
PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
November 7, 2011
Minutes

Members Present: Bruce Bixby
 Fred Famble
 Pam Yungblut
 Tim McClarty
 Clint Rosenbaum
 Gary Glenn

Members Absent: David Todd

Staff Present: Jon James, Director of Planning and Development Services
 Ed McRoy, Asst Director of Planning and Development Services
 Dan Santee, City Attorney
 Kelley Messer, City Attorney
 Ben Bryner, Planning Services Manager
 Matt Jones, Planner II
 Zack Rainbow, Planner II
 Debra Hill, Secretary II (Recording)

Others Present: Terry Browder
 Laura Browder
 Tom Choate
 Dave Boyll
 Sharon Riley
 Don Whitehead
 John Decker
 Bruce Kreitler
 Robert Kern
 David McMeekan
 Tim Cook
 Brennan Peel
 Mike Dunnahoo
 Chris Stokes
 Eddie Pope
 Mike McMahan
 Janell Dry

Item One: Call to Order

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

Item Two: Invocation

Mr. McClarty gave the Invocation.

Item Three: Approval of Minutes

Mr. Rosenbaum moved to approve the minutes of the October 3, 2011 meeting. Mr. Famble seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

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

Item Four: Plats

Mr. Rainbow presented the staff report for this case. Mr. Rainbow stated that PP-4411 and FP-4511 has been requested to be tabled.

PP-4411

A public hearing to consider a preliminary plat of Lots 1 and 2, Block A, Continuation 3, Five Points Business Park, Abilene, Taylor County, Texas.

FP-4511

A public hearing to consider a plat Lot 1, Block A, Continuation 3, Five Points Business Park, Abilene, Taylor County, Texas.

Mr. Famble moved to table PP-4411 and FP-4511. Mr. Rosenbaum seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of six (6) in favor (Bixby, Famble, Rosenbaum, Yungblut, Glenn and McClarty) and none (0) opposed.

Mr. Rainbow presented the staff report for this case. Planning staff recommends approval of these requests.

PP-4111

A public hearing to consider a preliminary plat of Southern Cross Estates, 101.32 Acres Out of the William E. Vaughn Survey NO. 106, Abstract NO. 412, Taylor County, Texas.

FP-4711

A public hearing to consider a plat of Lots 16 and 17, Block C, Section 1, Oldham Forbes Estates, an Addition to the City of Abilene, Taylor County, Texas.

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

Mr. Glenn moved to approve PP-4111 and FP-4711. Mr. Famble seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of six (6) in favor (Bixby, Famble, Rosenbaum, Yungblut, Glenn and McClarty) and none (0) opposed.

Item Five: Zoning

a. Z-2011-29

Public hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on a request from Sharon Riley to rezone property from LI (Light Industrial) to HC (Heavy Commercial) zoning, located at 849 and 875 E HWY 80.

Mr. Matt Jones presented the staff report for this case. The subject parcels total approximately 1.5 acres and are currently zoned LI. The properties have been developed with commercial buildings. The adjacent properties have LI zoning to the south, east, and west and HC zoning to the north across E HWY 80.

Currently the properties are zoned LI and have been developed with commercial buildings. The properties are currently being used as a restaurant and an event center. The surrounding properties have been developed with a mixed group of uses ranging from hotel/motel, to retail, and auto related uses.

The Future Land Use section of the Comprehensive Plan designates this general area for commercial activity. The subject properties are also along an Enhancement Corridor. An application for a building permit was submitted for a use that is not allowed in LI. The request would correct the legal non-conforming uses on the subject properties. HC zoning is a more appropriate zoning along an Enhancement corridor as it does not allow some of the more intensive industrial uses. The requested zoning would be compatible with the surrounding uses, and would be more appropriate with the intentions of Enhancement Corridors.

Property owners within 200 feet of the zoning request were notified. Zero (0) comment form was received in favor and one (1) in opposition of the request. Planning staff recommends approval of the request.

Mr. McClarty opened the public hearing.

Mrs. Sharon Riley (applicant) spoke in favor of this request. Mrs. Riley explained the purpose of this request was to enable her to put a kitchen addition on to an existing building.

Mr. Bixby moved to approve Z-2011-29. Mr. Glenn seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of six (6) in favor (Bixby, Famble, Yungblut, Glenn, Rosenbaum and McClarty) and none (0) opposed.

b. Z-2011-31

Public hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on a request from Sharon Yost to rezone property from RS-6 (Single Family Residential) to RS-6/H (Single Family Residential with Historic Overlay) zoning, located at 3434 S. 9th St.

Mr. Ben Bryner presented the staff report for this case. The subject property is approximately 0.23 acres and is currently zoned RS-6 (Single Family Residential). The property has been developed with a residential dwelling unit. The adjacent properties have RS-6 zoning to the north and east with RS-12

(Single Family Residential) zoning to the west and south. The property was annexed in 1927 and was zoned RS-6 sometime after it was annexed.

Currently the property is zoned RS-6 and has been developed with a residential dwelling unit. The house, Jones/Yost House, was built in 1949 by Morgan Jones Jr. and owned for several years by an architect who was employed by the David Castle Architecture & Engineering Firm. The style of the home exemplifies the Ranch style of architecture that was prominent during the 1950's. The ranch house is noted for its long, close-to-the-ground profile and minimal use of exterior and interior decoration creating an informal living style. This house embodies many ranch style features: single-story, long, low roofline with a side gable, L-shaped plan, large windows, with shutters, and deep overhanging eaves. Interior features characteristic of the style have also been preserved.

The Future Land Use section of the Comprehensive Plan designates this general area as low-density residential. The requested zoning is an overlay zoning that would not affect the underlying residential zoning and would be compatible with the surrounding land uses. No other properties in the area have received the overlay, but this request could encourage other properties to seek the Historic Overlay zoning.

Property owners within 200 feet of the zoning request were notified. One (1) comment forms were received in favor and zero (0) in opposition of the request. Planning staff recommends approval of the request. The Landmarks Commission recommended approval by a vote of six (6) in favor to none (0) in opposition.

Mr. Bixby questioned if the windows on this property are the original windows. Mr. Bryner stated that they were.

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

Mr. McClarty asked if the owner of the property was the applicant for this request. Mr. Bryner stated that they were.

Mr. Famble motioned to approve Z-2011-31. Ms. Yungblut seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of six (6) in favor (Bixby, Yungblut, Rosenbaum, Glenn, Famble and McClarty) and none (0) opposed.

Item Six: Conditional Use Permit:

CUP-2011-03

Public hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on a request from Terry Browder for a conditional use permit to allow a Bed and Breakfast in RS-12 (Single Family Residential) zoning, located at 642 Sayles Blvd.

Mr. Jones presented the staff report for this case. The subject property is approximately 0.7 acres and is zoned RS-12 (Single Family Residential). The surrounding properties have RS-12 zoning to the east, south, and north, and the properties to the west have RS-6 (Single Family Residential) zoning. The area was annexed in 1895 and was zoned AO when it was annexed. The RS-12 zoning was applied to the property in 1997. The home was given Historic Overlay zoning in 1985.

Currently the property is zoned RS-12. The property has been developed as a single family dwelling. All of the surrounding properties have been developed primarily with single family residential dwelling units. There is some commercial zoning to the west along S. 7th St.

The Future Land Use section of the Comprehensive Plan designates this general area as low density residential. The applicant plans to develop the property as a Bed and Breakfast. The applicant intends on having no more than 5 rooms, and will serve breakfast to the patrons staying at the bed and breakfast. Based on the information provided, a Conditional Use Permit at this location will be compatible with the surrounding uses.

Staff recommends approval as requested with the following conditions:

1. No parking will be allowed between the building and the public ROW and should remain as landscape area.
2. A sidewalk will be required along S. 7th St. prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.
3. A solid 6' fence will be provided to shield parking from adjacent residential properties.

Property owners within 200 feet of the zoning request were notified. Two (2) comment forms were received in favor and zero (0) in opposition of the request.

Mr. Bixby asked clarification on the location of the proposed parking. Mr. Jones described the area would be along the north and west side of the property.

Mr. Glenn asked if the fence would be visible from Sayles. Mr. Jones stated that the existing landscaping would provide a screening for the fencing and required parking.

Mr. James explained that as described in the conditions, this area would be maintained as a landscaped area.

Mr. Rosenbaum questioned parking requirements for this request. Mr. Jones stated that it could be five plus one. Mr. James explained that this would be the minimum requirements.

Ms. Yungblut asked if this request would change the Historical Overlay on this property. Mr. Jones stated that it would not.

Mr. McClarty opened the public hearing.

Mr. Tom Choate (agent for the applicant) spoke in favor of this request. Mr. Choate described the history of the property and the importance of preserving the history of this home. He added that in April of 2003 this property was approved by the City of Abilene for Bed and Breakfast. Mr. Choate stated that the parking and landscaping are adequate for this property. He added that the required sidewalk would be an additional expense to the applicant and would be the only sidewalk along South 7th and would not add to the safety or the value of the property. He asked that the required sidewalk be removed from the conditions as stated by staff.

Mr. McClarty asked clarification on the location of the proposed sidewalk. Mr. Jones stated that there is a sidewalk located in the front of the property facing Sayles. He added that the sidewalk in this request would be located on South 7th and would connect to the existing sidewalk located on Sayles.

Mr. Choate discussed the main concern is the approval of the Conditional Use Permit for the Bed and Breakfast. He added that the required sidewalk would be a burden to the applicant and since this is not a new development they should not be required to build the sidewalk. He then reiterated that the main reason for this request is to approve the CUP and the preservation of this historical property.

Mr. McClarty closed the public hearing.

Mr. Bixby discussed the sidewalk ordinance stating that there should be sidewalks on arterial streets and not necessarily in residential areas. He added that the City Council had made it clear that wanted sidewalks in these areas. Mr. Famble addressed the issue of the property owner being financial responsible for the addition of the sidewalk. Mr. McClarty stated that the way sidewalks were to be implemented was through new development and he states this is considered a new development. He added the property owners have the right to address the City Council and request a waiver for the sidewalk improvement. Mr. Rosenbaum agreed with Mr. McClarty and Mr. Bixby that the sidewalks should be implemented in new development areas.

Mr. Rosenbaum moved to approve CUP-2011-03 with the conditions recommended by staff. Mr. Bixby seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of six (6) in favor (Bixby, Famble, Glenn, Rosenbaum, Yungblut and McClarty) and none (0) opposed.

Item Seven: Capital Improvement Program (CIP):

Public Hearing to receive potential project suggestions from the public regarding the 2012-2016 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 (2011) is the Capital Budget. Projects approved in this first year (2011) will be authorized for funding. Projects scheduled for the subsequent years (2012-2015) 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 complement 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. McClarty opened the public hearing.

Ms. Janell Dry (Sign Pro) expressed concerns regarding the lack of covered benches at local bus stops. She added this would be very beneficial to the citizens of Abilene waiting to use our City Link Transit system. Ms. Dry stated she would support this kind of program added to the CIP program for the 2012-2016 projected plan.

Mr. Don Whitehead (citizen) questioned the publicity of the CIP project suggestions. Mr. James answered that there is more information on the City of Abilene's website and that this is just the first of many meetings regarding the proposed CIP budget.

Mr. McClarty closed the public hearing.

Item Eight: Ordinance Amendment:

- a. Public hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on an ordinance amending the Land Development Code related to Wind Energy Conversion Systems.

Mr. McRoy presented the discussion for this Ordinance. During the approval of the Land Development Code (LDC), Staff noted that the new provision in the ordinance allowing Wind Energy Conversion (WEC) systems might require additional modifications in the future to make these systems more easily accessible. In response, the Council directed the staff to research the issues and bring back an ordinance change if we found the standards to be overly restrictive. Staff has completed our review and determined that several changes are warranted both in terms of clarification as well as regulation.

Staff is proposing to allow certain WEC's by right in the majority of the non-residential zoning districts so long as they meet specific regulations to mitigate potential negative impacts. This would, for the first time, allow a qualifying WEC system to be installed with a building permit thus avoiding the need for a special approval or public hearing. WEC's with greater potential for negative impacts would require approval of a Special Exception (SE) by the Board of Adjustment (BOA). The BOA process would provide nearby property owners the opportunity to note their concerns. The Board could then add appropriate conditions if needed or deny installations found to be incompatible, with the area.

The WEC use is currently not listed in the Land Use Matrix. It is proposed to be included and identified as 'Wind Energy Conversion System (WEC)'. The sections proposed for amendment are Section 1.4.4.1 – Special Exceptions, Section 2.4.2.1 – Land Use Matrix, and Section 2.4.7 – Wind Energy Conversion Systems (WEC).

After discussion of the Ordinance Amendment concerning the Wind Energy Conversion Systems, the Planning and Zoning Committee moved to table this request until the next monthly meeting.

Ms. Yungblut moved to table the Ordinance Amendment to the December 5th, 2011, Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. Mr. Glenn seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of six (6) in favor (Bixby, Famble, Yungblut, Glenn, Rosenbaum, and McClarty) and none (0) opposed.

- b. Public hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on an ordinance amending the Land Development Code related to the Sign Regulations.

Mr. Jon James presented the staff report for this case. As part of the process of updating the City's development ordinances per the recommendations of the City's 2004 Comprehensive Plan, City staff began a process in 2005 to update these codes through the creation of a Land Development Code Review Committee. In addition to the primary review committee, additional representation was added to the core group for a special Sign Ordinance Review Committee whose sole focus was on reviewing and recommending updates to the City's sign regulations. In 2006 this committee made general recommendations to the Planning and Zoning Commission. Following up on those recommendations, the P&Z made some general recommendations for changes to the sign ordinance. A draft of new sign regulations which has been compiled by staff based on the guidance from this previous input. This draft has been sent to the Sign Ordinance Review Committee for review and changes have been made based upon their individual input.

Mr. James outlined the revisions to the sign ordinance.

Attached Signs (Wall Signs):

- 20% of front façade in Commercial & Industrial (10% on other facades)
 - 5% of all façades in Office, Public, and other Non-residential Districts
- Double if no freestanding signs

Freestanding Pole Signs:

- Freestanding Pole Signs are generally allowed for properties with arterial or freeway frontage in all non-residential districts and for non-residential uses within residential districts, with some limitations.
- Signage on a canopy, such as a gas station, is limited to 20% of the canopy area (i.e., treated like a building façade). If greater than 20% of the canopy area, then it is considered a freestanding sign.
- Freestanding signs are only permitted as a Conditional Use in the Downtown district.
- 1 freestanding pole sign allowed per site (includes adjoining properties under common ownership and/or joint use such as a shopping center), plus one additional sign for every 400 feet of street frontage over 400.
- Shopping centers, or other multi-tenant situations on the same property or adjacent property treated as a single "site", may use a shared group sign in lieu of all other freestanding signs. Group sign must be monument-style sign with architectural features (brick, masonry, etc.). To be eligible for the larger size group sign, it must replace at least 2 otherwise allowable freestanding signs.

	Maximum Height:	Maximum Area:
Freestanding Sign on Interstate	50 ft.	200 sf
Group Sign on Interstate	50 ft.	300 sf
Freestanding Sign on Freeway	40 ft.	200 sf

Group Sign on Freeway	45 ft.	300 sf
Freestanding Sign on Arterial or Minor Arterial	20 ft.	100 sf
Group Sign on Arterial or Minor Arterial	25 ft.	200 sf

Freestanding Monument (Ground) Signs:

- Allowed in addition to allowable freestanding pole signs, if any.
- Allowed in non-residential districts and for non-residential uses within residential districts, with some limitations.
- Only permitted as a Conditional Use in the Downtown district.
- 1 sign per 250 feet of street frontage for each street

Maximum Height: 8 ft. (10' if multi-tenant group sign)
Maximum Area: 96 sf (150 sf if multi-tenant group sign)

Off-Premise Advertising Signs (Billboards):

No changes from current standards (updated in 2007)

Electronic Message Signs:

No changes from current standards (updated in 2008)

Prohibited Signs:

- Portable signs – existing allowed to continue for 2 years
- Exception for permitted temporary sign
- Pennants/streamers, balloons, and banners (except as permitted temporary sign)
- Parked vehicles used for advertising
- Flags used as advertising (individual government and non-commercial flags are exempt)

Temporary Signs:

- Freestanding temporary signs are prohibited, including bandit signs.
- Exception for grand opening events
- Attached temporary signs, such as banners, are limited to no more than 32 sf, must be permitted, and are limited to a maximum of 15 days in a 6 month period.

Other Requirements:

- Power service to freestanding signs and billboards must be underground.

- On-premise directional signs limited to 6 sf in area and 4 ft. in height and no more than 2 per street frontage per site.
- Existing nonconforming permanent signs are grandfathered (burden is on the sign owner to show proof that a sign was pre-existing).
- Existing nonconforming portable and temporary signs, including flags, streamers, pennants, balloons, etc. must be removed no later than 2 years after the effective date of the ordinance.
- New sign permits for a freestanding sign are not issued for a site with existing nonconforming signs.
- Nonconforming freestanding signs should be removed when a business closes and has been vacant for more 1 year, or 2 years for a leased property (i.e. it is no longer grandfathered after this time).
- Typical construction, safety, and maintenance requirements (site triangle, power lines, construction standards, etc.)
- Designated historic signs may be allowed to continue even though nonconforming.
- The ordinance add special provisions for development signs during construction, menu boards for drive-through restaurants, roof signs, sponsorship signs, and subdivision entrance signs.

Mr. McClarty opened the public hearing.

Mr. Robert Kern (Acme Sign) expressed concerns with the new sign ordinance. He discussed the fee schedule, portable signs, enforcement of sign permits, monument signs, menu signs, electrical signage and homemade signs. Mr. Kern discussed the portable signs, stating that he does not use the portable signs but does believe if these were prohibited, this would be a hardship for the sign companies that use these. He discussed the ratio of sign permit fees to the cost of the actual signs Mr. Kern added he would like to see a workshop set up with local vendors to discuss the concerns with this ordinance.

Mr. Bixby questioned the enforcement of expired licenses of employees of sign companies. Mr. Kern stated that the State of Texas has required each sign electrician is required to be licensed with the Texas Department of Licensing and Regulations.

Mr. Glenn asked clarification on the Texas State Association. Mr. Kern stated that this is an association of Texas sign companies with the objectives to improve the sign companies.

Mr. James expressed that information regarding the new sign ordinance was distributed to local sign companies and any input towards the implementing of the new sign ordinance would be reviewed and discussed.

Mr. McClarty discussed the origination of the sign ordinance. He added that in this process he would like to see a good compromise between the City of Abilene and the sign companies.

Mr. Tim Cook (Day Sign Company) Discussed concerns with going to the extremes regarding the sign ordinance. He added that the esthetics of the signs can under power the importance of the sign itself. Mr. Cook stated that the regulations regarding some of the signs could possible impact local sign companies financially.

Mr. Bixby questioned Mr. Cook's perspective regarding portable signs and trailer signs. Mr. Cook stated that he himself does not use the portable signs and says they are hard to regulate but believes the prohibiting of portable signs would affect the lively hood of those companies that do. Mr. Cook compared the trailer signs to the portable signs, stating they can obstruct vision when placed next to roadways.

Ms. Yungblut asked if Mr. Cook had ever been contacted by a business wanting to relocate to Abilene and that business not relocating to Abilene because of the restrictions related to the sign ordinance. Mr. Cook stated that he had. Mr. James asked clarification with which businesses have not relocated to Abilene because of the sign regulations. Mr. Cook discussed the Cracker Barrel, Chili's and other businesses. Mr. James clarified that he did not believe that this was not the case with these businesses.

Mr. James reiterated that the planning staff is open to discuss the proposed sign ordinance with businesses concerned with the proposed new regulations.

Mr. Mike Dunnahoo (owner Star Dodge) discussed his concerns with going to the extremes with implementing too restrictive of sign ordinances. He stated that his business uses the portable signs, balloons, and banners and without these types of signs he would not be able to promptly display the current sales promotions.

Mr. Bixby asked how often Mr. Dunnahoo uses banners in his business. Mr. Dunnahoo stated that he uses these banners frequently. He added that with TV, Abilene Reporter News and radio, it would take two or three days to process the ads to run and with the banners, he could have the signs displayed within a 24 hour period. Mr. Dunnahoo adding that if the portable signs were to be prohibited, this could affect the small business owners that could not potentially afford the stationary signs and this could cause the businesses to be located somewhere else.

Mr. Rosenbaum asked if the portable signs were to be permitted in the sign ordinance and the sign was in violation and a citation was given, what would be his perspective on this. Mr. Dunnahoo stated that it would not be a problem and he would pay the fine.

Mr. Bruce Kreitler (Broken Willow Tree Service) discussed the economic impact that signs have for our community. He added that if signage did not impact the community than there would be no need for them and businesses would not pay the permit fees involved. Mr. Kreitler expressed concerns with prohibiting portable signs. He added that if the portable signs were prohibited this could impact business owners that can only afford this kind of signage. Mr. Kreitler discussed that signs in neighborhoods are not necessarily the main problem. He discussed deteriorating buildings, boarded up buildings and vacant parking lots. Mr. Kreitler stated that the portable signs are there for information and are not intrusive. He added that portable signage is a consumer's choice to read and not forced to see them such as TV ads, radio ads, e-mails and solicitations.

Mr. McClarty added clarification that this sign ordinance was researched thoroughly and many hours have been spent and 79% of the survey respondents have agreed that this sign ordinance would have a positive effect on our community. He added that the Planning and Zoning Commission has been charged with negotiating a compromise for the proposed sign ordinance. Mr. McClarty stated that these groups were made up local citizens.

Ms. Yungblut discussed that existing signs would be grandfathered in and would not be required to be changed. She added that the only signs that would need to be upgraded would be new developments. Mr. James stated that repairs to signs are allowed. He added that if the sign were to be changed by 60%, then the new ordinance would be in effect. Mr. McClarty stated that there are still a number of issues with this sign ordinance that will need to be worked out.

Mr. James discussed the issue of businesses not coming to Abilene in regards to sign regulations. He added that there are also businesses that likely would not relocate to Abilene because of the appearance of parts of the community and addressing the aesthetics of the community was one of the goals in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. John Decker (InSight Signs) spoke in favor of the portable signs. He discussed the economic effect his portable signs have had with various businesses in the Abilene area. Mr. Decker expressed concerns with prohibiting the use of portable signs and the impact it would have on small business owners.

Mr. McClarty closed the public hearing.

Mr. Rosenbaum moved to table the Ordinance Amendment to the December 5th, 2011, Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. Mr. Glenn seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of six (6) in favor (Bixby, Famble, Yungblut, Glenn, Rosenbaum, and McClarty) and none (0) opposed.

Item Nine: Director's Report:

None.

Item Ten: Adjourn

The Planning and Zoning Commission meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:40 P.M.

Approved: _____, Chairman