
PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION

April 6, 2009

Minutes

Members Present: Bruce Bixby
Ovelia Campos
Fred Famble
Clint Rosenbaum
David Todd

Members Absent: Gary Glenn
Tim McClarty

Staff Present: Jon James, Director of Planning and Development Services
Dan Santee, City Attorney
Ed McRoy, Assistant Director of Planning and Development Services
Kelly Messer, Assistant City Attorney
Ben Bryner, Planning Services Manager
Matt Jones, Planner I
Zack Rainbow, Planner I
JoAnn Sczech, Executive Secretary, Recording

Others Present: Dave Boyll
Rollie H. Sheppard, Jr.
Wendell Mathis
Fred Owen
Coy Tate
Mike Casey
Jean Casey
Steve Stovall
Marlene Higgins
Francis Renfroe
Zella McKinney
Charles L. Spicer
B.J. Prichard
Mark & Lindy Garrett
Matthew Muzechenko
Alan Burns
Nick Coates
James L. Cole
Fred Ewing
Blair Church
Mary Ann Fergus
Paula Beall
Scott Hearne
Kirk House
Ryan
Paul Johnson
Kay Spiva
Richard Belt

Kris Kimbrell
Norma Springer
Earl Foster
Tal Fillingim

Item One: Call to Order

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

Item Two: Invocation

Ms. Campos gave the Invocation.

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

Item Three: Approval of Minutes

Mr. Clint Rosenbaum provided the following corrections to the minutes:

- ⇒ **March 2, 2009 – Approval of Plats – Mr. Rosenbaum’s name should be added to those voting in favor of approval.**
- ⇒ **March 16, 2009 – Z-2009-04 – Mr. Glenn’s name should be added to those voting in favor of tabling this item.**

Ms. Campos moved to approve the minutes of the March 2nd and 16th meetings, with corrections.

Mr. Bixby seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Item Four: Rezoning Requests

1. Z-2009-03

Public hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on a request from Brian Delehanty, Agent: Paul Johnson & Associates, to rezone property from O (Office) to GC (General Commercial) zoning, located at 701 South Judge Ely Boulevard.

Mr. Bruce Bixby moved to remove this item from the table. Mr. Rosenbaum seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Ben Bryner presented the staff report for this case. The original request was to rezone property from O (Office) to GC (General Commercial). The request has been amended to rezone from O (Office) to SC (Shopping Center).

Planning staff recommends denial of Shopping Center zoning.

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

Currently the property is zoned O (Office) and has not been developed. The properties to the east are developed with single-family homes, the properties to the north and south are also undeveloped, and Craig Middle School is directly across Judge Ely Boulevard to the west. The Judge Ely Bike Path runs along the west ROW line of the subject properties.

The Future Land Use section of the Comprehensive Plan designates this general area as part of a Local Community Center and an Enhancement Corridor. Commercial activity along Judge Ely Boulevard is compatible with the surrounding area. But given the close proximity to residential areas and a school, some commercial uses may not be appropriate. There is also a Bike Path along the east side of South Judge Ely Boulevard so access and traffic flow might be an issue for the subject property. The PDD zoning to the north allows for uses permitted within the SC zoning. In addition, that PDD zoning includes restrictions on building design, parking & ingress/egress, and signage. For these reasons, Staff does not feel that SC zoning is appropriate for this property and recommends a PDD zoning.

Mr. Bryner had prepared a draft PDD ordinance for this area and presented this information to the Commission members. A copy of the proposed PDD was sent to the Commissioners prior to this meeting.

Mr. Todd asked if the PDD proposal was submitted to the proponent.

Mr. Bryner stated that this information was submitted to the proponent today.

Mr. Bixby provided a list of uses within the PDD if the SC zoning is retained. Some of these uses could possibly be objectionable to the residents of this area, e.g., pool halls, service groups, funeral homes, auto parts stores, gasoline sales, liquor stores, pet stores, etc.

Mr. Bryner stated that these uses are the reason for preferring O (Office) zoning. Staff did not craft the PDD eliminating many of the SC uses due to the fact that the PDD to the north of this property was approved recently with no restrictions on SC uses.

Mr. Bixby stated that Office zoning is quite often utilized as a “buffer” between residential and more intense uses.

Mr. Famble opened the public hearing.

Mr. Paul Johnson stated that just today he received information regarding a PDD and has not had an opportunity to review this recommendation. Mr. Johnson stated that he felt sure the owner or the property would be willing to work with staff, particularly due to the proximity of the school to this property. Mr. Johnson stated that eliminating all curb cuts off Judge Ely Boulevard is very restrictive. Also, the elimination of “no drive-thru” businesses would not be practical. With the proper design, the drive-thru line could be queued so as not to obstruct traffic flow on Judge Ely Boulevard. Mr. Johnson stated that they have contacted residents of this neighborhood and received no opposition to the development.

Mr. Todd asked Mr. Johnson if he felt he and his client might want to review the PDD and discuss this issue with City staff.

Mr. Johnson stated that he would speak with his client if that is the request of this Commission.

Ms. Mary Ann Fergus, representing the interest of the property owners to the south, stated that either SC or a PDD would be favorable.

Mr. Famble closed the public hearing.

Mr. Bixby stated that it is his belief that Office zoning is the correct transitional zoning - SC zoning is much too permissive in what is allowed in this zoning district for this location.

Mr. Bixby moved to deny rezoning from Office to Shopping Center.

Mr. James stated that denying the SC zoning today, the applicant would then have to apply for a new zoning case (PDD). Tabling the case with direction to staff and the applicant to investigate a PDD, the applicant would not be required to pay a new application fee and basically restart the process.

Mr. James stated that at the Commission's March meeting, it was staff's understanding that they work with the applicant on crafting a PDD. Staff contacted the applicant regarding a PDD and was informed that the client was not interested in a PDD at this time, but would change the rezoning request from GC to SC.

Mr. Bixby withdrew his motion.

Mr. Famble reopened the public hearing.

Mr. Todd asked Mr. Johnson if he would prefer the Commission table this item or go forward with the SC rezoning request.

Mr. Johnson stated that he had no problem with tabling this item.

Mr. Famble closed the public hearing.

Mr. Bixby moved to table Z-2009-03 until the May Commission meeting. Ms. Campos seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of five (5) in favor (Bixby, Campos, Famble, Rosenbaum and Todd) to none (0) opposed.

2. Z-2009-05

Public hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on a request from Glen Weatherbee, Agent: Tal Fillingim, to rezone property from PDD-104 (Planned Development District) to AO (Agricultural Open Space) zoning, located at the northwest corner of Oldham Lane and Loop 322.

Mr. Matt Jones presented the staff report for this case. The request is to rezone property from PDD to AO. The subject parcel totals approximately 84.29 acres and is currently zoned PDD-104 (Planned Development District). The subject property is undeveloped. The adjacent properties have AO (Agricultural Open Space) to the west and north, single and multi-family zoning to the east, and PDD-107 (Planned Development District) to the south. The area was annexed in 1968 and was later zoned to PDD-104 in 2006.

Currently the property is zoned PDD-104 and has not been developed. The City of Abilene has one of its fire stations in the northeast corner of this PDD. There is single and multi-family zoning located to the east across Oldham Lane from the subject property. The remainder of the properties that surround the subject property are zoned for agricultural uses and used as such.

The Future Land Use section of the Comprehensive Plan designates this general area as a Community Enhancement Corridor and for residential uses. The current zoning allows for service and retail uses along Loop 322 with single and multi-family uses along Industrial Boulevard. Agricultural Open Space is considered the City's base zoning and is less intensive than the current PDD allows for. The requested AO zoning is also compatible with the surrounding uses.

Property owners within 200 feet of the rezoning request were notified. One comment form was returned in favor and ten (10) in opposition.

Planning staff recommends approval as requested.

Mr. Rosenbaum asked the proposed uses for the PDD.

Mr. Jones stated that proposed uses within the PDD include commercial, office, and single family and multi family uses.

Mr. Famble opened the public hearing.

Ms. Francis Renfroe stated that when the PDD rezoning request was submitted, many meetings were held and a great deal of money was spent to agree upon the rezoning request. Ms. Renfroe stated that much of the land has been cleared and did not understand why AO zoning should be reinstated. Ms. Renfroe stated that she submitted a comment form in opposition of the rezoning. Ms. Renfroe stated that going back to the AO zoning would be a step backward because the possibility for development is in place.

Mr. Todd stated that language exists within the PDD which states that if a building permit is not applied for within 18 months from the date of the zone change, the Planning Director may initiate action for the PDD to revert back to its original zoning. The original PDD request was over three years ago.

Mr. Charles Spicer stated that he agrees with Mrs. Renfroe that rezoning to AO will be a step backward. There is a good plan in place now – a great deal of time was spent with Mr. Weatherbee and the City staff to develop a PDD that would be compatible with the neighborhood. Mr. Spicer stated that if the property is being rezoned to reduce the amount of taxes paid, rezoning should not be considered. Mr. Spicer stated that the property is listed on the tax roll as “unimproved property” and is appraised at significantly less than the purchase price. Mr. Spicer stated that if a tax reduction is not the reason for Mr. Weatherbee's request, then there must be another reason. Mr. Spicer stated that if the property is rezoned to AO, the parcel will undergo another zone change at a future date and he does not look forward to going through the negotiation process again. Mr. Spicer requested that the subject property not be rezoned.

Mr. Tal Fillingim, agent for Mr. Weatherbee, stated that a portion of the 85+ acres (approximately 50 acres) will be to establish native grassland. This is one step toward obtaining an agriculture exemption for the property. The rezoning request to AO allows the owner to pursue the agricultural exemption.

Mr. Todd asked if Mr. Weatherbee had sold any of the property within this parcel of land.

Mr. Fillingim stated that none of the property has been sold.

Mr. Famble closed the public hearing.

Mr. Todd moved to approve rezoning request Z-2009-05. Mr. Bixby seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of five (5) in favor (Bixby, Campos, Famble, Rosenbaum and Todd) to none (0) opposed.

3. Z-2009-06

Public hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on a request from Steve Stovall, Agent: Enprotec/Hibbs & Todd Inc., to rezone property from RS-6 (Single Family Residential) to RS-6/PH (Single Family Residential/Patio Home Overlay) zoning, located at 3501 Chimney Rock Road.

Mr. Matt Jones presented the staff report for this case. The request is to rezone property from RS-6 to RS-6/PH. The subject parcel totals approximately 2.66 acres and is currently zoned RS-6 (Single Family Residential). The subject property is undeveloped. The adjacent properties have single family residential zoning to the north, south, and west, with PDD-26 (Planned Development District) to the east. The area was annexed in 1963 and zoned RS-6 sometime after being annexed, with part of the subject property being zoned RS-6 in 1988.

Currently the property is zoned RS-6 and has not been developed. The properties surrounding the subject property are all zoned to allow for single family residential and the majority of the lots have already been developed as such. There are properties directly to the east that allow for patio home development.

The Future Land Use section of the Comprehensive Plan designates this general area as low density residential. The requested Patio Home Overlay zoning is compatible with the Future Land Use Map and is also compatible with all of the current uses surrounding the subject property.

Planning staff recommends approval as requested.

Property owners within 200 feet of the rezoning request were notified. Two (2) comment forms were returned in favor and four (4) in opposition of the request.

In order to conserve time, Mr. Jones also presented the staff report case Z-2009-07 at this time.

4. Z-2009-07

Public hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on a request from Steve Stovall, Agent: Enprotec/Hibbs & Todd Inc., to rezone property from RS-6 (Single Family Residential) to O (Office) zoning, located at 3501 Chimney Rock Road.

Mr. Matt Jones presented the staff report for this case. The request is to rezone property from RS-6 to O. The subject parcel totals approximately 2.4 acres and is currently zoned RS-6 (Single Family Residential). The parcel has been developed and used as a church. The adjacent properties have RS-6 zoning to the north, south, east, and west.

The area was annexed in 1963 and zoned RS-6 sometime after being annexed, with part of the subject property being zoned RS-6 in 1988.

Currently the property is zoned RS-6 and has been developed and used as a church facility. The properties surrounding this property are all zoned for single family residential and the majority of the lots have already been developed as such.

The Future Land Use section of the Comprehensive Plan designates this general area as low density residential. The requested Office zoning is typically considered to be compatible with low density residential zoning. There is a node of commercial development within close proximity of the subject property on the corner of Buffalo Gap Rd. and Chimney Rock Rd. that has similar uses to that which would be allowed with the requested zoning.

Planning staff recommends approval as requested.

Property owners within 200 feet of the rezoning request were notified. Three (3) comment forms were received in favor and six (6) in opposition of the request.

Ms. Campos asked the reason for the opposition to this request.

Mr. Jones stated that the main reason for opposition was increased traffic and traffic-related issues for this residential area.

Mr. Famble opened the public hearing regarding Z-2009-06.

Mr. B. J. Pritchard, agent for Mr. Stovall, stated that patio homes would be a perfect fit with the neighborhood since there are currently several patio home developments surrounding this property. Mr. Pritchard provided illustrations of the potential development.

Mr. Famble closed the public hearing regarding Z-2009-06.

Mr. Bixby moved to approve the rezoning request for Z-2009-06. Ms. Campos seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of four (4) in favor (Bixby, Campos, Famble and Rosenbaum); one (1) abstention (Todd); and, no (0) opposition.

Mr. Famble opened the public hearing regarding Z-2009-07.

Mr. B.J. Pritchard, agent for Mr. Stovall, provided an illustration of the proposed use for this site. Mr. Stovall proposes to renovate the existing church structure for use as a real estate office. Mr. Stovall proposes to place limited parking in the front of the structure with additional parking at the rear of the site. Mr. Stovall also proposes to enhance the detention pond adjacent to this property – create a family-type park with picnic tables, walking/jogging trail and baseball practice field. Mr. Pritchard stated that in their opinion the volume of traffic will not be greatly affected.

Mr. Steve Stovall stated that he is currently under contract to purchase the property. Mr. Stovall stated that he has visited with residents in the area to explain his plans for the area. Mr. Stovall stated that current concerns of the residents are: (1) appearance of the property; and, (2) traffic issue. Mr. Stovall

provided pictures of the current structure, which is in a state of disrepair. The current appearance of this structure affects land and tax values. Mr. Stovall stated that his goal is to improve the neighborhood, the appearance of the property, to use the property, provide infill development, and provide a substantial increase to the City's tax base.

Mr. Mike Casey stated that he lives directly across the street from the property being considered today for rezoning. Mr. Casey stated that he is opposed to any development that would add additional traffic to this neighborhood.

Ms. Zella McKinney stated that she is in favor of this request as Mr. Stovall's project will benefit the entire neighborhood and improve property values in the area.

Mr. Richard Belt stated that he is opposed to this request because of the lighting in the area and an increase in traffic. Mr. Belt stated that he did not understand why the Commission is considering a request to place an office in the middle of a residential neighborhood.

Mr. Rollie Sheppard stated that if this rezoning request will improve the appearance of the site then he is in favor of the request.

Ms. Paula Beall stated that Mr. Stovall has asked her company to assist him in developing a plan to rehabilitate this property. The appearance of the office, when completed, will fit well with the residential neighborhood and a landscaping plan has been developed for the site.

Mr. Fred Owen stated that he, too, would like to see this area developed. Mr. Owen stated that the fact that currently there exists a junk heap which no one can seem to enforce is not a reason to build something that is not needed in the middle of a residential area. Mr. Owen stated that the proposed office will increase traffic in this area and do nothing for the property value of the homes that currently exist in this area. Mr. Owen stated that there is a code enforcement problem in the area which the City needs to address and he is not in favor of this request.

Mr. Larry Church stated that while his residence does not border the site being considered, it will in some form increase the value of properties in the neighborhood. Mr. Church stated that it is quite possible that the planned improvements will generate significant traffic. Mr. Church suggested to the Commission and to Mr. Stovall that rather than emptying traffic onto Chimney Rock, that the proponent investigate a way to exit the traffic from the backside of the property on the Mabry Lane.

Mr. Famble closed the public hearing.

Mr. Bixby stated that this is a difficult case because churches are allowed in residential zoning and this case is the other side of the case, i.e., what happens when the structure no longer functions as a church. This is a special privilege provided by the City to churches to allow this use in this zoning, with the understanding that it would always be a church or residential zoning. Mr. Bixby stated that this is a difficult case because on one hand property owners have a legitimate expectation that the surrounding zoning will continue; however, on the other hand it is a legitimate concern that the project request at this meeting will clean up the area. Mr. Bixby stated that the question here is what happens to a church structure once it ceases to be utilized as a church. Mr. Bixby stated that there is always going to be the "temptation" to try to utilize a (church) structure as a commercial use in a residential area.

Mr. Famble asked staff about signage if the property is rezoned.

Mr. James stated that the business would be allowed a sign with a maximum area of 36 square feet and a maximum height of 12 feet.

Ms. Campos stated that she is not dismissing the residents concerns; however, she felt this would be an improvement to the area.

Ms. Campos moved to approve Z-2009-07. Mr. Rosenbaum seconded the motion and the motion failed by a vote of two (2) in favor (Campos and Rosenbaum); two (2) in opposition (Bixby and Famble); and, one (1) abstention (Todd).

5. Z-2009-08

Public hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on a request from Sojourner Drilling Corporation, Agent: Mary Ann Fergus, to rezone property from RS-6 (Single Family Residential) to AO (Agricultural Open Space) zoning, located at 3865 Old Anson Road.

Mr. Matt Jones presented the staff report for this case. The request is to rezone property from RS-6 to AO. The subject parcel totals approximately 5.53 acres and is currently zoned RS-6 (Single Family Residential). The parcel has not been developed. The adjacent properties have RS-6 zoning to the east, MH (Mobile Home) zoning to the south, and AO (Agricultural Open Space) to the north and west. The City of Impact also borders the subject property to the north. The area was annexed in 1963 and zoned RS-6 sometime after it was annexed.

Currently the property is zoned RS-6 and has not been developed. The properties to the east are developed with single-family homes and are more characteristic of rural residential properties, the property to the south is developed with a mobile home, the properties to the north and west are used for agricultural purposes, and the City of Impact borders the property to the north. The entire property lies within the 100 year flood plain.

The Future Land Use section of the Comprehensive Plan designates this general area as open agricultural space. The properties surrounding the subject property are mostly developed with single family dwellings that resemble rural type residential properties, except to the north where the City of Impact has some commercial uses. The area around the property is also used for agricultural purposes making the request compatible with the current surrounding uses.

Planning staff recommends approval as requested.

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.

Mr. Famble opened the public hearing.

Ms. Mary Ann Fergus, representing Sojourner Drilling Corporation, stated that rezoning of the area is being requested to allow drilling on the site. Ms. Fergus stated that such use would increase the value of the land and the amount of taxes collected.

Mr. Todd asked if a drilling permit from the City had been obtained.

Mr. Burns responded that rezoning is being requested in order to be in the correct zoning district for drilling.

Mr. James stated that the proponent had submitted the application for drilling and was denied by Planning Staff because the site was not zoned properly for zoning.

Ms. Marlene Higgins stated that her property joins the property on which the drilling is to take place if the rezoning is approved. Ms. Higgins stated that she did not return her comment form, however, she is in favor of the request.

Mr. Famble closed the public hearing.

Mr. Bixby moved to approve Z-2009-08. Mr. Todd seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of five (5) in favor (Bixby, Campos, Famble, Rosenbaum and Todd) to none (0) opposed.

Item Five: Street Name Change

SNC-2009-01

Public hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on a request from Nick Coates to change the name of Nichol Drive to John C. Stevens Street.

Mr. Matt Jones presented the staff report for this case. The request is to change “Nichol Drive” to “John C. Stevens Street.” The street extends approximately 120 ft to the northeast from Rountree Drive. There are currently no lots that have frontage on Nichol Drive.

The applicant is requesting to change the name of Nichol Dr. to John C. Stevens St. There are currently no lots that have an address on Nichol Dr., so no property owners would be directly affected by the change in the name of the street.

The Plat Review Committee recommends approval as requested.

Planning staff recommends approval as requested.

Property owners within 200 feet of the request were notified. Three (3) comment forms were returned in favor of the request and one (1) in opposition.

Mr. Famble opened the public hearing. No one came forward and the public hearing was closed.

Ms. Campos moved to approve SNC-2009-01. Mr. Famble seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of four (4) in favor (Bixby, Campos, Famble and Rosenbaum) and one (1) in ~~opposition~~ abstention (Todd).

Item Six: Ordinance Amendment

Public hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on an Ordinance amending Section 23-313 of the City of Abilene Zoning Ordinance regarding building lines.

Mr. Ben Bryner presented the staff report for this item. This ordinance amendment specifically pertaining with setbacks associated with the Zoning Ordinance's manufactured housing district. The current setbacks for lots with MH (Manufactured Housing) zoning are 25 feet in the front, 15 feet in the rear, and 7.5 feet for the interior sides. Many of the City's mobile home subdivisions were platted 30 to 40 years ago and platted with a 15 foot front building line. Most of the lots in mobile home subdivisions are 50' X 110'. That only leaves room for a 70 foot mobile home to be placed on the property.

According to Trinity Homes and Palm Harbor homes, greater than 80% of the single wide mobile homes they sell are 72-76 feet in length.

Staff is proposing an amendment to Section 23-313 in the Zoning Ordinance to allow an exception to the required front building line for properties with MH zoning when adjacent to minor streets and subcollectors. The exception will allow a front building line of 15 feet.

Planning staff recommends approval of the proposed amendment.

Mr. Rosenbaum asked about carports considered by the Board of Adjustment.

Mr. Bryner stated that currently if the carport encroaches into this setback, a variance from the Board of Adjustment would be required for approval (five (5) feet from the property line). Staff has discovered that most of the carports or garages in these areas are to the side of the mobile home and ordinarily do not require a variance.

Mr. Famble opened the public hearing. No one came forward and the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Rosenbaum moved to approve the Ordinance Amendment. Mr. Todd seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of five (5) in favor (Bixby, Campos, Famble, Rosenbaum and Todd) to none (0) opposed.

Item Seven: Discussion Item

Select member of Planning and Zoning Commission to participate in the South Downtown Process Committee.

Mr. Jon James stated that at the conclusion of the downtown TIF District, the City Council set aside approximately \$100,000 for a South Downtown Study. The north side of the downtown area received most of the benefits of the TIF district. This study is to create a plan to encourage similar improvements for the south side of the downtown area. The Council has retained a Consultant to complete the South Downtown Plan and the consulting team is establishing a Process Committee for the project. It has been requested that at least one member of the Planning Commission serve on this Process Committee. Mr. James mentioned that Mr. Bixby has been recommended as a member of this Committee as a property owner in the downtown.

Mr. David Todd stated that he is a part of the consulting team and therefore would be unable to serve on this Committee.

Mr. Rosenbaum was recommended to represent the Planning Commission. Mr. Rosenbaum stated that he would be happy to serve; however, his current schedule involves a great deal of travel. Mr. Rosenbaum asked the timeframe for this work and the number of meetings anticipated.

Mr. James responded that there will likely be one or two meetings in April and one or two meetings in May. Mr. James stated that he could not provide a meeting schedule beyond May as the consulting team is determining the schedule. Mr. James stated that his guess would be one to two meeting per month for six to eight months.

Mr. Rosenbaum stated that he would be willing to serve; however, his schedule for the next three to four months will involve a great deal of travel and he is not sure how many meetings he will be able to attend.

Ms. Campos stated that evening meetings would work better for her and the AISD will be in a very busy timeframe very soon. Ms. Campos asked Mr. Famble if he would be available to serve.

Mr. Famble stated that he would check his schedule and if possible he would serve.

Ms. Campos stated that if it is not possible for Mr. Famble to serve, she will serve on the Committee. Ms. Campos stated that she did not think it would be a good idea to split the meetings between two Commissioners.

Mr. James recommended contacting those Planning Commissioners not present today also to determine if they would be interested in serving.

Mr. Rosenbaum asked if the meeting would be open meeting and would it cause a problem if more than one Commission attended the meetings.

Mr. James stated that this would not be a problem as long as a quorum of the Commission was not present at any meeting.

Mr. Rosenbaum stated that he would like to participate; however, with his current schedule the meetings would be on a "hit or miss" basis.

Mr. Bixby recommended submitting the names of Fred Famble and Clint Rosenbaum as the two members of the P & Z Commission.

Item Eight: Director's Report

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

The Commissioners received a memorandum from staff providing this information.

Mr. James stated that staff has prepared a summary sheet for the Capital Improvements Program. As mentioned at last month's meeting, the City has significantly less funding for this CIP than in the past.

Mr. Ed McRoy provided the Commissioners with a summary sheet and briefed the Commissioners regarding the funding reductions and changes made to the CIP program.

Item Nine: **Adjourn**

There being no further business, the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Approved: _____, Chairman
