



City of Jonesboro

900 West Monroe,
Jonesboro, AR 72401
<http://www.jonesboro.org/>

Meeting Minutes - Draft Metropolitan Area Planning Commission

Tuesday, April 12, 2011

5:30 PM

900 West Monroe

1. Call to order

2. Roll Call

Present 9 - Margaret Norris; Lonnie Roberts Jr.; Joe Tomlinson; Brian Dover; Paul Hoelscher; Jerry Halsey Jr.; Ron Kelton; John White and Jim Scurlock

3. Approval of minutes

Approval of the MAPC Meeting Minutes for March 8, 2011.

A motion was made by Joe Tomlinson, seconded by Jim Scurlock, that this matter be Approved . The motion carried by the following vote.

Aye: 8 - Margaret Norris; Lonnie Roberts Jr.; Joe Tomlinson; Brian Dover; Paul Hoelscher; Ron Kelton; John White and Jim Scurlock

4. Subdivisions

PP 11-03: Barrington Park Phase V

Carlos Wood, P.E. on behalf of Jim Abel request approval of a 18- lot Subdivision for Barrington Park Phase V. Located to the east of the terminus of Annadale Circle.

Carlos Wood representing Jim Abel for preliminary subdivision for Phase 4 asking for approval. No questions or concerns by the Commission. Mr. Spriggs noted that there were no outstanding issues from Planning or Engineering Staff.

A motion was made by Joe Tomlinson, seconded by John White, that this matter be Approved . The motion carried by the following vote.

Aye: 8 - Margaret Norris; Lonnie Roberts Jr.; Joe Tomlinson; Brian Dover; Paul Hoelscher; Ron Kelton; John White and Jim Scurlock

FP: 11:03 FloyRed Commons, Commercial Park Subdivision

Location: Existing Craighead County Fairgrounds, located on the west side of Stadium Blvd., South of Dayton Ave. and North Brazos St. intersection of Stadium Blvd., 6 commercial lots.

Mr. John Easley, AET. Represented the Craighead County Fair Board. He is asking for final approval of 4 lots. Mr. Spriggs confirmed the change from 6 to 4 lots. Consistency is achieved with the preliminary plan.

A motion was made by Jim Scurlock, seconded by Joe Tomlinson, that this matter be Approved . The motion carried by the following vote.

Aye: 8 - Margaret Norris;Lonnie Roberts Jr.;Joe Tomlinson;Brian Dover;Paul Hoelscher;Ron Kelton;John White and Jim Scurlock

5. Site Plan Reviews

Site Plan Review: NEA Baptist Memorial Cancer Center- Planned District-PD-C

Tim Gibson, P.E. of Askew Hargraves Harcourt & Associates, Inc., requests MAPC site plan approval of the NEA Baptist Cancer Center, 4800 E. Johnson Ave. for a 27,250 sq. ft. single story building.

Staff: Mr. Spriggs noted that this is a request for final site plan approval for the center as part of the Planned District approved over a year ago. This supplemental portion that will be located in the rear of the property. Staff has received all necessary drawings for approval of the facility. They have submitted the preliminary landscaping and photometrics plans and still will assure compliance with the Planned District standards formerly approved. We see no adverse affect on the rear abutting properties in the rear. We recommend approval by MAPC with the stipulation that Staff will coordinate final approval administratively during the permit process.

Mr. Tomlinson noted that he was enthused to see this submittal come through and made a motion to approve as noted; **Seconded by Ron Kelton, that this matter be approved. The motion carried by the following vote.**

Aye: 8 - Margaret Norris;Lonnie Roberts Jr.;Joe Tomlinson;Paul Hoelscher;Jerry Halsey Jr.;Ron Kelton;John White and Jim Scurlock

Abstain: 1 - Brian Dover

George Hamman, Civilogic requests MAPC's review of a Preliminary Site Plan for Family Fellowship Baptist Church, located on Hwy. 351, 2441 Old Greensboro Rd., for a 242 seat worship facility. 71 parking spaces are proposed.

George Hamman: This is a conceptual site plan for the Family Fellowship new facility. From the calculation of 61 required parking spaces; we propose 71 spaces. This is the overall plan of what they would like to accomplish. They have received permit approval of the State Highway Department for the entrance. This is how they would like to see the site laid out. We will try to get the detention down to the southwest corner. We would approval of the conceptual site plan, with the permission to work out the design details with the staff.

Staff:

Mr. Spriggs noted MAPC previously approved this use as a Conditional Use wit in the R-1 Single Family District absent a site layout. Mr. Spriggs noted that the church has purchased the property/lot to the west which will be used for storm water detention. Staff sees no issues with the proposal.

Mr. White asked if this was a conceptual plan that will come back. Mr. Hamman responded that he would not like to waste the MAPC time and he is asking for approval contingent upon final administrative approval by staff of the design details. Mr. Tomlinson asked how Hwy. 351 and Peach Tree are in relationship to the Master Street Plan. That could be a pretty good intersection approval.

Mr. Hamman agreed and noted that they finished all of their field boundary work today. The Hwy. 351 is 80 ft. wide and Peach Tree will be a minimum of 60 ft. Mr. Tomlinson stated that if Hwy. 351 is widened, he hopes that they take that into consideration where they place the church. Mr. Hamman stated that they will take that into consideration and allow for that. Mr. White made a motion to approve, seconded by Mr. Scurlock. The motion carried by the following vote.

Aye: 8 - Margaret Norris;Lonnie Roberts Jr.;Joe Tomlinson;Brian Dover;Paul Hoelscher;Ron Kelton;John White and Jim Scurlock

6. Conditional Use

CU 11-04 Selective Site Consultants- T-Mobile Wireless Tower Facility

Location: 3104 Colony Drive, Jonesboro. Applicant proposes to construct a cellular communications tower at the said location, within a C-3 Commercial Zoning District.

Phil Davidson: Spoke on behalf of T-Mobile. Stated that Chairman covered the details.

Staff: Mr. Spriggs gave staff comments. Notifications and documents, and details on screening/fencing required were submitted. Mr. Spriggs asked for clarification on the 50 ft. setback requirements.

Mr. Davidson: We went 40 ft. instead of a 50X50 compound. We will now be able satisfy that requirement. Mr. Spriggs noted that Staff raised that concern because of the apartment units to be built just north of the boundary of the site. The applicant has done due diligence in seeking out co-location.
No Public Input.

Mr. Tomlinson asked will the setback be sufficient as required. Mr. Spriggs noted that although it is commercial it will have to meet those setbacks. Mr. Tomlinson made a motion to approve the item as submitted, seconded by Margaret Norris, that this matter be Approved . The motion carried by the following vote.

Aye: 8 - Margaret Norris;Lonnie Roberts Jr.;Joe Tomlinson;Brian Dover;Paul Hoelscher;Ron Kelton;John White and Jim Scurlock

7. Rezoning

Lance Sloan on behalf of the owner Derek Baltz, of 300 N. Kathleen St. request a rezoning from R-1 to I-1 Light Industrial, for 4.58 acres of land.

Applicant: Lance Sloan, applicant representing the owner and himself to rezone from R-1 to I-1. Has an outstanding contract to purchase the property contingent upon the rezoning. The use is for storage and warehouse.

Staff: Mr. Spriggs: We have forwarded the analysis in the staff report. It is surrounded primarily by residential with the exception to being adjacent to the railroad and airport to the west. The applicant has requested I-1 Limited Industrial, however staff is suggesting a modification to the I-1 Limited Use Overlay District; so that there can be some level of control on the build out of this lot. We realize that there are some challenges in terms of right of way and access management; which has been an issue for other rezonings in this area. Mr. Spriggs suggested that the MAPC consider L.U.O. as an alternative.

Mr. Spriggs added: In the applicant it was revealed that the applicant proposes 20 buildings at 1,000 sq. ft. each. If approved as I-1, any uses permitted on the use-tables would be allowed with a limited amount of constraints. In instances where the property abuts residentially zoned property, we would require some form of privacy fence screening. The Master Street Plan recommendations were listed- Kathleen Street is listed a collector road recommended as an 80 ft. right of way; 60 ft. was denoted on the plans.

Commission: Mr. Joe Tomlinson asked the applicant would he be acceptable to the MSP collector right of way; Mr. Sloan noted that would be acceptable. Mr. Roberts asked if the limited use overlay would be acceptable to the applicant; Mr. Sloan replied yes it would be acceptable.

Mr. Spriggs read recommended stipulations: 1. That a 6ft.- privacy fence be installed along the perimeter of the property where it abuts single family residential. That a final landscaping and lighting plan be submitted as a part of the site plan review process before the MAPC prior to any construction; 3. That the property be rezoned to an I-1, LUO, Mini-storage/warehousing. 4. That the applicant agrees to dedicate the required right of way to satisfy the 80 ft. collector road recommendation along Kathleen St.

Action: Motion was made by Mr. Kelton to recommend approval of the rezoning to City Council, with the above stipulations; 2nd by Mr. Scurlock. The motion carried by the following vote.

Aye: 8 - Margaret Norris; Lonnie Roberts Jr.; Joe Tomlinson; Brian Dover; Paul Hoelscher; Ron Kelton; John White and Jim Scurlock

RZ 11-10: Nina Hedger, Estate Administrator requests MAPC approval of a rezoning from R-1 to RM-8 Low Density Multi-family for 17.27 acres. Location: South side of Greensboro Rd, and East Side of N. Caraway Rd., Acreage at the rear of 1008 N. Caraway Rd.

John Easley on behalf of Nina Hedger. The owners do not want to create a typical apartment complex. They wish to build the property into residential four-plex clusters; and have them spread out over the property. The four-plexes will resemble a single family detached home; with required parking

around it. We are asking for an RM-8 Multi-family District.

Public Input: 33 persons stood in opposition. Vance Sales presented a letter :
To: Metropolitan Area Planning Commission (MAPC)

From: Residents of the Greater North Caraway Residential Area

Subject: Hedger and Lamberth Rezoning Application Case Number RZ 11-10,
For North Caraway and Greensboro Road, submitted March 17,2011.

This is an open letter to the members of the MAPC from the residents of North Caraway Road, Alex Drive, Greensboro Road, and Sylvan Hill and Smokin' Oaks Subdivisions. We strongly oppose the rezoning of 17.27 acres at the corner of North Caraway and Greensboro Roads by Hedger and Lamberth from R-1 residential to MP-8 multi unit apartments. Should such a change be granted, the quality of our neighborhood will be drastically and irreversibly diminished for the following reasons:

1. The rezoning of these 17.27 acres is not consistent with the current land use plan as admitted in their answer to question 5, p. 2 of their application. Every piece of property contiguous to the 17.27 acres is zoned R-1. Placing 8 units per acre or approximately 130 units could add 300 or more persons and 150 vehicles in this location. Such a situation raises a number dangerous issues.

2. The entrance and exit of those living in the 130 units would be at the bottom of the hill on North Caraway. At this point approaching vehicles arriving over the nearby hill pose a hazard to those entering and leaving the area. An even greater hazard is posed if a school bus is stopped at this location. Traffic will be greatly increased on North Caraway making the situation for the increased number of pedestrians and for children waiting for school busses all the more precarious. Moreover, there is no sidewalk on North Caraway Road! (Mrs. Vance showed pictures).

Mrs. Vance spoke on blind hill and visibility problems of the entrance to the development, sewer connections.

3. The crime rate of our peaceful neighborhood will surely increase. Studies reveal that high density apartment complexes have increased crime rates. For example, the Jonesboro police reports for July 31, 2008, through March 30, 2011, reveal that there have been 1242 calls to the police from "The Grove" located at North Caraway and Johnson Avenue for minor to major offenses! Additionally, one only has to look at "Apartment City," which lies north of Johnson Avenue and several blocks west of the proposed rezone area, to understand why a police department station is to be built on Johnson Avenue.

4. The character of our neighborhood will be greatly diminished. The nature of an apartment complex is transient. The residents have no loyalty to the neighborhood; they have no investment in the neighborhood; they may live in the area one month, six months or perhaps a year or two. On the other hand, by far the majority of the residents of R-1 housing are owners of their homes and traditionally reside there for years. They care for their homes and their yards and they become acquainted with their neighbors. The "North Caraway" neighborhood consists of ASU faculty and staff, retired professionals,

business persons/managers, medical doctors, nurses, etc. A strong sense of community has been shown over the years in the "Tuesday Night Out" events, at which there have been almost 100 people in attendance. Furthermore, realtors have been heard to comment that this neighborhood area "is one of the best kept secrets in Jonesboro."

5. Should the Hedger/Lamberth request be granted to build this complex, the MAPC will be setting a very dangerous precedent. Should this deviation from the zoning code be allowed, the area streets would be adversely impacted as they presently exist, and the development of additional R-I areas would be stopped dead.

6. It is our contention that building codes are established as a guarantee to prospective buyers of a home that the area of their prospective home will remain a stable and comfortable environment. This is what the residents of the R-I residents have accomplished for a long number of years. We ask the members of MAPC to project themselves into our situation. We are a stable oasis in our location in north Jonesboro and are very proud of our neighborhood.

We ask that you reject the application in question and thank you for your public service.

Mr. Scott Darwin, presented a letter:

I'm Scott Darwin, a retired professor of German from ASU, and I have lived at 807 Sylvan Hill Road for almost 23 years. My home is three houses away from N. Caraway Rd. I would like to address first the issue of the traffic on N. Caraway should this complex be built.

Currently the traffic on this road is moderate to light. On any given day between the hours of 7 a.m. and 6 p.m. the average number of cars is around 225 with surges in the morning, noon and evening hours. There are times during the day when no cars pass by for 10 or so minutes. Now with the proposed apartment complex with approximately 130 units we can anticipate at the minimum 130 additional cars. But some apartments will have more than one car; so, for the sake of argument, let's say 40 more. Now we have 170 cars. If each car leaves the area and returns once a day, then we have 340 more cars on Caraway. But many of the people in the apartments will be students who will make more than one trip to campus per day. Let's say 50 students make two trips a day; thus 100 more cars. Then there are visitors and service vehicles. Let's say 5 service vehicles and 45 visitors per day; thus 100 more cars per day. So the number of cars passing by Sylvan Hill Drive in an 11-hour period will jump from 225 cars to an additional 540 cars for a grand total of 765 for an average of 70 cars per hour, or 1.15 cars per minute. N. Caraway will turn into Johnson Avenue but with only two lanes. Then there will certainly be a few motorcycles in the mix with loud mufflers. The cars, unfortunately, will not all be Priuses that glide quietly by, but rather they will have loud music, rumbling engines and glass pack mufflers. So, if this complex is built, I can say good-bye forever to the quiet hours on my back porch and to the already relatively unsafe walks to ASU.

The greater, in fact, greatest reason why this complex should not be built is that of crime. For thirty years North Jonesboro has been notorious for its crime

rate. The center of this criminal activity is "Apartment City." This situation is so bad that the city of Jonesboro decided last year to build a new police station on East Johnson Avenue in an effort to get a hand on crime in this area. Before the construction of "Apartment City" there was already a neighborhood of new houses, which were engulfed by apartments from all sides and whose owners lost money as their home values plummeted and who had to flee the area for self protection. Now, fast forward thirty years to August 2008. This is the date that The Grove at the corner of N. Caraway and E. Johnson opened for business. The Grove is a so-called upscale, gated apartment complex with all of the amenities: swimming pool, party house and basketball and volley ball courts. Since its opening on the first of August 2008 to March 31, 2011, there have been 1242 calls from The Grove to the Jonesboro Police Department for minor to major offenses. Let me repeat that number: 1242. This gives an average of 1.28 calls per day! Now let's look at the reasons that these calls have been made. This information is taken from the reports that I obtained from the Jonesboro Police Department. All together the report is 65 pages long. Here now is a sampling for the calls to the police:

Guns 4; Shots heard 21; Drugs 13; Theft/burglary 55; Home invasion 1; Fighting 14; Harassment 4; Vandalism 11; Trespassing 2; Threats 6; Assault 9; Extra patrol 38; Disturbance 12; Disturbance with weapon 20; Bomb threat 1; Towing 150; Service to vacate apartment 53; Criminal mischief 4; Unwanted person 8; Noise/Loud Party/ Loud Music 191.

Now having heard these numbers about the noise and criminal activity of The Grove, may I ask you to look at the answers once again provided by the Lamberths on page two of the application for rezoning: Questions 6, 7, 9 and 11.

Now I ask you: Would you wish to have this cesspool of criminality in your neighborhood? Would you wish to have to call the police daily for noise, gun shots, disturbances, drugs, unwanted persons, assault, harassment, trespassing, bomb threats, fighting, theft, home invasion, vandalism and criminal mischief? The noise, the loud music, the sound of gun shots and the criminality will not stop at the property line; instead they will spill over into our decent neighborhood. After the residents have exhausted all possibilities of preying on one another, the culprits will look just across N. Caraway and Greensboro Road for other places to plunder. Furthermore, the value of our homes will plummet. When people consider the purchase of a home, they will often ask for a police report for the area. A prospective buyer would be highly disinclined to buy a house in an area with a crime sheet the length of the one I have here in my hand. I repeat: the report is 65 pages long.

The city of Jonesboro has already made two horrendous mistakes: First it allowed Apartment City to be built. The city did not learn from that mistake, for just three years ago it gave permission for the construction of The Grove. Another grave mistake. Please don't make this mistake again. A sign of wisdom is that we learn from our mistakes. If you do repeat this mistake for the third time, you will succeed at totally killing a once peaceful, quiet and upstanding neighborhood, an oasis for employees of ASU and of other professional people who like the convenience of living close to town and to their places of employment. In dosing I implore you not to allow these apartments to be built.

Mr. John Easley: the Lamberths are aware of the Grove's problems and

impacts; but they do not that same development on their property. The quiet aspect is what they are going for- where you don't have 3 story buildings and a massive complex lined up down both sides of the property. They want to develop 4-plexes that could be bought and the other 3 could be rented out. The entrance to Caraway road is on the bottom of the hill and that is what we have been dealt. WE cannot adjust that without the City's involvement. A develop of even R-1 Single family will have that same problem. The sewer will be done at the cost of the developer and not the City. I am well aware of the crime rate of the Grove. The Lamberth's and the Hedgers are aware of that; and they sincerely desire to not let that happen. Concerning the density, RM-8 is a step above RS-6 which was equivalent to the old R-1 Single Family District. We are just a few units above that. If it comes down to density, we are open for suggestions and your input.

Mr. Spriggs: As noted in the staff report- this site has much history: This property was petitioned for a rezoning from R-1 to R-3, Multi-Family High Density for 48 units (Same Ridges of Jonesboro (Currently built on Patrick Rd.); Case RZ03-21 was denied by the MAPC, and later an appeal was considered on December 1, 2003 By City Council, and the item was denied due to the lack of a 2nd to the Motion.

Land Use Plan recommended single family as noted. The comprehensive is currently being updated and will be completed in 2012. The Master Street Plan recommends Caraway and Greensboro Rd. as Collector Roads, with a right of way of 80 ft.; 60 ft. is denoted on the rezoning plat. The pedestrian and student traffic on Caraway Rd. is a concern and challenge as mentioned earlier. This request was not presented as a limited use overlay and there was no site plan available for your review. Therefore it was difficult to weigh the impacts on the surrounding area in terms of access management, buffering and lighting. With the area being majority single family residential, Staff would recommend holding to a low density in terms of the way this area should develop. We are suggesting consideration of a limited use overlay and a lower density type of improvement in the future. We have all of the case files from the 2003 case as well as a list of the requirements of the RM-8 District.

Mr. Kelton asked why is this not spot zoning. Mr. Spriggs noted that typically spot zoning would be defined by the existing surrounding mix of zoning districts in the area. This would not be construed as spot zoning having a comparable density with the surrounding R-1 Single family residential district which is 5.4 units per acre. Absent a layout it would be difficult to determine.

Mr. White: In the denial of 2003 were there any details. Mr. Spriggs noted that there were a number of residents that are present that raised concerns similar. There were more details available- an environmental study was done. Many of the same dynamics were raised today as in 2003. There was a layout presented.

Mr. White: In looking at this map, I see only R-1 Single Family. Are those the result of a policy of an annexation. Mr. Spriggs stated typically that these properties are typically brought in during annexation. No new rezonings area on record changing to R-1. Mr. White asked what the maximum density would be with single family home- it would be 5.4 units per acre Mr. Spriggs noted (gross density).

Mr. Tomlinson noted inconsistency with the Land Use Plan.

Mr. Kelton asked for clarification on the drainage patterns. Mr. Easley stated that he water drains from Northwest to the Southeast. As part of the development there will be detention facilities on the Southeast portion of the

site. As part of the storm water regulations, we will have to mitigate our run-off. Mr. White asked how long has the property been for sale? Unknown.

Mr. White asked if it were consistent with the Land Use Plan. Mr. Spriggs stated that the Land Use Plan is one of the instruments that is used in decision making as well as the review criteria for approval of a rezoning are set out in the staff report.

Mr. Easley stated that concerning the Land Use Plan, the density could be brought to RM-4, would be less density than R-1 and comparable. (4 units per acre). This would take the traffic load down. Mr. Spriggs stated that this would result in 68 units instead, cutting the proposal in half from what was requested originally. Single family under the current R-1 would result in approximately 93 single family homes (gross density).

Commission: Mr. Hoelscher suggested that we table this and let them come back with a layout to look at. It's difficult to look at this without a layout and now we talked about several options that will have a long term effect on the neighborhood. That provides a way for him to meet with the neighbors to deal with the opposition.

Mr. Easley asked for consideration of a modification to the RM-4 L.U.O. for 4 units per acre. Mr. Spriggs stated that the MAPC could modify a request especially it's coming from the petitioner.

Mr. Spriggs asked the applicant what was their position on the Master Street Plan recommendation of 80 ft. Mr. Easley stated that they have no problem with that. (Condition No. 4).

Opposition Comments: Scott Darwin reiterated that their preference is single family and not apartments; and gave further opinion of people who rent vs. ownership.

Mr. Tomlinson made a motion to deny. Mr. Spriggs suggested that the motion be made in the affirmative.

Ms. Duncan stated that typically you are making the motion to call the question. You can vote no. You are just moving the process along so that the vote can be held.

Mr. Spriggs stated that this is the purpose for having our voting procedures on tonight's agenda. So that the recommendation sent to Council can be clear and concise.

Mr. Tomlinson withdrew his original motion. Mr. Easley requested that the item be tabled. Mr. White made a motion that the item be tabled, seconded by Margaret Norris, that this matter be Tabled. The motion carried by the following vote.

Aye: 5 - Margaret Norris; Lonnie Roberts Jr.; Paul Hoelscher; John White and Jim Scurlock

Nay: 3 - Joe Tomlinson; Brian Dover and Ron Kelton

Abstain: 1 - Jerry Halsey Jr.

8. Staff Comments

118 Melrose Street, Bob & Naomi Green Request MAPC approval of a 6 ft. privacy fence in the front yard (Southside only); and 6 ft. open style fencing along the frontage in pursuant to Section 117: 329, Fences.

Fence Item #1: 118 Melrose

Mr. Spriggs explained the request of the fence request in regards to the new

fence ordinance. Mr. Tomlinson asked for clarification on the open style fence. Robert Green stated that it would be ornamental iron so you can see thru the fence. The south side will have a 6ft. privacy fence to match the other. He presented a sketch.

Mr. Thomas White stated that he spoke to the neighboring owner ASU Baptist Center, and they did not have any opposition to the request for the fence. Mr. Green explained security issues that he's had in the past. Grace Missionary Baptist Church has concurred. He has called the police 2 or 3 times a year. Someone cut the copper out of the rental house in the rear.

A motion was made by Lonnie Roberts Jr., seconded by Margaret Norris, that this matter be Approved . The motion carried by the following vote.

Fence Item #2: 1209 W. Washington:

Steve Barkley, 1209 W. Washington- He purchased lot 10. He is requesting a 7 ft. fence. He built the existing fence 35 years ago. He wants the 7 ft. fence because the old one is 7 ft. the property on the south and east side is mostly rental property. I have had boards kicked in on my existing fence. I want to fence this whole lot with like material. I'd like the extra fence. (6 ft. is the maximum height.). It is 75 ft. from the curb. It will align with the house. Mr. Kelton asked what the neighbors thought of this.

Mrs. Susan Hall, a neighbor asked what will be on Washington? Mr. Barkley explained that it will be 75 ft. from the curb. It will go from the corner of the house. She stated no objection.

A motion was made by Brian Dover, seconded by Ron Kelton, that this matter be Approved . The motion carried by unanimous vote.

Aye: 8 - Margaret Norris;Lonnie Roberts Jr.;Joe Tomlinson;Brian Dover;Paul Hoelscher;Ron Kelton;John White and Jim Scurlock

Discussion of MAPC Bylaws- Voting Procedures:

*All actions taken in an administrative or recommending capacity (including, but not limited to recommendations on special use permits, subdivisions, rezonings, annexations, text amendments, site plan review, planned developments, land use plans, master street plan, or comprehensive plan amendments, shall be complete and shall include a **finding of fact**, listing what the Commission determines to be relevant facts in the case in order to eliminate misleading statements, hearsay, irrelevant, and incomplete recommendations to City Council.*

Removed Tabled.

9. Adjournment