

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION Springfield, Missouri

The Planning and Zoning Commission met in regular session March 5, 2015, in City Council Chambers at Historic City Hall. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Tom Baird.

Roll Call: Present: Tom Baird (Chairman), Gabrielle White (Vice-chair), Jason Ray, Melissa Cox, Randall Doennig and Andrew Cline.
Absent: Matt Edwards, Phil Young and David Shuler.

Staff in attendance: Mary Lilly Smith, Director of Planning, Bob Hosmer, Principal Planner, Sarah Kerner, Assistant City Attorney, Matt Schaefer, Planning, Dawne Gardner, Public Works, Rodney Colson, Public Works, and Sandy Goddard, Administrative Assistant.

Minutes: None.

Communications : Mr. Hosmer requested to table Z-04-2015 w/Conditional Overlay District No. 85 and Preliminary Plat of Menards West. The applicant has requested the items be tabled to the April 9, 2015 Planning and Zoning meeting. Mr. Hosmer reviewed the summary of City Council's meetings.

The Consent Agenda items were approved as presented.

*Vacation 776
Commission*

Missouri Highways & Transportation

Mr. Hosmer stated the applicant is requesting the vacation of apportion of unused right-of-way in the 3800 block of South Glenstone Avenue outer road, a platted private road referred to as Glenstone Terrace. The street is no longer necessary with the new intersection improvements at Glenstone and Independence and the existing right-of-way serves no useful purpose to the public.

Mr. Baird opened the public hearing. As there were no speakers to the issue, the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Ray motioned to **approve** Vacation 776. Mr. Doennig **seconded** the motion. The motion **carried** as follows: Ayes: Baird, White, Ray, Cox, Doennig, and Cline. Nays: None. Abstain. None. Absent: Edwards, Shuler and Young.

*Vacation 777
Commission*

Missouri Highways & Transportation

Mr. Hosmer explained the purpose of this request is to vacate the remaining unused right-of-way of Luster Avenue between new Luster Avenue and Republic Road. The

street was removed as part of the new intersection improvements at Glenstone and Independence. A new street has been constructed in its place so the existing right-of-way serves no purpose to the public.

Mr. Baird opened the public hearing. As there were no speakers to the issue, the public hearing was closed.

Ms. Cox motioned to **approve** Vacation 777. Mr. Ray **seconded** the motion. The motion **carried** as follows: Ayes: Baird, White, Ray, Cox, Doennig, and Cline. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Edwards, Shuler and Young.

Z-04-2015 w/Conditional Overlay District No. 85
Patricia McCurry

Donald &

Mr. Ray motioned to **table** *Z-04-2015 w/Conditional Overlay District No. 85* and the *Preliminary Plat of Menards West* to April 9, 2015. Mr. Cline **seconded** the motion. The motion **carried** as follows: Ayes: Baird, White, Ray, Cox, Doennig, and Cline. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Edwards, Shuler and Young.

Z-11-2015 w/Conditional Overlay District No. 89
Southern Bank

Great

Mr. Hosmer stated this is a request to rezone approximately 0.46 acres of property generally located at 1858 and 1866 East Cairo Street from an R-TH, Residential Townhouse District to an HC, Highway Commercial District; and establishing Conditional Overlay District No. 89. The applicant is proposing to use the property for parking for the Great Southern Bank Operations Facility to the north and in the future for office uses. The Conditional Overlay District will limit the uses on the subject property to commercial off-street parking lots and the general office use group. The Conditional Overlay District will also require additional right-of-way to be dedicated for Cairo Street and construction of sidewalk along the property frontage of Cairo Street. Additional design requirements are sidewalks are required along the frontage of the subject property on Cairo Street. Cairo is classified as a local commercial which requires 30 feet of right of way from the centerline. An additional ten (10) feet of right-of-way shall be dedicated for Cairo Street. Dysart is classified as a local commercial which requires 30 feet of right of way from the centerline. An additional ten (7) seven feet of right-of-way shall be dedicated for Dysart Street and a 10 foot by 10 foot right of way sight triangle is required at the intersection of Cairo and Dysart.

Ms. Cox questioned the differences in stormwater services noting there is an option for a buyout on this request, but the next item does not have that option.

Mr. Colson said the way the contours run on the north property everything drains to the north and northwest, draining to the street. The south property would drain onto other people's property so there was no option given for a buyout.

Mr. Baird asked if there are existing sidewalks along Cairo but not on the street south of that, which would be Walnut. Mr. Baird asked if there are not sidewalks does the city require applicants to install sidewalks or is that a buyout situation.

Ms. Gardner stated that is correct. The sidewalks are a requirement of the zoning ordinance depending on the classification of the street and the zoning. There is an option to pay a fee in-lieu of but it has to meet the four criteria. If the applicant chooses to apply for the fee in lieu of they will have to meet the criteria and would then be approved by the Administrative Review Committee.

Mr. Baird opened the public hearing.

Mr. Tyler Peck, 1720 W. James River Road, Ozark, Missouri, commented he is representing Great Southern Bank.

Mr. Baird closed the public hearing.

Mr. Cline motioned to **approve** Z-11-2015 w/Conditional Overlay District No. 89. Ms. Cox **seconded** the motion. The motion **carried** as follows: Ayes: Baird, White, Ray, Cox, Doennig, and Cline. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Edwards, Shuler and Young.

Z-12-2015 w/Conditional Overlay District No. 90
Southern Bank

Great

Mr. Hosmer stated this is a request to rezone approximately 0.33 acres of property generally located at 1859 and 1863 East Walnut Street from an R-TH, Residential Townhouse District to an HC, Highway Commercial District; and establishing Conditional Overlay District No. 90. The applicant is proposing to use the property for parking for the Great Southern Bank Operations Facility to the north and in the future for office uses. The Conditional Overlay District will limit the uses on the subject property to commercial off-street parking lots and the general office use group. The Conditional Overlay District will also require additional right-of-way to be dedicated for Dysart Avenue and sidewalk construction along the property frontage of Walnut Street. Additional design guidelines are a sidewalk will be required to be constructed along the property frontage of Walnut Street. Dysart Avenue is classified as a local commercial which requires 30 feet of right of way from the centerline. An additional (5) five feet of right-of-way shall be dedicated for Dysart Avenue.

Mr. Baird opened the public hearing.

Mr. Tyler Peck, 1720 W. James River Road, Ozark, Missouri, commented he is representing Great Southern Bank.

Mr. Doennig motioned to **approve** Z-12-2015 w/Conditional Overlay District No. 90. Ms. Cox **seconded** the motion. The motion **carried** as follows: Ayes: Baird, White,

Ray, Cox, Doennig, and Cline. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Edwards, Shuler and Young.

*Z-13-2015 Live/Work Overlay District No. 1 (Moon City Creative District)
City of Springfield*

Mr. Hosmer explained this is a request to rezone approximately 24 acres of property generally located north of Chase Street, west of Washington Avenue, south of Atlantic Street and east of Broadway Avenue, to establish Live/Work Overlay District No. 1. On December 15, 2014, City Council adopted Resolution #10187 which accepted the Moon City Creative District Strategic Plan. Upon accepting the Plan, Council initiated the proposed Live/Work Overlay District rezoning, in addition to a proposed Planned Development District rezoning for commercial and industrial properties in the Moon City Creative District. Springfield Planning and Development Department staff assisted the neighborhood residents with drafting the strategic plan; the proposed Planned Development District; and the Live/Work Overlay District requirements included in the proposed rezoning amendment.

The Live/Work District is proposed for the area zoned R-SF, Single-Family Residential District and R-TH, Residential Townhouse District generally north of Chase Street and south of Atlantic Street. The Live/Work District is intended to attract artists on a local, regional, and national basis to relocate to Moon City and the surrounding historic neighborhood by allowing expanded business opportunities in the residences. The objectives of this program are to revitalize and preserve neglected structures, increase the City's tax revenues, expand tourism, financially benefit our existing businesses, and continue to revitalize the historic Woodland Heights Neighborhood. The Live/Work District allows a number of uses that are already permitted as home occupations. The Live/Work District expands on the home occupation concept by allowing: a) more floor area to be devoted to work space; b) employees and customers on site; and c) a sign in the front yard or on the residence. Based on research of other creative districts, staff does not believe there will be a significant increase in traffic in the neighborhood. Most artists will generally receive only a couple customers a day because the artists tend to have other outlets, such as commercial galleries and art festivals, for most of their work.

Mr. Baird opened the public hearing.

Ms. Victoria Ball, 2115 Washington commented she is opposed to the proposal because they own property at 1918 Washington in an HC District. Ms. Ball stated they operate Moore's Trash Service and are concerned about their business and future expansion of services, asking if the zoning will remain the same and what the requirements will be that would affect the business and equipment they use.

Mr. Hosmer clarified they are discussing the live/work area outlined in red on the display. The area in green is Planned Development 347, which he believes Ms. Ball is referring to, showing her property on the display map. Mr. Hosmer stated the Planned Development is allowing the same uses except removing some of the district uses not

currently be used in that district. Mr. Hosmer noted that Ms. Ball resource recovery collections center would be allowed in the PD and how they are currently operating their business would be a permitted use. Mr. Hosmer noted the equipment would be an accessory use; something they utilize for their business which is allowed.

Mr. Baird asked Mr. Hosmer how this will affect Ms. Ball's ability to operate her business as she is currently doing and in future; will this somehow hamper their future efforts to expand her business.

Mr. Hosmer said it is his understanding it will not; it is the same uses that are allowed currently.

Ms. Rita Silic, 1881 N. Main expressed support of the proposal while expressing a concern about the signage in the yards and losing the residential feel of the neighborhood. Ms. Silic asked that consideration be given to temporary signage, not permanent; at the end of the day the sign be removed from the yard.

Mr. Hosmer reviewed the size of the signage allowed in the neighborhood, adding it would not illuminated signage, no higher than four feet.

Ms. White asked if there is a stipulation as to permanent verses temporary.

Mr. Hosmer stated there is not.

Mr. Paul Lee, 1913 N. Campbell commented on the signage, asking what will be torn down and what new construction will be done.

Mr. Baird noted there will be no demolition in the live/work district or the planned development area. This will allow an overlay that will allow the owners to other things with their property.

Mr. David Pitts, 2307 N. Benton, stated he owns property at 413 E. Chase and has the same questions as Ms. Ball; how will this affect his tow yard operation which has storage of vehicles at the corner of Jefferson and Chase.

Mr. Hosmer asked if the property was zoned R-SF, Single Family Residential.

Mr. Pitts said yes; they were grandfathered in as far as the parking and storage of vehicles; will the uses be the same as to what they are doing now.

Mr. Hosmer stated basically they are a legal, non-conforming use and can continue that unless they stop for twelve (12) months. The zoning will remain the same.

Ms. Phyllis Ferguson, 1920 N. Robberson in Woodland Heights Neighborhood spoke in favor of the proposed rezoning stating that the fabric of the neighborhood is strengthened with such a district.

Mr. Ken Boles, 734 S. Weller commented he owns a business located at 219 and 303 West Chase. Mr. Boles did express his concern that the rezoning and the planned development should not be tied together which is the impression he got. Mr. Boles stated he supports the overlay for the live/work but if it affects the operation of his business then he would not support the request.

Mr. Steve Miller, 1865 N. Jefferson spoke in favor of the proposed Moon City live/work district, adding this is about community; this is a positive for the community.

Ms. Linda Passeri, 1868 N. Missouri Avenue, remarked she is an artist and has a studio in her home and stated she is in favor of this proposal moving forward to improve the neighborhood and expand her business.

Mr. Baird asked Ms. Passeri what type of artist would come to this neighborhood.

Ms. Passeri mentioned 2-D painters, portrait painters, maybe sculptors' adding she has talked to architects and some people in the performing arts expressing interest in a studio which would be a great addition to the neighborhood.

Mr. Cline asked Ms. Passeri based on her position as an artist and the people she has spoken with how many people she would estimate of living in this area.

Ms. Passeri observed that five (5) years out if they got five new studios that would be a good steady slow growth which would be feasible and realistic.

Mr. Baird closed the public hearing.

Mr. Baird asked Mr. Hosmer to give a summary of the difference between the two cases; the zoning and the planned development.

Mr. Hosmer pointed out the live/work district is predominately a residential district and the overlay district will allow the residential to have home occupations and similar type of uses for art studios and art galleries, music studios, computer programmers, offices for architects and engineers and the performing arts in allowing them to utilize signage and employees. The Planned Development is predominantly the heavy manufacturing with commercial services and industrial and limited business districts. We are combining those districts together into more of a mixed use commercial manufacturing district, however staff has removed some items that we thought were not being utilized or would not be compatible with the neighborhood.

Mr. Doennig motioned to **approve** Z-13-2015 Live/Work Overlay District No. 1. Mr. Cline **seconded** the motion. The motion **carried** as follows: Ayes: Baird, White, Ray, Cox, Doennig, and Cline. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Edwards, Shuler and Young.

Mr. Hosmer said this is a request to rezone approximately 52 acres of property generally located on the north and south sides of Chase Street between Broadway Avenue and Robberson Avenue, and those properties located on the east and west sides of Washington Avenue between Chase Street and Atlantic Street and properties located at the intersection of Lyon Street and Atlantic Avenue from an HM, Heavy Manufacturing, Light Industrial, Commercial Services, LB, Limited Business, and R-SF, Residential Single Family District to a Planned Development District No. 347. On December 15, 2014, City Council adopted Resolution #10187 which accepted the Moon City Creative District Strategic Plan and initiated the proposed Planned Development District rezoning, in addition to a proposed Live/Work Overlay District rezoning for the residential properties in the Moon City Creative District. Springfield Planning and Development Department staff assisted the neighborhood residents with drafting the strategic plan; the proposed Planned Development District; and the proposed Live/Work Overlay District.

The proposed Planned Development District is for the properties that front on both sides of Chase Street and Washington Avenue and the properties centered round the intersection of Atlantic Street and Lyon Avenue. Most of the properties are currently zoned industrial and commercial. A few are zoned residential. The proposed Planned Development District generally preserves the uses currently permitted in the existing non-residential zoning districts while permitting commercial and residential uses that add to the vitality of the Moon City Creative District. There are two areas, A & B, defined in the Planned Development District. Area A generally includes the properties currently zoned Heavy Manufacturing (HM). Area B generally includes the properties that are zoned Commercial Services (CS).

Mr. Cline asked if staff polled what types of businesses are currently using all those green areas and will the change in zoning adversely affect any of the current businesses but reasonable expectations of how those businesses might expand or change over time.

Mr. Hosmer stated he understands there was a land use conducted in the area; looking at uses and making certain they are compatible. They looked at the uses in the heavy manufacturing district and took out the uses not currently be used. Mr. Hosmer stated he has given his business card to several members of the audience and they can visit with him and he will go through all the uses and make certain their businesses are not adversely impacted.

Ms. White asked for clarification on Areas A and B from the staff report and what areas those include.

Mr. Hosmer reviewed the location map and outlined the areas as designated Area A and Area B.

Mr. Baird opened the public hearing.

Mr. Ken Boles asked if there is a difference in the zoning and what the proposed plan is for the property to the south of Chase, along the railroad and to the east of Washington.

Mr. Hosmer stated that is in the Area A District, which is more manufacturing; since it was more manufacturing it was left as HM while allowing them to have commercial as well as all the other uses.

Mr. Boles referred to Section 4-4300, HM, Heavy Manufacturing which has a description of what is allowed in HM and Planned Development 347 will be identical to that with a few exceptions that are marked out on the information received from Mr. Hosmer. Mr. Boles asked that item "P" be stricken from that list which is construction equipment storage yards because they do have construction equipment they store for jobs they are working. During emergency situations, they do have large storage stackable storage containers in their yard, which is fenced and blocked in. Mr. Bolls stated he does not want to change his business plan and not be able to use the property he purchased.

Mr. Ray asked staff if they have comments to address Mr. Bolls comments.

Mr. Hosmer stated Planning and Zoning Commission could recommend that item "P" be inserted into the Planned Development or send it on to Council as written. Mr. Hosmer stated he would speak with Mr. Boles to clarify that information adding he would speak with staff and see how they interpret it.

Mr. Cline asked if a grandfather clause would work in this instance.

Mr. Hosmer stated that under the code, they would be non conforming depending on the situation and there would not be a way for them to allow a clause to expand the non conforming uses.

Mr. James Ball, 1918 N. Washington, with Moore's Trash Service referenced the construction equipment storage, stating he stores commercial dumpsters on the property. They are considering doing roll off dumpsters which is construction equipment, asking how this will affect his business.

Mr. Hosmer stated if it is part of the business, it is an accessory use to the business and is allowed.

Mr. Michael Paulik, 3328 Edmundson Road, St. Louis, Mo., 63114, commented he has property at 842 West Chase and would like the construction equipment storage use left in the Planned Development. Mr. Paulik stated he rents out the property to different business owners and this would tie up his rental if construction equipment storage was disallowed. Mr. Paulik stated he has spent a lot of money on improving the property and stated he is against the PD.

Mr. Dustin Brandhorst, commented he owns a house in Woodland Heights and rents the building at 524 W. Chase, stating he owns a small construction company and they have construction equipment on the property. If item “P” is removed as a use from the PD, this will not allow them to have their construction equipment on the property and they store materials there as well when they have big jobs. The building they rent is for sale and he and his partner have looked at purchasing the building, but they don’t want to do that if they cannot store their construction equipment on the property.

Ms. Phyllis Ferguson, 1920 N. Robberson, commented Mr. Rognstad told them this was more a matter to clean up some of the zoning along Chase Street. Ms. Ferguson stated they do not have a problem with having construction equipment storage yards; they do not want to keep anyone from doing business.

Mr. Hosmer stated staff’s position is they have no problem with inserting construction equipment storage yards back in the permitted uses in the Planned Development and construction equipment would be allowed in both Areas A and B.

Mr. Baird closed the public hearing.

Ms. White clarified that the uses that are allowed are recycling, household resource recovery centers as long as they conform with the screening requirements that are already a part of the zoning code and with the addition of the construction language that has been discussed, then the majority of the concerns of the neighborhood are being addressed from the business standpoint.

Mr. Hosmer said yes.

Mr. Cline **motioned** that item “P”, construction equipment storage yards in Section 4-4300 of the Zoning Ordinance be reinserted as a use in both areas A and B. Mr. Ray seconded the motion. The motion carried as follows: Ayes: Baird, White, Ray, Cox, Doennig, and Cline. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Edwards, Shuler and Young.

Mr. Ray motioned to **approve** Planned Development 347 (Moon City Creative District) as amended. Mr. Doennig **seconded** the motion. The motion **carried** as follows: Ayes: Baird, White, Ray, Cox, Doennig, and Cline. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Edwards, Shuler and Young.

Text Amendment Recreational Vehicle Parks In R-MHC District
Springfield

City of

Mr. Hosmer commented this is a proposal to amend Sections 1-1323, Travel Trailer, Camper, Recreational Vehicle, and Other Trailer Parking, and 4-1500, R-MHC, Manufactured Home Community District, of the Zoning Ordinance to allow recreational vehicle (RV) parks in the R-MHC District. City Council initiated amendments to consider

adding recreational vehicle parks to the list of permitted uses within the R-MHC, Manufactured Home Community District with restrictions at their meeting on August 13, 2012. This initiation was in response to a letter from Mr. Craig F. Lowther. Currently, the regulations for the R-MHC District state that recreational vehicles (RV's) may not be occupied as dwellings. Recreational vehicle parks, along with campgrounds, are only permitted in the HC, Highway Commercial and CS, Commercial Service Districts. The proposed amendments will allow recreational vehicle parks in the R-MHC District if the district has direct access to a collector or higher classified roadway. This will concentrate any recreational vehicle parks within these manufactured home developments to be located along major highways so that the traveling public can have quick access without disturbing any adjacent residential neighborhoods. This will provide additional locations for tourists, construction crews and other visitors to temporarily reside.

Mr. Baird asked about a letter listed as Exhibit 1 in the staff report dated 2012, asking if it has been in committee that long or has there resurgence in interest in this case.

Mr. Hosmer noted it is an item that has been on backlog and they are attempting to push the ones through that have been initiated.

Ms. Cox asked about the time limit mentioned in the letter stating there is nothing in the text amendment that has a time limit asking if that might create a potential issue.

Mr. Hosmer stated it is a question of enforcement.

Mr. Doennig asked Mr. Hosmer how many potential properties this is going to impact with those restrictions on them.

Mr. Hosmer said very few (about 12 properties throughout the city).

Mr. Doennig commented that it would be fair to say that someone could live in a recreational vehicle indefinitely in that situation.

Mr. Hosmer said yes.

Mr. Baird opened the public hearing.

Mr. Craig Lowther, 901 S. Louis Street, commented he is available for questions.

Mr. Baird closed the public hearing.

Mr. Ray motioned to **approve** Text Amendment Recreational Vehicle Parks in R-MHC District. Ms. Cox **seconded** the motion. The motion **carried** as follows: Ayes: Baird, White, Ray, Cox, and Cline. Nays: Doennig. Abstain: None. Absent: Edwards, Shuler and Young.

Revised Preliminary Plat-The Hill
John Price

Mr. Hosmer stated this is a request to approve a revised preliminary plat to subdivide approximately 12.89 acres into an eight (8) lot residential subdivision with subdivision variances and common area at 2915 S. Lone Pine Avenue. The property is currently zoned R-SF, Single-Family Residential District. The property is currently zoned R-SF, Single-Family Residential District. The lots will be accessed by a private street with a gate which will be dedicated as common area. The common open space requirements of Section 5-2300 and gates across private street requirements in Section 5-2800 of the Zoning Ordinance must be met. The only differences between the revised preliminary plat and the original is that they have eliminated one private street and reduced the number of lots from 10 to 8. The applicant is also requesting a subdivision variance for a lot without full frontage on a public street and two subdivision variances from the Public Works Design Standards for Street Design. Staff supports the subdivision variance requests. If Planning and Zoning Commission approves the preliminary, then the plat will be forwarded to City Council for acceptance of public streets and easements. An approved preliminary plat is active for two (2) years.

Mr. Baird asked about one entrance/exit point as it has been an issue in the past; are there certain sizes or acreages of property that is allowed to do this.

Ms. Gardner commented that is for emergency access and it depends on the length of the street and fire has approved this with one access and the length of the street is short enough for a cul-de-sac.

Mr. Hosmer stated regulations are eight hundred (800) feet for a cul-de-sac and also more than twenty (20) lots would require the fire access so they are the standards.

Mr. Baird opened the public hearing.

Mr. Teresa Davison, Heithaus Engineering, commented she is available for questions.

Mr. Baird closed the public hearing.

Mr. Cline motioned to **approve** the Revised Preliminary Plat The Hill. Mr. Doennig **seconded** the motion. The motion **carried** as follows: Ayes: Baird, White, Ray, Cox, Doennig, and Cline. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Edwards, Shuler and Young.

University Plaza Exhib. Center & Trade Hall Redevelopment Plan Termination
City of Springfield

Mr. Matt Schaefer stated staff is presenting a request to terminate the University Plaza Exhibition Hall and Trade Center Redevelopment Plan at the North side of the 600 block and south side of the 700 block of East Saint Louis Street. On May 2, 1983, City Council adopted Resolution No. 6962, which declared approximately 4.85 acres along the north side of the 600 block of East Saint Louis Street (site of the former Sear's department store) a blighted area pursuant to Chapter 99.320, RSMo and authorized the Land Clearance for Redevelopment Authority to prepare a redevelopment plan for this area. The University Plaza Exhibition Hall and Trade Center Redevelopment Area was declared blighted as part of a proposal to redevelop the Area pursuant to Missouri's Urban Redevelopment Corporations Law (Chapter 353, RSMo). The Statute allowed the Center City Redevelopment Corporation and its successors to receive up to 25 years of partial real property tax abatement, provided the Redevelopment Area was redeveloped according to the adopted University Plaza Exhibition Hall and Trade Center Redevelopment Plan.

The Redevelopment Plan has been fully implemented, resulting in the construction of the Center City Exhibition Hall and Trade Center and the University Plaza Exhibition Hall and Trade Center. These buildings are known today as the Springfield Expo Center and the University Plaza Convention Center. The Redevelopment Area received 25-years of partial real property tax abatement, which ended in 2013. The Redevelopment Plan is no longer necessary and may be repealed.

Ms. White commented that this is something the rest of the community needs to be made aware of.

Mr. Schaefer stated this will be heard before City Council in a couple of weeks and will be given publicity in that regard. Staff is taking proactive steps to review these areas and to remove them from the books if necessary.

Mr. Baird opened the public hearing.

Mr. Ray motioned to **approve** University Plaza Exhibition Center & Trade Hall Redevelopment Plan Termination. Ms. White **seconded** the motion. The motion **carried** as follows: Ayes: Baird, White, Ray, Cox, Doennig, and Cline. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Edwards, Shuler and Young.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:20 p.m.



Bob Hosmer, AICP
Principal Planner