MEETING RECORD

NAME OF GROUP:	PLANNING COMMISSION
DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING:	Wednesday, January 30, 2008, 1:00 p.m., City Council Chambers, First Floor, County-City Building, 555 S. 10th Street, Lincoln, Nebraska
MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:	Gene Carroll, Michael Cornelius, Dick Esseks, Wendy Francis, Roger Larson, Robert Moline, Lynn Sunderman and Tommy Taylor (Leirion Gaylor-Baird absent); Marvin Krout, Ray Hill, Brian Will, Tom Cajka, Sara Hartzell, Christy Eichorn, Jean Walker and Teresa McKinstry of the Planning Department; media and other interested citizens.
STATED PURPOSE OF MEETING:	Regular Planning Commission Meeting

Chair Gene Carroll called the meeting to order and requested a motion approving the minutes for the regular meeting held January 16, 2008. Motion for approval made by Sunderman, seconded by Francis and carried 7-0: Carroll, Esseks, Francis, Larson, Moline, Sunderman and Taylor voting 'yes'; Cornelius abstaining; Gaylor-Baird absent.

CONSENT AGENDA
PUBLIC HEARING & ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION
BEFORE PLANNING COMMISSION: January 30, 2008

Members present: Carroll, Cornelius, Esseks, Francis, Larson, Moline, Sunderman and Taylor; Gaylor-Baird absent.

The Consent Agenda consisted of the following items: **MISCELLANEOUS NO. 07010, CITY MISCELLANEOUS NO. 08001 and COUNTY MISCELLANEOUS NO. 08002.**

Ex Parte Communications: None

Item No. 1.1, Miscellaneous No. 07010, was removed from the Consent Agenda and scheduled for separate public hearing.

Taylor moved to approve the remaining Consent Agenda, seconded by Larson and carried 8-0: Carroll, Cornelius, Esseks, Francis, Larson, Moline, Sunderman and Taylor voting 'yes'; Gaylor-Baird absent.

REQUESTS FOR DEFERRAL:

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 07003,
ANNEXATION NO. 07005
AND
CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 07063, I-80 WEST LINCOLN
BUSINESS CENTER PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT,
ON PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT
N.W. 48TH STREET AND INTERSTATE 80.
CONT'D PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE PLANNING COMMISSION: January 30, 2008

Members present: Moline, Cornelius, Francis, Esseks, Larson, Taylor, Sunderman and Carroll; Gaylor-Baird absent.

The Clerk announced that the attorney for the applicant has requested an additional two-week deferral. Moline moved deferral, with continued public hearing and action scheduled for February 13, 2008, seconded by Esseks and carried 8-0: Moline, Cornelius, Francis, Esseks, Larson, Taylor, Sunderman and Carroll voting 'yes'; Gaylor-Baird absent.

MISCELLANEOUS NO. 07010,
"NORTHWEST 48TH & I-80 AREA" BLIGHT DETERMINATION
PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE PLANNING COMMISSION: January 30, 2008

Members present: Moline, Cornelius, Francis, Esseks, Larson, Taylor, Sunderman and Carroll; Gaylor-Baird absent.

Ex Parte Communications: None.

Staff recommendation: A finding of reasonable presence of substandard and blighted conditions.

This application was removed from the Consent Agenda due to a letter received from Lincoln Public Schools about use of Tax Increment Financing (TIF) funds.

Staff presentation: **Sara Hartzell of Planning staff** submitted a letter from Lincoln Public Schools discussing some concerns about use of TIF funds in new residential areas.

Hartzell discussed the land uses in the area, which are shown as industrial, commercial and residential. This is the first step in the process of a redevelopment plan. She believes that the City has adopted a policy of not using TIF in "new" residential areas. Existing residential areas are appropriate for TIF.

The project previously deferred on today's agenda (I-80 West Lincoln Business Center

PUD) covers most of the proposed blighted area located on the west side of N.W. 48th Street. As that project comes forward, there will also be a Comprehensive Plan amendment to the land use plan so that there is no residential on the south side of Holdrege Street. On the east side, however, there is still some residential shown. We do not know yet for certain what the land use is going to be on that site. At this point, there has been a blight study in the area and this is a request to have the area designated as blighted and substandard in order to move forward with a redevelopment plan.

Esseks suggested that this entire area looks like an agricultural area that is being farmed and probably getting an agricultural use value assessment. He does not see how it can be defined as an area which is blighted. It looks like an area waiting to be developed. There are 30 homes in the area, most of which are not in good shape, but he suspects they are older farmsteads that have not been improved with the expectation that the area will be developed. It is an area waiting for development and in excellent position to be developed. How can we call it blighted? Hartzell agreed that this is different than some of the other blighted areas. There is a list of criteria and evaluation methodologies used to come to the "blighted" conclusion which the consultant can explain.

Carroll noted that LPS is requesting that all of the residential be excluded from TIF. Where does this issue get addressed? Hartzell noted that the blight study does not say where the TIF would be used. The blight study evaluates the existing condition. She believes that the redevelopment plan will talk about the general intentions for this area, and beyond the redevelopment plan are redevelopment projects. She anticipates that the area west of N.W. 48th will be part of that redevelopment plan as a project. As other areas on the east side come forward, they would come forward as an amendment to the redevelopment plan and would come before the Commission again.

Larson believes the question is – will these agricultural lands turn into residential uses? Hartzell explained that the main concern of LPS is that new residential development means new use of schools and new burdens on those schools. Larson wondered about making this stipulation in the blight determination. **Marvin Krout, Director of Planning,** stated that there is interest and some private planning going on on the east side of Holdrege, and we know that the property at the southeast corner of Holdrege and N.W. 48th is being contemplated for commercial uses – whether that would extend all the way to N.W. 40th, we do not know. You can identify an area as being blighted and then come in with a redevelopment plan that is less land area. There is still an opportunity to comply with the wishes of LPS to make sure there is no TIF used over any residential areas, and that redevelopment plan will come before the Planning Commission.

Francis inquired whether the 18 properties identified as deteriorating and 24 properties as obsolescent are owned by the developer at this time. Hartzell did not know for sure.

Proponents

1. David Landis, Director of Urban Development, has had discussions with the owners and developers of the land on the west side of N.W. 48th. Their goal is to do a commercial development south of Holdrege. There are four owners on the east side of N.W. 48th who have been in conversation and there is hope that it will become a piece of attractive developable land supported by TIF as a potential site for economic development growth.

Esseks observed that there is such a great distinction between this large agricultural area and other redevelopment projects that have come before the Commission in truly blighted parts of our city. This looks like an area ripe for commercial development. The land is mostly undeveloped. Esseks believes that the distinction is so great that this potential blighted designation will introduce such a contradiction that we may threaten the future use of blighting areas in other parts of the city that could be developed otherwise. He is worried about setting a precedent and what looks like a manipulation of the law to achieve a purpose. Is there some other way to provide financial incentive to these developers? Landis suggested that it is a political question. Is there a political risk of using a blight designation in a way that might call into question the use of the law and threaten the ability to use TIF in a more appropriate usage? Lincoln is probably the last community in Nebraska to ask itself this question. He does not know of a TIF designation that has ever been challenged in court and that has not been upheld by the court. We will essentially be joining the very common practice of this entire state. What was originally a community development tool meant to save and rejuvenate the core, has been stretched in its application by practically every community in the state. He understands the sensitivity but this is a study which has been done by a professional consultant. In the market place, this is an economic development tool that everyone else is using in this context and in this type situation.

Esseks discussed the costs and suggested that it seems incumbent for us to determine whether there are other tools which are less costly. Landis suggested that this is a political question as opposed to a planning question. Taxes will continue to be paid in this area. There is no attempt to move this land into a non-tax status. LPS has no objection to using TIF if the property is moved from its agricultural use to commercial, but LPS does object if it is used for residential purposes. Given the N. 56th situation, Landis assured that there is an understanding between the City and LPS. He will not be back here asking the Planning Commission to TIF new residential property; however, he will be back here requesting to use TIF for a national warehouse distribution center which wants to bring 150 jobs and 60 million dollars of investment.

Esseks pointed out that the Comprehensive Plan does provide for consideration of the cost effectiveness of proposed projects. It is in the interest of the public that we look at whether the public will be served from a public health and benefit point of view. Landis suggested that the Comprehensive Plan also says it is wise to preserve and enhance the entryway corridors into Lincoln and to work with developers interested in providing new industrial and office sites. For commercial and industrial districts, the Plan also advocates locations with adequate road capacity that are compatible with existing or planned residential uses, all of

which apply to this area. The Plan also admonishes us to locate commercial and industrial in areas accessible by various modes of transportation, which also applies to this area.

Cornelius acknowledged that he is here to review this report from the consultant and make a determination. His understanding of the application of TIF is that, along with factors such as substandard conditions or blighted conditions, there be a "but for" this tool there is no possibility of development. How do we apply the "but for" condition here, right by a major freeway, with access, open land, etc.? Landis suggested that the question is not whether there will be development, but will there be "this" development, i.e. would "this" development in "this" form exist absent the TIF? TIF provides new resources and allows a larger development and an upgraded development. Therefore, Landis submitted that this proposal meets the "but-for" test. The "but-for" is not the hurdle that one might think it would be in the application of TIF. We will have the obligation to meet the "but-for" test, but it is more narrow than what its name might imply. Cornelius suggested that it's hardly a test at all.

Landis went on to state that 20 years ago, the blight designation was sold as the tool to attack impoverished areas of Lincoln. In the last 20 years, the market place has grabbed this tool and transformed it from community development to more economic development applications, and this particular blight designation falls into one of those categories.

Landis confirmed that the consultants are certified planners and they have done this for other communities as well. He does not know of a certified planner's report that has not been upheld by a court.

Francis expressed concern about allocating TIF funds on a first come first serve basis. Landis explained that there is a maximum utilization, which is 35% of the city. Lincoln is currently at about 11%. A great many of the core neighborhoods are already in the 11%.

Support

1. Danay Kalkowski appeared on behalf of **Ringneck Development, LLC,** in support of the blight designation. Her client has a contract interest in some of the property and owns the property to the north of Holdrege Street. Ringneck supports the blight as shown, even though the Comprehensive Plan today shows a little bit of residential in the northern portion on the south side of Holdrege. The applications that have been submitted for the I-80 West Lincoln Business Center PUD do show commercial and industrial development all the way to the north boundary of the property (Holdrege) with residential uses being shown to the north of Holdrege. The area north of Holdrege is not included in the study, and it

was removed because of the intent to develop as residential. There is intent to develop all of the property on the west side of 48th all the way to Holdrege as industrial and

commercial.

Francis trusts that there will not be a lot of corrugated metal buildings making up the development. Kalkowski indicated that they do not have design standards laid out yet, but that is not what she has heard mentioned at all as far as proposed uses.

There was no testimony in opposition.

ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION: January 30, 2008

Larson moved a finding of reasonable presence of substandard and blighted conditions, seconded by Moline.

Esseks stated that he will support the motion. Because we are probably in or are facing an economic recession and need to maximize economic development opportunities, he will defer to the argument of Dave Landis that TIF is generally used as geographically broadly applied development tool and that the state Legislature voted to define it as such.

Carroll stated that he will support the motion because we need to be consistent with what was done on N. 56th Street.

Motion carried 8-0: Moline, Cornelius, Francis, Esseks, Larson, Taylor, Sunderman and Carroll voting 'yes'; Gaylor-Baird absent. This is a recommendation to the City Council.

MISCELLANEOUS NO. 08003,
"SOUTH 19TH STREET UPDATE AREA" BLIGHT DETERMINATION.
PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE PLANNING COMMISSION: January 30, 2008

Members present: Moline, Cornelius, Francis, Esseks, Larson, Taylor, Sunderman and Carroll; Gaylor-Baird absent.

Ex Parte Communications: None.

Staff recommendation: A finding of reasonable presence of substandard and blighted conditions.

Staff presentation: **Sara Hartzell of Planning staff** explained that this is a blight determination for an area of the Near South Neighborhood, and that the process on this one is a little different than normal. This area was actually part of a very large blight study done in 1996 that included N. 27th Street and "scooped" around the Downtown. It was called the "North 27th Corridor/Enterprise Community Target Area Neighborhood Area Blight and Substandard Determination Study". The N. 27th Street area was brought forward to be accepted as blighted at that time, but the entire area was never brought forward. This is a small piece of the Enterprise Community Target Area now being brought forward.

Urban Development went back to the consultant that did the 1996 study and had them do an update of the study to confirm that the pieces that they had previously been shown as blighted and substandard still exist.

Proponents

1. David Landis, Director of Urban Development, explained that the 1996 blight study was undertaken at that time because there was a federal program for enterprise zones and the federal government wanted cities to make application to become enterprise zones as a tool to bring community development into older areas of town. This study was done to support that application and to continue to get federal funds in the housing area. There is interest in using a TIF process and blight designation from the Capitol environs south to almost South Street.

This is a request to blight this small area now because the city has been approached to assist in development consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and good community development by establishing greater home ownership in older neighborhoods. This proposal is brought forward based on a letter from Hanna Keelan that says "we checked our work and while there have been some changes, the essential conditions continue to exist." This designation is needed for this area at this time because there is a building season upon us and it keeps the costs low to build during a building season.

Larson inquired as to how much of this blighted area will be redeveloped. Landis stated that it would be subject to anyone who wants to bring forth a development. We don't have to use a RFP process. He would be is interested in seeing a proposal for owner-occupied housing. This would be the restructuring of existing residences and LPS would not be offended for use of TIF on residential property. Cornelius suggested that is because the taxes currently paid on these units will continue to be paid. Landis agreed, stating that the buildings in this area have been paying taxes to the schools for a long time. When those apartments are replaced by townhomes or condominiums, there would be another jump of valuation which would go towards the project and the increase in taxes would hopefully come back to all of the political subdivisions that provide services. The TIF funds are historically used for infrastructure improvements; however, the Law Department is now suggesting that TIF can be used in furtherance to public benefit, and the public benefits that are accrued will also be recited. It is a public benefit to increase the home ownership in older neighborhoods in which you have a disproportionate amount of apartment units, and that greater home ownership would encourage more stable, livable neighborhoods. That is a public benefit as well as a private benefit.

Francis expressed concern about there being any benefit to the existing homeowners. Are we making any funds available to help those long term owners in that area make improvements with less interest rates or some kind of benefits? Landis acknowledged that there are other resources for the existing homeowners such as money to assist in rehabilitation; money for first time home buyers; and all the other things that Urban

Development does outside of the TIF realm, such as CDBG or HOME funds.

There was no testimony in opposition.

ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION: January 30, 2008

Cornelius moved a finding of reasonable presence of substandard and blighted conditions, seconded by Moline and carried 8-0: Moline, Cornelius, Francis, Esseks, Larson, Taylor, Sunderman and Carroll voting 'yes'; Gaylor-Baird absent. This is a recommendation to the City Council.

CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 07061
FROM B-1 LOCAL BUSINESS DISTRICT TO
B-2 PLANNED NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS DISTRICT
AND
PRE-EXISTING USE PERMIT NO. 07001A
FOR 16,000 SQ. FT. OF COMMERCIAL FLOOR AREA
AND AN ADJUSTMENT TO REQUIRED PARKING,
ON PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT
SOUTH 70TH STREET AND VAN DORN STREET.
CONT'D PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE PLANNING COMMISSION: January 30, 2008

Members present: Moline, Cornelius, Francis, Esseks, Larson, Taylor, Sunderman and Carroll; Gaylor-Baird absent.

Ex Parte Communications: Esseks stated that he visited the site twice in the last two weeks.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the change of zone and conditional approval of the amendment to the pre-existing use permit.

Staff presentation: **Brian Will of Planning staff** submitted a revised site plan and a copy of a letter from the applicant to Jayne Snyder, the owner of the property to the south.

Proponents

1. Steve Glenn, the applicant, explained that Glenn's True Value is a convenience hardware store at 70th & Van Dorn Street, which he purchased over a year ago. A big part of the convenience hardware business is the lawn and garden business (25%). He is here to sell flowers as part of the business. This store had 70,000 customers this last year, with an average transaction of $15.00; the average customer spends less than 15 minutes in the store, resulting in 1,356 customers a week, 192 customers a day on average. The store is open 83 hours a week, that being 17 customers an hour.

Glenn confirmed that the architect re-measured and has resubmitted the site plan, which now shows 32 parking spaces. 4.25 is the average number of parking stalls that he needs based on the numbers above. These are real numbers – not speculation – actual numbers from historical data.

Glenn stated that he is strongly committed to the good neighbor theory. He has talked to the neighbor to the south. He is also proposing to: 1) attempt to find off-street parking to lease on a long term basis for employee parking (although he has not reached any agreement yet); 2) he has been in contact with Silverhawk Investigations and Security about the possibility of paying a full-time security guard to be on-site during the April-May-June period to keep people from parking on the property to the south; and 3) post "no parking signs" where necessary. He believes this shows good faith.

Glenn suggested that the Commission consider the spirit of zoning based on the facts as opposed to the letter of the law. If we are focusing on the letter of the law, he has to have more parking stalls, but he would hope that the city would focus as much on the spirit of the law, i.e. what is really practical. The numbers are factual and practical and will allow him to operate as a small business in Lincoln, profitably.

Esseks is interested in allowing Glenn to be able to have this addition to the business which he has visited twice in the last two weeks. His concern is with the spirit of the law; that is, to prevent physical harm to the customers or harm to their vehicles. He referred to the comment from Public Works & Utilities indicating that this will create unsafe conditions for flow and safety of pass-by traffic in public right-of-way. He is concerned with the intersection of 70th & Van Dorn. He believes that people coming out of the property to go onto Van Dorn, either to the east or west, will be obstructed by those waiting for the traffic light to change. He suggested that it would be easy to enforce the no parking signs if there were a security person to facilitate the flow in and out. His concern is with people getting hit that have been to the flower tent. A security officer is a great idea, but we need to make sure he can come up to the north by the flower tent.

Larson sought clarification of the "flower" sales. Glenn stated that he is in the "convenience impulse flower purchase" – annual flowers. There will be very limited amount of shrubs and trees.

Glenn went on to state that if there is anything that makes it difficult for a customer to come in or leave the business, it hurts his business. If he has a major problem, he will have to take the tent down.

Moline inquired whether the store rents garden equipment. Glenn acknowledged that he does rent certain types of equipment and it goes out the north door.

Francis asked whether Glenn had considered making the Van Dorn Street an "exit only". Glenn had not considered it and agreed that it might be a good idea. He would need to do

a traffic count to see how many come in that way. Ethan Allen had people parking both ways on each side of the building. He has made this a one-way to open up the flow.

Glenn asked the Commission to consider that he has made improvements and added to the parking since the grand opening.

Carroll wondered about designating the most southern parking stalls for employees only. Glenn would like to have the employees park off-site. Carroll suggested that designating the southern parking stalls for employees would eliminate people trespassing onto the southern property.

Glenn advised that the delivery trucks come either early in the morning or late. Now that the parking has become more sensitive, he will make sure the deliveries are done differently. Glenn acknowledges that the key is to be very sensitive to the parking concerns of his neighbor to the south.

Esseks suggested that all of the parking stalls be striped. He also noted that a full-time security person would be expensive, and suggested that a staff person be assigned this duty. Glenn stated that he was trying to show good faith by agreeing to hire a security guard. Esseks urged that there is a need to assign someone to traffic circulation control.

Opposition

1. Dr. Jayne Snyder, 810 Lakewood Drive, owner of 2845 S. 70th Street, the neighbor to the south, testified in opposition, stating that she still has some concerns. She is at her business about 12 hours a day, so she knows what happens along 70th Street. She has had her business there for 18 years and has owned commercial property in Lincoln for over 30 years. She suggested that Mr. Glenn's data is tainted. There are many times when there are no available parking stalls and part of the reason is that people do not always make a purchase. She is concerned about the 20' from the tent to Van Dorn Street – she has measured it and was under the assumption that that 20' was asphalt pavement, but it is actually an incline up to the sidewalk in Van Dorn Street. The 20' to the back of the tent actually goes up hill to some trees. The tent sits on the asphalt. She also believes the handicap area is unusable.

The area shown as "crushed rock" on the south side adjacent to her building is "grass" and it is a fenced-in area. Behind that chain link fence is rental equipment, scaffolding, bobcats, rototillers, pallets, and long flat trailers. She pointed out that the staff report indicates that both the B-1 and B-2 zoning would require that there be no items stored in that area, but yet it remains to be there. She has had several discussions with Mr. Glenn about this and the fence has encroached upon her property. She is not only concerned about the safety of people coming and going, but also about the items being stored, the large trash containers, the 20' storage trailer parked there, etc. Deliveries come during the day at least three times a week. When they have a sale, there is a semi-trailer parked there. The area

is congested with many items other than just cars.

Dr. Snyder showed some photographs of the 20' trailer that has been sitting there for over a month, as well as an empty refrigerator. The delivery trucks make it difficult to park on the south side of the building.

In general, Dr. Snyder is still concerned. Her snow removal bill was $1,000 in December, and she spent over $6,000 repairing the parking lot. She does not do that to maintain her parking lot for another business. The parking lots are separate and under separate ownership. This property is not large enough to accommodate all this hardware "stuff". Now they are going to put a tent up that is going to take up more of the space.

Response by the Applicant

Glenn pointed out that the photographs were taken in December or January, when, based on the number of customers, he only needs three parking stalls in January. Is this a time we're moving goods in and out? Yes, we're moving all of our fertilizer in and our Christmas goods out. It comes down to the issue - am I going to do something that is not in the best interest of my customer? He disagrees that he is not a good neighbor.

Glenn understands that he will need to move the stored items off-site. They are low velocity items - things that are not rented daily. They are usually delivered to a job site. He could turn that area into more parking.

Glenn submitted that he is running a business. He has to have a trash receptacle. He also tries to recycle. There is a practical aspect of running a business and serving a customer. He is trying to do a good job of it and he is willing to commit the resources to be a good neighbor.

CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 07061
ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION: January 30, 2008

Moline moved to deny, seconded by Sunderman.

Moline grew up in an Earl May store and he would love to approve this, but in his mind and good conscience, he does not believe there is enough parking or space to handle all of those uses and the amount of traffic, and there is no way we can make that space bigger.

Esseks stated that he shares Moline's concern, but he will vote against the motion with the hopes to impose some conditions on the use permit that are acceptable to the applicant that might make the constrained space feasible.

Taylor understands the concerns of the neighbor, but he also appreciates the energy of the applicant in terms of what he plans to do. He understands the constraints, but he thinks

that some of those things can be mitigated. You have to have confidence in the entrepreneur putting a business together. He believes that changes can be made and that this applicant will make those changes. He supports this application.

Carroll pointed out that this is an attempt to make this parcel fit into the five-acre designation of B-2 zoning. He believes that is a stretch for the conditions that have to be adjusted to make that work. It is too far to go for what we are trying to do.

Motion to deny carried 5-3: Moline, Cornelius, Francis, Sunderman and Carroll voting 'yes'; Esseks, Larson and Taylor voting 'no'; Gaylor-Baird absent. This is a recommendation to the City Council.

PRE-EXISTING USE PERMIT NO. 07001A
ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION: January 30, 2008

Esseks moved to approve the staff recommendation of conditional approval with two additional conditions: 1) a certified security person be on duty from 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday (amended to Monday through Sunday), to guide traffic in and out of the property; and 2) all parking spaces must be striped. Motion was seconded by Taylor.

Cornelius stated that he will vote against the motion because, in his mind, there are too many conditions that would be required to make this work. He understands that the peak times are when the neighboring business is not open, but there are concerns by that property owner with regard to the use of her property during those times.

Carroll is opposed based upon the vote to deny the change of zone request.

Francis would like to see this small business be able to expand, but she has concerns with the parking issues that are not addressed to the neighbor's satisfaction. She is entitled to the use of her property by her own customers.

Moline would like to see this happen, but the neighbor to the south has property rights and she does not want to share parking.

Motion for conditional approval, as amended, failed 2-6: Taylor and Esseks voting 'yes'; Moline, Cornelius, Francis, Larson, Sunderman and Carroll voting 'no'; Gaylor-Baird absent.

Cornelius moved to deny, seconded by Francis and carried 6-2: Moline, Cornelius, Francis, Larson, Sunderman and Carroll voting 'yes'; Taylor and Esseks voting 'no'; Gaylor-Baird absent. This is a recommendation to the City Council.

Meeting adjourned at 2:41 p.m. The Planning Commission then met in Room 113 of the County-City Building for a briefing by the Urban Development staff on the South 19th Street

Redevelopment Plan, which is scheduled for public hearing before the Planning Commission on February 13, 2008.

Please note: These minutes will not be formally approved until the next regular meeting of the Planning Commission on February 13, 2008.

F:\FILES\PLANNING\PC\MINUTES\2008\pcm0130.08.wpd