

**MINUTES
URBAN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
ZONING ITEMS PUBLIC HEARING**

January 28, 2010

- I. **CALL TO ORDER** – The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, 2nd Floor LFUCG Government Center, 200 East Main Street, Lexington, Kentucky.

Planning Commission members present: Carolyn Richardson, Chair; Patrick Brewer; Marie Copeland (arrived at 1:32 p.m.); Mike Cravens; Ed Holmes; Mike Owens; Lynn Roche-Phillips; Joan Whitman; and William Wilson. Absent were Derek Paulsen and Frank Penn.

Planning staff members present: Chris King, Director; Bill Sallee; Barbara Rackers; Jimmy Emmons; Traci Wade; Tom Martin; Chris Taylor; and Stephanie Cunningham. Other staff members present were Rochelle Boland, Department of Law; Steve Parker, Division of Engineering; Tim Queary, Urban Forester; Captain Charles Bowen and Firefighter Allen Case, Division of Fire and Emergency Services; and Bob Carpenter, Division of Building Inspection.

- II. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – A motion was made by Mr. Wilson, seconded by Mr. Brewer, and carried 8-0 (Copeland, Paulsen, and Penn absent) to approve the minutes of the December 17, 2009, meeting.

III. **POSTPONEMENTS AND WITHDRAWALS**

1. **WWM, LLC; AUSBROOK POLO, LLC & POLO I, LLC ZONING MAP AMENDMENT & HAMBURG EAST (PLANNED EAR-3 & CC ZONES) ZONING DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

- a. MAR 2009-17: WWM, LLC; AUSBROOK POLO, LLC & POLO I, LLC (2/11/10)* – petition for a zone map amendment from an Agricultural Rural (A-R) zone to a Community Center (CC) zone, for 52.32 net (69.12 gross) acres; and from an Agricultural Rural (A-R) zone to an Expansion Area Residential-3 (EAR-3) zone, for 90.37 net (92.05 gross) acres, for property located at 2950 Winchester Road (a portion of).

LAND USE PLAN AND PROPOSED USE

The 2007 Comprehensive Plan (Expansion Area 2a) recommends a mixture of Community Center (CC), Transition Area Overlay (TA), and Expansion Area Residential-3 (EAR-3), defined as 6-18 dwelling units per gross acre (without the use of transferable development rights), and 24 dwelling units per gross acre (with transferable development rights) future land uses for the subject property. The petitioner proposes a future residential development on the eastern side of Polo Club Boulevard and a large community center development, which requires a residential component, on the western side of Polo Club Boulevard.

The Zoning Committee Recommended: **Disapproval**, for the reasons provided by staff.

The Staff Recommended: **Disapproval**, for the following reasons:

1. The requested Community Center (CC) zone and Expansion Area Residential-3 (EAR-3) zone are not in agreement with the land use recommendation of the 2007 Comprehensive Plan, or of the more detailed Expansion Area Master Plan, which preceded it, for the following reasons:
 - a. These Plans recommend Expansion Area Residential-3 (EAR-3) for 53.8 gross acres on the western side of Polo Club Boulevard, and likewise for 27.7 gross acres on the eastern side of Polo Club Boulevard. The EAR-3 land use category is defined as residential development of 6-18 dwelling units per gross acre (612–2,450 dwelling units) without the use of transferable development rights, and up to 24 dwelling units per gross acre with transferable development rights (a maximum of 2,860 dwelling units).
 - b. The amount of land requested for high density residential use is 90.4 gross acres, which is 11.8 gross acres less than the 102.2 acres proposed by the Plans (EAR-3 and TA combined). With the density requirements of the EAR-3 zone, the expected range of density would be 552–1,657 dwelling units (with the ability to transfer development rights for up to a maximum of 2,210 dwelling units). At the low end, this is a reduction of only 60 units; but if high densities could be achieved, it could mean a loss of 853 units.
 - c. These Plans recommend Transition Area Overlay (TA) for 20.7 gross acres of EAR-3 land on the eastern side of Polo Club Boulevard, between the EAR-3 and CC land use designations, which is designed as an overlay and includes proposed uses such as civic, cultural and religious institutions. The petitioner does not propose a Transition Area (TA) overlay to allow for a complete “community of place” to be developed.
 - d. These Plans recommend 37.5 acres of Community Center (CC) future land use on the eastern side of Polo Club Boulevard, adjacent to Man o’ War Boulevard. However, the amount of land requested for Community Center land use is 52.3 acres, which is 14.8 gross acres greater than the 37.5 acres recommended by the Plans, and is not proposed in a location that is oriented toward the surrounding neighborhood.
2. There have been no major unanticipated changes of an economic, social or physical nature in the area of the subject property since the adoption of the 2007 Comprehensive Plan.
3. The existing Agricultural Rural (A-R) zone is not inappropriate at this location, insofar as it is the most common current zoning designation for the land added to the Urban Service Area in 1996.

* - Denotes date by which Commission must either approve or disapprove request.

4. The proposed zoning categories in the configuration and size requested by the petitioner are inappropriate for the following reasons:
 - a. Sufficient retail land is developed or planned within close proximity to Interstate 75 in the immediate area – all of which would offer a variety of services to the traveling public.
 - b. Higher density residential uses are often recommended along major thoroughfares.
- b. ZDP 2009-87: HAMBURG EAST (EAR-3 & CC AREA) (2/11/10)* - located at 2950 Winchester Road.
(HDR Engineers)

The Subdivision Committee Recommended: Approval, subject to the following conditions:

Should this plan be approved, the following requirements should be considered:

1. Provided the Urban County Council rezones the property EAR-3 and CC; otherwise, any Commission action of approval is null and void.
2. Urban County Engineer's acceptance of drainage, storm and sanitary sewers, and floodplain information.
3. Urban County Traffic Engineer's approval of parking, circulation, access, and street cross-sections.
4. Building Inspection's approval of landscaping and landscape buffer information.
5. Urban Forester's approval of tree inventory map.
6. Greenspace Planner's approval of the treatment of greenways and greenspace.
7. Denote: No building permits shall be issued unless and until a final development plan is approved by the Planning Commission.
8. Revise note number 11.
9. Correct metes and bounds, bearings and distances to match corrected ZOMAR information along Man O' War Boulevard.
10. Denote: At the time of the Final Development Plan, arrangements for the completion of the sanitary sewer and the regional detention facility shall be identified.

Petitioner Representation: Rena Wiseman, attorney, was present representing the petitioner. She requested a one-month postponement of this item.

Action: A motion was made by Ms. Roche-Phillips, seconded by Ms. Whitman, and carried 8-0 (Copeland, Paulsen, and Penn absent) to postpone MAR 2009-17 and ZDP 2009-87 to the February 25, 2010, Planning Commission meeting.

- IV. **ZONING ITEMS** - The Zoning Committee met on Thursday, January 7, 2010, at 1:30 p.m. in the Division of Planning Office. The meeting was attended by Commission members Patrick Brewer, Ed Holmes, Joan Whitman, and William Wilson. The Committee reviewed applications, and made recommendations on zoning items as noted.

A. ABBREVIATED PUBLIC HEARINGS ON ZONE MAP AMENDMENTS AND RELATED PLANS

The staff will call for objectors to determine which petitions are eligible for abbreviated hearings.

Abbreviated public hearings will be held on petitions meeting the following criteria:

- The staff has recommended approval of the zone change petition and related plan(s)
- The petitioner concurs with the staff recommendations
- Petitioner waives oral presentation, but may submit written evidence for the record
- There are no objections to the petition

B. FULL PUBLIC HEARINGS ON ZONE MAP AMENDMENTS AND RELATED PLANS – Following abbreviated hearings, the remaining petitions will be considered.

The procedure for these hearings is as follows:

- Staff Reports (30 minute maximum)
- Petitioner's report(s) (30 minute maximum)
- Citizen Comments
 - (a) proponents (10 minute maximum OR 3 minutes each)
 - (b) objectors (30 minute maximum) (3 minutes each)
- Rebuttal & Closing Statements
 - (a) petitioner's comments (5 minute maximum)
 - (b) citizen objectors (5 minute maximum)
 - (c) staff comments (5 minute maximum)
- Hearing closed and Commission votes on zone change petition and related plan(s)

Note: Requests for additional time, stating the basis for the request, must be submitted to the staff no later than two days prior to the hearing. The Chair will announce its decision at the outset of the hearing.

Note: Ms. Copeland arrived at this time.

* - Denotes date by which Commission must either approve or disapprove request.

1. RAS LAND, INC., ZONING MAP AMENDMENT & RAS PROPERTY ZONING DEVELOPMENT PLAN

- a. MARV 2009-14: RAS LAND, INC. (AMD.) (3/22/10)* - amended petition for a zone map amendment from a Two-Family Residential (R-2) zone to a High Rise Apartment (R-5) zone, for 0.25 net (0.33 gross) acre, for property located at 333 South Upper Street.

LAND USE PLAN AND PROPOSED USE

The 2007 Comprehensive Plan (Sector 1) recommends Downtown Master Plan future land use for the subject property. The petitioner has amended their application and now proposes reuse of the historic structure for residential use only. The petitioner proposes removing a small addition to the rear of the building, construction of one residential unit in the same location, and locating six dwelling units in the existing structure, for a total of seven units (with 12 bedrooms).

The Zoning Committee Recommended: **Approval**, for the reasons provided by staff.

The Staff Recommends: **Approval**, for the following reason:

1. The proposed High Rise Apartment (R-5) zoning is in substantial agreement with the 2007 Comprehensive Plan and the *Downtown Lexington Masterplan*, for the following reasons:
 - a. The proposed residential land use of the property is in agreement with the *Masterplan's* recommendation for this portion of the South Upper corridor as a residential neighborhood area.
 - b. The *Masterplan* states that near downtown "neighborhoods are well established, and require only selective infill and redevelopment. These historic neighborhoods should be preserved and vacant lots should be infilled with context-sensitive buildings." The maintenance of the existing historic structure with minimal exterior alternations, which must be managed and approved through the Board of Architectural Review and the Division of Historic Preservation, are in keeping with the desired direction of the *Masterplan*.
 - c. The 2009 *LFUCG Housing Market Study* found that "attached housing" is an important and growing niche in Lexington; that there remains a demand for higher intensity development, such as that proposed with this zone change, that should be accommodated; and that such higher intensity development should be planned for, especially inside of New Circle Road. Thus, it is appropriate to maintain a high density residential land use at this location (although at a lower level than in the past), where it can act as a transition between lower density residential to the south and west, and the higher intensity church and residential uses to the north and east.
 - d. The subject property is currently considered a non-conforming use, as well as a non-conforming structure. Until 2005, the building was utilized as a 10-unit apartment building; that use existed and was lawfully permitted at the time the property was down-zoned in 1997 from an R-4 zone to an R-2 zone. The petitioner is now requesting a reduction in density from what could most likely be permitted today, and such density is closer to that recommended by the prior 2001 Comprehensive Plan, which is appropriate at this location.
 - e. The Historic South Hill Neighborhood will be able to maintain its urban residential core, and the proposed residential density of 28.0 units per acre supports the urban nature of the neighborhood; both such ideas are in accord with the recommendations of the 2007 Comprehensive Plan and the *Downtown Lexington Masterplan*.
2. This recommendation is made subject to the approval and certification of ZDP 2009-76: RAS Property, prior to forwarding a recommendation to the Urban County Council. This certification must be accomplished within two weeks of the Planning Commission's approval.
3. Under the provisions of Article 6-7 of the Zoning Ordinance, the subject property shall be limited to only the following uses:

PRINCIPAL PERMITTED USES

- a. Multi-family dwellings.

ACCESSORY USES

- a. Private garages, storage sheds, and parking areas.
- b. Living quarters, without cooking facilities and not rented, for guests and employees of the premises.
- c. Swimming pools and tennis courts.
- d. Home offices.
- e. No more than one (1) ground mounted satellite dish antenna, as regulated by Article 15-8 of the Zoning Ordinance.

CONDITIONAL USES

- a. The permitted conditional uses in the R-1A zone, as restricted by Article 8-5(d) of the Zoning Ordinance.

These use restrictions are necessary and appropriate for the subject property in order to ensure greater compliance with the 2007 Comprehensive Plan and *Lexington Downtown Masterplan*, and to protect the surrounding Historic South Hill Neighborhood from inappropriate and incompatible R-5 development.

b. REQUESTED VARIANCES

1. Reduce the required front yard on S. Upper Street from 20 feet to 0 feet for a principal structure

* - Denotes date by which Commission must either approve or disapprove request.

2. Reduce the required front yard on Macks Alley from 10 feet to 0 feet for a principal structure.

The Staff recommended: Approval of the requested front yard variances for the principal structure, for the following reasons:

- a. Granting the requested variances should not adversely affect the public health, safety or welfare, nor alter the character of the general vicinity. The proposed addition will align with the existing structure, which is already at the zero-foot setback. The redevelopment of this property will be required to be done in a manner consistent with Certificates of Appropriateness that must be issued by the Board of Architectural Review.
- b. The subject property is bounded by a public street on three sides, with Macks Alley to the rear and side of the lot. Variances on such a property would not result in a circumvention of the Zoning Ordinance requirements.
- c. Strict application of the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance would necessitate that the existing structure be considered non-conforming due to the front yard setback of the R-5 zone, thereby not allowing any enlargement of the structure without a variance. Granting the variance will allow the BOAR the ability to approve an addition that will architecturally appropriate and context-sensitive to the existing and proposed development of Upper Street, given that it is located in a local Historic District.
- d. The requested variances are not the result of any prior actions of this applicant, nor did they arise as a result of a willful violation of the Zoning Ordinance.

This recommendation of approval is made subject to the following conditions:

1. Provided the Urban County Council rezones the property R-5; otherwise, any Commission action of approval of these variances is null and void.
 2. Should the property be rezoned, it shall be developed in accordance with the approved Preliminary Development Plan, or as amended by a Final Development Plan, and in accordance with a Certificate of Appropriateness as approved by the Board of Architectural Review.
 3. A note shall be placed on the Preliminary Development Plan indicating the dimensional variances that the Planning Commission has approved for this property under Article 6-4(c) of the Zoning Ordinance.
 4. All necessary permits shall be obtained from the Division of Building Inspection prior to construction.
- c. ZDP 2009-76: RAS PROPERTY (1/28/10)* - located at 333 South Upper Street.
(Barrett Partners)

The Subdivision Committee Recommended: Approval, subject to the following requirements:

1. Provided the Urban County Council rezones the property R-5; otherwise, any Commission action of approval is null and void.
2. Urban County Engineer's acceptance of drainage, storm, and sanitary sewers.
3. Urban County Traffic Engineer's approval of street cross-sections and access.
4. Building Inspection's approval of landscaping and required street tree information.
5. Addressing Office's approval of street names and addresses.
6. Urban Forester's approval of tree preservation plan.
7. Denote Historic Overlay (H-1) zone in site statistics.
8. Denote developer's information.
9. Denote storm drainage locations.
10. Denote: Board of Architectural Review approval will be required at the time of a final development plan.
11. Correct tree canopy information.
12. Correct plan title to reflect status as a preliminary development plan.
13. Denote landscape buffer adjacent to the R-2 zone.
14. Denote: This property shall be developed in accordance with the approved final development plan.

Zoning Presentation: Ms. Wade presented the staff report, stating that this request had been amended after its original filing. She added that the staff had received one letter of support from the South Hill Group prior to the amendment of the application.

Ms. Wade briefly oriented the Commission to the location of the subject property. She noted that the subject property lies within the South Hill Historic District and has H-1 overlay zoning. The subject property has frontage along South Upper Street and Macks Alley, with streets located on three sides of it. Other zoning in the vicinity includes B-2B for the Methodist Church to the north; and R-2 for the majority of the other properties in the area, which was the result of a neighborhood request for downzoning in 1997. The subject property was part of that downzoning as well, and was re-zoned from R-4 to the current R-2 zoning. The neighborhood has a mixture of residential densities, including single-family and apartment units.

Ms. Wade displayed several aerial photographs of the subject property. She stated that the petitioner is currently requesting the R-5 zone in order to redevelop the property. The petitioner proposes to maintain the existing structure, but remove

* - Denotes date by which Commission must either approve or disapprove request.

a small addition at the rear of the structure, and replace it with a larger addition for use as a residential unit. That unit, combined with the proposed six units in the existing structure, would result in a total of seven dwelling units on the subject property, or a density of 28 residential units per acre. The petitioner is also proposing conditional zoning restrictions which would limit the principal use of the property to multi-family residential use, and limit the accessory and conditional uses as well. The subject property is currently vacant, following a fire in 2005. The staff found that there had been 10 residential units in the building prior to the fire based on Division of Building Inspection records, so the density proposed by the petitioner is lower than what would currently be permitted on the property.

Ms. Wade said that the 2007 Comprehensive Plan recommends Downtown Master Plan land use for the subject property. The Downtown Master Plan states that the DTMP should either be implemented, or the Planning Commission should consider the recommendations of previous Comprehensive Plans for the site, as well as any other current, relevant information. The 2001 Comprehensive Plan recommended Medium Density Residential land use for the subject property, which is defined as 5 – 10 dwelling units per acre. The DTMP recommends a residential neighborhood area for the subject property and all of the South Upper Street corridor. It also makes statements about the preservation of well-established neighborhoods; the use of selective Infill and Redevelopment; and placing an emphasis on the redevelopment of vacant lots. Ms. Wade stated that, based on those statements from the DTMP, the staff considered the petitioner's request for R-5 zoning to be in substantial agreement with the 2007 Comprehensive Plan. The staff also considered that the building and the lot are currently non-conforming; the LFUCG Housing Market Study indicated that attached housing is a growing market in Lexington; and there has recently been a high demand for this type of housing. The staff also believes that the density proposed on the subject property is in keeping with the rest of the surrounding neighborhood, and it would not adversely affect the neighborhood. The staff, therefore, is recommending approval of this request, for the reasons as listed in the staff report and on the agenda with conditional zoning restrictions as submitted by the petitioner. The Zoning Committee also recommended approval of this request, for the reasons provided by staff.

Commission Questions: Mr. Owens stated that the proposed R-5 zoning would allow a high-rise apartment with offices on the first floor, and asked if the proposed conditional zoning restrictions would eliminate that possibility. Ms. Wade answered that the conditional zoning restrictions would prohibit such a use of the subject property.

Development Plan Presentation: Mr. Martin presented the corollary preliminary development plan, noting that a revised staff recommendation had been distributed to the Commission members prior to the beginning of this hearing. He noted that the plan meets the number of parking spaces as required by the Zoning Ordinance. The proposed footprint of the building is just over 3,800 square feet, with a total of 9,200 square feet of building area proposed. The building is proposed to be 35 feet in height, with 2½ stories and a courtyard area.

Mr. Martin stated that, since the Subdivision Committee meeting, the petitioner had presented a new plan that met many of the original conditions for approval. The staff is currently recommending approval of the plan, subject to the following conditions:

1. Provided the Urban County Council rezones the property R-5; otherwise, any Commission action of approval is null and void.
2. Urban County Engineer's acceptance of drainage, storm, and sanitary sewers.
3. Urban County Traffic Engineer's approval of street cross-sections and access.
4. Building Inspection's approval of landscaping and required street tree information.
5. Addressing Office's approval of street names and addresses.
6. Urban Forester's approval of tree ~~preservation~~ inventory plan.
7. ~~Denote Historic Overlay (H-1) zone in site statistics.~~
8. ~~Denote developer's information.~~
9. ~~Denote storm drainage locations.~~
7. ~~10.~~ Denote: Board of Architectural Review approval will be required at the time of a final development plan.
11. ~~Correct tree canopy information.~~
8. ~~12.~~ Correct plan title to reflect status as a preliminary development plan.
9. ~~13.~~ Denote landscape buffer adjacent to the R-2 zone.
14. ~~Denote: This property shall be developed in accordance with the approved final development plan.~~
10. ~~11.~~ Denote conditional zoning restrictions.

Mr. Martin noted that condition #6 reflects the appropriate level of approval of the Urban Forester. At the Subdivision Committee meeting, the staff had expressed some concern about the tree canopy information. The staff has since conferred with the petitioner and with the Urban Forester, who made a visit to the site, and is now comfortable with the wording of condition #6.

Commission Questions: Ms. Copeland asked how many stories in height would be permitted for a building in the requested R-5 zone. Mr. Martin answered that the height of the building would be dictated by the setback and floor area ratio requirements. Ms. Copeland asked what would be allowed on this site. Mr. Martin responded that the building height

* - Denotes date by which Commission must either approve or disapprove request.

on the subject property is “maxed out,” and, without the requested variances, the petitioner could not meet the requirements of the zone.

Mr. Owens asked if a note should be added to the development plan with regard to the requested variances. Mr. Martin answered that, should the Commission choose to approve those variances, a note will be added to the development plan, so no additional condition would be necessary.

Variance Presentation: Mr. Emmons noted that condition #3 of the staff’s variance report requires that the variance information be added to the corollary development plan. With regard to Ms. Copeland’s question, he said that the R-5 zone has a 4:1 height-to-yard ratio, so the building would not be allowed to be greater than 40 feet in height, based on the 10-foot side yard requirement shown on the development plan.

Mr. Emmons stated that the petitioner is requesting two variances: one, to reduce the front yard along South Upper Street from 20 feet to 0 feet; and the other, to reduce the front yard along Macks Alley from 10 feet to 0 feet. The subject property is bounded by public streets on three sides, since Macks Alley makes a 90-degree turn along the boundary of the property. The existing structure currently exists at a 0’ setback along South Upper Street; so, if the property is rezoned to R-5, it would be considered nonconforming, and would not be allowed to expand. The proposed addition, therefore, could not be constructed unless the requested front yard variances are approved.

Mr. Emmons said that the staff is recommending approval of the two requested variances, for the reasons listed on the addendum.

Commission Questions: Mr. Holmes stated, with regard to Ms. Copeland’s question, that the maximum building height on the subject property would also be limited by parking requirements, since there are no spaces provided beyond the number required by the Zoning Ordinance.

Ms. Copeland asked how high the proposed building could be if the requested variances are approved. Mr. Emmons answered that the building could be 40 feet in height; the existing building is 35 feet in height. Ms. Copeland asked if the petitioner proposes to maintain the existing structure at the front of the property. Mr. Emmons answered that the petitioner does propose to maintain that existing structure.

Petitioner Presentation: Tony Barrett, Barrett Partners, was present representing the petitioner. He thanked the members of the Historic South Hill Neighborhood Association for their cooperation and participation in several meetings regarding this project. He also thanked the staff for their assistance, as the petitioner amended their request and presented a revised development plan for the property.

Mr. Barrett submitted several exhibit items into the record of the meeting, including photographs and excerpts from the Comprehensive Plan and the Downtown Master Plan.

Mr. Barrett stated that the petitioner proposed to maintain the existing structure along South Upper Street, and remove the “shed” from the rear of the property. A single-unit condo is proposed for the owner’s residence in the new addition at the rear of the property, with six residential units in the existing structure. The petitioner has had contractors onsite for the past three months working on the restoration of the existing structure, which had suffered from years of neglect. The petitioner is eager to go forward with the project, and would appreciate the Commission’s favorable recommendation on this rezoning request, in order to do so.

Citizen Comment: Peter Cassidy, president of the Historic South Hill Neighborhood Association, stated that the residents appreciated the petitioner’s willingness to work with them to develop a plan for the subject property that would be in keeping with the character of the area. The residents have been concerned for some time about “non-residential creep” into the neighborhood. They are pleased with the staff’s recommendation of approval of this request, as they believe that the proposed development will provide a buffer against non-residential uses.

Zoning Action: A motion was made by Mr. Holmes, seconded by Mr. Brewer, and carried 9-0 (Paulsen and Penn absent) to approve MARV 2009-14, for the reasons provided by staff.

Variance Action: A motion was made by Mr. Owens, seconded by Ms. Whitman, and carried 9-0 (Paulsen and Penn absent) to approve the two requested variances, for the reasons provided by staff, and subject to the four conditions as listed on the agenda.

Development Plan Motion: A motion was made by Ms. Whitman, and seconded by Mr. Owens to approve ZDP 2009-76, subject to the 10 conditions as listed in the staff’s revised recommendation.

Legal Comment: Ms. Boland noted that there was a typographical error on the staff’s recommendation, which actually included nine conditions. Ms. Whitman revised her motion to include nine conditions, rather than ten.

Development Plan Action: Ms. Whitman's motion carried, 9-0 (Paulsen and Penn absent).

V. COMMISSION ITEMS

- A. COMMISSION CONSIDERATION OF A RESOLUTION REGARDING THE WORLD EQUESTRIAN GAMES** – The Commission will consider a proposed Council resolution recognizing the need for temporary land uses during the World Equestrian Games that may not be permitted by current zoning regulations; creating a temporary use designation as an "Official Temporary World Equestrian Games Related Use;" and establishing procedures and requirements for the establishment of such uses. This resolution was distributed to Commission members at last week's work session.

Director Comments: Mr. King stated that some key representatives from the Mayor's office and the World Equestrian Games Foundation could not be present today. They asked that this item not be discussed at this time, but be re-docketed for one of the Planning Commission's February meetings. Mr. King noted that this item did not require any type of notice, so there would be no need for an official action of postponement by the Commission. Once the necessary parties have verified when they can be in attendance, this item will be re-docketed.

- VI. STAFF ITEMS** – No such items were presented.

- VII. AUDIENCE ITEMS** – No such items were presented.

VIII. MEETING DATES FOR FEBRUARY, 2010

Subdivision Committee, Thursday, 8:30 a.m., Planning Division Office (101 East Vine Street).....	February 4, 2010
Zoning Committee, Thursday, 1:30 p.m., Planning Division Office (101 East Vine Street).....	February 4, 2010
Subdivision Items Public Meeting , Thursday, 1:30 p.m., 2 nd Floor Council Chambers.....	February 11, 2010
Work Session, Thursday, 1:30 p.m., 2 nd Floor Council Chambers.....	February 18, 2010
Technical Committee, Wednesday, 8:30 a.m., Planning Division Office (101 East Vine Street).....	February 24, 2010
Zoning Items Public Hearing , Thursday, 1:30 p.m., 2 nd Floor Council Chambers.....	February 25, 2010

- IX. ADJOURNMENT** – There being no further business, Chair Richardson declared the meeting adjourned at 2:03 p.m.

Frank Penn, Chair

Mike Owens, Secretary