



**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR SESSION MEETING OF THE QUEEN CREEK
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

Tuesday, November 10, 2009 7:00 P.M.

Council Chambers, 22350 S. Ellsworth Road, Queen Creek, AZ 85242

1. **CALL TO ORDER** The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. **ROLL CALL**

Present

Chairman Trapp-Jackson
Commissioner Atkinson
Commissioner Ingram
Commissioner Perry
Commissioner Reyes
Commissioner Sossaman

Absent

Commissioner Moore

Staff

Present

Community Development Director Condit
Planning Manager Balmer
Principal Planner McCauley
Community Development Assistant Laura Moats

Absent

Others in attendance

Scott McCoy, CMC Steel Attorney (Earl, Curley & Lagarde, P.C.)
Lynn Kusy, Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport (PMGA)
Gail Barney, Kenny Barney and Jason Barney
Ralph Pew, Pew and Lake
Tyler Wright, Pew and Lake
Mario Mangiamele, IPlan Consulting

3. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Members of the public may address the Commission on items not on the printed agenda.

Please observe the time limit of three minutes. Speakers' cards are available at the door, and may be delivered to staff prior to the commencement of the meeting. **There were no public comments.**

4. **Consent Agenda:** Matters listed under the Consent Agenda are considered to be routine and will be enacted by one motion and one vote. Public Hearing items are designated with an asterisk (*). Prior to consideration of the Consent Agenda, the Chairman will ask whether any member of the public wishes to remove a Public Hearing item for separate consideration. Members of the Commission and/or staff may remove any item for separate consideration.

- a. **Consideration and Possible Approval of October 14, 2009 Work Study and Regular Session Minutes**
- b. ***Public Hearing, Consideration and Possible Approval of Rock Point Church, RZ09-039/SP09-040/CU09-041**

Motion: Commissioner Ingram
To approve the Consent Agenda, as presented.
2nd: Commissioner Reyes
Vote: All ayes. Motion carried 6-0 (Moore absent)

5. ***Public Hearing, Discussion and Possible Action on Text Amendment to Zoning Ordinance, Article 6.16, Sign Regulations, TA09-075** A request by the Town of Queen Creek for an Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance, Article 6.16 Sign Regulations (**This item will be continued to the December Commission Meeting**)

Planning Manager Balmer noted the need for additional study by staff; therefore, staff is recommending this be continued.

Motion: Commissioner Sossaman
To continue the Text Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance, Article 6.16, Sign Regulations, TA09-075, to January 13, 2010.
2nd: Commissioner Atkinson
Vote: All ayes. Motion carried 6-0 (Moore absent).

6. **Public Hearing, Discussion and Possible Action on Major General Plan Amendment Application, Victoria Estates Parcels 10, 11 & 11A, GP09-057/RZ09-059**, A request Ralph Pew on behalf of Taylor Morrison Homes to amend the General Plan Land Use Map for 125 +/- acres known as Victoria, Parcels 10, 11 and 11a, located at the northeast corner of Hawes and Ocotillo roads, from Medium Density Residential (2-3 dwellings per acre) to Medium High Density Residential-A (0-5 dwellings per acre).

Planning Manager Balmer presented staff report and Power Point presentation.

Mr. Balmer noted when the Barney Major General Plan Amendment was processed last year, there was concern that the Council would not have a way to ensure the changes would exactly match the proposed zoning in the General Plan cases; therefore, the zoning and GPA cases are being processed concurrently this year.

Mr. Balmer illustrated an aerial photo of the subject property, along with the surrounding developments of Queen Creek Marketplace, Queen Creek Crossroads and Queen Creek Fiesta.

He noted the proposal will be a self-contained, “active-adult” community with walking paths, small-scale amenities, and private streets. The site is currently zoned Medium Density Residential. The applicant is proposing MHDR-A and MHDR-B, bringing the number of lots from 345 to 475.

Mr. Balmer noted the staff analysis included in packet shows the density goes from 3.0 to 3.8 dwelling units per acre to accommodate the additional units. The town’s utility system will accommodate this demand. The project will not provide a direct positive revenue stream for the town, but it will be less costly than the current plan, and it will provide indirect revenue generated from additional sales tax.

Mr. Balmer noted one of the primary concerns gathered from public comment is if the active adult community is approved by Council, how will the town ensure the project does not become a typical conventional subdivision with the same types of homes found in single family home communities generating school-aged children? Mr. Balmer stated staff’s position is that the location is a good place for an active adult community to be placed, since it is close to Town Center shopping, restaurants and other businesses.

Staff is recommending approval of this proposal, subject to the conditions provided in the staff report.

Commissioner Atkinson asked if there is any possibility of this being a gated community. Mr. Balmer responded discussion about a gated community has not taken place. He added the proposal includes private streets, and with private streets, there is typically a gated entrance.

There were no further questions from the Commission.

Mr. Ralph Pew of Pew and Lake, 1744 South Val Vista, Suite 217, Mesa, Arizona, addressed the Commission on behalf of Taylor Morrison Homes. He stated the applicant has applied for zoning concurrent with the Major General Plan Amendment, noting the applicant would like to bind and commit this property to an age-restricted active adult community, as proposed in the application. He noted there will be a slight increase in density of one unit per acre to accommodate the age-restricted community.

Mr. Pew stated the zoning requires the development as proposed in the narrative booklet, which describes all the amenities. The trend in age-restricted communities is to put emphasis on golf courses, as typically done in the past; however, for communities of this size and nature, having a golf course is no longer typical. He stated the sought-after amenities for a community of this size include a pool, fitness center, parks, trails, and hobby rooms. He stated the applicant concurs with all staff findings and recommended conditions of approval.

Mr. Pew referred to the recommended stipulations relating to the zoning portion of this case, stating the project will be required to have a PAD, preliminary plats and final plats. The applicant recognizes the zoning case tonight establishes a base zoning, and they will have to go through Site Plan, Subdivision Plat and Final Plat approval later; however, the applicant is requesting the wording “shall require approval of PAD”, be amended to say, “if necessary”.

Mr. Pew stated if the property owner meets all standards, there may not be a need for a PAD; therefore, this stipulation may not be necessary.

Mr. Pew provided the following statements for the Commission to consider:

- 1: Approval of the request will require a Zoning Ordinance be adopted, which includes reference to the project narrative. The applicant will be required to develop the site in accordance with the narrative which requests an age-restricted community.
- 2: The applicant will work with staff and the town attorney to comprise a Development Agreement which will ensure this type of development (i.e. age restricted).
- 3: The applicant will provide a Deed Restriction.

Mr. Pew stated this location is well-suited for this type of development since it is close to the hospital, airport, and Town Center.

There were no questions from the Commission.

Chairman Trapp-Jackson opened the Public Hearing at 7:22 P.M.

- 1) Steve Richardson: Roman Estates 20866 S. Hadrian Way, Queen Creek; Mr. Richardson stated he is speaking on behalf of a group of five people living in this area. He stated he is not in total opposition to the project; however, he is skeptical that this project will be successful. He thanked Ralph Pew and Taylor Morrison for their information. He expressed concerned that there is no golf course because he thinks this demographic would be favor a golf course. Secondly, he is concerned about the lack of bus transportation, and no indoor shopping malls. He feels these types of amenities draw this demographic and the project may not be successful without them. If the project is successful, he doesn't think it will be bad. He stated his problem is that he worries once the zoning has been approved, there is a chance for the developer to walk away and another developer to come in and develop single family homes at the higher density. He is also concerned about increased traffic in this area that may not flow well since there are only two access points planned for the project.

Chairman Trapp-Jackson asked staff to respond to Mr. Richardson's concerns.

Mr. Balmer stated if the project failed, a new application would need to be filed before any development could take place on the property. This would include restarting the process of public participation, including neighborhood meetings, open houses and public hearings. In addition, the Development Agreement would have to be modified, which is a contract between the Town and the developer. Amending the Development Agreement would require Council action. Mr. Balmer stated if the conditions of approval are not met, the proposed zoning is also not approved. Mr. Balmer stated a Major General Plan amendment requires a Super-majority vote of 5 out of 7, rather than a majority vote.

Mr. Balmer responded to Mr. Richardson's second issue of road improvements. He stated the applicant is responsible for half-street improvements, which include new curbs and gutters, and streetlights.

Mr. Pew responded to Mr. Richardson's concerns, stating this is not a project for "elderly" people. It for people ages 55+. The applicant has agreed to 3.8 units/acre in density which is part of the zoning case. Regarding traffic on Hawes Road, Mr. Pew stated the traffic generated from this project will be less than what is currently planned for today. The applicant will be required to do road improvements.

- 2) Jason Bauer: 19701 E. Augustus, Roman Estates, Queen Creek; Mr. Bauer stated he is a resident and Queen Creek business owner. He is not opposed to the active-adult living portion as much as location because he moved his family here for the country style living and because he felt it was a good place for children. In addition, there is a good workforce in Queen Creek. He is concerned for Town's future and thinks this may not be what the Town wants to grow into. He does not believe this is the best location for this type of development and it is not revenue-wise. He is also concerned about whether or not this project becomes a gated community. He thinks it needs the security of a gate to alleviate children from Desert Mountain Park and the surrounding area from penetrating this site. Mr. Bauer stated he feels the town has done a wonderful job at designing a good lifestyle which he thinks is important.

Chairman Trapp-Jackson asked the applicant and/or staff to respond to Mr. Bauer.

Ralph Pew responded the applicant has given thought to the impact this development will have on the community. The applicant feels the project will add an element of diversity to Queen Creek for current residents who are aging, in that it will provide a continuum of care and a place for these residents to go without moving out of the community. In addition, the location is ideal for this demographic because it is close to Town Center amenities. The applicant does not feel the project will ruin the town's identity.

There being no further public comment, the public hearing was closed at 7:33 P.M.

Commissioner Atkinson stated he does not have a problem with the proposed density in this location. He feels it is an ideal location; however, he is opposed to any age-discrimination and he is against any gated community, especially in the downtown/Town Center area.

Commissioner Perry asked staff to readdress the applicant's concerns over the PAD stipulation. Mr. Balmer responded the reason the stipulation is included in staff's recommendation is to ensure Council would see this project again, and under a PAD, have ability to not only look at the underlying zoning but also the amenity package, landscape package and building elevations. Mr. Balmer stated although Mr. Pew has indicated the applicant might not need PAD, the actual fact is most projects in town are PADs for one reason or another. Mr. Balmer stated given this, and the fact staff has not spoken with the applicant pertaining to why it would not be a PAD, staff's recommendation is to keep this

stipulation as is. Mr. Balmer added the applicant may talk to Council in the interim and Council can decide whether or not the requested change would be appropriate.

Chairman Trapp-Jackson commented during the Work Study it was noted that part of motion needs to include the letter distributed during Work Study from Pew and Lake dated November 10, 2009. She stated this is important because of the Development Agreement proposal, since the letter states they will in fact do a Development Agreement and the project is subject to preliminary plat, final plat and PAD approval.

Commissioner Ingram asked if the streets were considered public or private when the calculation on cost of services was done. Mr. Balmer responded it was based on public streets, and added for every \$100 of service, the town receives approximately \$75 to \$80 in revenue. The lower the density, the less revenue the town receives. As the density goes up, the town has fewer costs. Mr. Balmer stated the town would not be responsible for maintaining the streets if they were private, therefore, this would help the cost of service.

Commissioner Perry commented he does not like gated communities. He understands the neighbor's concern; however, he does not think penetration of children will occur in this subdivision. He is also not a fan of retirement communities; however this is a small component and adds to continuum of care that Queen Creek is missing right now.

Motion: Commissioner Perry

To recommend approval of GPA09-057/RZ09-069, Victoria Estates Parcels 10, 11 and 11A (Taylor Morrison) with the addition of the development booklet and Pew and Lake's November 10 letter, subject to conditions of approval outlined in the staff report.

2nd: Commissioner Sossaman
Vote: **Motion carried 5-1 (Atkinson voting "nay"; Moore absent).**

- 7. Public Hearing, Discussion and Possible Action on Major General Plan Amendment Application, Barney Farms, GP09-058/RZ09-060, A request by Ralph Pew on behalf of Barney Farms to amend the General Plan Land Use Map designation for 257 acres located at the northwest corner of Queen Creek and Meridian roads from Employment Type B to Employment Type A, 20 acres of Community Commercial, 137 acres of Medium High Density Residential-A (3-5 dwellings per acre), and 79 acres of Medium High Density Residential-B (5-8 dwellings per acre).**

Planning Manager Balmer presented the staff report and Power Point. He included the applicant's development plan, which shows slightly over 1,000 dwelling units proposed. Mr. Balmer stated the staff analysis shows the following:

- The subject area is partially in aircraft over flight areas II and III (AOA), which presents noise and over flight related issues.
- The proposed project would replace 217 acres of Employment-designated land use with residential uses.
- The request is inconsistent with the General Plan goal to develop a job to population ratio of .4 jobs per capita.
- The proposed land use plan would generate significantly less construction and operating revenue at build-out for the Town than the current plan.
- The proposed project would generate significantly more traffic than the current plan.
- The proposed project does not reflect Resolution 780-09, and would eliminate the possibility of the realignment of Signal Butte Road north of Queen Creek Road.
- The Town's water and waste water systems will have the capacity to accommodate this project, once systems are extended to the site.
- The proposed project design does not consider the future development plan for East Park.
- There is potential for future incompatibility with East Park from lighting, traffic, noise, etc.
- The proposal presents concerns over the compatibility of residential uses in an employment area.
- Approval of this project could set a precedent for additional residential requests in the area.

Mr. Balmer illustrated the over flight map, pointing out over flight areas AOAI, AOAI, and AOAI. He explained the colored areas, showing where residential uses are incompatible and where the FAA and Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport are agreeable to mitigation efforts. Mr. Balmer stated the over flight issue is more than just noise; it is the number of planes that fly over a person's home.

Mr. Balmer stated the applicant hired an aviation consultant to address over flight and noise contour issues. The report was included in the agenda packets. Based on the report, it is the applicant's opinion the noise contour levels will decrease over time. In addition, the applicant's position is:

- The primary over flight area will be west of the property.
- In areas outside the 65 DNL the FAA would agree to housing (with conditions), if the local community so desires.
- The AOA II boundary subject to question.
- Both Mesa and Gilbert have approved housing nearer the airport than is being proposed in this case.
- Local communities are being overly protective of the over flight areas for PMGA.

Mr. Balmer emphasized the Signal Butte/Meridian roads issue pertaining to Resolution 780-09, which was approved by Council on April 15, 2009. He stated the General Plan's Transportation Element was amended to incorporate the need for the realignment of Signal Butte and Meridian roads between Queen Creek and Ocotillo roads.

Mr. Balmer stated staff's recommendation, as follows:

To recommend GP09-058/RZ09-060 as originally presented be denied, or a continuance granted in order to:

- Allow the applicant and staff to work together to develop a possible alternative land use and transportation plan for the entire square mile bounded by Germann, Queen Creek, Signal Butte and Meridian roads, incorporating a proposed realignment of Signal Butte Road and a compatible land use plan;
- Allow an amended proposal to be submitted for consideration, once a more detailed plan for an alternative land use and transportation plan for the area has been developed

Ralph Pew of Pew and Lake addressed the Commission on behalf of the Barney Family.

Mr. Pew presented background on this application, which includes an original application of June 15, 2009 and an amended application on October 21, 2009. Mr. Pew reiterated the amended application is not included in the materials under discussion tonight. The original application filed in June proposes 20 acres of Community Commercial, 20 acres of Employment Type A, and a mixture of Medium-High Density Residential-A and Medium-High Density Residential-B. Mr. Pew stated this is the application that was presented to the citizens and neighborhood groups. As the process evolved and comments were gathered from citizens, staff, and consultants, the applicant concluded this Major General Plan Amendment cycle and this property may give Town Council the opportunity to implement its decision reflected in Resolution 780-09. The amended plan was presented to staff in October. It proposes the same amount of acreages and same uses as proposed in original application, with Employment Type A on the north, Community Commercial on the southeast and MHDR-A and MHDR-B in the center of the project. Mr. Pew stated the acreages did not change. However, the applicant would like to propose the concept of bringing Meridian Road northeast to Signal Butte Road to connect to the Signal Butte alignment. He noted the Commission cannot vote on the amended application tonight because it has not been legally advertised as such and it must be reconsidered by Town staff. In addition, East Park has gone through design, engineering, and planning, to which the residents have provided public input. Mr. Pew requested the Commission recommend a continuance in order to give the applicant the opportunity to review the proposed amended transportation plan with Town staff and Council. The applicant feels it is more important to get the connection between Signal Butte and Meridian roads.

Mr. Pew illustrated the proposed zoning exhibits from June 15, 2009 and October 21, 2009, noting the June 15th submittal did not anticipate a cross-over from Meridian to Signal Butte Road. He presented the proposed reconfiguration of East Park, which will accommodate the connection from Meridian Road to Signal Butte Road.

Mr. Pew addressed the over flight areas, stating the exhibit which has been used by the Town to illustrate AOA districts, I, II and III indicates housing is allowed in Area II. According to the legend, red is AOA I where residential is prohibited; AOA II lists mitigation efforts that need to be implemented when noise sensitive uses are in AOA II. Mr. Pew illustrated Vineyard south of

Queen Creek, questioning why a home would be prohibited here but allowed further northwest in Area III. He concluded the lines are convenient planning lines, not noise contour lines. He noted the entire Barney property is completely out of AOA II.

Regarding economic absorption, Mr. Pew stated the Town should let development occur. He referred to a 2006 Urban Land Institute (ULI) study, which concluded there is an overabundance of Employment land in the subject area, and pointed out the idea that employment development this far south of the freeways will be challenging and will take a long time. Mr. Pew noted the ULI study stated 2,500 acres of Employment may be absorbed in the next decade, and pointed out there is approximately 13,900 acres of employment acreage surrounding the freeways. Mr. Pew stated development of Barney land will be a catalyst to economic development.

Mr. Pew illustrated the Fulton Homes development southeast of the Barney property (Ironwood Crossing). This development has 2,100 homes. Mr. Pew stated it is a very successful project. In addition, he noted the Pinal County comprehensive plan immediately east of Barney Farms (adjacent to CMC Steel) is planned for moderate low density residential. Mr. Pew stated Barney will cap their density and this will provide a transitional buffer to the residential developments to the east.

Commissioner Sossaman referred to the Pinal County Comprehensive Plan and asked how the Ironwood Crossing subdivision is getting utilities. Mr. Pew responded Fulton Homes has made arrangements with Johnson Utilities for service.

Chairman Trapp-Jackson opened the Public Hearing at 8:30 p.m.

- 1) Scott McCoy of Earl, Curley & LaGarde, P.C., 3101 North Central, Phoenix, representing CMC Steel addressed the Commission in opposition of the Barney proposal. Mr. McCoy showed photos of CMC Steel plant in start-up mode and provided a history of CMC Steel. He noted this is an intense industrial use on 225 acres of land. He stated the reasons for CMC Steel's opposition as follows: CMC Steel wants to protect its \$135 million investment. Secondly, there is a large amount of truck traffic, 24 hours a day/7 days a week. CMC Steel feels it is unwise to introduce 1,000 families into this type of transportation situation. Another impact will be the perception that CMC Steel is a bad neighbor. Mr. McCoy stated they go out of their way to be a good neighbor and buffer their site from surrounding property owners. However, a large community of 1,000 homeowners would present challenges. The character of this area is currently Employment/Industrial. Allowing this change will change the character of this area. Mr. McCoy stated the Town already has an abundance of residential land use. He stated the densities in the proposed project are more of an urban type of density and are not well-suited for this area.
- 2) Lynn Kusy – PMGA, Executive Director, 5835 S. Sossaman Road, Mesa, addressed the Commission in opposition to the proposed project. He stated a letter was included in the agenda packet from PMGA opposing the MHDR-A component of the proposal. The Airport Authority opposes new residential in AOA II surrounding the airport. AOA II is a firm boundary, not just a concept. Mr. Kusy explained the AOAs are specifically designed to protect the airport from residential encroachment, based on long term maximum

development of the airport including many types of air traffic and business opportunities. He illustrated many changes over the last 10 years. He stated the mapping is a complex mathematical model issued by the FAA which evolves due to surrounding changes. The AOA areas have remained constant even as changes have occurred at the airport. The 2012 Revised Noise Compatibility Plan will be pursued by PMGA. Mr. Kusy responded to the residential development in Gilbert that was pointed out by Mr. Pew in his presentation. Mr. Kusy stated the residential development in Gilbert in AOA II was there in 1996. Morrison Ranch was not platted and rezoned after maps were adopted. The current flights are not an issue. Homes built here will remain into the future as airport traffic continues to grow.

Commissioner Perry referred to a letter (mentioned by Mr. Pew in his presentation) from PMGA to the City of Mesa regarding the Kitchell development, in which PMGA provided wording different from what they provided in their letter to Queen Creek on the Barney property. Commissioner Perry asked Mr. Kusy to address Mr. Pew's concerns over the PMGA stipulation on the Kitchell development letter. Mr. Kusy stated this is standard language and PMGA is only making a recommendation. He stated if the Town decides to grant the proposal, then the airport is requesting stipulations. Mr. Kusy stated the two letters are similar but use slightly different language.

Chairman Trapp-Jackson requested staff respond to Mr. Kusy and Mr. McCoy.

Mr. Pew clarified the applicant is prepared to stipulate to a 4.5 du/acre maximum density. The reason it currently shows 0-5 dwelling units and 0-8 dwelling units is to be consistent with the General Plan; however the zoning case will stipulate 4.5 as a cap. He also noted the homes shown on the Gilbert map show some homes developed prior to 1999 and some after 1999. Mr. Pew stated he is specifically asking the town to make a policy decision that represents what is in the best interest of Queen Creek at this end of town. He requested a continuance.

Chairman Trapp-Jackson closed the Public Hearing at 8:45 p.m.

Commissioner Sossaman stated he is in favor of what the applicant is requesting because the town is in a unique opportunity to do what is in the best interest of Queen Creek. The Transportation corridor is something the Planning and Zoning Commission has been presented with because of the Signal Butte alignment. To not continue this would not allow the Commission and Town a chance to do what's best for this area, which he feels is the number one issue with citizens. Secondly, continuing this item allows an opportunity to reconfigure a very linear park.

Motion: Commissioner Sossaman

To continue GP 09-058/RZ09-060, Barney Farms.

2nd: Commissioner Ingram

Vote: All ayes. Motion carried 6-0. (Moore absent).

Commissioner Sossaman commented he would like the opportunity to reconfigure East Park. Additionally, the north/south arterial is extremely important to the town. However, he thinks the density of houses proposed is too great in this area.

Commissioner Perry stated he agrees with most of Commissioner Sossaman's comments. He feels the transportation opportunity is big, and this is why the Commission agreed to add another square mile to the north section of the conceptual transportation plan (exhibit to Resolution 780-09) to provide more opportunities. He feels the applicant and staff can come up with something good for transportation. In addition, the reconfiguration of East Park, which is very linear, is great. It will give the town the opportunity to reconfigure something that will be more useable and more visible to the community. He has no problem with the 4.5 cap on density; however, he feels there should be a bigger buffer on the north side to protect the industrial uses in that area. Additionally, Commissioner Perry likes the idea of forming a core of residential with Fulton as he feels putting some residential immediately adjacent to employment does allow the opportunity for people to walk or ride bikes to work. Commissioner Perry finished by stating there are enough positive things to consider with the amended proposal that make it worthwhile to continue to a later date.

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

All Administrative Items were discussed during Work Study Session.

- 8. Review** of next month's agenda items.
- 9. Report** on Town Council Action.
- 10. Summary of Current Events** from members of the Commission.

Motion: Commissioner Sossaman

To cancel the December 9, 2009 Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting.

2nd: Commissioner Perry

Vote: **All ayes. Motion carried 6-0 (Moore absent).**

Commissioner Perry asked staff to send the staff report and related information on the proposed amendment to the Sign Ordinance to the Commission for review prior to January if possible.

Mr. Balmer responded staff will be working on this item between now and the January meeting. Mr. Balmer stated he plans to meet with the Commissioners on an individual basis to ensure accurate and complete information is presented at the January meeting.

Chairman Trapp-Jackson requested the appointment of a Vice-Chair to fill Karen Fehlan's vacancy be placed on the January agenda.

11. Adjournment

Motion: Commissioner Ingram
To adjourn.
2nd: Commissioner Reyes
Vote: All ayes. Motion carried 6-0 (Moore absent)

The meeting adjourned at 8:53 p.m.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

By: _____
Kathy Trapp-Jackson, Chairman

ATTEST:

Laura Moats, Community Development Assistant

I, Laura Moats, do hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, the foregoing Minutes are a true and correct copy of the Minutes of the November 10, 2009 Regular Session Meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and that a quorum was present.

Dated this day of , 2009.
Passed and Approved this day of , 2009.