



MINUTES
TWIN FALLS CITY PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
October 14, 2014 6:00PM
City Council Chambers
305 3rd Avenue East Twin Falls, ID 83301

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS

CITY LIMITS:

Nikki Boyd Jason Derricott Tom Frank Kevin Grey Gerardo "Tato" Munoz Christopher Reid Jolinda Tatum
Chairman Vice-Chairman

AREA OF IMPACT:

Ryan Higley Steve Woods
Vice-Chairman

CITY COUNCIL LIAISON

Rebecca Mills Sojka

ATTENDANCE

**CITY LIMIT
MEMBERS**

<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Boyd	Derricott
Frank	
Grey	
Munoz	
Reid	
Tatum	

AREA OF IMPACT MEMBERS

<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Higley	
Woods	

CITY COUNCIL LIAISON(S): Hawkins, Mills Sojka

CITY STAFF: Carraway-Johnson, Nope, Spendlove, Strickland, Vitek, Wonderlich

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER:

Chairman Frank called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M. He then reviewed the public meeting procedures with the audience, confirmed there was a quorum present and introduced City Staff.

II. CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. Approval of Minutes from the following public meeting(s): **September 23, 2014**
2. Approval of Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law:
 - *Geronimo, LLC-app 2674 (SUP 09-23-14)*
 - *Geronimo, LLC app 2675 (SUP 09-23-14)*

Motion:

Commissioner Grey made a motion to approve the consent calendar, as presented. Commissioner Munoz seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor of the motion

Unanimously Approved

III. GENERAL PUBLIC INPUT: NONE

Motion:

Commissioner Munoz made a motion to amend the agenda to allow the Commission to discuss the Request for Qualifications for the Comprehensive Plan Amendment. Commission Tatum seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor of the motion

Unanimously Approved

- Zoning & Development Manager Carraway-Johnson explained that in order for the Comprehensive Plan Update to occur a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) needs to be posted. A draft of the RFQ has been created with a list of the items that need to be updated or added to the plan. A recommendation from the Commission to the City Council to approve the RFQ as presented is needed in order for staff move forward.
- Chairman Frank explained that it is time to update the Comprehensive Plan document. This will be an advertisement to request assistance on updating the document. He recommended that anyone interested in being involved in the process to contact staff.
- Commissioner Woods asked why the airport was added to the Comprehensive Plan and asked how the public can be involved in this process.
- Zoning & Development Manager Johnson explained that the Airport section is required to be added to the Comprehensive Plan by new state statute. As for the public being involved they can contact the Planning & Zoning Department if they are interested.
- Commissioner Munoz clarified that specific sections will be updated and the airport section will be added to the plan, the plan is not being totally rewritten.

Motion:

Commissioner Woods made a motion to recommend approval of the RFQ to the City Council. Commissioner Munoz seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor of the motion.

Unanimously Approved

IV. ITEMS OF CONSIDERATION: NONE

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1. Request for a **Special Use Permit** to operate a drive-through coffee business with extended hours of operation on property located at 572 Pole Line Road. c/o Adam and Mandy Hanby on behalf of Dutch Brothers (app. 2677)

Applicant Presentation:

Hailey Barnes, EHM Engineers, Inc., representing the applicant, explained the request is for a coffee shop with a drive thru and extended hours. The hours of operation will be from 5am to 11pm with a drive thru. The plans for the building have been submitted and the stacking requirements for the drive through have been met. She explained that parking should not be an issue because there is a cross –use agreement for the development in place allowing customers to use any of the available parking spaces on the property.

Staff Analysis:

On April 23, 2012 the City Council approved the final plat of Pole Line Commercial Subdivision-A PUD with conditions. On April 23, 2012 the City Council approved the Amended C-1 PUD Agreement #220 – Pole Line Commercial PUD. The property is zoned C-1 PUD. The request is to

construct a new drive-through coffee shop at 572 Pole Line Road. The C-1 zone requires a Special Use Permit for any facility to have a drive-through window. The applicant is also requesting to operate from 5:00 am to 11:00 pm, Monday through Sunday. The C-1 zone requires a Special Use Permit to operate outside the hours of 7:00 am to 10:00 pm. The Pole Line Commercial Subdivision 1 & 2 C-1 PUD Agreement does not waive the Special Use Permit process for extended retail hours of operation or the drive-through window.

The applicant submitted a request for an SUP to allow a drive-through window and extended business hours of 5:00 am to 11:00 pm. The applicant anticipates one (1) to six (6) vehicles in the drive-through lanes during the majority of the hours of operation. There will be between two (2) to four (4) employees on the premises during the hours of operation and for cleanup and preparation of opening times. The site is in a commercial area that will serve highway traffic, nearby hotels and other commercial businesses. The applicant does not anticipate any significant impacts to neighboring businesses.

Per City Code 10-4-8.2: Permitted retail/trade uses operating outside the hours of seven o'clock (7:00) AM to ten o'clock (10:00) PM require a Special Use Permit in the Commercial Highway District (C-1). The C-1 Zone is intended to provide commercial activities of various sizes from large retail stores to small specialty shops with residential opportunities for persons wishing to work and live in a unified environment. The C-1 PUD Agreement does not waive the Special Use Permit process for extended retail hours of operation.

Per City Code 10-7-13: Any facility with drive-through windows are required to comply with minimum requirements for vehicle stacking. Fast food restaurants and drive-in banks require nine (9) spaces or such other number as approved by Planning & Zoning Commission, but no less than six (6). All others are required to have six (6) spaces. The proposed site plan is indicating drive through windows on both sides of the building. The drive-through windows will be located on the north and south sides of the building. The stacking lane proposed along the south side of the building indicates three (3) vehicles. The stacking lane proposed along the north side of the building indicates three (3) vehicles, but has room for at least one (1) more. This makes a total of six (6) to seven (7) spaces.

Possible Impacts: The property is located along Pole Line Road which is a high traffic major arterial street. There are currently hotels, commercial retail, and professional offices located in the immediate area. These various businesses may not be greatly impacted by the proposed use and extended hours.

The proposed site plan indicates a parking area to the west of the proposed building site that is shown as "not being constructed at this time". The applicant is proposing outdoor seating to the south of the building. The addition of walk-up customers could impact the parking on the north

side of the DaVita Dialysis building. The subdivision has a cross-use parking and access agreement. Upon review with Troy Vitek, Assistant City Engineer, he felt this parking area should be constructed at this time. The Commission may wish to put a condition on this Special Use Permit that the parking area to the west of the proposed building be constructed prior to issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy.

The required improvements per City Code 10-11-1 thru 8, such as landscaping, parking, etc., will be reviewed for compliance at the time of building permit process.

Planner I Spendlove stated upon conclusion should the Commission grant this request, as presented; city staff recommends approval be subject to the following conditions:

1. Subject to the site plan amendments as required by Building, Engineering, Fire, and Zoning Officials to ensure compliance with applicable City Code Requirements and Standards.
2. Subject to hours of operation being no earlier than 5:00 a.m. and no later than 11:00 p.m.
3. Subject to the parking area with six (6) parking spaces on the west side of the proposed building being constructed prior to issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy.

P&Z Questions/Comments:

- Commissioner Woods asked about the outside seating area and asked about safety concerns for pedestrians crossing the drive through lane. He also asked if there is a requirement for a restroom if outside seating is provided. Is there a plan for trash receptacles for people? The plan shows an exit to Pole Line Road and asked where the entrance to the lot is located.
- Mr. Handy explained that he currently works for a Dutch Brothers and the walk across the driving lane has not been an issue. He also explained that they are not sure they will be providing a patio but have included it in case; there will not be any seating inside the building, so a restroom will not be provided.
- Eric Cornell, Dutch Brothers General contractor explained the location of the entrance and exit to the site and that trash receptacles are provide for customers.
- Commissioner Frank asked about the number of required parking spaces and if that would be an issue.
- Mrs. Handy explained the employees will be parking in the back and that the spaces needed for the customers should be plenty.
- Commissioner Munoz clarified that no inside seating will be provided.
- Commissioner Grey asked for traffic flow clarification through the site.
- Planner I Spendlove explained that traffic flow through the site.

- Commissioner Tatum asked which access is being used by DaVita Dialysis.
- Planner I Spendlove explained there is a cross use agreement for this property and showed the traffic flow to Davita Dialysis.

Public Hearing: Opened

Randy Hansen, from Randy Hansen Automotive stated that the traffic flows through his businesses parking lot. His concern is how to prevent this from happening when the access to the property is very limited and he is also concerned that the exits will be used as entrances by people. The space available now is limited with DaVita Dialysis and the addition of this business is going to make the traffic flow even more difficult for traffic flow and parking.

Public Hearing: Closed

P&Z Questions/Comments:

- Assistant City Engineer Vitek explained ITD negotiated the access to the properties and the development is stuck with the existing plan. The people on Pole Line Road may use the exit as an entrance and staff does not know how to address that issue. The total parking is reviewed at the time of building permit and the cross use agreement documents will be verified.
- Commissioner Grey asked if there is a process for changing the access to the property.
- Assistant City Engineer Vitek, stated changes would require a permit and the property owner would have to petition the state to make any changes.
- Commissioner Boyd stated that currently the area is not as developed and once the property is developed people will have to learn the layout so they can navigate safely through the development.
- Commissioner Munoz explained that we need considering a drive through and extended hours. The traffic flow and access is not something the Commission has the ability to change.

Closing Statement:

Mr. Handy stated this has been a dream for him and his wife for the past three years; they want to be part of a community and thinks this will be a good addition to the community.

Mrs. Handy stated they are willing to educate their customers on traffic flow and they want to be good neighbors.

Deliberations Followed:

- Commissioner Boyd stated she likes the hours when you traveling through the area early or late at night it will be nice to have a place you can get a good cup of coffee.
- Commissioner Munoz agrees he doesn't have any issues with the request. He thinks the applicant and customers can work through the traffic flow concerns and further development of the site will make a difference.
- Commissioner Frank stated if the customer doesn't feel safe approaching the property then they frequent the business.
- Commissioner Tatum stated she is still concerned that this may be hazardous to existing or future neighboring uses. She can foresee that this is going to a popular business in this area with a lot of traffic she thinks it may cause a hazard to the adjacent business.
- Commissioner Munoz explained the cross use agreement allows for the traffic to travel between businesses.
- Commissioner Tatum understood that however without knowing if the cross use agreement is between the two businesses she is not sure that will solve the traffic problems she foresees.
- Planner I Spendlove explained that the code does not require screening between two commercial properties however the code doesn't prevent that from happening either unless there is a cross use agreement between the properties. He is currently not aware of which properties are included in the cross use agreement.
- Assistant City Engineer Vitek explained that originally the properties in question were platted all at one time and later split into two plats with separate ownership. He is not aware of what arrangements have been made for cross use agreements. Cross use agreements are between properties not something the City enforces. The City can only require that access to the property be available. He knows by the design of the subdivision where the applicant want to build that a cross use agreement exists because of the way the access to the property is designed, however he is not sure it that agreement extends to Randy Hansen's property.
- Commissioner Boyd stated that if something develops that is not in the best interest of all of the businesses in this area that they will be willing to work together to resolve any issues that arise.
- Commissioner Munoz explained that a request to consider revocation of the Special Use Permit can be made by anyone if the conditions are not met.

Motion:

Commissioner Boyd made a motion to approve the request, as presented, with staff recommendations. Commissioner Grey seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor of the motion.

Approved, As Presented, With The Following Conditions

1. Subject to the site plan amendments as required by Building, Engineering, Fire, and Zoning Officials to ensure compliance with applicable City Code Requirements and Standards.
 2. Subject to hours of operation being no earlier than 5:00 a.m. and no later than 11:00 p.m.
 3. Subject to the parking area with six (6) parking spaces on the west side of the proposed building being constructed prior to issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy.
2. Request for the Commission's recommendation on a request for a **Zoning District Change and Zoning Map Amendment** for a 40 (+/-) acre undeveloped parcel from R-1 VAR within the Area of Impact to C-1 PUD/Urban Village-Urban Infill to allow a mixed-use development compatible with the Urban Village/Urban Infill designation on property located at the southwest corner of Pole Line Road East and Eastland Drive North. c/o Gerald Marten, EHM Engineers on behalf of Northeast Investments, LLC (app. 2644)

Applicant Presentation

- Gerald Martens, EHM Engineers, Inc. representing the applicant stated real reason for moving this project forward at this time is so that the Bishops Storehouse can begin plans for construction and operation. He explained that the property is located at the southwest corner of Eastland Drive North and Pole Line Road East it consists of 40 acres and has some significant improvement made over the past few years when Eastland Drive North was widened. On the Comprehensive Plan this property has been identified as Urban Village/Urban Infill. There have not been any standards developed for this designation and staff has worked closely with the applicant to try and identify some design criteria. The designation would require a mixed use type of development with design restrictions. He displayed on the overhead a master plan showing the Bishops Storehouse located along the northwest corner of the development just west of Mountain View Drive extended. The approach where Mountain View Drive will be extended out to Pole Line Road East has been established and will be completed as part of the project. He reviewed the proposed uses for each section of the development. The proposal is to have the northeast corner of the development west of Mountain View Drive extended be designated commercial/professional only and the only way residential would be allowed is if the residence is incidental to the business. On the south end of the development 150' north of Cheney Drive would be designated for professional and residential that is restricted to individually owned residences, townhomes, or zero lot line residences. Lots on the east side of Mountain View Drive extended would have to have a minimum of 2500 sq. ft. of living space, to the west side of

Mountain View Drive extended would have to have a minimum of 1400 sq. ft. of living space. Materials would be restricted to brick, stucco, stone or a combination thereof, no garages will face Cheney Drive. The roof pitch will not be less than 6 in 12 to establish a residential character compatible with the development to the south; and the maximum building height not to exceed 28'. The remaining 6.6 acres north of the 150' line and west of Mountain View Drive extended would be zoned R-2 R-4. and R-6 Professional allowing for residential, multi-family or offices. The highest density with the R-6 zoning would equal approximately 70 units within the 6.6 acres. Currently the only interest in this property has been from the LDS Church to develop the Bishop Storehouse on the northwest corner; there are not any other interested parties for the remaining portion of the development. The landscaping for the project is beyond what is required by City Code and signage for the project would be limited to monument signs only. A pedestrian walkway has been incorporated into the plans to allow for safe passage through the project. Staff has proposed three conditions if this is approved, he would recommend a fourth condition that would delete any R-6 (5 Units or bigger) be precluded from any of the property within 150' of Cheney Drive on the south and anywhere east of Mountain View Drive. The commercial area would have a size limit on the building footprint so that there is no chance for big box retail anything larger than 40,000 sq. ft. would require a Special Use Permit. The parking requirements have been double from what code requires, the office building sizes has been restricted to 20,000 sq. ft. if built within the 150' along Cheney Drive. The only location where apartments would be allowed is within the 6.6 areas west of Mountain View Drive extended. They have tried to be sensitive to the neighbors and they feel they have met the Urban Village/Urban Infill intent with this design, keeping in mind that this corner would not be conducive to large retail stores or conventional single family dwellings. If this request is approved the next step would be to plat the property into two parcels one lot for the Bishops Storehouse and the other lot for the remaining portion of the property. Once there was an interest in the remaining portion of the property an amended plat would be provided, giving more specifics. As part of the zoning a PUD (Planned Unit Development Agreement) is required and this is their best guess for what the project would look like complete.

- Johnny Watson, Rexburg, ID, the LDS Church representative, reviewed on the overhead the development of the Bishops Storehouse. He explained the parcel the LDS Church is interested in will be approximately 2 acres with a mercantile/storage type use. The Bishops Storehouse functions as a convenience store for patrons in need of assistance. The building will be approximately 32' in height and approximately 14,500 sq. ft. with the patron access to the building located along the south side and a truck delivery area located along the west side of the building. They feel this will be a great addition to the area and set the benchmark for development of this property.

**Planning & Zoning Commission Minutes
October 14, 2014**

- Don Johnson, Salt Lake City, UT, the LDS Church representative, stated he has prepared a packet for the Commission describing the Bishops Storehouse. This building will not only be attractive but functional within the community. Each congregation tries to make sure their patrons are taken care of and assist them in becoming self-sufficient. They also assist with supporting emergency needs within the community. There is a tremendous need for this facility in the Twin Falls area and it will be a nice addition to the community.
- Mr. Martens stated there is a wetland located along the Bishop Storehouse property that will be managed accordingly. They have tried to listen and clarify what they are planning and at this point there are not any other plans for the remaining portion of the property.

P&Z Questions/Comments:

- Commissioner Woods asked about fencing/screen requirements.
- Mr. Martens explained they will meet the code requirements.

Staff Analysis

Planner I Spendlove stated this is a request for an Annexation and a Zoning District Change And Zoning Map Amendment from R-1 VAR in the Area of Impact to C-1 PUD for 40 (+/-) acres to allow a planned mixed use development compatible with Urban Village/Urban Infill designation consisting of a combination of commercial, professional and residential uses, on property located at the southwest corner of Pole Line Road East and Eastland Drive North. Staff will address the issue of annexation first, followed by the analysis of the proposed C-1 PUD.

Annexation is allowed under certain circumstances. The property must be within the Area of Impact, adjacent to current city limits, and formally applied for by the owner of the property. This +/- 40 acre parcel is within the Area of Impact and abuts city limits on almost all sides. With this application submitted by the owner, all criteria for annexation have been met. The commission is not tasked with making a decision on whether the annexation is appropriate. The task of the Commission is to assign an appropriate Zoning District to the property if it were to be approved for annexation. Since this request also contained an application for a rezone to C-1 PUD it would be appropriate for the Commission to review the Zoning Request/PUD and make a recommendation on whether it is an appropriate zone, as presented, for the designated area if it were to be annexed.

The PUD Agreement submitted by the applicant is similar in layout, form and function to those previously submitted by other entities. The Covenants in the document address the nature of the development through limited "Uses", and phasing of the development. There is no time limit placed on the development between phases. The PUD has addressed Street, Sewer, Water, and Drainage Improvements through typical Covenants that address Improvement Plans, Design,

Phased Construction and Construction Supervision as well. One item that will require further examination is the status of the “**Private Drives**” as shown on the Master Development Plan. The City has recently encountered problems with private drives as it pertains to response by emergency personnel. Staff recommends placing a condition that the Status of the Private Drives to be determined by Staff and may be established during the platting process.

In general, the PUD “Uses” and “Development Criteria” are similar in form and function to the C-1 Zoning District. However, it is essential that the PUD reflect the ideals and design for the Urban Village/Urban Infill designation found in the Comprehensive Plan. Since we do not have an Urban Village/Urban Infill zoning district in place and for familiarity, staff will identify those sections that will differ from the C-1 Zoning District currently in practice within City Code.

- **Covenant #2 Nature of the Development:** *A-Uses: Except as provided herein, the uses shall be limited to those allowed in Exhibit C.*

The uses within 150 feet of the Southerly boundary between Mountain View Drive and Eastland Drive North will be limited to professional offices and residences to include individual residences, town homes, and condominiums and zero lot line residences, that must follow the R2 and R4 zoning standards. All building within 150 feet of the southerly boundary shall be further restricted as outlined in Covenant 5-F.2.

The uses of the property at the northwestern corner of the property between the westerly boundary of the property and Mountain View Drive and within 350 feet of Pole Line Road will be limited to a “Bishop’s Storehouse” facility as depicted in Exhibit D.

All other property between the westerly boundary and Mountain View Drive will be limited to professional office space uses as conforming to Exhibit “C” and residential uses conforming to R2, R4 or R6 District Standards.

- o **Possible Impacts:** the list of uses provided in *Exhibit C* is a modified list of the current C-1 Zoning District. The applicant has only removed items from the list as shown in current C-1 Zoning Code; no new uses were introduced to the list. This was an attempt to address the need to conform to the Urban Village/Urban Infill designation on the Comprehensive Plan.

The other items addressed in this section limit the development on certain identified properties to specific uses. One area limits the development to the LDS Bishops Storehouse, another area is limited to residential uses that will have certain standards as identified in this PUD under **Covenant 5- F:Building Standards -2 Cheney Drive Restrictions**

- **Covenant #5 – C: Landscaping:** *Perimeter landscaping shall be required to be installed on each parcel of the Property and in the public right-of-way adjacent thereto at planting season for the proposed vegetation. Such landscaped perimeter shall be installed from the back of the curb in the public right-of-way, and shall be extended toward the interior of lots to the dimensions set forth below.*

Pole Line Road – 35 Feet {Inclusive of five foot (5') detached pedestrian pathway}

Eastland Drive – 35 Feet {Inclusive of five foot (5') detached pedestrian pathway}

Mountain View Drive – 20 Feet

Cheney Drive – 20 Feet

All parking areas shall include landscape islands spaced at intervals not exceeding eight standard parking spaces.

- o **Possible Impacts:** The requirements identified for landscaping go beyond what is required in current City Code. Specifically, the perimeter landscaping will include a detached sidewalk to allow for safer pedestrian traffic on Pole Line Rd East and Eastland Drive North.

The interior parking lot landscaping is also more than will be required in City Code. The City recently adopted a new parking code that requires landscaping islands at intervals of fifteen (15) spaces.

These proposed standards will result in a development that has increased landscaping and vegetation buffers for internal users as well as those areas surrounding the development. Overall, staff believes these changes to be positive and will greatly beautify the roadway corridors that connect to the surrounding areas above what current city code requires.

- **Covenant #5 – D: Landscaping Plan:** *At the time of development, each parcel shall be landscaped to include the following: Fifty percent (50%) of the lineal footage of street frontage of landscaping shall have berms with a ridge elevations of at least eighteen inches (18") in height with at least fifty percent (50%) of the berming having a minimum ridge elevations of (30") in height. The landscaped perimeter shall have a minimum of one tree per five hundred (500) square feet of landscaped area and a minimum of one shrub per one hundred (100) square feet of landscaped area. At least seventy five percent (75%) of the shrubs and trees shall be evergreen. Trees and shrubs may be grouped but not over seventy-five feet (75') between such groupings. All trees shall have a height of at least four feet (4') when planted. Plants and trees will be selected for their hardiness and variety in color and texture. In addition to the foregoing,*

each individual parcel must also satisfy the landscaping requirements of the underlying "C-1" Zone.

- o **Possible Impacts:** As described, the development will require more landscaping in areas that are not currently required in City Code. This additional landscaping would help towards making the development more in-line with the Urban Village/Urban Infill designation as described in the Comprehensive Plan for this area. Also, the grouping, height and type of trees and shrubs required could lend toward a more water wise landscape for the area.
- o In order to avoid issues with pedestrian and vehicle safety concerns, evergreen trees should be placed a safe distance from the detached sidewalk and roadway along Pole Line and Eastland Drive. This is to avoid sight corridor obstruction and ice formation on sidewalks and roadways during winter months.
- **Covenant #5 – F: Building Standards-1. Architectural Style**
 - ...g. Building Size:** *All buildings shall conform to the IBC. Building footprints exceeding 40,000 square feet shall be required to obtain Special Use Permit approval as outlined in Twin Falls City Code, as amended.*
 - o **Possible Impacts:** This item is a departure from any base zoning code the city currently has enacted. The purpose behind this requirement is to bring the development more in line with the Urban Village/Infill description found in the Comprehensive Plan. This item makes this development distinctly different from the C-1 Zone. It will also direct the design of the project to help achieve that Urban Village/Infill aesthetic and environment.
- **Covenant #5 – F: Building Standards-2.Cheney Drive Restrictions**

All buildings within 150 feet of the Southerly boundary shall be of residential architectural character and shall not exceed a footprint of 20,000 square feet, unless a greater footprint size is approved by through the Special Use Permit process.

Residential units within 150 feet of the South boundary shall have the following additional requirements:

 - a. *Minimum living unit size of East of Mountain View Drive shall be 2,500 square feet exclusive of garages.*
 - b. *Minimum living unit size West of Mountain View Drive shall be 1400 square feet exclusive of garages.*
 - c. *Exterior material shall be brick, stucco or stone, or a combination thereof.*
 - d. *No garage doors shall face Cheney Drive.*

- e. *Roof pitches shall be not less than 6 in 12.*
 - f. *Building height shall not exceed 28 feet.*
- o **Possible Impacts:** These regulations restrict the development standards for building within 150 feet of the north boundary of Cheney Drive. These criteria mainly focus on restrictions for residential units, overall only Professional Offices and Residential units may be developed in this restricted area. All future buildings will be impacted by these regulations in the form of maintaining a residential character and the building footprint size limitation of 20,000 square feet, among other things.
- **Covenant #5 – F: Building Standards-3.Sign Plan**
 - a. *Project Identification Signs: Project identification signs will be monument type signs with a maximum height of 10 feet measured above the adjacent curb.*
 - b. *Building Signs: Building signage shall be limited to wall mounted signs and/or monument type signs with a maximum height of 10 feet measured above the adjacent curb, with a maximum size of 100 square feet per building. No Pylon or roof mounted signs will be allowed. No building wall mounted signs shall be visible from Cheney Drive West.*
- o **Possible Impacts:** This list of requirements is more restrictive than the current sign code which is designed by the developer.
- **Covenant #5 – F: Building Standards-7.Pedestrian Improvements:**

The Developer will provide detached pedestrian and bicycle access from and to the perimeter public sidewalk. The walkways may be constructed of asphalt, concrete or concrete pavers and designed to provide access from all developed parcels.

 - o **Possible Impacts:** Staff does not feel this change will have a significant impact to the development or its connectivity to surrounding areas. Pathways required for ADA Compliance will still need to be met according to applicable codes and laws.

Planner I Spendlove stated upon conclusion should the Commission choose to recommend the zoning, as presented, staff recommends final approval be subject to the following conditions:

1. Subject to site plan amendments per Building, Engineering, Fire and Zoning Officials for compliance with City Code requirements and standards.
2. Status of the Private Drives to be determined by Staff and may be established during the platting process.
3. Subject to addressing evergreen tree placement along Pole Line and Eastland road in the PUD Agreement with Staff Approval.
4. Delete R-6 use for any area within 150 of Cheney and east of Mountain View

PZ Questions/Comments

- Assistant City Engineer Vitek explained the he is willing to work with the developer on the location of the private drives, the accesses along Eastland Drive North and Pole Line Road East are constructed but they may need to be amended to accommodate traffic flows.
- Mr. Martens stated he concurs with the changes recommended by staff. The applicant is also aware traffic has changed in the area and they will make changes accordingly.
- Commissioner Woods asked about the pitched roof requirements.
- Mr. Martens explained the roof pitch criteria apply only to the area within 150' of Cheney Drive.
- Commissioner Woods asked if a building could be 40,000 sq. ft. that is 50' tall.
- Mr. Martens explained it is possible with the way it is written but only in the commercially zoned area without requiring a special use permit.
- Commissioner Woods asked about pedestrian paths.
- Mr. Martens explained that the pedestrian path will be designed with staff approval to meet City Code requirements that make the path safe for crossing Pole Line Road East.
- Commissioner Frank asked about a time line for the pedestrian path being developed and if it would be built when the Bishops Storehouse was constructed.
- Mr. Martens stated the current development plan would only include development to the south boundary of the store house along Mountain View Drive. Right-of-way for the pedestrian path would be dedicated as part of the platting process for its entire length. It would be very difficult to build the permanent path before the road is built but it would be feasible to create a temporary path until completion.
- Commissioner Frank stated he would like to see something temporary at least for the short term so that pedestrians have a path.
- Commissioner Munoz asked if drive through and extended hours of operation would require a special use permit under the Urban Village/Urban Infill zoning designation.
- Planner I Spendlove stated yes if these are not called out as allowed uses in the PUD Agreement they will follow regular zoning requirements.
- Commissioner Higley asked for clarification about the construction of Mountain View Drive.
- Mr. Martens clarified the requirement is that the road be built to city standards on the portion located along east side the Bishops Storehouse and only be constructed to half the width. However an agreement has been made with the Bishops Storehouse that this portion will be built to full width which is approximately 48 ft. It won't be developed its full length but will be dedicated to its full length.
- Commissioner Higley asked what the width is for Cheney Drive and it is built out to its full width.
- Mr. Martens explained it is built to its full width which is 48 ft.

**Planning & Zoning Commission Minutes
October 14, 2014**

- Planner I Spendlove clarified that both of these streets are designated as collectors.
- Commissioner Higley stated he has some uses that he is not sure fits the Urban Village/Urban Infill list that should be allowed.
- Mr. Martens explained that he struggled with some of the uses listed but there is such a wide gamete of things that could be fall into each use its hard to say what would be appropriate. He suggested that if the Commission is not sure the items could be moved to the Special Use Permit category which forces the applicant to come through and say what they want to construct.
- Planner I Spendlove explained there is a description of what the community is looking for with this designation. In essence it is a mixed use with multiple types of residential, businesses with different scales. The thing that is not defined clearly is the scale of the uses for example a small printing shop may be appropriate, and if the Commission is trying to avoid the large scale 40,000 sq. ft. building that prints books maybe it isn't appropriate, which is why the applicant suggested if a use is questionable it could be included under the Special Use Permit required list.
- Commissioner Higley stated he just doesn't want to overlook something now and realize later that it was approved at this stage.

Public Hearing: Opened

- Jan Hyatt 2119 North Temple Drive she has lived in this area of town for 32 year. She stated currently she has difficulty getting out onto Eastland Drive North from North Temple. There is already a traffic problem in this location there are multiple lane size changes and she cannot imagine getting out of her subdivision if this development is approved. The neighbors are not excited about this development; this is not what they want. Her house backs onto Cheney Drive and it is going to become a four lane road. She has seen a couple 100 houses built, many roads built and doesn't think anyone built in this location thinking there was going to be apartment buildings and retail at this location. A traffic impact study is necessary currently most people turning from North Temple Drive onto Eastland Drive North are turning right because it is impossible to go left. She proposes that this change not be approved, when they purchased their property this area was zoned R-1 Variable and she would like it to stay that way. She doesn't think any of the surrounding subdivisions knew this was the plan and it looks like they don't have a choice based on the Comprehensive Plan.
- Carla Smith 1463 Mountain View Drive next to the retention pond. This zone change becomes very personal to her family. She is concerned with safety and traffic impacts on the neighborhood if this development is approved. The increased density to the area is going to bring additional safety concerns to the neighborhood. She would like the zoning to remain the same. Currently she sees many children run to the retention pond to play

and she is concerned about them as well. She thinks a traffic study needs to be done before this is ever approved.

- Ross Conlin, 2197 Julie Lane stated he lives on the corner at Eastland Drive North where the lanes change from 4 lanes to 2 lanes and cars have a tremendous problem getting out onto Eastland Drive North. He is familiar with the area and there are many traffic concerns for this area.
- Tom Courtney, 1948 Galena Drive stated that he thinks the area that has been somewhat glossed over is the current zoning of the area. He thinks this needs to be looked at from the area south of Cheney Drive that is R-1 Variable and is totally developed. Each of the home owners in this area purchased their home or built in this area with the knowledge that the area to the north was zoned R-1 Variable providing them with a significant buffer until you get to the R-4 zoned property. With what is being proposed today, this will be a very significant change, and personally some of the property to the north should be something other than R-1 Variable. He is not opposed to some commercial or even R-4 development however he would like to see a buffer greater than 150' in order to protect the values of the properties that are already developed south of Cheney Drive in one of the most restrictive residential zones within the city.
- Valerie Brown, 2137 North Temple Drive she stated that seven years ago her and her husband invested approximately \$700,000.00 in building their dream home with the intent to leave it as a large part of the estate for their children. They chose a peaceful quiet neighborhood and looked at the Comprehensive Plan expecting that they would be surrounded by R-1 Variable zoning. They paid their taxes and trusted the City of Twin Falls to follow the plan and protect their investment and quality of life. The current R-1 Variable zoning from the city code provides a low density residential environment to allow the present and future residents to live and play in a place with ample space, personal privacy, private open space and free from encroachment by commercial and industrial activities. Placing a commercial development with high density housing approximately 150' from her side yard feels like encroachment. Turning their little quiet residence streets into busy streets speeding into the commercial development putting the neighborhood and the dozens of people they watch every day walk, run or bike through the area at risk. Changing the R-1 Variable to a C-1 Zone really what the City of Twin Falls is looking for, has a traffic study been completed and evaluated, if not she would like to request that be done. She asks that the Commission stick to the code and deny the zone change.
- Nathan Welch 1345 Mountain View Drive, state he thinks the developers are great at what they do and is not questioning the value of these items. He would however like to keep this area zoned R-1 Variable to keep personal properties from being encroached upon by commercial development. In the 2015 Master Transportation Plan a light is mentioned for this area, this light has not been discussed this evening. He thinks that to

get trucks in and out from the Bishop Storehouse onto Pole Line Road East or Eastland Drive North would be almost impossible because of traffic in this area currently. A light should be installed prior to this change taking place. Should the Commission choose to recommend the zoning change, he would like to refer to the Urban Village/Urban Infill definition in the Comprehensive Plan that states open space and parks being a key component to the development which is something missing from this proposal. The city plan also talks about needing a park in this square mile area, and he would like more open space created, he would like to have a maximum of 35' for building heights and no gas stations be allowed because of the traffic issues at the curve. He asked that the apartment area be limited to R-4 zoning and not allow for R-6 zoning.

- Greg Wickern, 1345 Hinkley Circle stated there is already a C-1 designated area north of this location across Pole Line Road East by adding this type of development in this area it is going to create a bigger challenge for traffic then there already is in this area. The natural progression to him for this area would be to have commercial along the edge of that corner and residential on the inside. If the commercial is brought further in on the corner the density is going to become unwieldy.
- Chris McFarland, 1406 Riverridge he has concerns about changing the zoning and doesn't know where the traffic is going to go with Cheney Drive still not completed. Pole Line Road East has not been widened completely which will also create issues. Lack of specific plans on the proposed change concern him as well. Leaving uses open for interpretation because there are not specifics makes it difficult. Before this is approved he would like to know for sure what we getting ourselves into, determine if it is too quick and if more information is needed. He wants to make sure that things are enforced in the covenants and the people's lives are kept safe.
- Brent Hyatt, 2119 North Temple Drive, stated the Urban Village/Urban Infill Designation is a concept addressed in the Comprehensive Plan however it doesn't exist in the City Code as a Zoning District, so there are no requirements. It is interesting to watch the staff try and overlay that concept without any guidance. He believes that at some point between now and 2030 there will be an ordinance that outlines what an Urban Village/Urban Infill zone requires, and he is convinced it won't have 50' buildings that are 40,000 sq. ft. in size. That seems like it is at odds with what he has seen, most municipalities require a defined plan and although there are some elements of this proposal that are defined most of it is just illustrated and it keeps being said that at each phase it will be looked at again. If this gets passed tonight the plan will be brought back with a C-1 zone which is significant. He also would like to have a traffic study completed. He stated he turns right every morning to come to work but if he had to turn left he would be very frustrated and he wouldn't go out that way unfortunately he would take Mountain View Drive to get out of the subdivision. He is concerned that the density that has the potential to create will be

detrimental. The Urban Village/Urban Infill idea is not to increase the density but to bunch the density together so you have more open areas, trails, parks & plazas. He sees some density with multi-family housing but he doesn't see the offset. He would also like to thank the landowner for taking care of the weeds this year.

- Brent White, 2028 Candleridge stated that in several years ago the Planning & Zoning Commission had to consider a significant item that had to do with the Canyon Rim Overlay. This was significant on many levels, such as transportation and traveling north and south through the community and the overall impacts to the community. If you look at this corner you realize that the proper development between Pole Line Road East and Eastland Drive North determines the future development in this area. Good decisions will lead to the best outcomes, and ultimately if you go back to the CRO decisions that were made were made after months and months of study and information gathering because once the decisions were made they couldn't be reversed. Making this decision is very significant and without traffic signals at the intersections of Mountain View Drive and Cheney Drive left turns are virtually impossible onto Eastland Drive North and Pole Line Road East giving people only one direction to get out of the subdivision safely. What he thinks is interesting about tonight is that there are 100's of issues that are important and the Commission has been asked to establish the model for Urban Village/Urban Infill without knowing what it is; this designation came about because people wanted a place to live, work, play, educate, worship and recreate "a village". We all have a sort of intuitive understanding of what a village is and people wanted to get away from the necessity of traveling all over town for things. The Commission is being asked to set the precedence for this designation and ultimately with very limited information. On the one hand property owners who invested under certain zoning establish by years and years of consultation with the community and on the other side a developer who has the desire to do development. He works for a developer they do the best they can they want the community to improve but ultimately it is about money and the developer has determined that this use is better than the residential, when all of these people bought their home expecting to see residential in this area. He thinks the developer need to show that there is a strong preponderance of reasoning for this change, because you're going to set into motion so many issues that won't be able to be reversed once you take that step. He would recommend that the rezone be denied until we know what an Urban Village/Urban Infill designation is what the warrant study shows for signals this area, we know where the money is going to come from for these things and we know what is going to happen to Cheney Drive.

- Sue Higley, 2108 South Temple Dr stated that a few months ago she was here to request a Special Use Permit to build a garage and family gathering room on her property and was chastised very strongly about the traffic it would funnel into her cul-de-sac the noise, the lights and how it could interfere with neighbors. It is a room that will be used by the family a couple times a year and hopefully by the neighborhood, but there was so much concern over the garage that she can't understand why these concerns are not the same for this development. The lights, the noise and the traffic alone are going to impact the entire neighborhood and it is going to change their lives. She doesn't even try to go out on Eastland Drive North and travels Mountain View Drive. If she needs to go shopping she is only about 5 minutes from her residence she doesn't need commercial within walking distances of her home. The other concern is that everywhere she goes she sees empty offices and they haven't been used so she doesn't see the need for more professional office either. She loves the quiet of the neighborhood and that is so nice and she would ask that it be kept for more homes. Everything is within walking or drive distance already, we don't need this developed for commercial.
- Susanne Alder, 1443 Mountain View Drive stated that she moved here from San Diego and she has seen quite a few of these Urban Village/Urban Infill development along the outskirts of the communities and they are beautiful, they have parks, huge water displays but they are on 500 acres or more not on 40 acres. This is going to be a mess on such a small piece of land it will not be an Urban Village.
- Matthew Blake, 1372 Galena Court stated he has only lived here for 2 months; he came here for a couple of different reasons. He has lived around urban developments before and definitely more than what is being proposed. He moved here to build a home, build a family and they were looking in this area for lots. They have lived in high density areas, apartment buildings and are very aware of what type of lifestyle can be in these places and he knows what type of lifestyle he doesn't want there and the caliber of individual coming to this development is going to be less. He would not build his home here because he doesn't want to have interaction with that high density population in that area. Maybe he is biased from living in areas such as Philadelphia, PA and Richmond, VA. He moved here because he wanted lots of land and this area was very appealing to him and his family but not if this gets approved.
- Steve Victor, 2111 North Temple Drive, he moved to this area of town because of the impacts the C-1 commercial development had created for him at his home off of Hankins Road. He wanted to get away from the changes that come with C-1 Zoning. He thinks the Ensign Subdivision is one of the most beautiful subdivisions in the area and if you allow commercial businesses and apartments in this 40 acre parcels it will destroy this area. He knows the Mr. Taylor and thinks he is trying to make maximum use of this property but he is opposed to this zoning change.

- Jerry Higley, 2108 South Temple Drive stated he agrees with his neighbors this is a primo subdivision. He stated he and his partners own the undeveloped lots in Ensign Point and it is not there intent to have property values to go down, nor is it there intention to have the subdivision compromised by having Commercial built almost on top of them. They pay some of the highest taxes in the City and if you want to get less taxes out of us allow this development.
- Dell Smith, 1463 Mountain View Drive stated we all concur as a community that the canyon properties are the face of Twin Falls and if you drive into Twin Falls and see a very dense commercial and apartment area next to a bunch of beautiful homes and add more traffic issues to the area it is going to be put a bad face on Twin Falls in that area of town. He requests that the Commission keep the zoning R-1 VAR.
- Cindy Bezas, 1413 Riverridge Street she wanted to thank the Commission for their efforts. She stated she understood that the R-6 zoning is prohibited in the 150' adjacent to Cheny Drive but wanted to ask if it is prohibited in the rest of the development. That high density is not best for this area, but the thought she wanted to share is that she has a son in college facing big decisions and when we make big decisions we have to look to the future and it may be the right decision just not the right time. She asks that the Commission say no to this plan at this time.
- Daniel Alder 1443 Mnt View Dr he chose this area because of the R-1 Variable zoning that is what he liked and is what he wanted. They pay a lot to be in this location and would like to keep the R-1 Variable. It seems that the traffic impact study needs to be done, the data is not there and compared to what he does you can't make decisions without enough data. You get what you get when you make decisions without enough due diligence. The high density changes the dynamics of the area and there are already issues with traffic in this area. He has to go over to Home Depot and come out at the light to turn left onto Pole Line Road East without this development. He would prefer that we keep it R-1 Variable.
- DeVoe Brown, taken over the development of Ensign Point but the objective is to protect the home values and the people are concerned about their property values. He would like the opportunity to work with this developer to see if a better plan cannot be developed.
- Joseph Adkins, 1423 Riverridge he has just moved in about a month ago and they chose to live here because of the community feel. This change would definitely take away from that and he would like it to remain R-1 Variable.

- Allison Welch, 1435 Mountain View Drive stated she agrees with her neighbors they don't want the R-1 Variable changed, especially until there is a plan for the remainder of the property and handling the traffic. Having the driveways along Mountain View Drive because it will become a complete collector street would have a major impact.
- Kent Taylor 2571 Falls Ave E, the applicant, stated he has owned this property for approximately 8 years and has worked with the city widening Pole Line Road East and installing on infrastructure for the property. He is a very community minded individual and has lived here 41 years. He appreciates the comments made about maintaining property value and making the area safe for children. What prompted him to try and move forward was that he was approached by the LDS Church to construct a Bishop Storehouse; this was his attempt to be able to get that done. His vision for this area was not conveyed very well which is a deficiency on his part. He stated he did the Glanbia development downtown and as part of that project he made sure a park was put in to enhance the area. He stated he would take the comments back and consider the issues. He did not realize that traffic was as big an issue as what has been portrayed tonight. He doesn't want to build any development that doesn't accommodate traffic and safety issues. If there is traffic and safety issue the businesses won't thrive. He has a legacy in this town and he intends to uphold that legacy. He would suggest if at all possible that the Commission table the item until they have had a chance to address the concerns of the neighbors.
- Diana Wickern, 1345 Hinckley Circle stated she has live all over the world and while she appreciates Mr. Taylor's vision for this property she still has concerns. She doesn't know anything about Planning & Zoning but she does know about family and what it takes to raise a family and it concerns her when she sees commercial and multi-family butting up next to single family homes. It takes a lot of planning and tolerance when there is so much diversity. She doesn't want this to become an urban landfill, she wants the community to grow and remain nice; and this doesn't fit with her family plan.
- Sue Higley, 2108 South Temple Drive stated that from past experience when the church builds a welfare center, they have considered other options and this is not the only location they have considered.

Public Hearing: **Closed**

Closing Statements:

Mr. Martens stated that traffic is a big issue the City is working towards addressing the issues and they are aware that a traffic study would be required and if traffic signals are required they will be installed before building can occur. They recognized the Urban Village concept is in its infancy which is why they worked with staff to try and design this plan. After all of the feedback tonight

he would recommend tabling the item and will coordinate some neighborhood meetings. The Comprehensive Plan calls out for this in this area but there needs to be some discussion on what the concept should be.

Deliberations Followed:

- Chairman Frank asked for clarification on the procedure for tabling the item if the Commission so chooses.
- City Attorney Wonderlich explained now that the public hearing is closed if the Commission chooses to table the item it would be tabled indefinitely until the developer told us they would like it to be scheduled again. There could be two different routes taken in this case. The first would be that they have met with the neighbors they think the existing plan is a good plan and they ask that the Commission make a decision, on what has been presented this evening, there would be no more public testimony taken. The other route would be they have met with the neighbors, they have made changes and it will come back like a new public hearing item, in either case full notification would be required so that the neighbors have an opportunity to come to the meeting and hear the discussion.

Motion:

Commissioner Woods made a motion to table the item indefinitely until re-application is made by the applicant and that full notification is made to the neighbors on the notification list as well as anyone that spoke here tonight that was not on the notification list. Commissioner Boyd seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor of the motion.

Tabled

Chairman Frank called for a break at 9:15pm and reconvened at 9:22pm.

3. Request for the Commission's recommendation on a **Comprehensive Plan Amendment** from AG to Medium Density and to extend the Water Service Boundary Area for property located on the east side of the 500, 600, and 700 blocks of Hankins Road North. c/o Brad Wills on behalf of Twin Falls School District #411 and the City of Twin Falls (app. 2670)

Applicant Presentation

Brady Dickenson, director of operations for the Twin Falls School District, stated the school district bought this property in 1990. The property and the community passed a bond to build an additional elementary school this location is one of the proposed areas for the new school. The request is to amend the Comprehensive Plan to allow for this to occur and to move the water boundary to encompass the school district property. They would like to change the Comprehensive

Plan to medium density to match what is across the street. He asked that the Commission approve the request.

Staff Analysis

The Twin Falls School District acquired the Sackett Farm in 1990. In April 2008 the City Council approved the Conveyance Plat of the Sackett Farms Subdivision. This conveyance plat consisted of 53.6 +/- acres with two (2) lots. Lot 1, consisting of 51.3 +/- acres, was retained by the Twin Falls School District and Lot 2, consisting of 2.3 +/- acres, was transferred to the City of Twin Falls in order to construct a Regional Pressurized Irrigation Pump Station. Lot 1 has remained as farm ground.

On July 8th 2014, the Planning and Zoning Commission made a recommendation to approve the Annexation and on August 4th, 2014, the City Council voted to annex these properties into City Limits. Ordinance #3075 was published on August 21, 2014 officially annexing this property into City Limits.

This request has two parts – **1)** the first part is to expand the Water Service Boundary, identified in Twin Falls City Comprehensive Plan Vision 2030. The boundary currently runs parallel to this property along Hankins road to the West. The request is to add the entirety of the School District and City owned property, (+/-) 53 Acres. **2)** The second part of the request is to amend the Future Land Use Map by changing the designation of this same area from Agriculture to Medium Density Residential. He explained on the overhead the designations for the area on the current maps.

The property currently owned by the school district is zoned R-1 Variable and has been annexed into the city. A narrative provided by the applicant outlines the future plans for the property. The requested change from Agriculture to Medium Density is a shift for this area. The Comprehensive Plan has different descriptive paragraphs for Agriculture and Medium Density designations. Copies of each designation description were provided in the staff report. The Comprehensive plan also describes the environment in which schools should be placed.

The Agriculture Designation was designed to preserve farm ground and direct development inward towards the corporate City Limits. This area was recently annexed into the City of Twin Falls, and therefore it would be appropriate to amend the comprehensive plan to direct future residential growth within City Limits. In no way does changing the Water Service Boundary guarantee the City Services for these properties, but it will allow for the planning and modeling process to continue. All requirements for future services put forth by the Engineering Department will need to be met prior to services being granted.

Planner I Spendlove stated upon conclusion the Commission may recommend approval of this request, recommend changes to the request, or recommend denial of this request. The decision made by the Commission will then be forwarded to the City Council for a decision.

PZ Questions/Comments:

- Commissioner Frank seems like this designation should have happened before when the Comprehensive Plan was created last time and this change being requested tonight should have come before the annexation.

Public Hearing: Open and Closed Without Concerns

Motion:

Commissioner Grey made a motion recommend approval of this request, as presented, the City Council. Commissioner Woods seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor of the motion.

Recommended for approval, as presented, to City Council

Scheduled for November 10, 2014 City Council Public Hearing

4. Requests the Commission's recommendation on the Zoning Designation for property consisting of 4.75 (+/-) acres of undeveloped land. The property is currently zoned C-1 in the Area of Impact and is proposed for development of a municipal water storage facility on property located at 2951 Marie Street. c/o City of Twin Falls (app. 2669)

Staff Analysis

A Record of Survey and Lot Line Adjustment was completed in December of 2013 so the City could purchase the property for development of a second water storage facility. The City Council held a public hearing and approved establishment of the use of a Municipal Potable Water Storage Facility at this location on July 7, 2014. This request is the second process in the development of a Municipal Water Storage Facility at this location. The property is currently outside of City Limits and the City would request that the zoning designation remain C-1; Commercial Highway District. The Commission is being asked to make a recommendation on whether or not the current zoning designation requested is appropriate. The Comprehensive Plan identifies this area as commercial retail outside of city limits. He displayed on the overhead a site plan of the property and explained the reason for the request is to annex property owned and maintained by the City in order to gain governmental jurisdiction over its own property.

Planner I Spendlove stated upon conclusion should the Commission find the C-1 zoning designation appropriate, they should forward a positive recommendation to the City Council.

Public Hearing: **Opened and Closed Without Concerns**

Motion:

Commissioner Munoz made a motion to recommend C-1 as the appropriate zone, as presented, to the City Council. Commissioner Woods seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor of the motion.

Recommended for approval, as presented, to city council

City council public hearing scheduled November 17, 2014

VI. ITEMS FROM THE ZONING DEVELOPMENT MANAGER AND/OR THE PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION:

Zoning & Development Manager Carraway-Johnson displayed the public hearing notice on the overhead and reviewed the items scheduled for the next hearing on October 28, 2014.

VII. UPCOMING PUBLIC MEETINGS: (held at the City Council Chamber unless otherwise posted)

1. Public Hearing-**October 28, 2014**
2. Work Session-**November 5, 2014**

VIII. ADJOURN MEETING:

Chairman Frank adjourned the meeting at 9:45 PM

Lisa A Strickland
Administrative Assistant
Planning & Zoning Department