

MINUTES
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
MARCH 6, 2014

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

**Ms. Tootie Burns
Mr. Andy Lee
Ms. Sara Loe
Mr. Steve Reichlin
Mr. Anthony Stanton
Mr. Rusty Strodman
Mr. Bill Tillotson
Mr. Doug Wheeler**

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT

Dr. Ray Puri

I) CALL TO ORDER

MR. REICHLIN: We'll call the March 6th, 2014 Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting to order.

II) APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MR. REICHLIN: Are there any adjustments to the agenda? I understand that there has been a withdrawal. Would Staff care to comment?

MR. SMITH: That's correct. Yes. I think the first item on the agenda, the rezoning at 1517 Ross Street, has been withdrawn.

MR. REICHLIN: Okay. That's noted.

III) APPROVAL OF REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

• February 20, 2014

MR. REICHLIN: Is there anybody that has any concerns or corrections of those meeting minutes? Mr. Wheeler?

MR. WHEELER: I'd move for approval.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MR. REICHLIN: Take a roll call, please. We'll go with a voice vote. All in favor, say aye. Same sign, nay.1

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

IV) PUBLIC HEARINGS

Case No. 14-15

A request by Best Five, LLC (owner) for approval of a C-P (Planned Business District) Development Plan on 2.23 acres of land, known as Lots 3 & 4 of Corporate Lake Plat 14, and associated variances. The subject properties are zoned C-P and located at the southeast corner of Southampton Drive and Executive Drive, and at the northeast corner of Executive Drive and

Corporate Plaza Drive.

MR. REICHLIN: Can we have a staff report, please?

Staff report was given by Mr. Clint Smith of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommendation: Approve the proposed Southampton C-P development and Design Parameters, with associated variances to Section 29-17(d)(2) to reduce the front yard setback to 18 feet on Lot 3, and to Section 29-17(d)(6) to permit a maximum of five directional signs at the entrances as shown on the C-P development plan.

MR. REICHLIN: Any questions of Staff?

MS. BURNS: I had a -- I wondered if parking was still going to be allowed on Executive Drive that runs to the west of the development?

MR. SMITH: To the best of my knowledge, I don't -- that was not discussed whether that would be restricted, so I would assume that it would be -- it would remain as parking on that, but I'm not sure.

MS. BURNS: Thank you.

MR. REICHLIN: Are there any other questions of Staff? Mr. Strodtman?

MR. STRODTMAN: Is the dumpster for Lot 4 kind of almost separated on the far right? Is that the dumpster that --

MR. SMITH: Correct. They actually have two dumpsters, and per the applicant, they actually have a -- let me see if I can show it on there.

MR. STRODTMAN: On the far right hand --

MR. SMITH: There is a dumpster at this location which will serve the site, but then also there is a dumpster located here, which is technically off-site, but according to the applicant, these will be shared dumpster facilities for both Lots 3 and 4, and also Lots 1 and 2 to the east.

MR. STRODTMAN: So will there be any changes made to how the tenants are supposed to get to that fourth -- I mean, they just have to go down the sidewalk and, I guess, go into the parking lot and get to it or cut across the landscaping?

MR. SMITH: Right. We did raise that issue actually with the applicant and they felt confident with this location and this arrangement that they would be able to haul their trash to those locations.

MR. STRODTMAN: Okay. Kind of a side note, but the question is does the City ever consider the inlet location when looking at a dumpster?

MR. SMITH: I'm sorry. Can you explain that?

MR. STRODTMAN: Like, you know, grease and things of that nature that would come out of a -- with restaurants --

MR. SMITH: Uh-huh.

MR. STRODTMAN: -- you would typically see a grease collector of some type in those compact -- you know, in the dumpster areas? Do we ever look and consider where the inlet is in relation to those dumpsters? Not specifically to this project, but just in general.

MR. SMITH: I don't -- you know, I don't have that information.

MR. STRODTMAN: Just kind of curious.

MR. SMITH: Yeah. We could double-check on that, but I don't have that in front of me.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you.

MR. REICHLIN: Are there any other questions of Staff? Seeing none, I will open the public hearing. I'll just briefly go over what the rules of engagement are. Those speaking in favor can -- the first or the -- if you have an organized representative, they have six minutes. Any other individuals interested in speaking subsequent to that will get three minutes. And it doesn't look like we have a big crowd tonight, so there may be some leeway. And please give us your name and address.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MR. KREITE: Yes. My name is Matthew Kriete. I'm with Engineering Surveys and Services with offices at 1113 Fay Street. I am the civil engineer on the project. I think Clint gave a very good summary of the project here. I have just a couple of items. On the terms of the right-of-way, currently Southampton has right-of-way adequate to meet current ordinances. The additional easement provided is above and beyond even what the ordinance provides, so I think we see the importance of an additional left-turn lane potentially for the school and potentially for Executive Drive in the future and want to make sure the City has the adequate space to make sure -- to get that built. In terms of the parking lot, Executive Drive, no -- I mean, this plan doesn't have any consideration of that, nor do I think that is something that really from the C-P perspective could be discussed here. It's really public right-of-way, but I would think my client would be pleased if that parking did go away. I will say that. And otherwise, I just want to clarify the square footage. The basement is an addition to the 17,000-square feet, so it's a total of 21,200. I didn't want there to be any confusion to that fact. Otherwise, I would be happy to answer any questions that you all have.

MR. REICHLIN: Are there any questions of this speaker?

MR. KRIETE: Thank you.

MR. REICHLIN: Is there anybody else interested in speaking on this matter? Seeing no other interest, I'll close the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MR. REICHLIN: Comments of Commissioners?

MR. LEE: It seems relatively straightforward to me, and I would move that we vote to approve.

MR. TILLOTSON: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: Who was the second? I'm sorry.

MR. REICHLIN: Bill Tillotson was the second.

MR. TILLOTSON: And with the full recommendation of Council [sic]; is that what you're saying?

MR. LEE: Yes.

MR. STRODTMAN: And I'm assuming that is to include the variances as well?

MR. LEE: Approved as Staff recommends.

MR. REICHLIN: May we have a roll call, please.

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes, sir. Item No. 14-15, A request by Best Five, LLC for approval of a C-P Development Plan on 2.23 acres of land, known as Lots 3 & 4 of Corporate Lake Plat 14, and associated

variances.

Roll Call Vote (Voting “yes” is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Reichlin, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodtman, Mr. Tillotson, Mr. Wheeler, Ms. Burns, Mr. Lee, Ms. Loe.

Motion carries 8-0.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. Vice Chair, the motion for forwarding to City Council has been approved.

MR. REICHLIN: Thank you.

Case No. 14-17

A request by Red Oak Investment Company (owner) to amend the Statement of Intent on 12.91 acres of land zoned C-P (Planned Business District). The subject site is located on the south side of Grindstone Parkway at Grindstone Plaza Drive.

MR. REICHLIN: May we have a staff report, please?

Staff report was given by Mr. Steve MacIntyre of the Planning and Development Department.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the proposed amendment to the C-P Statement of Intent, subject to the applicant providing an executed greenspace conservation easement to the City for the 2.11 acre off-site tree preservation area as shown in the attached exhibit.

MR. REICHLIN: Are there any questions of Staff? Mr. Wheeler?

MR. WHEELER: Do you know what the traffic count on Grindstone is?

MR. MacINTYRE: No, I do not. Not off the top of my head.

MR. WHEELER: I'll ask the applicant.

MR. REICHLIN: Are there any other questions of Staff? Yes, Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: Where is the nearest wildlife corridor on that west end of Grindstone?

MR. MacINTYRE: I suppose it --

MS. LOE: Or is there any -- is there any corridor to the west of the site?

MR. MacINTYRE: It depends on what you would consider a corridor for wildlife as opposed to --

MS. LOE: In your analysis, did you identify anything?

MR. MacINTYRE: I did not. However, the stormwater culvert is considered a habitat corridor. I believe there would be --

MS. LOE: How big are the culverts?

MR. MacINTYRE: I do not know the diameter of the culverts.

MS. LOE: Okay.

MR. MacINTYRE: Yeah.

MR. REICHLIN: Any other questions of Staff? Seeing none, we'll open the public hearing. The rules of engagement as previously stated still hold true.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. LAMAR: Good evening. My name is Phebe LaMar, and I'm here on behalf of the applicant. We have offices at 111 South Ninth Street. I'm here on behalf of Red Oak Investments, which has developed Red Oak South. That is located, as you know, across Grindstone Parkway from WalMart.

When the plat for this property was first approved, the Statement of Intent provided for specific locations for tree preservation. These locations are shown on the picture that is currently on the screen, specifically, at either end of the site. They're -- maybe I can point to it. I don't know if I can or not, but, specifically, you can see that there is tree preservation on the far eastern side, on the far western side, and then there is also the tree preservation that is at issue here that is kind of in the middle of the site. We are here this evening because unfortunately after having additional discussions with the City Arborist over the last few months and discussions with several possible end users for these lots, it appears that doing tree preservation in the middle of a commercial development is probably not the best location either for the health of the trees or for ensuring that this is a quality development on a major corridor in our town. In addition, with the proposed location of the new electric easement down Grindstone, a portion of this tree preservation is likely to be removed sometime in the relatively near future without at any action all by Red Oak. Given all of these considerations, we approached the City Staff to try to determine if there is some way that we can substitute a more substantial area of trees on property that is downstream from this location, but still in the same watershed, and on property that is owned by my client directly across Grindstone and behind Grindstone Plaza. It is important to note that the proposed property is in a location that abuts another conservation area on which the City is planning to build a trail already. This will result in an enlargement of that area, which will have a whole host of benefits. These will include providing a better location for wildlife than what will actually be provided in the current location. It is also property that without this agreement will be developed at some point in the future, and providing for the tree preservation there will allow for an increase in the buffer between the nature trail to be built there and whatever development is going in in the future. While it is on the other side of Grindstone from the current tree preservation location, it is actually a part of the original larger tract that was divided by Grindstone when that right-of-way was condemned. And even without accounting for the area that will be taken as a result of the electric lines to be installed, it is actually more than twice the amount of preservation property of what is currently located on these lots. Given all of this, we respectfully ask that you approve the trade of tree preservation areas located, such that in the arborist's opinion, they are more likely to survive and actually accomplish the intent of the tree preservation ordinance on the property that was originally part of one big tract. This can be accomplished by amending the Statement of Intent as has been submitted to you by Staff. We are here this evening as -- I am here this evening on behalf of the applicant. We have here this evening in addition, one of the owners of applicant, and, in addition, Tim Crockett will be speaking to you next. If you have any questions, we'll be happy to answer them. I can actually probably answer, at least with some degree of exactness, the question that you asked earlier, Mr. Wheeler. The traffic counts in this area are approximately 30,000 a day. That's -- that's not exactly current, but it is within a few thousand one way or the other.

MR. WHEELER: Thank you.

MS. LAMAR: Sure.

MR. REICHLIN: Are there any other questions of this speaker? Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: How is the area where you are proposing to remove the trees going to be developed if

the trees are removed?

MS. LAMAR: I don't know exactly at this time, but the proposal would be that the development go all the way up to what the current conservation easement is. You'll have a picture -- you had a picture of that earlier, and Mr. Crockett will also have a picture for you.

MS. LOE: Okay.

MS. LAMAR: But essentially, the -- what is planned at some point in the future is to take the development where -- in that location all the way up to the edge of the current trees, which, frankly, isn't going to be terribly beneficial for the trees that are already in the conservation easement, much less for the trees that we are proposing to preserve under this easement.

MS. LOE: But the area that is shaded grey right now, will that continue to be landscaped?

MS. LAMAR: Sure. There is landscaping requirements in the ordinance that require that there be landscaping on each of these properties.

MS. LOE: Okay. So we're not -- so that would still be a landscaped area?

MS. LAMAR: Well, there would be landscaping on each of these lots. Yes.

MS. LOE: That is not my question. My questions is the area that is grey right now, shown in the middle, would that same area continue to be landscaped?

MS. LAMAR: No, not necessarily. I mean, it's poss-- there will probably be landscaping in that area, but I don't know because there is no actual end user at this time. Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: So when we transplant, basically the trees from where we are taking them out in the grey area and we're moving them across the street, it extends the preservation plan? So that doesn't -- so in the future you put those trees there, somebody can't just come in and chop them down and build there?

MS. LAMAR: Absolutely. That is correct. There will be a conservation easement. There is actually a draft that City Staff already has that includes that 2.11 acres on the other side. That is going to be the City's property to preserve --

MR. STANTON: Okay.

MS. LAMAR: -- and whatever.

MR. REICHLIN: Are there any other questions? Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: That area across the Grindstone Parkway --

MS. LAMAR: Yes.

MS. LOE: --looks to be -- that's part of the conservation area along the stream to the east of WalMart.

MS. LAMAR: Okay.

MS. LOE: I'm -- I mean, I'm looking at a --

MS. LAMAR: Yeah. I'm not looking at the same picture that you are, but I would be happy to.

MS. LOE: That works. That looks approximately to be the same area as the parcel you are saying does not do well in a developed location. I'm just curious as to why we have approved a similar footprint previously if now this is coming to us and we're being told this footprint doesn't do well.

MS. LAMAR: Well, my understanding from what you were told a few minutes ago by City Staff is that it hasn't done particularly well, and as a result, I think they are trying something new.

MS. LOE: Okay. I'll ask for clarification. Thanks.

MS. LAMAR: Okay.

MR. REICHLIN: Any other questions?

MS. LAMAR: Thank you.

MR. REICHLIN: Seeing none.

MR. CROCKETT: Mr. Reichlin and members of the Commission, my name is Tim Crockett with Crockett Engineering Consultants, 260 North Stadium. In an effort not to duplicate some of the things that was already said, I think that Ms. LaMar, and especially Mr. MacIntyre gave a very good staff report updating the Commission on what the request is. Here is a couple of pictures of the existing trees that we have on the property right now that is under protection. You can kind of see that we've got some -- we've got some cedars; we've got a few locust; we've got some understory growing in there. I -- trees that the City Arborist has labeled as invasive species. While they are protected and they are a part of the climax forest, he sees a tree line such as this much more desirable. He would rather have this. He said these are much more desirable trees, larger trees, more mature. And as located here, it is adjacent to the existing tree preservation area. As illustrated before, going through the WalMart site, we have development on both sides of that corridor. And I believe that that gives an issue to those trees being that they are being crowded out. It eliminates the wildlife corridor; it eliminates a lot of the necessities that the trees need for existence, and that's exactly what is potentially going to happen on the site that it is at now. Now, by placing that additional tree preservation area as noted, what that is going to do is it is going to enhance the existing area and allow it to grow and, of course, be protected on one side. As Ms. LaMar indicated, this piece of property that we are talking about -- the existing location and the proposed location -- are all part of the parent parcel. If this was one development at one time, those trees -- we could simply move the -- move the location -- simply do it administratively. It's all in the parent parcel. This property has been subdivided here recently with the extension of Grindstone. And that took place -- it basically bisected the property, and now we have two parcels, one of which has been subdivided -- excuse me -- two of which have been subdivided further. I have talked to the City Arborist specifically about this and I asked him specifically what was it that you looked at that made you approve or recommend approval for this request. First of all, the obviously additional acreage was very lucrative to him. He liked the idea of having over twice the amount of tree preservation area. The exchange takes place in the same watershed. I think this is extremely important. We are not asking for trees to be replaced with trees that are in a completely different watershed or relocate it completely off-site at a remote location. These are simply downstream in the same watershed in the same stream that crosses this property, which is very important to him. Again, we have talked about the idea -- he's fearful that the existing tree preservation area will become invasive species with scrub vegetation. He says what is going to happen -- what he fears over time is that the mature climax trees will be pushed out by these -- by this other growth, if not maintained. And, of course, in his words, the proposed tree preservation area is truly old growth forest.

He looked at those trees; he's walked to that site. Actually, we asked him to pinpoint the location in which you would like trees to be preserved, and this is where he came up with them. He said this is old growth forest that we would like to have preserved. Of course, he talked about the .97. He believes it is too small for wildlife habitat. The trees are likely to die due to the future parking lot. And then, also, he sees a benefit because this tree preservation that we are proposing screens the nature trail that Parks & Recreation are proposing in the area. This allows additional screening from any potential development in that area. So again, the advantages that we are talking about is to increase by more than two times, adds two acres, provides screening, and provides -- protects larger and higher quality trees. To give you a little more rundown on exactly what we are talking about here, the area that is shown as grey attached is a specific area that we are talking about preserving. The triangular piece that is not shaded to the south of that is what is already preserved today. So with that, I would be happy to answer any questions.

MR. REICHLIN: Are there any questions of this speaker?

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MR. REICHLIN: Seeing none. Is there anybody else who wishes to speak on this matter?

Seeing none, I'll close the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MR. REICHLIN: Comments of Commissioners, please? Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: I would just like to say that I understand that that two-acre parcel with those old growth trees is compelling and sexier than this little parcel, but I'm really conflicted about this one because I don't think we can just move all our greenspace to one consolidated area. I think that we need to -- I think there is some real needs for keeping the greenspaces infused -- or diffused throughout our urban landscape. And I have to admit, when I pulled out and looked at Grindstone, I really feel like we are creating a bit of a collar or a barrier at that edge of Grindstone. And, no, this is not about creating a habitat, I agree. An acre is not a habitat. But it is about creating a location where the Grindstone nature area can still move to the habitat south of town. And we don't want to start landlocking these areas. So I'm really conflicted about this one. I love the old trees, but I'm really feeling the adjacencies presented by the site have a completely different argument for them.

MR. STRODTMAN: I have a question for Staff. Who will -- will the City maintain the 2.11 acres once the easement has been completed?

MR. MacINTYRE: Under the conservation easement, I believe there is some maintenance available as far as removing any species that might not be desirable in there of trees and understory. I'm not sure how frequently or if it happens at all in many instances. To be honest, it is probably something that would occur based on more likely an immediate need to remove a tree that may be damaged and about to fall on a trail for --

MR. STRODTMAN: But it would be maintained if there was maintenance needed?

MR. MacINTYRE: Yes. That would be -- any maintenance that would be needed, it is allowed by the greenspace conversation easement and it would certainly -- it would be under the City's task to perform.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you.

MR. REICHLIN: Anybody else? Mr. Lee?

MR. LEE: Yeah. It seems to me that this is a nice trade off of a property that is going to be developed sooner or later. And those trees, if we leave -- if they are left there are going to get choked at some point. I agree with Ms. Loe that it can't be a wildlife -- .97 acres, that can't be a wildlife area, and that with 30,000 or more -- that are going to grow on Grindstone, that the exhaust and so on and so forth are going to affect that spot anyway. So with the fact that Red Oak is willing to move over across Grindstone and set up a much larger area for the preservation and the trail and all that is going to be added over there, this just seems to me that this is a nice trade off.

MS. LOE: I just -- I wanted a clarification from Staff. This might decide my vote. An electrical easement was mentioned that would potentially remove a considerable amount of trees in the area we are looking at that was not brought up in the staff report, and I just wondered if you could touch on that.

MR. MacINTYRE: I wasn't actually aware of that easement.

MS. LOE: Oh.

MR. MacINTYRE: So it may be something that the applicant's engineer could explain a little bit more.

MR. CROCKETT: Absolutely. The electrical easement that was mentioned I believe is the south transmission line that Water and Light is currently working on. I believe that Grindstone Parkway is an alignment for that overhead power line that is going through there. And, Ms. Loe, I apologize, a pointer never works very well on the screen, and, of course, it's not going to work now. But basically, the south side of the right-of-way is -- again, Water and Light has given us an indication that the south side of the right-of-way is where they want to put that overhead power line. And what that does is it is going to set outside of the right-of-way on an easement that goes through there that would potentially remove additional trees. So it's the south -- I'm not sure what Power and Light is going to be calling it, but it is the larger transmission line that goes across the south portion of Columbia.

MS. BURNS: Excuse me, Mr. Crockett.

MR. CROCKETT: Yes?

MS. BURNS: This is connecting the Peachtree substation with the Grindstone substation?

MR. CROCKETT: That's my understanding, yes, ma'am.

MS. BURNS: Okay. I think the larger -- there are different variance of --

MR. CROCKETT: Yes.

MS. BURNS: -- wattage carrying lines. I believe the other ones were headed down Nifong. So I don't know if these are the larger, heavier carrying power lines.

MR. CROCKETT: Ms. Burns, I'm not familiar with how large they are. They just kind of gave us an indication that there is going to be some easements needed and some power lines -- overhead power lines in this area.

MS. BURNS: Okay.

MR. LEE: Mr. Crockett?

MR. CROCKETT: Yes, sir?

MR. LEE: Did you say those are going to be overhead lines?

MR. CROCKETT: That is our understanding. Correct.

MR. REICHLIN: Mr. Wheeler?

MR. WHEELER: I don't have a question. That -- I'm just -- as far as the issue goes, I understand Ms. Loe's position and what she is saying. I think we -- that when the WalMart came through -- and I was on the Commission, but not here during that period. But it kind of limited any kind of wildlife crossing pattern when we did whatever those are because -- well, they are bizarre. But I also see this as like a little island on an extremely busy road that may or may not benefit much of anything in wildlife as far as wildlife goes. I think -- we were given that when this came in, simply there was a ditch there, and at that time it was felt it was going to be problematic to fill it. And I personally think that with this trade off, we end up with a better product for the development on the south side of Grindstone; we have better street frontage. We don't have this little pocket of trees, but, frankly, if you've driven by there it is really not all that attractive now. And, you know, in addition to that, we still get what we normally get, which is 15 percent of each lot has to be open, landscaped in some manner, and we have the tree preservation areas on the ends. And we trade off what I see as, you know, a more useful and environmentally friendly parcel to the north, admittedly not on Grindstone, but I think ultimately it would benefit what we are trying to benefit here in a better manner. And so I intend to support it.

MR. REICHLIN: Would anybody else like to comment on this matter? Mr. Tillotson?

MR. TILLOTSON: I intend to support it, but I just want to add some little tidbit. Where my house is I've got about one and a half acres that runs along WW, and 27 years ago when I built my house, I had these beautiful oaks and hickories all lined up along WW as kind of a buffer. As -- being such a smart individual that I am, as other trees starting growing and scrub growing, I thought, boy, that is great because I'm going to have more buffer. I'm going to have more stuff impairing the vision from WW to my house. And now I look out, my big oaks have died; my hickories are dying; and all I've got is one and a half acres of scrub, and simply because it wasn't maintained or taken care of. And when I look at this little .97 acres, I see that that's going to happen to that anyway. It's not going to be taken care of and maintained. And if we can utilize a greater space that we have some chance of maintenance from time to time from the City, I think it is not necessarily something you would like to see, but I think it is a better use of that greenspace. So with that, I intend to support it.

MR. REICHLIN: Anybody else caring to weigh in?

MR. STANTON: I intend to support it. Yeah, I tend to support it for all the reasons that have already been stated. We can choose to do nothing and reject this and then this parcel of land dies off and we don't have a win. What -- the proposal that is on the table and the recommendation that is on the table, we increase our tree preservation area, win or lose. So I think I plan to support this simply because of that.

MR. REICHLIN: Anybody else?

MR. STRODTMAN: I'll go ahead and make a motion, if there is no further discussion. And I

motion the approval of the amended Statement of Intent subject to applicant providing an executed greenspace easement for off-site tree preservation.

MR. LEE: Second.

MR. REICHLIN: That's Mr. Lee with the second. May we have a roll -- will there be any discussion on this motion? Seeing none, I'll request a roll call.

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes, Mr. Vice Chair. Item No. 14-17, a request by Red Oak Investment Company to amend the Statement of Intent on 12.91 acres of land zoned C-P. The subject site is located on the south side of Grindstone Parkway at Grindstone Plaza Drive.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Reichlin, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodtman, Mr. Tillotson, Mr. Wheeler, Ms. Burns, Mr. Lee. Voting No: Ms. Burns. Motion carries 7-1.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. Vice Chair, the motion for the approval to move it up to City Council has been approved.

MR. REICHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

V) COMMENTS OF PUBLIC

MR. REICHLIN: Comments of public? Anyone interested on weighing in on whatever?

VI) COMMENTS OF STAFF

MR. REICHLIN: How about comments of Staff?

MR. MACINTYRE: Yes. The next meeting will be held on March 20th, and we have just a couple of items on that agenda, tentatively, of course. The first being a subdivision, Southland Plat 1A, which is a replat, and this is actually reflective of a new policy that we have of taking all replats through you for review and recommendation, whereas previously, we used to forward replats directly to Council. And it's in response to sensitivity concerns that have been raised to some of these replat items actually having some substantial content that really does merit or warrant review by you. So we'll be doing that from now on, and this is the first case, I believe, that we are doing that with as a change in policy. The second is a public hearing item, a rezoning request from R-1 to R-2 on El Cortez Drive. And a couple of you may have actually been here in the past for a similar rezoning request right next door to it just a few years ago. Here are the overview maps -- locator maps at the sites. The first, the Southland Plat 1A, is actually a division of this little property here into two minimally sized lots. And that site is located just to the south of The Crossing's church -- actually, just east of the site we just talked about on the tree swap request. The second, the rezoning request is just on the west side of Providence Road, near the outer road that serves it south of Nifong, and -- I believe it is south of Nifong.

MR. ZENNER: North.

MR. MacINTYRE: North. Pardon me. Just north of Nifong. And it's on El Cortez Drive.

MR. ZENNER: I just want to make sure that the Commission is aware that it is that time of the year again that we will be having to do our evaluation of the Capital Improvement Budget. That will be coming up at the -- I've got to remember if we've got it on the last agenda for the month of March or the

first agenda for April. But we will be getting our electronic copy or at least a link to the copy of the Capital Improvement Budget for 2015. We will invite our regular attendees, which are our Public Works Director and his staff or assignees that he would like to attend, as well as most likely this year, potentially our Water and Light staff, Ted Johnson, as well as Ryan Williams, the assistant director to talk about particular projects that are there. We have historically in the past also invited Parks and Recreation. We have been asked by our finance department to be able to provide comments back on a relatively short time schedule, which is the normal course that they have asked us, so the earlier we are able to discuss this project, the better. And I believe with that in mind, I think I have requested that the material be provided to us here within the next week to ensure that we have the opportunity to discuss it at the last meeting of this month. I just wanted to let you know that. Obviously, the issues that have come up as it relates to infrastructure availability and some of the other project timing, as well as the completion of Columbia Imagine, I think places us in a position right now to maybe pay some attention to our Capital Improvement program and projects more closely than we have in the past. We have priorities, obviously, that the Capital Budget lays out, and obviously with some of the goals and objectives of Columbia Imagine, it may be interesting to suggest reorganizing those if you as a Commission believe that considering what we just went through. Now, we will provide you the link as soon as we have it available and then keep your eye out on the next work session agenda to find out if we are discussing it then or at the first meeting in April. With that, that's all we have to offer. I appreciate your attendance this evening.

VII) COMMENTS OF COMMISSIONERS

MR. REICHLIN: Comments of Commissioners? Anybody -- some pressing matter? Seeing none, I'll entertain a motion for adjournment.

MR. WHEELER: So moved.

MR. REICHLIN: I'll second. Have a good evening.

VIII) ADJOURNMENT

(The meeting was adjourned at 7:55 p.m.)