

---

**PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**  
**June 2nd, 2014**  
**Minutes**

---

Members Present: Fred Famble ~ Chairman  
Bruce Bixby  
Robert Calk  
Joy Ellinger  
Gary Glenn  
Tim McClarty  
Clint Rosenbaum

Members Absent: All Present

Staff Present: Jon James, Director of Planning and Development Services  
Dan Santee, City Attorney  
Ben Bryner, Planning Services Manager  
Zack Rainbow, Planner II  
Donna Boarts, Secretary II (recording)

Others Present: Pierce Carpenter Raul Espinoza  
Faith Gage Nick Coates  
Jeanne Farquharson Betty Prude  
Craig Holmes Lee Woody  
Mark Roberts Mike Barber  
Phillip Jergins Rusty Plocheck  
Darnell/Bessie Sloan James Rogge  
Stephanie Goodrich Megan Santee  
Kris Kowatch Amber Pierce  
Judy Harris Seaton Higginbotham  
Rhonda Holder

**Item One: Call to Order**

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

**Item Two: Invocation**

Chairman Famble gave the Invocation.

**Item Three: Approval of Minutes:**

**Mr. McClarty moved to approve the minutes of the April 7<sup>th</sup>, 2014 and May 5<sup>th</sup>, 2014 meetings. Mrs. Ellinger seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.**

**Item Four: Plats:**

Mr. Zack Rainbow presented the staff report for these cases.

**FP-4813**

Creekside Addition, To the City of Abilene, Taylor County, Texas.

**FP-1414**

Section 2, Tate Subdivision, To the City of Abilene, Taylor County, Texas.

**MRP-3514**

Lot 109, a Replat of Lots 9 Through 15, Block 3, W.O. Kemper Subdivision of Block 11, Bowyer Subdivision, City of Abilene, Taylor County, Texas.

**FP-4014**

Plat of 97.38 Acres for Block A-E, Section 4, Lake Ft. Phantom Hill Subdivision, City of Abilene, Jones County, Texas.

**PP-4214**

Preliminary Plat for Antilley Road Subdivision, Abilene, Taylor County, Texas.

**PP-4414**

Highway 351 Addition, 28.3172 Acres out of the NW/4 of Section 25, Blind Asylum Lands, Abstract No. 1007, City of Abilene, Taylor County, Texas.

**FP-4814**

Casey Addition, to The City of Abilene, Taylor County, Texas.

Chairman Famble opened the public hearing.

Ms. Faith Gage (Resident) Lake Fort Phantom Hill. Ms. Gage spoke about her concern of the amount of right-of-way (ROW) being dedicated and the impact for adjacent properties. She also spoke about compliance with the Lake Fort Phantom Hill Master Plan.

Mr. Seaton Higginbotham (Resident) Lake Fort Phantom Hill. Mr. Higginbotham is a member of the Real Estate Round Table that was used to determine the lake plans by creating a vision for the lake. He stated that he feel that a 60' ROW in a residential neighborhood is excessive. He stated that the group is looking for the same lakeshore appeal that is out at Lyle Lake.

Mr. Chairman Famble Closed the public hearing.

Mr. Bixby inquired whether the Commission could table the plat for the lake until they have a better idea on the standards at the lake. The meeting in October would allow the time that is needed to review and present the standards.

Mr. McClarty questioned if we have the option to TABLE this item?

Mr. Jon James explained that although we have denied a very few plats before, the reason for doing so was because they did not meet the ordinance standards.

Mr. Dan Santee stated that a Plat is not able to be tabled and that they are automatically deemed approved after 30 days.

Mr. Bixby asked that since the commission is not able to deny without a valid reason, could the City withdraw the plat?

Mr. Santee stated that the City could withdraw it if need be.

Mr. Bixby inquired if 60' of ROW is passed, could the Commission reduce and change it at a later date?

Mr. Jon James indicated that the City could do that. There is a procedure (a street closure) that would need to be implemented.

Chairman Famble opened the public hearing.

Ms. Faith Gage stated that there was a concern, as they were informed by Maxey Sheppard Surveying, of an excessive curve in Mohegan. She explained that if it was not removed it could become more magnified with the 60' ROW.

Chairman Famble Closed the public hearing.

**Mr. Rosenbaum moved to approve FP-4813, FP-1414, MRP-3514, FP-4014, PP-4214, PP-4414 and FP-4814. Mrs. Ellinger seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote of four (5) in favor (Famble, Calk, Bixby, Ellinger, Rosenbaum) (1) in opposition on PP-4414 (Bixby) and (2) in opposition on FP-4014 (Glenn, McClarty).**

**Item Five: Zoning:**

**Chairman Famble moved up zoning item # D**

**d. Z-2014-22**

Public hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on a request from Nick Coates to rezone property from AO (Agricultural Open Space) & RS-6 (Single-Family Residential) to PD (Planned Development) zoning, located at 2668 Garfield Ave and the approximately 12.04 acres to the north.

Currently the property is zoned AO and is undeveloped. The property to the north is zoned PD and undeveloped. Interstate 20 is also located a short distance north of the subject property. The properties to the south are largely developed with single-family homes. The property to the east is developed as a large apartment complex. The owner is asking for the PD zoning with underlying MF zoning to develop the land as an apartment complex. As part of the PD zoning, the applicant is proposing that the current RS-6 area would remain undeveloped with exception of access to the north 12 acres. This property requested to be rezoned to MF zoning in June of last year with the intent of developing as a nursing facility. This request was recommended for denial due to a failed motion of approval with a 2-3 vote. The request was not appealed to City Council therefore considered as denied.

The Future Land Use section of the Comprehensive Plan designates this general area as ‘low density residential’. The applicant is requesting the zone change to allow for development of an apartment complex. The area to the south consists of single-family homes. The primary access for this property currently is through the neighborhood on Campus Court. There is a large apartment complex adjacent to the east, but access is from N. Judge Ely Blvd and the I-20 frontage road. The requested zoning would be compatible with the adjacent apartment use but could negatively impact the adjacent single-family residential uses to the south.

Property owners within a 200-foot radius were notified of the request. Zero (0) comment forms were received in favor and six (6) in opposition.

### **PLANNING STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of the requested PD zoning.

Mr. Bixby inquired whether this particular PD (Planned Development) zoning requires access to the frontage road on east Stamford. He asked if the developer needs to connect Campus Court to the frontage road of the freeway.

Mr. Bryner stated that the PD does not eliminate the need for Campus Court and therefore the requirement is for it to connect. The Commission reviewed the MTP (Master Thoroughfare Plan) last year and made a recommendation for Campus Court to be downgraded from a “collector” to a “local” street. City Council approved the change to the street per the Commission recommendation. A thoroughfare closure is needed to officially eliminate the requirement for Campus Court to connect to the freeway. At this time the City has not processed any thoroughfare closures for the ROW.

Chairman Famble opened the public hearing.

Mr. Nick Coates (Property Owner) spoke about the plans for this property. Mr. Coates stated that this property will be a new independent living retirement community providing meals, transportation, on-site medical care and activities for approximately one hundred (100) senior citizens with twelve (12) staff members.

Mr. McClarty questioned if the PD can be written so that it permits the retirement facility only and does not allow apartments. He asked Mr. Coates if he would be opposed to writing the PD that way.

Mr. Coates was in agreement with that option.

Mr. Jon James stated that it could be written that way. He also stated that the PD can be written so that there is no access allowed onto Garfield Ave and could require access up to the frontage road. Dedicate of a portion of Campus Court would be required adjacent to the property. The project would use the half-width ROW (right of way) as a driveway access until the adjacent property develops and the road is constructed.

Mr. Bixby inquired from a developer’s point of view if it is feasible to use E. Stamford Street as the primary access and not Garfield Avenue/Campus Court from the south.

Mr. Coates stated that it would require building a street with curb and gutter. With the access of Garfield Ave, there would be more than one road that you can get you there.

Mrs. Ellinger asked for clarity on where the main entrance will be.

Mr. Coates stated that the main entrance would be from Garfield Ave with the driveway built across the proposed 2-acre area to remain undeveloped.

Mr. Rusty Plocheck spoke in opposition of this zoning. He stated that the 3-story building will take away from his view and privacy. He indicated that he operates a ham radio that monitors emergency weather. If the zoning is approved, he will need to extend the height of the radio tower to be able to acquire a radio signal.

Mr. McClarty inquired, *“What type of development do you feel would be appropriate?”*

Mr. Plocheck stated that a single-level facility that would exit onto the feeder road would be appropriate. Traffic would then not become an issue.

Mr. Don Powell spoke in opposition of this zoning due to the increase traffic in the Hillcrest neighborhood.

Mr. McClarty inquired, *“What type of development do you feel would be appropriate?”*

Mr. Powell stated that he would like to keep the property as-is.

Mr. Darryl Sloan resides one block west of Garfield Avenue. Mr. Sloan spoke in opposition of this zoning. He does not want Campus Court extended to the access road due to traffic.

Mr. McClarty inquired, *“What type of development do you feel would be appropriate?”*

Mr. Sloan stated RS-6 or RS-8 (Single-Family Residential) would be appropriate.

Mr. Phillip Jergins spoke in opposition of this zoning due to the increase of traffic. He would like to see Campus Court closed to through traffic.

Mr. McClarty inquired, *“What type of development do you feel would be appropriate?”*

Mr. Phillip Jergins stated RS-6 or RS-8 (Single-Family Residential) with access from E. Stamford Street.

Mr. Pierce Carpenter (property owner-outside the 200 ft. notification range) spoke in opposition due to the traffic that feeds into Campus Court. He is also concerned that it might bring decreased property values.

Mr. McClarty inquired, *“What type of development do you feel would be appropriate?”*

Mr. Carpenter stated RS-6 (Single-Family Residential) on the Garfield Avenue property is appropriate. This would still allow the 12 acres behind to develop but wants the main entrance off of E. Stamford Street, not Campus Court or Garfield Avenue.

Mr. Kris Kowatch spoke in opposition of this zoning. He stated that the proposed zoning for the property is not a set standard and can include different restrictions or requirements for the property. He stated that not connecting to Campus Court, instead requiring that it only connects to E. Stamford Street, is important to him. Being that it is a PD zoning, he stated that there are possibly other interests for this property that could be included in the zoning.

Mr. McClarty inquired, *“What type of development do you feel would be appropriate?”*

Mr. Kowatch stated that he is not concerned as much of what develops there, but is more concerned that there is no connection onto Campus Court or other adjoining streets.

Chairman Famble closed the public hearing.

Mr. Glenn asked to have Mr. Coates come up to the podium again to speak.

Chairman Famble re-opened the public hearing.

Mr. Glenn questioned Mr. Coates if it was possible to put the building at the back end of the property and make the improvements needed for the driveway to improve your access onto E. Stamford.

Mr. Coates stated that E. Stamford is now a one-way street. Additionally, when Campus Court was made a local road, it changed all the plans for the site.

Chairman Famble closed the public hearing.

Chairman Famble opened the public hearing.

Mr. McClarty stated that after the building was built, there would still be an ample amount of property left. He asked Mr. Coates what his plans for the remainder of the property were.

Mr. Coates stated that he does not have any plans at this time.

Mr. McClarty specified that if the "buffer" increased from 140 feet to 200 feet, it should not affect the development.

Mr. Coates explained it would cost more for infrastructure, specifically the drive, due to the extra 60 feet.

Mr. McClarty stated that he would like to **revise** the **PD** to allow for an Independent Living facility only and increase the buffer size another 50-60 feet. He also asked for staff to initiate a thoroughfare closure request for Campus Court to evaluate the possibility of closing the ROW to prevent traffic going through the neighborhood.

Chairman Famble closed the public hearing.

Mr. Bixby specified that he feel the 140' buffer is plenty. Main concerns are brining traffic down Campus Court, and the potential to extend Campus Court to east Stamford. If Campus Court was not allowed as access there would be potentiality two other access points. If the Commission decides to allow this, we need to be assured that it would never connect to East Stamford Street.

The commission discussed the need to review the changes to the PD Zoning at their next meeting.

**Mr. Bixby made a motion to TABLE Item Z-2014-22 to the July meeting. Mr. McClarty seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote seven (7) in favor (Bixby, Calk, Ellinger, Glenn, McClarty, Rosenbaum, and Famble) and zero (0) in opposition.**

Page 6 of 13

June 2nd, 2014

Planning and Zoning Commission

**a. Z-2014-19**

Public hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on a request from Russ Petty, agent Bing Outdoor Media, LLC, to rezone property from NR (Neighborhood Retail) to GR (General Retail) zoning, located at 1766 S. Clack St.

Mr. Ben Bryner presented the staff report for this case. The property is being considered for an off-premise (billboard) sign. The existing NR zoning does not allow for such signs. The applicant is requesting a change to the GR zoning which would allow for an off-premise sign. The surrounding area is developed generally with single-family residential homes to the west & retail uses to the north and south along Highway 83-84.

The Future Land Use section of the Comprehensive Plan designates this general area for commercial activity and is part of a Major Commercial/Business Center node. There are several different businesses operating along the freeway ranging from personal service, retail, and restaurant uses. The requested zoning would specifically allow for an off-premise sign on the property. Although there are single-family homes directly adjacent to the west, staff has determined that the GR zoning would be appropriate due to its orientation toward Highway 83-84 and the designation in the Future Land Use map.

Property owners within a 200-foot radius were notified of the request. One (1) comment form was received in favor and one (1) in opposition.

**PLANNING RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of GR zoning.

Mr. Bixby inquired what the zoning was before NR (Neighborhood Retail).

Mr. James stated that anything that was zoned *Limited Commercial* under the old zoning ordinance automatically became NR (Neighborhood Retail). Our ordinance by default does not allow billboard signs within 400 feet of residentially zoned properties. The applicant will be applying for a variance to allow for one at this location. Staff has indicated that GR (General Retail) is an appropriate zoning district in this location.

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

**Mr. Bixby made a motion to approve Z-2014-19. Mr. Glenn seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote Seven (7) in favor (Bixby, Calk, Ellinger, Glenn, McClarty, Rosenbaum, Famble) and zero (0) in opposition.**

**b. Z-2014-20**

Public hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on a request from Robert Hamil & Angela Hamil Willis, agent Jim Hatchett, Jr., to rezone property from MH (Manufactured/Mobile Home) to GC (General Commercial) zoning, located at 5601 Hwy 277 S.

Mr. Ben Bryner presented the staff report for this case. The property is being considered for the sale of grave monuments. The Elliot Hamil Garden of Memories cemetery is located to the south of this property. The surrounding area is developed generally with manufactured homes to the east and a small bank to the north. The applicant is requesting a change to the GC zoning which would allow for the desired use. The GC zoning would allow for display of merchandise on the property.

The Future Land Use section of the Comprehensive Plan designates this general area for low density residential development. The requested zoning would be to specifically allow for a grave monument business in association with the cemetery to the south. Due to the manufactured homes directly adjacent to the east, staff has determined that the GC zoning would not be appropriate due to its proximity and the designation in the Future Land Use map. However, a lower intensity zoning like Neighborhood Retail or Neighborhood Office would be compatible, but would not allow for the proposed use.

**PLANNING STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends denial of GC zoning.

Property owners within a 200-foot radius were notified of the request. One (1) comment form was received in favor and zero (0) in opposition.

Mr. McClarty stated that the only way to have monuments next to a funeral home would require the zoning to be GC (General Commercial).

Mr. James indicated that there are concerns that it might detract from the area due to the appearance of the outside storage of the monuments if not done correctly.

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

Mr. McClarty stated that it should go to a PDD (Planned Development District) to be able to regulate the appearance and allow for the use that it is intended for.

Mr. James proposed that the Commission could write a PDD zoning today and send to City Council for a vote, make a motion to table the item and bring it back at the July 7<sup>th</sup> meeting, approve the current zoning request of GC zoning, or approve something less intensive such as GR (General Retail) or NR (Neighborhood Retail) zoning.

Mr. McClarty suggested that the Commission table the item and bring back as a PDD (Planned Development District) for the July meeting.



**Mr. McClarty made a motion to TABLE item Z-2014-20 to the July 7, 2014 meeting. Mr. Glenn seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote seven (7) in favor (McClarty, Rosenbaum, Bixby, Calk, Ellinger, Glenn, and Famble) and zero (0) in opposition.**

**c. Z-2014-21**

Public hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on a request from NIB, Inc. & Robert Calk, agent Tom Niblo, to rezone property from RS-6 (Single-Family Residential) to NO (Neighborhood Office) zoning, located at 841 EN 10<sup>th</sup> St.

Mr. Ben Bryner presented the staff report for this case. Currently the property is zoned RS-6 and is undeveloped. The adjacent properties to the west and south are developed with single family homes as well as the properties to the north across EN 10<sup>th</sup> Street. The property to the east across Avenue F is developed with a multi- family home. This property requested to be rezoned to NO (Neighborhood Office) back in 2010 with the intent of developing as a parking lot. The request was denied by the City Council. A motion was made to deny the request with a 4-3 vote on the motion.

The Future Land Use section of the Comprehensive Plan designates this general area as low density residential. The subject property is also along an Enhancement Corridor and part of a Local Community Center as defined by the Comprehensive Plan. The applicant is requesting the zone change to allow for a small office development. The requested zoning would be compatible with the surrounding residential uses as well as the Comprehensive Plan. Neighborhood Office has been determined to be an appropriate zoning adjacent to residential property due to the property being at the intersection with an arterial street. The required landscaping and buffering will help to soften the impacts of any development on the surrounding neighborhoods.

**PLANNING STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval as requested.

Property owners within 200 feet of the zoning request were notified. Zero (0) comment form was received in favor and three (3) in opposition of the request.

Chairman Famble opened the public hearing.

Mr. Tom Niblo (agent for the property owner) inquired if there were any questions for him.

Chairman Famble closed the public hearing.

**Mr. Glenn made a motion to approve Z-2014-21. Mr. McClarty seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote six (6) in favor (Glenn, McClarty, Rosenbaum, Bixby, Ellinger Famble) zero (0) in opposition, and one (1) abstained (Mr. Calk).**

**e. Z-2014-23**

Public hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on a request from Vincent Coates to rezone property from HI (Heavy Industrial) to LI (Light Industrial) zoning, located at 4290 S. Treadaway Blvd.

Mr. Ben Bryner presented the staff report for this case. Currently the property is zoned HI and is developed as the previous site of Bill Reed Distributors. The desired use of the property is for the sale and service of automobiles, trucks, trailers and recreational vehicles. The current zoning does not permit this use in the district. The surrounding area is developed generally with light industrial and heavy commercial uses. The applicant is requesting a change to the LI zoning which would allow for the desired use.

The Future Land Use section of the Comprehensive Plan designates this general area for heavy commercial/light industrial development. The requested zoning would be to specifically allow for the sales and service of automobiles, trucks, trailers and recreational vehicles. The area has not developed to the heavy industrial uses that were anticipated when rezoned in 1977. The requested LI zoning in this location is deemed compatible with the Future Land Use Map and the adjacent uses in the area.

#### **PLANNING STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval as requested.

Property owners within 200 feet of the zoning request were notified. Four (4) comment forms were received in favor and zero (0) in opposition of the request.

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

**Mr. Rosenbaum made a motion to approve Z-2014-23. Mr. Glenn seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote seven (7) in favor (Rosenbaum, Bixby, Calk, Ellinger, Glenn, McClarty, and Famble) and zero (0) in opposition.**

**f. Z-2014-24**

Public hearing and possible vote to recommend approval or denial to the City Council on a request from Tannehill Corporate Offices, LLC, agent Judy Harris, to rezone property from HI (Heavy Industrial) to GC (General Commercial) & HC (Heavy Commercial) zoning, located at 4542 Loop 322.

Mr. Ben Bryner presented the staff report for this case. Currently the property is zoned HI and is developed with 3 separate buildings with multiple tenants in each building. The purpose of the zoning is to allow for a greater mix of uses on the property. The current zoning is restrictive and does not permit many uses that have sought to locate on the property. Specifically, a child care center was denied as the use is not allowed in the HI zoning. The surrounding area is developed

generally with light industrial uses. The applicant is requesting a change to the GC & HC zoning which would allow for a greater mix of uses.

The Future Land Use section of the Comprehensive Plan designates this general area for heavy commercial/light industrial development. The requested zoning would be to specifically allow for commercial and personal service uses not allowed in the HI zoning. The area has not developed with the heavy industrial uses that were anticipated when rezoned in 1980. The requested GC & HC zoning in this location is deemed compatible with the Future Land Use Map and the adjacent uses in the area. Additionally, the frontage along Loop 322 would be more suitable for commercial development.

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 RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval as requested.

Mr. Bixby stated that the GC (General Commercial) zoning that is being proposed appears unusual due to the surrounding zonings in the area.

Mr. James stated that the surrounding areas could conceivably be zoned something less intensive. Staff discussed whether the area is appropriate for a daycare business due to the area largely being zoned LI (Light Industrial) and HI (Heavy Industrial) area. After discussion staff agreed it was an appropriate zoning due to other uses present in the area.

Chairman Famble opened the public hearing.

Mrs. Judy Harris (Agent) spoke in favor. She stated that because the area is zoned HI (Heavy Industrial) some of the existing tenants are not in compliance. She indicated there is a need for a zoning update. The proposed use is an after-school daycare program that is not permitted in the existing zoning.

Mrs. Wendy Sheridan (Daycare Owner) spoke in favor. The proposed daycare center follows the school age program procedures. The ages of the children range from five (5) years old through 6<sup>th</sup> grade. Operations during the school year are from 3-6 pm and during the summer months from 7:30 am-6 pm. She stated that it meets the Daycare Center criteria as opposed to an educational school program.

Chairman Famble closed the public hearing.

**Mr. McClarty made a motion to approve Z-2014-24. Mr. Famble seconded the motion and the motion carried by a vote seven (7) in favor (McClarty, Rosenbaum, Bixby, Calk, Ellinger, Glenn, Famble) and zero (0) in opposition.**

**Item Six: Discussion Item:**

Page 11 of 13

June 2nd, 2014

Planning and Zoning Commission

## **Discussion on Sidewalk Ordinance and Map-Based Criteria for Sidewalks.**

Mr. Jon James spoke about the sidewalk mapping with different options that we would like to get feedback on before we move forward.

- 1) *No Changes from past directions.*
- 2) *Map based definition of where sidewalks are required. Show us where sidewalks are and are not required.*
- 3) *Fee in lieu, when it went before City Council they expressed some interests in hearing more about this and give them more of an overview on how it works.*
- 4) *Map based prioritization for city projects showing where city funds are being allocated for city sidewalks. Develop criteria in the ordinance.*

### **Definition:**

Map-Based requirements: This data is not available or up to date. In order to develop this data at a detailed level we would need to create an adequate map, it would involve a lot of analysis and data collection that we don't have currently. We are recommending only having to analyze to that level of detail when a project comes to our attention.

- How far are they from apartments and residential?
- Is it on a safe route to school?
- Is it on a bus route?
- Looking at a proposed development is there evidence of pedestrian activity.
- Problem: As the city grew, the maps were not updated.

### **Point System Criteria's: 1-4 points**

- Street on a safe route to schools~ 4 points
- On or near a bus route ~ 2 points
- Low and moderate income tract ~ 1 point
- Less traveled areas ~ 1 point
- Higher traffic volume streets ~ 1 point
- Activity Center areas ~ 1 point

Chairman Famble questioned if the point rating shows where the sidewalk money is needed most.

Mr. Bixby indicated that the *Safe Routes To School* should be on a separate map, due to it being a different criteria that should be mandatory.

Mr. McClarty stated the maps are the most informative approach and would like to get rid of the waivers altogether.

### **Item Seven: Director's Report:**

All was approved by City Council as staff had recommended.

**Item Eight: Adjourn**

The Planning and Zoning Commission meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:00 P.M.

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