

MINUTES
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
JANUARY 21, 2025

Item A: Call to Order and Announce that a Quorum is Present

With a quorum present, the Lewisville Planning and Zoning Commission meeting was called to order by Chair Karen Locke at 6:35 p.m. on Tuesday, January 21, 2025, in the Council Chambers, of the Lewisville City Hall, 151 West Church Street, Lewisville, Texas.

Members present: Chair – Karen Locke, Vice-Chair Erum Ali, Jack Tidwell, Rick Lewellen, Ainsley Stelling, Francisca Al-waely, Joshua Peterson

Members absent: none

Staff members present: Richard E. Luedke, Planning Director; Michele Berry, Planning Manager; Jon Beckham, Senior Planner; Lauren Cook, Planner I; Patty Dominguez, Senior Planning Technician; Lauren Crawford, Deputy City Attorney.

Item B1: Approval of Minutes

Consider the minutes of the January 7, 2025, Regular Meeting. Commissioner Tidwell raised a question about a specific statement on page three of the minutes regarding a 50-foot requirement for plantings and berms. The commissioner inquired if the 50-foot measurement mentioned in the minutes was correct or a possible typo. Planning Director Richard Luedke confirmed that the 50-foot measurement was correct. *A motion was made by Francisca Al-waely to approve the minutes as presented, seconded by Rick Lewellen. The motion passed unanimously (7-0).*

Item C: Public Hearing

2. Continued Public Hearing: Consideration of a Special Use Permit for Licensed Massage Therapy; on Approximately 1.1601 Acres, Legally Described as Lot 2, Block A, Lewisville Plaza Phase 2, Located at 1010 Edmonds Lane; Zoned Local Commercial District (LC); as Requested by Yangjuan Zhao, Top Massage, on Behalf of Jay Maharaj LLC, the Property Owner. (Case No. 24-09-16-SUP)

Michele Berry, Planning Manager, gave an overview and stated that the request is to operate a licensed massage therapy business in a space previously occupied by a similar business, which had legal issues related to prostitution, triggering the special use permit requirement for any health or massage establishment wishing to open in that space. Michele further stated that the applicant has provided documentation of her business operations, including her massage therapist licenses and measures to comply with state regulations (e.g., hours of operation, clothing requirements, licensing of therapists). Staff's concern is that, despite the applicant's efforts, the location has a history of illegal activity, and there is a pattern in Lewisville where businesses with similar issues are reopened with new ownership but continue to experience the same problems. In addition, the applicants existing business in Flower Mound has a police report, related to sexual misconduct, though no charges were filed. Staff's recommendation is denial of the special use permit request due to concerns about the location's history and the potential for repeated issues of prostitution and human trafficking. The applicant was present and available for questions. Chair Locke opened the public hearing. Rusty Chiu, 9915 Corinth Lane, Frisco, Texas (translator for the applicant,

Yangjuan Zhao) spoke on behalf of the applicant. He addressed several points: The previous owner of the business (Ms. Tao) had her case dropped, and she misunderstood that she was allowed to reopen after the charges were dropped. He urged the commission not to stereotype the applicant, noting that she has implemented several measures (e.g., licensed therapists, no provocative clothing, limited signage) to ensure compliance with regulations and to maintain a legitimate business. He also mentioned that there were no police visits or reports of illegal activities at the applicant's current location in Flower Mound. He requested that the commission reconsider the decision and approve the special use permit, emphasizing the applicant's commitment to running a legitimate business and being an asset to the community. Commissioner Ainsley expressed concern about the location's history of issues, noting that it is not related to the applicant, the clientele at this location may still have certain expectations based on past activities. The commissioner suggested the applicant consider a different location where a special use permit wouldn't be required. With no one else indicating a desire to speak, the public hearing was then closed. There was no discussion. A motion was made by Ainsley Stelling to recommend denial of the special use permit, seconded by Erum Ali. The motion passed unanimously (7-0). Richard E. Luedke, Planning Director, stated that the item would appear before the City Council on February 17, 2025, at 7:00 p.m. for a second public hearing and a final decision.

Item D: Regular Hearings

3. Regular Hearing: Pinnell Subdivision Phase IV, Lot 4R; on 0.935 Acres; Zoned Light Industrial (LI) District; Being a Replat of Pinnell Subdivision Phase IV, Lots 4, 6, and 8; Located at 587 and 591 Benjamin's Way. (Case No. 24-12-14-RP)

Jon Beckham, Senior Planner, gave a brief overview and staff's recommendation. There was no discussion. A motion was made by Erum Ali to disapprove the replat due to deficiencies and delegate to staff the authority to accept and approve the plat when deficiencies are corrected, seconded by Jack Tidwell. The motion passed unanimously (7-0).

4. Consideration of Three Alternative Standards Related to Architectural Standards in the IH-35E Corridor Overlay District; on a 1.13-Acre Portion of Huffines Chevrolet Warehouse Addition, Block A, Lot 1; Located on the South Side of Bennett Lane, Approximately 890 Feet East of IH-35E; Zoned Light Industrial (LI) District, as Requested by Trent Clark, of A Plus Desing Group, the Architect, on Behalf of Huffines Lewisville Property LP, the Property Owner (Case No. 25-01-1-AltStd)

Jon Beckham, Senior Planner, gave a brief overview and staff's recommendation. During the presentation the memo and exhibit were noted to have an error in Alternative Standard C) which noted the east elevation in error instead of the west elevation. Commission Member Ainsley Stelling inquired about the reasoning behind such a large percentage of reduction. Jon Beckam responded that the elevation facing public right-of-way was meeting the IH-35E Overlay requirements, and the elevations requesting the alternative standards were high quality in the context of proposed building's location. Nathaniel Tavares with A Plus Design Group, 2653

Sagebrush Drive Suite 200, Flower Mound, Texas 75028, was present and available for questions. A motion was made by Rick Lewellen to approve the alternative standards as presented, seconded by Joshua Peterson. The motion passed (6-1), Ainsely Stelling voting nay. Richard E Luedke, Planning Director, stated that the item would appear before the City Council on February 3, 2025, at 7:00 p.m. for a second regular hearing and a final decision.

5. Tabled Item: Consideration of a Recommendation for Amendments to the Unified Development Code by Amending Article VII, “Uses, Parking Requirements, Supplemental Use Regulations And Certain Distance Requirements of Volume II of the Lewisville City Code, Known as the Unified Development Code, by Amending Chapter VII.3; “Supplemental Use Regulations”, Section VII.3.24, Manufacturing, Light Intensity; Manufacturing, Medium Intensity; Manufacturing, Heavy Intensity; and Warehouse Distribution Facility, to Provide Additional Standards, and Amending Exhibit VII.2.3-4, Non-Residential Zoning Districts, to Clarify Applicability of Special Use Permit Requirements for Such Uses in Certain Zoning Districts.

Richard E. Luedke, Planning Director, provided an overview of the proposed amendments which had been changed since put in the packet on Friday. He thanked the community for their input, which included approximately 200 emails, phone calls, and in-person conversations with business and property owners expressing concerns and seeking clarification. The main goal of the proposed amendments is to require a Special Use Permit (SUP) for new manufacturing or distribution warehouse facilities. This would apply particularly to vacant properties or those previously developed for lower-intensity uses (e.g., office, retail, restaurants, hotels). The intention is to address compatibility issues that may arise when high-intensity uses are introduced into areas originally designed for less intensive purposes. A 500-foot buffer rule would apply to properties near lower-intensity uses, determining when an SUP is required. Properties with an approved Planned Development (PD) would not be subject to these new provisions, as these developments have already gone through a public hearing process. Existing properties that have a Certificate of Occupancy (CO) as of March 3, 2025, will not be affected by the new provisions. If no CO exists, alternative documentation will be reviewed to determine the building's use as of that date. Properties currently in the development process are considered "vested," and the new regulations would not apply unless significant redevelopment occurs. Commissioners raised several questions about the practical implications of the proposed changes, including the potential impact on current tenants, landlords, and business owners. A concern was voiced regarding property owners potentially having to rush to document the existing uses of their properties. Richard clarified that having a CO would simplify the process, and businesses would be grandfathered in. The amendments were designed to protect small businesses and to prevent higher-intensity uses (such as 24-hour trucking operations) from negatively affecting the surrounding area. Richard also clarified that the proposed changes would not affect current businesses unless there were major expansions or redevelopment (e.g., tearing down buildings to rebuild with higher-intensity uses). The Special Use Permit (SUP) application fee was discussed, with a cost of \$750, plus additional fees for signage. A reminder was given that although this was not a public hearing, the public had the right to speak on the item. Individuals wishing to speak were invited to fill out a speaker card.

The final decision on any Special Use Permit (SUP) request would be made the City Council, after a recommendation is made by the Planning and Zoning Commission. Chair Locke had three emails/letters to read into the record and proceeded to read the following:

First

“My name is Lance Kent and I am an owner of a small office warehouse in the Old town area. When I received a notice that said: The city of Lewisville is holding a hearing, that will determine whether you may lose the right to continue using your property for its current use. I was surprised that was even possible. This property has been used for Light manufacturing which is within its Zoning classification, ever since it was purchased over 10 years ago. The property’s value was, and is, determined by: its location, its improvements and the uses allowed by its zoning, now and in the future. If some of my options for the use of this property will be reduced by this change, so will its valuation. Will the city compensate me for this reduction in valuation? So I called the Planning and Zoning department and spoke to John Beckham to find out what the intention of this zoning change was. He was very helpful and told me the City received a number of complaints from a few large established residential communities about the semi truck traffic, noise and air pollution created by new large warehouse developments adjacent to their property. It would seem, if you create a housing development adjacent to property zoned light Industrial, you should not be surprised or complain when it is developed for one of its intended purposes. Perhaps, the housing development should take some responsibility for creating the barrier between it and who it perceives as its offensive neighbor. Currently, property zoned Light Industrial has the right to be used for Light Manufacturing or Warehouse distribution among a number of other uses. Under the amendment these property owners could lose that right and would require a special use permit, which would require additional time and expense and ultimately may not be approved. Many potential buyers or renters of the property will look elsewhere to avoid this bureaucratic red tape. This devalues the property and is not fair to the current owners. Finally, in the Memorandum written by Richard E. Luedke, AICP, Planning Director on January 7, 2025 to the Planning and Zoning committee, which summarizes Mr. Luedke’s analysis of the need for this amendment, states “... to mitigate harmful impacts associated with future development or redevelopment of Manufacturing, Light Intensity;...” This idea that there are Harmful impacts associated with light manufacturing is totally wrong. We, as a country have been trying to attract Manufacturing jobs back to our shores for years. Its become a National economic goal. We should be creating incentives to attract Manufacturing to our city, not more barriers to block it. Light Manufacturing creates jobs. These jobs are not only on the assembly floor, but also jobs in Engineering, Accounting, Sales, Marketing, Purchasing, IT, Maintenance, Secretarial and Quality Control. This amendment makes it more difficult for Small manufacturers to locate in Lewisville. People want to live close to where they work. If you want to attract people to Lewisville to live, then create policies that attract Light Manufacturing jobs to Lewisville, and the people will follow. My recommendation, is to vote NO on this amendment and devote your time and energy to creating policies that will attract more Light manufacturing jobs to our city not discourage them.”

Second

“Jeff Traylor Owner of several properties at or around 418 Jones St. Lewisville Texas. I hope this email finds you well. I attended and spoke at the meeting on 1-7-25. I wanted to say thank you

for your time and patience. Karen Locke was most respectful and it was appreciated. Also please if one of the members could confirm you received this it would be greatly appreciated. I write you because the problem with this request by staff is not finished. If I could take a moment of your time to give a little prospective on this topic and verbiage. Most of us who own commercial property understand the city wants to clean up Lewisville. There are many places where the town is trashy and old. In an effort They have made it almost impossible to do anything CAR related activities in town. It's a slow grinding constant pressure of changing requirements. Never one big move just a steady step to chip away at what we have today. Below I will list key questions or concerns. Below that is some background information. Hard to do it in a letter but its all I have.

- The goal is to stop buildings from being torn down and replaced with warehouse. – Most of us have no problem with that. There are rules today if a structure is changed by some %. Update that section.
- They can add wording for Pre-Existing Non-Conforming to say “ All Pre-Existing Non-Conforming will continue to be subject to zoning, permitting and Certificate of Occupancy as were in in effect as of 1-1-2025.”
- Or that “Pre-Existing Non-Conforming will not be subject to SUP or Administrative Procedures unless the structure is changed/ altered in size by some % or we request something not allowed within or current zoning” This would come into play if they tear it down...
- They staff like to use terms like major site change or if the use changes to something else. These are term they use to trip us up. The use changes. If you have a guy making screws and then a guy wants to store hot sauce, that's a use change. INTO A SUP.
- They start off saying Major Expansion or New Development. But then they start including us All Pre-Existing Non-Conforming. Do you know how we got put into this category. The city changed the rules around us over time and that forced them to put us into it. When we were built, the builders complied with all the rules.

If you remember I said that for most of our tenants stay for 3-5 years then they move on. My tenants last longer but only because they have fewer options available to them. If you could look up my address. 418 Jones Street. It's a cluster of buildings next to the water treatment facility. But also look to the south and southwest and you will see homes. Most of these homes are in Light Industrial area. Several within 500' of my and others commercial buildings. None of this has been built or changed in decades. The proposed Grand Fathered wording is cover for if a tenant moves out we city staff can step in and prevent things we do not like. It sounds crazy right. But its how it works. Staff can stall a request for weeks if not months. Tenants do not plan that much time so they will have to pass. They have an existing lease somewhere that is expiring and they need to move soon. The SUP process is another BLACK HOLE. First the process takes months. Everyone knows it so we all try to just stay away from it. But if the Staff does not like what your requesting they will not support it to council. I mean if they do not like it... Even if it is listed as allowed with SUP they will kill it. Its all up to taste and what people want. We want to work with clear rules. If you do these things we will allow X. But SUP does not work that way. Neither will some type of Administrative Process. Please do not subject us to this. I finish by saying lets be fair. Things get rubber stamped and all of you move on. We are stuck trying to live within a

code and it not much different than tax code to understand. Your at the mercy of the IRS, we are at mercy of city staff. Most are good people but most of the time they do not work well with us. Make a simple and direct change to prevent one type of building from being torn down for another with out the city having some input. But stop them from adding the ability to alter existing zoning processes. Forcing us and our tenants to jump through hoops, spend money and SO MUCH TIME. It is not making Lewisville a better place, its making it a More Controlling State. Simply say no.”

Third

From Murl Richardson, “Michele and Jon, I am not certain if you will be supplementing information to the P&Z this evening but I did want to reiterate my recommended modifications to the proposed development requirements referenced below and the SUP requirement should be removed if the new project is compliant with the development requirements.”

The following filled out a card indicating their opposition to this item, Chair Locke read their names:

Keith McDaniel, 111 W Carruth Ln, Double Oak, Texas 75077

Donny Troung, 380 E SH 121 Suite 100, Lewisville, Texas 75057

Andrew Bowman, 2401 Windchase Drive, Flower Mound, Texas, 75028

Larry Rose, unknown address

Jeff Traylor, 650 McMakin Road, Bartonville, Texas 76226

Lance Vanzant, 513 W Hickory, Denton, Texas 76201

Russell Jenkins, 997 Grandy’s Ln, Lewisville, Texas 75077

Tommy Mann, 500 Winstead Building, Dallas, Texas 75201

Luis Pedraza, 545 E Church St, Lewisville, Texas

Henry Wright, 1403 Seminole Dr, Richardson, Texas 75080

Melba Houston, 629 Hardy St, Lewisville, Texas 75057

Patricia Wright, 1109 Lagoon Dr, Dallas, Texas 75207

Mike Green, 1006 E Main, Lewisville, Texas 75067

George Wright, 1109 Lagoon Dr, Dallas, Texas 75209

Allen Meyer, 2700 Old Acton Rd, Denton, Texas 76210

Larry Meyer, PO Box 4, Argyle, Texas 76226

Dixon Rich, 117 Tambark Circle, Coppell, Texas 75019

Rick Steeno, 2019 Vista Dr, Lewisville, Texas

Cheestety Ward, 1308 Palisades Dr, Lewisville, Texas 75067

Tanaka Powell, 818 Madison, Lewisville, Texas 75067

Joyce Powell, 1305 Palisades, Lewisville, Texas 75067

Randy Biernacki, 901 E SH 121, Lewisville, Texas 75057

Chair Locke called for anyone who she had called and wishing to speak should come forward, state their name and address, and speak directly into the microphone.

Lance Vanzant, 512 W. Hickory, Denton Texas 76201, representing the Leatherwood family, spoke regarding their business, Leatherwood Plastics, located on Crescent Drive in the Light Industrial District. He explained that the business has been in continuous operation since 1984. He expressed concern about the proposed ordinance, particularly as the business does not currently have a zoning or site plan on record. However, he stated that the company does possess a Certificate of Occupancy (CO) and inquired about the procedure for ensuring compliance with the new regulations before the March 2025 deadline. He noted that the revised draft of the ordinance seemed to address some of their concerns.

Tommy Mann, 500 Winstead Building, Dallas, Texas 75201, representing multiple clients, spoke in opposition and expressed concerns about the changes in the language of the proposed ordinance, particularly the revisions made just before the meeting. He highlighted two significant changes: 1) The requirement that every property within 500 feet must contain certain uses, as opposed to the previous version which allowed properties if their property line was within 500 feet; and 2) A revision regarding the legal status of projects, where the language changed from recognizing projects with a concept plan or zoning plan submitted before the meeting to requiring a Certificate of Occupancy, which occurs later in the development process. Mann stressed that these changes could impact clients who have projects in development, potentially rendering them non-conforming, which could create significant financial and operational challenges. He disagreed with staff's characterization of non-conforming status as insignificant in the commercial real estate world. He also pointed out the potential issue with the calculation of the 20% opposition required under state law, as the new language might affect how this opposition is calculated and could trigger a three-fourths voting requirement. Mann concluded by urging caution with the process, emphasizing the importance of thoroughly reviewing the language before proceeding, as the late changes could have unintended consequences.

Henry Wright, 1403 Seminole Dr, Richardson, Texas 75080, representing a site currently in development, spoke in opposition and expressed concerns about the recent revisions to the ordinance. He stated that when he began the development, it complied with all relevant codes and permits, but the new language now potentially renders his site non-conforming, despite significant financial investment. He described the revised language as ambiguous and expressed frustration over the need to potentially fight for compliance in the future, particularly if his tenant faces issues obtaining a Certificate of Occupancy (CO). Wright also questioned why he, as a developer, would need to list and defend potential uses for the site when he had previously adhered to the code and regulations. He argued that the process feels rushed and the new language could create barriers for

future development, leading to longer approval times, reduced property values, and potentially driving new development away from the city.

Jeff Traylor, 650 McMakin Rd, Bartonville, Texas 76226, spoke in opposition and expressed concerns about the recent changes in the language of the ordinance. He noted that while the revisions were an improvement, there are still ambiguities, particularly around the use of properties within 500 feet. Using his own property as an example, he mentioned that some properties in light industrial areas are currently being used as residences, which could be problematic if they are now classified under this new ordinance. Traylor also raised issues with the responsibility of ensuring that all tenants are compliant with the Certificate of Occupancy (CO) requirements, specifically that they are using one of the allowed uses under the light industrial zoning. He was concerned that buildings with tenants who had Special Use Permits (SUPs) might fall into a gray area once those tenants leave, as the CO could reflect the previous use rather than the new permitted use. Additionally, he pointed out that if a tenant moves out just before the March 2025 deadline, it could create complications if the building is vacant and the new tenant doesn't have the proper CO on file at the time of occupancy. Traylor emphasized the need for careful wording in the ordinance to avoid gaps or unintended consequences, suggesting that buildings that have been vacant for a short period (such as six months) should still be treated as compliant if they are used in the same way as before. He concluded by stressing the important role of the Commission in conducting thorough due diligence on these matters before presenting recommendations to the City Council.

Winston Edmondson, 1292 Marchant Place, Lewisville, Texas 75065, spoke in support and shared his concerns about warehouses being built in the city, particularly in areas where they don't fit well with the community. He emphasized that while the city does not oppose warehouses outright, there are situations where the placement or design of a warehouse negatively impacts the quality of life for residents. Edmondson expressed frustration with how previous warehouse developments were approved without community input and how elected officials had dismissed concerns, claiming there was nothing that could be done. He thanked city staff for their thoughtful approach to the new language, noting that it strikes a good balance between protecting property owners' rights and ensuring the interests of the community are considered. Edmondson explained that the proposed changes would not ban warehouses but would allow the city council to evaluate certain projects on a case-by-case basis, providing a "stopgap" to prevent unsuitable developments in residential areas or near neighborhoods. He cited a specific example of a potential warehouse near a residential area and praised the proposed process for allowing the city to pause and evaluate such projects. Edmondson also suggested that while this is a good first step, further safeguards, such as annual safety inspections for warehouses, could be beneficial in the future. He concluded by urging the Planning and Zoning Commission to support the proposed changes as a balanced solution.

Rick Steiner, outside counsel for UNARCO Material Handling, Inc., 501 E Purnell St., Lewisville, Texas, addressed the commission regarding his client's property. His client owns a light industrial building that has been in operation for 30 years, along with a 3-5 acre adjacent lot. The area is now within 500 feet of newly constructed residential apartments. Steiner sought clarification on the impact of the 500-foot requirement, particularly when considering future development. He expressed concern about whether a new building on the vacant lot would require a special use

permit (SUP), given the proximity to residential areas. Steiner recommended tightening the “grandfathering” or “existing use” language to prevent confusion in such cases, especially given the size of the vacant lot. He also raised concerns about transparency and communication with businesses, stressing the need for better understanding between the city and local businesses about future plans. Lastly, Steiner critiqued the SUP process, referencing a recent case where a business met all requirements but was denied an SUP based on an inference rather than evidence. He expressed dissatisfaction with the process and suggested that such decisions could undermine public trust in the system. He emphasized that businesses complying with the law should be allowed to operate, regardless of personal opinions about their type of business.

Commissioner Stelling asked for clarification from staff regarding the language change between what was sent on Friday and what was received today. She requested an explanation in simple terms to better understand the difference. Planning Director Richard E. Luedke explained the difference between the language from Friday and the updated version. The original language referred to concept plans, engineering site plans, and zoning plans, which are part of a Planned Development (PD). The clarification made it clear that developments within an existing PD would be exempt from the 500-foot rule, which could trigger a Special Use Permit (SUP). The new language now refers to the Certificate of Occupancy (CO), which is the necessary permit for a business to occupy a space, providing clearer guidance on compliance when the ordinance goes into effect. Commissioner Ali asked for clarification on the concern raised by a developer whose project is still in the concept plan development stage and not yet ready for a Certificate of Occupancy (CO). Specifically, they wanted to understand whether such projects would be exempt from the Special Use Permit (SUP) process until reaching the CO stage, and how this scenario applies to ongoing developments. Richard E. Luedke clarified that state law is clear regarding vesting to zoning. Specifically, once a developer submits the first permit in a series (such as a concept or zoning plan), they are vested to the zoning and the associated land use classifications. The Special Use Permit (SUP) is a zoning tool, and the developer's rights are vested at that initial permit submission, not requiring an SUP later in the process. Commissioner Al-waely expressed concern about the proposed changes, stating that the drawbacks of the proposal seem to outweigh the potential benefits. Based on this, she recommended that the Planning and Zoning Commission not move the proposal forward to the City Council. This was presented as her personal opinion and stated that she would not vote in favor of advancing the proposal. Chair Locke thanked the audience for their respectful conduct and expressed appreciation for their attendance and comments. She emphasized the importance of hearing from the community and acknowledged that their input was valued. Commissioner Tidwell raised a concern regarding the timing of the language updates, which have been released shortly before meetings. He suggested that there might be an opportunity to allow more time for review and consideration, possibly through a workshop or a presentation. Commissioner Tidwell expressed appreciation for the presentation but mentioned that he was still processing the information and asked if there was any new language released earlier in the day. Planning Director Richard E. Luedke acknowledged the complexity of the matter and confirmed that the final hard copy of the language was completed around 3:30 PM on the day of the meeting. He recognized the challenge of balancing the concerns raised and emphasized that a significant amount of staff time and thought had gone into addressing as many

concerns as possible. Commissioner Lewellen shared personal experience, mentioning that he lives across from a warehouse currently under construction. He highlighted concerns about the increasing traffic and other issues related to the development. He emphasized the importance of considering the residents who live around industrial sites, noting that they are also taxpayers and have a vested interest in ensuring that their quality of life is protected. He urged the need for provisions that safeguard the interests of the people who live in these areas. There was no further discussion. A motion was made by Rick Lewellen to recommend approval of the Unified Development Code amendments as presented, seconded by Ainsley Stelling. The motion passed (6-1), Francisca Al-waely voting nay. Richard E. Luedke, Planning Director, stated that the item would appear before the City Council on February 17, 2025, at 7:00 p.m. for a second public hearing and a final decision.

Item E: Adjournment

A motion was made by Erum Ali to adjourn the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Ainsley Stelling. The motion passed unanimously (7-0). There being no other business to discuss, the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting was adjourned at 8:04 p.m.

These minutes will be approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission at the next scheduled meeting.

Respectfully Submitted,

Approved,

Michele Berry, AICP
Planning Manager

Karen Locke, Chair
Planning and Zoning Commission