

MINUTES ADOPTED BY THE GREENVILLE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
OCTOBER 20, 2015

The Greenville Planning and Zoning Commission met on the above date at 6:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers of City Hall.

Mr. Tony Parker – Chair \*

|                      |                         |
|----------------------|-------------------------|
| Mr. Terry King - *   | Ms. Betsy Leech –*      |
| Ms. Chris Darden – * | Ms. Margaret Reid – X   |
| Mr. Doug Schrade – X | Mr. Mark Gillespie - *  |
| Ms. Ann Bellis – *   | Mr. John Collins - *    |
| Mr. P.J. Connelly- X | Mr. Anthony Herring - * |
| Mr. Dustin Mills - * |                         |

The members present are denoted by an \* and the members absent are denoted by an X.

**VOTING MEMBERS:** Bellis, King, Darden, Leech, Gillespie, Herring, Mills, Collins

**PLANNING STAFF:** Chantae Gooby, Planner II; Andy Thomas, Senior Planner; and Betty Moseley, Staff Support Specialist III.

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Dave Holec, City Attorney; Merrill Flood, Assistant City Manager; Scott Godefroy, City Engineer, and Jewell Jones, Communications Technician.

**MINUTES:** Ms. Leech stated that on page 10 of the September 15th minutes, she is noted as voting no to the Barnhill Contracting Company application, however, she actually voted yes.

**Motion was made by Mr. King, seconded by Ms. Leech to amend the minutes to reflect the stated change. Motion carried unanimously.**

**Motion was made by Mr. Collins, seconded by Ms. Darden to accept the September 15, 2015 minutes as amended. Motion carried unanimously.**

**NEW BUSINESS**

**REZONINGS**

ORDINANCE REQUESTED BY EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY TO REZONE 2.19 ACRES LOCATED NEAR THE NORTHWEST AND NORTHEAST CORNERS OF THE INTERSECTION OF EAST 10TH STREET AND CHARLES STREET FROM CDF (DOWNTOWN COMMERCIAL FRINGE) TO OR (OFFICE-RESIDENTIAL [HIGH DENSITY MULTI-FAMILY]) - Approved

Ms. Gooby delineated the property. It is located near the northwest and northeast corners of the intersection of East 10th Street and Charles Street. McDonalds is on one corner and Kinko's is on the other. This section of Charles Street was closed by City Council this month. Between Charles Boulevard/Cotanche Street and Greenville Boulevard, East 10th Street is considered a connector corridor which is anticipated to contain a variety of higher intensity activities and uses. Based on the analysis comparing the existing zoning and the requested rezoning, the proposed rezoning classification could generate less traffic than the existing zoning. Surrounding Land Uses and Zoning: North: OR - East Carolina University Main Campus; South: CDF - One (1) vacant lot, commercial strip center, and Arby's; East: OR - East Carolina University Main Campus; and West: CDF - McDonald's. The Future Land Use Plan Map recommends mixed-use/office/institutional (MOI) at the northeast corner of the intersection of East 10th Street and Cotanche Street transitioning to office/institutional/multi-family (OIMF) to the north and east. In staff's opinion, the request is in compliance with Horizons: Greenville's Future Land Use Plan Map.

Ms. Leech stated that she was concerned about the amount of traffic if there is another multifamily building such as the one on Reid and Cotanche. Are there any regulations that would impact where the driveways will be and where the traffic will empty out?

Ms. Gooby replied that there will be a traffic impact study. There is a traffic light at the corner of Charles and 10<sup>th</sup> that will handle any additional traffic.

Ms. Leech stated that this area already has a lot driveways emptying on to a very busy street. This is a street that will be significantly busier when we widen it and have a larger corridor going through it. Increasing traffic in this area will mean developing it so that there are not a lot of opportunities for accidents.

Ms. Gooby stated that we have less curb cuts than we did historically.

Chairman Parker opened the public hearing.

No one spoke in favor or in opposition of the request.

Chairman Parker closed the public hearing and opened for board discussion.

Ms. Darden asked if anyone knew what was being proposed for the area.

Chairman Parker replied that this was just a discussion for the zoning request. There are no guarantees they will build what they stated they intend to build.

Mr. Flood stated that they should consider the full range of uses that could be proposed for the area. There is a site plan for a new student activity center. ECU wants similar zoning for all their properties; however, you do have to consider all uses.

**Motion was made by Mr. Gillespie and seconded by Mr. Collins to recommend approval of the proposed rezoning, to advise that it is consistent with the comprehensive plan and other**

**applicable plans, and to adopt the staff report which addresses plan consistency and other matters. Motion carried unanimously.**

### **PRELIMINARY PLATS**

REQUEST BY CHERRY CONSTRUCTION COMPANY, LLC FOR A PRELIMINARY PLAT ENTITLED "GREENBRIER PLACE". THE SUBJECT PROPERTY IS LOCATED ON THE SOUTH AND WEST OF DUNHAGAN ROAD ADJACENT TO BEDFORD WEST, PHASE 1 AND NORTH OF THE FORK SWAMP CANAL. THE PROPERTY IS FURTHER IDENTIFIED AS TAX PARCELS #51642, #77432 AND A PORTION OF TAX PARCEL # 77420. THE PRELIMINARY PLAT CONSISTS OF 1 LOT ON 13.358 ACRES. THE PROPERTY OWNERS ARE PICO HOLDINGS, LLC AND CHERRY CONSTRUCTION COMPANY, LLC. THE DEVELOPER IS CHERRY CONSTRUCTION COMPANY, LLC. -  
Approved

Mr. Thomas delineated the property. He stated that the property is located on the south and west of Dunhagan Road adjacent to Bedford West, Phase 1 and north of the Fork Swamp Canal. The property is zoned R6. This property will have some minor impact by the flood plain; part of the 500 year flood plain touches it. Evans Street is a major thoroughfare. This is a revision to the preliminary plat entitled "Bedford West, Phases 1 & 2" and approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on July 17, 2007. The original preliminary consisted of 24 single-family homes. The developer desires to build single-family homes developed under the Multi-Family standards which are allowed under the ordinance. This development is intended to be similar to the adjacent Palmer Place which was built by the same developer. Part of this approval is for the layout of the public streets. The Engineering Department has developed a street section which will allow a 28 back to back curb street section with a 30 foot right of way. In accordance with the Manual of Standard Designs and Details, they will be responsible for reporting this change to the City Council next month and adding this street section to the Manual. There is a mention of changing a street name. If this is desired, the applicant will have to fill out an application for a street name change and appear before the Planning and Zoning Commission. The street renaming is a separate process and procedure. There is an existing storm water pond which this development will tie into. Some of the existing drainage is being re-routed to accommodate this development. The Engineering Department and the Planning Staff have worked with the developer and designer on this project for some time. The applicant will submit a site plan that will contain the homes and building envelopes. This will be a staff approval. There will be no costs to the City of Greenville associated with this subdivision other than routine costs to provide public services. The City's Subdivision Review Committee has reviewed the preliminary plat and has determined that it meets all technical requirements with the Engineering Department's change to the design standards.

Ms. Bellis asked if the P&Z commission normally sees plats.

Mr. Thomas replied yes. This approval is for the public streets that are being provided. They are developing single family homes under the multi-family standards. A site plan will be submitted.

Ms. Bellis asked if the site plan would be submitted to the P&Z.

Mr. Thomas replied that it would be a staff approval.

Ms. Leech stated that she was concerned about the amount of traffic on Evans Street. This is a corridor that has a lot of density. She asked how traffic would be diverted away from Evans Street and if the use of additional corridors would help traffic flow.

Mr. Thomas replied that Evans Street is a major corridor and future citizens will have the same access as current citizens and those who live in other communities.

Ms. Leech asked if there were other streets that divert around Evans or do all streets empty into Evans.

Mr. Thomas replied the traffic pattern twists around Dunhagan and ties back to Fire Tower Road. People won't have to exclusively use Evans Street. It has access to two major thoroughfares.

Ms. Leech asked if a traffic study had been done.

Mr. Thomas replied no. Traffic impact analyses are not normally done for preliminary plats.

Chairman Parker asked if this is normally done during the zoning stage.

Mr. Thomas replied yes. This is zoned R6, so they certainly could build more multi-family units than they are proposing.

Chairman Parker asked if that means they are actually building less so there could be less traffic impact.

Mr. Thomas replied exactly.

Chairman Parker opened the public hearing.

Mr. Mike Baldwin, representative of Cherry Construction, spoke in favor of the request. He stated that staff had worked very hard to come to a mutual agreement to allow contractors to come in and do something similar to Palmers Place. This property is zoned R6. Under R6, we could have put apartments there. That would have yielded approximately 13,000 trips per day. We are planning to put 43 single-family homes there that will yield about 364 trips per day. It will be smaller than Palmer Place but there will be a lot more green area. The storm water pond will be upgraded to have a fountain in it. We are trying to make it an amenity and not an eye sore. This design does allow interconnectivity. We have Dunhagan as well as Legend Court. This allows two routes for emergency traffic and regular traffic distribution.

Ms. Bellis asked where the traffic would exit.

Mr. Baldwin replied that it goes in several directions due to interconnectivity. About fifty percent will be primarily on Evans Street, by Keller Williams. Other exits would be at North Wendell and south toward Fire Tower. Traffic will be dispersed due to interconnectivity.

Mr. Patrick Johnson, property owner, spoke in opposition of the request. He stated that he and Ms. Johnson own lot 37 which is on the cul-de-sac of Legend Court. The property was purchased in 2008, mainly because it was a cul-de-sac. He stated they plan to build this year and never dreamed that a road would cut through the cul-de-sac. He requested an alternative to be done. He stated that he had no objection to the project, just connection to cul-de-sac.

Mr. Mills asked if the interconnectivity to the cul-de-sac a requirement.

Mr. Thomas replied interconnectivity is always desired. If it was constructed with only one entrance, then the houses would have to be sprinkled.

Mr. Mills asked if there were any alternatives to the ingress/egress that would not involve the cul-de-sac.

Mr. Baldwin stated that there was not. However, this will not be the main entrance into the subdivision. This is part of weighing the odds of interconnectivity. This could have very well been a named access for 221 apartment units. The betterment for the community has been dealt with.

Chairman Parker asked if, before the plat was designed and the road cut-through was there, this was a sellable lot.

Mr. Baldwin replied yes.

Chairman Parker asked if Mr. Cherry bought this lot when the design was developed.

Mr. Baldwin replied that Mr. Cherry has owned it for some time.

Chairman Parker asked if when he bought it was it considered a residential lot for single-family purposes.

Mr. Baldwin replied that it was still considered a residential lot for single-family purposes. That's why there were in the spirit of single-family development.

Ms. Leech asked if there were any restrictive covenants that would have restricted a road.

Mr. Baldwin replied no. It's for single-family purposes and this development is for single-family.

Ms. Leech stated that the property will lose value due to a street being built, and it was not the anticipated use when the gentleman purchased it.

Mr. Baldwin replied that's why we have public hearing and notices sent out. This was a big key in this development. The work that has transpired since February was for this access point. If this is not provided then we're back to square one.

Mr. King asked if Mr. Johnson had just received the notice this weekend.

Mr. Baldwin replied that he was not sure when Mr. Johnson receive the notice.

Mr. Johnson stated that he received the notice last week.

Mr. King stated that he was surprised that they had been in negotiations since February and Mr. Johnson is just finding it out.

Chairman Parker asked if a house had already been built would you cause him to demolish it.

Mr. Baldwin replied that he would defer that question to Mr. Cherry.

Ms. Leech asked if there were any other alternatives with any other lot.

Mr. Baldwin replied that if so we would have used it.

Chairman Parker closed the public hearing.

Mr. King asked for clarification on when the notice went out.

Mr. Thomas replied that the noticed were mailed October 9, 2015, which is according to preliminary plat procedure.

Mr. Mills stated there are a lot of vacant lots in the area, and it is very rare that a new road is built into a cul-de-sac. He asked if any consideration was given to acquiring lots that allow direct access to Dunhagan Road.

Ms. Darden asked if there were houses on all the lots around where Mr. Mills has mentioned or was the cul-de-sac ingress/egress the better way to go.

Mr. Baldwin stated that lots 34 and 35 were also owned by Mr. Cherry however that would put two intersections too close together. It doesn't meet the separation requirement for intersections.

Ms. Darden asked if they could put up a buffer.

Mr. Baldwin replied that they were going to put up nice landscaping.

Ms. Darden asked if he would still have privacy away from the road.

Mr. Baldwin replied yes.

Mr. Gillespie stated that most communities are getting away from cul-de-sacs because you end up with a lot of little islands with no interconnectivity.

Chairman Parker stated that a lack of interconnectivity is why people are going back to the grid pattern.

Mr. Baldwin stated that Mr. Flood had encouraged getting back to old style.

**Motion made by Ms. Darden seconded by Mr. Gillespie, to approve the preliminary plat entitled “Greenbrier Place”. Motion passed unanimously.**

REQUEST BY BILL CLARK HOMES FOR A PRELIMINARY PLAT ENTITLED "SAGEWOOD". THE SUBJECT PROPERTY IS LOCATED NEAR THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF THE INTERSECTION OF NC HIGHWAY 43 S AND IVY ROAD. THE PROPERTY IS FURTHER IDENTIFIED AS TAX PARCELS #23083, #02247 AND #46270. THE PRELIMINARY PLAT CONSISTS OF 87 LOTS ON 41.941 ACRES. THE PROPERTY OWNERS ARE JEFFREY GRABOWSKI AND DIXON FAMILY FARMS, INC. THE DEVELOPER IS BILL CLARK HOMES. - Approved

Mr. Thomas delineated the property. This property has been before the Planning and Zoning Commission a couple of times. It is south of Ivy Road and east of NC 43. The Greenville Utilities Commission oversized the pump station to serve a larger area. The applicant appeared before the Greenville City Council on June 11, 2015 to request a sewer extension outside the ETJ. Then the City Council acted on a request to annex the property on August 13, 2015. A future land use plan amendment was heard by the Planning and Zoning Commission on August 18, 2015 and approved by the City Council on September 10, 2015. A rezoning was heard by the Planning and Zoning Commission on September 15, 2015 and approved by the City Council on October 8, 2015. There was some concern from some area property owners during the previous proceedings about drainage. The topography of the property has the property draining from NC HWY 43 to the east and southward and eastward from Ivy Road to wetlands that border on the eastern side of the property. The drainage requirements are that the run off after the development cannot exceed the run off before the development. There will be an increase in volume but not intensity. There are several dry retention ponds scattered throughout the development that will store the stormwater runoff. These detention ponds will be maintained by the Homeowner's Association. There is an existing cemetery between lots 6 and 7. Sidewalks are provided throughout the development. Sewer and electric service will be by the Greenville Utilities Commission. Water will be provided by Eastern Pines Water Corporation. The sewer was requested not to be extended to the adjoining property to the south because GUC intends to serve the property from further south going back to this property. There is a non-access easement on lot 86 which means this lot will be served internally and not from Ivy Road. There will be no cost to the City of Greenville associated with this subdivision other than routine costs to provide public services. The City's Subdivision Review Committee has reviewed the preliminary plat and has determined that it meets all technical requirements.

Chairman Parker asked about access to a corner lot.

Mr. Thomas replied that there was a five foot non-access easement around Ivy Road. This lot will be served internally from the subdivision.

Ms. Bellis asked if there was the expectancy to develop to the south.

Mr. Thomas replied that they were expecting to serve about 2,000 acres in this area.

Ms. Bellis asked if water and sewer would be extended to these properties.

Mr. Thomas replied that Greenville Utilities will extend the sewer and Eastern Pines would extend the water.

Mr. Gillespie asked if the sewer would be extended down to Chicod School.

Mr. Thomas replied exactly.

Mr. Mills stated that one concern was the traffic exiting out of Ivy on to 43. He stated the information shows a right turn lane has been proposed. He asked if this was approved tonight who would approve the acquisition of the property for this lane.

Mr. Thomas replied that NCDOT did approve it and it will be installed in the second phase of the development.

Mr. Linwood Stroud, representative for Bill Clark Homes, indicated that he had already acquired ten feet of property for this lane.

Mr. Herring asked what was going to be done about the two graveyards.

Mr. Thomas replied that the graveyards will be left in place. One graveyard will be in the middle of the development.

Mr. Herring asked if people still actively visit those grave sites.

Mr. Thomas replied that he would need to speak with the surveyor and developer. Their intention is to leave the cemetery where it is and build around it, similar to the Greenville Mall.

Chairman Parker opened the public hearing.

Mr. Linwood Stroud, Engineer, representative for Bill Clark Homes, spoke on behalf of the application.

Mr. Gillespie asked at what point the retention ponds will be installed.

Mr. Stroud replied that there was several retention ponds designed throughout. These are dry retention ponds so they are designed to handle a storm and dry up after a few hours. Each phase will have retention ponds, so they will be developed incrementally.



Mr. Gillespie stated that the retention ponds are to be maintained by the homeowners. He asked if this will be a covenant in the deeds.

Mr. Stroud referred the question to Mr. Landon Weaver.

Mr. Landon Weaver, representative of Bill Clark Homes, stated it was listed as common area.

Mr. Gillespie asked how the maintenance would be enforced.

Mr. Weaver replied that Bill Clark Homes will have officers when they set up the community. The officers hold these positions until there are enough homeowners to fill them. They have never had a problem in the past. Most people want to be active in their community.

Mr. Stroud stated that there would be mandatory dues.

Mr. Thomas stated that the City would require the homeowner association documents to be viewed by the City Attorney Office prior to final plat.

Mr. Gillespie stated that because of the houses being built there was no possibility of future interconnectivity.

Mr. Weaver replied that the street runs to the property line. If someone were to develop the property next to it, they could connect to that street.

Mr. Gillespie stated that lots 77 and 78 were the point he was referring to.

Mr. Weaver replied that they had access to Hwy 43.

Mr. Gillespie stated that lots 82 and 83 terminate.

Mr. Stroud stated that they didn't terminate, they were temporary turn-arounds for emergency vehicles until the street is extended.

Mr. Thomas delineated the area in question on the map.

No one spoke in opposition.

Chairman Parker closed the public hearing.

**Motion made by Ms. Darden and seconded by Mr. Collins to approve the preliminary plat entitled "Sagewood". Motion passed unanimously.**

OTHER ITEMS OF BUSINESS

**Item 4: Presentation of Street and Pedestrian Transportation Improvement Bond**

Mr. Flood gave the presentation of Street and Pedestrian Transportation Improvement Bond. The City of Greenville will have one bond question related to Street and Pedestrian Transportation on the November 3, 2015 ballot. The question will ask voters if they want to spend \$16 million to improve streets, provide sidewalks, and other improvements and transportation projects. A bond is an issuance of debt, similar to a home mortgage. This is a General Obligation bond which means that the City will use its taxing powers if necessary. The City will have seven years to issue the bond. The City has a legal debt capacity of \$444 million. Currently, outstanding debt is about \$41.1 million. Annual debt payments per year are about \$5 million. The last bond referendum was in 2004 and included \$20.8 million for street improvements, the West Greenville revitalization plan, the Center City revitalization program, and storm water improvements. The bond rating for the City is AA. This is an excellent rating.

Street Improvements: \$10,000,000:

The City of Greenville is responsible for more than 700 lane miles of streets throughout the City. This ongoing project is designed to repair and maintain some of the worst of those roads. Project funds will be used to mill, repair, and resurface City-maintained roads. Streets are selected using a roadway conditions analysis (performed in 2014), Public Works maintenance records and sample road cores, utility coordination, suitability for resurfacing, and road classification - major or minor roadway. Streets that are being considered and have been evaluated for repairs include Arlington Boulevard between Stantonsburg Road and Fire Tower Road, Elm Street between 14th Street and the Tar River, portions of Hooker Road, and several other major road segments.

West 5th Street Streetscape: \$1,950,000:

The design and construction of functional and aesthetic improvements to streets in West Greenville send a clear signal to residents and investors that West Greenville is in the midst of a revival. The streetscape project for West Fifth Street started with the 2004 bonds and included an area from Memorial Drive to several blocks east. Funds from this bond would continue streetscape improvements from Cadillac Street to Tyson Street. Improvements include modification of sidewalks and streets to enhance pedestrian safety, lighting improvements, public transit stops, planting of scenic trees and vegetation, storm water improvements, and the potential for civic art projects that celebrate the history and sense of place that make West Greenville special.

10th Street Connector Enhancements: \$1,750,000:

The 10th Street Connector is an NCDOT project currently underway that will connect 10th Street and Stantonsburg Road. This will become the primary route for visitors coming from areas west of Greenville to easily get into the downtown area. It will be a gateway to the heart of our city and one of the first impressions created for visitors. The \$1,750,000 would fund the costs associated with the improvements that are above NCDOT's standards. In essence, this money will allow for extended and larger sidewalks, street lights, trees and other items to present a more beautiful first impression of our city. These enhancements will provide for pedestrian safety and encourage walking as a viable means of transportation.

Sidewalks: \$1,400,000:

This project would build about nine miles of sidewalks along thoroughfares and other high priority locations. Presently, many streets and major thoroughfares do not have sidewalks to provide safe travel for pedestrians. Projects have been evaluated and prioritized and will be completed as money permits. The City Council has prioritized approximately 33.5 miles of sidewalks for construction. The additional sidewalks and sidewalk improvements throughout Greenville will improve pedestrian safety, community character and appeal, as well as encourage walking as a viable alternative means of transportation.

East Side Greenway: \$750,000:

The Federal Highway Administration recognizes greenways as shared-use paths that serve as “the arterials of the bicycle and pedestrian transportation system.” These paths, which are often referred to as linear parks, are really designed to create safe routes for non-vehicular traffic. Greenville’s greenways are primarily located in conservation areas along streams and the Tar River which lends to their use for relaxation and recreation; but their portions adjacent to streets helps provide access to various parts of the city. The greenways create a safe alternative for people who wish to travel via bicycle or on foot, but want to avoid traffic.

Funds for this extension would start to provide connection from the eastern side of Greenville all the way across town to the soon to be completed western extension (which ends at the VA Clinic near the hospital). Joggers, bicyclists, and walkers would have a safe path where they do not have to worry about competing with cars for road space. Greenways are also often cited as critical components leading to a higher quality of life which can help Greenville’s economic development teams attract and retain new businesses and investment along or near greenways.

Under North Carolina law, a local government holding a referendum for the purpose of issuing general obligation (G.O.) bonds must specify general categories of capital projects for which bond proceeds may be used. Within these categories, a local government may identify specific projects that are intended to be funded by the bond proceeds. However, due to the lengthy process involved with identifying, designing, and implementing projects, as well as the lack of detailed cost and other project information available at the time of the bond referendum, the specific projects identified in the bond package may change over time. The question that the actual bond referendum therefore asks of voters is whether the local government is authorized to use the G.O. bonds as a financing tool for the general category of projects up to the amount specified in the question.

Mr. Herring stated that the City was doing an excellent job on West 5<sup>th</sup> Street. He asked how much of the bond money will be used for tearing down houses.

Mr. Flood replied that the 2004 bond was covering that part. It is part of the West Greenville Revitalization efforts. This is a long term goal, probably even twenty years for completion and may exceed \$50 – 60 million. All of the 45 Block grant and bond funds have been allocated until we reach certain milestones.

Ms. Leech asked if the specific projects for this bond already been addressed and designated and if so, was the information available to the public.

Mr. Flood replied yes. The street improvements will be handled by the Streets Department and they will evaluate which sidewalks will be completed as determined. This bond will accelerate the original plan.

Chairman Parker asked which committee would address Greenville not doing enough bonds. He stated they should be doing them every four or five years.

Mr. Flood replied that City Council is aware, and the Bond Committee did make a recommendation along those lines. City Council is discussing looking at a bond strategy and mapping out some long term strategies.

Mr. Collins asked how far the Greenway will go on the eastern side of town.

Mr. Flood replied that there were about six or eight miles of greenway now. There is an additional section being planned to the west. The Greenway Master Plan has greenways throughout the city as well as connections to parts of the county. It is a growing system. Several sections are under construction as we speak.

Mr. Gillespie stated that what it will do is provide construction documents and detailed planning on the construction. It will also provide match money – if you get a Federal grant they require match money. So if you have some money set aside you have to have an initial plan first.

Ms. Leech asked if there would be public meetings that people can go to and get more information regarding this.

Mr. Flood replied the information was being relayed to all boards and commissions and is on our website. There is not really a formal public hearing but you can contact the City Clerks' Office to request more information or a presentation.

Mr. Flood stated that due to the number of new members, staff would be polling the committee to set up a workshop. It may be after the New Year before this is finalized.

**With no further business, motion was made by Ms. Darden seconded by Ms. Bellis to adjourn. Motion passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 7:44 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted,

Merrill Flood, Secretary to the Commission  
Assistant City Manager