

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

PLANNING COMMISSION/ BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

January 16, 2007

Commissioners Present: Cowman, McLean, Gage, L. Smith, Wrischnik

Others Present: Justin Givens, Ross VanderHamm, Brian McCauley, Alan Hire

Item 1: Consider the minutes for the December 19, 2006 meeting.

Chair Cowman called the meeting to order with the first order of business the consideration of the minutes from the December 19, 2006 meeting.

Commissioners Gage and McLean made a motion to approve the minutes as submitted with all Commissioners voting in favor.

Item 2: Paola Crossing – review of final site plan and possible approval

Planner Givens presented the staff brief. Clint Stewart with Taylor Design Group was in attendance. Paola Crossing is the newest shopping center proposed for Paola. The center will be retail-shopping space located adjacent to the new hotel. Four Points Development, LLC. has provided a preliminary site plan and concept drawings for the building. The Planning Commission did approve the Preliminary Plan at the December 12, 2006 meeting. Subsequently, the City Council did approve the Preliminary Plan at their January 9, 2007 meeting.

Analysis: The submitted plan has been reviewed against the Paola Land Development Ordinance and comments have been provided for from the Public Works Department. A separate engineering analysis is being performed but is not complete at this time. Attached is a comment sheet provided to the design firm, owners and other engineers involved in the project.

Actions: The Planning Commission may:

1. Approve the site plan without comment or condition
2. Approve the site plan with the following conditions attached.
 - a. An approved engineering analysis stating conformation with all requirements
 - b. An approved lighting plan
 - c. An approved signage plan prior to any sign construction
 - d. Public Works approval of all Water, Sanitary and Storm Water Sewer, design
 - e. Confirmation of approved materials for the awning

3. Not approve or table the approval of the site plan until that time in which the Commission feels that all aspects of the Land Development Ordinance have been met or satisfied.

Recommendation: Staff recommends the approval of the Final Site Plan with the above conditions attached and any others that may be applied by the Planning Commission.

Planner Givens stated he has had conversation with the mechanical engineer who designed the lighting plan, and it will be rectified. At the City Council meeting there was discussion about the dumpster placement and screening. Clint Stewart agreed with Planner Givens that the location had been chosen due to the way traffic would flow through the site and an attempt to minimize future damage to the lot due to weight and travel. The Council also inquired about the type of material that would be used for the awnings, which staff is working through with the developer.

City staff is having an independent engineer review the plans and any approval would be contingent upon that engineering approval.

Commissioner Cowman inquired if there was an alternate location for the trash dumpster. Clint Stewart indicated that they could re-work some things and possibly get it into the southwestern corner. Cowman said he felt it would be a better solution if it could be worked out.

Alan Hire with Spring Star Development, developers of the hotel, indicated that the fire hydrant location may be a concern. He also expressed concern about the location of drives and traffic flow for the developments on lots 9 east and 9 west.

Commissioners Cowman and Gage made a motion to approve the final site plan for Paola Crossing with all conditions noted and the additional conditions that the trash dumpster be relocated and that the Fire Department approve the site plan. All Commissioners voted in favor.

Item 3: O'Reilly Variance Request – Consider a variance request from the LDO limiting the expansion of existing metal buildings to 15% of the original building footprint.

Planner Givens presented the staff brief. O'Reilly Automotive has asked for a variance from the Land Development Ordinance, specifically Division 15.100 which reads;

DIVISION 15.100 PROHIBITED MATERIALS

Because they are out of character with the historic character of Paola, metal-sided or concrete-slab buildings are permitted only as indicated below:

- A. **Metal-Sided Buildings.** Permitted in the I District. Permitted in the BP and TA Districts provided that the street facades shall be constructed of decorative masonry materials, except when an overlay district has higher standards (e.g. the City Entrance Area Standards). The façade of any building in the BP and TA district, which is located within 200' of any street right-of-way, including any highway right-of-way, shall be considered a street façade and constructed of decorative masonry materials (Ordinance 2799, 06/11/02). **Metal buildings existing at the time**

of adoption of this ordinance may be expanded up to 15% of the original building footprint (Ordinance 2772, 03/21/01).

Analysis: A 15% addition to the building would not have provided significant space for the desired building expansion. The LDO provides for variances under certain circumstances.

SECTION 21.250 VARIANCES

This Section establishes the procedures and conditions for a variance from this Ordinance's standards.

This Section permits, under limited circumstances, a building or structure that does not comply with this Ordinance's standards when strict enforcement would represent a unique, undue, and unnecessary hardship.

SECTION 21.251 STANDARDS FOR VARIANCES

To approve a variance, the Board of Zoning Appeals shall apply the following standards:

- A. Under no conditions shall a variance permit a use that is not otherwise permitted in the district. The applicant shall be instructed to submit a zoning change request (Section 21.210) or a beneficial use appeal (Division 21.400), which are the only ways such a change of use may occur. *The automotive store is an allowed use.*
- B. Special circumstances or conditions exist peculiar to the land or building for which the variance is sought that do not apply generally to lots, land, or buildings in the neighborhood. *Not Applicable*
- C. The special circumstances and conditions have not resulted from any act of the applicant subsequent to this Ordinance's adoption. *The store was built in 1995 and no additions have been made.*
- D. The special circumstances and conditions are such that strict application of this Ordinance's provisions would deprive the applicant of the reasonable use of the land or building. *The applicant feels that he would not have significant space for an addition at 15%.*
- E. Granting the variance is necessary to relieve the applicant of an unnecessary hardship imposed by the regulations. *The applicant feels that additional footage is needed to better serve his clients*
- F. The variance granted is the minimum necessary to relieve the unnecessary hardship and permit a reasonable use of the land. *Agreed, this variance if granted will be minimal over the 15% allowed.*
- G. Granting the variance will not be injurious to the neighborhood surrounding the land where the variance is proposed, and is otherwise not detrimental to the public welfare. *Agreed, the expansion is located in the back of the building and rear setbacks will be maintained.*
- H. Granting the variance is in harmony with this Ordinance's purposes and intent.

Agreed, this section allows for 15% additions and the variance sought is for only slightly over what is allowed.

- I. Granting the variance is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan.
Agreed, seen as if improving business this variance would be encouraged
- J. Variances on natural resources shall not be permitted; standards for mitigation are contained in Division 05.200. If relief is requested, the applicant shall be required to submit an application for beneficial use determination (Division 21.400).
This section is not applicable
- K. No variance shall be granted for development in the floodplain or floodway. In the event a landowner in Paola or Paola's Community Growth Area is of the opinion beneficial use of the landowner's property has been denied by applying this Ordinance, a remedy can be sought by following the procedures listed in DIVISION 21.400 BENEFICIAL USE APPEAL AND DETERMINATION.
This section is not applicable

SECTION 21.252 CONDITIONS AND RESTRICTIONS ON VARIATIONS

In approving the application for any variance, the Board of Zoning Appeals may impose additional restrictions and conditions on such approval. Restrictions and conditions may be limits on the use of the property, the standards for locating the use, standards for mitigating the impact on adjoining property owners who would lose protection as a result of permitting the variance, or standards to protect the general health, safety, and welfare. All conditions imposed upon any variance shall be expressly set forth in writing with the granting of such variance.

Actions: The Board of Zoning Appeals may:

1. Approve the variance without comment or condition
2. Approve the variance with conditions to be attached during the meeting
3. Not approve or table the approval of the variance until that time in which the Board of Zoning Appeals feels that all aspects of the Land Development Ordinance have been met or satisfied.

Recommendation: Staff recommends the approval of the variance.

Commissioner Cowman inquired if the addition would encroach on rear setback requirements. Planner Givens indicated it would not.

Commissioners Gage and McLean made a motion to approve the variance for O'Reilly's with all Commissioners voting in favor.

Item 4: Heger Variance Request – Consider a variance request from the required setbacks in the Estate District.

Planner Givens stated that Mr. Heger was present at the meeting, then presented the staff brief. Mr. Heger has asked for a variance from the minimum setbacks in the LDO specifically:

SECTION 03.210 ACCESSORY USES, RESIDENTIAL

B. Detached Garages and Storage/Utility Sheds.

Lots 3 acres or more

Minimum Setback – Must Comply with Table 4.110A – 50’ Side Yard

Maximum Size Height – No Limit

Building Materials – Shall not be constructed of scrap material

Analysis: Due to the location of Mr. Heger’s lateral lines for his septic system a 50’ building setback not feasible. The LDO provides for variances under certain circumstances.

SECTION 21.250 VARIANCES

This Section establishes the procedures and conditions for a variance from this Ordinance's standards.

This Section permits, under limited circumstances, a building or structure that does not comply with this Ordinance's standards when strict enforcement would represent a unique, undue, and unnecessary hardship.

SECTION 21.251 STANDARDS FOR VARIANCES

To approve a variance, the Board of Zoning Appeals shall apply the following standards:

- A. Under no conditions shall a variance permit a use that is not otherwise permitted in the district. The applicant shall be instructed to submit a zoning change request (Section 21.210) or a beneficial use appeal (Division 21.400), which are the only ways such a change of use may occur. *Sheds of this nature are permitted uses.*
- B. Special circumstances or conditions exist peculiar to the land or building for which the variance is sought that do not apply generally to lots, land, or buildings in the neighborhood. *The location of the lateral lines and other codes that require distances to be kept from them.*
- C. The special circumstances and conditions have not resulted from any act of the applicant subsequent to this Ordinance's adoption. *The structure was built in 1970.*
- D. The special circumstances and conditions are such that strict application of this Ordinance's provisions would deprive the applicant of the reasonable use of the land or building. *The locations of the laterals create a situation where a strict application of the 40’ setbacks would create an undesirable location for the proposed shed.*
- E. Granting the variance is necessary to relieve the applicant of an unnecessary hardship imposed by the regulations. *Agreed, the variance will allow the shed to be placed in a location better suited for the use.*

- F. The variance granted is the minimum necessary to relieve the unnecessary hardship and permit a reasonable use of the land. *Agreed, the new structure must maintain a 10' setback from any lateral line.*
- G. Granting the variance will not be injurious to the neighborhood surrounding the land where the variance is proposed, and is otherwise not detrimental to the public welfare. *Agreed, at present no other structure is on neighboring property and would not hinder any development of any other property*
- H. Granting the variance is in harmony with this Ordinance's purposes and intent. *Agreed, a 10' setback or less is required in many districts for accessory structures.*
- I. Granting the variance is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan. *Agreed, if this area where to develop the setback would be compliant with other zoning districts.*
- J. Variances on natural resources shall not be permitted; standards for mitigation are contained in Division 05.200. If relief is requested, the applicant shall be required to submit an application for beneficial use determination (Division 21.400). *This section is not applicable.*
- K. No variance shall be granted for development in the floodplain or floodway. In the event a landowner in Paola or Paola's Community Growth Area is of the opinion beneficial use of the landowner's property has been denied by applying this Ordinance, a remedy can be sought by following the procedures listed in DIVISION 21.400 BENEFICIAL USE APPEAL AND DETERMINATION. *This section is not applicable.*

SECTION 21.252 CONDITIONS AND RESTRICTIONS ON VARIATIONS

In approving the application for any variance, the Board of Zoning Appeals may impose additional restrictions and conditions on such approval. Restrictions and conditions may be limits on the use of the property, the standards for locating the use, standards for mitigating the impact on adjoining property owners who would lose protection as a result of permitting the variance, or standards to protect the general health, safety, and welfare. All conditions imposed upon any variance shall be expressly set forth in writing with the granting of such variance.

Actions: The Board of Zoning Appeals may:

1. Approve the variance without comment or condition
2. Approve the variance with conditions to be attached during the meeting
3. Not approve, or table the approval of the variance until that time in which the Board of Zoning Appeals feels that all aspects of the Land Development Ordinance have been met or satisfied.

Recommendation: Staff recommends the approval of the variance for Mr. Heger.

Commissioners Cowman and Gage made a motion to approve the variance in setback requirements for 26465 W. 287th Street. All Commissioners voted in favor.

Item 5: Townley Sign Deviation – Consider a request for a deviation from the Sign Regulations of the LDO.

Planner Givens stated that Ed Townley, spouse of applicant, was present and then presented the staff brief. Susan Townley, of Farmers Insurance has recently opened an office in the shopping center located at Piankishaw and Silver. The pole sign, on the property has not been used for some time save the one sign for Artistic Hair. It appears that this sign is non-compliant with current LDO regulations and no new signs have gone up. The one sign appears to be grandfathered in.

Analysis: Per the LDO, applicants may request Sign Deviations based on the following criteria; *SECTION 21.245 DEVIATIONS FROM SIGN REQUIREMENTS*
The Planning Commission shall consider the following criteria in acting upon a request for deviation:

Purpose And Intent Of Code: Is granting of the deviation in compliance with the general purpose and intent of the City's signage regulations? *Yes, this is a multi-tenant sign that currently is used by one tenant*

- A. **Impacts On Adjacent Properties:** Will granting of the deviation adversely affect neighboring property owners or residents? Is the image presented by the sign or attention-attracting device consistent or compatible with that in the area as a whole? *The individual sign as placed in the structure will not adversely affect any neighbor and it will, I feel, actually help improve the look of the pole sign with an additional sign as opposed to the one lone sign.*
- B. **Safety:** Will granting of the deviation adversely affect safety? For free-standing signs, a safe sight-distance setback is required, and the sign location must not encroach upon potential future right-of-way needs. The use of signs or attention-attracting devices should not significantly distract traffic on adjacent streets. *No, safety should not be affected by the addition of another sign.*
- C. **Visual Clutter:** Will granting of the proposed deviation significantly clutter the visual landscape of the area? The proposed deviation, in addition to all existing or potential future signs on nearby tracts, should be reviewed for their impact on cluttering the visual landscape. Reductions in the total number of signs or their size may be needed, or setbacks increased, to compensate for other signs and attention-attracting devices in the area. *This sign will not add negative clutter to the area*

- D. **Site Constraints:** In some situations, topography, landscaping, existing buildings or unusual building design may substantially block visibility of the applicant's existing or proposed signs from multiple directions. While visibility of a sign or attention-attracting device is not to be guaranteed from all directions, deviations may be appropriate to provide reasonable visibility of a business's main sign. *There are no sight constraints that are affecting this sign.*
- E. **Lighting:** Sign or attention-attracting device lighting should not disturb residents of nearby residential land uses or adversely affect traffic on adjacent streets. *The sign will not be lighted.*
- F. **Promotion Of High Quality - Unique Design:** The proposed sign(s) should be of high quality and must be compatible and integrate aesthetically with daytime/nighttime color, lighting and signs of the development and adjacent buildings. Facade signs may include unique copy design including painting of walls or integration into canopies/awnings, shapes, materials, lighting and other design features compatible with the architecture of the development of surrounding area. Attention-attracting devices should be of a unique, high quality design, which accentuates the architecture of the building(s) served, versus functioning solely to draw attention to it. *The sign will use the company logo and shall be in character with most signs within the city.*

Actions: The Planning Commission may:

1. Approve the deviation without comment or condition
2. Approve the deviation with conditions,
 - a. That at that time when the Artistic Hair sign becomes abandoned the pole sign and any other subsequent sign placed on it must become compliant with the regulations stated in the Land Development Ordinance.
3. Not approve or table the approval of the deviation until that time in which the Planning Commission feels that all aspects of the Land Development Ordinance have been met or satisfied.

Recommendation: Staff recommends the approval of the deviation with the attached conditions.

The applicant indicated that the property owner does not allow signs on the building, so the pole sign is their option for advertising. Commissioner Cowman stated that he understands the need for advertising, but is concerned about making a non-compliant sign more non-compliant.

There was discussion about how the sign could be brought into compliance or what type of signage would be allowed.

Commissioner Gage asked who was responsible for bringing the sign into conformance with current sign regulations. Planner Givens stated that staff could not force the owner to bring the sign into compliance until the original sign comes down as it is currently grandfathered.

Commissioner Cowman stated his concern that if this was approved and Artistic Design leaves, then the applicant is left without advertising due to the requirements.

Commissioner Rhodes stated he felt that the tenant should not be responsible for bringing the pole into compliance, that it should be the property owner.

Commissioners Rhodes and Gage made a motion to approve the sign deviation request with the condition that when any part of the original sign changes (Artistic Hair), at that time the pole sign must come into compliance with current regulations. Commissioners Rhodes, Gage and Wrischnik voted in favor with Commissioners Cowman and McLean voting against.

Item 6: Reece-Nichols Realty – Design and color review of Reece-Nichols building remodel

Planner Givens presented the staff brief. Kathy Minden, owner of Reece-Nichols has provided an updated drawing of her building for design review. This matter was addressed at the December meeting but any action was tabled. The commission requested further information as to the final design and color scheme.

Analysis: The LDO provides the Planning Commission the authority to review and approve design and color schemes in certain locations that are essential to the community.

SECTION 15.220 CITY ENTRANCE AREA STANDARDS

City entrances are shown on the Zoning Map. All buildings in these areas regardless of the zoning shall be subject to design review by the Planning Commission. Only one of the three entrances has important existing buildings; Baptiste Drive has the hospital and high school. Other entrances will develop in the future. The following building standards shall be applied to the design review of non-residential uses:

- A. **Materials.** Masonry materials including integrally colored textured block, brick and stone with unpainted finishes are required on all street exposures. The use of stucco or exterior insulated finish system may also be permitted. Metal is not a permitted exterior finish material. On Baptiste Drive, the materials should be selected to complement and blend with the high school and hospital. (Ordinance 2799, 06/11/02) *The design renovation calls for stucco and stone to be used to accentuate the buildings design.*
- B. **Colors.** The basic colors shall be earth tones or brick colors. The Baptiste Drive area shall use tones that are consistent with the hospital and high school. No important buildings existed as of the date of adoption of this Ordinance at the other two City entrances. The Planning Commission should review the first buildings in these areas and select a range of colors that can be extended to the rest of the corridor. *The colors selected are those of an earth tone hue.*
- C. **Style.** There is no single style that is mandated for the entrance area. However, building elevations should be sensitive to the scale and style of neighboring buildings. Design themes that reflect the city square band shell should be strongly considered. If a business

park is the proposed use, an overall design guideline should be approved. *The remodel calls for extending the existing roofline 2' and removing the sloped edge and creating a flat wall surface. This will give the building a more modern look.*

SECTION 15.410 DESIGN REVIEW STANDARDS

In conducting the design review, the Planning Commission shall evaluate the plan against the following criteria. Approval requires that the criteria have been met or are inapplicable to the specific project, and that the development is significantly superior to one that simply met the Ordinance requirements.

1. The project is compatible with surrounding uses in terms of scale and adherence to the traditional character of Paola. *Agreed, staff feels that this remodel will bring the building into closer conformity to the character of Paola.*
2. The architecture, project layout, landscaping, and signs contribute to a harmonious and diverse character that has a strong sense of unity. *Agreed, the plans design will blend better with the neighboring brick and stucco structures in the vicinity and the district in general.*
3. Monotony is avoided and the plan provides an environment that has interest and diversity without becoming chaotic or discordant. *Agreed, the building will be different in actual color but uses the encouraged materials.*
4. The buildings are designed to be part of Paola, rather than a plan or character that can be applied to similar uses across the nation. Formula buildings and color schemes are undesirable. *Agreed, the building as it stands looks more dated and formulaic than it will once completed.*
5. The streetscape protects or enhances the entrances to Paola, making them distinct from similar land uses in other communities. *Agreed, the buildings remodel calls for materials and color schemes that are encouraged in this area.*
6. The combination of architecture, signs, and landscaping creates a sense of place for those developments having many buildings, or which contribute to an overall sense of unity if the development is a single building. *Agreed, the building once completed will fit better into the Entrance Zone than as built.*
7. The streetscape and building design reduces apparent building mass of large buildings to match the City's small town character. *Agreed, the current look with the shake shingles is a very dated look and once complete the remodel will promote the characteristics that the City has chosen.*

Recommendation / Actions: Depending on information given at the meeting the Planning Commission may:

1. Approve the Design Review
2. Deny the Design Review
3. Table any action until further review can be completed

Kathy Minden, property owner was in attendance and stated that there would be no brick on the building and the color was dark gray instead of black. There was discussion in regards to gray being an earth-tone color.

Commissioners Cowman and Gage made a motion to approve the color and design review for Reece-Nichols. All Commissioners voted in favor.

Item 7: Text Amendment / Street Trees in conjunction with the Paola Tree Board

Planner Givens presented the staff brief. The Paola Tree Board has invited staff to several meetings to discuss the placement and types of street trees that are required in our Landscaping Ordinances. The general concern was that the types of trees that were being planted were not conducive the objectives or reasons for their requirement in the LDO. Also, and more importantly there is concern that the location of many street trees will cause problems to public infrastructure (streets, sidewalks, curbs) in future years. Because of these concerns, the Tree Board has suggested a possible text amendment to the LDO.

Analysis: Currently, there is no required location for a street tree or a specific type of tree to be planted in Paola development. Through this text amendment, a preferred location would be provided for as well as alternate locations if needed. Additionally, the tree board would provide an approved list of street trees to be planted and rotated on a biennial basis. This would be done to encourage healthy trees, a better canopy, and more variety in the number of street trees that are planted in the future.

Issue: Does the Commission feel that a text amendment is needed to promote the desired effect and protect public infrastructure?

Actions: The Planning Commission may:

1. Accept the recommendation of the Paola Tree Board and select a date for public hearing on the proposed text amendment.
2. Reject the recommendation.
3. Table the matter for further study.

Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Planning Commission accept the recommendation of the Paola Tree Board and set a date for public hearing for the proposed text amendment.

Commissioner Cowman asked for clarification of the definition for a street tree. Brenda Wrischnik, president of the Paola Tree Board, gave background and some explanations of different tree qualifications. Jack Rowlett, Tree Board member, offered some additional clarifications.

The Commissioners felt that a definition for 'street tree' should be added to the LDO to assist in clarification.

Commissioner Rhodes expressed concern about future complications by making requirements so specific that older established neighborhoods would not be able to meet them. Planner Givens suggested that might be something that the city planner would be responsible for reviewing.

The Commissioners decided to table this item until staff has made changes to clarify requirements and returned to the Commissioners.

Item 8: USD 368 Administration Building – discussion of design review.

Planner Givens presented the staff brief. At the December meeting, the Planning Commission did approve a design review for the USD 368 Administration Building. This building is to be located on the school districts campus in between to existing buildings. The plan called for a metal building that would have a front façade of brick and stone while the three other sides would be metal with brick accents. Staff provided some comment that the visible west elevation might be of some concern. An elevation view was submitted which showed a limited or screened view of the property. Staff also determined that based on the LDO a design review and approval would have to be granted from the Planning Commission based on Division 15.100 which stated that outside of I, BP and TA zones metal-sided buildings were only permitted if the development submitted architectural, landscaping, and sign reviews and received Planning Commission approval. The Planning Commission agreed with staff's recommendation and approved the design and materials of the building.

Analysis: Since that time there have been some concerns raised as to whether metal-sided buildings are expressly prohibited in districts outside those specified in 15.100 A. Staff interpreted the LDO as stating that outside of those zones metal-sided buildings could only be used if they met the criteria in 15.100 C. Following a discussion with the City Council, staff has been directed to re-address the issue with the Planning Commission.

Issue: Two issues seem to be directly related to staffs recommendation, the Planning Commissions decision, and Council Concerns.

1. Is staffs interpretation correct as to the application of Division 15.100?
2. Is there an implicit prohibition of metal-sided buildings in the Suburban Zone?

Additional conversations about the design have led to a number of other issues being raised about the location of the USD 368 Administration Office.

1. Is the area zoned properly?
2. Is the administration building an allowed use in the Suburban Zone?

Actions:

Recommendation:

Commissioners had discussion about the property's current zoning and the use classification of the building. The Commissioners agreed that the property is most likely not zoned correctly for the uses occurring on the property.

Commissioners Cowman and McLean made a motion to approve the design review for USD 368. All Commissioners voted in favor.

Planner Givens and USD 368 staff will look at rezoning the property and should bring something to the Planning Commission in the near future.

Item 9: Items From Staff

- a. Executive Summary – Comprehensive Plan
Planner Givens presented the staff brief. The Comprehensive Plan Update Public Hearing is set for January 18, 2007 at the Public Works Department. As part of the update, Commissioners have received copies of the final version except for the Executive Summary from Jim Kaup. Mr. Kaup has provided that summary for your review prior to the meeting.
- b. Work Study Session
Planner Givens presented the staff brief. As discussed at the previous meeting several items need the attention of the Commission that would shape future development in Paola. These are more discussion items and since meeting agendas have been extremely full recently a work session was proposed. Topics of the work session could include, 50 foot Right of Ways in certain areas, Downtown Parking Standards and "Snout Houses".

Analysis: I would like to have this work session sometime prior to the February meeting so that if any action would come about from the study session it could be included on the February agenda. Possible dates include, February 1, 7, 8, 14, 15. I am open to a time or date.

Commissioners decided to have the work study session on February 8th at 5:30 pm.

Item 10: Items from Commissioners

There were no items from the Commissioners at this time. However, Alan Hire was in attendance and asked to speak to the Commissioners, which they allowed. Mr. Hire supplied a list of questions to the Commissioners and spoke to them about the Marais des Cygnes Public Utility Authority's water plan project.

Item 11: Adjourn

There was a motion to adjourn with all Commissioners voting in favor.