

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MARCH 23, 2021

The Planning and Zoning Commission of the City of McKinney, Texas met in regular session in the Council Chambers, 222 N. Tennessee Street, McKinney, Texas, on Tuesday, March 23, 2021 at 6:05 p.m.

Commission Members Present: Chairman Bill Cox, Vice-Chairman Brian Mantzey, Hamilton Doak, Deanna Kuykendall, Cam McCall, Bry Taylor, and Scott Woodruff – Alternate

Alternate Commission Member Charles Wattley was present; however, did not participate in the meeting.

Commission Member absent: Christopher Haeckler

Staff Present: Director of Planning Jennifer Arnold, Planning Manager Caitlyn Strickland, Planner IIs Kaitlin Gibbon and Danielle Mathews, and Administrative Assistant Terri Ramey

There were approximately 35 guests present.

Chairman Cox called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m. after determining a quorum was present.

Chairman Cox called for public comments on non-public hearing agenda items. There were none.

The Commission unanimously approved the motion by Commission Member Doak, seconded by Commission Member McCall, to approve the following Consent item, with a vote of 7-0-0.

21-0244 Minutes of the Planning and Zoning Commission Regular Meeting of March 9, 2021.

END OF CONSENT AGENDA

Chairman Cox called for consideration of the plat consideration under Texas Local Government code Chapter 212. They were considered separately.

21-0021PF Consider/Discuss/Act on a Preliminary-Final Plat for Painted Tree Lakeside West Phases 2 & 3, Located Approximately 350 Feet East of Lake Forest Drive and on North Side of Summit View Drive. Ms. Kaitlin

Gibbon, Planner II for the City of McKinney, explained the proposed preliminary-final plat request. She stated that Staff is recommending approval with conditions and offered to answer questions. There were none. On a motion by Vice-Chairman Mantzey, seconded by Alternate Commission Member Woodruff, the Commission unanimously voted to approve the request as recommended by Staff, with a vote of 7-0-0.

21-0019PF Consider/Discuss/Act on a Preliminary-Final Plat for Trinity Falls Planning Unit 8 East, Located on the Northeast Corner of Olympic Crossing (County Road 228) and County Road 227 (Future Hardin Boulevard). Ms. Kaitlin Gibbon, Planner II for the City of McKinney, explained the proposed preliminary-final plat request. She stated that Staff recommends disapproval of the request due to its lack of conformance with the requirements of the Engineering Design Manual and the Subdivision Ordinance. She offered to answer questions. Chairman Cox asked if the applicant was aware of Staff's recommendation for disapproval. Ms. Gibbon said yes. Chairman Cox asked if the applicant was present at the meeting. Ms. Gibbon said no. On a motion by Vice-Chairman Mantzey, seconded by Commission Member McCall, the Commission unanimously voted to disapprove the request as recommended by Staff, with a vote of 7-0-0.

END OF PLAT CONSIDERATION UNDER TEXAS LOCAL GOVERNMENT CODE
CHAPTER 212

Chairman Cox continued the meeting with the Regular Agenda Items and Public Hearings on the agenda.

20-0080Z Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on a Request to Rezone the Subject Property from "PD" - Planned Development District, "RS 60" - Single Family Residence District and "TMN" - Traditional McKinney Neighborhood Overlay District to "PD" - Planned Development District and "TMN" - Traditional McKinney Neighborhood Overlay District, to Allow for Commercial and Industrial Uses and to

Modify the Development Standards, Located on the Southwest corner of Coleman Street and Berry Avenue. Ms. Kaitlin Gibbon, Planner II for the City of McKinney, explained the proposed rezoning request. She stated that Staff appreciates the applicant's proposal and enhancements for the site; however, the proposed commercial and added warehouse use does not align with the placetype of Historic Town Center – Residential as designated by the Comprehensive Plan for the subject property. Ms. Gibbon stated that Barry Avenue, located to the north of the subject property, serves as a distinct line from the commercial properties that front onto U.S. Highway 380 (University Drive) and the established residential block located to the south of the subject property. She stated that given these factors, Staff was unable to support the request. Ms. Gibbon offered to answer questions. There were none. Mr. T.J. Lane, 503 N. Kentucky Street, McKinney, TX, explained the proposed rezoning request. He discussed the history of the subject property and adjacent properties. Mr. Lane stated that Barry Avenue was partial abandoned in the 1960s, which impaired the access to the subject property. He stated that the subject property sat mostly vacant for 75 years. Mr. Lane stated that the proposed project will provide better security, enhanced screening and landscaping, and improved Fire Department access. He offered to answer questions. Vice-Chairman Mantzey asked if the applicant had any discussions with the adjacent property owners about the proposed development plans. Mr. Lane said no. Chairman Cox opened the public hearing and called for comments. There being none, on a motion by Vice-Chairman Mantzey, seconded by Commission Member Doak, the Commission unanimously voted to close the public hearing, with a vote of 7-0-0. Chairman Cox asked about the special ordinance provision listed in the Staff Report. Ms. Gibbon explained that the special ordinance provisions are that the development regulations that the applicant proposed must be followed for the zoning request if

the Commission and City Council approves the proposed rezoning request. She stated that Staff was in support of the proposed site enhancements. Ms. Gibbon stated that Staff was not in support of the warehouse and commercial components given that it does not align with the Comprehensive Plan. Chairman Cox asked Mr. Lane if they agreed to the list of requirements if the request is approved. Mr. Lane said yes. Alternate Commission Member Woodruff asked when the Burnside's purchased the property. Mr. Lane stated that the Burnside's owned the property for a long time (approximately 20-25 years). Chairman Cox stated that the letter of intent explained a lot about the proposed rezoning request. He stated that they plan to enhance the landscaping around the property. Chairman Cox stated that they agreed to follow the special ordinance provisions. He stated that he was in support of the proposed rezoning request. Vice-Chairman Mantzey stated that he did not feel it was a bad project. He stated that with the lack of outreach to the adjacent residential property owners, going from a residential use to a commercial use, and Staff's recommendation of denial that he would not be in support of the proposed rezoning request. Alternate Commission Member Woodruff stated that he drove over to the site. He stated that the abandonment portion of Barry Avenue makes it difficult for access to the properties. Alternate Commission Member Woodruff stated that he was in favor of the proposed rezoning request. On a motion by Commission Member McCall, seconded by Commission Member Doak, the Commission voted to approve the proposed rezoning request with the special ordinance provisions listed in the Staff Report, with a vote of 6-1-0. Vice-Chairman Mantzey voted against the motion. Chairman Cox stated that the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission will be forwarded to the City Council meeting on April 20, 2021.

21-0019Z Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on a Request to Rezone the Subject Property from "PD" - Planned Development District

to "PD" - Planned Development District, Generally to Modify the Development Standards, Located South of Pearson Avenue and Heritage Drive, and Approximately 160 Feet East of Redbud Boulevard. Ms. Danielle Mathews, Planner II for the City of McKinney, explained the proposed rezoning request. She also discussed the zoning and uses on the adjacent properties. Ms. Mathews stated that a zoning request for the subject property was brought before the Planning and Zoning Commission on November 10, 2020 and was ultimately approved by City Council on December 1, 2020. She stated that the applicant has since submitted a site plan for review; however, some issues were exposed during Staff review. Ms. Mathews elaborated on the proposed development regulations which were not included in the original zoning request. She stated that Staff recommends approval of the request and offered to answer questions. There were none. Mr. Casey Gregory, Sanchez and Associates, 2000 N. McDonald Street, McKinney, TX, explained the proposed rezoning request. He clarified that the reduction in the distance from the driveway to a tree was for the tandem spaces in front of a garage spot only. Mr. Gregory stated that it would only affect the center drive; otherwise, they could lose a couple of garage spots. He stated that they were not request any land use changes or increasing the number of units per acre. Mr. Gregory stated that this request is to clean up some of the oversights from the recently approved zoning request for the subject property. He offered to answer questions. There were none. Chairman Cox opened the public hearing and called for comments. There being none, on a motion by Vice-Chairman Mantzey, seconded by Alternate Commission Member Woodruff, the Commission unanimously voted to close the public hearing and recommend approval of the proposed rezoning request as recommended by Staff, with a vote of 7-0-0. Chairman Cox stated that the recommendation of the Planning

and Zoning Commission will be forwarded to the City Council meeting on April 20, 2021.

21-0034Z Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on a Request to Rezone the Subject Property from "PD" - Planned Development District and "REC" - Regional Employment Center Overlay District to "C2" - Local Commercial District, Located on the Northeast Corner of Collin McKinney Parkway and Piper Glen Road. Ms. Kaitlin Gibbon, Planner II for the City of McKinney, stated that 22 letters of opposition were submitted after the meeting packet was created and were distributed to the Commission prior to the meeting. She explained the proposed rezoning request and current zoning on the subject property. Ms. Gibbon briefly discussed some of the concerns raised in the letters of opposition and the submittal phases where they would be addressed. She stated that Staff is of the professional opinion that the legacy district "BG" – General Business District and "C2" – Local Commercial District were compatible zoning districts. Ms. Gibbon stated that Staff was supportive of the reduction of the minimum height requirement of two stories to allow for a one-story development on this property given its location adjacent to single-family residential properties. She stated that given these factors, Staff recommends approval of the proposed rezoning request. Ms. Gibbon offered to answer questions. Vice-Chairman Mantzey asked if Staff evaluated the proposed uses when considering rezoning the property to "C2" – Local Commercial District. Ms. Gibbon said yes. She stated that the "C2" – Local Commercial District requires more discretionary approvals for certain uses with a specific use permit than the "BG" – General Business District. Ms. Gibbon reiterated that the legacy district "BG" – General Business District and "C2" – Local Commercial District were compatible zoning districts. Vice-Chairman Mantzey stated that this was not a typical development in McKinney. He asked about the traffic impact to Craig

Ranch. Ms. Gibbon stated that the traffic impact would be evaluated during the site plan process. She stated that the restaurant component was allowed under the current zoning on the property. Commission Member Taylor stated that he was trying to understand the zoning change for the property. Ms. Gibbon stated that the main drive of the zoning change was due to the current zoning requiring a two-story minimum height. The proposed rezoning request would allow them to build a one-story building. Vice-Chairman Mantzey asked if the current restaurant overlay would allow for a full delivery service without a walk-in component. Ms. Gibbon said yes, the current zoning allows for carryout only style restaurants or dine-in style restaurants. Alternate Commission Member Woodruff asked if the daycare use would be permitted under the current zoning and if it would need a specific use permit to operate. Ms. Gibbon stated that a daycare use would be permitted under the current and proposed zonings. Chairman Cox asked if the restaurant use would require a specific use permit under the current zoning. Ms. Gibbon said no, a restaurant use would be permitted. Chairman Cox stated that the applicant is close to being able to do what they want under the current zoning. Ms. Gibbon said yes. Ms. Shannon Bloemker, Crave Delivery, (2900 W Excursion, ID), called in to participate in the meeting. Mr. Chris Rogers, Kimley-Horn, 13455 Noel Road, Dallas, TX, stated that he was the Engineer on the project. He stated that they thought the developer was going to be present to make the presentation. Mr. Rogers offered to answer questions. Vice-Chairman Mantzey asked for clarification on the proposed business model versus a regular restaurant. Ms. Bloemker stated that it would be a combination of several different kitchens that are collocated together. She apologized that additional information was not shared; however, she was unaware that it would be needed during the proposed rezoning request. Ms. Bloemker stated that those documents were normally

turned in during later submittal phases. She explained the proposed development. Ms. Bloemker stated that they have a flagship location in Boise, Idaho with a number of James Beard award winning chefs that are part of the restaurant collective that share kitchen space. She stated that Crave Delivery pickups and delivers the high-end food from there. Ms. Bloemker felt that this would be a great addition to this area. Vice-Chairman Mantzey asked about the deliver hours and how many delivery vehicles do they have coming in and out of the site regularly. Ms. Bloemker stated that they do not have fleets of vehicles. She stated that they have individual drivers that are employees. Ms. Bloemker stated that they do have some vehicles that they own. She stated that they offer pickup for breakfast and lunch. Ms. Bloemker stated that they offer deliver for dinner, typically between 4:30 – 8:30 PM. Alternate Commission Member Woodruff asked about the layout of the kitchens and shared spaces. Ms. Bloemker stated that some of the kitchens could be larger than others. She gave the example of where three different restaurant concepts could be run out of one kitchen. Ms. Bloemker stated that they would be the same restaurants that are located at their other locations. She stated that people could chose for several different restaurants for one delivery. Commission Member Kuykendall stated that typically when we have a full room of residents in opposition to a request, she likes to ask what types of conversations took place between the applicant or developer and the adjacent residents. Ms. Bloemker stated that they have not purchased the property yet and just at the beginning stages. She explained that they were trying to remove the second story requirement by rezoning the property, since they did not feel that the adjacent residents would want a two-story building at the site. Ms. Bloemker stated that they have not prepared any designs for the site at this time. She stated that she felt the property owner would prefer the zoning in this request even if they did not purchase the

property. Chairman Cox opened the public hearing and called for comments. The following ten residents spoke in opposition to the proposed rezoning request. They expressed concerns regarding developing an industrial food prep and distribution through delivery drivers at this location, did not feel that the proposed development should be defined as a restaurant use, felt it would be similar to a warehouse use, large delivery trucks parked at this location for long periods of time, light pollution, noise pollution, air quality and odor issues, increased traffic issues, rodent issues from the food waste, decrease in property values, quality of life concerns, felt the proposed use should be located in light industrial or commercial warehouse areas, brings no intrinsic value to the adjacent established residential community, this is located at a major access point into McKinney and Craig Ranch, Piper Glen being a narrow road that should not have automobiles parking on it that could cause emergency access issues, traffic issues from the nearby daycare on Piper Glen, public hearing notices not received by all area residents, notices on the property not being located where some of the area residents drive by so they did not see them, and lack of communication from the applicant regarding the proposed plans for the property.

- Mr. Thomas Middleton, 5713 Heron Bay Lane, McKinney, TX
- Ms. Mary Ann Mulherin, 8609 Wakefield Drive, McKinney, TX
- Mr. Dave Cassman, 6209 Heron Bay Lane, McKinney, TX
- Mr. David Hemer, 8616 Wakefield Drive, McKinney, TX
- Ms. Nancy Brown, 6208 River Highlands Drive, McKinney, TX
- Mr. Michael Mulherin, 8609 Wakefield Drive, McKinney, TX
- Mr. Tyler Dawson, 6205 Heron Bay Lane, McKinney, TX
- Mr. David Anglin, 8608 Wakefield Drive, McKinney, TX
- Mr. James Massey, 5912 Heron Bay Lane, McKinney, TX
- Ms. Joann Pond, 8617 Wakefield Drive, McKinney, TX

The following 16 residents turned in speaker cards in opposition to the proposed rezoning request; however, did not wish to speak during the meeting:

- Mr. Steve Andelman, 5917 River Highlands Drive, McKinney, TX
- Ms. Shirley Anglin, 8608 Wakefield Drive, McKinney, TX
- Mr. Ken Ardoin, 8716 Tour Drive, McKinney, TX
- Ms. Cynthia Brown, 6000 Heron Bay Lane, McKinney, TX
- Mr. Jim Brown, 6208 River Highlands Drive, McKinney, TX
- Ms. Ellen Dawson, 6205 Heron Bay Lane, McKinney, TX
- Mr. Mark Diamond, 5912 River Highlands Drive, McKinney, TX
- Mr. Frank Elrod, 8613 Wakefield Drive, McKinney, TX
- Mr. James Gooch, 6105 River Highlands Drive, McKinney, TX
- Mr. David Hemer, 8616 Wakefield Drive, McKinney, TX
- Ms. Masako Hemer, 8616 Wakefield Drive, McKinney, TX
- Mr. Bobby Holt, 6201 Heron Bay Lane, McKinney, TX
- Ms. Susan Holt, 6201 Heron Bay Lane, McKinney, TX
- Mr. Rodger Jones, 8604 Wakefield Drive, McKinney, TX
- Mr. Joseph Konrath, 6370 Piper Glen Road, McKinney, TX
- Mr. George Scott, 5901 Heron Bay Lane, McKinney, TX

On a motion by Vice-Chairman Mantzey, seconded by Alternate Commission Member Woodruff, the Commission unanimously voted to close the public hearing, with a vote of 7-0-0. Commission Member Kuykendall asked about the differences between a restaurant and a production facility. Ms. Gibbon explained that the City's ordinance defines a restaurant or cafeteria that has a carryout service meets an establishment where food is prepared for the general public where there on no designated areas for dining on the premises, indoor or outdoor. She stated that the City's ordinance also has a definition for the drive-through component where an establishment where a prepared food or drink is prepared and served or consumed by customers in motor

vehicles in a drive-through window for off premises consumption. Ms. Gibbon stated that Staff does not feel that the proposed development was an industrial use. She stated that Staff feels that it is a kitchen that is preparing food to be delivered through an app or their website. Ms. Jennifer Arnold, Director of Planning for the City of McKinney, stated that there had been a lot of discussion regarding the delivery component. She stated that Staff looks at the definitions located in the City's ordinances. Ms. Arnold stated that the delivery component is not a wholesale or manufactory delivery. She stated that it would be similar to how Staff would evaluate a Domino's Pizza or Papa John's Pizza that has a kitchen onsite that does not offer dine in at their location and has delivery drivers that delivers the food. Vice-Chairman Mantzey stated that during the Work Session held prior to this meeting Ghost Kitchen is being proposed to be added to the ordinance due to it outgrowing the current definition. He stated that this would have its own category in the future. Ms. Arnold stated that was correct. She stated that a Ghost Kitchen use would have the same allowances as a restaurant with a drive-through in the proposed ordinance amendments. Vice-Chairman Mantzey thought the proposed site would be approximately 14,000 square feet with 16 restaurants within one building. He stated that Gloria's Latin Cuisine in McKinney is approximately 7,200 square feet. Ms. Arnold stated that she was told it was 16 concepts, not necessarily 16 different restaurants being proposed. Commission Member Kuykendall expressed concerns about not seeing a concept plan for the proposed development and having a hard time imagining what they are proposing. She stated that she is having a hard time with the difference between a production facility with prepackaged goods being shipped out versus a pizza store that does not allow dine in. Alternate Commission Member Woodruff asked if the difference was business to consumer versus business to business. Ms. Arnold stated that this is a rezoning

request and explained what they were proposing. She stated that the applicant has not submitted a full package to the City. Ms. Arnold stated that the site planning process comes after the zoning. She stated that they would be permitted to develop a two-story restaurant with carryout use under the current zoning on the subject property today. Vice-Chairman Mantzey stated that the proposed rezoning would allow the proposed use easier. Ms. Arnold stated that it would allow a one-story building instead of a two-story building on the site. She stated that the use category would remain the same regardless of what happens with the zoning. Vice-Chairman Mantzey stated that the residents will not picture a ghost kitchen and a restaurant as the same thing, even if they pitch the business to consumer or business to business as the defining moment. Ms. Arnold stated that based upon the conversations with the applicant and definition of what a restaurant with carryout is in the City's ordinance, it would meet that requirement. Commission Member Kuykendall questioned where Staff draws the lined, since there were a lot of residents here tonight questioning the difference between a production facility as opposed to a restaurant with carryout. Ms. Arnold stated that when the delivery is business to business and not direct to consumer would change the use. Commission Member Kuykendall asked if they would be allowed to cater. Ms. Arnold stated that even restaurants are allowed to cater. Commission Member McCall asked if some of the concerns raised tonight by the adjacent residents would be addressed during the site planning process. Ms. Arnold stated that was correct. Alternate Commission Member Woodruff asked about the definition of a faux two-story building. Ms. Arnold stated that it was not clearly defined in the City's ordinance. She stated that it was really up to Staff's interpretation whether or not that the proposed development satisfies the two-story requirement. Alternate Commission Member Woodruff asked the applicant about the volume going out on a nightly

basis. Ms. Bloemker stated that it could be 100 deliveries during a four-hour peak time. Commission Member Doak stated that sounds like less volume than a Domino's Pizza. Ms. Bloemker stated that they are a high-end food delivery service. She stated that they would be serving award winning food from people who have won various culinary awards. Vice-Chairman Mantzey asked about the square footage being considered for this site. Ms. Bloemker stated that it was around 14,000 square feet. Commission Member Doak asked if the 14,000 square footage included the daycare. Ms. Bloemker stated no and that she was not sure why they were not present at the meeting to discuss their half of the subject property. Alternate Commission Member Woodruff asked about the average ticket price. Ms. Bloemker stated that it was approximately \$72.00 for dinner and a little less for lunch. Mr. Rogers with Kimley-Horn stated that there would be less deliveries made each night compared to some other area restaurants. Vice-Chairman Mantzey stated that he has a hard time believing that a 14,000 square foot restaurant would have less deliveries than a smaller restaurant due to what it will cost to operate. Ms. Bloemker stated that they would also offer carryout at this location. Alternate Commission Member Woodruff asked about their average alcohol sales. Ms. Bloemker stated that it would be about the same as an area restaurant. Commission Member Kuykendall stated that she would be in favor of tabling the proposed rezoning request to give the applicant an opportunity to communicate with the adjacent residents what they are proposing to develop on the subject property. Vice-Chairman Mantzey stated that the property owner put Ms. Bloemker in a hard position by not being present at the meeting and not speaking with the area residents beforehand. He stated that he looks forward to the business being located in McKinney; however, he didn't necessarily think this was the best location for it. Vice-Chairman Mantzey stated that he did not believe that a ghost kitchen was a

restaurant due to the impact to the neighborhood. He did not feel that the neighbors or McKinney residents see it as a restaurant. Vice-Chairman Mantzey stated that he would be in favor of tabling the request in order to allow the property owner to reach out to the area property owners to discuss the plans for the property. He was not comfortable with the delivery system through the Craig Ranch roads and a large facility located near residential. Commission Member Doak stated that he felt the proposed use was a perfect use for the subject property. He felt that a ghost kitchen was still a kitchen and was no different than a Domino's Pizza. Commission Member Doak stated that if we take size into consideration that we would be dictating what is and is not a restaurant. He stated that Staff has a definition for a restaurant in the City's ordinances. Commission Member Doak stated that a ghost kitchen was inside that definition. Ms. Bloemker stated that she hopes the proposed rezoning request was not tabled. She reminded the Commission that she was not the applicant. Ms. Bloemker stated that the daycare component does not want to be two-story either. She felt that the property owner wants to rezone the property to allow for one-story. Ms. Bloemker stated that it would be a beautiful building and would be landscaped. Commission Member Doak asked if the building would look like a restaurant from the outside. Ms. Bloemker said yes. Chairman Cox stated that what is being considered tonight was a rezoning request and not a site plan request. He stated that the proposed use happens to fall within the proposed rezoning request. Ms. Gibbon stated that was correct. Chairman Cox stated that Ms. Bloemker was put on the spot without all of her tools to make the presentation during the meeting. Vice-Chairman Mantzey stated that there was a room full of residents with questions without the applicant being present. On a motion by Commission Member Kuykendall, seconded by Vice-Chairman Mantzey, the Commission voted to reopen the public hearing and table

the proposed rezoning request to the April 13, 2021 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting with a recommendation that the applicant meet with the area residents prior to the next meeting, with a vote of 6-1-0. Commission Member Doak voted against the motion.

- 20-** Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider/Discuss/Act on a Specific Use
- 0012SUP2** Permit to Allow for a Car Wash, Located on the Southwest Corner of Collin McKinney Parkway and Lake Forest Drive. Ms. Kaitlin Gibbon, Planner II for the City of McKinney, explained the proposed specific use permit to allow for a car wash. She stated that the zoning for the subject property was recently approved for “C1” – Commercial Neighborhood District and requires a specific use permit be granted for a car wash to operate on the subject property. Ms. Gibbon stated that Staff evaluated the request and feels that the site is appropriate for the proposed use and is compatible with existing land uses of the adjacent properties. She offered to answer questions. There were none. Mr. Doug Galloway, 3508 Edgewater Drive, Dallas, TX, explained the proposed specific use permit for a high-end, quality car wash. He believed that the proposed building would exceeds the City’s building requirements. Mr. Galloway offered to answer questions. There were none. Chairman Cox opened the public hearing and called for comments. There being none, on a motion by Commission Member McCall, seconded by Commission Member Doak, the Commission unanimously voted to close the public hearing and recommend approval of the proposed request as recommended by Staff, with a vote of 7-0-0. Chairman Cox stated that the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission will be forwarded to the City Council meeting on April 6, 2021.

END OF THE REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS AND PUBLIC HEARINGS

Chairman Cox called for public comments regarding matters not on the agenda. There were none.

Chairman Cox called for Commission and Staff comments. There were none.

On a motion by Commission Member Doak, seconded by Commission Member McCall, the Commission unanimously voted to adjourn the meeting, with a vote of 7-0-0. There being no further business, Chairman Cox declared the meeting adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

BILL COX
Chairman