
PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
February 7, 2011
Minutes

Members Present: Bruce Bixby
 Gary Glenn
 David Todd
 Clint Rosenbaum
 Fred Famble
 Tim McClarty

Members Absent: Ovelia Campos

Staff Present: Jon James, Director of Planning and Development Services
 Ed McRoy, Assistant Director of Planning and Development Services
 Dan Santee, City Attorney
 Ben Bryner, Planning Services Manager
 Matt Jones, Planner II
 Ken Dozier, Fire Chief
 Mindy Patterson, Finance Director
 Debra Hill, Secretary II, Recording

Others Present: Pat Hippley
 Dawn Wagner
 Tony Neitzler
 Barbara Pointer
 Justin Allen
 Eddie Chase
 Dan Boyll
 Dewayne White
 Zachary Jackson
 Jeff Jackson
 M.L. Vandervoort

Item One: Call to Order

Mr. McClarty called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m. and declared a quorum present.

Item Two: Invocation

Mr. McClarty gave the Invocation.

Item Three: Approval of Minutes

Mr. Bixby moved to approve the minutes of the January 3, 2011 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting and Mr. Rosenbaum seconded the motion, The motion carried unanimously.

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

Item Four: Plats

Mr. Bryner presented the report for the plats. Mr. Todd asked to abstain from MRP-0411 and MRP-0511

MRP-0111

A public hearing to consider a plat of Lots 301 and 302, a Replat of Lot 101, Block 1, Button Willow Addition, Industrial Section, City of Abilene, Taylor County, Texas.

MRP-0211

A public hearing to consider a plat of Lots 203 and 204, a Replat of lot 103 out of the South Part of Block 1, Cos-Humble Addition, City of Abilene, Taylor County, Texas.

MP-0311

A public hearing to consider a plat of Lots 1 and 2, Block A, Engelke Addition, a Subdivision of 3.13 acres of land out of the South 1/2 of Section 43, Blind Asylum Lands, Taylor County, Texas.

MRP-0411

A public hearing to consider a plat of Lots 101, 102, and 103, Block B, Hale Addition, Abilene, Taylor County, Texas. A Replat of Lots 1-33, Block B, Lots 1-55, Block C, Hal Addition, Abilene, Taylor County, Texas.

MRP-0511

A public hearing to consider a plat of Lot 101, Block 34, Merchants Subdivision, Abilene, Taylor County, Texas. A Replat of the east half of Block 34, Merchants Subdivision of Parts of W.G. Cannon Survey and Section 86, Block 14, T&P Railroad Company Survey, Abilene, Taylor County, Texas.

Planning staff recommends approval of the requests.

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

Mr. Rosenbaum moved to approve MRP-0111, MRP-0211, MP-0311, MRP-0411 and MRP-0511. Mr. Bixby seconded the motion and the motion to approve carried by a vote of six (6) in favor (Bixby, Glenn, Rosenbaum, Todd, McClarty and Famble) and none (0) opposed. (Mr. Todd abstained from MRP-0411 and MRP-0511)

Item Five: Zoning

a. Z-2011-01

Public hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on a request from Red Armadillo, Ltd. to amend PD# 77, located at 3726, 3802, and 3950 Catclaw Dr.

Mr. Jones presented the staff report for this case. The subject parcels total approximately 8.25 acres and are currently zoned PD (Planned Development). There has been a retail space and an office space developed within the PD on approximately 2 acres and the rest of the PD is undeveloped. The adjacent properties have AO (Agricultural Open Space) zoning to the west, MF (Multi Family) to the east and south, and GC (General Commercial) zoning to the north.

Currently the properties are zoned PD and are developed with a retail space (Dollar General) and a medical office space (Dr. J's Emergency Care) on the northern lots. The remaining area of the PD is undeveloped. The properties to the north are developed with retail shopping centers. The properties to the east are developed with apartments. The property to the west is a regional drainage and detention area and is undevelopable.

The Future Land Use section of the Comprehensive Plan designates this general area as restricted open space. However, the area is also part of a Major Commercial/Business Center. The applicant desires to have an additional drive accessing his property on Catclaw Drive. The current PD only allows for a maximum of 3 driveways along the entire frontage of the PD boundary, therefore an additional drive on this property would restrict the remaining undeveloped portion from having any drives. The applicant is requesting to amend the PD zoning in order to allow for additional driveways along Catclaw Drive. The requested amendment would be compatible with the surrounding commercial and multi-family uses as well as the Comprehensive Plan. However, the original reasoning for limiting the number of driveways was to reduce congestion and to address safety issues regarding the curvature of Catclaw Dr. Therefore, the total number of driveways should still be limited with future driveways within the PD providing cross access.

Property owners within 200 feet of the rezoning request were notified. Four (4) comments were received in favor of the request and none (0) in opposition. Staff recommends finding an alternative location for the driveway and including cross access to provide the desired access to the property.

Mr. Bixby asked about the landscaping requirements, how does this compare to properties closer to Southwest Dr.

Mr. Jones stated the Planned Development for this area does not have these types of restrictions. The Shops of Abilene are General Commercial zoning and do not require any landscaping islands in the driveways.

Mr. Bixby asked if this was an original PDD. Mr. Jones stated it was. Mr. Bixby asked does this predate the latest landscaping requirements. Mr. Jones stated it did predate this requirement.

Mr. James clarified that the normal landscaping requirements would apply, this is only in case they wanted to add a diverter median in the driveways. If they do this, it allows them to have the extra width needed for their driveways.

Mr. Bixby asked if the island is more of a safety concern more than a landscaping concern.

Mr. James stated that it was and if they did add an island it needs to be landscaped.

Mr. Jones stated this amendment would allow for properties to have access to their properties and the drive design would be addressed during the site plan process.

Mr. Todd asked that since the original PDD had two or three driveways, how did this filter through the system like this. Mr. Jones stated that if the developer meets the requirements we can't not allow them to do something. Mr. Bixby asked if the developer was informed of the requirements. Mr. Jones stated the architect and developer were made aware of the requirements and this PD would only allow two driveways if the parking is oriented toward the front. Mr. Rosenbaum asked if this was originally designed for a strip mall parking and if so, is this not violating the original PDD. Mr. James stated that was correct and that is the reason for the limitations on the driveways. Mr. Bixby asked if there would be a requirement to offset the drives away from the drives that run perpendicular. Mr. Jones stated the standard offsets would apply.

Mr. Bixby asked would the landscaping meet the requirements for the current streetscapes. Mr. Jones stated that it would.

Mr. Glenn asked if the six driveways are going to be three or four individual curbed parking lots or is this going to lead into one big parking lot like the Shops of Abilene. Mr. Jones stated this would be addressed in the site plan application and staff would push for this area to be a more unified parking area with common access.

Mr. Bixby asked if six driveways would meet the spacing for access management. Mr. Jones stated it would currently.

Mr. James stated staff would like to add the provision within this PDD stating that in no case should this allow driveways that would not comply with access management that would otherwise not be allowed.

Mr. Rosenbaum asked if the street was wide enough for two lanes and a turning lane. Mr. Jones stated it was not.

Mr. McClarty opened the public hearing.

Dr. Jackson (co-owner of the Red Armadillo) spoke in favor of this request, stating this is a safety issue for the Fire Department responding to emergency calls.

Mr. Bixby asked why the Fire Department would be called. Mr. Jackson explained the Fire Department is a first responder and then the ambulance would follow. He stated that with two driveways this would give easier access for emergency personnel to enter and exit the area. Mr. Rosenbaum asked how would this affect the parking area and does this meet the parking requirements stated in the PDD. Dr. Jackson stated the need to add six to eight additional parking spaces due to under estimating the spaces needed.

Mr. McClarty asked if Dr. Jackson still owned the property in this PDD. Dr. Jackson stated the property was divided and the 5.5 acres in now owned by his ex-wife.

Mr. McClarty asked clarification on the intent of the remaining property.

Mr. James stated that the request is for a second drive for Dr. J's. Staff then realized that looking at the PDD a problem for the rest of the properties that needed to be addressed at this time for additional drives. There were no possible driveways for the remaining property. The owner would come back in the future asking for those driveways anyway.

Mr. McClarty closed the public hearing.

Mr. Bixby agreed to the additional driveways.

Mr. Bixby moved to approve Z-2011-01 as written with the additional statement of access management. Mr. Famble seconded the motion and the motion to approve carried by a vote of five (5) in favor (Bixby, Glenn, Todd, McClarty and Famble) and one (1) opposed (Rosenbaum)

- b. Z-2011-02
Public hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on a request from Stanley Redding to rezone property from HC (Heavy Commercial) to GR (General Retail) zoning, located at 3549 Grape St.

Mr. Jones presented the staff report for the case. The subject parcel is 1-acre out of a 5-acre property and is currently zoned HC (Heavy Commercial). The 5-acre property is undeveloped. The adjacent properties have AO (Agricultural Open Space) zoning to the north and east, HC zoning to the south, and RS-6 (Single Family Residential) zoning to the west.

Currently the property is zoned HC and is undeveloped. The applicant wishes to build a home on a 1-acre parcel and operate his business on the remaining 4 acres. The properties to the north and east are developed with residential dwelling units on large parcels. The properties to the west are developed residential neighborhoods. The properties to the south are developed with commercial businesses

The Future Land Use section of the Comprehensive Plan designates this general area as a commercial area with low-density residential designation just to the north. The applicant is requesting the zone change in order to build a single-family residence. The current zoning does not allow for residential uses, therefore a home can not be built on the property. The requested zoning would be compatible with the existing HC zoning to the south and provide a transition to the existing residential to the north and would allow for the single-family residence. The requested zoning would also be compatible with the adjacent residential uses as well as the Comprehensive Plan.

Property owners within 200 feet of the rezoning request were notified. One (1) comment was received in favor of the request and none (0) in opposition. Staff recommends approval as requested.

Mr. Bixby asked if this request was to allow for the dwelling. Mr. Jones stated it was.

Mr. McClarty opened the public hearing.

Page 5 of 12

February 7, 2011

Planning and Zoning

Mr. Chase (representative for the applicant) spoke in favor, explaining Mr. Redding owns the property and wants to build a house on one acre and use the remaining property for his commercial business.

Mr. White, adjacent property owner, asked the width of the property. He also inquired as to what type of commercial business is being proposed. Mr. White asked if this would affect any of the properties around this area.

Mr. McClarty closed the public hearing.

Mr. Glenn moved to approve Z-2011-02. Mr. Todd seconded the motion and the motion to approve carried by a vote of six (6) in favor (Bixby, Glenn, Rosenbaum, Todd, McClarty and Famble) and none (0) opposed.

- c. Z-2011-03
Public hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on a request from John Kerr to rezone property from AO (Agricultural Open Space) and LI (Light Industrial) to PD (Planned Development) zoning, located at 4000 E. Overland Trail.

Mr. Bryner presented the staff report for this case.

Mr. McClarty asked to abstain from Z-2011-03.

The subject parcels total approximately 44.3 acres and is zoned AO (Agricultural Open Space) and LI (Light Industrial). The property was developed with a commercial use and has a residence on the rear part of the property. The east side of the PD area is undeveloped. The adjacent properties have AO zoning to the west, north, south, and east, LI zoning to the east, and PD (Planned Development) zoning to the south.

Currently the property is zoned AO & LI and is developed with a commercial use and has a residence on the rear part of the property. The east side of the PD area is undeveloped. There are some commercial uses on the properties to the east, but the general area is still largely undeveloped.

The Future Land Use section of the Comprehensive Plan designates this general area as part of a Gateway/Business-Industrial area. The applicant desires to develop the property as a recreational travel trailer park that caters to those with horses that participate in the rodeo and livestock events held throughout the year in the City of Abilene. The applicant also desires to maintain an area adjacent to I-20 that would allow for retail and commercial uses. The requested zoning would be compatible with the surrounding commercial uses as well as the Comprehensive Plan.

Property owners within 200 feet of the rezoning request were notified. One (1) comment was received in favor of the request and one (1) in opposition. Staff recommends approval PDD-135 as written.

Mr. Bixby asked if there is a water line or roadway improvement required for East Overland Trail.

Mr. Bryner stated this is a TXDOT road and they have acquired all the right of way they needed. He stated there is a thoroughfare plan showing a collector level road approximately in this area, the applicant has been informed of this requirement and plan to incorporate the thoroughfare into their development. Mr. Bryner stated this would be looked at during the site plan process. He added that he was unaware of any water line and if the applicant needed water this would be something they would acquire on their own.

Mr. Bixby asked if the water lines would need to be increased. Mr. Bryner stated they possibly would, depending on what was existing there and the usage they would require. This would be part of developing the property.

Mr. Bixby asked if tract two would require sidewalks. Mr. James explained that tract two is intended to be commercial and the idea was that citizens could walk out of the RV Park and safely walk to any of the commercial businesses.

Mr. Rosenbaum asked where would the sidewalk be located. Mr. Bryner stated they would be located closer to the front of the property line.

Mr. Bixby asked when developing tract one, would this trigger sidewalk improvements on tract two. Mr. Bryner stated the PD would exempt the sidewalk improvements until tract two is to be developed.

Mr. Todd asked about water development and emergency response access. Mr. Bryner stated this would be addressed in the site plan process.

Mr. Famble opened the public hearing.

Justin Allen (intern architect for Tim Rice McClarty) spoke in favor of the application. Mr. Allen explained the purpose of the application. Mr. Allen explained the relocating of the thoroughfare. He asked to move the thoroughfare to the west property line.

Mr. James stated this is something that would be addressed in the site plan evaluation. This is not part of the consideration for today.

Mr. Allen asked that the map he supplied be part of the PD.

Mr. Famble closed the public hearing.

Mr. Bixby asked to clarify the map provided by Mr. Allen.

Mr. James stated that Mr. Allen wanted it included in the PD as a concept plan, to clarify any confusion there might be.

Mr. Bixby moved to approve Z-2011-03. Mr. Rosenbaum seconded the motion and the motion to approve carried by a vote of five (5) in favor (Bixby, Glenn, Rosenbaum, Todd, and Famble) and none (0) opposed.

Page 7 of 12

February 7, 2011

Planning and Zoning

Item Six: Thoroughfare Plan Amendment:

Public hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on amendment to the Master Thoroughfare Plan regarding the reclassification of certain streets to Minor Arterials.

Mr. James requested to table the Master Thoroughfare Plan for consideration until the next meeting.

Mr. McClarty opened the public hearing. No one came forward to speak on this item and the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Rosenbaum asked to briefly explain this amendment. Mr. James stated this is a reclassification of certain streets to Minor Arterial. In the past, streets would be classified Arterial, then Collector. Adding this new classification would be downgrading some Arterial streets to Minor Arterial or some Collector streets will be upgraded to a Minor Arterial. The staff is working with Public Works on this reclassification. Mr. James requested this to be tabled until the next Planning and Zoning meeting in March.

Mr. Famble motioned to table Thoroughfare Plan Amendment to the March Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. Mr. Glenn seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of Six (6) in favor (Bixby, Glenn, Rosenbaum, McClarty, Famble and Todd) and zero (0) in opposition.

Item Seven: Capital Improvement Program

Public Hearing and possible vote to consider recommendation to the City Manager regarding the 2011-2015 CIP.

Mr. McRoy presented the information regarding the Capital Improvement Program.

The City of Abilene's Capital Improvements Program (CIP) is a 5-year plan used to identify needed capital projects and to coordinate the financing and timing of these projects. CIP projects are long-term investments rather than day-to-day operating expenses. Typical items include infrastructure and assets that are relatively costly, (\$25,000+) and that are expected to have a long life, (15+ years). Projects in a CIP can vary widely, but typically they include the acquisitions, upgrading or major repair of streets, water lines, sewer lines, drainage facilities, large vehicles, buildings, parks, major equipment or similar projects. The first year of the CIP (2010) is the Capital Budget. Projects approved in this first year (2010) will be authorized for funding. Projects scheduled for the subsequent years (2011-2014) are included in the CIP for planning purposes only.

Capital Projects represent a significant allocation of public resources. The CIP is a planning tool used to forecast, prioritize, coordinate and strategically invest those resources in an efficient and effective way that balances needed improvements with available financing. This long-term approach allows the City to more accurately anticipate and prepare for future needs. The City can also use the CIP to help achieve goals of the Comprehensive Plan. The type of projects chosen, their location, their timing, and the amount of expenditures can compliment the Comprehensive Plan directly or they can make certain goals more achievable.

The Process begins with the distribution of instructions to department heads requesting projects for consideration for the next five-year CIP period. Department heads are responsible for reviewing the most recent CIP to determine the funding necessary for projects that are currently programmed in the CIP and the Strategies identified in the Comprehensive Plan. Based on this review and a review of the new requirements for capital improvements for the next five-year period, the department head completes a Project Sheet. Once the Project Sheets are completed and prioritized, the five-year Plan is submitted to the Planning and Zoning Commission (P&Z) for review and recommendation to the City Manager. During the process, appropriate funding is determined for each of the first year projects, and a proposed capital budget and five-year plan is submitted by the City Manager to the City Council for their consideration and approval. The Finance Department conducts an analysis each year to determine that projected capital projects cost and the projected estimates for available debt instruments are reasonable and in accordance with existing standards. Upon Council adoption, the final CIP document is produced and distributed to the Departments for implantation of the program.

The CIP projects receive funding from various sources but primarily rely on Certificates of Obligation (C.O.). Other sources of funding include General Obligation (G.O.) Bonds, General Fund Revenue, Water and Sewer Utility Fund Revenues and State and Federal funds in the form of grants.

Mr. Glenn inquired about (4020-11-05) the Concrete Pavement & Sidewalk repairs. Mr. McRoy explained the money would be used for projects that Public Works would determine is in the highest and best interest of the community.

Mr. Glenn expressed concerns that this money would be dispersed into other projects beside the CBD (Central Business District).

Mr. James explained when this was originally created it was with the knowledge the streets and sidewalks in the downtown area were failing and needed much repair. He stated this was a multi year project to address all those issues.

Mr. McRoy stated there is a scheduled meeting today February 14th, 2011 if the Commissioners are not comfortable enough to make a recommendation. He added the City Council is expected to take action on March 24, 2011 if everything is to go according to plan.

Mr. McRoy explained the additional funding for future replacement of Fire apparatus with the CIP program. Beginning in 2015, with this thought, continue the replacement of Fire apparatus through the C.O. The current Fleet Services budget does not have funds to replace Fire equipment. The current budget is set up to replace other City vehicles on a more frequent manner. The Fire equipment is generally not replaced as often. The recommendation is to use the CIP for funding in replacing future Fire Apparatus.

Mr. McRoy stated the addition of three projects 4410-11, 4411-11 and 4412-11 to the CIP program. He stated these are projected for after 2015.

Mr. McClarty asked if this was the correct place to purchase the Fire Apparatus, and asked for clarification on the self insurance of the City of Abilene.

Page 9 of 12

February 7, 2011

Planning and Zoning

Mr. Bixby expressed concerns that this is an ongoing process for replacement of Fire Apparatus. He also expressed concern that a third of the CIP money was being used for replacing equipment.

Mr. Glenn asked how was other vehicles replaced when needed. Mr. James explained the City of Abilene has a fleet replacement fund set aside for replacing other vehicles that have a shorter life span. The Fire equipment is not in this fund because they have a longer life span and are more expensive.

Mr. Todd asked how Fire trucks have been replaced in the past. Mr. McRoy added that in 2007 when he came to work for the City of Abilene, the CIP had been used to replace two Fire apparatus.

Mindy Patterson explained the Fleet replacement fund is part of the budget process, meaning each month money is set aside based on the annualization of the cost of that equipment. Currently the Fire Dept is not part of this process, so in years past the only way to replace equipment for the Fire Dept is through the CIP program.

Mr. Bixby asked if there were no other way to purchase this Fire truck. Ms. Patterson replied that this was the only way for this current one. She added that the Fire equipment could be purchased out of the General fund, but the budget for this year has already been set. Ms. Patterson stated that Mr. Gilley requested that Finance look into an alternative process for the future.

Mr. McClarty asked for clarification on the replacement of equipment. Ms. Patterson explained these are two different funds. The Fleet replacement fund is for replacing other vehicles that have a shorter life span. Meaning that if a vehicle, such as a tractor, dump truck etc, were to be wrecked, it would come out of the Fleet replacement fund. She explained that the City of Abilene is self insured and this does not mean this Self insurance is just for vehicles, it also covers Health insurance, Liability claims, Life insurance and Property insurance.

Mr. Glenn asked if the Self Insurance was an investment. Ms. Patterson stated that money is invested when possible, but in the last two years the Self insurance has gone below two hundred thousand dollars and the claims can be from two to three million dollars. She also stated that in the past, money has been transferred from the year end savings to the Self insurance fund just to keep it liquid.

Mr. Glenn asked about setting aside a special fund just for Fire equipment. Ms. Patterson agreed this could be added to the Fleet replacement fund or take money from the General fund, but in order to do that the City would have to cut cost somewhere else, raise taxes or get new revenue to cover the money coming out of the General fund.

Mr. McClarty stated there needs to be a shelter for homeless citizens of Abilene added to this CIP program, \$250,000.00 over a five year period would be sufficient. He proposed in 2011 a feasibility study (\$5,000) be done and after the feasibility study in 2012 have \$45,000 set aside for constructing a building for our homeless. And in 2013 set the implementation of this program projected over the next five years. Mr. McClarty stated he has since learned that the some of these studies have been completed and sitting there waiting to move forward.

Mr. Rosenbaum discussed two policy changes, area street maintenance projected for 2015 and the purchasing of Fire apparatus.

Mr. Famble asked if this is how the purchasing of Fire equipment has been done in the past. Mr. Rosenbaum stated the Fire equipment came out of the CIP fund for lack of a bond election.

Mr. McRoy explained that in 2007 the Fire equipment were not a planned purchase. The equipment that was replaced was beyond repair. He also stated the Council had anticipated a bond election for purchasing Fire equipment in the future, but with the issues with the economy that was not implemented.

Mr. Bixby asked if there would be a recommendation for a bond election for the Fire apparatus in the future. Mr. McRoy explained that is something that the P & Z Commission would have to recommend to the City manager. He also stated that this would have no affect on this critical need now.

Mr. Bixby addressed the infill development, there were two items listed on the unfunded list considered to be South Downtown area and possibly a third item labeled park improvements. Mr. Bixby asked if the third item labeled park improvements should have been labeled Land banking. Mr. McRoy explained the third item could be used for Land banking. Mr. McRoy also stated this could be used for the South Downtown Abilene (SoDa) area but not exclusively for this area.

Mr. Bixby asked clarification on the proposed two way conversion, does this conversion have to be done at the same time. Mr. McRoy replied that it would be difficult to segment the conversion. He added that in the future, there would be more Capital projects added to this process for the SoDa area.

Mr. James stated that in addition to that the staff is looking into alternative ways to fund those projects. One is Bond elections for those that come up in the near future, as part of that process each department will submit potential projects to be considered by that committee. He stated that in the future staff could possibly be submitting SoDa projects as well as some other funding recommendation that the consultant requested to be included as a public improvement or TIF districts.

Mr. Glenn asked where the EMT project stands for the next five years.

Ken Dozier, Fire Chief, explained the EMT committee is still in the discussion phase. He stated that this process would involve the purchase of EMT vehicles and the modification of the stations. The recommendation from the committee is to move forward with this process. He explained that this is why it is not in the projections at this time.

Mr. McClarty opened the public hearing.

Mr. Vandervoort (representing the National Federation of the Blind) addressed concerns for the addition of sidewalks and safe intersections for the disabled. He stressed his concerns that if the CIP funded larger projects this could cause the sidewalk improvements to be put aside until a later date or completely eliminated.

Mr. McClarty stated that the long term process is to add sidewalks throughout the City of Abilene. He also stated the CIP shows 10% of the funding is set aside for sidewalk improvements.

Mr. McClarty closed the public hearing.

Mr. Bixby made the suggestion to remove the replacement of the Fire apparatus from the CIP project.

Mr. Famble asked what hardship would this put on the Fire Dept.

Mr. Bixby stated he would like to see the other projects like the bicycle program, street repairs, and athletic lighting put back on the CIP funding list.

Mr. Rosenbaum agreed.

Mr. Bixby stated he believes there could be other means of funding the replacement of the Fire truck.

Mr. Famble suggested sending this to Council, with the statement that this is not where the Fire truck replacement needs to come from.

Mr. James stated that this could be passed on formally to the City Council as a recommendation.

Mr. Bixby suggested making a recommendation to the Council on how this money should be spent.

Mr. Santee clarified that this recommendation would go to the City manager and then he would make a recommendation to the Council.

Mr. James stated that there is scheduled a second monthly meeting for February 14th for further discussions if needed.

Mr. Bixby motioned to table the Capital Improvements Plan until the next meeting, February 14th, 2011 at 1:30. Mr. Famble seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of Six (6) in favor (Bixby, Glenn, Rosenbaum, McClarty, Famble and Todd) and zero (0) in opposition.

Item Eight: Director's Report

Mr. James stated the City Council approved the Planning & Zonings Commissioners recommendations.

Item Nine: Adjourn

The Planning and Zoning Commission meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:20 P.M.

Approved: _____, Chairman