

**CITY OF RICHARDSON  
CITY PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES – NOVEMBER 15, 2011**

The Richardson City Plan Commission met November 15, 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  
Gerald Bright, Commissioner  
Janet DePuy, Commissioner  
Marilyn Frederick, Commissioner  
Barry Hand, Commissioner  
Thomas Maxwell, Commissioner  
Eron Linn, Alternate

**MEMBER ABSENT:** David Gantt, Chairman  
Don Bouvier, Alternate

**CITY STAFF PRESENT:** Michael Spicer, Director of Dev. Svcs.  
Sam Chavez, Asst. Director of Dev. Svcs. – Planning  
Chris Shacklett, Planner  
Kathy Welp, Executive Secretary

**BRIEFING SESSION**

Prior to the regular business meeting, the City Plan Commission met with staff to receive a briefing on agenda items and staff reports. No action was taken.

**MINUTES**

**1. Approval of the minutes of the regular business meeting of November 1, 2011.**

**Motion:** Commissioner Linn made a motion to approve the minutes as presented; second by Commissioner Bright. Motion passed 7-0.

**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. Concept Plan:** A request for approval of a revised concept plan for Custer Court. The approximate 31-acre site is located at the southeast corner of President George Bush Highway and Custer Parkway.

**Motion:** Commissioner Bright made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as presented; second by Commissioner Frederick. Motion passed 7-0.

- 3. Zoning File 11-18:** A request by Howard L. Lawson, representing the Lawson Company to rezone a 4.7-acre lot from C-M Commercial with special conditions to C-M with special conditions and I-M(1) Industrial with a Special Permit for self-service warehouse with associated outdoor vehicle storage located at 528 W. Arapaho Road, north side of Arapaho Road, west of Custer Road.

Mr. Shacklett advised the Commission the applicant was requesting to rezone 3.49-acres from C-M Commercial to I-M(1) Industrial, as well as requesting a Special Permit for a self-service warehouse. He stated the reason for the rezoning was to allow the applicant to request a Special Permit which is only allowed under Industrial zoning.

Mr. Shacklett noted that the applicant was proposing to construct 422 indoor units within the 65,000 square foot building, as well as provide 30 outdoor vehicle storage spaces. The outdoor spaces would be divided up with 17 along the eastern property line limiting the height of the vehicle to 8 feet, and 13 along the east side of the building limiting the height to 13 feet. He added that the only change proposed for the building would be the addition of stone elements to the bottom of the columns, a planter box on the south elevation, and an 8-foot wall and metal gate to control access to the outdoor storage area.

In closing his presentation, Shacklett presented a line-of-sight exhibit provided by the applicant showing the visibility from Custer Road and noted that the masonry wall would screen the 8-foot vehicles as well as screen the majority of the 13-foot vehicles (RVs) located adjacent to the building.

Commissioner DePuy asked if the stone was being added as an enhancement to the base of the columns and the planter box, or would it match the masonry wall that will be constructed.

Mr. Shacklett replied that the idea was to add some enhancement to the building and the screening wall will be made of brick.

Commissioner Frederick asked how wide the driveway was at the southeast corner of the site. She expressed concern that it might be too small for RVs to maneuver, and if the driveway was too narrow it might encourage people to use the residential street to access the site.

Mr. Shacklett replied that it appeared to be a 15-foot wide driveway, but suggested the applicant might be able to modify the landscape island to increase the maneuverability.

Commissioner DePuy asked if the property was within one of the City's Redevelopment/Enhancement areas.

Mr. Shacklett replied that it was within the West Arapaho Redevelopment/Enhancement area.

With no further questions for staff, Vice Chair Hammond opened the public hearing.

Mr. Howard Lawson, 7411 Hines Place, Dallas, Texas, stated he owned six self-storage facilities in the metroplex and was proposing to convert the existing vacant building to an interior self-storage facility with exterior RV and boat storage on the east side. He said with the enhancements to the exterior of the building, including additional landscaping, and interior/exterior cameras to make it safer, it would be a viable business for the community.

Commissioner DePuy asked if there had been many incidents of criminal activity in the area.

Mr. Lawson replied he did not have a police report, but the previous evening there had been a brick thrown through the window and graffiti painted on the back of the building. In addition, he had spoken with the neighbor to the north and they seemed to like the idea of having a viable business adjoining their property.

Commissioner Hand asked if Mr. Lawson owned the building, and if his other businesses were all in second generation retail buildings.

Mr. Lawson replied that he did not own the building and it was under contract from Legacy Texas Bank.

Regarding his other businesses, Lawson said that they were all different and gave an example of a Payless Shoe Store in Irving that had been converted to a self-service storage facility.

Commissioner Maxwell asked for clarification of the traffic flow in the outside storage area. He also expressed concern that a larger vehicle could only enter the site through Jolee Street.

Mr. Lawson replied the traffic would enter through the east side, travel towards the rear of the property and exit in the northwest corner.

Regarding a RV entering the site and the maneuverability, Mr. Lawson said he would defer to the architectural consultant for the answer.

Commissioner Linn asked how successful his other self-storage sites had been.

Mr. Lawson replied that his company had taken buildings that may have had issues and turned them into viable businesses. He added that the feasibility study showed there was a need for this type of business in the City.

Commissioner Bright asked if there would be 24-hour access to the site; did the other facilities have outdoor storage; and would the applicant be willing to go forward with the project without the outside storage.

Mr. Lawson replied that they did not typically have 24-hour access to their sites, but the management could provide access under special circumstances and the standard hours of operation would be 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Regarding outside storage, Lawson said only a few of his other properties had outside storage, but outside vehicle storage was needed in the City and it would make the project more viable.

Commissioner Maxwell asked if there would be staff on site 24 hours; would the entire building be used for storage; and would the glass windows be part of a storage unit.

Mr. Lawson replied that there would not be 24-hour staff; the entire building would be used for storage; and there would be a hallway between the glass windows and the units. He added a security system would be installed and monitored, including cameras on all the doors and windows and the City police department would be contacted if necessary.

Vice Chair Hammond asked for clarification if customers would be able to access the building 24 hours per day.

Mr. Lawson replied that most of the time the customers do not need 24 hour access, but the customer could make arrangements with management to have access outside of normal business hours.

Commissioner DePuy commented that the Commission had expressed concern during the briefing session about the outside storage because of the desire to enhance some of the outdated areas in the City; however, they were happy to have a building occupied and usable as opposed to vacant. She asked if there was a possibility of raising the height of the wall.

Mr. Lawson replied that that line of sight study showed that RVs would be barely visible, plus the gate would be made of a solid metal material.

Mr. Richard Ferrara, 405 N. Waterview, Richardson, Texas, advised that he was a consultant retained by the applicant and the bank to help them understand community issues, and asked the Commission to consider the following three items: 1) the original project had been much larger in scale and was greatly reduced taking into consideration the impact on the surrounding neighborhood; 2) suggested possibly barricading the alley where it dead ends into the back of the business to alleviate any problem with traffic through the residential area; 3) the radii needed for turning larger vehicles would be based on the ability for the City's fire trucks to gain access to the property and would be determined during the development review process.

Another item Mr. Ferrara asked the Commission to keep in mind was the City's regulation of parking RVs on private property and the fact that most walls/fences on private property are 6 feet high, whereas the wall at the proposed site is 8 feet in height. He added that raising the

height of the wall would not be an option because it could cause an engineering problem with wind load.

Mr. Ferrara concluded his presentation stating the requested outdoor storage and screening were reasonable and it would provide a needed service for the community.

Commissioner Hand asked for clarification if the applicant was under contract to purchase the property.

Mr. Ferrara replied that Mr. Lawson would be purchasing the property.

Commissioner Maxwell asked about the current fire lane configuration and did it wrap around the building. He also wanted to know the requirement for stacking at the entry gate.

Mr. Shacklett replied the fire lane did not wrap around the structure and was located on the south side of the building. He added that the Fire Department would work with the applicant regarding access to the site during the development process, but as far as required fire lanes, they were already in place.

Regarding stacking at the entry gate, Shacklett said there was no stacking requirements because of the unique nature of the site (residential street crosses an alley and dead ends into a shopping center).

Commissioner Maxwell asked if the traffic flow was reversed, would the outside storage still be usable and suggested that by doing so the access gate could be recessed so there would be no stacking issues.

Mr. Ferrara said he did not see a problem with changing the traffic flow, but suggested a condition should be added stating the entrance into the area should conform to the staff review whether or not the wall would have to be recessed for the back or at a different angle.

Commissioner DePuy said she liked the idea of barricading the entrance off Jolee.

Mr. Richard Ramey, representing Legacy Texas Bank, 707 E. Arapaho Road, Richardson, Texas, said he has known the applicant for over twenty years and had previous favorable business dealings with him. He added that the contract was a "for sale" contract on the property with a contingency that it would be a self-storage business.

Mr. Ramey noted that the property has been owned by the bank for most of the year, and they have looked at other possible uses for the property, but it is not suitable for retail or other uses and seems to fit well with the proposed use. He acknowledged that although the property is within the enhancement area, there are five separate property owners and the possibility of all five pieces being redeveloped as a whole was not very likely.

Mr. Ramey closed his comments stating that barricading the entrance Jolee would not cause a problem for the applicant, but reminded the Commission that the other property owners in the area should be consulted first.

Mr. Shacklett remarked that the driveway was wider than previously stated and would be closer to 35 to 40 feet.

Mr. David Beatty, representing Northrich Baptist Church, 1101 Custer Road, Richardson, Texas, stated the church, which is located and owns land north and west of the subject property, felt that having the property occupied versus vacant would deter problems with criminal mischief for both the church and Mr. Lawson's property.

No other comments were made in favor or opposed and Vice Chair Hammond closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Hand commented that the discussion and questions for the item were well thought out and important, but asked the Commission to take a higher level view of area and the fact that the building was located within an enhancement/redevelopment area. He read from the staff report quoting that the area might be better served by "duplexes, townhomes, or senior housing with a focus on the office and retail needs of the surrounding neighborhood."

Mr. Hand continued stating that the area should be transitioned and redeveloped to a higher use and felt if the item was approved as presented, the opportunity to develop the property to a higher use would be lost. He suggested that the Commission ask the owner to dig deeper and rethink the proposal and felt that the proposed use would only put more stress on the property.

Vice Chair Hammond said that while he respected Commissioner Hand's opinion, he disagreed that the ability to redevelop the property, especially with five separate owners, was not very likely. He added that the property might redevelop in 10-15 years, but in the mean time the proposal was an excellent use for the property.

Commissioner Frederick concurred with Mr. Hammond's comments regarding the time frame for redevelopment of the property and felt the proposal was within the initial goal of the City to take a property that was in need of occupancy and vitality and make good use of it until the property could be repurposed at a later date.

Commissioner Bright said he appreciated the applicant's proposal and felt it might be a needed business in the City, but expressed concern about setting a precedent for allowing outdoor vehicle storage.

Commissioner Maxwell said he was generally in favor of the proposal, but asked the staff if Exhibit B would be attached to the zoning request as it moves forward through the development process and would issue of access be dealt with at that time.

Mr. Chavez replied that the item would come before the Commission again as a development/site plan; however, at the current time it was up to the Commissioners to determine if the request was an appropriate use of the land. He added that the question regarding access would be addressed during the development process.

Commissioner Linn concurred with Mr. Hand's opinion regarding the City looking at distressed or underused properties and establishing better long-range land use planning; however, he felt the proposed development was similar in nature to a previously approved case where a building was repurposed for a dog hotel so it did not remain vacant and was therefore generally in support of the current item.

Vice Chair Hammond suggested that the staff and Commission compare the current proposal with the vehicle storage in the City of Plano that was not screened compared to the current proposal to see the difference a screening wall would make.

Commissioner Hand asked if the Special Permit could be rescinded if the master plan for the area changed.

Mr. Shacklett replied that it could be recalled and reevaluated at any time.

Commissioner DePuy stated that although she had concerns about the area, and concurred that the City should focus on redevelopment, she was realistic and understood the center would most likely not redevelop within the near future. She said she felt comfortable with the fact that the Special Permit could be recalled if there was a change in the development status.

**Motion:** Commissioner Frederick made a motion to recommend approval of Item 3 as presented; second by Commissioner Bright. Motion passed 6-1 with Commissioner Hand opposed.

4. **Zoning File 11-20:** A request by Aubrey Ellington, A&S Ellington Properties, LLC, representing Chicken Express to amend the zoning, revise the concept plan and building elevations for a drive-thru restaurant on a 1.29-acre lot located at 1240 W. Campbell Road, northwest corner of Campbell Road and Lake Park Way.

Mr. Shacklett stated the applicant was requesting to amend the zoning to delete the requirement for a retail building, and to revise the concept plan and elevations for a 3,182 square foot drive-thru restaurant. He briefly reviewed the history of the property noting that

in 2010 a concept plan was approved for a 4,500 square foot building with a drive-thru restaurant and attached retail space.

Mr. Shacklett pointed out that the elevations for the proposed building would be similar to the nearby Lake Park townhomes and the Braum's store utilizing comparable materials. He added that access to the property would be from driveways on Campbell Road and Jonsson Boulevard, as well as a previously agreed upon cross access agreement between the Braum's property and the current property.

Mr. Shacklett noted there would be 50-foot landscape buffer along Campbell Road, and 30-foot landscape buffers along Jonsson and Lake Park. He added that staff had been working with the applicant to modify their elevations to match the roof, brick, and stone architectural features of the adjacent Braum's restaurant, and suggested using non-vision glazing material on the faux brick windows to the rear of the building, which the applicant declined to change.

Commissioner DePuy noted that the staff report stated the proposed restaurant would be the only drive-thru restaurant on the north side of Campbell between Coit and Waterview and thought that Braum's had originally planned to have a drive thru window.

Mr. Chavez replied the staff report was correct and explained that although the Braum's restaurant did have a drive-thru; it also had a retail component so the proposed Chicken Express would be the first "*restaurant*" with a drive-thru element.

Commissioner Bright asked for more details regarding the proposed "soldier course non-vision glazing" at the rear of the restaurant.

Mr. Shacklett replied that soldier brick course would be used as a frame around the non-vision glazing material and would give the appearance of windows on that wall.

Commissioner Hand asked if there was a requirement to have stone above the open patio as opposed to another material.

Mr. Shacklett replied there was no requirement, but the stone was there simply to help the applicant reach the required 85% masonry on the building.

Commissioner Frederick asked if the staff was suggesting that every faux window should be covered in non-vision glazing.

Mr. Shacklett replied that was the staff's suggestion.

Commissioner Maxwell asked if there was a reason in the earlier zoning request to require a retail portion on the lot, and if there was a blanket mutual access agreement exhibit associated with that agreement.

Mr. Shacklett replied that he did not know the specific reasons for the previously required retail and might have been presented that way by the earlier applicant.

Regarding the access agreement, Shacklett said there is an executed agreement with the 2.5-acres that states access shall be provided between the properties.

Commissioner Linn asked if there was a plan to add a side entrance/exit on Lake Park Way to help facilitate traffic flow on the site, and should the Commission amend the proposal to include that as a requirement.

Mr. Shacklett replied that if the Commission wanted a driveway on to Lake Park Way, the request should be added when the motion was made.

Commissioner DePuy asked if there had been any correspondence received regarding the proposed zoning case and Mr. Shacklett replied that no correspondence had been received, but a few phone calls did come in asking general questions about what was happening to the site.

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

Mr. Randy Pogue, Pogue Engineering, 1512 Bray Central Drive, McKinney, Texas, thanked the Commission for hearing their request and suggested the possible reason Schlotzsky's did not go forward as planned in the original concept plan was due to some of the constraints on the property (i.e., setbacks and square footage of building), which would limit the amount of parking and access to the site.

In response to question about reciprocal easement agreement, Pogue explained the agreement was not defined by a specific fire lane, but was a blanket agreement over the subject property and the adjoining properties.

Mr. Pogue stated that if the Commission mandated an access to Lake Park Way, the area that would least impact the site by removing parking spaces or hampering traffic flow would be in the area of the south fire lane. He acknowledged that the proposed location might violate the spacing criteria to Campbell Road, but felt this location would minimize the impact to the site as opposed to locating the access mid site which would eliminate eight to nine parking spaces.

Commissioner Bright asked staff if locating an access point along the south fire lane should be added as a special condition, or would that be in violation of the City's driveway spacing requirements.

Mr. Shacklett replied that bringing the access point too far south would violate the spacing requirement, but it could be made part of the motion that a driveway was required along Lake Park Way and between the Commission and Council meetings staff would work with the applicant on the location of the driveway.

Mr. Pogue interjected that if an access point was a violation of the City's spacing requirement, and the Traffic Department did not allow the access at that point, he would not want to be forced to put the access mid-block. He suggested the motion should be worded to allow flexibility.

Mr. Chavez said the City's driveway standards ranged from 50 to 85 feet and pointed out that measuring 85 feet from back of curb, which is the City's standard, would be workable and cause the least impact to the site. He suggested that if the Commission wanted to require the additional access, the motion should be "to show an additional curb cut along Lake Park Way in conformance with the City's driveway standards."

Commissioner DePuy asked if it would be better to access Lake Park Way closer to Jonsson Boulevard as opposed to Campbell Road because Campbell was a busier street.

Mr. Shacklett replied that if a driveway cut was put on Lake Park Way it would not help the ingress to the site and would act only as an exit.

Commissioner Bright asked if the driveway was able to meet the driveway standards, could the staff estimate how many parking spaces would be lost.

Mr. Shacklett and Mr. Pogue estimated that approximately 6 spaces would be lost, but the site would still be sufficiently parked per City regulations.

Commissioner Hand asked if the access could come in off the south drive, cut across the front of the building and bend off to the north and then back to Lake Park.

Mr. Pogue replied that the typical approach is required to come in at 90 degrees to the street and because of the space, and getting the radii back in, there would not be enough room to angle it and still get the 90 degree angle.

Commissioner Hand asked if that would still be the case if it was a "right in" and "right out".

Mr. Pogue replied that the opening to Lake Park could be a "right out" only and Mr. Hand said that might be a better option.

Mr. Chavez added that he did not think there was a standard for "right in" or "right out," but noted that the 85 feet would be slightly over the southern most parking space on the east side of the site, which would cause the loss of 1 to 2 parking spaces.

Vice Chair Hammond asked if the Commission recommended approval, could the staff work with the applicant on the access point as long as it fell within the City standards.

Mr. Chavez replied that, based on the material presented, he felt it could be worked out and still stay within City standards.

With no further comments in favor or opposed, Vice Chair Hammond closed the public hearing and called for comments or questions from the Commission or a motion.

**Motion:** Commissioner Bright made a motion to recommend approval of Item 4 as presented with an added condition that a driveway be placed along Lake Park Way in conformance with City standards; second by Commissioner DePuy. Motion passed 7-0.

5. **Zoning File 11-21:** A request by Eyal Avnon, representing David Weekley Homes, to rezone a 5.87-acre tract of land O-M Office with special conditions to RP-1500-M Patio Home zoning with modified development standards located at the northwest corner of Lake Park Way and Jonsson Boulevard.

Mr. Shacklett advised the applicant was requesting a change in zoning on a 5.8-acre vacant tract of land located at the northwest corner of Lake Park Way and Jonsson Boulevard, just east of the Lake Park townhome development. He added that the request would allow the development of a 37-lot, single family, gated subdivision with the main entrance/exit located at a median opening on Lake Park Way and an exit only and emergency services driveway at the southwest corner of the property.

Mr. Shacklett noted that the proposal included a request to reduce the minimum lot width from 50 feet to 40 feet, and the side setback would not be set at time of zoning approval. He pointed out that patio homes are typically required to be built on the lot line on one side with a 10-foot setback from the other lot line. The applicant would be including that 10-foot separation, but was unsure if they would be designing a center-loaded product with a 5-foot setback on either side, or the typical zero lot line configuration.

Regarding minimum lot square footage, Mr. Shacklett stated it would be 4,000 square feet, 100 feet deep by 40 feet wide, and a minimum 1,800 square feet, two-story home. In addition, because the applicant was requesting front-entry garages, staff was recommending that the garage not be allowed any closer than 20 feet from the street and the remainder of the home would be required to be located 15 feet from the street, or 12 feet if the front area included a porch.

In closing his presentation, Mr. Shacklett reviewed some of the special conditions listed on Exhibit C including:

- No interior sidewalks,
- Non-radial lot lines on lots on the cul-de-sac,
- Landscaping along the rear lots 16-20
- Landscaping along the side lots 20 and 37
- Lots to back upon streets with less than 100 feet of right-of-way
- Garage doors shall be custom, metal carriage style doors
- Fences shall be stained, board-on-board with vertical tubular steel posts
- Storm water control/detention area shall be landscaped and maintained by the HOA

Commissioner Bright asked if the subdivision would require a Homeowners Association (HOA), would it be mandatory, and should it be stated as mandatory in the ordinance.

Mr. Shacklett replied that there will be a mandatory HOA, but felt it did not need to be stated in ordinance because the City's Subdivision and Development Code required the HOA.

Commissioner DePuy asked if the applicant had presented elevations, and had they provided any information on price points.

Mr. Shacklett replied the applicant was not required to present elevations for approval, only to meet to the City's masonry ordinance for single family homes.

Regarding the price points, Shacklett said the applicant had not provided staff with any information, but they were available for questions during the public hearing.

Commissioner Linn asked if the zoning was changed to residential would the City require sidewalks.

Mr. Shacklett replied the City did require sidewalks, but felt the removal of the requirement was not as crucial because it would be a gated community as opposed to public streets.

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

Mr. Bill Grant, Oakmont Capital Group, 5700 W. Plano Parkway, Plano, Texas, reported that by design or default, the implementation of residential into the Lennox Development has created a mixed-use development and the proposed project would blend in well with the surrounding area allowing residents to walk within the development and to the nearby businesses.

Mr. Grant stated that the development met the City's standards of having two off-street parking spaces in the garage and two in the driveway allowing each residence to accommodate four vehicles. He added that the community would feature quite a bit of green space and 10 extra parking spaces for visitors.

Regarding a question posed in the briefing session about ground floor master bedrooms, Mr. Grant said that most developers would prefer to have ground floor master bedrooms, but with the increase in the cost of land, and the smaller size of the lots, it was something they could not do in a smaller footprint such as the proposed development.

Commissioner Hand asked if there were access points at the end of each cul-de-sac that would allow residents to walk out of the development.

Mr. Grant replied the residents would be able to exit the development at the main entrance/exit on Lake Park Way, and exit only on Jonsson Boulevard. Mr. Shacklett added that there would be separate pedestrian gates at both the exits.

Commissioner Hand said he felt the fact that the only pedestrian exits were so far apart degraded the walkability and purpose of the neighborhood. He also thought it was counterintuitive not to have sidewalks in a walkable community.

Mr. Grant said the walkability of the development pertained to the ability to walk to the restaurants and other services in the area.

Commissioner Linn asked if the street easements were narrower than typical residential streets and what benefit that provided to the project.

Mr. Grant replied that it provided a more close-knit neighborhood and would reduce the speed of vehicles. Mr. Shacklett pointed out that the proposed project had the same pavement width as public streets, but the property lines would be at the curb instead of the setback required in typical residential developments.

Commissioner Frederick said she felt there would always be a high demand for zero lot line garden homes with a master bedroom on the first floor, and noted that some of the lots had a different configuration regarding the rear build-to line and suggested the developer put the best floor plan on the best lot.

Commissioner DePuy concurred with Mr. Frederick's comments and suggested the developer might take out one or two of the lots to make the other lots larger and those lots could accommodate floor plans with master bedrooms on the ground floor, which would be vital for the subdivision to sell quickly.

Mr. Grant said he agreed and felt most builders were in favor of putting master bedrooms on the ground floor, but in order to produce an affordable product the proposed design was the best way to go.

Commissioner DePuy asked what the price point would be on the homes in the subdivision.

Mr. Eyal Avnon, representing David Weekley Homes, 3301 N. I-H 35, Carrollton, Texas, said he could not give the actual price point, but given the purchase price of the real estate, maintaining detention ponds, privatizing the streets, and expenses associated with a gated community, it would be a higher price point, upscale community.

With no further comments in favor or opposed, Vice Chair Hammond closed the public hearing and called for any comments from the Commission. No comments were made and Mr. Hammond called for a motion.

**Motion:** Commissioner Frederick made a motion to recommend approval of Item 5 with the special conditions listed in Exhibit C; second by Commissioner DePuy. Motion passed 7-0.

**ADJOURN**

With no further business before the Commission, Vice Chair Hammond adjourned the regular business meeting at 9:17 p.m.



---

Bill Hammond, Vice Chair  
City Plan Commission