooden deck, landscaping, a patio, etc.

Mr. McClarty closed the public hearing.

Dr. Long stated that she did not understand the point in tabling this item. The request is for GC zoning and she stated that she is not inclined to approve GC zoning. What is the purpose of tabling this item?

Ms. Elder stated that the Commission might provide direction to the applicant as to the type of zoning they would like to be requested – different zoning; smaller area; etc.

Mr. Dan Santee stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission always has the option of granting a more restrictive zoning classification. The presumption has been, from a Legal standpoint, that if the Commission desired a more restrictive zoning classification, that would be their recommendation. In this case, the applicant could not request rezoning (different from that approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission) for 12 months. This is the reason Legal staff has always encouraged the Commission to table an item; thus allowing the applicant to appear before the Commission the following month and save an additional filing fee.

Mr. James stated that if the item is tabled at this meeting, the item will appear on the agenda next month as a rezoning request to GC because this was the original filing request – even if everyone is agreement of a more restrictive zoning category.

Dr. Long moved to table this item to allow time for the property owners involved to dialog regarding uses that are agreeable to both parties. Mr. Famble seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of five (5) in favor (Famble, Harkins, Long, Luther and McClarty) to none (0) opposed.

Item Seven: Subdivision Regulations Amendment

Public hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on amendments to Section 23-262.5(B) regarding cul-de-sac design and construction requirements.

Gloria Elder presented the staff report for this item. Ms. Elder stated that Planning staff was contacted by the Public Works Department requesting our assistance in amending the design standards for new cul-de-sacs. The current standard for all zoning districts besides Industrial and Heavy Commercial districts requires a 50' radius of right-of-way dedication for the turnaround, with only a 40' radius of paving. The newer, larger Solid Waste vehicles have difficulty maneuvering around the cul-de-sac, especially if any vehicles are parked within the turnaround. In addition, the small turnaround area may cause difficulty for emergency vehicle access and maneuvering.

The City Engineer recommends increasing the minimum size requirements for all cul-de-sac turnarounds to be equal with the current standard for Heavy Commercial and Industrial zoning districts. The new requirement would provide a 60' radius for right-of-way dedication and a 50' radius for paving.

In addition to the turnaround standards, staff has also looked at the maximum length for cul-de-sacs compared to our peer cities. Our current standard for Industrial and Heavy Commercial zoning districts is 600' of length, but all other areas are permitted to have up to 1000' cul-de-sacs as long as each one serves no more than 25 single-family homes. Staff's recommendation is to bring our requirements in line with our peer cities and make our standard consistent throughout the city regardless of zoning by requiring a maximum 600' length for all cul-de-sacs. This will ensure better access to and from neighborhoods during emergency situations and reduce the amount of people affected if the single entrance to the cul-de-sac became temporarily inaccessible.

In order to clarify how cul-de-sacs are measured, staff proposes to amend the wording to ensure that the length is measured from the end of the cul-de-sac to the nearest through street with more than one outlet, which is how our current ordinance is being applied. Staff recommends changing the language to remove any doubt regarding the intent of this provision.

This is a four part request:

- a. Increase the minimum turnaround radius of right-of-way dedication to 60' in all areas
- b. Increase the minimum turnaround radius for paving to 50' in all areas
- c. Decrease the maximum cul-de-sac length from 1000' to 600' in all areas
- d. Clarify the language for measuring cul-de-sac length

Planning staff recommends approval of the proposed amendment.

Ms. Elder stated that staff will be looking at multiple zoning district - not just single-family dwellings which is the district addressed by the current ordinance. Duplexes and multi family developments are not addressed. Currently this type of development is allowed on cul-de-sacs and this is a safety concern. Multi family developments will be omitted from the proposed cul-de-sac regulations so that staff can study these areas in depth. A more comprehensive recommendation for this type of development will be provided for the Land Development Code.

Enlarging the turnaround portion of the cul-de-sac will add area to the paving and right-of-way dedication and to the length of the sidewalk circling the cul-de-sac.

Additional right-of-way: 3,456 sq. ft. (44%)

Additional paving: 2,827 sq. ft. (56%)

Additional Sidewalk: 63 feet (31%)

Staff feels that these changes will allow adequate access for Solid Waste vehicles and emergency vehicles.

Mr. McClarty asked if health/safety/welfare concerns have been raised in the past due to the length of cul-de-sacs?

Mr. James responded that there are several reasons why most cities limit cul-de-sacs:

1. Basic street connectivity – multiple means of ingress/egress - reduces traffic activity and provides connectivity for pedestrian and bicycle.
2. Health/Safety issues – entrance for emergency response vehicles and exits for citizens to evacuate the area. With the new Land Development Code, staff is investigating limiting the number of homes with only one access point.

Mr. McClarty opened the public hearing.

Mr. Bruce Bixby provided the following information for discussion:

1. Regarding the 50-foot versus 60-foot cul-de-sac, all of the lots on the straight portion of the street leading up to the cul-de-sac would have to be larger. Mr. Bixby stated that if the cul-de-sac is widened, more land is required for the lots on either side of the cul-de-sac.
2. Therefore, the costs for land and pavement will be increased.
3. Mr. Bixby stated that the City has had the 50-foot cul-de-sacs for a long time and seem to be OK – What has changed? Perhaps the refuse vehicles have increased in size.
4. Regarding the length of the cul-de-sacs and the through streets, as subdivisions plans are being developed, more through streets require more pavement and therefore costs are increased.

Mr. Bixby stated that care should be taken when amending an ordinance to not attempt to remedy an issue that has not been a problem. Every issue being discussed at this meeting impacts the cost of a home.

Mr. Harkins stated that “balance” is the key. In the current situation where there is not absolute means of measuring the length of the cul-de-sac – this issue require clarification.

Mr. Bixby stated that there are two (2) questions to be answered:

1. “What are we measuring to?”
2. “What is the allowable length?”

Mr. Harkins stated that a third question to be answered is the size of the cul-de-sac (circle).

Mr. Bob Hammond stated that he has spoken with six to eight developers regarding this issue and the only real concern raised regarding this issue is the length of the cul-de-sac. This becomes a much larger problem in the ETJ where the lot sizes are larger. Mr. Hammond stated that he spoke with one developer who was requested by Taylor County to utilize the 60 foot radius, and this was not a problem; however, the 1000 foot length is necessary in order to get enough lots in the ETJ.

Mr. McClarty closed the public hearing.

Mr. Harkins asked for comments from Bob Lindley, City Engineer, regarding the refuse vehicles.

Mr. Lindley stated that the request to review cul-de-sacs was received from both the Fire Department and the Solid Waste Division of the Public Works Department. The new refuse

trucks are bigger and heavier and the fire trucks have difficulty maneuvering within a cul-de-sac. Mr. Lindley stated that maneuvering these vehicles - due to the weight coupled with the heat in summer – causes a great deal of damage to the street surface.

Mr. Harkins requested that four parts of these Subdivision Regulations amendments be considered individually.

Mr. James requested that items a. and b. be considered in one motion because there is no need to increase the right-of-way if the pavement width is not increased.

Mr. Harkins moved to deny items a. and b. (increase the minimum turnaround radius of right-of-way dedication to 60' in all areas; and, increase the minimum turnaround radius for paving to 50' in all areas). Mr. McClarty seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of five (5) in favor (Famble, Harkins, Long, Luther and McClarty) to none (0) opposed.

Dr. Long moved to approve items c. and d. (decrease the maximum cul-de-sac length from 1000' to 600' in all areas; and, clarify the language for measuring cul-de-sac length). Mr. Famble seconded the motion.

Mr. McClarty stated that his preference would be to vote on items c. and d. separately.

Dr. Long amended her motion to approve item c. (decrease the maximum cul-de-sac length from 1000' to 600' in all areas). Mr. Famble seconded this motion.

Mr. Harkins requested discussion prior to voting on this item. Mr. Harkins stated that he thought he could see the need for longer cul-de-sacs in the ETJ (with larger lots – 1 to 2 acres). He did not, however, see such a need for smaller lot developments (either in town or in the ETJ).

Mr. McClarty stated that he still has not heard a reason where it has been a Health/Safety issue in the past and no one has provided this information other than our “Sister Cities” follow these guidelines. Mr. McClarty stated that there is no question in his mind that if the length is decreased, costs for first-time homeowners will be increased (increase in pavement will result in costs that will be passed on to the homeowners). Mr. McClarty stated that until he has more information regarding solid Health/Safety reasons, he is not in favor of the decrease in cul-de-sac length).

Dr. Long's amended motion to approve item c. (seconded by Mr. Famble) was denied by a vote of two (2) in favor (Famble and Long) to three (3) opposed (Harkins, Luther and McClarty).

Mr. James stated that because this motion failed for lack of affirmative votes, the motion is still on the table for additional motions regarding item c.

Mr. Luther asked if the ETJ could be separated from this item and considered in a different manner.

Mr. James stated that if this is the direction from the Commission, he would recommend keeping the 1000' distance for one (1) acre lots or greater (in the ETJ or within the City). This would be consistent with the distinction currently in the Subdivision Regulations. The 600' requirement would apply only to lots of less than one (1) acre.

There were no additional motion regarding item c.; therefore, the motion made by Dr. Long failed due to lack of a majority.

Mr. Harkins moved to approve staff's recommendation regarding item d. (clarify the language for measuring cul-de-sac length – measuring from the center of the cul-de-sac to a through street). Mr. McClarty seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of five (5) in favor (Famble, Harkins, Long, Luther and McClarty) to none (0) opposed.

Mr. McClarty requested that the following questions be answered prior to hearing the Director's report: 1) Status of staff research regarding ETJ (water lines, etc.) prior to submission to City Council; 2) Status of Rural Development Code – what information is involved in this code and why did it not come before the Planning and Zoning Commission; and, 3) Sidewalk issue – did the Planning and Zoning Commission (and the City) provide the community with adequate time to act and/or discuss this issue. Mr. McClarty requested that item b. under the Director's report be discussed first.

Item Eight: Director's Report

b. Update on homeless shelter

Mr. James stated that staff has been meeting with representatives of the homeless shelter regarding this request. Staff has provided other funding options (CDBG funds) to this group. Mr. James stated that in terms of the CIP request, the CIP is being forwarded to the City Council without a specific recommendation but with the Commission's direction to continue to study this issue and work with this group with the intent of including this item (homeless shelter) in next year's CIP (if an arrangement can be determined that would be eligible for CIP funding).

Mr. McClarty stated that last month the Commission and staff discussed a small amount of uncommitted funds that could possibly be utilized for seed money for studies. Mr. McClarty asked how this was addressed by City staff.

Mr. James stated that currently City staff has no plans from the individuals representing the homeless shelter that would include an element that is fundable through the CIP. In order to utilize these funds to finance a study, it would have to be tied to some plan that would be eligible for CIP funding. Staff continues to investigate this issue and will bring this issue to the City Council. The Council could potentially set aside these funds for this purpose.

Mr. McClarty stated that this is an issue that should be addressed and pursued by the City.

Mr. James addressed additional concerns expressed by Mr. McClarty:

1. ETJ Regulations – The City Manager appointed a committee at the direction of the City Council. This committee included representatives from the County, City staff, Water Supply Corporations, and others. This committee developed a consensus recommendation that has been developed into ordinance form by staff.

This ordinance has been submitted to the City Council and will be considered by the Council on March 22, 2007.

2. Rural Residential Zoning – This was submitted as a companion ordinance amendment with the ETJ Regulations for rural residential zoning. This amendment would allow “a large lot zoning classification” that could be utilized in the City using the same “lowered” standards available to ETJ development. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of the Rural Residential Zoning districts at the time the ETJ regulations were reviewed.
3. Sidewalks – The City currently has a Sidewalk Master Plan and Sidewalk Ordinance in effect. The ordinance was adopted by the City Council and revised to include a waiver provision (for sidewalks) to allow an appeal process to the City Council regarding the installation of sidewalks.

- a. Update on Community Appearance ordinance revisions.

Mr. James stated that staff intended to present the revised Landscaping Ordinance at this meeting; however, a couple of issues prevented this: 1) Staff wanted to ensure that all of the Commission’s recommended changes were included in the ordinance; and, 2) Staff’s intent was to present this information to the entire Commission (the terms of two (2) Commissioners have expired and the Council has not yet made appointments for these expired terms). This information should be on the April agenda.

Also, the Sign Ordinance Review Committee has met and a recommendation from this group and staff has been developed for the regulation of billboards. The suspension on billboard permits expires in June and staff has focused only on amendments to the billboard regulations. The remainder of the Sign Ordinance will be undertaken as soon as this issue has been resolved. An ordinance amendment regarding billboards will be submitted to this Commission in April and then forwarded to City Council for their consideration.

- c. Discuss the March 22nd City University Board and Commission Fair.

Mr. James asked for volunteer(s) to participate in a panel discussion regarding Boards and Commissions for City University participants. This panel discussion will be held on March 22nd from 5:00 to 5:30 p.m. Mr. James asked the Commissions to contact him if they are interested in participating in this panel discussion.

- d. Recent City Council decisions regarding items recommended by the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Commissioners were provided with a memorandum outlining final decisions by the City Council on recommendations from the Planning and Zoning Commission. All items were approved by the Council consistent with the recommendations of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Item Nine: Adjourn

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

Approved: _____, Chairman