

**CITY OF KANNAPOLIS, NC
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
Minutes of Regular Meeting
November 4, 2015**

The Kannapolis Planning and Zoning Commission met on Wednesday, November 4, 2015 at 6:00 PM at the Kannapolis Train Station, 201 South Main Street, Kannapolis, North Carolina.

Commission Members Present: Chairman David Baucom
Vice-Chairman Scott Trott
Chris Puckett
Bob Caison
Alan Overcash
David Steele

Commission Members Absent: William Cranford

Visitors: Jim Gamble, Bohler Engineering

Staff Present: Zachary Gordon, AICP, Planning Director
Josh Langen, AICP, Senior Planner
Kassie Watts, AICP, CZO, Senior Planner
Wes Webb, P. E. Engineering
David Jordan, IT

Recording Secretary: Pam Scaggs

CALL TO ORDER

Commission Chairman David Baucom called the meeting to order at 6:01 P.M.

ROLL CALL AND RECOGNITION OF QUORUM

Recording Secretary Pam Scaggs called the roll. The presence of a quorum was recognized.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chairman Baucom asked for a motion to approve the agenda which was made by Mr. Trott, seconded by Mr. Puckett and the motion unanimously approved.

APPROVAL/CORRECTION OF MINUTES

Chairman Baucom requested a motion to approve the October 7, 2015 minutes which was made by Mr. Steele, seconded by Mr. Puckett and the motion was unanimously approved.

ZONING MAP AMENDMENT – Z-2015-05 (Continued from October 7, 2015)

Chairman Baucom asked Mr. Gordon if the site visit that occurred Thursday, November 29, 2015, was a public record meeting? Mr. Gordon responded that it was not a public meeting but a field visit for the Commission to gain perspective on the proposed grocery store. Chairman Baucom asked that emails received from residents and public comment be entered into record to avoid “rehashing” the same details. He then addressed the audience and asked attendees planning to

1 speak, to comment on additional items only and not reference last month's meeting, the site visit
2 or any emails that have been sent.

3
4 Planning Director, Zac Gordon reviewed the PowerPoint detailing Case #Z-2015-05 which calls
5 for a rezoning from C-2 – CZ (Originally called "CU-C2") General Commercial – Conditional
6 Zoning to C-2 – CZ (Amended) General Commercial – Conditional Zoning to allow for
7 construction of a grocery store or similar use. The applicant is Bohler Engineering and the property
8 owner is Charles S. Smith. The property is identified by Cabarrus County Parcel Identification
9 Number 5622-69-3764, comprises approximately 4.09 acres and is located at 2825 Dale Earnhardt
10 Boulevard. Mr. Gordon stated that notice of the public hearing had been mailed to adjacent
11 property owners, an ad was placed in the paper and appropriate signage posted on the site.
12

13 Mr. Gordon stated the Planning and Zoning Commission may render a final decision regarding a
14 zoning amendment by an affirmative vote of at least three-fourths of the members of the
15 Commission present. If there is a denial, an approval by a vote of less than three-fourths of the
16 members of Commission present, or if an appeal is presented, then only the City Council shall
17 have the authority to make a final decision on a rezoning application per section 3.3.4.2.2 of the
18 Unified Development Ordinance (UDO). Mr. Gordon also stated that any final decision rendered
19 by the Commission may be appealed within fifteen (15) days to the City Council.
20

21 Mr. Gordon then reviewed the background of the request for the Commission. He directed
22 attention to both the aerial and zoning maps, Future Use Land Map, Site Map and a rendering of
23 the proposed building. Mr. Gordon then referenced Section 3.3.5 of the UDO which includes
24 approval criteria for rezoning. Mr. Gordon noted that there are three (3) major criteria that staff
25 reviewed:
26

- 27 1. The size of the tract in question,
- 28 2. Whether the proposal conforms with and furthers the goals and policies of the
29 Comprehensive Plan (Land Use 2015 Plan), other adopted plans, and the goals, objectives,
30 and policies of this Ordinance [UDO],
- 31 3. The relationship of the uses envisioned under the new zoning and the uses currently
32 present in adjacent tracts.
33

34 Mr. Gordon noted that staff findings and recommendation for approval have not changed since the
35 previous Planning and Zoning Commission meeting held on October 7, 2015 and that a grocery
36 store has historically been permitted in both a C-1 district and also within the C-2-CZ zoning
37 district. Mr. Gordon also noted that a grocery store or similar use would be consistent with the
38 2015 Future Land Use plan.
39

40 **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

41 Mr. Gordon stated that the staff recommendation has not changed and that the request remains
42 consistent with the goals and strategies of the City of Kannapolis. Therefore, staff recommends
43 approval of Conditional Zoning Z-2015-05 with conditions as were noted in the staff report dated
44 September 24, 2015, as well as completion of recommended items noted in the Traffic Impact
45 Study. Mr. Gordon noted that during the last meeting (October 7, 2015), there was representation
46 made that the Traffic Impact Study (TIS) indicated a need for a traffic signal at the intersection of
47 Cold Water Ridge and Dale Earnhardt Boulevard. At the time, NCDOT was not supportive of that

1 traffic signal but has since indicated that they would be supportive should Z-2015-05 be approved,
2 along with other associated Dale Earnhardt Boulevard improvements called for by the TIS.
3

4 Mr. Gordon stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission can choose to either approve or deny
5 the rezoning request as presented, or approve with modifications. Mr. Gordon referenced the
6 conditions that must be met if the rezoning is approved. If approved, the Technical Review
7 Committee (TRC) will need to review the development proposal against the UDO with regard to
8 requirements such as lighting, infrastructure, landscaping, etc., in order to ensure compliance.
9 Chairman Baucom asked if any of the conditions have changed? Mr. Gordon responded "no".
10

11 **ACTIONS REQUESTED**

- 12 1. Hold Public Hearing
- 13 2. Motion to approve (deny) a Resolution to Adopt a Statement of Consistency
- 14 3. Motion to approve (deny) a Resolution to Zone
15

16 Chairman Baucom asked if the Statement of Consistency should be approved first? Mr. Gordon
17 responded "yes because it sets the tone for the rezoning". Mr. Gordon also noted that there is a
18 fifteen (15) day appeal period regardless of whether the request is approved or denied. Mr. Gordon
19 reiterated that an approval must be by a three-fourths vote or City Council will have final authority
20 on the decision. Mr. Gordon also stated that the Statement of Consistency is a staff recommended
21 Statement and that the Commission is free to amend or write their own Statement of Consistency.
22

23 Jim Gamble, with Bohler Engineering, representing the property owner Steve Smith and MGP
24 Retail, directed the Commission's attention to aerial maps of the site from both 2005 and 2014
25 pointing out construction of the I-85 exit as well as surrounding retail development. Mr. Gamble
26 noted that Bohler is requesting that the Commission consider changes to conditions that were put
27 in place more than twelve (12) years ago. Mr. Gamble presented the applicant's site plan and
28 stated that Bohler appreciates the input of the neighbors and as a result has made several changes
29 to their original plan:
30

- 31 1. Increase setbacks and buffer yards
- 32 2. Relocation of the driveway
- 33 3. Sight lighting limitations
- 34 4. Retaining wall with fence
- 35 5. Security fence around perimeter of property
- 36 6. High quality building structure
- 37 7. High quality landscape plantings throughout the property
38

39 Mr. Gamble directed the Commission's attention to a site rendering and noted that zoning would
40 allow for a 48 foot building height but that Bohler is proposing a 33 foot building with the rear
41 wall approximately 14 feet in height. Mr. Gamble also introduced a computer generated site map
42 and stated that it was close to what would actually be built should the rezoning request be approved.
43

44 Mr. Trott asked if the loading dock would be located on same side as the 14 foot wall? Mr. Gamble
45 responded that the loading dock would be located on the other side of the building but that an
46 approximate 14 foot wall would also be constructed at the loading docks to help alleviate noise.
47

1 There being no further questions from the Commission, Chairman Baucom opened the meeting
2 for public comment at 6:28 PM. Chairman Baucom asked that comments be kept to a three (3)
3 minute maximum and reiterated that public comment should not include any comments previously
4 made during the October 7, 2015 meeting.
5

6 Tim Ruane of 2452 Forrestbrook Drive thanked members of the Commission for visiting the site
7 and stated that he hoped it gave them, as it did him, a better perspective of the impact the proposed
8 building would have on the Forrestbrook community. Mr. Ruane cited the UDO and stated that
9 rezoning to a C2 district should be avoided when abutting to a Residential District. He also stated
10 that he originally understood the rezoning was a 'relaxation of the conditions' but the proposed
11 project is more than a relaxation of conditions but is actually a request to change conditions. Mr.
12 Ruane stated that he along with other residents spent a lot of time and money to come to an
13 agreement with both the property owner and the City in 2003 and does not understand why that
14 agreement is being dismissed. He also stated that the Forrestbrook community is not against
15 development at the proposed site but would like to keep the development consistent and reasonable
16 with current zoning that is also compatible with the 2015 Land Use Plan. He asked that the
17 rezoning request be denied.
18

19 Gary Sharpe of 2422 Forrestbrook Drive provided handouts to the Commission regarding the
20 watershed (see Exhibit A). Mr. Sharpe voiced concerns about the proposed building with regards
21 to the proposed watershed boundary line. He stated that the land would have to be built up to +725
22 elevation as well a large tank or holding system built on site. He also stated the end result would
23 produce a huge building with massive retaining walls butting up to adjacent residential property
24 which he, along with the Forrestbrook community, feels is unacceptable. Mr. Sharpe suggested a
25 compromise would be for Bohler to construct a smaller store similar to other Lidle stores in Europe
26 and that restrictions in place for the current zoning remain.
27

28 Chairman Baucom asked Mr. Gordon to address the watershed issues. Mr. Gordon referred the
29 Commission to the staff report, page 5, #6 of the Policy Issues:

30 **Will there be environmental impacts that the new use will generate, such as excessive**
31 **storm water runoff, water, air or noise pollution, excessive nighttime lighting, or other**
32 **nuisances?**

33 Located in the Lake Concord Watershed Critical Area Overlay District, the property is
34 limited to 24% impervious coverage. The applicant will need to have the Critical Area
35 Overlay boundary adjusted so that the site is no longer regulated by Article 4.16. The
36 applicant will need to alter the site to have storm water runoff diverted from the Critical
37 Area and then apply to the Board of Adjustment to adjust the boundary.
38

39 Mr. Gordon stated that there is no question that the terrain would need to be built up. He also
40 noted that if an approval was granted, the applicant would still need to petition the Board of
41 Adjustment for a watershed boundary modification and if it were denied, the applicant's rezoning
42 request would not be able to move forward. Mr. Gordon stated that the boundary can be modified
43 and introduced Wesley Webb, P.E. Engineer with City of Kannapolis for further questions
44 regarding the boundary modification.
45

1 Tommy Doonan, 2444 Accadia Court, stated that the Commission would have to make a decision
2 to allow commercial development or protection of property. Mr. Doonan also stated that he has
3 no issue with the development of the grocery store but does not want it in the proposed location.
4

5 Vickie Carpenter of 913 Brushwood Avenue stated that she sent a letter to the Commission and
6 stated that after the site visit, she feels her property will be impacted most and was scared of the
7 proximity and height of the proposed building. She doesn't understand why the Conditional Use
8 Permit that was issued in 2002, Office and Institutional Zoning, which was put into place to protect
9 their neighborhood, is being disregarded. She asked the Commission to consider the impacts to
10 their neighborhood and to their homes.
11

12 Chairman Baucom asked Ms. Carpenter if she had any objection to her letter being entered into
13 Public Record? Ms. Carpenter responded "I do not".
14

15 Lisa Valdez, attorney representing the Forrestbrook neighborhood, distributed documents to the
16 Commission (see Exhibit B) and stated that she had worked as a Planner with Benchmark for the
17 City of Kannapolis during 2003. She stated that the application, with exception of the site plan,
18 does not mention construction of a grocery store and that the applicant is asking the Commission
19 to remove conditions that were put in place in 2003 which were designed to mitigate impacts to
20 the surrounding neighborhood. Ms. Valdez stated that the proposed plan is not compatible with
21 nor does it comply with the UDO, specifically Article 3.4. She also stated that there was no thought
22 put into the layout of the store to mitigate impacts to the neighbors and referenced the high walls,
23 loading docks, lights, noise, and smells. She directed Commission attention to a draft Statement
24 of Consistency and asked that they deny the rezoning request.
25

26 Chairman Baucom asked Ms. Valdez if she had been hired by the Forrestbrook community and
27 she responded "I was".
28

29 Dawn Floyd of 2415 Forrestbrook Drive stated that she opposes the proposed rezoning plan. Ms.
30 Floyd stated that the restrictions currently on the property do not prohibit development but that
31 they are reasonable and allow for development that is consistent with their neighborhood. She
32 asked that the Commission consider all of the facts, the environmental impacts as well as impacts
33 to their community and choose to develop the property in a manner that is consistent with the plan
34 already in place and that it not be undone to the detriment of their community.
35

36 Jerry Fritz of 2411 Windingbrook Drive stated that he opposes the rezoning plan. Mr. Fritz talked
37 about the noise from the loading docks, generators and the amount of cars. He also talked about
38 the size of the proposed fences and the height of the trees that would have to be planted to block
39 view of the store. Mr. Fritz thanked the Commission for visiting the site and reiterated that he
40 opposes the proposed rezoning.
41

42 David Probst of 630 Windsor Place spoke in favor of the proposed development. Mr. Probst talked
43 about the need for a grocery store as well as it would be a good tax base for Kannapolis. He also
44 stated that the proposed traffic signal at the intersection of Cold Water Ridge and Dale Earnhardt
45 Boulevard would improve traffic safety.
46

47 Rodney Floyd of 2415 Forrestbrook Drive stated that he is not against any development coming
48 to Kannapolis. He pointed out several other property locations nearby that would be a better

1 location for the grocery store. Mr. Floyd talked about the neighborhood prior to other development
2 and stated that they are trying to preserve what they have left of the Forrestbrook community. He
3 reiterated that he is not against the development of the grocery store or progress for the City of
4 Kannapolis but he is against building the grocery store in the proposed location.
5

6 Jeff Johnson of 2420 Forrestbrook Drive stated that the agreement the Forrestbrook community
7 reached with Mr. Smith, the property owner, have restrictions and conditions already in place that
8 will allow for development, progress and a tax base for the City of Kannapolis. Mr. Johnson asked
9 the Commission to consider the impacts the size of the proposed grocery store will have on the
10 Forrestbrook community not only now but in the future as well.
11

12 There being no further questions or comments from the public, Chairman Baucom closed the
13 Public Hearing at 7:00 PM.
14

15 Chairman Baucom read the Statement of Consistency and asked for a motion to adopt which was
16 made by Mr. Caison, seconded by Mr. Trott and approved with a 4-2 vote (Mr. Caison, Mr. Trott,
17 Mr. Overcash and Chairman Baucom voting in favor; Mr. Steele and Mr. Puckett voting against).
18

19 Chairman Baucom read the rezoning request, asked that it be entered into record and asked for a
20 motion to approve which was not made. Mr. Baucom asked Mr. Gordon if there was no motion
21 made to approve, does that mean the request is denied? Mr. Gordon stated that if no motion is
22 made to approve the rezoning request, the existing zoning remains but that the Commission would
23 then need to make a motion to deny the rezoning.
24

25 Chairman Baucom asked for a motion to deny the rezoning request which was made by Mr. Steele,
26 seconded by Mr. Puckett but was not approved with a 2-4 vote (Mr. Steele and Mr. Puckett voting
27 in favor; Mr. Caison, Mr. Trott, Mr. Overcash and Chairman Baucom voting against).
28

29 Chairman Baucom made the motion to approve the rezoning request and asked for a second which
30 was made by Mr. Overcash and approved with a 4-2 vote (Mr. Caison, Mr. Trott, Mr. Overcash
31 and Chairman Baucom voting in favor; Mr. Steele and Mr. Puckett voting against).
32

33 Mr. Gordon noted that since the approval was by less than three-fourths vote, a final decision on
34 this case will be made by the City Council. The date of this meeting will be determined by City
35 Council.
36

37 **CODDLE CREEK RESERVOIR CRITICAL AREA OFFICIAL ZONING MAP**
38 **AMENDMENT – Z-2015-06**

39 Planning Director, Zac Gordon presented a PowerPoint detailing Case #Z-2015-06 which calls for
40 an Official Zoning Map Amendment. The amendment will add 1.64 acres to, and remove 3.16
41 acres from, the Coddle Creek Reservoir Critical Area Watershed Protection Overlay District. The
42 applicant is Faggart Family Trust, the property is located off Macedonia Church Road and is
43 further identified by Cabarrus County PIN: 4691-79-5791. The property is currently zoned AG –
44 Agricultural.
45

46 Mr. Gordon noted that notice had been mailed to adjacent property owners, a legal ad placed in
47 the newspaper and appropriate signage posted on the property.
48

1 Mr. Gordon then directed attention to both the current zoning map for the subject property and an
2 aerial map as well as the Future Land Use Map. Mr. Gordon also directed attention to a Watershed
3 Boundary Survey map which details the area that will be removed and the area that will be added
4 to the Critical Area Watershed Protection Overlay District.
5

6 Mr. Wesley Webb, P.E. Engineer for the City of Kannapolis, stated that the red line represents the
7 current boundary and the blue line is based off a field survey and represents where the boundary
8 should be located. Mr Webb stated, based upon the field survey, 1.64 acres should be added to,
9 and 3.16 acres should be removed from, the Critical Area Watershed resulting in a net decrease of
10 1.52 acres within the Coddle Creek Reservoir Critical Area Watershed Protection Overlay District.
11

12 Mr. Trott asked if the area located within the red dotted line flows towards the reservoir? Mr.
13 Webb responded that is what is currently depicted but is inaccurate. He stated the accurate
14 depiction is the area contained in the blue line. Chairman Baucom asked what happened to cause
15 this change? Mr. Webb stated that the original boundary line (red line) was based upon someone
16 looking at a map and the blue line is based upon an actual land survey.
17

18 Mr. Gordon referenced the staff report and noted that the Applicant filed an appeal of the location
19 of the Watershed Protection Overlay District boundary for the Coddle Creek Reservoir Critical
20 Area WS-II CA on their property and that a Board of Adjustment Public Hearing was held on
21 October 13, 2015 in which the appeal was approved. Mr. Gordon noted that Mr. Webb reviewed,
22 and is in agreement with, the survey that shows a modification in the boundary lines. Mr. Gordon
23 stated that upon approval from the Planning & Zoning Commission to adopt a revised Official
24 Zoning Map reflecting the Watershed Protection Overlay District boundary, the new map will be
25 forwarded to Julie Ventaloro with the Stormwater Permitting Program of the NC Division of
26 Energy, Mineral, and Land Resources (NCDEMLR) for "official approval" which would complete
27 the boundary modification process.
28

29 Mr. Gordon referenced Article 4.16.5 of the Unified Development Ordinance regarding adjustment
30 to exterior boundaries of the Watershed Protection Overlay District, which states:

31 *In determining whether a property or part of a property drains to the Watershed as*
32 *indicated on the Map, the Board of Adjustment shall base its determination on actual field*
33 *conditions of the property as determined by topographical conditions. In making its*
34 *determination, the Board of Adjustment may require the appellant to produce relevant*
35 *expert testimony and exhibits.*

36 *After hearing such appeal, the Board shall find the subject property (all or part) is either*
37 *in the designated Watershed or out of the designated Watershed. If the Board shall find*
38 *that the subject property is out of the designated Watershed, the Board shall order the Map*
39 *to be adjusted to show the subject property to be outside the designated Watershed. In*
40 *making such order, the Board of Adjustment shall designate the Watershed in which the*
41 *subject property is located. If such designation causes the subject property to be located*
42 *in another Watershed Overlay District, the order shall cause the Map to be adjusted to*
43 *show the same.*
44
45

1 **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

2 Staff finds Z-2015-06 is consistent with the goals and growth strategies of the City of Kannapolis,
3 and with the 2015 Land Use Plan, adopted by City Council, which calls for the existing overall
4 land use and zoning pattern to continue, including residential densities, and is reasonable and in
5 the public interest because it allows the City to consider the future development of the property
6 based on the merits of a development plan submittal, and in light of the existing zoning designation
7 of the subject property. Based on these findings, staff recommends approval of Zoning Map
8 Amendment Z-2015-06. The Commission may choose to approve or deny the petition as
9 presented.

10
11 **ACTIONS REQUESTED**

- 12 1. Hold a Public Hearing
13 2. Motion to approve (deny) a Resolution to Adopt a Statement of Consistency
14 3. Motion to approve (deny) a Resolution to Zone
15

16 Chairman Baucom asked if this case is a rezoning case or if it is changing the map? Mr. Gordon
17 responded that this is an Official Zoning Map Amendment. Mr. Baucom asked what is the purpose
18 behind the map amendment? Mr. Gordon responded that there is a limitation on development of
19 property located within the watershed and that this map amendment will correct the current map.
20

21 Chairman Baucom opened the floor to public comment at 7:29 PM. There being no further
22 questions or comments, the public portion was closed at 7:30 PM.
23

24 Chairman Baucom asked for a motion to approve a Resolution to Adopt a Statement of
25 Consistency Z-2015-06 as presented which was made by Mr. Trott, seconded by Mr. Steele and
26 the motion was unanimously approved.
27

28 Chairman Baucom asked for a motion to approve a Resolution to Zone Z-2015-06 which was made
29 by Mr. Caison, seconded by Mr. Trott and the motion was unanimously approved.
30

31 **LAKE CONCORD PROTECTED AREA OFFICIAL ZONING MAP AMENDMENT – Z-**
32 **2015-07**

33 Planning Director, Zac Gordon presented a PowerPoint detailing Case #Z-2015-07 which calls
34 for an Official Zoning Map Amendment. The amendment will remove 1.748 acres from the
35 Lake Concord Protected Area Watershed Protection Overlay Districts. The applicant is Arbor
36 Lane Investments, Inc., the property is located off Coldwater Ridge Drive and is further
37 identified by Cabarrus County PIN: 5622-58-3753, 5622-58-4755, 5622-58-5865, 5622-58-6992
38 and 5622-58-8929. The property is currently zoned C-2 – General Commercial.
39

40 Mr. Gordon noted that notice had been mailed to adjacent property owners, a legal ad placed in
41 the newspaper and appropriate signage posted on the property.
42

43 Mr. Gordon directed the Commission's attention to the Aerial, Zoning and Future Use Land Maps
44 as well as the Watershed Boundary Survey and pointed out the area to be removed from the
45 watershed. Mr. Gordon stated that like the previous case, a survey was conducted on the subject
46 property and it was determined that 1.748 acres will no longer be located within a Watershed
47 Protection Overlay District Zone. Mr. Gordon noted that Mr. Webb has also reviewed, and is in

1 agreement with, the changes requested. A Board of Adjustment Public Hearing was held on
2 September 8, 2015, at which the appeal was approved.

3
4 Mr. Gordon reiterated that like the previous case, upon approval from the Planning & Zoning
5 Commission to adopt a revised Official Zoning Map reflecting the revised Watershed Protection
6 Overlay District boundary, the new map will be forwarded to Julie Ventaloro with the Stormwater
7 Permitting Program of the NC Division of Energy, Mineral, and Land Resources (NCDEMLR)
8 for "official approval" which would complete the boundary modification process.
9

10 **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

11 Staff finds Z-2015-07 is consistent with the goals and growth strategies of the City of Kannapolis,
12 and with the 2015 Land Use Plan, adopted by City Council, which calls for the existing overall
13 land use and zoning pattern to continue, including residential densities, and is reasonable and in
14 the public interest because it allows the City to consider future development of the properties based
15 on the merits of a development plan submittal, and in light of the existing zoning designation of
16 the subject properties. Based on these findings, staff recommends approval of Zoning Map
17 Amendment Z-2015-07. The Commission may choose to approve or deny the petition as
18 presented.
19

20 **ACTIONS REQUESTED**

- 21 1. Hold a Public Hearing
- 22 2. Motion to approve (deny) a Resolution to Adopt a Statement of Consistency
- 23 3. Motion to approve (deny) a Resolution to Zone
24

25 Chairman Baucom asked if there will be more Zoning Map Amendments in the future due to
26 increased development? Mr. Gordon introduced Mr. Webb and asked him to respond. Mr. Webb
27 stated that both of these cases happen to be in areas where there may be potential development but
28 that the purpose is to correct map zoning where it is incorrect.
29

30 Mr. Caison asked if the City initiates these types of requests or if it is the property owner who
31 requests the change? Mr. Gordon responded that the City did not initiate these requests but that
32 both the City and the Engineering department review all requests to ensure accuracy before being
33 brought to Public Hearing.
34

35 Chairman Baucom opened the floor for public comment at 7:43 PM. There being no further
36 questions or comments, the public portion was closed at 7:43 PM.
37

38 Chairman Baucom asked for a motion to approve a Resolution to Adopt a Statement of
39 Consistency for Z-2015-07 as was presented which was made by Mr. Steele, seconded by Mr.
40 Overcash and the motion was unanimously approved.
41

42 Chairman Baucom asked for a motion to approve a Resolution to Zone for Z-2015-07 which was
43 made by Mr. Caison, seconded by Mr. Trott and the motion was unanimously approved.
44

45 **PLANNING DIRECTOR UPDATE**

46 Mr. Gordon asked the Commission to consider a change to the regular scheduled monthly meeting
47 from the first Wednesday of the month to the first Tuesday of the month. This is an intentional
48 move to separate the Board of Adjustment meetings from the Planning & Zoning Commission

1 meetings. Mr. Gordon cited the reasoning was due to the logistical challenges placed on Staff to
2 prepare for back to back meetings the same week. Chairman Baucom stated that he likes Mr.
3 Gordon's thought process on changing the meeting because it makes better sense and is in the best
4 interest of the public. Mr. Trott indicated that he has a meeting conflict with Tuesday that cannot
5 be moved. Mr. Gordon stated that Planning would send something out to the Commission with
6 the proposed 2016 Regular Meeting Schedule.

7
8 **ADDITIONAL ITEMS:**

9 Mr. Gordon stated that there is no meeting for the Commission in December.

10
11 Mr. Baucom asked if the first Planning and Zoning Commission meeting in the New Year would
12 be held in the new building? Mr. Gordon responded that the meeting would most likely remain in
13 the Train Station but that February's meeting would probably be held in the new building.

14
15 Mr. Baucom addressed the Commission and thanked them for their time and service to the City.
16 He stated that some of the cases aren't always easy as represented by Z-2015-05, but that they are
17 important and that there will most likely be similar cases in the future. Mr. Baucom stated that it
18 is the Commission's responsibility to ensure that all are treated fairly including the property owner,
19 adjacent property owners and the applicant. He then thanked Mr. Gordon and the Planning
20 department for all their hard work.

21
22 Mr. Steele asked where the Planning Department would be located in the new building? Mr.
23 Gordon responded that Planning will be located on the 3rd floor, in the back left corner of the
24 building.

25
26 **ADJOURN:**

27 There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:58 PM on Wednesday, November 4,
28 2015.

29
30
31 
32 David Baucom, Chairman
33 Planning & Zoning Commission
34

35 
36 Pam Scaggs, Recording Secretary
Planning & Zoning Commission