

**CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
DECEMBER 14, 2021**

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Danielsen called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M.

2. **ROLL CALL**

Members Present: Bass, Danielsen, Opperman, Rater, Rew, Scott, Stroebele, and Van Houten  
Members Absent: Halm, Haner, and Hutcheson  
Vacancy: None  
Staff: Gibbons, Monrroy, Siracuse, Wade, and Weber

3. **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

Motion by Van Houten, second by Bass to adopt the agenda as presented by staff. Motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

4. **APPROVAL – MINUTES OF OCTOBER 12<sup>TH</sup> MEETING**

Motion by Scott, second by Stroebele to adopt the minutes as presented. Motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

5. **PROOF OF PUBLICATION** – Gibbons

6. **REVIEW OF MEETING PROCEDURES** – Danielsen

7. **PUBLIC HEARINGS** - *(Refer to the taped recording of these proceedings for official verbatim minutes)*

A. CASE #PC-21-004: Public hearing on the request of Woodsonia MOTB, LLC to adopt a planned commercial development plan for property legally described as Lot 1, Mall of the Bluffs, Replat 1. Location: 1751 Madison Avenue.

Monrroy provided an overview of the requests.

The following member of the public spoke in favor of the request:

Jeff Elliott, Woodsonia MOTB, LLC, 20010 Manderson St, Elkhorn, NE 68022, spoke as a representative of the applicant.

No one from the public spoke in opposition to the request.

Danielsen closed the public hearing.

Scott said this project would be nice and help traffic flow in the area. Gibbons provided clarifying details about the parking lot. Scott asked where traffic would come from to get to the site. Gibbons provided an explanation of the street plan for the site and its surroundings and mentioned the possibility for Hy-Vee to add a fuel station and convenience store on their parking lot.

Rew asked about sight lines related to street landscaping. Gibbons stated that the parking lot permit process will include a review of sight lines and landscaping. Gibbons also mentioned the location of pedestrian access. Rew raised concern about difficulty turning into and out of parking lot due to increased traffic in the area from redevelopment. Gibbons stated the drive aisle will be the standard 24 feet wide. Elliott stated that Menard Drive will be wider than typical and will have a center median.

Rew asked if truck traffic is expected for the three buildings to the right of Menard Drive (not included in the Woodsonia development plan). Gibbons stated it would depend on the future building occupants, which are unknown at this time but likely to be retail. Rew reiterates concern about truck traffic and said it is something to think about as the project moves forward.

Motion by Danielsen, second by Bass, to recommend approval of the request to adopt a planned commercial development plan for the property legally described as Lot 1, Mall of the Bluffs, Replat 1, as per Staff's recommendations.

VOTE: AYE – Bass, Danielsen, Opperman, Rater, Rew, Scott, Stroebele, and Van Houten. NAY – None. ABSTAIN – None. VACANT – None. ABSENT – Halm, Haner, and Hutcheson. Motion carried.

- B. CASE #SAV-21-006: Public hearing on the request of Scott Porter to vacate and dispose of 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue right-of-way located between South 34<sup>th</sup> and South 35<sup>th</sup> Streets and abutting property legally described as Lots 16 through 30, Block 19, Brown's Subdivision and Lots 1 through 15, Block 18, Brown's Subdivision, Council Bluffs, Pottawattamie County, Iowa. Location: Unimproved right-of-way abutting properties addressed as 3401 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 1115 South 35<sup>th</sup> Street, and 1207 South 35<sup>th</sup> Street.

Weber provided an overview of the request.

The following members of the public spoke in favor of the request:

Doug Rice (2940 Whitetail Drive, Logan, IA 51546) spoke as a representative of the applicant. Amy Vance (1115 S. 35<sup>th</sup> Street, Council Bluffs, IA 51501) spoke as one of the adjacent landowners who has agreed to purchase their portion of the vacated right of way.

No one spoke in opposition to the request.

Danielsen closed the public hearing.

Scott stated that the request seems straightforward and would make good use of the land.

Motion by Scott, second by Rew, to recommend approval of the request to vacate and dispose of 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue right-of-way located between South 34<sup>th</sup> and South 35<sup>th</sup> Streets and abutting property legally described as Lots 16 through 30, Block 19, Brown's Subdivision, and Lots 1 through 15, Block 18, Brown's Subdivision, Council Bluffs, Pottawattamie County, Iowa, as per Staff's recommendations.

VOTE: AYE – Bass, Danielsen, Opperman, Rater, Rew, Scott, Stroebele, and Van Houten. NAY – None. ABSTAIN – None. VACANT – None. ABSENT – Halm, Haner, and Hutcheson. Motion carried.

- C. CASE #ZT-21-005: Public Hearing on the request of C P Holdings, Inc., represented by Jason James, to amend Section 15.18.030 of the Council Bluffs Municipal Code (Zoning Ordinance) to allow 'Manufacturing, Light', as defined in Section 15.03.462, as a conditional use (subject to further limitations) in the P-C/Planned Commercial District.

Siracuse provided an overview of the request.

The following member of the public spoke in favor of the request:

John Jerkovich (535 W Broadway, Suite 100, Council Bluffs, IA 51503) spoke as a representative of the applicant.

Rew asked Jerkovich if the former Council Bluffs School district building (which is the reason for this request) at the Mall of the Bluffs site would be used for manufacturing transmissions or something else. Jerkovich stated that the facility will just be used to manufacture a component for torque converters, and the impact to the surrounding area would be minimal.

Stroebele stated that while he is in favor of the request, he has concerns about traffic related to the employees and trucks at the school district building if used for light manufacturing. Stroebele asked if the city has plans to control traffic flow and/or improve streets in the Mall of the Bluffs area. Danielsen reminded the commission that discussion about the request should occur after the public comment period and asked Stroebele to resume his discussion once the public hearing is closed. Danielsen continued the public hearing.

No one spoke in opposition to the request.

Danielsen closed the public hearing.

Stroebele continued his question about potential traffic and street improvements in the area surrounding the school district building that led to this request. Stroebele reiterated that traffic concerns will not sway his vote one way or another and that he supports the request. Gibbons stated that neither developers nor the city plan to improve Madison Avenue, Bennett Avenue, or Mall Drive at this time. Gibbons stated there is no need to upgrade streets in or around the Mall of the Bluffs site, as the existing streets previously handled shopping mall traffic without issue. Gibbons stated that the intent of this request is to pioneer a solution for reuse of vacant brick-and-mortar retail facilities and that the text amendment has the potential to promote the vitality of the City's shopping centers. Gibbons stated that because light manufacturing in P-C districts would be subject to a conditional use permit, traffic circulation would be part of the review for each site.

Jerkovich stated that retail uses would create more traffic than light manufacturing uses because retail facilities would have a similar number of employees in addition to customers, so traffic is not a concern. Rew asked a question to clarify traffic access, and Gibbons responded to clarify that the access road for the school district building is a private road.

Danielsen stated support for reusing vacant retail buildings and adding them back onto the tax rolls without adding high-volume traffic. Gibbons emphasized that the adaptive reuse requirement in the proposed text amendment would ensure light manufacturing operations only locate in existing buildings in P-C districts. Gibbons stated the City is still committed to our shopping centers and this text amendment and previous ones will help support them.

Rew asked if the Mall of the Bluffs site is larger than 50 acres. Gibbons stated the site is larger than 50 acres. Gibbons clarified that the 50-acre minimum in the proposed text amendment refers to an entire contiguous area zoned P-C, not an individual parcel of land zoned P-C.

Scott commended Jerkovich on his presentation and project related to the old school district building.

Scott stated he could foresee a future scenario in which someone wants to build a new building for light manufacturing in a P-C district and asked if limiting light manufacturing to adaptive reuse of existing buildings is the best option. Gibbons stated this limitation is the best option and said the City can consider changing the limitations in the future if the need arises.

Scott asked how staff determined the 50-acre minimum P-C district area for locating light manufacturing in a P-C district. Gibbons explained the reasoning for this limitation and how the acreage will be calculated to determine eligibility.

Motion by Bass, second by Stroebele, to recommend approval of the request to amend Section 15.18.030 of the Council Bluffs Municipal Code (Zoning Ordinance) to allow 'Manufacturing, Light', as defined in Section 15.03.462, as a conditional use (subject to further limitations) in the P-C/Planned Commercial District, as per Staff's recommendations.

VOTE: AYE – Bass, Danielsen, Opperman, Rater, Rew, Scott, Stroebele, and Van Houten. NAY – None. ABSTAIN – None. VACANT – None. ABSENT – Halm, Haner, and Hutcheson. Motion carried.

- D. CASE #ZT-21-006: Public hearing on the request of the City of Council Bluffs to amend Section 15.24.040, 'Fence Regulations', of the Council Bluffs Municipal Code (Zoning Ordinance) relative to permit requirements for fences, fence height and placements, underground electrical fences used for the purposes of containing household pets, fences required for swimming pools, and security fences.

Monrroy provided an overview of the request.

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

Danielsen closed the public hearing.

Bass asked how the City will make people aware of proposed changes to the fence code. Gibbons responded that information will be added to the City website and the City also has preliminary drafts of pamphlets and brochures. Gibbons stated that the proposed code updates have been in the making for a while due to multiple City departments concerns about persistent fence issues, and the departments agreed that requiring a permit for fences would be a good way to get in front of those issues before they arise. Gibbons stated that the update would provide more flexibility for privacy fences.

Rew asked if we know what other cities do regarding fence permit requirements and expressed concern about a fence permit being too much of a burden. Rew stated opposition to proposed permit requirement. Monrroy responded that several other Iowa communities have fence permit requirements. Monrroy used Cedar Rapids as an example. Gibbons stated that a fence permit would not be an arduous task and could be simple enough that approval could be granted the same day someone applies for a permit. Gibbons also stated that the permit fee would hopefully be minimal. Gibbons estimated that 40% of fences in the city may be nonconforming and that a simple permit requirement would be the best way to prevent fences from being constructed improperly.

Rew asked who would be responsible for determining correct property lines when applying for a fence permit. Gibbons responded that property line verification is the responsibility of the property owner. Gibbons stated that the purpose of the permit would be solely to verify compliance with the fence code. Danielsen said the permit process seems straightforward.

Stroebele asked if existing nonconforming fences would be grandfathered in. Gibbons stated they would be grandfathered in and that this is how the City currently handles fences, with enforcement typically approached from a maintenance standpoint. Gibbons reiterated support for permits as a way to make sure fences are constructed properly to begin with.

Scott asked what the biggest fence issues currently are in the City. Gibbons stated the biggest issues are fence height, board placement, and encroachment into sight triangles.

Scott asked Gibbons if he had a fence in his backyard. Gibbons responded no. Scott asked Gibbons if he had a cornfield in his backyard. Gibbons responded no. Scott asked why the code limits backyard privacy fences to six feet in height. Scott suggested some people may want a fence higher than six feet to create their own “oasis.” Scott suggested the City could raise the height limit to seven feet for residential privacy fences. Danielsen stated that people who want a more private oasis could choose to live outside City limits. Scott disagreed and asked again why the height limit is six feet. Gibbons responded that six feet is the existing standard in Council Bluffs and is a standard height limit in other communities across the country. Gibbons stated that the code does offer flexibility to approve taller fences on a case-by-case basis for extenuating circumstances. Scott reiterated support for being able to create an “oasis” on residential property. Gibbons stated that even if the City set a higher height limit, someone will always want a taller fence. Gibbons said that fence height limits can always be reevaluated, but six feet is a good general standard and is also ideal from a public safety and police standpoint.

Scott asked if outriggers count toward fence height. Gibbons said yes. Scott asked if this is a new requirement in the proposed text amendment. Monrroy stated that the updated language is not changing the existing requirement, just clarifying how fence height is measured. Scott asks again about outriggers, particularly in commercial and industrial districts. Gibbons reiterated that we are not changing existing standards for commercial districts.

Rew asked if the code states the ability to get approval for fences higher than the regular limit. Gibbons stated the code does allow this, but this type of request is very uncommon.

Stroebele asked how the City determines whether a fence is newly constructed or existing. Gibbons responded that it is usually clear when a fence is newly constructed because the appearance of new materials typically stands out. Gibbons stated that the County’s aerial imagery and Google Street View photography are also used. Gibbons reiterated that the intent of this text amendment is mostly to provide clarification on existing fence standards.

Scott asked whether staff had considered the impact of fence permit fees on property owners, particularly those with lower incomes. Gibbons responded that the fence permit fee should be minimal, ideally no more than 1% of the total cost of the fence, and this minimal fee should not make or break a fence project. Gibbons stated he would like the fee to be as low as possible, perhaps lower than \$30, but ultimately City Council has the authority to set fees. Scott reiterated that it may not be fair to impose a permit fee on everyone who wants to build a fence just because some people build nonconforming fences. Gibbons stated that the intent of the text amendment is not to place an undue burden on anyone but rather to clarify existing fence standards and even allow more flexibility in some instances. Gibbons stated the proposed permit requirement is intended as a way to prevent nonconforming fences from being constructed in the first place. Gibbons stated that a permit with a small fee will prevent people from having to spend significantly more money to fix nonconforming fences. Scott reiterated concern about adding a permit requirement for fences. Danielsen asked for examples of other things that require permits. Gibbons

mentioned several examples. Scott reiterated concern for the permit fee's potential burden on people with low incomes. Danielsen stated a permit with a small fee of \$30 or less is reasonable considering the total cost of building a fence and because permits are required for most other building projects.

Opperman asked if replacement of existing fences would require a permit. Gibbons said yes, because a replacement fence is considered a new fence.

Rew asked if it would be possible to approach fence issues more incrementally. Gibbons replied that the City has already tried incremental steps and many fence issues still arise, which is why the City is proposing this text amendment. Gibbons advised the commission that they have the ability to make a recommendation in favor of the clarified/modified fence standards but against the addition of a permit requirement.

Motion by Danielsen, second by Van Houten, to recommend approval of the request to amend Section 15.24.040, 'Fence Regulations', of the Council Bluffs Municipal Code (Zoning Ordinance) relative to permit requirements for fences, fence height and placements, underground electrical fences used for the purposes of containing household pets, fences required for swimming pools, and security fences, as per Staff's recommendations.

Scott asked about the possibility of allowing more types of fencing material, specifically regarding metal panels, suggesting that this material can be used for fences in creative and visually appealing ways. Gibbons asked if Scott wanted to amend the motion to recommend allowing metal panel fences in residential districts. Scott replied yes. Gibbons advised Scott to make a motion to amend the previous motion in that manner. Gibbons advised that metal panel fences are typically associated with industrial sites and that the commission should be cautious with a recommendation to allow metal panel fences in residential districts. Stroebele asked if it would be possible to allow metal panel fencing with specific approval from the City. Stroebele stated he does not think poor quality metal panel fences would be built in a residential area in Council Bluffs. Gibbons disagreed and said a recommendation to allow metal panel fencing should come with clarification on appearances. Van Houten agreed and expressed a desire to be careful in deciding whether to recommend allowing metal panel fencing.

Scott asked about allowing pre-cast panels. Stroebele said he understands what Scott is getting at, but the reality is that most fencing in the City is built with chain link or wood. Stroebele suggested allowing materials that cover the vast majority of fences that property owners want to build, and the City can always add material types in the future if strong desire is demonstrated.

Rew stated that he appreciates the conversation around Scott's concerns. Van Houten agreed.

Scott asked about the requirement that 10-foot tall fences in industrial districts be made of vinyl-coated chain link material. Monrroy stated that this is an existing requirement, and it is only highlighted in the draft text amendment because some of the wording was changed for clarification.

Danielsen mentioned the possibility of amending the recommendation to review the text amendment and revisit the case at the next City Planning Commission meeting. Gibbons said that, procedurally, the meeting needed to be pulled back to order. Gibbons advised that the board should vote on the motion made earlier and make amendments only if that motion fails.

Opperman asked if there is flexibility for the City to administratively allow fence materials not listed in the code. Gibbons replied that the flexibility is only for fence heights, not materials.

The commission voted on the original motion.

VOTE: AYE – Danielsen and Van Houten. NAY – Bass, Opperman, Rater, Rew, Scott, and Stroebele. ABSTAIN – None. VACANT – None. ABSENT – Halm, Haner, and Hutcheson. Motion failed.

Stroebele asked if there could be a provision to allow people to just get a permit if they want special approval for fence types not allowed by the code. Scott supported this idea.

Gibbons asked if the commission would like to recommend approval of the text amendment as written, except without the permit requirement. Gibbons stated he would not support allowing people to pay the City a fee to allow a nonconforming fence and needs more clarification from the commission. Scott expressed support for recommending no permit requirement. Stroebele disagreed.

Rew asked if there would be a penalty for building a fence without a proper permit. Gibbons said yes.

Motion by Bass, second by Stroebele, to recommend approval of the request to amend Section 15.24.040, 'Fence Regulations', of the Council Bluffs Municipal Code (Zoning Ordinance) relative to permit requirements for fences, fence height and placements, underground electrical fences used for the purposes of containing household pets, fences required for swimming pools, and security fences, as per Staff's recommendations and with the addition of flexibility for the Community Development Director to allow fence materials not listed in the code.

VOTE: AYE – Bass, Danielsen, Opperman, Rater, Stroebele, and Van Houten. NAY – Rew and Scott. ABSTAIN – None. VACANT – None. ABSENT – Halm, Haner, and Hutcheson. Motion carried.

- E. CASE #URV-21-011: Public hearing on the request of the City of Council Bluffs to create the 16th Avenue Urban Revitalization Area and to adopt the required plan for an area legally described as a parcel of land situated in the North Half (N1/2) of Section 2, Township 74 North, Range 44 West and the Southeast Quarter of the Southwest Quarter (SE1/4 SW1/4) of Section 35, Township 75 North, Range 44 West of the Fifth Principal Meridian, City of Council Bluffs, Pottawattamie County, State of Iowa, according to an official plat of said land filed in the District Land Office, bounded and described as follows: Beginning at a point on the North-South centerline of said Section 2, from which point the center of said section bears South, 264.98 feet; thence North 89 degrees 50 minutes 17 seconds East, 200.00 feet; thence North 00 degrees 00 minutes 17 sections East, 2150.79 feet to the south line of 16th Avenue; thence along said south line South 89 degrees 30 minutes 12 seconds West, 200.0 feet to a point on said North-South centerline of said Section 2; thence along said North-South centerline North 20.90 feet to the north quarter corner of said Section 2; thence along the North-South centerline of said Section 35, North 00 degrees 21 minutes 09 seconds West, 60.00 feet to a point on the north line of 16th Avenue, said point also being the southwest corner of Lot 12, Block 36, Fleming and Davis Addition; thence South 89 degrees 38 minutes 51 seconds West, 16.0 feet; thence North 00 degrees 21 minutes 09 seconds West, 646.37 feet to a point on the south line of 14th Avenue prolonged, said point being South 89 degrees 38 minutes 53 seconds West, 16.00 feet from the northwest corner of Lot 1, Block 29, Fleming and Davis Addition; thence South 89 degrees 38 minutes 53 seconds West, 379.00 feet; thence South 75 degrees 42 minutes 26 seconds West, 399.46 feet; thence South 82 degrees 12 minutes 26 seconds West, 126.58 feet; thence South 21 degrees 28 minutes 31 seconds East, 2490.70 feet to a point on the North-South centerline of

said Section 2; thence along said North-South centerline, South 441.28 feet to the Point of Beginning. Containing an area of 1,548,471 square feet, more or less, or 35.548 acres, more or less; **AND** A parcel of land legally described as being the East 16 feet of the South 686 feet, except the South 178 feet of the North 323 feet, all in the SE1/4 SW1/4 of Section 35-75-44, City of Council Bluffs, Pottawattamie County, Iowa. Said parcel of land contains an area of 8,276 square feet more or less, or .19 acres, more or less. Location: A tract of land located between South 16<sup>th</sup> Street and the Union Pacific railway, lying south of 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue and north of 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

Gibbons provided an overview of the request.

Scott asked if the URV designation applies to only the project mentioned or if it can apply to other surrounding properties. Gibbons replied that it only applies to the boundary shown on the map. Gibbons stated that properties outside the boundary can get URV designation by going through a separate process or amending the existing revitalization area. Scott asked for clarification on the application process. Gibbons provided clarification.

Rew asked about parking and access to the proposed cold storage facility. Gibbons explained the location of the building and its parking lot.

Rew stated this location would be good for a cold storage facility.

Scott asked if the cold storage facility would be able to utilize the nearby railroad tracks. Gibbons said yes.

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

Danielsen closed the public hearing.

Motion by Rew, second by Van Houten, to approve the request to create the 16th Avenue Urban Revitalization Area and to adopt the required plan for an area legally described as a parcel of land situated in the North Half (N1/2) of Section 2, Township 74 North, Range 44 West and the Southeast Quarter of the Southwest Quarter (SE1/4 SW1/4) of Section 35, Township 75 North, Range 44 West of the Fifth Principal Meridian, City of Council Bluffs, Pottawattamie County, State of Iowa, according to an official plat of said land filed in the District Land Office, bounded and described as follows: Beginning at a point on the North-South centerline of said Section 2, from which point the center of said section bears South, 264.98 feet; thence North 89 degrees 50 minutes 17 seconds East, 200.00 feet; thence North 00 degrees 00 minutes 17 sections East, 2150.79 feet to the south line of 16th Avenue; thence along said south line South 89 degrees 30 minutes 12 seconds West, 200.0 feet to a point on said North-South centerline of said Section 2; thence along said North-South centerline North 20.90 feet to the north quarter corner of said Section 2; thence along the North-South centerline of said Section 35, North 00 degrees 21 minutes 09 seconds West, 60.00 feet to a point on the north line of 16th Avenue, said point also being the southwest corner of Lot 12, Block 36, Fleming and Davis Addition; thence South 89 degrees 38 minutes 51 seconds West, 16.0 feet; thence North 00 degrees 21 minutes 09 seconds West, 646.37 feet to a point on the south line of 14th Avenue prolonged, said point being South 89 degrees 38 minutes 53 seconds West, 16.00 feet from the northwest corner of Lot 1, Block 29, Fleming and Davis Addition; thence South 89 degrees 38 minutes 53 seconds West, 379.00 feet; thence South 75 degrees 42 minutes 26 seconds West, 399.46 feet; thence South 82 degrees 12 minutes 26 seconds West, 126.58 feet; thence South 21 degrees 28 minutes 31 seconds East, 2490.70 feet to a point on the North-South centerline of said Section 2; thence along said

North-South centerline, South 441.28 feet to the Point of Beginning. Containing an area of 1,548,471 square feet, more or less, or 35.548 acres, more or less; **AND** A parcel of land legally described as being the East 16 feet of the South 686 feet, except the South 178 feet of the North 323 feet, all in the SE1/4 SW1/4 of Section 35-75-44, City of Council Bluffs, Pottawattamie County, Iowa. Said parcel of land contains an area of 8,276 square feet more or less, or .19 acres, more or less, as per Staff's recommendation.

VOTE: AYE – Bass, Danielsen, Opperman, Rater, Rew, Scott, Stroebele, and Van Houten. NAY – None. ABSTAIN – None. VACANT – None. ABSENT – Halm, Haner, and Hutcheson. Motion carried.

**8. OTHER BUSINESS** (*Refer to the taped recording of these proceedings for the official verbatim minutes*)

- A. Planned Residential (PR) Overlay and Infill Development Regulations Discussion - Gibbons provided a brief overview of the proposed text amendments regarding the planned residential overlay and infill housing regulations that were presented at the November 2021 City Planning Commission meeting. Gibbons asked if the commissioners had any feedback.

Scott asked if the amendments would apply to new construction. Gibbons said yes.

Gibbons stated that these text amendments will be brought to the commission for a vote at the January 2022 City Planning Commission meeting.

- B. City Council update: Wade provided an update of City Council actions relative to recent planning cases.

- C. Other items of interest:

Scott asked whether City staff would consider any of the concerns he raised regarding fences earlier in the meeting. Gibbons explained that the board has already made and approved a motion that did not recommend changing any fence standards. As such, staff will not change any fence standards. Scott reiterated concerns regarding fence standards. Scott asked if he could make a motion to recommend that staff review the fence text amendment and bring it back to the commission next month.

Wade advised the commission on the option of a motion to reconsider.

Motion by Scott, second by Rew, for a motion to reconsider CASE #ZT-21-006 and continue it to the January 2022 City Planning Commission meeting.

VOTE: AYE – Bass, Opperman, Rew, Scott, Stroebele, and Van Houten. NAY – Danielsen and Rater. ABSTAIN – None. VACANT – None. ABSENT – Halm, Haner, and Hutcheson. Motion carried.

**9. ADJOURNMENT** – Danielsen adjourned the meeting at 7:54 P.M.

*The recording of this proceeding, though not transcribed, is part of the record of each respective action of the City Planning Commission. The recording of this proceeding is incorporated into these official minutes of this Commission meeting as if they were transcribed herein.*