

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting No. 2562

Wednesday, October 7, 2009, 1:30 p.m.

City Council Chambers

One Technology Center – 175 E. 2nd Street, 2nd Floor

Members Present	Members Absent	Staff Present	Others Present
Cantrell	Marshall	Alberty	Boulden, Legal
Carnes	Shivel	Feddis	Steele, Sr. Eng.
Dix		Fernandez	
Leighty		Huntsinger	
Liotta		Matthews	
McArtor		Sansone	
Midget			
Walker			
Wright			

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices on Thursday, October 1, 2009 at 8:10 a.m., posted in the Office of the City Clerk, as well as in the Office of the County Clerk.

After declaring a quorum present, Chair Cantrell called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

REPORTS:

Worksession Report:

Ms. Cantrell reported that the Planning Commission had a work session at 11:00 a.m. today to hear from Janet Tharp regarding the PLANitULSA Vision Plan.

Director's Report:

Mr. Alberty reported on the BOCC and City Council agendas and activities.

Mr. Alberty reported that the TMAPC Receipts for the month of August 2009 are down 50% from this time in 2008 and for the year about 27%.

Minutes:

Approval of the minutes of September 16, 2009 Meeting No. 2560

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted 8-0-0 (Cantrell, Carnes, Dix, Leighty, Liotta, McArtor, Midget, Walker, "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Marshall, Shivel, Wright "absent") to **APPROVE** the minutes of the meeting of September 16, 2009, Meeting No. 2560.

CONSENT AGENDA

All matters under "Consent" are considered by the Planning Commission to be routine and will be enacted by one motion. Any Planning Commission member may, however, remove an item by request.

2. **LS-20337** – Tein Lam (9331)/Lot-Split (PD 18A) (PD 9)
Northwest corner of South Rockford Avenue and East 58th Street, 5746 South Rockford Avenue
3. **LS-20338** – Lou Reynolds (9334)/Lot-Split (PD 18B) (CD 7)
East of South Kingston Avenue and north of East 60th Place, 6010 South Lakewood Avenue
4. **LC-211** – Lou Reynolds (9334)/Lot Combination (PD 18B) (CD 7)
East of South Kingston Avenue and north of East 60th Place, 6010 South Lakewood Avenue
5. **The Reserve at Stonebrook** – (8211) Final Plat (PD 8) (CD 2)
West of the northwest corner of West 81st Street South and South Elwood Avenue

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

This plat consists of 39 lots in two blocks on 24.49 acres.

All release letters have been received and staff recommends **APPROVAL**.

6. **Tom's Kids** – (8333) Final Plat (PD 26) (CD 8)
Southwest corner of 116th Street alignment and South
Yale Avenue

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

This plat consists of two lots in one block on 40 acres.

All release letters have been received and staff recommends **APPROVAL**.

7. **BOA-20964** – (9330) Plat Waiver (PD 6) (CD 9)
1347 East Skelly Drive, East of South Quaker Avenue,
North of East 51st Street

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The platting requirement is being triggered by a Board of Adjustment approval of a Special Exception to permit an apartment use in a CS district.

Staff provides the following information from TAC at their September 17, 2009 meeting:

ZONING:

TMAPC Staff: The site has been previously platted.

STREETS:

No comments.

SEWER:

No comments.

WATER:

No comments.

STORM DRAIN:

No comments.

FIRE:

No comments.

UTILITIES:

No comments.

Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the plat waiver.

A YES answer to the following 3 questions would generally be FAVORABLE to a plat waiver:

	Yes	NO
1. Has Property previously been platted?	X	
2. Are there restrictive covenants contained in a previously filed plat?	X	
3. Is property adequately described by surrounding platted properties or street right-of-way?	X	

A YES answer to the remaining questions would generally NOT be favorable to a plat waiver:

	YES	NO
4. Is right-of-way dedication required to comply with Major Street and Highway Plan?		X
5. Would restrictive covenants be required to be filed by separate instrument if the plat were waived?		X
6. Infrastructure requirements:		
a) Water		
i. Is a main line water extension required?		X
ii. Is an internal system or fire line required?		X
iii. Are additional easements required?		X
b) Sanitary Sewer		
i. Is a main line extension required?		X
ii. Is an internal system required?		X
iii. Are additional easements required?		X
c) Storm Sewer		
i. Is a P.F.P.I. required?		X
ii. Is an Overland Drainage Easement required?		X
iii. Is on site detention required?		X
iv. Are additional easements required?		X
7. Floodplain		
a) Does the property contain a City of Tulsa (Regulatory) Floodplain?	X*	
b) Does the property contain a F.E.M.A. (Federal) Floodplain?		X
8. Change of Access		
a) Are revisions to existing access locations necessary?		X
9. Is the property in a P.U.D.?		X
a) If yes, was plat recorded for the original P.U.D.		
10. Is this a Major Amendment to a P.U.D.?		X
a) If yes, does the amendment make changes to the proposed physical development of the P.U.D.?		
11. Are mutual access easements needed to assure adequate access to the site?		X

12. Are there existing or planned medians near the site which would necessitate additional right-of-way dedication or other special considerations? X

*The project includes interior remodeling only.

8. **PUD-600-A – Castlerock Builders/Steve Wright** (PD-18) (CD-8)

South and west of the southwest corner of 91st Street South and South Yale Avenue (Detail Site Plan for a 3,250 square foot office building.)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The applicant is requesting approval of a detail site plan for a 3,250 square foot (SF) office building. The proposed use, Use Unit 11 – Offices, Studios and Support Services is a permitted use within Development Area A of PUD-600-A.

The submitted site plan meets all applicable building floor area, open space, building height and setback limitations. Access to the site is provided from one point along the private South Toledo Avenue. Parking has been provided per the applicable use unit of the Zoning Code at a ratio of one space per 300 SF of building floor area. A six-foot screening fence has been constructed along the east boundary line per PUD requirements. Landscaping is provided per the Landscape Chapter of the Zoning Code with a minimum five-foot landscape buffer along the east, south and west boundary lines as required. There is no parking lot lighting proposed at this time.

Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the detail site plan for Lot 3, Block 6 – Ashton Creek Office Park.

(Note: Detail site plan approval does not constitute landscape and/or sign plan approval.)

The Planning Commission considered the consent agenda.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Action; 8 members present:

On **MOTION** of **MIDGET**, TMAPC voted **8-0-0** (Cantrell, Carnes, Dix, Leighty, Liotta, McArtor, Midget, Walker, "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Marshall, Shivel Wright "absent") to **APPROVE** the consent agenda Items 2 through 8 per staff recommendation.

Ms. Wright in at 1:34 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING

- 9. **Jet Port Industrial Park –** (2407) Preliminary Plat (PD 16) (CD 3)
 West of Highway 169, North of West 46th Street North
 (Request continuance to 10/21/2009 for work on platting
 issues.) (Continued from 9/16/2009.)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Ms. Fernandez stated that there is a request for a continuance in order to work on platting issues. She requested a continuance to October 21, 2009.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **MCARTOR**, TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Cantrell, Carnes, Dix, Leighty, Liotta, McArtor, Midget, Walker, Wright "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Marshall, Shivel "absent") to **CONTINUE** the preliminary plat for Jet Port Industrial Park to October 21, 2009.

OTHER BUSINESS:

- 10. **Holy Apostolic Church/Sack and Associates – Refund Request for Plat Waiver.**

Plat Waiver was withdrawn before review.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Ms. Fernandez stated that this waiver was withdrawn as a result of a Board of Adjustment case being withdrawn. Staff never reviewed this waiver and staff recommends a full refund.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **MIDGET**, TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Cantrell, Carnes, Dix, Leighty, Liotta, McArtor, Midget, Walker, Wright "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Marshall, Shivel "absent") to **APPROVE** the refund request for the withdrawn plat waiver for Holy Apostolic Church/Sack and Associates for \$250.00 per staff recommendation.

11. **Discussion regarding TMAPC holding evening meetings.**

TMAPC COMMENTS:

Ms. Cantrell stated that staff has provided a packet with emails that were received regarding night meetings.

Ms. Cantrell stated that it was her impression that the last time the Planning Commission met during a work session there was discussion about a number of different possibilities. She recalled that staff would look into some other alternatives as well. She understood that some of the issues would be addressed by staff today. The sheet that staff distributed today is simply questions about issues that could arise if there were night meetings.

Mr. Alberty stated that he may have misunderstood. He thought last week that he had said once the decision was made then staff would collect the information necessary. If that is the Planning Commission's wish, then they need to give staff direction that they are moving forward with night meetings and therefore answer these questions. Staff tried to raise more questions, and then provide answers. Staff has been consistent in stating that it is the Planning Commission's decision and staff will adapt. Will there be a cost? Definitely, there will be a cost and the Executive Director of INCOG has indicated that staff would absorb the additional costs if that is the Planning Commission's decision and desire. If the Planning Commission needs numbers or accounting to make their decision, then staff will be happy to look into that.

Ms. Cantrell stated that it would be an issue for her if there would be additional costs. If it would be a huge expense, then that would be something that would weigh on a lot of people's decisions, but without that information it is difficult to make a decision.

Mr. Alberty stated staff can go from here and provide answers. Mr. Alberty apologized for misunderstanding and providing what was requested. Mr. Alberty cited several factors that will need to be looked at regarding cost. The only thing that staff will have deal with is the amount and level of availability of our Planners if we do go to a strict night schedule. Mr. Alberty stated the Planning Commission doesn't need to be overly concerned about personnel issues, because staff will adapt.

Ms. Cantrell stated that she appreciates staff looking into the issues. She realizes that staff looked at a few other jurisdictions and it looks pretty well split. Some meet during the day and some meet during the evening. The bottom line is that the Planning Commission needs to decide for themselves.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

CONCERNS REGARDING THE TMAPC HOLDING NIGHT MEETINGS

October 7, 2009

- Use of the City Council meeting room: Will there be an additional cost? Is the room available?
- Security: Will Security Staff be available? Is there an additional cost for that? Escorts to vehicles after a given time?
- What parking will be available for TMAPC members? Staff? Visitors/applicants? Where? Will there be a cost? What about during special events at the PAC, when the lots are often closed to the non-attending public or number of spaces is limited?
- Federal Fair Labor Laws: What do they say about various classes of workers? Providing a meal if meeting occurs over a normal mealtime? Reimbursement or compensation for time spent?
- Meeting fatigue: People's attention spans are largely determined by the sizes of their bladders and length of time they can remain seated. The later in the agenda, even with afternoon meetings, the more attentions seem to stray and the more restless people become. Sometimes, the cases that are later in the agenda receive less critical attention than those earlier on the agenda. The later the meetings last, the more people with childcare and other caregiver issues have tended to leave. (A study in Mammoth Lakes, CA in November 2008 found that evening meetings for its planning commission were not feasible because of the childcare issue, among other things.)
- TGOV: Will the City still wish to tape and televise? What if the TMAPC chooses to meet in a different location (i.e., Williams Tower conference room)?
- Covering the desk on meeting nights: If staff members are allowed to come in at noon on Wednesdays when there are meetings that will leave only those who don't attend the meetings to cover. Will this give the perception that we aren't serving the public adequately? We should post a sign with a caveat in the lobby on those days.
- Agenda packets for the next week: Thursday's agenda packet will need to be completed/proofread/corrected/copied on Wednesday afternoon or Thursday morning at the latest. If staff opts to come in late on Thursday morning after a Wednesday evening meeting, this could impact the packet process.

- BOA meetings: If the TMAPC opts for night meetings, can the BOA be far behind? The same concerns will apply.
- Day of the week: Many people choose to attend religious functions on Wednesday nights. This would effectively preclude their participation at some or all of the PC meetings. If another evening is chosen, it presents similar difficulties. (Monday night is football night; Thursday night is Council; Friday and the weekends are family. Basically, the only night left is Tuesday and some schools hold events then.)
- The surrounding smaller communities often hold their planning commission meetings and/or City Council meetings in the evenings. If the TMAPC chose to do so also, this may preclude some of the public/developers/representatives from attending those.
- The Planning Commission is a recommending board and holds meetings in the day time; the City Council is the final decision maker and meets in the evenings. This gives the public a 50/50 chance to make one of the meetings to speak about the issue and perhaps levels the field.
- Transmittal time: By holding a meeting on Wednesday evening, any non-controversial case from the TMAPC will likely not be transmitted to the City or County by Thursday morning, as some are now.
- TMAPC members' willingness/ability to meet in the evenings: Some have expressed the intent to resign or not be reappointed if meetings are to be held in the evenings.

INTERESTED PARTIES COMMENTS:

Sarah Kobos, 3709 East 43rd Street, 74135, stated that this is an issue that she hears a lot about because she is involved in different community organizations. She was very happy to read the TMAPC Mission statement and the line "...to provide a public forum that fosters public participation and transparency in land development and planning" because that is everyone's goal. Unfortunately, the current meeting time serves as an obstacle to that goal and effectively silences the voices of everyone in the community that has an 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. job. By having a 1:30 p.m. meeting, it would mean that an interested party would have to take the entire afternoon off from work and that is not convenient. The time is convenient for people who do not work, developers who are paid to attend the meeting and evidently convenient for staff.

Ms. Kobos stated that she has always had salaried positions where she was expected to work more than 40 hours a week and has had salaried positions where, if she was on call and would have to come in at night, there would be

leeway to take a couple of hours off to compensate. Sometimes the meetings run quickly and efficiently and sometimes they are lengthy.

Ms. Kobos commented that one thing she has noticed when she has participated in the TMAPC meetings is that when an issue affects a neighborhood and then gets continued multiple times, it is almost a tactic, she believes, used to repress any form of debate. She believes that fewer people show up at the following meetings. Ms. Kobos commented that she is not opposed to development and she is in favor of very intelligent, smart appropriate development. She thinks sometimes what the Planning Commission sees is people that come, who can come, may be a little more conservative about what they want to see and perhaps the Planning Commission is not hearing the voices of younger professionals. Ms. Kobos feels that night meetings will bring a more varied demographic audience. The Planning Commission should hold their meetings at a time when people can attend and she feels the ideal starting time would be 6:00 p.m. She also feels that one could compromise and start at 4:30 or 5:00 p.m. as a start time.

Ms. Kobos stated that aside from night meetings, she would like to see better communication and more use of technology to help people stay engaged in this game. Ms. Kobos cited an example of Google maps that the BOA is currently using for information on upcoming cases. She would like to see the TMAPC use the same technology. Perhaps eventually the TMAPC would have live streams through the internet and people at work could tune in to see what is going on. Ms. Kobos concluded that possibly the TMAPC could try the night meetings for six months and see if there would be a more diverse participation by the community.

TMAPC COMMENTS:

Ms. Cantrell stated that staff has done a wonderful job with the BOA maps and TMAPC will have that same tool very soon. Mr. Alberty stated that it is ready to go.

Mr. McArtor stated that Ms. Kobos commented that the present meetings exclude people who work during the day, including young professionals. He asked Ms. Kobos if she actually knows folks who feel they are excluded. In response, Ms. Kobos stated that she was one of them. She explained that at her previous job she simply didn't have the type of job where she could leave. Mr. McArtor stated that it seems to him that most citizens, as a general rule, who attend the meetings are those whose own property is being impacted. As a general rule, he wouldn't think young professionals and working folks would just want to hang around TMAPC meetings because it is fun and exciting. He believes people will only attend when it is something that could impact their property. Perhaps someone will attend these meetings one time for something that would impact their neighborhood or two times maybe in one's entire life in this community, and he finds it hard to believe that it can't be planned ahead of time and get off of

work. Ms. Kobos stated that if one is really interested in this stuff, it happens more than once in a lifetime. PLANitULSA is talking about a Comprehensive Plan and by having workshops at night and communicating what it was all about. They had a record turnout and they also had the highest engagement by younger people of any city the Fregonese team has worked with. This led people to realize that there is a tremendous desire for change and to say the status quo is not working and we want to try some new ideas to see some things happen. The TMAPC will be approving the new Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning Code that will allow some of these different ways of developing. Younger people want to see some mixed use, changes and progressive ideas. It would be unfair to be considering these issues at a time that perhaps that demographic group couldn't attend. She commented that she doesn't have a scientific study to prove it, but has some casual experience of being at these meetings. Mr. McArtor stated that these things are important and should be considered. He further stated that if one followed Ms. Kobos's argument, the Planning Commission could foresee evening meetings in which the room will be much more filled than normal with folks who are not just interested in their own neighborhoods and their own property, but just in general some of the issues that have been brought up. Mr. McArtor stated that his experience has been that day meetings are generally shorter than night meetings and he isn't sure if it is the fatigue factor. He foresees the evening meetings, under Ms. Kobos's theory, with a lot more people attending who are going to want to talk and it will extend the meetings and make management of these things difficult. It is kind of like in the business that he does. It is really important to take heed of every person on every case and make sure justice gets done for everybody, but the other thing is to make the dockets run smoothly and not let them back up. Mr. McArtor asked Ms. Kobos if she had any concern that some of the meetings might become more unwieldy than they are, if in fact there is more participation. Ms. Kobos stated that she can't conjecture, but her thought was to give it a try and see if it allows a greater, broader representation of the community to participate. At the same time if this is supposed to be a public hearing, why hold it in a dark cave at an odd time and why not hold it at a time when people can come? If the goal is to simply go into a conference room and make decisions, then the Planning Commission could do that at the work sessions and wouldn't need to have this. Mr. McArtor stated that he believes that Ms. Kobos is trying to make her point, but he does have to take issue about being in a dark cave, because 1:30 p.m. is hardly an obscure time, hardly a roving band (the TMAPC meet in the same room each time), and there have been so many cases when people have filled the room two or three times because the case was continued a few times. There was no delineation of people attending; in fact it may have been more.

Ms. Wright thought the Planning Commission was considering a 4:00 p.m. meeting and not necessarily evening. Mr. McArtor stated that a decision hadn't been made yet. Ms. Cantrell stated that about 80 percent of the meetings run less than two hours. Ms. Wright stated that if the Planning Commission started at 4:00 p.m., then most anyone would have to take off from work maybe one hour

to possibly only 30 minutes. Mr. McArtor stated that he believes it is an error to assume that a meeting that took two hours that started at 1:30 p.m. will also take two hours if it starts at 4:00 p.m. He believes that this not necessarily a correct assumption. Mr. McArtor further stated that he doesn't mean to sound adversarial and if there is a vote he will vote to try it in some way, shape or another. He believes it is worth a try, but he is concerned about the heightened expectations and some of the assumptions of the argument.

Ms. Cantrell stated that she believes that so many of the Planning Commission agendas are less than two hours is because there have been quite a few like today where people don't care about plats. They won't come and argue about right-of-way and all of that. Lately, and this may be a sign of the economy, they have had a lot of simple cases. The cases that are more contentious are the ones that take a longer period of time, no matter what time you start. Her goal is to never have a meeting as long as the one involving the Target application. A nine-hour meeting is too long and no one is able to think straight.

Mr. Midget stated that this has been discussed for years and he would like to at least try it out. He is confused on whether it would be one meeting a month or all of the meetings. Mr. Midget commented that he is hesitant to move all of the meetings to the evening. He likes the idea of 4:00 p.m. better than 7:00 p.m. If it is held on Wednesday, there will be people wanting to attend church. Do this on a trial basis and get a feel of what kind of work load this will have. Mr. Midget agreed with Mr. McArtor that most people will not attend the meeting unless it impacts them personally. Mr. Midget stated that when there was a City Commission, he remembers that they used to meet on Friday, 9:00 a.m. and Tuesdays at 1:00 p.m. At the time, Mayor Terry Young wanted to change it to have at least one night meeting and they did so at 6:00 p.m. and now all of the Council meetings are in the evening.

Mr. Leighty stated that he would support evening meetings, but he would like to see a consistent time. He would propose a 5:15 p.m. start time and those who get off at 5:00 p.m. could be here by 5:30 p.m. and attend the meeting. When he came on board, he thought he wouldn't want to change the times for his own personal reasons, but this is about serving the City and there have been enough compelling reasons to give this a trial for six months.

Ms. Wright stated that she believes the Planning Commission should stay with the 4:00 p.m. starting time. If the meeting should happen to be a short meeting, as today's is it wouldn't be over time for staff.

Mr. Alberty stated that there are two meetings a month that are advertised for public hearing and if the meetings are going to be separated, he would suggest that the Planning Commission consider those two meetings be in the evening. It would be the first and third Wednesday of each month. The third meeting, which is held the fourth Wednesday is only for continued applications and if the

Planning Commission thought a case had considerable interest in it then do not continue it to the third meeting of the month. Most of the fourth Wednesday meetings are when the training session, regular meeting and work sessions are held.

Ms. Wright stated that it would be an excellent thing to consider. The Planning Commission could hold two evening meetings for the 1st and 3rd Wednesday of the month for public hearings and then on the 4th Wednesday keep the schedule as is when very few people need to attend. Ms. Cantrell agreed and suggested that all of the consent agenda items be put on that meeting as well since they tend to be platting issues. Mr. Leighty agreed and called back his comment that all of the meetings should be at a consistent time.

Mr. Carnes stated that Tulsa does have rush hour twice a day and if the meeting started at 4:00 p.m., then at least we would avoid the rush hour. The public meetings are the only ones that people care about and you will find out that nobody cares unless it is in their own backyard. Mr. Carnes cited the many Mayors that have brought up this issue. Mr. Carnes stated that the current system works and day meetings keep everything professional. Once they are night meetings, then you get the rowdies.

Mr. Dix stated that he doesn't care personally whether it is day or night meetings. He does prefer the 4:00 p.m. starting time better than the 5:15 p.m. starting time. He is concerned for staff and having to work comp hours to make up their time for working in the evening and covering the office during the day. He explained that he has attended hundreds of these meetings in other cities and when he found out they met in the daytime, he was pleased because he wouldn't have to travel at night and then drive home arriving around 10:00 p.m. or 11:00 p.m. In his business it was always contentious and the meetings were long.

Ms. Cantrell stated that the Planning Commission stills needs some input from staff in terms of how much it costs to have evening meetings.

Mr. Boulden recommended that there be no vote today because of the wording on the agenda. Mr. Boulden stated that Ms. Kobos mentioned in her presentation that the Planning Commission approves the changes in the Zoning Code and he has tried many times to emphasize that the Planning Commission does not approve the Zoning Code changes. The Planning Commission makes recommendations to the City Council for Zoning Changes and changes to the Zoning Code. To that point it is also perhaps something that the Planning Commission should consider is that, at least presently, the Planning Commission has day meetings and City Council who actually takes the action has night meetings. In a way the Planning Commission and the City Council do cover the issues, or at least the important issues, by the day and night meetings.

Ms. Cantrell countered that while that is true that the Planning Commission is a recommending body for the Zoning Code and zoning changes, but for the Comprehensive Plan if the TMAPC says no, then it goes nowhere else.

INTERESTED PARTIES COMMENTS:

Chip Atkins, 1638 East 17th Place, 74120, stated that the Planning Commission did hold a night meeting and it was very well attended. There were over 30 to 40 people in the audience for Zoning Code changes. It started at 6:00 p.m. and it was very well attended. Mr. Atkins explained that he was late for this meeting because he had to wait for a delivery and this is something that happens to everyone during the daytime. Mr. Atkins indicated that when he was on the TPC subcommittee was better attended during the 4:00 p.m. time rather than the current 11:00 a.m. meeting time. He prefers the Planning Commission meet at 5:15 p.m. rather than 4:00 p.m. Mr. Atkins submitted a letter from Julie Hall supporting evening meetings (Exhibit A-1).

TMAPC COMMENTS:

Ms. Cantrell asked the members if they would like to try holding night meetings for the 1st and 3rd Wednesday at 4:00 p.m.

Ms. Cantrell stated that the Planning Commission would like staff to look into holding night meetings for the 1st and 3rd Wednesday at 4:00 p.m. She directed staff to see about the availability of the room, the cost to staff, TGOV, parking and security hours.

Mr. Boulden asked if the Planning Commission was considering trying this starting this year or next year. Mr. Boulden stated that the schedules can be amended as long as they are posted ten days in advance of the meeting.

Ms. Wright suggested that the new time start in January 2010.

Ms. Cantrell requested that this issue be on the October 28, 2009 meeting, under the public hearing in order to take action.

Mr. Dix stated that if there were a vote today he would prefer to keep it at 1:30 p.m., but if the majority wants to move it to 4:00 p.m. he would not oppose it. Mr. Dix further stated that if the Planning Commission does go to evening meetings and start having control issues regarding length of time for speaking, etc., it will be a Chairman's issue. Ms. Cantrell stated that she is fully aware of that and fully intend try to maintain some restrictions.

* * * * *

There being no further business, the Chair declared the meeting adjourned at 2:19 p.m.

Date Approved:

Michelle Carter

Chairman

ATTEST:

Joshua A. Walk

Secretary

