

**MINUTES  
CITY OF AMES  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

Date: June 16, 2010	Kori Heuss, Chairperson	2011
	Jeff Johnson	2011
Call to Order: 7:00 p.m.	Debra Lee	2012
	Chuck Jons	2012
Place: Ames City Hall	Elizabeth Beck, Vice-Chairperson	2012
Council Chambers	Norman Cloud	2013
	Mark Stenberg	2013
Adjournment: 9:45 p.m.	All Members Were Present	

**MAJOR TOPICS DISCUSSED:**

1. Rezoning of land located at 1025 Adams Street (proposed Adams Memorial Greenway) from RL (Residential Low-Density) to S-GA (Government/Airport)
2. Rezoning of land located at 1013 Adams Street (including Adams Memorial Greenway land at 1025 Adams Street) to establish the O-H (Historic Preservation Overlay) District and designate the property as a Local Historic Landmark
3. Conservation Subdivision Ordinance

---

**CALL TO ORDER:** Kori Heuss, Chairperson, called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA:**

**MOTION:** (BECK/JONS) to approve the Agenda for the meeting of June 16, 2010.

**MOTION PASSED:** 7-0

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF MAY 5 AND SPECIAL MEETING OF MAY 18, 2010:**

**MOTION:**

(JOHNSON/STENBERG) to approve the Minutes of the meeting of May 5, 2010.

**MOTION PASSED:** 7-0

(STENBERG/BECK) to approve the Minutes of the special meeting of May 18, 2010.

**MOTION PASSED:** 7-0

---

**PUBLIC FORUM:** There were no public comments.

---

**Rezoning of land located at 1025 Adams Street (proposed Adams Memorial Greenway) from RL (Residential Low-Density) to S-GA (Government/Airport)**

Mark Stenberg excused himself from the discussion for this item due to a potential conflict of interest.

Ray Anderson, planner, gave an overview of the proposed rezoning. The City of Ames has obtained ownership of the property at 1013 Adams Street (including the property at proposed 1025 Adams Street) as a gift through the Mary Adams Estate. The three-acre site at 1015 Adams Street (proposed Lot 2) is planned for use as a City park to be named Adams Memorial Greenway.

The City initiated rezoning of the property at 1025 Adams Street (Adams Memorial Greenway) from RL to S-GA (Government/Airport) to reflect that the property is now owned by the City of Ames.

The Ames Historical Society has also submitted an application requesting that the City of Ames designate the property at 1013 Adams Street, which presently includes the property at 1025 Adams Street (Adams Memorial Greenway), as a Local Historic Landmark by establishing the O-H (Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay) on the property, which is being processed concurrently with this zoning proposal.

A Final Plat for Mary Adams Subdivision has been prepared and is being processed concurrently with the rezoning proposals. The plat will divide the property into two lots. Lot 1 will include the existing residence on 1.88 acres. Lot 2 will be for use as a City park (Adams Memorial Greenway) and will include 3.09 acres.

MOTION: (BECK/JOHNSON) to accept Alternative #1, which states:

The Planning and Zoning Commission recommends that the City Council approve the proposed rezoning of land located at 1025 Adams Street from RL (Residential Low-Density) to S-GA (Government/Airport), based upon staff's findings and conclusions, with the following conditions:

- A. That the proposed rezoning of property at 1025 Adams Street be approved only in conjunction with the approval of the Final Plat of Mary Adams Subdivision.
- B. The rezoning shall not be effective until the recording of the Final Plat of Mary Adams Subdivision.

Chuck Jons said before this item goes to Council, he would like staff to find out why most of that front area isn't considered to be part of the property that goes with the home. We have not heard tonight why that north/south line was drawn on the proposed plat map, and it seems that from a historic preservation approach, one of the dramatic things about that home and lot is the expanse that you obtain from Adams Street. He said he supports the motion, but would like staff to relay this information to the Council when they have their discussion on this item.

Jeff Johnson said this is less of an issue for him since he isn't hearing anything from the members of the Ames Historical Society or the Ames Historic Preservation Commission. If those things were an issue in terms of how they impacted the property, he doesn't think those lines would be where they are and coming to us at this time.

Mr. Jons said he doesn't want this to be part of the motion, but in fairness he thinks it is important for the City Council to understand why the lines for the property were drawn where they are.

MOTION PASSED: 6-0-1 abstention

---

**Rezoning of land located at 1013 Adams Street (including Adams Memorial Greenway land at 1025 Adams Street) to establish the O-H (Historic Preservation Overlay) District and designate the property as a Local Historic Landmark**

Mark Stenberg excused himself from the discussion for this item due to a potential conflict of interest.

Ray Anderson, planner, gave an overview of the proposed rezoning. The Ames Historical Society has submitted an application requesting that the City of Ames designate the existing house, constructed in 1958, and property at 1013 Adams Street as a Local Historic Landmark. The City of Ames has obtained ownership of the entire property as a gift through the Mary Adams Estate. The house is located in the southeast corner of the site on 1.88 acres of land that is proposed as Lot 1 of Mary Adams Subdivision. It is the intent of the City to sell the house on Lot 1 for use as a single-family home. The remaining 3.09 acres of the site (proposed Lot 2) is planned for use as a City park to be named Adams Memorial Greenway. The Greenway will be addressed as 1025 Adams Street.

The Ames Historical Society request proposes designation of the entire site, including the residence and the greenway, as a Local Historic Landmark. This is accomplished with the O-H (Historic Preservation Overlay) zone. This is an overlay zone, but it retains the underlying zoning designation of RL (Residential Low) for the portion of the site with the house, and will have an underlying designation of S-GA (Government/Airport) for the balance of the property. It is the City, as the new property owner, that is proposing the division of land into two lots for the purpose of selling the residence, and retaining the open space as a public park.

Establishment of the Local Landmark designation is accomplished through applying the O-H (Historic Preservation Overlay) District designation to the property. The RL (Residential Low-Density) base zone of proposed Lot 1 will remain unchanged.

The City has initiated rezoning of proposed Lot 2 (Adams Memorial Greenway) from RL to S-GA (Government/Airport) to reflect that the property is now owned by the City of Ames, which is being processed concurrently with this zoning proposal.

A Final Plat for Mary Adams Subdivision has been prepared and is being processed concurrently with the rezoning proposals. The plat will divide the property into two lots. Lot 1 will include the existing residence on 1.88 acres. Lot 2 will be for use as a City park (Adams Memorial Greenway) and will include 3.09 acres.

Chuck Jons questioned the placement of the proposed lot lines on the final plat that is currently being processed.

Mr. Anderson explained that since the land was willed to the Parks and Recreation Department, the staff from the Parks and Recreation Department worked with the Ames Parks and Recreation Commission to determine where those lots lines should be.

Mr. Jons said it appears that there could be a conflict because of the historical significance of the property if this is going to be a city park. On one hand you want to save the scenery, but on the other hand you want to invite people into the park, which can sometimes work in contradiction.

Mr. Anderson explained that there isn't much to go on in the current design guidelines within Chapter 31 of the *Municipal Code* for criteria for the overlay for preserving the park, which emphasizes the importance of the City retaining ownership of that park. He said it would take action by city boards, commissions, and council to approve any changes to what would happen with that parkland.

Mr. Jons said another way to ask that question is who and why was it decided to divide the property the way it is being divided. Why not keep the front part along with the house and have the back part that abuts Ada Hayden be the two acres on the north end.

Mr. Anderson said he wasn't involved with the conversations the Parks and Recreation Commission had, but knows they wanted to have access from Adams Street since the other access from Dawes Drive is narrow, steep, and not obvious to the public.

Mr. Johnson asked if that would be vehicular access or pedestrian access. Mr. Anderson said it would be pedestrian access.

Elizabeth Beck said she isn't adverse to the historic overlay for this property, but wants to discuss potential issues that could come up in the future. She asked what would happen to the historic overlay if all of the trees had to be destroyed because of disease.

Mr. Anderson said the design guidelines have very little guidance as far as landscaping or open space; they primarily are written to address structures. If trees were removed and new trees were planted, that wouldn't be in violation of the overlay designation.

Ms. Beck said if those three acres have historical significance, then what's in there by virtue of the overlay would have to have historical significance. If you are taking down 100-year old oak trees because of disease, where is the historical significance if you have to eliminate something on the property?

Mr. Osguthorpe said the Commission may want to consider the criteria that is part of and will be applicable to the overlay, which is what the Commission is reviewing tonight. But if there are some things the Commission thinks may not have been addressed or have questions on, we can go back to the individuals that developed the criteria to see if they may be able to provide some additional information.

Ms. Beck said she wants it to be known that she isn't against this; she just wants to make sure that when we do something that has historic significance we know what we are talking about when it is land and not a structure. The structural guidelines are there, but it isn't clear about the open land guidelines or what happens when other things come in as Ada Hayden Park and the surrounding neighborhood becomes more developed.

Dennis Wendell, representative from the Ames Historical Society, applicant, stated that they are available for questions and support the staff recommendations.

Erv Klaas, 1405 Grand, Ames, Iowa, stated that he served on the Parks and Recreation Commission when discussion was occurring on the management of this area. He explained that

the woodland area is mostly on the steep slope that faces the lake. When a floral survey was taken of this area in 2002, it was discovered that there were a lot of prairie plants under the forest that indicated this area was once a savanna, which is an open area of prairie with scattered trees. The scattered trees are still there, but there have been a lot of woody growth underneath because of the lack of management of the area. If you want to manage an area like this, you have to do some clearing of the smaller, woody materials that tend to crowd out that understory of native species. The decision was then made by the Parks and Recreation Commission to have a crew come in and clear most of that understory out of the part that is on City property. The part of the woodland that is on private property would benefit from that same kind of clearing, which allows prairie plants to come back; however, there has to be active management to keep the invasive species from growing back. When you talk about an historical area, ecosystems are constantly changing. And if you want to keep an area as it is you have to have management, and the Park Master Plan calls for an active management of that area as a savanna. Mr. Klaas further stated that the access part is going to remain a primitive foot path that gives those that live in the immediate area access to the park.

Ms. Beck asked if the historical significance is to return the land to the concept of the savanna.

Mr. Klaas replied that is correct.

Mr. Jons asked Mr. Klaas if he was around when the plat boundaries were drawn.

Mr. Klaas said he could not share light on that decision, but knows that the Parks and Recreation Commission thought it would be desirable to have an access and open area to the park; otherwise that area immediately behind the house would be essentially unavailable to the public.

Mr. Jons suggested a possible easement to that back area that would still maintain continuity to the home.

David Smith, 4102 Laura Court, said when he bought the house he lives in five years ago, he was told that the Adams property would be a city park. He said he was also told that Mrs. Adams wanted the whole piece preserved, and thinks the City is trying to do what they can to accomplish that, with the exception of the house that is going to be privately owned. Mr. Smith expressed concern if the City is going to take this area back to the oak savanna because that means all of the trees except for the oaks will be cut down. He said cutting down these trees would not be in the best interest of the city because of the expense, and for the wildlife that lives within. He said this is a very beautiful area, and thinks Mrs. Adams would have wanted this area to remain the way it currently is.

Dennis Wendell, 917 Adams Street, explained that the little strip of land off of Dawes is there because Dr. Adams considered adding a caretaker house and that strip was a potential driveway, which is very steep and totally not feasible today. He said he doesn't want to speak for Nancy Carroll, but knows that she thinks of this as a passage greenway through to where you want to go. It will be a mown path until you reach the chop trail that goes down to Ada Hayden Park. He said this will be a passive park; a totally natural area with no playground equipment or picnic tables.

Ms. Beck asked Mr. Wendell if there has been any discussion by his group about preservation of the savanna.

Mr. Wendell said no because their issue pertains more to the house since there was some talk about demolition. Mr. Wendell then spoke about how the house could not meet the ADA requirements if it was converted into a gathering place as Mrs. Adams wanted. He said as much as Nancy Carroll wanted to meet the terms of the will, it was not economically feasible. There was no endowment to fund the conversion of the house, so the best solution is to retain it as a house that they can preserve.

Mr. Jons asked Mr. Wendell about the proposed division of the property.

Mr. Wendell said he knows Nancy Carroll wanted access from Adams Street in the form of a path. He said he knows she is also thinking of low maintenance and right now the City crews mow this area.

Julie Schwery, 4196 Grant Avenue, asked if the property with the house could be developed further with more than one house on it. She also asked where vehicle parking will occur for this park.

Mr. Anderson replied that a second house would not be allowed to be constructed on the property because current zoning regulations allows for only one single family dwelling on a lot.

Mr. Osguthorpe addressed the question pertaining to vehicle parking for the park. He said if this park is retained in a more passive state, there will not be a need for additional parking. If there is an identified need for more parking, we will have to look at how we might utilize the site for parking; however, at this time there hasn't been any discussion about adding more parking for this park.

Ms. Beck asked if the people that buy the property with the house would be expected to mow the access to the park on Adams Street.

Mr. Anderson said no; the City will take care of mowing its own property.

MOTION: (JONS/CLOUD) to accept Alternative #1, which states:

The Planning and Zoning Commission recommends that the City Council approve the proposed rezoning of land located at 1013 and 1025 Adams Street to establish the O-H (Historic Preservation Overlay) District and designate the property as a Local Historic Landmark, based upon staff's findings and conclusions, with the following conditions:

- A. That the proposed rezoning of properties at 1013 and 1025 Adams Street be approved only in conjunction with the approval of the Final Plat of Mary Adams Subdivision.
- B. The rezoning shall not be effective until the recording of the Final Plat of Mary Adams Subdivision.
- C. That #2 of the proposed Design Criteria, which references substitute materials, be deleted.

MOTION PASSED: 6-0-1 abstention

## Conservation Subdivision Ordinance

Tracy Warner, Public Works Municipal Engineer, introduced Corey Mellies, Public Works Civil Engineer II, and Pat Sauer, the consultant that works with the City on storm water issues. Ms. Sauer is also an employee of Iowa Association of Municipal Utilities, as well as the Iowa Storm Water Education Partnership.

Ms. Warner explained that about a decade of work has been done on storm water related issues, as well as conservation subdivision, in conjunction with low-impact storm water features. In 2000, the City had a request from a few citizens to look at how we could incorporate more environmentally friendly features into residential subdivisions. In 2006, the City sponsored an educational workshop on this subject.

The purpose of a conservation subdivision is to strike a balance between well-designed residential development, meaningful open space conservation, and natural resource protection. With the close proximity and important resource that Ada Hayden Lake is to the City, it was determined that the best way to not only protect but to enhance this area is through adoption of a Conservation Subdivision Ordinance. While this ordinance might later be considered for application anywhere in the community, the immediate intent is to require compliance with this ordinance only for future residential subdivision development in the undeveloped areas of Ada Hayden Watershed north of Bloomington Road.

In reviewing the draft ordinance with developers, issues were identified where input was needed from the Planning and Zoning Commission prior to Council consideration of the ordinance. The areas for further input include the requirement for open space and lots adjacent to open space.

Staff has identified the following three options to consider regarding open space:

1. Open Space Option #1 – **25% required open space**: This option for open space would require that 25% of open space be provided within the overall subdivision. This would include conservation areas, but would not include rights-of-way.
2. Open Space Option #2 – **Alternative percentage of open space**: This option would require that some percentage of open space less than or higher than 25% be provided within the overall subdivision. Again, this would include conservation area but would not include rights-of-way.
3. Open Space Option #3 – **No specified minimum open space requirement**: This Option would not specify a minimum amount of open space. Rather, the applicant would need to demonstrate that the proposed subdivision contained sufficient open space to meet the stated intent and performance criteria within the ordinance.

In the intent statement of the draft Conservation Subdivision Ordinance, it is stated that one purpose of the ordinance is to promote interconnected greenways and environmental corridors throughout Ames. An additional benefit to abutting open space is the fact that it creates the illusion of large lots while creating conservation area. To help provide these benefits, the draft ordinance contains language related to the number of lots that must abut open space. After considering how the proposed ordinance could be applied to land actually owned by these three developers, it was determined that the following three options should be presented:

1. Lots Abutting Open Space Option #1 – **Required percentage**: This option would set the number of lots that must abut open space at 80%. This means that 80% of the lots in the subdivisions would need to have open space abutting the property. The ordinance does allow for the abutment to include open space that is across a roadway to fulfill the requirement.

2. Lots Abutting Open Space Option #2 – **All lots:** This option would require all lots to abut open space. Again, the ordinance allows for the abutment to include open space that is across a road way to fulfill the requirement.
3. Lots Abutting Open Space Option #3 – **No requirement:** This option would not have any requirements for lots to abut open space.

Steve Osguthorpe mentioned that the Land Use Policy Plan has a number of goals that speak to its desire to protect the environmentally sensitive areas, water quality, and things the Conservation Subdivision Ordinance intends to address. He further mentioned the goals and statements about efficiencies and land capacity, and what gets to the question of density. He reminded the Commission about several conversations that have occurred in the past about which portions of the City we impose density requirements, which ones we don't, and what the purpose of those are. If we were to take a look at these in isolation, it may appear that the Conservation Subdivision Ordinance might undermine some of those density goals to achieve our targeted population. But we need to look at this in balance to make sure we are weighing each issue in the balance and try to achieve both objectives. Because of those very specific issues about environmental concerns, staff believes the Conservation Subdivision Ordinance achieves and balances both objectives. Mr. Osguthorpe stated that it is important the Commission forward this to the Council this evening as there are some timing issues that need to be resolved with the Rose Prairie project. If the Commission believes that there isn't enough information to forward this to the Council, there is an alternative listed that allows the Commission to forward the proposal to the City Council without a recommendation.

Elizabeth Beck said we have identifiable projects in front of us, Rose Prairie and Ada Hayden, but this can also be applied elsewhere. She said she is concerned about not wanting to lock ourselves in here in a way that we start making exceptions. She said she understands the conservation point, which is important to all of us on the Commission, but is a little hesitant to go with option number 1 for open space and option number 1 for abutting space. She said she isn't comfortable with option #3 because it might be site specific or development specific, which is why she doesn't want to lock into a number. However, she said she also doesn't want to have us out there just roaming randomly around with percentages.

Ms. Warner explained how water quantity is already controlled throughout the City. She said water quality control is a new step, and the City is required to pass a new ordinance for water quality control city-wide with all subdivisions. Ada Hayden is the area that is required now because it is important for our drinking water source indirectly. She then explained how they came up with the 25% for the required open space. She stated that when they were working with the developers, it became clear that there is a range as each developer does business differently. One developer would prefer to have a number that they needed to work towards and be more definitive. Other developers expressed interest in wanting more land to develop instead of putting it in conservation area, so it is a balance.

Pat Sauer spoke about the goal of conservation subdivision and low-impact development, which is trying to prevent run-off from leaving the property. She then addressed the use of phosphorous on lawns and fertilizer on agricultural property. She spoke about the education requirement in the ordinance. She said we cannot have an ordinance telling the public they cannot apply phosphorous and fertilizers, but there is an education component within the ordinance for the public about the use of phosphorous and fertilizers.

Erv Klaas, 1405 Grand Avenue, Ames, Iowa, spoke in favor of the proposed ordinance. He said this is an important decision and supports the recommendation that the Planning and Public



Works Departments have given. He talked about coming before the Commission and the Council in 2008 about protecting Ada Hayden and is glad to see this come to be.

Catherine Scott, 1510 Roosevelt, Ames, Iowa, spoke and suggested that the ordinance not require a minimum percentage for open space and let the site determine what the minimum should be. She also suggested that staff think about considering if there should be a maximum.

Kurt Friedrich, 100 6<sup>th</sup> Street, Ames, Iowa, said he is supportive of where the ordinance is heading, but would like flexibility with the open space requirement. He also asked the Commission to consider a recommendation to allow flexibility with regard to urban density requirement as it relates to specific pieces of land. The proposed ordinance still has the urban density requirement of 3.75 units per acre, which he thinks is a conflict within this area and within a conservation development with providing a variety of housing choices, which is one of the goals of the LUPP.

Roger Hamblin, 4158 Grant Avenue, Ames, Iowa, said this ordinance has been coming together for a number of years and agrees with the direction for where it is going. He spoke in agreement with the City's concern about the density with the Friedrich's property because it isn't conducive to try to get the density as high as you can for this area if we are trying to conserve and protect the natural areas. He spoke in appreciation for staff showing maps of the proposed conservation subdivision developments, which gave the audience a better visualization for what may happen in these areas and showing how the developments can affect the surrounding properties and the water run-off.

Mr. Johnson said had things gone the way they were originally planned to go, Rose Prairie would be under construction. He said he is also on record for what we ended up doing with Ada Hayden Park. He said for him, a 25% minimum arrives at a happy medium as opposed to the 40% because it protects what we have; the minimum gives us at least a level of confidence that it will be done.

Mr. Jons said the City is again with their density requirement getting involved in what he considers to be the minutia of trying to develop a nice open space. He said the intentions are great under those assumptions, but he thinks the density requirement we have is inappropriate. He said he understands the situation that staff wants to move this thing through, but he would be in favor of recommending to Council that at some point soon they address the density issue.

Mr. Friedrich pointed out to the Commission that with their original layout and with staff's revised layout of their subdivision, the lot count really didn't change. He said we really have the same goals in terms of open space, it is just who owns the open space. In this situation, we show more of the open space on the individual lots so the lots themselves are a little bigger. With staff's design, their lots were compressed with the open space up north within the subdivision and not next to the park.

Mr. Johnson said if the intent is to protect the watershed, part of what he sees in both of these drawings is which of these is giving more credence to the waterway. He said he is trying to keep his thinking about the watershed because that is what was of interest to him with the Rose Prairie development.

Mr. Friedrich said they agree, but thinks they can accomplish that here with a little different design.

Debra Lee asked if staff thinks that preserving 25% of all of the area we are talking about in the watershed would be adequate to achieve the goal of protecting the watershed.

Ms. Warner said it is a balance with the storm water management and preservation of the natural resources. She mentioned that the Friedrich site is probably the one that is going to need to push to get the 25%; whereas Rose Prairie with preservation of the natural resources as they exist on the property is more like 40%.

Norman Cloud said he is leaning towards open space option 1 for 25% and for option 1 for abutting open space. He said he thinks this is a good way to protect the watershed that still allows enough flexibility for people to actually do things.

Ms. Beck said she agrees. She said she was first concerned about option 1 on each case, but thinks there has been enough work done on this by the appropriate people that they have put forward the best recommendation. She said she is now confident that this has been a very detailed review and is comfortable with going with staff's recommendation.

MOTION: (CLOUD/JONS) to accept Alternative #1, which states:

The Planning & Zoning Commission recommends that the City Council adopt an ordinance incorporating the following open space target options and open space abutment options:

- Open Space Option #1 – **25% required open space**: This option for open space would require that 25% of open space be provided within the overall subdivision. This would include conservation areas, but would not include rights-of-way.
- Lots Abutting Open Space Option #1 – **Required percentage**: This option would set the number of lots that must abut open space at 80%. This means that 80% of the lots in the subdivisions would need to have open space abutting the property. The ordinance does allow for the abutment to include open space that is across a roadway to fulfill the requirement.

Mark Stenberg said if we are hearing from people that they would like a number to shoot for, he is questioning if these alternatives gives them a number because it really doesn't give them a definite answer. He said he understands that every parcel of ground is going to be different, but it is his concern that it is still pretty open-ended.

Mr. Cloud explained that if there are a lot of natural features on the property it's automatically going to be greater than 25%. If there aren't a lot of natural features, they are going to have to carve out some open space just to get to 25%.

MOTION PASSED: 7-0

MOTION: (JONS/STENBERG):

The Planning and Zoning Commission would like the City Council to begin addressing concerns related to the density issues as soon as possible.

MOTION PASSED: 7-0.

COMMISSION COMMENTS: Chuck Jones welcomed Debra Lee to the Commission.

Elizabeth Beck welcomed Ms. Lee to the Commission. She commended staff for the work done on all of the action items tonight, particularly the Conservation Subdivision Ordinance.

Kori Heuss welcomed Ms. Lee to the Commission.

Jeff Johnson welcomed Ms. Lee to the Commission. He commended staff for the collaboration that occurred between staff and the developers in the conversations that have occurred pertaining to the Conservation Subdivision Ordinance.

Norman Cloud welcomed Ms. Lee to the Commission. He stated his appreciation for staff for their hard work. He thanked the audience for coming up and speaking on the items because it helps with the discussion and helps give perspective to things. He also thanked the developers for coming in and stating their positions.

Mark Stenberg welcomed Ms. Lee to the Commission. He stated that he is excited about the Conservation Subdivision Ordinance because we need to do everything to protect Ada Hayden Park.

---

STAFF COMMENTS: Steve Osguthorpe thanked the Commission for their time and effort they put in. He welcomed Ms. Lee to the Commission.

Staff reviewed the tentative agenda for the meeting of July 7, 2010.

---

With no further business coming before the Commission, the Chair declared the meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

---

Kori Heuss, Chairperson  
Planning & Zoning Commission

---

Cindy Hollar, Recording Secretary  
Department of Planning & Housing

S:\PLAN\_SHR\Council Boards Commissions\PZ\Minutes\2010 Minutes\Minutes-06-16-10.doc