CITY OF RICHARDSON
CITY PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES – JUNE 21, 2022

The Richardson City Plan Commission met on June 21, 2022, at 7:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers, 411 W. Arapaho Road, Richardson, Texas.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bryan Marsh, Chairman
Stephen Springs, Vice Chairman
Kenneth Southard, Commissioner
Sibyl LaCour, Commissioner
Nate Roberts, Commissioner
Joe Costantino, Commissioner
Michael Keller, Commissioner
Gary Beach, Commissioner

MEMBERS ABSENT: Gwen Walraven, Commissioner

CITY STAFF PRESENT: Sam Chavez, Interim Director – Development Services
Daniel Harper, Senior Planner
Chris Shacklett, Interim Asst. Director – Planning
Connie Ellwood, Executive Secretary
Angie Nations, Administrative Secretary I

BRIEFING SESSION

Prior to the start of the regular business meeting, the City Plan Commission met with staff regarding staff reports and agenda items. No action was taken.

REGULAR BUSINESS MEETING

1. **Approval of Minutes of the regular business meeting of May 17, 2022.**

   Motion: Commissioner Costantino made a motion to approve the minutes as presented; Seconded by Commissioner Southard. Motion passed 7-0.

PUBLIC HEARING

1. **Zoning File 22-05 – PD Planned Development – Greenwood Square:** Consider and act on a request to rezone approximately 4.4 acres located on the north side of Arapaho Road, east of West Shore Drive from O-M Office to PD Planned Development for the R-1100-M Residential District with amended development standards and a concept plan to accommodate the development of up to 33 single family residential lots. *Owner: Ben Caldwell, Shaddock Caldwell Builders & Developers, LLC. Staff: Daniel Harper.*

   Mr. Harper began his presentation stating the application was for a PD Planned Development to accommodate the development of thirty-three (33) single-family residential lots located on the north side of Arapaho Road, east of West Shore Drive. The 4.4-acre property is zoned O-

M Office per Ordinance 2250-A. The property was surrounded by a variety of retail, residential, church and office uses. The property located to the east of the subject property had an office building constructed along the shared property line.

The subject property was designated as "Enhancement/Redevelopment – West Arapaho" on the City's 2009 Future Land Use Plan. This designation called for this area to be subject to a future study, like the study performed for the Collins/Arapaho TOD and Innovation District. The stated focus was on better serving the retail and office needs of the surrounding neighborhoods. The description within Comprehensive Plan stated that residential uses such as duplexes, townhomes, or senior housing may be appropriate at certain locations, especially adjacent to existing neighborhoods. He stated the proposed land use of single-family detached residential does not comply with the suggested denser residential housing types; however, the proposed development is denser than traditional single-family developments in the area. The proposed development would be similar in density to a traditional duplex zoning district (D-1400-M Duplex).

Mr. Harper continued stating the proposed concept plan for the subject property was located between an office development to the east; a retail and office development to the west separated by the drainage easement of Cottonwood Creek; and the Greenwood Hills neighborhood located to the north. The 33- home development has access to Arapaho Road. To accommodate this entrance, left turns in and out of the development for eastbound and westbound traffic would be constructed at a median opening on Arapaho Road. The median opening would be aligned with the existing driveway located on the south side of Arapaho Road at 725 W. Arapaho Road. The left turn lanes would be 175-feet-long to accommodate both left turns in and out of the subject property and the church property to the south. A proposed emergency access lane would be constructed at the northwest corner of the property to connect to the alley located north of the development. This access lane would be gated and could only be used by emergency services. An additional five (5) feet of alley right-of-way would be dedicated directly south of the present alley dedication, making a total of fifteen (15) feet of dedicated alley right-of-way and a total paved width of thirteen (13) feet. A trip generation memo was produced by the applicant and demonstrated limited traffic generated by the proposed development. The memo stated twenty-eight (28) trips were generated during the AM peak hour, and thirty-six (36) trips were generated during the PM peak hour. This number indicated to staff that a further traffic study was not needed. The development would have a density of 7.5 units per acre and would include two (2) shared open spaces as well as four (4) unique features called pocket gathering spaces.

Mr. Harper presented renderings of the proposed project. Mr. Harper stated staff provided the Commission with items for consideration touching on the unique elements of the application. Due to the proposed design, the applicant had designed twenty-two (22) of the homes to utilize shared driveways that would provide access to opposing garages. Private access easements would be created by the plat on lot types employing a shared driveway. The distance between opposing garage doors sharing a driveway would be a minimum of twenty-five (25) feet to allow for proper maneuverability. Parking or placement of any other items on shared driveways would be explicitly prohibited per the zoning regulations and in the HOA documents to ensure that each garage would be sufficiently accessible.

The street widths for the proposed development are twenty (20) feet in width in lieu of the standard twenty-seven (27) feet. This proposed width had been reviewed and approved by the Richardson Fire Department for safety standards, however, it did not allow for on-street parking on both sides of the street within the 20-foot-wide pavement section that would be typical of a single-family residential neighborhood with a 27-foot-wide pavement section. To address this issue, the applicant included twenty-one (21) on-street parallel parking spaces that were designed outside of the 20-foot-wide pavement section, which would still allow for two-way traffic. The development contained thirty-three (33) homes with 2-car garages totaling sixty-six (66) off-street parking spaces in garages coupled with twenty-one (21) spaces on-street. The proposed amount of guest parking provided may be insufficient for the neighborhood considering that parking in driveways would be prohibited due to the proposed shared driveway design. Staff did express some concerns to the applicant regarding this potential issue.

Mr. Harper continued by speaking to the maintenance easement located on the east portion of the property. A 3-foot maintenance easement would be provided along the eastern property line of the proposed development to provide access to the perimeter fencing and the building located on the property to the east (west wall of adjacent building is located directly on the property line). That property owner would be provided access through the individual residential lots, connecting to the 3-foot maintenance easement along the east property line of the subject property. Staff included this as part of the proposed conditions.

Unique features to be included within the development were pocket gathering spaces. Four (4) pocket gathering spaces would be located on Block C and provide shared common space for the neighborhood. The pocket gathering spaces were a unique concept to this development and would be considered shared common spaces for the neighborhood. These areas would include seating and other amenities. The applicant included an exhibit to illustrate the pocket gathering space concept. At a minimum, the gathering space would provide a wall separating the space from the private yard space of the adjacent homes and a bench on at least two (2) sides of the space. These spaces would be required to be maintained by the HOA.

The applicant requested to construct a 6-foot-tall wooden fence along the north side of Arapaho Road with a minimum 14-foot-wide landscape buffer to be utilized as screening for the development. Where single-family lots back upon a street, the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance (CZO) requires a 6-foot-tall masonry wall or a living screen within a landscape buffer at least twenty (20) feet wide be provided to screen residential lots from the street. They were requesting to provide a 14-foot landscape buffer in lieu of a 20-foot landscape buffer and a wooden fence in lieu of a masonry wall for neighborhood screening.

Staff recommended that private fencing for the lots backing to the western property line, adjacent to the drainage easement be made of tubular steel fencing and not a wooden fence.

Staff recommended the screening wall along Arapaho Road be constructed of masonry material consistent with other residential subdivisions within the City of Richardson. The requested 14-foot landscape buffer was the maximum achievable landscape buffer for the

subject property per the applicant. A six-foot wooden fence would sit atop a 4-foot retaining wall. The wall would appear to be a 10-foot-tall wall from outside the neighborhood. The applicant requested the wooden material to ensure a more cohesive and aesthetically pleasing look to the neighborhood and requested to keep this look in lieu of the masonry wall as required by the City.

The proposed modifications to the base R-1100-M Residential Zoning Regulations, Subdivision Regulations and Site Development Regulations were being requested to accommodate the denser nature of the development on the subject property.

Staff displayed a list of zoning conditions provided by the applicant to be included in the Planned Development regulations geared toward the specific needs of the proposed neighborhood.

Staff encouraged the applicant to pursue public outreach as abutting neighborhoods would potentially have an interest. The applicant stated a public event and information session was held for this proposal. Additionally, the applicant and eastern property owner have been in contact with each other and the City to discuss access easement concerns on the eastern property line.

Mr. Harper concluded his presentation stating no correspondence had been received regarding this request aside from a conversation with the property owner to the east. He then made himself available for questions.

Commissioner Beach asked about on-street parking and would the HOA limit it to guests only. He also asked if residents who owned extra-large vehicles be able to park in a garage or would they need to utilize on-street parking.

Mr. Harper stated there was nothing codified in the CZO about restricting the on-street parking to guests only. This could be enforced by an HOA document, but there was nothing specific about this within the CZO or PD regulations. He continued stating the garage sizes proposed by the applicant with their floor plans were typical garage sizes. Staff could not speak to the height or depth requirements for parking an extra-large pickup truck. He stated the unique scenario of the neighborhood required potential buyers to make an educated decision.

With no further questions from the Commission of staff, Chairman Marsh opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to come forward to speak on behalf of the request.

Mr. Ben Caldwell, 1436 Cheyenne Drive, Richardson came forward as the applicant and thanked staff for their thorough presentation. He provided background information concerning his development expertise and spoke about a similar project Shaddock Caldwell developed approximately three (3) years prior in Richardson for a similar sized property which was called Mimosa Place, located south of Campbell Road, on the east side of Mimosa Drive. For that development, meetings were held with surrounding homeowners sharing the vision and receiving feedback. A zoning change was required changing the zoning from O-M Office District to a PD Planned Development District specifically tailored for a very focused quality

product. That development contained eighteen (18) homes and was almost completely built out, and the price point for the development was just under $1.6 million per unit for a fully custom product. Similarly, the goal for the proposed property was to develop an exceptional quality product that would enhance the surrounding communities and assist with the highly sought-after residential need within Richardson.

Mr. Caldwell then provided a presentation with renderings of unit type illustrations. Mr. Caldwell discussed the anticipated home sizes and prices as well as the surrounding development. He continued discussing the intent to utilize shared driveways similar to a development in Plano, Texas. He stated the shared driveway concept allowed them to accomplish the aesthetic of the project.

Mr. Caldwell stated he had met with the Greenwood Hills neighborhood at the beginning of the process over a year ago, and that there was support for the project. He stated that an event was held at their office more recently and that surrounding owners were invited to attend, but only the commercial property owner to the west attended. Mr. Caldwell stated it was important to him to work with the community.

Mr. Caldwell continued presenting renderings of the proposed development. He discussed the staff recommendation to utilize full masonry along Arapaho Road; however, the applicant's opinion was that due to the grade difference of the retaining wall adjacent to the street, should all masonry be utilized, it would appear as if it were a sound barrier wall along a highway. To be more aesthetically pleasing, the applicant recommended a 6-foot-tall horizontal picket wood fence atop a 4-foot-tall masonry retaining wall to provide a more contemporary, welcoming and aesthetically pleasing look.

Mr. Caldwell continued by discussing the proposed dedicated parking and parallel parking and that a minimum 20-foot-wide lane would be provided for vehicle travel without being impeded upon by on-street parking. He stated fire trucks, moving trucks, and other larger vehicles would have the ability to maneuver without issue.

Mr. Caldwell concluded his presentation stating they were committed to quality, and excited for the opportunity before them. He thanked City staff and then made himself available for questions.

Commissioner LaCour asked if the applicant had completed a similar project that included the horizontal wood picket fencing. She also inquired about the fencing and how it held up in appearance from weathering and who would be responsible for maintaining the fencing.

Mr. Caldwell stated that the perimeter of the Mimosa Place community was all cedar wood fencing and has held up well due to ongoing maintenance. The responsibility of maintaining the fencing would be HOA responsibility. The HOA would ensure fence maintenance would take place on a regular basis.

Commissioner Roberts inquired about the responsibilities of the HOA. He also stated the streets within the development would be city maintained; however, he wanted to know about the plans for street lighting. Finally, he inquired if a dog park would be available to residents.

Mr. Caldwell responded the HOA would be responsible for areas such as common area maintenance and perimeter fencing. He stated there were still some landscape requirements to be determined, but he wanted to make sure that landscaping be consistent throughout the development. Mr. Caldwell continued stating there would be agreements with Oncor for street lighting. The streetlights would not be metered but paid by bulk rate. He also stated the goal was to minimize above ground structures (e.g., telephone boxes or transformers). He continued by stating there would not be an official dog park; however, they would have access to open spaces available for residents that have animals.

Commissioner Beach asked about residents who owned extra-large vehicles and the ability to park in a garage. Many garages parking spaces were only eight (8) foot in width, making it impossible to park an extra-large vehicle. Commissioner Beach asked what considerations were given to this, if any, and would they utilize on-street parking.

Mr. Caldwell responded that all units would have two (2) garage parking spaces. Their development standard was to install 9-foot-wide garage parking spaces to accommodate larger vehicles. Within this proposed community, they would all have double garage doors. He indicated the depths of the garages would vary. He also stated from a sales standpoint, it was very important to inform buyers of a garage size to ensure their vehicle would fit. It would be a conversation the real estate agent would have with the potential buyer.

Mr. Shacklett stated the City's requirement for a typical garage dimension for single-family homes was eighteen 18-feet-deep by eighteen 18-feet-wide to accommodate a garage for two (2) vehicles. The applicant was providing twenty-one (21) foot in depth and twenty (20) foot in width.

Commissioner Beach reiterated that on-street parking should be reserved for guests only and not for residents with oversized vehicles.

Mr. Caldwell stated that language would need to be included in the HOA documents requiring that the parallel spots would be exclusively for guests.

Commissioner Southard asked about residents that owned more than two (2) vehicles and how that issue would be addressed. He further commented that the units would cater to a more affluent buyer with active social lives. Parking could potentially be an issue for residents that host social gathering events such as football watching parties.

Mr. Caldwell reiterated the need for the HOA to clearly state that the parallel spots would be exclusively for guests. This proposed community would provide two (2) garage parking spaces per unit. Residents requiring more than this would be deterred from purchasing within said development.

Commissioner Southard asked what the targeted demographic for the development was.

Mr. Caldwell responded he could see the development appealing to both families with young children as well as empty nesters. He felt it would be a mix of multiple demographic types.

Commissioner Southard reiterated his concerns regarding guest parking and congestion for the site.

Commissioner Costantino asked if potential buyers that own extra-large vehicles typically ask the realtor about the garage sizes. He also asked about the closing process and if the HOA documents were reviewed at that time as part of the closing process.

Mr. Caldwell responded yes to both questions. He reiterated that communication was key between the real estate agent and buyer on the front end before purchasing.

Chairman Marsh asked if the architectural style was accurately depicted in the renderings.

Mr. Caldwell responded largely yes, but there could be slight changes (e.g., color) as the final construction documents had not been completed.

Chairman Marsh commented that the applicant wanted to go forward with the wooden fence along Arapaho Road. Were there additional conditions within the packet that were recommended by staff that you were opposed to?

Mr. Caldwell stated they also want to allow wooden privacy fences between homes and across the fronts for the lots that are adjacent to the creek on the west side of the property.

Chairman Marsh asked staff to comment on the concerns of tying the wooden fencing and into the shorter 4-foot-tall tubular steel fencing along the creek.

Mr. Harper stated the proposed regulations stated privacy fencing shall not exceed six (6) feet in height, nor shall it exceed the height of any adjacent perimeter fencing or masonry wall.

He continued stating the perimeter fencing of the western property line along the drainage easement was proposed to be four (4) foot in height, therefore the privacy fencing on the private properties would be limited to four (4) foot in height per the proposed regulations.

Mr. Caldwell stated the privacy fencing would tie into the tubular fencing at a 45-degree angle or a transition from a 6-foot wooden privacy fence down to the 4-foot tubular fencing.

Chairman Marsh inquired about the fencing along Arapaho Road and why there would be approximately three (3) to four (4) foot of masonry on the bottom.

Mr. Caldwell responded there was a retaining wall, and it was grade separated. The retaining wall varies in height based on the natural terrain. The retaining wall measured anywhere from three (3) foot to five (5) foot. There would also be separation from Arapaho horizontally by

the landscape providing a feeling of distance for safety in addition to the vertical elevation elements. The grade separation provides a safer feel.

Commissioner Beach asked about the tubular fencing on the west side of the property and why it was only 4-feet-tall and not 6-feet-tall.

Mr. Caldwell responded it was due to the floodplain. The box culverts that run beneath Arapaho Road are undersized. In a 100-year flood event, they would back up and cause storage space on the subject site to be created to accommodate this. The entire site essentially was being raised up above its current grade to be out of the 100-year floodplain and provide the storage in a 100-year flood event.

Mr. Shacklett clarified Commissioner Beach's question regarding the tubular steel fence height along the west property line.

Mr. Caldwell stated that a 4-foot fence would enable a resident to feel more connected to the greenspace and would be more aesthetically pleasing.

Mr. Shacklett stated staff's concern was not that the fence was only 4-feet-tall, but the concern was tying in a wooden fence to a metal fence, regardless of height.

With no further questions for the applicant, Chairman Marsh opened the public hearing and asked if there was anyone that wanted to speak in favor of the request. Seeing none, he then asked if there was anyone to speak in opposition to the request.

The following individuals came forward to speak in opposition to the request:

- Shlomo Friman, 1810 Cheyenne Drive, Richardson and owner of office property to the east of the subject property at 720 W. Arapaho Road
- Burt Wayne Bailey, 724 Pinehurst Drive, Richardson
- Martha Bailey, 724 Pinehurst Drive, Richardson

With no further speakers, Chairman Marsh asked the applicant to come forward to respond.

Mr. Caldwell came forward to provide responses to the issues addressed by those in opposition. He stated vehicles would not have the ability to exit the community to the north. That entry/exit gate would specifically be for emergency access. There would be no direct access to the alley north of the property or to Pinehurst Drive. He also stated the alley would not be utilized even though they would be expanding the alley width. Mr. Caldwell also stated trash pick-up would be typical of residential trash pickup throughout the City.

Commissioner Southard asked if there would be a communal mailbox.

Mr. Caldwell stated there would be a communal mailbox as required for new communities by the United States Postal Service.

Mr. Caldwell also stated that proper access for Mr. Friman's building to the east would be maintained so Mr. Friman can maintain the west side of his building, thus the 3-foot easement that is being proposed. He indicated he would welcome future dialogue with Mr. Friman regarding fences with gates to allow access to greenspace for residents that potential wanted pets. He felt there were solutions that could be worked on together.

Commissioner Costantino asked if it would be possible to add several additional parking spaces on the southwestern corner off Arapaho Road.

Mr. Harper responded it was to be used as open space accessible to residents with animals but was also located in the floodplain and would be used as flood storage.

Commissioner Southard asked would there be any ability to create additional parking on Lot 1, Block A at the northwestern corner of the property, which was currently planned to be a larger residential lot.

Mr. Caldwell stated the extra space on Lot 1 was a yard for that lot; however, one (1) parallel parking space could potentially be obtained from Lot 1. He stated that he favored having the yard amenity.

Vice Chairman Springs concurred with the other Commissioners regarding parking concerns. He asked if a lot were lost, would the project still be feasible.

Mr. Caldwell responded it was not that absolute. He emphasized the importance of the streetscape and the feel with units facing one another versus parking areas. He pointed out an additional unit could have been placed on Lot 9; however, green space was more important as an amenity to the residents who had animals. He reiterated that Lot 1 could potentially be modified to provide one (1) additional parallel parking space, but he was not in favor for aesthetic reasons and economic reasons. He would lean toward utilizing Lot 9 for additional parking and maintaining Lot 3 for residents with animals.

Vice Chairman Springs also stated the applicant should continue to work with the property owner to the east regarding access easement agreements.

Mr. Caldwell responded that this is a more difficult situation since the building to the east was allowed to be built on the property line and that the 3-foot setback along the property line would meet Building and Fire Code requirements. Conversations with Mr. Friman largely revolved around his business having unfettered access along the western side of his building. Continued conversations would be forthcoming to determine an agreeable solution. He stated going beyond a 3-foot access easement would pose challenges for the proposed development.

With no further questions or comments in favor or opposition to the request, Chairman Marsh closed the public hearing and asked the Commission for further comment or a motion.

Commissioner Costantino asked if the Commission felt twenty-one (21) visitor parking spaces was sufficient.

Mr. Shacklett stated a traditional single-family residence had no requirement for visitor parking; however, there would be a 25-foot-long driveway providing capacity for visitor parking as well as along the street. Within a traditional patio home development, off-street parking spaces are required, and there is no requirement for visitor parking; however, patio homes typically have a rear setback of twenty (20) feet which could accommodate a driveway. Mr. Shacklett continued stating the closest comparable type of development would be a townhome development which required each dwelling unit to provide a minimum of two (2) off-street parking space within a garage. All garages shall be rear entry and accessed through an alley. It also required guest parking at a ratio of 0.5 parking spaces per dwelling unit. They may be located on the street or in designated off-street parking areas. It was intended for the parking to be conveniently dispersed throughout the project. This project was consistent with that standard.

Mr. Shacklett continued stating within a townhome development, a typical rear setback was five (5) feet so there would not be driveway capacity for parking. The street may be constructed with a full 27-foot-wide paved section with the ability to park on both sides of the street.

Commissioner Costantino asked the Commission if they felt the comparison to a townhome development was reasonable.

Chairman Marsh concurred that he felt this development was most like a townhome development, and this development met the requirement for guest parking.

Commissioner Beach asked if a continuance on this case should be made to allow Mr. Friman more time to meet with the applicant.

Chairman Marsh asked staff what the anticipated date was for review of this case by City Council.

Mr. Shacklett responded it was tentatively scheduled for City Council on July 11, 2022. The next City Council meeting date for a zoning case to be heard would be August 8, 2022. Regardless of whether the case was continued or if a recommendation was made, the Council date could be delayed providing additional time for Mr. Friman and Mr. Caldwell to continue conversation surrounding the border between their properties. Mr. Shacklett also stated the Commission could continue the case to a future CPC meeting date.

Commissioner Southard asked Mr. Caldwell how a 1-month delay would impact the project.

Mr. Caldwell responded that he recognizes the challenges for Mr. Friman and said should the Commission recommend approval, he would be willing to have this go before Council in August to allow time to engage in further conversations with Mr. Friman.

Vice Chairman Springs asked staff to display the staff recommendations for the Commission to review. He believed the most important points were in relation to the fence along Arapaho Road and the fence type along the western border as well as parking.

Commissioner Costantino asked if the standard for the fencing along the western property line should be written that the privacy fence should be no lower than the adjacent fence.

Mr. Shacklett responded no, the intent was to prohibit a 6-foot-tall fence wood fence with every individual resident fence that might be a different design or color, tying in perpendicularly and sticking up above the perimeter fence. On the west property line, the height of fence will not matter because the HOA fence is tubular steel.

Chairman Marsh stated a 4-foot-tall tubular steel fence along the western property line made sense along the rear of the western lots, but the transition of the private fencing tying into the tubular steel fence should be considered.

Chairman Marsh inquired about the grade change along the north property line along the alley and would it be elevated also.

Mr. Caldwell responded there was slight grade separation on the northern side of the property. This was one of the reasons the alley was not able to be utilized because of the grade separation required based upon floodplain analysis.

Chairman Marsh further commented he was in favor of the wooden fencing along Arapaho Road. It provided a more contemporary look. He stated the quality of the development is more important as opposed to the fencing material or parking. He stated Mimosa Place was an outstanding example of how to build higher density single-family detached housing. The product being proposed was a denser product and smaller in size, but the developer had demonstrated the quality they put into their projects. He stated the West Arapaho corridor was being upgraded in multiple locations. He felt this development was a big upgrade to the area and met a housing need.

Vice Chairman Springs stated he was not concerned with the fencing along the western property line; however, he stated there may still be a viable solution for the design of a masonry wall along Arapaho Road that was not a 10-foot-tall monolithic wall.

Chairman Marsh stated other enhancement and redevelopment areas also allow for a mix of uses, including residential uses.

Mr. Shacklett stated if a recommendation was made, that it be explicitly stated what the motion was for (e.g., the wall on Arapaho or to allow wood fencing for the lots along the west property line). He also suggested including a minimum requirement for twenty-one (21) visitor parking spaces generally as depicted on the concept plan. This would make it clear in the future that there was a minimum number of required parking spaces.

Chairman Marsh asked staff to confirm if the recommendation for parking requirements dealt with the setback distances on the driveways.

Mr. Harper confirmed, yes. Additionally, a new condition should be added that stated a minimum of twenty-one (21) on-street parking spaces shall be provided specifically for guest parking.

Motion: Commissioner Costantino made a motion to recommend approval of ZF 22-05 Planned Development – Greenwood Square with amended conditions, including a condition requiring a minimum of twenty-one (21) on-street parking spaces for guests, allowing 6-foot-tall wooden fences between the homes along the west property line and to allow a 6-foot-wooden fence with horizontally oriented pickets along Arapaho Road. Seconded by Commissioner Beach. Motion Passed 7-0.

ADJOURN

With no further business before the Commission, Chairman Marsh adjourned the regular business meeting at 8:59 p.m.

_____

Bryan Marsh, Chairman