
PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION

February 4, 2008

Minutes

Members Present:

Bruce Bixby
Ovelia Campos
Fred Famble
Lydia M. Long
Tim McClarty
Clint Rosenbaum
David Todd

Staff Present:

Richard Burdine, Assistant City Manager, Economic Development
Jon James, Director of Planning and Development Services
T. Daniel Santee, City Attorney
Paul Knippel, Director of Public Works
Edward S. McRoy, Assistant Director of Planning and Development Services
Don Green, Airport Manager
Tony Neitzler, Assistant Director of Community Service
Jim Berry, Assistant Chief of Police
Odis Dalton, Assistant Director, Finance
Robert Allen, Transportation Planner, MPO Director
A.C. Alrey, Economic Development
Matt Jones, Planner I
Zack Rainbow, Planner I
JoAnn Sczech, Executive Secretary (Recording)

Others Present:

Larry C. Sanders
Tommy Carpenter
Tommy Stevens
Charles Wolfe
Melvin Faircloth
Shawn Martin
Ray Templeton

Media Present:

Darcy Dupree, KRBC

Item One: Call to Order

Ms. Ovelia Campos called the meeting to order at 1:32 p.m. and declared a quorum present.

Item Two: Invocation

Mr. Fred Famble gave the invocation.

Ms. Campos read the opening statement for the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Item Three: Approval of Minutes

Mr. McClarty moved to approve the minutes of the January 7, 2008, Planning and Zoning Commission meeting as submitted. Mr. Famble seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Item Four: Plats

Zack Rainbow presented information regarding plats listed on the agenda. Two (2) plats are being submitted for consideration by the Commission. Mr. Rainbow stated that staff is recommending approval of these plats as both meet Subdivision Regulation requirements.

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

Mr. Bixby moved to approve MP-0108. Mr. McClarty seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of seven (7) in favor (Bixby, Campos, Famble, Long, McClarty, Rosenbaum and Todd) to none (0) opposed.

Mr. McClarty moved to approve MRP-0208. Mr. Todd seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of six (6) in favor (Campos, Famble, Long, McClarty, Rosenbaum and Todd), one (1) abstention (Bixby), and none (0) opposed.

Item Five: Rezoning Requests

a. Z-2008-05

Public hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on a request from the Abilene Improvement Corporation to rezone property from HC (Heavy Commercial) to PDD (Planned Development District) zoning, located at 1309, 1317, 1325, and 1401 Pine Street.

Mr. Matt Jones presented the staff report for this case. The subject parcels, including a Right-of-Way (requested to be abandoned by the same applicant), total approximately 1.55 acres and are currently zoned HC (Heavy Commercial). The properties are currently used for commercial purposes. The adjacent properties have HC (Heavy Commercial) zoning to the north, south, east, and west.

The area was annexed in 1895 and zoned to HC (Heavy Commercial) along with a large majority of the surrounding properties sometime after.

Currently the properties are zoned HC (Heavy Commercial) and are used as such. The surrounding uses are all compatible with the current zoning. The applicant owns the properties to the north and south of North 14th Street and is also seeking to have that right-of-way abandoned. The requested PDD (Planned Development District) currently has two options for street setbacks. While the setback option might favor development, it could fail to create and define an urban setting along Pine Street, which is an objective of the Comprehensive Plan for the Pine Street corridor.

The Future Land Use section of the Comprehensive Plan designates this general area as part of a community enhancement corridor for Pine Street. The requested PDD (Planned Development District) would be a good place to start to help in the revitalization of the Pine Street corridor. Through the use of building setbacks and several aesthetic conditions, the requested zoning and uses would start the enhancement of Pine Street as designated by the Comprehensive Plan.

Property owners within 200 feet of the rezoning request were notified. Two (2) comment forms were returned in favor of the request and none (0) in opposition.

Planning staff recommends approval of the PDD (Planned Development District) zoning.

Mr. Jones provided some of the requirements of the PDD ordinance:

Building Setbacks	Building Materials
Off-Street Parking	Driveway Access
Screening	Landscaping and Buffering
Sidewalks	Limitation of Outdoor Merchandise and Display
Freight Containers Prohibited	Shielded Lighting

Mr. Bixby asked for clarification regarding items 6-11 on page 13 of the ordinance, i.e., do these requirements significantly differ from what is required in the current ordinance. Mr. Bixby asked particularly about the landscaping requirements (since the Commission recently approved a Landscaping Ordinance).

Mr. Jones stated that these requirements do not differ greatly from the Landscaping Ordinance currently in place. Mr. Jones stated that staff is in the review process for a corridor overlay for Pine Street. The PDD ordinance incorporated many of the standards staff envisions for this area in the future.

Mr. James stated that as the ordinance is currently written, two options are provided for setbacks:

1. An "urban" type building close to the property line
2. A "suburban" type building with parking in the rear

Mr. James stated that staff has researched the possibility of a corridor on Pine Street and discussed some of the standards staff would like included in this corridor. This request was received prior to staff being ready to recommend standards for the entire corridor. In discussions with this particular applicant, some of the standards that staff will likely be recommending for the Pine Street corridor have been included in this ordinance.

Mr. Bixby stated that his preference for the PDD would be to refer back to the Zoning Ordinance whenever possible. Mr. Bixby asked staff if an appeal process was in place for such issues as building materials.

Mr. James responded that the applicant would always have the option of appealing to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Ms. Campos opened the public hearing

Mr. Richard Burdine, Assistant City Manager and staff contact for the Abilene Improvement Corporation (AIC) and Abilene Development Corporation (ADC) stated that the AIC is the owner of this property. The ADC is in negotiations with the AIC to possibly purchase this site. If the ADC purchases the site, it will be for the construction of the Life Sciences Accelerator Project. Several other sites are being considered for this project; however, the Pine Street site is the site preferred by the DCOA Board. Mr. Burdine stated that a site plan is not available at this time; however, in general terms the site would be for a building over 300 feet long. The design would require a very long and

narrow site such as the site on Pine Street. The building would be approximately 20,000 to 24,000 square feet and the investment will be between \$3 and \$4 million dollars to construct the facility.

Mr. Tommy Stevens asked what the plans are for the west side of the street, where parking for this building will be located and the height of the structure.

Mr. James stated that the case being considered today is a rezoning case and at the current time there is no site plan for the site. The location of the parking area and the height of the building will be indicated on the site plan.

Mr. Tommy Carpenter stated that he did not return a comment form because at this point he is unsure as to what the plans are for this property. Mr. Carpenter stated that without further information he cannot state whether he is in favor or in opposition of the request. Mr. Carpenter stated that his response would also depend upon the closure of North 14th Street. Mr. Carpenter asked how this zone change request would affect the area bordering the PDD; i.e., five years from now it could be that since his property borders this PDD the rules and regulations for his property are changed.

Mr. James responded that at the present time City staff is researching the possibility of a corridor overlay for Pine Street. Currently, research is limited to those properties fronting onto Pine Street; however, future discussions and plans may change. Currently, the corridor overlay principles come into play when redevelopment occurs on property within the corridor.

Ms. Campos closed the public hearing,

Mr. McClarty moved to approve Z-2008-05 with the following amendment:

Page 14 – Lighting – strike the last sentence (all lighting shall be fully shielded and directed away from residential areas).

Mr. Bixby seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of six (6) in favor (Bixby, Campos, Famble, Long, McClarty and Rosenbaum); one (1) abstention (Todd); and, none (0) in opposition.

Item Six: Thoroughfare Closure

a. TC-2008-02

Public hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on a request from Charles Wolfe to abandon approximately 300 feet of the north to south alley right-of-way in the 2900 Block of South 1st Street, between South 1st Street and South 2nd Street, and 81 feet of alley right-of-way to the west beginning at the above mentioned alley right-of-way, ending approximately 170 ft. west of Sammons Street.

Mr. Matt Jones presented the staff report for this case. This request is to abandon approximately 300 feet of the north to south alley right-of-way in the 2900 block of South 1st Street between South 1st Street and South 2nd Street, and 81 feet of alley right-of-way to the west beginning at the above mentioned alley right-of-way and ending approximately 170 feet west of Sammons Street.

Improvements in the alley right-of-way in this area have not been completed. The applicant owns property on the north, east, and west of the requested abandonment. The alley right-of-way to the north of the east to west alley is currently being used by the adjacent property owners and has been

fenced off and paved. The adjacent lots have access to either South 2nd Street, South 1st Street, or Mockingbird Boulevard.

The applicant intends to extend his current parking lot into the alley right-of-way and into his property to the west of the current parking lot for his facility. The applicant has also proposed and is in the process of moving a portion of the north to south alley approximately 81' to the west in order to maintain service to those properties currently receiving utilities in the alley right-of-way.

The Plat Review Committee recommends approval with the conditions that the applicant replats within 24 months and maintains an open drainage/utility easement, as well as insure that the new alley is operational before closure.

Staff recommends approval of the requested abandonment with the conditions suggested by the Plat Review Committee.

Property owners within 200 feet of the request were notified. Two comment forms were received in favor of the request and none in opposition.

Dr. Long asked if the alley is abandoned does the property revert back to the property owner.

Mr. Bixby stated that state law requires that the City receive compensation for this land.

Mr. Santee stated that this is not the manner in which it has been applied within the City of Abilene. The City does not do the replatting or bear any costs – the property reverts back to the properties from which it was taken.

Mr. James stated that since the property was originally dedicated from a private owner to the City, if the City abandons the alley, the property reverts back to the private owner and no sale of property occurs.

Ms. Campos opened the public hearing. No one came forward and the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Bixby moved to approve TC-2008-02 provided the east line of the new alley continues in a straight line to the north across the existing alley. Mr. McClarty seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of seven (7) in favor (Bixby, Campos, Famble, Long, McClarty, Rosenbaum and Todd) to none (0) opposed.

b. TC-2008-03

Public hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on a request from Abilene Improvement Corporation, Agent: Greg Blair, to abandon North 14th Street from the east right-of-way line of Pine Street for 140 feet east to the west right-of-way line of the alley paralleling Pine Street.

Mr. Matt Jones presented the staff report for this case. This request is to abandon North 14th Street, starting at Pine Street heading east to the alley right-of-way. The lots that are adjacent to the right-of-way also have access off of either Pine Street or Walnut Street, so there would be no lot created without street frontage. The North 14th Street right-of-way does not provide continuous roadway

access through the city, but is interrupted by several north to south rights-of-way, Pine Street being one of them.

The applicant intends to use the requested right-of-way area for new development, specifically a new building that would be used for the purpose of a medical lab and associated uses. The right-of-way currently serves a major part in the drainage for the area by carrying storm water to the east. This closure would not be unique to North 14th Street as there are already many interruptions to the continuous east to west access along the North 14th Street right-of-way.

The Plat Review Committee recommends approval with the condition that the applicant replats within 24 months and a drainage plan be approved by the City Engineer to ensure that existing drainage in the North 14th Street ROW is adequately accommodated without negative impacts.

Planning staff recommends approval with the conditions recommended by the Plat Review Committee and that abandonment of the ROW continues through to Walnut Street but maintaining an alley ROW equal to the width of the street pavement.

Property owners within 200 feet of the thoroughfare closure were notified. One (1) comment form was returned in favor and none (0) in opposition.

Mr. James stated that if the street remained open, the City's street requirements would require the street to terminate in a cul-de-sac.

Mr. Bixby stated that he did not want to be random about making such decisions and that the decision is not based on the proponent – the decision should be based on a set of criteria.

Mr. Jones stated that much has to do with the negative or positive effect on the neighborhood.

Mr. James stated that another consideration is block length and general street connectivity. In this area there is a good "grid" system and the connectivity is in place.

Mr. Rosenbaum asked if it was correct that if the entire section of the street from Pine to Walnut was abandoned and no alley required, than a utility easement or utility right-of-way would be required.

Mr. James stated that this is correct unless, as a part of the replat, the adjacent property owners relocate the utilities. Normally, an easement would be retained.

Mr. Rosenbaum asked if this abandonment is recommended would the property owners off Walnut Street would be required to replat.

Mr. James responded that, as recommended, one of the conditions of the closure is that the replat occurs within the next 24 months; otherwise, the closure does not take effect.

Mr. Rosenbaum asked how this affects the property owners east of the alley and west of Walnut Street.

Mr. James stated that depending on how this is worded and the recommendation of this Commission, all of the property would have to be replatted. Therefore, if the property owners to the east did not

want the abandonment, the applicant in this case as part of their replat would need to include those properties in their replat (with the approval of the property owners). Mr. James stated that another option is to treat the properties completely separately – if this applicant abandons their portion of the street and the properties to the east do not take advantage of this action, then, a situation develops where a street ends in an alley.

Mr. McClarty stated that the 24 month timeframe could be removed – if the current property owner wants this property they can have it and if they don't want the property it is still theirs and they do not have to go through the cost of replatting.

Ms. Campos stated that she is in favor of this project; however, does not want any burden placed on the adjacent property owners.

Ms. Campos opened the public hearing.

Mr. Melvin Faircloth stated that he owns three (3) lots on Walnut Street and he is in favor of this project; however, the map he received with the notification letter indicates the entire length of 14th Street. Mr. Faircloth stated that he has no objection to closing North 14th Street from the alley west to Pine Street but he would object to the street totally being closed.

Mr. Jack Chamberlain stated that he owns property in this area and when he first received notice that proposed the street closing he had objections. Mr. Chamberlain asked the following questions:

1. The street will not be officially closed until the platting process takes place.

Mr. James responded that until the property is replatted, the street would not be technically abandoned. If the replatting does not occur within 24 months the street closing will not take place.

2. Mr. Chamberlain asked if the project fails, then, the street will not be closed.

Mr. James stated that this is correct.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that after speaking with Mr. Burdine regarding this project and the enhancements that will be brought to the neighborhood, he has no objection to the thoroughfare abandonment.

Mr. Tommy Carpenter stated that he has concerns regarding the length of the alley (or distance) between North 13th Street to North 16th Street. North 14th Street between Pine and Walnut Streets is vital to his business as far as access to suppliers. If North 14th Street is closed from the west side of the alley to the east side of Pine Street, an alleyway to Walnut Street would need to be retained.

Mr. Bixby stated that if he is hearing Mr. Carpenter correctly, he is not very happy about North 14th Street closing west of the alley; however, he could live with this if the alley continues east from the alley to Walnut Street

Mr. Carpenter stated that Mr. Bixby's statement is correct. Mr. Carpenter stated that it would create a burden for them if the street is closed from the alley to Pine Street but would not be detrimental to their business.

Mr. Bixby asked Mr. Carpenter the width of alley required for access to his business.

Mr. Carpenter stated that he did not have a definite measurement or width in mind but it would need to

be the same width as the current street.

Mr. James stated that in this case staff is recommending that the alley width be wider than a typical alley – basically the width of the existing pavement.

Mr. Paul Gutierrez (1433 Pine Street, located next to 1401 Pine Street) asked if the rezoning would affect him. Mr. Gutierrez stated that if the zoning of his property will remain as it is then this case will not affect him whatsoever.

Mr. Robert Allen, Metropolitan Planning Organization and Transportation Planner, provided the following comments regarding the potential closure of the alley, particularly that portion to the east of the alley:

- √ In general, when a thoroughfare is closed, it is a good idea to replat the property. There are many pieces of land within the City that have not been claimed and for which no one takes responsibility.
- √ There appears to be a great deal of use of this alley by adjacent property owners. The adjoining properties are primarily commercial properties that appear to utilize many trucks and trailers and for this reason leaving some access from the alley over to Walnut Street is important.

Mr. Richard Burdine stated that the interest of the AIC would be to see the north-south alley remain open. Mr. Burdine stated they are in agreement with staff's recommendation to narrow the right-of-way (from 80 feet to the width of the pavement) which should incorporate any utilities located in this area.

Ms. Campos closed the public hearing.

Dr. Long asked about the water line that runs under the east-west alley, i.e., what happens to this strip of land if the water line is relocated – will the area be repaved?

Mr. James stated that if a private property owner does construction that results in the installation of a new water line or replacing a water line under a street, that property owner would be responsible for restoring the street.

Dr. Long asked if the area was narrowed and designated as an alley, would repaving be required.

Mr. James stated that Dr. Long has raised a good point – if the area becomes an alley, it must be restored to a good condition meeting the conditions for an alley which may not necessarily mean that it is paved to the same standards as a street.

Ms. Campos reopened the public hearing.

Mr. Tommy Stevens stated that his water service is delivered via the alley – it may come from 14th Street but it comes down the alley for his property.

Ms. Campos closed the public hearing.

Mr. McClarty moved to approve Z-2008-03 with the following conditions:

- √ **Utilize the design for the alley as proposed by staff**
- √ **The alley will remain the same width as the current paved street**
- √ **The easement area (property) on either side of the alley – from the alley east to Walnut Street – will revert to each property owner or either side and the property owners do not have to replat unless they wish to take ownership of this property – and there is no time limit for replating of this property**
- √ **From the alley to the west where the street has been closed, the property owners have 24 months to replat the property for the property to go through as originally indicated in the staff report.**

Mr. Bixby seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of six (6) in favor (Bixby, Campos, Famble, Long, McClarty and Rosenbaum); one (1) abstention (Todd); and, none (0) opposed.

Item Seven: Thoroughfare Plan Amendment

Public Hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council to Consider an Amendment to the Thoroughfare Plan in an area generally described as being within approximately 9,000 feet of the intersection of Buffalo Gap Road (FM 89) and Beltway South (FM 707).

Mr. Ed McRoy presented the staff report for this case. This item was considered by the Planning and Zoning Commission as a result of a preliminary development plan. Within the review of the preliminary development plan was a request for a thoroughfare closure which was approved by this Commission. Approval of this thoroughfare closure resulted in a dead-end street within the Thoroughfare Plan because the abandonment applied only within the property of the preliminary development plan. During deliberation of this preliminary development plan, the Planning and Zoning Commission requested staff to look at thoroughfares in the general area and provide an analysis as to how this change in the Thoroughfare Plan might affect this area. Most of the recommendations submitted for consideration today are similar to those provided previously with the following exception: the extension of the road from Sierra Sunset. Staff is proposing that a collector street be connected – paralleling Beltway South and then turn to the north farther south than originally proposed. Other changes recommended (based on creating a better traffic flow throughout the area) include:

- A road is extended to connect to Old Forrest Hill Road rather than through White Boulevard
- Realignment of streets to avoid collector roads crossing over high pressure gas lines in multiple locations
- Realignment of Lantana Avenue collector street in order to have less intersections along Beltway South

Mr. McRoy stated that staff has not received any opposition from property owners in the area regarding the Thoroughfare Plan Amendment.

Staff recommends approval of this Thoroughfare Plan Amendment.

Ms. Campos opened the public hearing.

Mr. Ray Templeton, Beltway Park Church, stated that the extension of Sierra Sunset will cross the southern most part of their property and they are very much in favor of this. Mr. Templeton stated that they are in the process of obtaining the necessary permits to extend Sierra Sunset.

Ms. Campos closed the public hearing

Mr. Bixby moved to approve the Thoroughfare Plan Amendment. Mr. Rosenbaum seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of seven (7) in favor (Bixby, Campos, Famble, Long, McClarty, Rosenbaum and Todd) to none (0) opposed.

Item Eight: Discussion Item

Presentation and report on the 2008-2012 Capital Improvements Program.

Mr. Ed McRoy presented information regarding the 2008-2012 Capital Improvements Program. The Commissioners were provided with a three-ring binder containing detailed information (in the draft stage) regarding the CIP Program.

Mr. McRoy reviewed the five year CIP Program that identifies capital needs throughout the city and addresses the timing and financing of these projects. CIP projects are long-term projects that involve significant costs. Year one (2008) is the "capital year" and projects listed for this year will have actual dollar amounts assigned. Years 2009-2012 are placed in the plan for planning purposes to integrate projects. CIP recommendations from the Planning and Zoning Commission will be forwarded to the City Manager for his consideration. The City Manager's recommendations will be forwarded to the City Council. The Council will hold a public hearing and the Council is scheduled to take action on the CIP on April 10, 2008.

Mr. McRoy stated that approximately \$2 million dollars are available for CIP projects this year. The breakdown of CIP projects is as follows: (1) municipal facilities; (2) transportation and drainage; (3) parks; (4) public safety; and (5) other (staff has no project recommendations at this time). Mr. McRoy highlighted some of the upcoming projects in the CIP.

Mr. Bixby asked about the Fort Phantom Project, i.e., what did the bond election pay for and what is being financed by the CIP.

Mr. Tony Neitzler, Assistant Director of Community Services, stated that at this point, nothing has been paid for with bond money. These funds have been set aside for the overall development of at least three park sites at Lake Fort Phantom Hill. The Certificates of Obligations (COs) are projected to assist with work in the Dyess area as well as some additional redevelopment at Seebee Park. Most of the money from the bond project will be dedicated to Johnson Park on the north side at the dam. Currently, conceptual plans are being developed for this project for submission to the State for grant funding. If funding is secured from the State, it may be possible to divert some of the bond money to the Dyess area or Seebee Park, depending on the amount of funds acquired.

Dr. Long asked what prompted the Maxwell Golf Course Irrigation Project indicated as a new project.

Mr. Neitzler stated that the Maxwell project has been in the plan on the unfunded list for a number of years. What brought this project in this year was some of the flood damage experienced at Maxwell Golf Course last spring. At that time it was realized that serious problems existed that needed to be addressed. A contractor operates the golf course for the City, but this flood damage is way beyond the scope of the operational contract and staff felt that the project should advance on the Community

Services priority list. This appears as a new project; however, it has either been on the far end of the list or as an unfunded project for a number of years. Circumstances now warrant that this project be brought forward.

Dr. Long asked why the Public Safety Improvements show up this year in “red” because she specifically remembers asking the Police Department last year if they anticipated needing anything in the next five years and was told “no” to this question.

Mr. Jim Berry, Assistant Chief of Police, stated the he could only speak to the Police Academy Building. Actually, this project was presented in 2005 as a part of the bond package. Since that time, the Academy has undergone extensive flood damage. In the process of renovation, mold and asbestos abatement was required. In December, the Police Department was notified of approval of \$240,000 in Federal funds which had been applied for approximately 18 months to two years ago. This is the reason the CIP project was generated.

Dr. Long asked if the CIP funding would be in conjunction with the Federal funding.

Chief Berry responded affirmatively.

Mr. James stated that when the Directors meet to review these projects and to prioritize them, they will be asked to look at their entire program for the five year period.

Mr. McClarty stated that four or five years ago, the Planning and Zoning Commission addressed the problem of the homeless in the City of Abilene. The Commission voted (7-0) for a project to be placed in the CIP to address this issue. This issue was address the next year and the Commission was told that the City of Abilene was investigating other methods for funding this project, or at least begin research on such a project. Mr. McClarty stated that this project was not included in last year’s CIP program; however, when this project was discussed at last year’s meeting, the Commissioners directed the City staff to make a recommendation to City Council that undesignated funds amounting to approximately \$20,000 to \$25,000 be utilized to at least study the situation and return a recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission. Mr. McClarty stated that he will continue to bring this issue forward every year until the City does something about homelessness in Abilene.

Dr. Long stated that Mr. McClarty’s interests have not gone unheeded because there is now a nonprofit in town that is addressing this very issue. Dr. Long stated that she is on the Board of Directors of this nonprofit and as soon as they are at a point where they can come back to the City – all the groundwork has been completed – they will do so.

Item Nine: Director’s Report

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

Mr. James stated that all the cases recommended for approval by the Commission at their December meeting were approved by the City Council on January 10, 2008. Also on January 10, the amendments to the Sidewalk Master Plan were approved by the Council except for the removal of the requirement in single-family neighborhoods.

b. Reminder of a special meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission on February 18, 2008, at 5:30 p.m. to hold a public hearing for the 2008-2012 Capital Improvements Program.

Mr. James stated that Commissioners have indicated that this meeting might be moved to another date or be considered at the regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission in March.

Mr. James asked the Commissioners to email him indicating the date they will be available – either the 18th or the 25th of February.

Item Ten: Adjourn

There being no further business, the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting was adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

Approved: _____, Chairman