

**CITY OF RICHARDSON
CITY PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES – MAY 3, 2011**

The Richardson City Plan Commission met May 3, 2011, at 7:00 p.m. at City Hall in the Council Chambers, 411 W. Arapaho Road, Richardson, Texas.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bill Hammond, Vice Chair
Janet DePuy, Commissioner
Marilyn Frederick, Commissioner
Barry Hand, Commissioner
Jim Henderson, Commissioner
Thomas Maxwell, Alternate

MEMBERS ABSENT: David Gantt, Chairman
Gerald Bright, Commissioner
Don Bouvier, Alternate

CITY STAFF PRESENT: Sam Chavez, Asst. Director of Dev. Svcs. – Planning
Susan Smith, Asst. Director of Dev. Svcs. – Dev. & Engr.
Israel Roberts, Development Review Manager
Chris Shacklett, Planner
Mohamed Bireima, Planning Technician
Kathy Welp, Executive Secretary

BRIEFING SESSION

Prior to the regular business meeting, the Plan Commission met with staff to receive a briefing on:

A. Agenda Items

The Commission was briefed on the agenda items. No action was taken.

B. Staff Reports

The Commission was briefed on upcoming development items. No action was taken.

MINUTES

1. Approval of the minutes of the regular meeting of April 19, 2011.

Commissioner Henderson requested to have additional information added to the discussion of the motion for Zoning File 11-04, and Vice Chair Hammond pointed out a typographical error.

Motion: Commissioner Henderson made a motion to approve the minutes as amended; second by Commissioner Hand. Motion passed 6-0.

CONSENT AGENDA

All items listed under the consent Agenda are considered to be routine by the City Plan Commission and will be enacted by one motion in the form listed below. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless desired, in which case any item(s) may be removed from the Consent Agenda for separate consideration.

2. **Revised Landscape Plan for Bank of America Wyndham Data Center:** A request for approval by Bank of America for a revised landscape plan for the existing 114,688 square foot data center. The 7.38-acre site is located at the southeast corner of Wyndham Lane and Infocom Drive.
3. **Site and Landscape Plans for Bank of America (Undeveloped Site):** A request for approval by Bank of America for site and landscape plans for the 4.41-acre undeveloped site located south of the existing datacenter at the southeast corner of Wyndham Lane and Infocom Drive.

Motion: Commissioner Hand made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as presented; second by Commissioner DePuy. Motion passed 6-0.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

4. **Replat of Crystal Creek Addition:** A request for approval of a replat of Lot 1, Block 1, of the Swordglisten Addition and 11.03-acres of unplatted property for the development of a 35-lot single-family detached subdivision. The site is located on the west side of Holford Road, south of Chainhurst Drive.

Mr. Roberts reported that the applicant was requesting a continuance to the May 17, 2011, City Plan Commission meeting to allow more time to work on drainage and water quality issues.

Vice Chair Hammond stated his understanding was to open the public hearing then take a motion to continue to the next Commission meeting; therefore, he opened the public hearing.

No comments were made in favor or opposed, and the public hearing remained open.

Motion: Commissioner Frederick made a motion to continue Item 4, Replat of Crystal Creek Addition, to the May 17, 2011, meeting; second by Commissioner Henderson. Motion passed 6-0.

5. **Zoning File 11-05:** A request by JD Dudley, representing Quik Trip, to revoke Ordinance 3802; a Special Permit for a motor vehicle service station, and to request a new Special Permit for a motor vehicle service station with modified development standards on the east side of Inge Drive, between Belt Line Road and Lockwood Drive.

Mr. Shacklett advised that the applicant was requesting the revocation of the previous ordinance and the issuance of a new Special Permit for a 5,668 square foot convenience store with 10 double-sided gas pumps. He noted that the applicant had been able to acquire additional property north of their site, which would allow the applicant to proceed with their Generation 3 store layout and add another 2 double-sided gas pumps.

Mr. Shacklett pointed out some of the new features noting that there would be an additional entrance to the property on Inge Drive; an increase to the buffer along Belt Line Road from 6-1/2 feet to 10-1/2 feet at the narrowest point, and fifteen feet for the remainder of the frontage area; an increase to the buffer along Inge Drive to 10-1/2 feet; and a minimum 17-foot landscape buffer along Lockwood Drive. He added that there would also be a rear driving aisle and the new Generation 3 store design would include additional entrances on the east and west sides of the building.

Shacklett highlighted some of the development standards that had been discussed with the applicant:

- Belt Line Entrance – originally a 28-foot throat depth approved in 2010; however, that was less than what would typically be required along Belt Line. The adjacent property owner, Burger Street, had made it known that they did not want to jeopardize the traffic movement at the adjoining entrance so the staff has recommended a new design to extend the landscape island to the west utilizing a mountable curb, as well as stamped concrete at the drive-thru exit. This redesign would provide visual separation between the drive-thru exits, direct vehicles to right and left turn exit lanes and that there was one-way traffic movement only.
- Northern Driving Aisle – the new design provides 360-degree circulation around the building with additional parking on the north side. On the south side, the applicant widened the driveway from 30 to 35 feet at the City’s request to provide the full 24-foot fire lane with an 11-foot loading/unloading area. However, staff suggested extending the landscape islands on the northeast and northwest corners of the building to create a buffer between the loading zone and the driving aisle.
- East/West Driving Aisles – based on the applicant’s corporate policies, they were requesting driving aisles 30 to 35 feet wide, but staff had suggested reducing the width to 24 feet because it would not encourage larger vehicles to park in the aisles while utilizing the convenience store and eliminate some of the concrete and use that area for landscaping.

- Landscape Islands – staff suggested the applicant extend the landscape island along the eastern property line to the edge of the fire lane so there would be no question as to the area inside or outside the fire lane, and it would be more visible to drivers indicating there was no access between the subject property and the property to the east.
- Access Easement – at the northeast corner of the property, the applicant had purchased a strip of land from the adjoining property owner as an access easement and staff suggested that rather than having an access easement, the property line should follow the edge of the driving aisle.
- Bollards – Quik Trip (QT) is known for using bollards and curbless designs around their store to better comply with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and they would be doing so at the current site.
- Signage – in previous discussions there were some questions regarding signage on the building, specifically lighting as it pertained to the sign code and it was determined that the Commission and City Council would have purview over the illuminated bands on the canopies over the three entrances. However, the button signs on the building and the canopy over the gas pumps would be regulated by the City’s Sign Code.

Mr. Shacklett concluded his presentation by stating the applicant was requesting two variances to the City’s Subdivision and Development Code, and one variance from the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinances:

1. Allow reduced internal stacking at the gas pumps as shown on the attached concept plan (Exhibit “B” Chapter 21-59).
2. Waive the requirement for the screening of the rear of a building that backs upon a dedicated street (Chapter 21-47)
3. Allow a dumpster and screening wall within the required 40-foot setback along Lockwood Drive.

Commissioner DePuy asked if the landscape islands would be landscaped with grass or bushes. She also wanted to know the dimensions of landscaping along Lockwood Drive

Mr. Shacklett replied that staff requested they be landscaped with some sort of grass, but more than likely the applicant would use pavers.

Regarding the landscaping along Lockwood Drive, Shacklett noted that the property did not run exactly parallel to Lockwood, but at the western end of the property by Inge Drive it was eighteen feet and widened to twenty-one feet on the eastern end.

Commissioner DePuy asked if the sidewalk itself would be up against Lockwood Drive, and was there any possibility of relocating the sidewalk away from the street so it ran down the middle of the landscaping.

Mr. Shacklett replied that the applicant would remove the existing sidewalk and replace it with new concrete, and there was a street easement 10 feet back of the curb so the thought was to keep the sidewalk in the public right-of-way; however, the applicant was able to provide a wider sidewalk along Inge Drive.

Commissioner Henderson asked if any consideration had been given to having entrance/exit along Lockwood Drive because it might provide better access to the frontage road of Central Expressway. He also wanted to know if the applicant had reached an agreement for an access easement in the northeast corner of the property.

Mr. Shacklett replied that in the original design there was a driveway off Lockwood Drive, but staff had a concern that it might be used as a cut through for vehicular traffic.

Regarding an access easement, Mr. Chavez replied that the applicant was negotiating with the adjacent property owner for an access easement so the driving aisle on the east side of the building would be partially located on QT's property and the proposed curb and landscape area along the driving aisle would prevent any vehicles from cutting through to Lockwood Drive.

Commissioner Maxwell asked to view the aerial photograph to clarify the access easement between the two properties. He also wanted to know if there was the potential for the building to the north to be torn down and rebuilt.

Mr. Shacklett replied that the property north of the applicant, 509-519 Lockwood Drive, had been a single platted lot with two buildings and a newly constructed parking lot that would supply sufficient parking for both buildings. When the owner of that property sold the western portion of the property to QT, it left a single office building and adjacent canopy on the remaining land. The owner of the land has been reviewing his options to tear down the canopy and add another office building, and the current parking would provide the needed spaces.

Commissioner Hand asked if the item before the Commission was a concept plan or development plan.

Mr. Shacklett replied that the request was similar to a site plan, but it was a Special Permit that would have zoning exhibits attached (Exhibit B and Black/White Elevations) and, if approved, the applicant would have to comply with the exhibits when they came back for the development plan process. He added that if the Commission wanted to make any changes to the exhibits, now would be the time to do so.

Commissioner DePuy stated she felt that an entrance/exit off Lockwood Drive would possibly cause a problem with larger trucks and that Inge Drive and Belt Line Road provided sufficient access to the property.

Vice Chair Hammond asked for clarification on the “notched” piece of property in the northeast corner of the applicant’s submittal. He also wanted to confirm if the property would have to be replatted.

Mr. Shacklett replied that they would have to replat not only the applicant’s property once the sale was finalized, but the previous owner’s property and the property directly east where the Burger Street restaurant was located.

Regarding the “notched” piece of property, Shacklett noted staff had suggested that QT’s property line should include the notched property as opposed to having just an access easement and that would alleviate any future problems with a driving aisle located on someone else’s property.

With no further questions or comments, Vice Chair Hammond opened the public hearing.

Mr. Joe Domeier, representing QT, 1120 N. Industrial Boulevard, Euless, Texas, stated that in response to the question about the “notched” piece of property, the purchase agreement between QT and the adjacent property owner was contingent upon a shared access agreement between the two properties, which would be recorded simultaneously with the land closing and shown on the plat as an access easement by separate document. He added that the original intent was to have a shared driveway through to Lockwood Drive and to add a temporary curb so if the adjacent property developed further the shared access drive would be available.

Vice Chair Hammond asked for clarification regarding the access; would it be from the QT property to the adjacent eastern property, and if it was QT’s intention to purchase the piece of property in question.

Mr. Domeier replied that QT did not intend to purchase the property but simply to add an access easement, which was common between adjoining developments. He added that initially QT wanted to allow access to the property from Lockwood Drive, but at staff’s suggestion the area was curbed to prevent cut through of vehicular traffic.

Commissioner Henderson asked if the area between the building on the adjoining property and QT’s property would be a driveway, and could the other property owner open up the proposed curb once it was installed.

Mr. Domeier replied that where the existing driveway is located would become part of the QT property and the area between that and the adjacent property/building would be landscape material. Also, if in the future access was needed to the adjacent property, the curb could be removed and the traffic would flow east from QT's property to the parking lot at the corner of Lockwood Drive and Custer Road, but that could not happen without coming back before the Commission because it would require a site plan revision.

Mr. Shacklett pointed out that the property between the existing building on Lockwood Drive and QT's property was not wide enough for a driveway, and as part of the development plans for QT, the adjacent property to the east, and the Burger Street property would be revised.

Commissioner Frederick asked the applicant if it would help to accept staff's recommendation to enlarge the landscape and curb area to discourage cut through traffic.

Mr. Domeier replied that the adjacent property owner had a concern over setback requirements if that area was enlarged, which could impact the size of their building and their ability to lease the space. He added that QT was currently working on a compromise to keep the seller happy and meet staff's requirements.

Mr. JD Dudley, representing QT, 1120 N. Industrial Boulevard, Euless, Texas, added that the current plans called for curbing only, but what they would like to do is add a 1 to 2 foot raised curb with stamped concrete in lieu of landscaping.

Commissioner Maxwell asked to clarify what was on the property east side of the curb; was it landscaped or paved. He also wanted to know why the dumpster location had been changed from the previous plans and thought it could be moved closer to the building on the east side.

Mr. Domeier replied that there was a sidewalk and the existing canopy east of the curb and a raised stamped curb that would flow into the current grade.

Regarding the dumpster location, Mr. Dudley replied that the dumpster had previously been located at the northwest corner of the site, but they were able to move it to the northeast corner when the entrance/exit to Lockwood Drive was removed. He added that the reason for the angle and position of the proposed dumpster was to allow the trash truck to pull in and back out unimpeded and said they would agree to add extra screening (i.e., shrubs and trees) around the enclosure.

Commissioner Hand complimented the applicant on acquiring more land and combining parcels; however, expressed concern about the design of the building with entrances on the front and both sides, but not on the rear of the building. He added that QT had the advantage of possibly being the "hub" of future retail development and asked if there could be something done to dress up the rear elevation.

Mr. Domeier replied that QT's sales were based on high volume as opposed to high dollar and when looking at possible new designs and what was the next niche in their market – food services, they were faced with adding more entrances to alleviate in-store congestion. He noted that in the new design, the check out area was brought to the front of the building and a food service area would be against the back of the building.

Mr. Dudley pointed out that because of the amount of time and millions of dollars that went into the design of QT's stores, their corporate office was reluctant to make any changes; however, he did note that the corporate office agreed to add brick parapets on all four sides of the building instead of the previously proposed mesh screening.

Commissioner Hand stated he would like to enhance the back of the building with coping QT's signature red and silver stripe and would rather have a brick screening wall with shrubs than look at the proposed rear elevation.

Commissioner DePuy stated she was in favor of the access agreement between QT and the property to the east because it would help the owner develop their property and agreed with most of Mr. Hand's comments about having a more walkable, friendly, retail environment. She added that she did not want large trucks coming and going along Lockwood Drive, was not in favor of a masonry wall, and encouraged the applicant to follow the staff's recommendations regarding the landscape islands along the east and west corners of the rear elevation.

Mr. Domeier replied that their biggest concern were the truck drivers and cited instances where QT had repeatedly asked the drivers not to use the ADA ramps for unloading their products, but they did it any way. He said that the larger vehicles, the 18 wheel trucks, would have problems making the turn around those islands, which would eventually tear up the curb/berm and possibly cause problems with the trucks being outside the loading zone and blocking traffic.

Commissioner DePuy asked to confirm that there would be no outside storage or display.

Mr. Domeier confirmed that if the Commission did not want outside storage they would make sure there would be none.

Commissioner Hand asked why the building was not placed on the lot with the rear of building facing east. He also suggested that additional details could be added to the building to mute the contrast between the front and back elevations, but said he would feel better if the elevations were removed altogether from the item.

Mr. Domeier replied that he was not sure what their corporate office would or would not approve and asked that if the Commission approved the item, the motion would contain wording that they work with staff to come up some solutions.

Mr. Shacklett replied that since the applicant met the City's masonry standards, and if the elevations were not attached to the Special Permit, the applicant could build a simple flat brick box and would not be required to do anything that was proposed on the elevations.

Regarding adding wording to the motion to encourage the applicant and staff to work together, Shacklett suggested the following wording for a special condition: "At the time of development plans, elevations shall be submitted and approved by City Plan Commission and the City Council." He explained that if the Commission went forward and accepted the elevations "as is," and the City Council also approved them, the item would come back before on a Consent Agenda and the Commission would vote to either approve or deny based on whether the elevations did or did not conform to what was approved during the zoning process. However, if the elevations were taken out of the zoning and required at a later time, the Commission would approve them during the development plan process, but then the elevations would have to go to City Council for approval.

Mr. Chavez added that in essence the Commission would extend the approval process by making the applicant come back twice for approvals.

Mr. Dudley noted that the difference between the Generation 2 and 3 stores were the rear pilasters that had been previously approved by the Commission and suggested that those pilasters be added to the motion for approval, which would give him at least two weeks to go back to his corporate office for approval prior to the item coming before the City Council. He added that the Generation 2 store did have a red band on the rear elevation, but the Generation 3 store would not have that same feature.

Commissioner Hand asked why they could not extend the horizontal red band to the rear elevation to help mute the difference between the front and rear elevations.

Mr. Dudley replied that the pilasters on the previously approved elevations would not be the same as those on the proposed elevation; they would match the front of the new design. He asked if the red band was extended to the rear elevations would that be acceptable.

Commissioner Hand replied that it would be acceptable and asked if they could try to do something with the cornice on the raised parapet.

Mr. Chavez suggested that the applicant mimic the cornice from the front elevation to help soften the rear elevation and elevate the landscape berm next to the sidewalk to soften the look of the rear elevation.

Mr. Dudley restated that the corporate office was reluctant to change the design and felt the red band would be something they would not want to add. As far as the parapet in the back

matching the front, Dudley advised that he had asked that question and their corporate office denied the request.

Commissioner Frederick asked if the pilasters proposed for the current submittal could mimic the front of the store using the same material.

Mr. Domeier explained that he and Mr. Dudley felt the pilasters were something that their corporate office would approve; however, the cornice had been requested for another market and had been denied.

Commissioner DePuy said she was in agreement with Mr. Domeier's explanation of why the additional islands near the loading zone would not be acceptable, and felt that pilasters would be a good addition to the rear elevation.

Mr. Shacklett asked if the applicant would be able to make some of the changes requested by the Commission and have them back to staff within a week in time for the next Plan Commission meeting on May 17th. Also, any item that was approved at the May 17th meeting would not be heard at the City Council level until the June 13th meeting, as was the case with any item approved at the current meeting.

Mr. Domeier replied that they were under extreme time constraints and would prefer if the Commission decided to approve the item that the motion should contain verbiage stipulating that QT would add pilasters to the rear of the building, and that they would work with staff to be ready for the next City Council meeting.

Mr. Dudley added that if the item was approved at the current meeting, QT would have six weeks to present any changes to their corporate office for approval.

Vice Chair Hammond stated he appreciated that QT was coming to the City of Richardson and was proposing a quality design, but pointed out that even though the last submittal presented some obstacles it was passed with compromises from both sides. Hammond felt that the additional property gave QT a greater ability to comply with the City's ordinance, nevertheless they were objecting to many of the staff's recommendations. He also wanted to know how many employees would be needed at the new location.

Mr. Dudley replied that there would be 8 to 9 employees per shift; however, at shift change there could be fourteen to sixteen employees.

Vice Chair Hammond expressed his concern about the stacking of vehicles at the gas pumps and the fact that the footprint of the building had not been pushed back even though extra land had been acquired and there seemed to be more than adequate parking on the site.

Mr. Dudley replied that in talks with staff and QT's traffic engineer, they felt the intent of the original ordinance was for a smaller scale gas station with congestion issues and said he felt they had addressed those issues with the previous submittal as well as with the current submittal. He added that if the design was changed to meet the original ordinance requirements, it would create a large area of concrete whereas they had taken some of that space and created larger landscape buffers in both the front and the back of the site, which helped to soften the overall look of the project.

Mr. Domeier added they felt the original ordinance was written when gas stations had 2 or 3 pumps and the stacking of vehicle was a major concern; however, the new Generation 3 store plan was designed for the current and future trend of customers not only coming in for gas, but also for the customer who would be making use of the food services section of the store and staying longer. He added that additional concrete was not a cost concern and cited other QT stores where larger areas of concrete had been built and how the appearance or look of the design was not as aesthetically pleasing as the proposed concept.

Vice Chair Hammond thanked Mr. Domeier for his explanation and wanted to note that he concurred with the applicant that putting entrances in both front and back would lead to the loss of operational floor space, but felt the rear elevation could have a little more decorative appeal.

Commissioner Henderson asked if the store would operate for 24 hours, was the gas delivered by QT's own vehicles, and did they control when the gas trucks arrived.

Mr. Domeier replied that the store would operate 24 hours per day and QT did have their own gas trucks, but need determined when the trucks would arrive.

Mr. Dudley added that QT store personnel would monitor the storage tanks and the gas delivery trucks usually came late at night or early in the morning, but if there happened to be a large volume of gas sales and a truck was needed during the day it would be delivered at that time.

Mr. Shacklett stated that if a motion was made in favor of the item, the Commission might want to add that the elevations were approved subject to the addition of the pilasters to the north elevation as well as the prohibition of outside storage or display of merchandise in addition to the conditions mentioned in the staff report.

With no further comments in favor or opposed, Vice Chair Hammond closed the public hearing.

Motion: Commissioner DePuy made a motion to recommend approval of Zoning File 11-05 as presented with the following additional conditions: pilaster to be added at

rear of building to mimic the front elevation, as well as no outside storage or display.

Commissioner Hand asked Ms. DePuy to amend her motion to require metal cornices at the raised corners of the buildings. He added that he was aware the applicant's corporate office may not want to make the change, but thought it should be added to the motion.

Mr. Chavez replied that if Mr. Hand's request was added to the motion and the applicant's corporate office would not make the change, the item would have to come back before the Commission before it could proceed to City Council for approval.

Commissioner DePuy declined to amend her motion.

Commissioner Frederick asked Ms. DePuy to amend her motion to add a requirement for landscape islands along the driveway at the northeast corner of the property.

Commissioner DePuy agreed to amend her motion.

Mr. Shacklett asked to clarify the motion as follows:

1. Ordinance 3802 shall be repealed.
2. A motor vehicle service station shall be allowed as defined in the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance and limited to the area shown on the attached concept plan, marked as Exhibit "B" and made a part thereof.
3. The motor vehicle service station shall be constructed in substantial conformance with the attached concept plan (Exhibit "B") and building and canopy elevations (Exhibits "C-1" & "C-2").
4. A variance to allow reduced internal stacking at the gas pumps as shown on the attached concept plan (Exhibit "B") shall be allowed.
5. A variance to waive the requirement for an 8-foot masonry screening wall or living screen within a landscape buffer in conjunction with wrought iron along Lockwood Drive shall be granted.
6. A variance to allow the dumpster and associated screening wall to be located within the required 40-foot front setback along Lockwood Drive as shown on the attached concept plan (Exhibit "B") shall be allowed.
7. No outside storage or display of merchandise.
 - And, revisions to Exhibit B to extend the islands along the eastern driving aisle per staff recommendations; and revisions to Exhibit C1 to add pilasters to the rear of the building to mimic the front elevation.

Commissioner DePuy concurred with the clarification. Second by Commissioner Frederick. Motion passed 6-0.

6. **Zoning File 11-06:** A request by Smitha Puppala and Madhuri Siddabhattuni, representing Little Steps Montessori School, to revoke Ordinance 3524; a Special Permit for a childcare center, and to request a new Special Permit for a childcare center at 635 W. Campbell Road, southwest corner of Campbell Road and Nantucket Drive.

Mr. Shacklett advised that the applicant was requesting the revocation of Ordinance 3524 that was limited to a childcare center for the YMCA, and approval of a Special Permit for a childcare facility at the same site. He added that the current Special Permit associated with Ordinance 3524 required employee and van parking on the south side of the building as well as bollards around the playground area for protection of the children and the applicant would keep those requirements in place. In addition, the State of Texas would license the facility for 275 children and the applicant said they were expecting 200 children and 20-25 employees.

Mr. Shacklett suggested that if the item was approved, the Commission not limit the Special Permit to any specific user so if the user ever changed, or there was a change of name, there would be no need to go through the zoning process again.

Commissioner DePuy asked if there was a large amount of traffic that would circulate behind the building in the area of the playground.

Mr. Shacklett replied that the area was generally for employee parking and deliveries and connects with the property to the west, but there would be more traffic on the north side of the building away from the playground.

Commissioner Henderson noted there were a number of other businesses in close proximity to the school that sold alcohol and asked if there was a prohibition on having the facility in the area.

Mr. Shacklett explained that the title of the business – Little Steps Montessori School, might be a little misleading because it was a childcare center that uses the Montessori style of instruction. He added that childcare centers were not added as a distance requirement in the City's alcoholic beverage ordinance, but there was also a junior high and a church in the immediate area of the childcare facility so there should be no problem with adherence to the City's ordinance.

With no further comments or questions, Vice Chair Hammond opened the public hearing.

Ms. Carmen Sexton, 4600 N. Josey, Carrollton, Texas, representing Little Steps Montessori School, stated that Montessori was a specific style of education, but the facility would

basically be a daycare center that would have children from ages 12 month to seven years old. She asked the Commission to approve their application so they could continue using the facility as a childcare center.

Ms. Courtney Underwood, 635 W. Campbell Road, Suite 232, Richardson, Texas, representing the property owner, stated they were in support of the application and appreciated staff's recommendation to change the Special Permit use for the space itself as opposed to being tied to a particular name or individual.

With no further comments or questions in favor or opposed, Vice Chair Hammond closed the public hearing.

Motion: Commissioner Hand made a motion to recommend approval of Zoning File 11-06 as presented; second by Commissioner DePuy. Motion passed 6-0.

ADJOURN

With no further business before the Commission, Vice Chair Hammond adjourned the regular business meeting at 8:50 p.m.



David Gantt, Chairman
City Plan Commission