

---

**PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

**September 2, 2008**

**Minutes**

---

Members Present: Bruce Bixby  
Ovelia Campos  
Fred Famble  
Lydia M. Long  
Clint Rosenbaum

Members Absent: Tim McClarty  
David Todd

Staff Present: T. Daniel Santee, City Attorney  
Jon James, Director of Planning and Development Services  
Edward S. McRoy, Assistant Director of Planning and Development Services  
Ben Bryner, Planning Services Manager  
Robert Allen, MPO, Transportation Planner  
Kelley Messer, Assistant City Attorney  
Matt Jones, Planner I  
Zack Rainbow, Planner I  
JoAnn Sczech, Executive Secretary, Recording

Others Present: William K. Morris, P.E.  
Mike Choate  
B. Bradshaw  
Malony Morrison  
Chris Westbrook  
Dave Boyll  
Ken P. Musgrave  
Bill Senter  
Scott Senter  
Terry T. Franklin

**Item One: Call to Order**

Mr. Fred Famble called the meeting to order at 1:32 p.m. and declared a quorum present.

**Item Two: Invocation**

Mr. Rosenbaum gave the Invocation.

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

**Item Three: Approval of Minutes**

**Mr. Rosenbaum moved to approve the minutes of the August 18, 2008, Planning and Zoning Commission meetings. Dr. Long seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.**

**Item Four: Plats**

Mr. Zack Rainbow presented information regarding plats a. - d. The plats are complete and are being submitted for consideration by the Commission. Mr. Rainbow stated that staff is recommending approval of these plats as all meet Subdivision Regulation requirements.

Mr. Famble 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.

**Ms. Campos moved to approve FP-2908; MRP-3308; MRP-4108; and, MRP-4308. Dr. Long seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of five (5) in favor (Bixby, Campos, Famble, Long, and Rosenbaum) to none (0) opposed.**

**Item Five: Rezoning Requests**

a. Z-2008-32

Public hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on a request from Stripes, LLC, Agent: Mike Choate, to rezone property from AO (Agricultural Open Space) to GC (General Commercial) zoning, located at the northeast corner of Loop 322 and East Industrial Boulevard.

Mr. Matt Jones presented the staff report for this case. The request is to rezone property from AO to GC. The subject parcel totals approximately 1.4 acres and is currently zoned AO (Agricultural Open Space). The parcel is undeveloped. The adjacent properties have AO to the north and east, with GC (General Commercial) to the south across East Industrial Boulevard, and AO and LI (Light Industrial) across Loop 322 to the west.

The area was annexed in 1968 and zoned AO (Agricultural Open Space). The property has been undeveloped since being annexed and remains AO.

Currently the property is zoned AO and is undeveloped. Most of the surrounding area is undeveloped. There is a multi-family subdivision to the northeast of the property, as well as a large insurance provider company across Loop 322 to the west. Cisco Junior College is located to the south of the subject property across East Industrial Blvd.

The Future Land Use section of the Comprehensive Plan designates this general area as a Major Commercial and Business Center. The Cisco Junior College and Lone Star Park additions to the south have established a higher aesthetic standard than the minimum standards for GC development. A PDD would be considered appropriate to ensure that the higher aesthetic standards will continue along Loop 322 with this development.

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

Planning staff recommends approval of a PDD.

Mr. Rosenbaum asked which PDD within this area staff is trying to match.

Mr. Jones stated that staff is attempting to match this PDD with the Lone Star Ranch PDD. Cisco Junior College, although not a PDD, was built to the standards of a PDD. Therefore, PDD zoning of the site would ensure the exterior matches that of Cisco Junior College. Rezoning to General Commercial (GC) would not ensure matching development in this area as it would with a PDD. Also, the area is not an Enhancement Corridor.

Mr. James stated that when Lone Star Ranch was developed, the discussion was to ensure that Loop 322 developed as a high quality, attractive corridor since the area was basically undeveloped. Mr. James stated that unless staff is provided a different direction today, previously it was decided that any new development along the loop would be developed as a PDD with higher standards.

Dr. Long asked why this area was not considered an enhancement corridor.

Mr. James stated that enhancement corridors were created as a part of the Comprehensive Plan and as written into the plan these were areas identified as areas or corridors requiring improvement. When the Comprehensive Plan was developed, the Enhancement Corridor designation was not placed on any new corridor or where new growth would occur. Mr. James stated that development in new corridors will be addressed in the corridor overlay and corridor overlay standards will be included in the new Land Development Code.

Mr. Famble opened the public hearing.

Mr. William Morris, Engineer for Stripes, stated that he is present to answer any questions from Commissioners. This site will be similar to the other Stripes facility (Dub Wright and Hartford) with high quality standards.

Mr. Mike Choate with Stripes, LLC, stated that he had spoken with Jon James and the Planning staff and it was not clear to him that higher standards for the exterior would be required for this development; however, additional communication with staff will be undertaken since a site plan has not yet been submitted. Mr. Choate stated that this property was acquired when the Town and Country Food Stores were purchased.

Mr. Rosenbaum asked Mr. Choate if the PDD was a drastic change or in line with the type of construction for a Stripes establishment.

Mr. Choate stated that the proposed PDD is a substantial change which will result in additional costs on their part. Mr. Choate stated that the typical façade for their structures is diamond shapes made of stucco on the front, sides and rear of the building. Mr. Choate asked staff if the location at Dub Wright and Hartford would have the same requirements.

Mr. James responded that this PDD is very similar to the PDD that has been approved by this Commission at Dub Wright and Hartford. Mr. James stated that, in fact, the standards might be higher at the Dub Wright location as it specifies a particular material to match the other buildings in the area (in particular, Dyess AFB requested that limestone be utilized to match building on the Base). Mr. James stated that at the time the PDD was approved, the site was owned by Town and Country and they had already designed the building and had provided architectural renderings of the proposed structure.

Mr. Santee stated that if Mr. Choate does not agree with the specifications agreed to by Town and Country, Mr. Choate can request that the PDD be amended.

Mr. Famble closed the public hearing.

Ms. Campos stated that she is concerned that the current land owner is being required to meet standards agreed to by the previous owner. Ms. Campos stated that if the current owner has no problem meeting this higher standard there is no problem. If they do object, however, they should not be held to the standards agreed to by a previous owner.

Mr. James stated that there are two issues:

1. If there is an agreement between the seller and buyer of a piece of property – this is outside the enforcement or jurisdiction of the Planning Department
2. The City has the ability and authority to set minimum standards for development  
Staff's philosophy along the Loop 322 corridor is that future development would be held to a higher standard – such as that of Lone Star Ranch. (Mr. James stated that if this Commission believes this standard to be too high, they could recommend that staff change the standard requirements.)

Dr. Long stated that if development in this area is to be held to a higher standard, then the area should be rezoned or designated as a corridor.

Mr. James responded that a PDD is a tool utilized by staff in order to obtain a higher standard of development. Mr. James stated that an overlay corridor could be placed on the area – and this might take place some time in the future – but until that happens, staff will continue to recommend the a PDD.

Mr. Rosenbaum stated that he is somewhat concerned to the PDD limiting the exterior to masonry. Mr. Rosenbaum stated that in his opinion stucco is a perfectly acceptable material in this instance.

Mr. James stated that if it is the consensus of the Commission, staff could be directed to rewrite the PDD regarding building materials – “Materials should be consistent with requirements of the enhancement corridor.”

Mr. Rosenbaum asked if the 10 foot maximum and an area of 80 square feet monument sign is consistent with signage in other PDDs in the area.

Mr. James stated that the standard recommended by this Commission for the new sign ordinance is 10 feet in height and 96 square feet in area. The final draft ordinance has not been submitted to the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council; therefore this recommendation and the ordinance have not yet been approved.

**Mr. Rosenbaum moved to approve Z-2008-32 with the exception of Part 7, B, 1a. – the wording be revised to be more consistent with the enhancement corridor language regarding building materials, particularly including stucco. Ms. Campos seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of four (4) in favor (Campos, Famble, Long and Rosenbaum); one (1) abstention (Bixby) and none (0) in opposition. Dr. Long voted to approve the PDD but asked**

**that the record reflects that she believes the zoning should be GC (General Commercial), instead of PDD.**

**Item Six: 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 between Southwest Drive and Catclaw Drive.

**Ms. Campos moved to remove this item from the table. Dr. Long seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.**

Mr. Ed McRoy, Assistant Director of Planning and Development Services, presented the staff report for this amendment. The P&Z first considered modifications to the Thoroughfare Plan in this area on April 7, 2008. At that time, the proposal was limited to a potential new collector street connecting Southwest Drive and US Highway 277. During this meeting, the P&Z expanded the proposal, directing staff to evaluate the potential for an additional connection east of Southwest Drive. The P&Z discussed this expanded option at its June meeting, gave more specific direction on a preferred alignment, and tabled further action to September to allow staff more time to focus on their preferred alignment.

A Preliminary Development Plan (PDP - Butterfield Meadows), and zoning for commercial, office and residential uses was recently approved along US Highway 277 near Bassetti Elementary School. Portions of this area have been platted and are currently under construction including a part of a collector street (Butterfield Parkway) which extends from US Highway 277 to the southeast. The Thoroughfare Plan currently shows this new collector (Butterfield Parkway) terminating at a T intersection with another future collector street (Kayla Drive) west of a tributary of Elm Creek. The developers of the Butterfield Meadows site approached City Staff suggesting we consider extending the "Butterfield Parkway" collector eastward to create a direct connection between US Highway 277 and Southwest Drive.

Such suggestions/requests are routinely reviewed by City Staff and forwarded to P&Z and the City Council when they are found to have potential merit. In evaluating modifications to the Thoroughfare Plan, staff considers a variety of concerns. These include; the need to provide an adequate, efficient, and logical transportation system, the need for consistent application of regulations and policies, the benefits and costs of connectivity, the need to balance private property rights with the public good, the need to prevent traffic congestion, and the ability to improve safety through road design.

Proposed roadway locations on the Thoroughfare Plan are intended to indicate approximate locations or corridors that become more specific as development occurs. Future thoroughfares that appear on the Thoroughfare Plan do not typically have a specific timetable for construction established within the plan. Construction of these roads most commonly occurs with the development of adjacent or surrounding undeveloped property.

This specific action to revise the Thoroughfare Plan would add two new collector street sections not currently shown on the Thoroughfare Plan and eliminate a looped collector. The new collector streets would provide cross connections between several radial thoroughfares in the area.

Western Section – US Highway 277 to Southwest Drive

The first proposed section (discussed by P&Z on 04/07/08) would extend a collector street that is already on the Thoroughfare Plan to create a continuous route between US Highway 277 and Southwest Drive by crossing a shallow tributary of Elm Creek that passes through the area. Historically, the City has tended to refrain from forcing developers to cross such features with roads where they might present a significant additional cost or engineering challenge. In this case, the change in elevation appears to be less than 10 feet reducing the engineering issues for this feature.

Improved traffic flow from this collector will promote the commercially zoned properties along US Highway 277 and it will provide more convenient and direct access for future residential lots expected to be developed in the area. This additional connection will reduce trip lengths, congestion and will enhance safety. **Staff recommends approval of this section.**

Eastern Section - Southwest Drive to Catclaw Drive

The second section, indicated as a preferred option by the P&Z, would continue the first section across Southwest Drive intersect Sharon Road, and then connect to Catclaw Drive at Rolling Green (see attached map). The main channels for both Elm Creek and Catclaw Creek with their associated floodplains pass through this area. A regional detention facility is also located west of Catclaw Drive near the intersection of Rolling Green Drive.

The City Public Works Department preliminary estimate indicates that a bridge crossing Elm Creek to accommodate the proposed thoroughfare would cost approximately \$1.7 million. A box culvert/low-water crossing for Catclaw Creek would cost approximately \$1.2 million. Modifications to the regional detention facility would be needed to accommodate the new road. Public Works has provided a very preliminary cost estimate for such modifications as \$150,000. This estimate does not include any costs associated with the acquisition of additional land or other expenses that may be needed to compensate for the loss of design volume out of the detention facility. The expense associated with bridges, culverts and crossing flood prone areas can be limiting factors that inhibit the development of property. A public subsidy or participation in the costs is sometimes necessary to facilitate the provision of such facilities.

Of the potential options evaluated, the identified path appears to have a number of positive elements. The proposed route provides access that is more direct to the Abilene Mall and nearby retail. The route passes through less 100-year floodplain than other potential routes. The route provides a greater opportunity to split the ROW burden by splitting a property line. The proposed route would create 4-way intersections at both Catclaw Drive and Southwest Drive providing a greater potential that these intersections might meet warrants for traffic lights in the future. Finally, the proposed route would offer relief to congestion that is expected to continue to intensify at the intersection of Catclaw and Southwest Drive.

However, in addition to the water features and floodplain challenges previously discussed, this area has a number of challenges that also limit its attractiveness. Electric transmission lines, an underground pipeline, topography variations, road curvature, and current land use activities and facilities in the area affect the viability of the route.

A significant elevation difference between Rolling Green Road and the west side of Catclaw Road would require significant buildup to accommodate the intersection. This intersection also has significant concrete drainage channel improvements that might require alteration to accommodate another road connection.

The intersection of Catclaw and Rolling Green lies at a point between two curves that limits visibility to approximately 400 feet north and 800 feet south of the intersection. If the new route connects with Rolling Green to maintain the current optimal 90-degree intersection angle, significant portions of the regional detention facility would need to be altered. An attempt to minimize this effect on the detention facility would require a deflection of up to 30 degrees from 90 on this intersection impairing intersection visibility. Current Subdivision Ordinance standards require intersections of new roadways to be situated at an angle of 90 degrees plus or minus 15 degrees.

Soil and sand extraction operations using pit mining methods are located in proximity to the proposed route. The southernmost pit does not appear to extend into or block this preferred route. Operations at this southernmost location appear to be suspended at this time. A more complete survey of conditions and a more fully developed roadway centerline will be needed to confirm the extent to which this feature might effect or block the preferred route. Two additional pits are actively in operation to the north of this currently preferred route. Staff met with the operators of this site when evaluating a route that would connect at Cedar Run. They have indicated in these discussions support for a new road that would connect at Cedar Run. Adoption of a new roadway section in the Thoroughfare Plan as proposed would not preclude continuation of extraction operations in the area.

Current traffic volumes observed along Rebecca Lane indicate there is substantial excess capacity in this roadway. This condition is expected to continue for a number of years. Although the intersection of Catclaw Drive and Southwest Drive is expected to have increasing congestion as the area develops, Staff believes that Curry Lane will offer an adequate outlet to relieve some of this pressure for travelers heading northbound up Catclaw Drive and for drivers traveling eastbound who wish to turn south onto Catclaw. The construction of Sharon Road from just south of Curry Lane to Rebecca Lane will also provide significant additional relief to congestion pressures in this area. Sharon Road is likely to be designated as a “minor arterial” (new classification) and upgraded with a future Plan update.

#### Staff Recommendation

City Staff recommends **approval** of the extension of the collector street in the Butterfield Meadows development easterly from its currently shown termination point to Southwest Drive, i.e., the “western section” as depicted in the attached Preferred Alignment Map. Staff **does not** recommend a collector street from Southwest Drive between Elm Creek and Rebecca Lane to Catclaw Drive at Rolling Green, i.e., the “eastern section.”

Mr. McRoy indicated that staff had previously discussed the proposed changes in terms of an eastern and western section but that it might be more advisable to consider the potential road amendments in thirds:

1. The section between Southwest Drive and Highway 277
2. The section between Southwest Drive and Sharon Road
3. The section between Sharon Road to Catclaw Drive (This is the most problematic section and the section not supported by Staff.)

Mr. Bixby stated that the map indicating the latest change seems to have captured the changes recommend by the Commissioners at their last meeting. Staff was directed to study a road toward Rolling Green and decide how this should work – staff’s recommendation being submitted to the Commission today is that this connection does not work. Mr. Bixby stated that the intersection of these roads is a “detail.” The general concept includes the recommendations of the Commission. Mr. Bixby stated that in addition to the information provided by Mr. McRoy, the reason for this design is that it appears as though 95% of the land traversed by this road is out of the floodplain (100 year) and would provide maximum ability to develop the area.

Mr. McRoy stated that with any thoroughfare planning, the primary discussion concerns corridors. As engineering plans are prepared for individual sites, it is sometimes discovered that the roadway must be relocated or intersections modified.

Mr. Bixby stated that he believed the general concept to be correct and did not feel that the Commission would want to attempt to design the intersection at this time.

Mr. McRoy stated that at the present time, only arterial and/or collector street categories are within the current Plan. Mr. McRoy stated that it appears that there is a need for a new category (minor arterial). Mr. McRoy stated that Sharon Road would be a suitable candidate for such a category in the future. Mr. McRoy requested clarification from the Commission (to the extent possible) regarding their perception of traffic flow in this area, i.e., is the primary concern to enhance the flow in a north/south direction through Sharon Road or paralleling Rebecca Lane.

Mr. Bixby stated that knowing that this (Thoroughfare Plan) is a general plan and subject to change, he stated that he did not see a problem with the “T” intersection – this plan can be amended in the future.

Mr. Famble opened the public hearing.

Mr. Scott Senter pointed out the tract owned by his family (which extends to Southwest Drive) and indicated the tract of land owned by the O.B. Stephens family. Mr. Senter stated that in the 1970s a plan was in place which conceptually extended Sharon Road to Antilley Road. Mr. Senter stated that they purchased right-of-way, surrendered right-of-way, swapped some land and viewed power lines installed along a future right-of-way. Mr. Senter stated that this is still a good plan and felt the City should expend infrastructure funds to install Sharon Road as a two-lane highway and let developers install curb and gutter, etc., to assist in relieving traffic congestion in the area. Mr. Senter stated that the “T” intersection connecting Southwest Drive with Highway 277 is a good idea; however, building a bridge in the area to cross the floodplain would be very expensive. Mr. Senter stated that in their opinion, Sharon Road accomplishes what needs to be accomplished in this area. Mr. Senter stated that their future plans revolve around the original Thoroughfare Plan. Now, changes are being considered due to a request for a Thoroughfare Plan amendment. The cost for installing an arterial street would be extremely expensive – expenses that cannot be recovered by a developer. Mr. Senter stated that extending Sharon Road to the Kohl’s Department Store (from Rebecca to Sharon) would create a huge improvement in traffic flow in this area. The extension of Sharon Road, as proposed by Mr. Senter, would afford Mr. Senter and Mr. Stephens the opportunity to design streets on their property as opposed to transecting their property.



Mr. Bixby stated that discussion at the last Commission meeting when this item was discussed centered around two issues: traffic flow and designing the thoroughfare not only for traffic flow but also to allow for the best use of the property utilized for the roadway. Mr. Bixby stated that the plan being presented today was favorable over other plans because it only crosses the creek one time and allows for development on both sides of the road (which lies within the 500 year floodplain).

Mr. Chris Westbrook with McMahon Law firm was present at this meeting to represent Elm Acres Venture Limited Partnership. Mr. Westbrook stated that Elm Acres Venture owns property on both sides of Southwest Drive and will, therefore, be impacted by both proposed changes to the Thoroughfare Plan. Mr. Westbrook stated that the Commissioners received a letter from Elm Acres which sets out their position regarding this issue. Mr. Westbrook stated that Elm Acres Venutre, LP, would urge denial of both plans for the following reasons:

1. Convenience and necessity may have become confused in this amendment.
2. The plan for Rebecca Lane, Sharon Road and the extension of Kayla Drive is in place and this plan accomplishes many of the efforts being considered at today's meeting.

Mr. Westbrook stated that the development of Sharon Road provides the thoroughfares required in this area. Mr. Westbrook stated that he understands and appreciates that the Commission must look at future development; however, this has been accomplished by a previous P&Z Commission and they have set forth a plan that will work and will cover the current and future "necessities" for this area.

Mr. Tal Fillingim with Jacob and Martin, agent for Butterfield Meadows, stated that to some extent this Thoroughfare Plan amendment was initiated by Butterfield Meadows, LLC. Mr. Fillingim stated that the master concept plan for Butterfield Meadows called for a possible extension of the collector street (Butterfield Meadows Parkway) to hopefully at a future date tie into Southwest Drive. Mr. Fillingim stated that he will be speaking only to that portion of the amendment from Kayla Drive to Highway 277. From a traffic and transportation standpoint, there is a need for a connection between Highway 277 and Southwest Drive. The locations indicated on the map provided for this amendment are approximate locations. Mr. Fillingim stated that they believe this to be a reasonable request and ask for the Commission's favorable consideration of the segment he mentioned earlier (Highway 277 to Southwest Drive) regardless of the plan amendment to the south.

Robert Allen, MPO Director, provided some historical perspective regarding the Thoroughfare Plan. Mr. Allen stated that the Metropolitan Planning Organization works closely with the City of Abilene in maintaining and developing the plan. Mr. Allen stated that in all revisions to the Thoroughfare Plan for the past 20+ years attempts have been made to shy away from mandating stream crossings where to the cost for such crossings is uncertain. Mr. Allen stated that the stream crossing being discussed at this meeting, based upon staff research, will not be a majorly expensive crossing to install (will be crossing a tributary and not a main creek or stream crossing). Mr. Allen stated that if the technology existed in 1990 to provide the level of information available today, the MPO would have recommend, as staff, at that time that this crossing be on the Thoroughfare Plan (that a collector street be located in this area). Mr. Allen stated that the discussion at this meeting will be a part of any amendment to the Thoroughfare Plan Policy in conjunction with the Land Development Code.

Mr. Famble closed the public hearing.

Mr. Bixby stated that the three property owners who spoke regarding this issue are very knowledgeable and he respects their opinions; however, the primary task for this Commission is to ensure that roads

are designed properly for the future of Abilene. Mr. Bixby stated that probably the area can be developed without the eastern section, although the plan does not work as well without the connection between Highway 277 and Southwest Drive. Mr. Bixby stated that the expense of the bridge is a great consideration in this plan.

Mr. Famble asked Mr. Bixby if he was recommending that the plan amendment end at Southwest Drive.

Mr. Bixby stated that in his opinion the best design for the future of Abilene is for some continuity and to allow the road to continue to Rebecca Lane, but there are cost constraints in crossing the creek. Mr. Bixby stated that the triangle created by Sharon Road, Southwest Drive and Rebecca Lane are sufficient.

Mr. James stated that the problem with delaying these plans is that if a development comes in tomorrow and this is not on the plan, they could develop in such a way that could preclude this amendment from ever happening in the future.

Mr. McRoy stated that the changes being considered by the Commission today, if they elected to act on this item, would be to add collector roads. This is important for determining right-of-way for platting purposes.

Mr. Rosenbaum stated that after careful consideration of the amendment, the original plan for the east side is the correct configuration. Mr. Rosenbaum stated that Curry Lane, from Sharon Road to Catclaw, should also be a collector street. Mr. Rosenbaum stated that the western portion of this amendment would be a convenience for the individuals in the surrounding subdivisions.

Mr. Bixby stated that he came to the same conclusion as Mr. Rosenbaum regarding the eastern portion of the plan. On the west side, Mr. Bixby stated that the City should proceed because it is much less expensive to cross the tributary and does much to relieve traffic.

**Mr. Bixby moved to approve the west section and delete the eastern section of the Thoroughfare Plan amendment (leave Sharon Road as it is – Highway 277 to Southwest Drive on the west and stop at Southwest Drive). Ms. Campos seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of four (4) in favor (Bixby, Campos, Famble and Long) and one (1) opposed (Rosenbaum)**

**Item Seven: Director's Report**

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

Commissioners were provided a memorandum regarding recent City Council actions. The rezoning request (to Office zoning) for property located on Sayles Boulevard near South 14<sup>th</sup> Street was denied by this Commission (due to a three (3) to three (3) tie vote) but was approved by the City Council (by a 4-2 vote).

Mr. James stated that he received an update from the Sefko Planning Group, Consultants for the Land Development Code. Mr. Sefko has assured Mr. James that a draft will be provided to staff this month. The Land Development Code Review Committee will be assembled and the draft will be reviewed within the very near future. In anticipation of this review, staff will not be moving forward with any

minor ordinance amendments. Any outstanding concerns will be included in this Code review.

**Item Eight: Adjourn**

There being no further business, the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_, Chairman