

**MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION
116 WEST NEEDLES
BIXBY, OKLAHOMA
October 24, 2012 6:00 PM**

SPECIAL-CALLED MEETING

STAFF PRESENT:

Erik Enyart, AICP, City Planner
Patrick Boulden, Esq., City Attorney

OTHERS ATTENDING:

See attached Sign-In Sheet

CALL TO ORDER:

Vice/Acting Chair Larry Whiteley called the meeting to order at 6:05 PM.

ROLL CALL:

Members Present: John Benjamin, Larry Whiteley, and Lance Whisman.
Members Absent: Jeff Baldwin and Thomas Holland.

CONSENT AGENDA:

1. Approval of Minutes for the October 15, 2012 Regular Meeting
-

Vice/Acting Chair Larry Whiteley introduced Consent Agenda Item Number 1. John Benjamin noted that he could not vote on the Minutes as he was not present at this meeting. The Commissioners decided to Pass the item to the end of the Agenda, in the event Jeff Baldwin would show up by then (it was not known if Mr. Baldwin would be in attendance). Vice/Acting Chair Larry Whiteley declared the item PASSED to the end of the Agenda.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

None.

PLATS

2. **Preliminary Plat / Final Plat – Southridge at Lantern Hill – Lantern Hill, LLC.**
Discussion and consideration of a Preliminary Plat and a Final Plat and certain Modifications/Waivers for “Southridge at Lantern Hill,” a resubdivision of all of *Lantern Hill*.
Property Located: 146th St. S. and Sheridan Rd.
-

Vice/Acting Chair Larry Whiteley introduced the item and asked Erik Enyart for the Staff Report and recommendations. Mr. Enyart summarized the Staff Report as follows:

To: Bixby Planning Commission
From: Erik Enyart, AICP, City Planner
Date: Friday, October 19, 2012
RE: Report and Recommendations for:
Preliminary Plat & Final Plat of Southridge at Lantern Hill

LOCATION: – 14728 S. Sheridan Rd. (pre-platted parcel address)
– 146th St. S. and Sheridan Rd.
– The NE/4 of the SE/4 of Section 15, T17N, R13E
– All of Lantern Hill

LOT SIZE: 39.9 acres, more or less

EXISTING ZONING: RS-3 Residential Single Family District / PUD 72

EXISTING USE: Lantern Hill, a vacant residential subdivision

REQUEST: (1) Preliminary Plat & Final Plat approval for a 115-lot residential subdivision
(2) Modification/Waiver from Subdivision Regulations Section 12-3-4.F to exceed the 2:1 maximum lot depth to width ratio
(3) Modification/Waiver from Subdivision Regulations Section 12-3-2.C to provide no stub-out streets
(4) Modification/Waiver from Subdivision Regulations Section 12-3-2.T to exceed the 300' maximum length dead end/cul-de-sac street for 147th St. S.
(5) Modification/Waiver from Subdivision Regulations Section 12-3-2.N to remove the sidewalk construction requirement along Sheridan Road

SURROUNDING ZONING AND LAND USE:

North: AG; Agricultural along S. Sheridan Rd.

South: AG; Rural residential, agricultural, and vacant along S. Sheridan Rd. & S. Kingston Ave.

East: AG; Agricultural along S. Sheridan Rd.

West: RS-3/CS/OL/PUD 62 and RS-3/PUD-46; 80-acres of agricultural land for a future development tentatively known as "Hawkeye." The The Ridge at South County residential development is to the northwest.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: Corridor + Development Sensitive + Vacant, Agricultural, Rural Residences, and Open Land

PREVIOUS/RELATED CASES:

BZ-333 – Lantern Hill, LLC – Request for RS-3 zoning for subject property – PC Recommended Approval 07/16/2007 and City Council Approved 08/13/2007 (Ord. # 974).

Preliminary Plat of Lantern Hill – Request for Preliminary Plat for subject property and Waivers from: (1) The 2:1 maximum depth-to-width ratio standard per SRs Section 11-3-4.F, (2) The stub-out street requirement per SRs Section 12-3-2.C, and (3) The 300' maximum length for a dead end/cul-de-sac street per SRs Section 12-3-2.T for 147th St. S. – PC Recommended Approval 11/19/2007 and City Council Approved with all Waivers 12/26/2007.

Final Plat of Lantern Hill – Request for Final Plat approval for subject property – PC Recommended Conditional Approval 09/15/2008 and City Council Approved 10/13/2008 (recorded 02/04/2009).

PUD 72 – Southridge at Lantern Hill – Lantern Hill, LLC – Request for PUD approval for subject property – PC recommended Conditional Approval 08/20/2012 and City Council Conditionally Approved 08/27/2012, including as Conditions certain requirements for minimum house construction and design quality (ordinance not numbered or signed as of 10/19/2012 due to the Applicant not having submitted the final version incorporating corrections and Conditions of Approval).

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Lantern Hill, containing 75 lots, four (4) Reserves, and three (3) blocks, was platted February 04, 2009. Infrastructure was completed and the lots were released for Building Permit issuance about a year later. Since then, not one lot has been sold, nor house built. The developer proposed PUD 72 to reduce the lot size requirements for use in a replat, to be known as "Southridge at Lantern Hill." The smaller lots will

likely reduce the lot costs, making them more affordable. Typical lots in Lantern Hill range from 90' X 150' (13,500 square feet, 0.31 acres) to 110' X 160' (17,600 square feet, 0.404 acres). The Zoning Code requires a minimum lot width of 65' in the RS-3 district, but PUD 72 reduced this to 60'. The developer has expressed this situation within the PUD by explaining the need to meet "market conditions" and provide "a consistent market of residential home construction."

ANALYSIS:

Subject Property Conditions. The subject property contains 39.9 acres and is zoned RS-3. It has been developed as Lantern Hill, a single-family residential subdivision with large lots, all of which are vacant and still belong to the developer/Applicant.

The subject property is bounded on the north by an 80-acre agricultural tract zoned AG, on the east by Sheridan Road, on the south by rural residential, agricultural, and vacant tracts along S. Sheridan Rd. and S. Kingston Ave, and on the west by an 80-acre tract approved for RS-3, CG, and OL zoning and PUD 62 for a development tentatively known as "Hawkeye."

The subject property is on the side of a hill and appears to drain to the east and northeast, ultimately to Bixby Creek.

Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan designates the subject property as (1) Corridor, (2) Development Sensitive, and (3) Vacant, Agricultural, Rural Residences, and Open Land.

The single family housing development anticipated by this plat would be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

General. The proposed replat subdivision contains 115 lots, and will retain the existing street network, the four (4) Reserve Areas, and the three (3) blocks (however, due to Reserve "B" completely separating parts of Block 2, Staff recommends the designation of a fourth block). Typical lots range from 60' X 155' (9,300 square feet, 0.21 acres) to 60' X 165' (9,900 square feet, 0.23 acres).

On October 15, 2012, the developer's engineer, Barrick Rosenbaum of Rosenbaum Consulting, LLC, requested an expedited plat review. The Planning Commission Chair has called a Special Meeting on October 24, 2012 to review and consider the plats. The City Council is anticipated to review and consider the plats at or before its November 12, 2012 regular meeting. Staff sent the plats and information to the TAC by email October 15, 2012, requesting comments be submitted in accordance with this accelerated review schedule. As of the date of this report, issues on utility relocations remain between the developer and BTC Broadband. TAC member comments are attached to this report.

The Fire Marshal's and City Engineer's memos, and the City Attorney's email, are all attached to this Staff Report. Their comments are incorporated herein by reference and should be made conditions of approval where not satisfied at the time of approval.

Access and Internal Circulation. Primary access to the subdivision would be from S. Sheridan Rd. via 146th St. S. and 148th St. S., all of which are existing. Internally, 147th St. S., S. 62nd E. Ave., and S. 63rd E. Ave. are also in existence.

As homes have not yet been constructed, and thus no addresses are in use in the addition, Staff suggests the developer consider renaming S. 62nd E. Ave. → S. Lakewood Pl. and S. 63rd E. Ave. → S. Maplewood Pl. This would be consistent with the metropolitan Tulsa addressing convention, employed throughout most of Bixby west of Sheridan Rd. for north-south avenues. Specifically, this would be consistent with street names in nearest subdivisions Eagle Rock and The Ridge at South County, and would be consistent with Kingston Ave. to the south. Finally, builders and homeowners may prefer having their address on "Lakewood Place" or "Maplewood Place" versus a numbered avenue.

Staff Recommendation. Staff recommends Approval Staff of the Preliminary Plat and Final Plat with the following corrections, modifications, and Conditions of Approval:

1. Subject to compliance with all Fire Marshal, City Attorney, and City Engineer recommendations and requirements.
2. Subject to a Modification/Waiver from Subdivision Regulations Section 12-3-4.F, as most lots appear to exceed the 2:1 maximum depth to width ratio as per SRs Section 12-3-4.F. Staff notes that this Modification/Waiver was approved with the plat of Lantern Hill, but only for a handful of lots, and those being the ones subject to the 130' PSO easement. The Modification/Waiver may be justified by citing its necessity as a product of a replatting of much larger lots into smaller ones, at 60' in typical width, while retaining existing streets, pursuant to PUD 72, and the location and width of the 130' PSO easement affecting certain lots.

3. Subject to a Modification/Waiver from Subdivision Regulations Section 12-3-2.C to provide no stub-out streets. Staff notes that this Modification/Waiver was approved with the plat of Lantern Hill, and that the streets are already in place.
4. Subject to a Modification/Waiver from Subdivision Regulations Section 12-3-2.T to exceed the 300' maximum length dead end/cul-de-sac street for 147th St. S. Staff notes that this Modification/Waiver was approved with the plat of Lantern Hill, and that the streets are already in place.
5. Subject to a Modification/Waiver from Subdivision Regulations Section 12-3-2.N to remove the sidewalk construction requirement along Sheridan Road. The City Engineer's and City Planner's recommendation is that there be payment of a fee-in-lieu of sidewalk construction along Sheridan Rd., so that monies in proportion to sidewalk construction along Sheridan Rd. be collected and placed in escrow for sidewalk construction in other locations within Bixby, to be determined as prioritized by capital improvements planning. The Waiver request letter and PUD text include this requirement.
6. Lot 42, Block 2 does not appear to meet the 60' minimum average lot width per PUD 72.
7. Lots 22 through 46, inclusive, Block 2, are completely separated from the balance of Block 2 by Reserve Area 'B.' Per the definition of "Block" in the Subdivision Regulations and the typical block numbering conventions, the two (2) areas need to be separate blocks.
8. Land Summary statistics on the plat face report Block 1 contains 30 lots, when it actually contains 50 lots.
9. Update Lot, Block, and Reserve number statistics on the first page to add the new block number, and to update lot numbers if/as needed.
10. Preliminary Plat: Elevation contours at one (1) foot maximum intervals not represented as required per SRs Section 12-4-2.B.6.
11. "Engineer/Surveyor" listed on the plats is HRAOK, Inc. but application filed by engineer Barrick Rosenbaum of Rosenbaum Consulting, LLC. Please reconcile if / as appropriate (SRs Section 12-4-2.A.4).
12. Consider renaming streets to coincide with the metropolitan Tulsa addressing convention, as used in Bixby, as follows:
 - a. S. 62nd E. Ave. → S. Lakewood Pl.
 - b. S. 63rd E. Ave. → S. Maplewood Pl.
13. It appears the common lot line between Lots 7 and 8, Block 1 (previously Lots 5 and 6, Block 1) was moved easterly approximately 3'. However, at least three (3) dependent dimensions were not correspondingly changed:
 - a. 7.5' U/E along easterly line of Lot 8.
 - b. 11' U/E along westerly line of Lot 7.
 - c. 4.32' distance between southeast corner of Lot 8 and the intersection of the northerly line of the PSO easement with the south line of Lot 8.
14. Text and linework conflict at Lot 7, Block 1, make reading difficult.
15. Consider making the common lot line between Lots 45 and 46, Block 2, perpendicular/radial to the arc of the curved street in order to eliminate the 1.09' variance between the easterly endpoint of C6 and the common lot corner. It is not clear if the 1.09' variance is to the west or to the east of the common lot corner, due to its exceptionally small size and the scale of the plat.
16. Angle/Bearing data missing from parts of all five (5) streets.
17. 109.35' Dimension missing from Lot 7, Block 2 (and was not due east/west in Lantern Hill).
18. Angle/Bearing data missing from north line of Lot 7, Block 2.
19. Angle/Bearing data missing from south lines of Lots 16, 17, and 18, Block 2 (and was not due east/west in Lantern Hill).
20. Angle/Bearing data missing from northerly lines (both instances) of Lot 12, Block 2.
21. Angle/Bearing data missing from northerly lines of Lots 20 and 21, Block 2 (and was not due east/west in Lantern Hill).
22. 102' dimension missing from northerly line of Reserve "C."
23. 13.50' dimension missing from northerly line of Lot 13, Block 2.
24. Angle/Bearing data missing from northerly lines of Lots 22 through 25, inclusive, Block 2.
25. Angle/Bearing data missing from common line between Lots 26 through 42, inclusive, Block 2.

26. *Angle/Bearing data not specified between the easterly line of Lot 37, and the westerly lot of Lot 46, Block 1.*
27. *Dimension missing on Lot 46, Block 1.*
28. *5.59' dimension on Lot 42, Block 2 does not appear to correspond to actual distance between lot corner and point of curve/tangency as represented.*
29. *North/south lot dimensions in Block 1 along the north side of 146th St. S. do not correspond with dimensions per the recorded plat of Lantern Hill.*
30. *It appears the common lot line between Lots 10 and 11, Block 2 (previously Lots 7 and 8, Block 2) was moved northerly a few feet vis-à-vis existing lots in Lantern Hill. However, at least two (2) dependent dimensions were not correspondingly changed:*
 - a. *5' U/E along northerly line of Lot 10.*
 - b. *11' U/E along southerly line of Lot 11.*
31. *Angle/Bearing data missing from northerly lines of Lots 6 and 17, Block 3 (and was not due east/west in Lantern Hill).*
32. *Angle/Bearing data missing from the main north-south line within Block 3 (and was not due north/south in Lantern Hill).*
33. *Lots 16 and 17, Block 1 missing distance between lot corners and points of curve/tangency.*
34. *Four (4) items of survey data represented on the North Entry Detail of Lantern Hill are not represented on this plat. On two dimensions along lot street frontages, the text overlaps linework on the plat, making it difficult to read.*
35. *Most of the internal side yard U/Es of the existing plat of Lantern Hill are not represented on this plat. U/E removal must be acceptable to all concerned utility companies. Verification of easement width and location adequacy must be provided by each serving utility company in the form of a release letter, due prior to recording the Final Plat (Subdivision Regulations Section 12-2-6.B).*
36. *If determined necessary or appropriate by the developer's legal counsel, prior to or upon the successful recording of the Final Plat of "Southridge at Lantern Hill," it may be necessary to vacate or partially vacate the concerned part of the underlying plat of Lantern Hill to completely extinguish certain elements, such as utility easement(s), which are dedicated to the public and accepted by the City.*
37. *15' B/L and U/E along the east side of Lot 5, Block 3. Consider reducing U/E to 10' or increasing B/L to 20' to provide a 5' buffer area, or the amount necessary to protect the integrity of the foundation and supporting wall, in the event of excavation of the U/E up to its interior edge.*
38. *Please add proposed addresses to the lots.*
39. *25' B/L and U/E along the north side of 146th St. S. Consider reducing U/E to 20' or increasing B/L to 30' to provide a 5' buffer area, or the amount necessary to protect the integrity of the foundation and supporting wall, in the event of excavation of the U/E up to its interior edge.*
40. *Deed of Dedication / Restrictive Covenants (DoD/RCs): FL/E (Fence and Landscape Easement) is not provided for – please add appropriate dedication and maintenance responsibility language.*
41. *DoD/RCs Preamble: Missing critical wording such as "And has caused the above described land to be surveyed, staked, platted, granted, donated, conveyed, and dedicated, access rights reserved, and subdivided ..." as per the City Attorney's recommendations regarding fee simple ownership of rights-of-ways.*
42. *DoD/RCs Preamble: Legal description used was the unplatted legal description used before the recording of Lantern Hill. Legal description used should be "All of Lantern Hill..." or something to that effect.*
43. *DoD/RCs Preamble: describes as "...a Subdivision in the City of Bixby." Title Block on face of plat describes as "...a resubdivision..." Please reconcile. See also Surveyor's Certificate; other occurrences possible.*
44. *DoD/RCs Section I.E: Does not appear to provide for passive recreational uses (such as walking trails) in Reserve Areas. Advisory.*
45. *DoD/RCs Section I.E.3: Refers to HOA formation in DoD/RCs Section III, but should be Section IV.*

46. DoD/RCs Section I.H: Please qualify this section as follows: "...damage to landscaping and paving, **when permitted by the City of Bixby**, occasioned...."
47. DoD/RCs Section I.I: Refers to HOA formation in DoD/RCs Section III, but should be Section IV.
48. DoD/RCs Section I.I: As per the Developer's Engineer Barrick Rosenbaum at the TAC meeting held September 03, 2008, Reserve B must also be designated a Utility Easement, as there will be utilities within it. Please confirm if this is or is not still the case. If so, please amend this section accordingly. Alternatively, if additional utility corridors are necessary which are not represented as covering parts of Reserve B as currently shown, such specific areas may be added as U/Es.
49. DoD/RCs Section I.I: Provides, "The use of Reserve ... shall be limited to use as open space, landscaping..." This does not appear to provide for passive recreational uses such as walking trails. Advisory.
50. DoD/RCs Section I.J.2: The description of the 5' and 5' is somewhat awkwardly written – is it intended to state that 10' will be maintained between residences, rather than the sum of the two 5' side yards? Advisory.
51. DoD/RCs Section II: Section is missing parts of PUD 72 as approved (signage, minimum house design/construction quality, Use Unit 5 neighborhood swimming pool and/or clubhouse, etc.).
52. DoD/RCs Section II Preamble: Refers to "Sections 1100-1107 of Title 42, Bixby Revised Ordinances (Bixby Zoning Code)." This appears to point to the City of Tulsa's Zoning Code. Please revise to simply "... the provisions of the Bixby Zoning Code pertaining to Planned Unit Developments (PUDs)," or something to that effect.
53. DoD/RCs Section II.D: Minimum lot frontage standard is not consistent with PUD 72.
54. DoD/RCs Section II.D: Contains a subsection .1 and no other subsections. Advisory.
55. DoD/RCs Section III.A.3: 2018 date used appears to be the same as was used in Lantern Hill, apparently the customary 10 years from the [drafting date] of that plat. If 10 years is intended, the date would be some time in 2022 or 2023. Advisory.
56. DoD/RCs Section III.A.3: Refers to HOA formation in DoD/RCs Section III, but should be Section IV.
57. DoD/RCs Section III.B: Does not contemplate the planned Use Unit 5 neighborhood swimming pool and/or clubhouse.
58. DoD/RCs Section III.B: Refers to amendment provisions in DoD/RCs Section IV.C instead of [V].C as presumed intended.
59. DoD/RCs Section III.G: Indicates masonry requirement of PUD 72 may be waived by the subdivision's Architectural Committee. Please qualify appropriately. See also City Attorney's recommendations on the matter.
60. DoD/RCs Section III.K: "...shall be concrete or asphalt..." Would cobblestone or Belgian block be permitted? Advisory.
61. DoD/RCs Section III.L: Would appear to prohibit standard wood fences. Advisory.
62. DoD/RCs Section III.O: Zoning Code allows accessory dwelling units (ADUs) only by Special Exception from the Board of Adjustment, or by PUD. Please qualify language allowing for 'servants quarters' that the same is subject to City of Bixby Zoning approval. Also, ADUs are more commonly occupied by family members (e.g. 'granny shacks') and not domestic servants.
63. DoD/RCs Section III.T: "... when being utilized in connection with construction or home maintenance or repair services pertaining to a residence." Advisory.
64. DoD/RCs Section III.U: "No exposed garbage can, trash can or any trash burning apparatus or structure shall be placed on any Lot or any Reserve Area except on the day the trash is picked up." Advisory.
65. DoD/RCs Section III.BB: Appears to be the same as DoD/RCs Section III.R Lot Maintenance. Advisory.
66. DoD/RCs Section IV Enforcement, Duration, Amendment and Severability: Duplicate Section number. Section V is presumed intended.
67. DoD/RCs Section [V].C: Refers to DoD/RCs Section II.B "Use," when Section III.B "Use" is presumed intended. Still, it is not clear what this is referring to. DoD/RCs Section III.L refers to specific lots.
68. The "Sheet 1 of 1" notation at the bottom right-hand corner of the first page of the plat is not accurate.

69. *The 07/24/2012 date prepared at the bottom right-hand corner of the plat does not appear to be accurate. Date of plat preparation is required per SRs Section 12-4-2.C.1 and 12-5-2.A.1.*
70. *Final Plat: Elevation contours, floodplain boundaries, physical features, underlying Zoning district boundaries, minimum improvements acknowledgement, and other such mapping details as required per SRs Section 12-4-2.B.6, by approval of this Final Plat, shall not be required on the recording version of the Final Plat, as such would be inconsistent with Final Plat appearance conventions and historically and commonly accepted platting practices.*
71. *A copy of the approved PUD 72 including all recommended corrections shall be submitted for placement in the permanent file.*
72. *A copy of the Preliminary Plat including all recommended corrections shall be submitted for placement in the permanent file.*
73. *A copy of the Final Plat including all recommended corrections shall be submitted for placement in the permanent file.*
74. *Due to the number of minor errors, Staff does not claim that the above represents all of the necessary corrections. The Applicant is advised to re-review the plat and Deed of Dedication and Restrictive Covenants and satisfy themselves as to its correctness.*

Erik Enyart explained that the most significant item in the plat was the lot which was too small. Mr. Enyart stated that, in his conversation with the Developer's Engineer prior to the meeting, he was informed this would be resolved by adjusting the lot lines to meet the minimum requirement. Mr. Enyart stated that the problem was due to the lot becoming narrower to the south, when it started out at only about 60' in width [at the north], and due to the fact that a lot can only claim one (1) year yard line, due to the definitions in the Zoning Code.

Vice/Acting Chair Larry Whiteley clarified with Erik Enyart the number of lots in the subdivision and the nature of the replat with more and smaller lots. Mr. Enyart clarified that Block 3, as shown on the plat, was there currently, with existing, larger lots. Mr. Enyart clarified that the streets are all in place, and that the new plat will be placed over the existing plat.

John Benjamin asked Erik Enyart if his recommendations included the City Attorney's recommendations, and Mr. Enyart responded that it did. Mr. Enyart referred the Commissioners to recommended Condition of Approval numbered 1.

Vice/Acting Chair Larry Whiteley asked Erik Enyart if the escrow account he was recommending would have to be used for sidewalks. Mr. Enyart responded affirmatively, stating that, as recommended, it would go into a City-owned escrow account, to be applied to the cost of construction for new sidewalks in future street improvement projects. Mr. Whiteley and Mr. Enyart clarified the matter further. Mr. Enyart stated that, for example, in the 151st St. S. widening project recently done by the City of Bixby and Tulsa County, had there been money in such an escrow account at the time, that money could have been applied to the cost of construction of sidewalks in that project.

Lance Whisman expressed concern over the excessive number of recommended corrections and Conditions of Approval. Mr. Whisman noted that recommended Condition of Approval # 74 in the Staff report acknowledged the large number of correction items. Mr. Whisman stated that he wanted to make a point that he considered the number excessive. Erik Enyart noted that, of all of the recommended corrections, modifications, and Conditions of Approval, the two largest [categories] were (1) minor surveying notations, and (2) comments on the Deed of Dedication and Restrictive Covenants. Mr. Enyart indicated that the items were small and could be easily fixed.

Barrick Rosenbaum of Rosenbaum Consulting, LLC stated that making the corrections would not be a problem.

Lance Whisman made a MOTION to Recommend APPROVAL of the Preliminary Plat and the Final Plat subject to all the corrections, modifications, and Conditions of Approval as recommended by Staff. John Benjamin SECONDED the Motion. Roll was called:

ROLL CALL:

AYE: Benjamin, Whiteley, & Whisman
NAY: None.
ABSTAIN: None.
MOTION CARRIED: 3:0:0

OTHER BUSINESS

Vice/Acting Chair Larry Whiteley confirmed with Erik Enyart that there was no other business to consider. No action taken.

CONSENT AGENDA (Resumed):

1. Approval of Minutes for the October 15, 2012 Regular Meeting
-

Vice/Acting Chair Larry Whiteley introduced the Consent Agenda Item Number 1 and asked to entertain a Motion.

Lance Whisman made a MOTION to CONTINUE to the Minutes of the October 15, 2012 Regular Meeting to the November 19, 2012 Regular Meeting. John Benjamin SECONDED the Motion. Roll was called:

ROLL CALL:

AYE: Benjamin, Whiteley, & Whisman
NAY: None.
ABSTAIN: None.
MOTION CARRIED: 3:0:0

NEW BUSINESS:

Vice/Acting Chair Larry Whiteley confirmed with Erik Enyart that there was no new business to consider. No action taken.

OLD BUSINESS:

Vice/Acting Chair Larry Whiteley confirmed with Erik Enyart that there was no old business to consider. No action taken.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, Vice/Acting Chair Larry Whiteley asked to entertain a Motion to Adjourn. John Benjamin made a MOTION to ADJOURN. Lance Whisman SECONDED the Motion. Roll was called:

ROLL CALL:

AYE: Benjamin, Whiteley, & Whisman
NAY: None.
ABSTAIN: None.
MOTION CARRIED: 3:0:0

Meeting Adjourned at 6:15 PM.

APPROVED BY:

Chair

Date

City Planner/Recording Secretary