

**MINUTES
OF THE MEETING OF THE
CITY OF BENBROOK
PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
THURSDAY, JULY 12, 2007**

The regular monthly meeting of the Planning & Zoning Commission of the City of Benbrook was held on Thursday, July 12, 2007 at 7:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers at 911 Winscott Road with the following members present:

Joe Hughes
Alfredo Valverde
John Dawson
Dian Price
Sanjiv Shah
Larry Marshall

Also Present:

Ed Gallagher, City Planner
Sue Clark, Recording Secretary
Dave Gattis, Deputy City Manager
Dan Tully, Councilmember
Keith Bailey, Councilmember
Ron Rainey
Barry Hudson
Tom Galbreath
Tom Eudaly
Brad Bowen
Ron Hoffman
Bryan Bonner
Jim Risky
Eddie Sullivan
Chris Wilde
and approximately 7 others

I. CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair Marshall called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

II. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

Regular Meeting – June 14, 2007

Motion by Mr. Shah to approve the minutes of the June 14, 2007 regular meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission as presented. Second by Mr. Valverde. The Vice Chair called the question.

Vote on the Motion:

Ayes: Mr. Hughes, Mr. Valverde, Ms. Price, Mr. Dawson, Mr. Shah, and Dr. Marshall

Noes: None

Motion carried 6 – 0

III. REPORTS OF CITY STAFF

A. ZONING

None

B. SUBDIVISION PLATS

P – 07 – 02 Preliminary plat of Benbrook Field Addition being 8.66 acres of land in the J.M. Evans Survey Abstract Number 466 (east side of Vista Way, between Sproles Drive and Mercedes Street and 9006 Benbrook Boulevard), 57.81 acres of land in the H. Covington Survey Abstract Number 257 and the J. Stephens Survey Abstract Number 1494 (west side of Benbrook Boulevard/U.S. Highway 377, north side of Mercedes Street, east of Walnut Creek, and south of I-20/Loop 820), and 2.41 acres of land in the H. Covington Survey Abstract Number 257 and the J.M. Evans Survey Abstract Number 466 (southwest of the intersection of Benbrook Boulevard and Mercedes Street)

Vice Chair Marshall introduced the item and asked for a report from the applicant.

Barry Hudson, with Dunaway Associates, 1501 Merrimac Circle, Fort Worth, said he was representing the applicants, Benbrook Economic Development Corporation and Richpenn Development. Mr. Hudson said the preliminary plat is in three separate parts; the northern section is roughly 54 acres, the central section at the southwest intersection of Benbrook Boulevard and Mercedes Street and is 2.4 acres, and the southern section which is 8.6 acres and separated by the “WalMart” tract.

Mr. Hudson said the Planning and Zoning Commission made a recommendation to the City Council at their June 14 regular meeting on a “PD” zoning of the property on the preliminary plat that is being considered by the Commission. He said the timing of the consideration is challenging because the City Council does not consider the planned development zoning until their next meeting on July 19, 2007. Based upon the regulations that have been written into the “PD” zoning and the recommendations of the Commission, they would like to move forward with the plat. Mr. Hudson said the timing is starting to get very critical for Home Depot as far as getting streets and utilities to the parcel and so the entire acreage can go ahead and be developed.

Chris Wilde with Dunaway Associates said he is the project engineer for Benbrook Field and he would go through the Staff comments in the report given to the Commission. He said if a comment is skipped it is because they are going to comply with the comment or it was just a general statement.

Staff Comment 1:

...The center site is a 2.41-acre area at the southwest corner of Benbrook Boulevard and Mercedes Street. The site includes the old Ryan’s Western Wear store property and potentially includes the Russell Feed Store property...

Mr. Wilde said Dunaway Associates mistakenly added the Russell Feed Store tract without authorization by the owner and it will be removed from the preliminary plat.

Staff Comment 3:

The preliminary plat indicates 20-foot right-of-way dedication areas at the frontage areas along Benbrook Boulevard/Highway 377 to accommodate future roadway expansion. In Note 1, the plat also references future right-of-way will conform to Texas Department of Transportation (TXDOT) requirements. Right-of-way dedication also should include sufficient area to accomplish all recommendations in the accompanying "Traffic Study Along US 377" traffic impact analysis report. Roadway improvements required by TXDOT and/or recommended by the traffic study should be installed as interim improvements if the development precedes the overall highway expansion.

Mr. Wilde said there are various areas on the preliminary plat showing 20-foot of right-of-way dedications that will match adjacent properties that have already provided that 20-foot dedication. He said, in the future, as the Benbrook Boulevard Master Plan becomes under review or under construction or if there are any requirements set forth by TXDOT such as deceleration lanes, right turn lanes, etc., they will dedicate right-of-way at that time. He said they do not want to put a note on the plat that says they will dedicate any additional right-of-way that is asked of them but would prefer to state that they will meet the TXDOT requirements at the time of construction. For instance, if they are required to put in a right turn lane, then they will dedicate an additional 10 feet of right-of-way.

Staff Comment 4:

Building lines along the proposed Vista Way frontage of Lots 1 and 2 of Block 1 should be 50-foot front yard building lines. In Block 2, the building lines along the Benbrook Field Drive frontage of Lot 1, and the Mercedes Street frontage of Lot 4, should be 50-foot front yard building lines. If Z-07-03 rezoning of Lots 5, 6, and 7 is approved as "HC-PD" as recommended by the Planning and Zoning Commission, a 50-foot front yard building line should be shown along the Mercedes Street frontage of Lots 5 and 6, and the Vista Way frontage of Lot 7. If the "D/HC-"PD" split zoning is approved, the 25-foot building lines shown on the three lots will meet the "D" standards and can be shown on the final plat and followed for future multi-family construction. If the commercial construction occurs on the three lots under the split zoning, a 50-foot building setback should be imposed.

Mr. Wilde said they showed the setbacks on the preliminary plat in accordance with the "PD" zoning that is being considered by Council the following week. He said they will change the building setback lines to 50 feet, per City Staff comment.

Staff Comment 5:

In proposed Block 2, south of proposed Benbrook Field Drive, the plat indicates Lot 2a and Lot 2b at the side and rear of the adjoining lot occupied by the Jack In The Box restaurant. Lot 2a is a landlocked lot and Lot 2b is a rather awkward configuration. It is Staff's understanding that the plat applicants are in negotiation with Jack In The Box for a land swap to reconfigure the restaurant property to achieve a more usable configuration of the Lot 2a and Lot 2b area. Any land swap should include a replat of the Jack In The Box property concurrent with the final plat of Benbrook Field. The resulting Benbrook Field loting should not include a landlocked lot and should include a 25-foot second front yard building line along Benbrook Field Drive.

Mr. Wilde said they are going to follow Staff's recommendation and combine Lots 2a and 2b into one lot.

Staff Comment 7:

Proposed Block 3, south of the Mercedes Street/Benbrook Boulevard intersection, indicates two lots and includes an adjoining property (Lot 1R, Block 1, Ruthardt Addition) owned by others and labeled "Further Ownership". It is Staff's understanding that the plat applicants are in negotiation to acquire the adjoining lot occupied by Russell Feed Store. As presented, Lot 1 should include a 25-foot second front yard building line along Mercedes Street and Lot 2 should include a 50-foot building line along Mercedes Street. If the area is a single lot, the 25-foot second front yard building line should apply along the entire Mercedes Street frontage. The Lot 1R, Block 1, Ruthardt Addition area was not part of the Z-07-03 rezoning application and that portion of proposed Lots 1 and 2 are incorrectly noted as proposed "HC-PD" Zoning.

Mr. Wilde said they are showing 15-foot setback in accordance with the "PD" zoning. Since the "PD" zoning has not been approved, they are going to show 25 feet as requested by City Staff.

Staff Comment 9:

As presented, proposed Lot 1, Block 4, includes an approximately four-foot wide by 162-foot long panhandle area extending north along Vista Way along the west frontage of the proposed future WalMart property. The long, narrow strip does not enhance Lot 1, Block 4, creates a rather awkward maintenance situation, and generally amounts to a reserve strip that is prohibited by the Subdivision Ordinance. The owners and developers should make all efforts to eliminate the strip and incorporate the narrow area with the WalMart site or show it as additional Vista Way right-of-way.

Mr. Wilde said they will comply with Staff's request to incorporate the strip into the WalMart site or show it as additional Vista Way right-of-way.

Staff Comment 10:

The Subdivision Ordinance, 16.28.030-A-2, specifies that block lengths shall not exceed 1,600 feet. The block length between Sproles Drive and Mercedes Street is approximately 2,525 feet along Benbrook Boulevard and approximately 2,150 feet along Vista Way. A street connecting Benbrook Boulevard to Vista Way between Mercedes Street and Sproles Drive, in accordance with the Subdivision Ordinance, is not shown on the plat, nor is a waiver proposed. On Lot 1, Block 4, the plat does indicate a 30-foot Mutual Access area connecting Benbrook Boulevard to Vista Way as an apparent alternate means of addressing the Subdivision Ordinance. Although the mutual access drive is not a public street and leaves an approximately 1,675-foot block on Vista Way and an approximately 1,925-foot block on Benbrook Boulevard, the Staff does not have a great objection to the proposal, provided the pavement is a minimum 30-foot width face-to-face, the pavement design meets street and fire lane standards, and is approved by the City Engineer, standard four-foot sidewalks are included on both sides of the drive, the drive and sidewalks are located in the standard arrangement in a 50-foot wide easement, and the entire access facility is installed with initial construction on Lot 1. The access facilities in the 50-foot easement should be maintained in good repair by the owner of Lot 1, Block 4. If Lot 1 is subdivided in the future, a Property Owners Association should be established for the maintenance of the access facilities. The instrument establishing the association should be approved by the City Attorney and recorded with the plat.

Mr. Wilde said the 30-foot access easement is to serve vehicular traffic to the WalMart site and connect Vista Way and Benbrook Boulevard. He said they are having issues with Staff's request because they cannot physically get pedestrian access on both sides of the road due to the narrowness of the lot as it gets closer to Benbrook Boulevard. They will provide the 30-foot pavement and the pedestrian access from Vista Way to Benbrook Boulevard but it will not be within the mutual access easement.

Staff Comment 11:

The plat does not indicate any provision for parkland dedication in accordance with Section 16.04.045 of the Subdivision Ordinance. Lot 1, Block 4, zoned for multi-family use appears to include approximately nine acres, net of 100-year floodplain for density calculations. With the proposed split zoning allowing multi-family uses on Lots 5, 6, and 7 of Block 2, and Lot 2 of Block 4, approximately five and one half acres could be used to calculate residential density if the multi-family option is exercised on each of the four split zoned lots. Approximately 2.25 acres to 3.62 acres of parkland, meeting ordinance qualification requirements, should be dedicated with the final plat.

Mr. Wilde said it is their intent to dedicate parkland but at this time they do not know how much they will have to dedicate due to various issues with the "PD" zoning request. He said they do not know if they will have to dedicate parkland for the parcels with "D/HC-PD" split zoning. Also, they are not sure how many units they will build between Vista Way and Walnut Creek. Mr. Wilde said they will add a note to the plat that states they will dedicate parkland per the Subdivision Ordinance at the time they know how much they have to dedicate.

Staff Comment 12:

The street section provided with the Preliminary Street Plan, reviewed by the City Engineer, indicates a standard 40-foot street with standard sidewalk for Vista Way and Benbrook Field Drive. No curb and gutter and sidewalk is indicated along the Loop 820 frontage of the plat area and the portion of the Benbrook Boulevard frontage of the plat area south of Mercedes Street, and where sidewalks are nonexistent north of Mercedes Street. Standard curb and gutter and standard sidewalk should be included along the Loop 820 frontage of the development and along the Benbrook Boulevard frontage south of Mercedes Street. Sidewalk should be installed along the Benbrook Boulevard frontage north of Mercedes Street where none exists.

Mr. Wilde said the developers are going to build sidewalks along the new Benbrook Field Drive and along Vista Way and complete the fragmented sidewalk along Benbrook Boulevard and the north and south side of Mercedes Street. He said that currently along the Loop 820 frontage road, water sheet flows off the road into an adjacent swale or drainage ditch. Staff's comment is to require the developer to build curb and gutter and sidewalk along the frontage road. Mr. Wilde said their intention was never to build curb and gutter along the frontage road but they will provide pedestrian access along the frontage road within the limits of their project. He said until the final engineering plans are complete, they will not know for sure if they will be able to provide the pedestrian access in the TXDOT right-of-way or if it will have to be on private property adjacent to the right-of-way. He said they do not want to build curb and gutter but maintain the existing drainage situation and let the water continue to flow into the ditch adjacent to the road.

Staff Comment 13:

A Tree Survey of existing trees was submitted but did not include a mitigation plan for replacement of trees that are proposed to be removed. Tree mitigation provisions should be in accordance with the "PD" Zoning Ordinance provisions of the Z-07-03 rezoning application. Tree mitigation provisions should be separate from landscape and buffer yard provisions of the "PD" Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Wilde said it is their intention to provide a tree mitigation plan and they will add a note to the plat stating they will provide it prior to the final plat, in accordance with the provisions of the "PD" zoning ordinance.

Staff Comment 14:

The Z-07-03 Planned Development zoning application included provisions for off-site signs, shared signs for businesses within the development, an entry tower identifier, development identifiers, and off-premise builder signs. In standard situations, signs are located on-site and in accordance with the Zoning Ordinance and are typically not a subdivision consideration. With the sign provisions as presented with the Planned Development zoning application, the plat should clearly designate the specific areas to be occupied by all off-site signs and common development identifiers. A property owners association should be established to address ownership, maintenance, liability, insurance, utility provisions and all other similar considerations and responsibilities associated with the off-site shared signs and development identifiers and the sites occupied by the structures. The instrument establishing the property owners association and addressing various rules and obligations should be approved by the City Attorney and recorded concurrent with the final plat.

Mr. Wilde said they will add a note to the preliminary plat, stating they will show the signs on the final plat, prior to the filing of the final plat.

Staff Comment 17:

The plat proposes the introduction of a new street, Benbrook Field Drive, connecting to Benbrook Boulevard/U.S. Highway 377, with a signalized intersection. The proposed street and signalization, described as "Driveway 2" in the "Traffic Study Along US 377", are supported by the traffic study in the Final Recommendations (4.3) of the report in the second of the three recommendations presented. The first recommendation in Section 4.3 of the report, recommends additional capacity in US 377 by additional lanes in both directions from Sproles Drive to IH 20 to support the proposed Home Depot and WalMart developments, Benbrook Field. The third recommendation in the Traffic Study is the addition of right-turn and deceleration lanes on southbound US 377 at Mercedes Street, Sproles Drive, proposed Benbrook Field Drive, the existing "shared" driveways at the Jack In The Box, CVS Drug, and Quik Lube sites. Although the report presents three recommendations for descriptive purposes, the recommendations described are a single recommendation that collectively address improvements to the roadways associated with the Home Depot and WalMart developments, to accommodate the additional traffic from the developments, and to have minimal impacts on existing traffic on US 377. The highway, including access control of public streets and private driveways, is the jurisdiction of the Texas Department of Transportation (TXDOT) and requires TXDOT approval and concurrence with any City approval. TXDOT is reviewing the preliminary plat submittal, including the traffic study information.

Mr. Wilde said there are various engineers currently working on road expansions, signals, and any improvements that need to take place in order for this development to occur. He said they know there are improvements that will need to take place although they are not crystal clear. As they move forward, they will continue to work with the other engineers and the City to make this happen but at this time they are not 100 percent certain what exactly it is going to take to get all these improvements done but they are working on it.

Staff Comment 18:

The preliminary plat does not indicate phasing of final plats and development. As presented, all final plats and associated infrastructure are expected to occur in a single phase.

Mr. Wilde said there are three separate projects on three separate schedules. The three areas are the area to the south of the WalMart tract, the area to the south of Mercedes Street, and the big tract with Home Depot and various other tenants. He said it is their intent to do the big tract in a single phase but the only issue is a flood study will be required for Walnut Creek because the

extension of Vista Way will come very close to the creek. He said they will have to go through several steps in order to build the road and get it permitted correctly. Unfortunately, the process takes time because they have to submit their flood study to the Corps of Engineers and delineate the stream and this could take months. Mr. Wilde said they have not been able to submit the flood study until they got the road designed and they are just now coming to completion on the road design. They do not want the development of the big tract project to be held up, so what they are going to do is build as much of the Vista Way extension as they can without having the flood study so they can get major tenants in before they have to build the entire section. This will speed up the process, get the tenants in faster, and meet everybody's schedule. The break point will be the intersection of Benbrook Field Drive and Vista Way.

Mr. Wilde said the portion of the Vista Way extension that is south of the Benbrook Field Drive and Vista Way intersection is the portion that will be affected by the CLOMR or flood study. At this time, he can not tell the Commission when that will be, dependent on the complexity of the flood study. Again, their intention is to do this in a single phase, although a portion of Vista Way may be delayed due to that flood study.

Mr. Wilde said they will comply with the City Engineer comments.

Fire Department Comment 2:

The "Benbrook" Field Drive street name shown to intersect with "Benbrook" Boulevard is a potential confusing circumstance for receiving calls, dispatching, and other elements in emergency response situations. It is suggested that an alternate street name with less confusing potential be used.

Mr. Wilde said they feel the name of the new street needs to be Benbrook Field Drive and if there is a fire, there will be major tenants that their names will be called out to identify the locations. He does not know that for certain, but he just wanted to state that they want to keep the name Benbrook Field Drive if they can. The Police Department did not have a problem with the name.

The Vice Chair asked for any comments or questions from the Commission.

Sanjiv Shah asked Mr. Wilde how they intend to provide the pedestrian walkway on both sides of the mutual access road, outside of the 30-foot easement (Staff Comment 10). Mr. Wilde said to clarify; they are not going to provide pedestrian access on both sides of the street due to the physical constraints of the site. They will provide pedestrian access on the south side only and it may meander and come closer to the buildings and not be a straight line sidewalk because of the parking spaces and parking islands. They do not know exactly how the site will lay out but they will make sure there is pedestrian access from Benbrook Boulevard to Vista Way but it will only be on one side of the easement.

Mr. Shah asked if the pedestrian access sidewalk from Benbrook Boulevard to Vista Way will be in a public right-of-way easement or on private property. If it is on private property, pedestrians could be cited for trespassing. Mr. Wilde said the mutual access easement and agreement will be maintained and owned by the property owners. He said each property owner will have a percentage of ownership of that mutual access easement and part of that will be to make sure they maintain a pedestrian access through their property. Mr. Wilde said they will not dedicate an easement for that access; it will just be part of the agreement that is made at the time of the sale of the individual properties.

Mr. Shah said basically, pedestrians will be trespassing. Mr. Wilde said the area is zoned "HC" and they are not sure what it will be used as, but it will not be any different than what you would

see in an office park or strip mall with sidewalks. This is commercial property and most commercial property has access from site to site.

Dian Price asked Mr. Wilde who will maintain the right-of-way on Benbrook Boulevard if they are not going to dedicate sufficient area to accomplish all recommendations in the accompanying "Traffic Study Along US 377" traffic impact analysis report. Mr. Wilde said it is not that they are not going to do anything until the expansion of Benbrook Boulevard. What they are saying is they do not want to dedicate any right-of-way that is not needed. As they progress with the plans for Home Depot and Benbrook Field Drive, and if they are required to put in a right hand turn lane, they will dedicate right-of-way at that time. He said they just want to wait to see where it is needed, how much is needed, and how it effects property owners that the right-of-way is actually on.

Mr. Shah said, in reference to Staff Comment 11, Mr. Wilde said they do not know how many multi-family units may be built, so they do not know how much parkland dedication would be required. Mr. Wilde said they are adding a note to the preliminary plat stating they will dedicate as much parkland dedication that is required per the current ordinance, prior to final platting.

The Vice Chair asked for a report from City Staff.

Ed Gallagher said the Benbrook Field preliminary plat includes 65 acres in three separate tracts on the west side of Benbrook Boulevard. Owners of the property are the Benbrook Economic Development Corporation and Richpenn Resources. Zoning on each of the three tracts is pending City Council approval July 19 of the Z – 07 – 03 Planned Development on the Commission's agenda last month.

Mr. Gallagher said the largest tract is 54.8 acres north of Mercedes Street between Benbrook Boulevard and Walnut Creek. The plat shows Vista Way extending through the tract to the Loop 820 frontage road and Benbrook Field Drive connecting Benbrook Boulevard with the Vista Way extension shown on the plat. He said most of the area between Benbrook Boulevard and the Vista Way extension is scheduled for "HC-PD" zoning and most of the area between Vista Way and Walnut Creek is scheduled for "D-PD" zoning. Two small areas at either end of the Vista Way extension are proposed as "D/HC-PD" zoning.

The smallest tract, 2.4 acres is at the southwest corner of Benbrook Boulevard and Mercedes and is scheduled as "HC-PD" zoning. The south tract is 8.65 acres with frontage on both Benbrook Boulevard and Vista Way, south of the proposed WalMart site and is also scheduled for "HC-PD" zoning.

Mr. Gallagher said the preliminary plat is generally complete and conforms to the Comprehensive Plan as it is proposed to be amended. A 20-foot right-of-way dedication is shown along Benbrook Boulevard for future expansion of the highway and TXDOT requirements. The right-of-way dedication should include area to accommodate the improvements recommended in the Traffic Study that was also submitted and the enhanced treatments in the Benbrook Boulevard Master Plan.

Building lines along Vista Way on Lots 1 and 2 of Block 1 should be 50 feet along with the Benbrook Field Drive frontage of Lot 1, Block 2 and the Mercedes Street frontage of Lot 4, Block 2. Mr. Gallagher said a 50-foot building line should be shown on the Mercedes Street frontage of Lots 5 and 6, and the Vista Way frontage of Lot 7, Block 2, with the recommended "HC-PD" zoning. If split zoning is approved, the building lines shown on the three lots are satisfactory for multi-family construction. If commercial construction occurs on those lots, a 50-foot setback will be required.

Mr. Gallagher said a landlocked lot and a small odd-configured lot are shown adjacent to the Jack in the Box property. It is staff's understanding that the developer is working on a land swap with the adjacent restaurant property. Any resulting swap should include platting of all of the resulting property and without a landlocked lot and with a 25-foot setback along Benbrook Field Drive.

Easements may need vacation on the existing platted property and other areas. Lots in Block 3 should observe a 25-foot second front yard building line or a 50-foot front building line along Mercedes Street and the Ruthardt Addition area should be deleted from plat consideration without that owner's permission. Necessary drainage and utility easements should be part of final platting and the four-foot wide panhandle portion of Lot 1, Block 4 should be eliminated with final platting.

Mr. Gallagher said a Mutual Access area is shown on Lot 1, Block 4 connecting Benbrook Boulevard to Vista Way as an apparent alternate to conformance with the Subdivision Ordinance maximum 1,600-foot block length. The Mutual Access drive is not a public street and leaves 1,675- and 1,925-foot block lengths on Vista Way and Benbrook Boulevard respectively. The Staff has no great objection to the ordinance deviation if the connection includes a 30-foot pavement section and sidewalks in a minimum 50-foot easement, the facilities in the easement are maintained by Block 4 owners, and the entire connection should be constructed with building construction on Block 4.

No provisions are shown on the plat for conformance with the parkland dedication requirements of the Subdivision Ordinance. The amount of dedication will depend on the outcome of the proposed split zoning and actual construction in those areas. However, approximately 3.62 acres meeting ordinance qualifications should be dedicated with the final plat.

Standard curb and gutter and sidewalks should be installed along the Loop 820 frontage with final platting and the Benbrook Boulevard frontage south of Mercedes Street, and sidewalks should be installed north of Mercedes Street where none exists. Interior walkways should be installed with construction on each lot.

Mr. Gallagher said tree mitigation should conform with provisions of the "PD" zoning application pending City Council approval and should be separate and in addition to landscape and bufferyard provisions of the "PD" zoning.

Signs are not normally a plat consideration however, the "PD" zoning for the Benbrook Field development calls for several off-site advertising signs and development identifiers. Specific areas for the off-site signs and identifiers should be included in final platting along with a property owners association, established to address ownership, maintenance, liability, insurance, utility provisions and all other similar considerations and responsibilities associated with the off-site shared signs and identifiers and the sites occupied by the structures. An instrument establishing the association and its rules and obligations should be approved by the City Attorney and recorded with the final plat.

Mr. Gallagher said recommendations of the "Traffic Study Along US 377" regarding improvements and access control to accommodate the development should be required as part of the final plat along with any requirements of the Texas Department of Transportation. Final platting, including associated infrastructure, should be built in a single phase and in accordance with final plat standards of the Subdivision Ordinance.

Mr. Gallagher said the City Engineer reports that a minimum centerline radius of 300 feet is required on Vista Way, a CLOMR is required for Vista Way, and several other items that Mr. Wilde addressed.

Considerations and requirement from Texas Department of Transportation regarding traffic impact, access, and signalization, and associated matters with the development are pertinent. However, review comments have not been received from TXDOT.

The Fire Department has no objection to the mutual access crossing Block 4 as an alternate to a street, provided it is 30 feet wide, meets fire lane standards and is marked as such, and is maintained by the property owner. The Fire Department also suggests an alternate name to proposed Benbrook Field Drive to avoid potential confusion with Benbrook Boulevard with calls, dispatching, and other matters with emergency responses. The Police Department has no objection to the Benbrook Field Drive street name and the mutual access crossing Block 4 in lieu of a street provided it is marked as a fire lane with no parking and has a center stripe.

The Benbrook Water Authority notes that a Developer/Authority Agreement is necessary and Authority Standard Specifications must be followed. Oncor Electric may require additional easement area to accommodate its facilities.

Mr. Gallagher said a waiver for nonconformance with the Subdivision Ordinance (16.28.030, A, Z) regarding maximum 1,600-foot block lengths should be specifically approved in conjunction with plat approval. Staff does not object to the waiver provided the mutual access on Block 4 is improved with a 30-foot pavement approved by the City Engineer, sidewalks are included on both sides of the drive pavement in a 50-foot access easement, the drive is completed with initial construction on Lot 1, Block 4, and the property owner be responsible for maintenance.

The Staff recommends approval of the preliminary plat of Benbrook Field Addition, (P – 07 – 02) subject to:

1. right-of-way dedication and installation of improvements in accordance with all the “Traffic Study Along US 377” recommendations and all TXDOT requirements,
2. building lines to conform with “HC” District Height and Area Regulations except as may be altered by the Planned Development zoning,
3. no landlocked lots, the disposition of the panhandle area on Lot 1, Block 4,
4. parkland dedication in accordance with provisions of the Subdivision Ordinance,
5. curb and gutter and sidewalks along Loop 820 frontage and curb and gutter and sidewalks along Benbrook Boulevard where none exists,
6. the designation of specific areas on final plat for all shared off-site signs and development identifiers, a property owners association responsible for all operation, maintenance and other considerations regarding the signs and identifiers with the establishment of the association, its responsibilities and obligations approved by the City Attorney and recorded with the final plat,
7. the prohibition of vehicular access to Benbrook Boulevard from Block 3, and the limitation of access from Blocks 2 and 4 to the mutual access points shown on the plat, and
8. conformance with all Engineering requirements, all TXDOT requirements, all public safety, BWA, and utility requirements, and all final plat requirements of the Subdivision Ordinance.

The Vice Chair asked for any comments or questions from the Commission.

Ms. Price asked why the applicants do not wish to comply with Staff recommendation Number 1, right-of-way dedication and installation of improvements in accordance with all the "Traffic Study Along US 377" recommendations and all TXDOT requirements. Mr. Gallagher said the Benbrook Boulevard Master Plan calls for three lanes in each direction and medians. The Traffic Study is addressing the impact of this project on the roadway and recommendations to maintain similar acceptable level of service as the road exists, which would require deceleration lanes and improved level service capability. Mr. Wilde said the right-of-way dedication would be dedicated in the future, but if something is platted and property is conveyed to a new owner, Mr. Gallagher said he is not sure how the obligation that is accepted by the developer, is passed on to a future owner and how it would work from a legal standpoint.

Mr. Shah asked if Staff's recommendation is to require the right-of-way be dedicated according to the Benbrook Boulevard Master Plan as it currently exists, versus the developer wanting to dedicate right-of-way per Benbrook regulations and as Benbrook Boulevard is today. Mr. Gallagher said the recommendation includes the 20-foot right-of-way dedication that has been part of the City platting requirements for quite a number of years for future expansion of Benbrook Boulevard. He said the Traffic Study, submitted by the applicants, addresses the impacts of this project on Benbrook Boulevard and has been submitted to TXDOT. Mr. Gallagher said the dedications and installation of improvements will be a conclusion by TXDOT, the three recommendations stated in the Traffic Study, the City Engineer, and the Traffic Engineer.

Mr. Shah said nobody knows today what the intersections will look like, but the City wants to set a right-of-way, based on some future configuration. Mr. Gallagher said that is correct and a 20-foot right-of-way is a very good estimate.

Joe Hughes asked how much benefit there is in installing curb and gutter along the Loop 820 frontage road as recommended, rather than leaving it with the existing drainage ditch. Mr. Gallagher said it has been a policy of the City of Benbrook for a number of years. He said for approximately the last 15 years, all projects adjacent to Loop 820/ 20 frontage roads and the projects on Highway 183/Southwest Boulevard, have all been required to install curb and gutter. Mr. Hughes said he is concerned with creating a drainage problem. Mr. Gallagher said he does not think curb and gutter would be creating a problem but it would need to be correctly engineered.

Mr. Shah said the Staff is recommending the mutual access on Block 4, Lot 1, from Benbrook Boulevard to Vista Way, should be a 50-foot wide easement with 30-foot pavement and sidewalks on both sides. The applicant had said they would build a 30-foot wide street, with pedestrian access on the south side of the street that may meander and come closer to the buildings and not be a straight line sidewalk because of the parking spaces and parking islands. Mr. Wilde also said the pedestrian access would not be in an easement. Mr. Shah asked if it would be acceptable for the developer to have pedestrian access on only one side of the street. Mr. Gallagher said, although the mutual access was not presented as a waiver for non conformance with the Subdivision Ordinance regarding maximum 1,600-foot block lengths, it was presumably presented as a substitute for a street which would normally have sidewalks on both sides. Mr. Gallagher said the access could be provided with sidewalks on only one side, but it should be embraced with an easement. Access is for vehicles as well as pedestrians.

Mr. Wilde said, typically they would only be required to build a 24-foot-wide fire lane for a drive like they are proposing. He said they are going to go ahead and build a 30-foot street with the

required curb and six-inch pavement depth and will look just like a public street. Mr. Wilde said the reason they do not want to widen the easement for pedestrian access, is because if they have a sidewalk adjacent to the road, they would not be able to run the sidewalk through the parking. They want the ability to maneuver in and out of the buildings as they go up to Vista Way and that's why they want the access easement just to encompass the street.

Dr. Marshall asked Mr. Wilde if the sidewalk would be part of the storefront and pedestrians or children riding a bicycle would have to walk in front of the store to go from Benbrook Boulevard to Vista Way. Mr. Wilde said in order to develop the narrow lot, there is a high possibility that the access may be in the very front of that building. He said they will do what they can to maintain access and they may have to make it a little wider in front of the storefronts in order to accommodate people to pass by each other, but at this time he can not say exactly what it will look like. Dr. Marshall said for people going from a residential area, up to the stores, he thinks it would be dangerous for a pedestrian walking out of a store, as opposed to a sidewalk adjacent to a thoroughfare. Mr. Wilde said when they are site planning the property they will do their best to maintain a safe pedestrian access point.

Mr. Shah asked Mr. Gallagher if the mutual access is an easement among the property owners, would it have setback requirements on the private street or just on Benbrook Boulevard. Mr. Gallagher said the only setback requirements would be on Benbrook Boulevard. The Staff's recommendation regarding the facilities for the vehicular and pedestrian access and the physical features are based on and coupled with the Staff's support of the necessary waiver regarding the block lengths as an alternate to a street.

Vice Chair Marshall opened the public hearing at 8:30 p.m. and asked if anyone wished to speak for or against the item.

Bryan Bonner said he is the operations manager of Russell Feed and Supply at 8704 Benbrook Boulevard. Mr. Bonner said the owner, Kenny Russell, asked him to read the following letter to the Commission.

"After reviewing the preliminary plat of Benbrook Field Addition as submitted to the city by the Benbrook Economic Development Corporation, we would like for Commission to be aware of the following:

Russell Feed & Supply property is located in block 3 of your preliminary plat and is noted as "future ownership".

We have had only preliminary talks with investor groups. They have mentioned wanting to relocate Russell Feed & Supply. We are not opposed to relocating if we can find another location in Benbrook. However, as I have stated, only preliminary talks have taken place.

Our feed business has been in the city of Benbrook for more than 20 years and wish to continue doing business long into the future here. Sincerely, Kenny Russell, Owner"

Tom Eudaly with Richpenn Resources, said the Russell property was on some long term platting things, and since they did know they were going to be receiving the property from WalMart back where they had the Murphy Gas, it inadvertently got stuck in some long term planning with Dunaway Associate. Not realizing it had been turned in as a preliminary plat request, Mr. Eudaly called Kenny Russell and let him know it would be taken off the plat.

Mr. Eudaly said the mutual access easement area is a site that he and Mr. Russell have discussed as a possible relocation site. It was never their intention to specifically make the

access point necessarily just for a waiver. Because of the narrowness of the tract, and the desired use they have for the property, it would be a great hardship on the tract, particularly in regards to a relocation or a business that has looked at the site. He said they would have submitted it out of the "PD" and everything if they thought it would cause a planning problem on the specific site. Mr. Eudaly said the site was acquired for a lot of money and they could have turned around and sold it individually to a user for a lot of money, but they kept it available as part of the EDC's and Richpenn's desire to clean up Benbrook Boulevard and re-image the street. This was part of a four year plan and they will do all that they can from a pedestrian standpoint, as will anyone they locate there, they will lay the plans out in accord with that.

Ron Hoffman, owner of McDonald's Restaurant in Benbrook for 24 years, said he is one of the founding members of the Benbrook Chamber of Commerce and the Benbrook Economic Development Corporation and is extremely pleased to see what the EDC and everybody is doing to really develop Benbrook. He said the Hulen and Bryant-Irvin corridors in Fort Worth have filled up and everything is coming this way.

Mr. Hoffman said his property has a 35-foot surface easement that drains the property behind the McDonald's and he is curious to see where all that water is going to go since he has not seen a drainage plan. He said they fully intend to rebuild their facility as soon as they get all the drainage issues worked out, making a major investment in tearing down the existing building and building a state of the art facility. With all the new setbacks that are coming in, they can work it out but they will have to go onto the existing surface drainage easement. Mr. Hoffman said he has been assured there is a drainage plan but he just wants to go on record that it is a big concern of his.

Chris Wilde said they have done a preliminary drainage plan for the entire development and they have walked the site. He said the runoff from the Home Depot and two retail anchors currently runs through the field, onto the parking lot, into the 35-foot surface easement, and into a three-foot by three-foot grate inlet that currently sits in the right-of-way. Mr. Wilde said their plan is to capture and divert the water that goes onto the McDonald's property, and put it into an underground storm drain system in Benbrook Field Drive. He thinks that when Mr. Hoffman gets ready to rebuild, he would be able to replat to abandon the existing easement and it will not be a problem for him anymore.

Ms. Price said Mr. Wilde had mentioned an urgency to move forward to get the project going and asked if any of the Staff recommendations going to hold up anything, or any recommendations that would be time consuming. Mr. Wilde said no, they have done their best to address Staff's comments and he does not see them delaying the project at all.

Mr. Gattis said he identifies five areas that are in contention under the Staff's comments and recommendations.

1. *"right-of-way dedication and installation of improvements in accordance with all the "Traffic Study Along US 377" recommendations and all TXDOT requirements,"*

Mr. Gattis said 20-foot gets the extra lane and the additional median width. It does not get the enhanced intersections that are part of the Master Plan and it does not get the right-hand turn lanes that the applicant's traffic consultant recommended. Staff is asking that at the time they final plat the lots, the best available data is used to get that right-of-way. He said once the property is platted, the City taxpayers would have to buy the right-of-way because you cannot require the dedication, once it is platted. You get it at the time of platting, or you buy it later.

2. *“parkland dedication in accordance with provisions of the Subdivision Ordinance,”*

Mr. Gattis said one of the issues with the “PD” zoning was the split zoned properties. Once the property is platted, the City has no way of requiring the parkland dedication. There are three different tracts that could be multi-family, so does the City wait for them to come in for a building permit, because once they are platted, they could go commercial or multi-family. The original concept was for the developers to do a linear park and he is hearing that the linear park is going away because they are unwilling to dedicate the parkland along Walnut creek.

3. *“curb and gutter and sidewalks along Loop 820 frontage and curb and gutter and sidewalks along Benbrook Boulevard where none exists,”*

Mr. Gattis said if the City does not require curb and gutter with this project, how will the City require it with the Town Center. It has been a standard policy when going from a rural section to an urban section and Benbrook is now an urban environment and we need to design to urban standards, not rural standards.

4. *“...A street connecting Benbrook Boulevard to Vista Way between Mercedes Street and Sproles Drive, in accordance with the Subdivision Ordinance, is not shown on the plat, nor is a waiver proposed. On Lot 1, Block 4, the plat does indicate a 30-foot Mutual Access area connecting Benbrook Boulevard to Vista Way as an apparent alternate means of addressing the Subdivision Ordinance. Although the mutual access drive is not a public street and leaves an approximately 1,675-foot block on Vista Way and an approximately 1,925-foot block on Benbrook Boulevard, the Staff does not have a great objection to the proposal, provided the pavement is a minimum 30-foot width face-to-face, the pavement design meets street and fire lane standards, and is approved by the City Engineer, standard four-foot sidewalks are included on both sides of the drive, the drive and sidewalks are located in the standard arrangement in a 50-foot wide easement, and the entire access facility is installed with initial construction on Lot 1....”*

Mr. Gattis said, in lieu of a normal public street, 30 feet is the minimum street the City would require, but if there is only a 30-foot wide street, there could be a building wall set right behind the curb because there are no building setback requirements that could be enforced. He said a compromise may be a 40-foot easement with a 30-foot street with a sidewalk going around the building but it has to be planned ahead so there are not future owners that would block off a pedestrian access.

5. Mr. Gattis said the final issue is phasing, which is something Staff has been concerned about but was never presented as part of the application. Phasing the three major tracts is not a big issue, but Staff’s concern is how they would split things up on the larger tract. Mr. Gattis said Staff could work with the developer on the Vista Way issue, whether that section gets built immediately or six to twelve months later when the CLOMR/LOMR gets approved, provided the developer had the financial assurance to do the whole thing at once. He said the City does not want everything around it to get platted and then the developer leave before finishing Vista Way.

Chris Wilde said there is at least one thing that will impact their schedule. The curb and gutter requirement along the IH 20/Loop 820 frontage would definitely impact the project because it is a substantial design effort. If they put curb and gutter in the street, the water would be channeled into the street. The road was originally designed to carry the water off the street quickly into the ditch and that is the way they anticipate it to stay.

Mr. Wilde said they have a statement on the face of the preliminary plat that states, "Future right-of-way will conform to the Texas Department of Transportation requirements". The issue is not that they do not want to dedicate the right-of-way, the issue is they do not know at this point how much to dedicate. Mr. Wilde said future right-of-way, that needs to be dedicated, per requirements by TXDOT, will be dedicated at the time it is required. Until that time, they are not going to say they will dedicate 30 feet, because they do not know if 30 feet is needed. Until they work out all the issues with the Master Plan and Traffic Study, they do not know how much they are going to have to dedicate.

Mr. Wilde said, at this time, they do not know exactly how much parkland dedication they are going to need to provide. As they move forward with the "PD" zoning, and as they move forward with the project and build a multi-family portion of the project, that portion will be required to dedicate a certain amount of parkland dedication, per the Ordinance. They are going to provide parkland per the Ordinance and a note will be added to the preliminary plat stating that.

Mr. Wilde said they only want to dedicate 30 feet for the street for the access easement. They do not know exactly how the pedestrian path will travel from Benbrook Boulevard to Vista Way and they do not want to put it in an easement because they do not want to be confined adjacent to the roadway. He said they want to be able to meander it as needed on an as needed basis.

Mr. Wilde said the phasing of the project is necessary because it is extremely difficult to estimate schedules as far as other government agencies that are reviewing their engineering. He said he does not think anyone wants to hold up any part of this project, especially with the flood work that will have to be done along the creek. It is a very lengthy process and they want to make it very clear that a portion of Vista Way could be delayed, due to that lengthy review process.

Ms. Price asked Mr. Wilde if the review process for Vista Way would take place while the Home Depot or WalMart were being built. Mr. Wilde said as soon as the road is designed, they are going to start submitting everything to the Army Corps and start getting it reviewed he just cannot speak on how long that process will take.

Joe Hughes asked if the 3.62-acre parkland dedication amount is a nominal figure or is there a plus or minus range. Mr. Wilde said it is an estimate and the problem is they have tracts that will be split zoned. One uncertainty is they can either be "HC" Commercial or "D" Multi-family, which would be required to dedicate parkland. The other uncertainty is how much parkland will be required on the lower side of Vista Way. Mr. Wilde said Mr. Gallagher did an estimate of how much parkland would be required and he thinks the estimate is pretty close.

Dr. Marshall asked if there were one phase of the preliminary plat that they wanted approved by the Commission or did they want all three phases approved. Mr. Wilde said they wanted all three phases to be approved.

Barry Hudson with Dunaway the parkland that has to be dedicated will be dependent on the CLOMR that has to be done because you only get half credit in the floodplain area. That could increase the required acreage if they are dedicating more linear parkland in the floodplain area so that could cause more fluctuation than the number of multi-family units. The intention is still to do the linear park and this preliminary plat is on the Benbrook Boulevard side of Walnut Creek and there will be more parkland dedicated on the other side with the single family housing that is not part of this preliminary plat. Mr. Hudson said it will be a significant linear park along Walnut Creek, as desired by the City.

Mr. Hudson said, in discussing the mutual access easement on the southern tract, he thinks it is a legitimate concern because there is no building setback from the easement. What they propose is a 10-foot building line setback from the edge of the easement so that would give an overall minimum of 50-foot. He said they are still proposing the meandering pedestrian path accommodated by the office layout or whatever happens there but they would be willing to do the 50-foot overall with the 30-foot easement and 10-foot building lines setbacks on either side.

Mr. Hudson said the concern about the frontage road on I 20/Loop 820, he understands Staff's concern about the entire frontage along I 20, particularly as you go back to the east. The section behind Albertson's is a fairly unique piece because it does drop off so severally down to Walnut Creek and the railroad so there are some very significant grades. He said you can see the amount of green space that they are showing between the existing pavement and the property line. That is a fairly significant drainage ditch, not a minor swale, and there are some velocity issues. The pedestrian access could be accommodated on the south side of the drainage ditch and he is not sure that this sets a precedent for the rest of the IH 20 frontage where the planned Town Center is to be located.

Jim Risky, owner of Risky's Barbeque, was concerned about who would be allowed to drive on the mutual access easement adjacent to his property. Mr. Shah said the street would be open to the general public.

Dr. Marshall asked who would maintain the mutual access easement if it is a private street. Mr. Gallagher said it is presented as one lot so that owner would be responsible. If that lot is subdivided, they would need to have a property owner's association to maintain the street.

Brad Bowen, with Richpenn Resources, said owner associations typically are utilized with residences and in this case where it is a commercial setting, they normally enter into an ACR agreement. It is a cross access easement agreement between parcels that includes the developers and the owners of all the parcels. He said the agreement governs cross access, access drives, cross parking, cross utilities, and all the various issues including the amount of parking, the height of buildings, and the architectural requirements, are all covered in the master document. The property lines will go to the center of the cross access drives and the owners will be required to maintain those drives, not the City. There will also be an agreement between the owners as to the cost sharing of the maintenance of the drives, cross access between parcels, sidewalk requirements to be built between parcels, and connections providing pedestrian access, not only from the outside through the parcels but between the parcels.

Ron Rainey, Executive Director of the Benbrook Economic Development Corporation, said he wanted to share some information with the Commission because he felt they needed all the information to make the right decision. He said they have heard numerous times areas referred to as the Home Depot tract and the WalMart tract and he wanted to assure the Commission those are under contract. They have not closed but they have high expectations that they will close. Mr. Rainey said what he really wanted to address is some of the confusion of the signalization of Benbrook Field Drive and the reason no one can say exactly what is going to happen there. He said the contract with Home Depot is conditioned with them getting a traffic signal at that entry. TXDOT has minimum requirements between signal lights of 1,000 feet. The total distance from the I 20 signal light to the Mercedes Street light is approximately 1,850 to 1,900 feet, under TxDOT's minimum requirements. Mr. Rainey said to say TxDOT is going to approve a light at Benbrook Field Drive and Benbrook Boulevard, and they need to dedicate the property for it, is a real big jump because at this point, they do not know that they will approve the light. He said the developers did the traffic impact analysis based on strong expectations that Home Depot and the other developments will occur, but he feels pretty confident that if they do not get the signal light,

they probably will not get Home Depot. Mr. Rainey said TXDOT is looking at the request and they have designed it expecting they will approve it, but until they approve it, they do not know how much of that right-of-way dedication is going to be required. If they do not get the signal, they do not have as large a development and there may not be as large a demand.

The Vice Chair closed the public hearing at 9:15 p.m. and asked if the Commission had any further comments, questions, or a motion.

John Dawson asked if the applicant had an objection to setting a minimum amount of acreage to be dedicated for parkland with the final plat. Brad Bowen said it is important to realize that this is a preliminary plat and not the time that dedication is done. Dedication is done at final platting and they are more than willing at the time of final plat to dedicate any and all that they are required to dedicate. Whether it is parkland, right-of-way, or whatever it is, they just do not want to state at the time of preliminary plat a set number that is not known. He said there are so many variables in the parkland calculation and one variable alone is if the property they dedicate in or out of the floodplain. They do not know at this time because they have not finished the CLOMR. If it is out of the floodplain, then they get full credit. If it is in the floodplain, they get half credit and that doubles the amount of acreage. In addition, the use of the split zoned lots, will determine the amount. He said if it is important for the Commission to have a set number of acreage for the parkland dedication, he does not see a problem with using calculations to determine that number.

Mr. Shah asked Staff if a number is necessary at the preliminary plat consideration for the parkland dedication acreage. Mr. Gattis said usually the developer knows how many dwelling units and acreage they are going to have and the parkland is shown on the preliminary plat. When they submit the final plat, adjustments can be made at that time. Mr. Gattis said in this case, their preliminary plat shows no parkland anywhere. Staff calculated the maximum number of dwelling units that could happen and that came out to 3.62 acres. From Staff's standpoint, if that needs to be adjusted at final plat, it will be adjusted. The split zoned lots could be final platted with the use still not determined. The City does not want to accept less than two acres in any one spot.

Mr. Shah asked if the Commission could require that the entire development be final platted at one time, whether it is developed in three phases or not, and set the required parkland acreage at 3.62, who is responsible to assure that number is correct. Mr. Gattis said parkland dedication is a requirement at final platting and if it has not been determined at final platting how many units are going to be built, then that number can be adjusted when the owner turns in a site plan for development of multi-family housing.

Discussion followed between Staff and the Commission on parkland dedication.

Chris Wilde said they will put a note on the preliminary plat that states, "at this time, approximately 3.62 acres of parkland meeting Ordinance qualification requirements must be dedicated with the final plat".

The Vice Chair asked for any further comments, questions, or a motion from the Commission.

Motion by Mr. Shah that the Commission approves Z – 07 – 02, preliminary plat of Benbrook Field, subject to:

1. Right-of-way dedication and installation of improvements in accordance with all the "Traffic Study Along US 377" recommendations and all TXDOT requirements,

2. Building lines to conform with "HC" District Height and Area Regulations except as may be altered by the Planned Development zoning,
3. No landlocked lots, the disposition of the panhandle area on Lot 1, Block 4,
4. Parkland dedication in accordance with provisions of the Subdivision Ordinance, (currently estimated at 3.62 acres, to be approved by Staff with the final plat)
5. Curb and gutter and sidewalks along Loop 820 frontage and curb and gutter and sidewalks along Benbrook Boulevard where none exists,
6. The designation of specific areas on final plat for all shared off-site signs and development identifiers, a property owners association responsible for all operation, maintenance and other considerations regarding the signs and identifiers with the establishment of the association, its responsibilities and obligations approved by the City Attorney and recorded with the final plat,
7. The prohibition of vehicular access to Benbrook Boulevard from Block 3, and the limitation of access from Blocks 2 and 4 to the mutual access points shown, and
8. Conformance with all Engineering requirements, all TXDOT requirements, all public safety, BWA, and utility requirements, and all final plat requirements of the Subdivision Ordinance, and
9. Approval of a waiver for the maximum block length, contingent on reconfiguration of the mutual access easement on Lot 1, Block 4, to be 40 feet wide, with 30-foot pavement width, and sidewalk on one side.

Second by Ms. Price. Following discussion on the motion, Vice Chair Marshall called the question.

Vote on the Motion:

Ayes: Mr. Valverde, Ms. Price, Mr. Dawson, Mr. Shah, Dr. Marshall, and Mr. Hughes

Noes: None

Motion carried 6 – 0

C. PD SITE PLANS

None

D. GENERAL

None

IV. PRESENTATIONS BY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS

None

V. CITIZENS PRESENTATIONS

None

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The Chair noted there were no additional matters of business on the regular Commission agenda and declared the Commission regular meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

APPROVED: _____ 2007

_____ Chair