The Planning and Zoning Commission met in regular session November 7, 2019 in the City Council Chambers. Chairman Randall Doennig called the meeting to order.

Roll Call - Present: Randall Doennig (Chairman), King Coltrin (Vice-Chairman), Cameron Rose, Britton Jobe, Joel Thomas, Dee Ogilvy, David Shuler, and Natalie Broekhoven. Absent: Melissa Cox. Staff in attendance: Bob Hosmer, Principal Planner, Nicholas Woodman, Assistant City Attorney.

MINUTES: The minutes of October 10, 2019 were approved.

COMMUNICATIONS: Bob Hosmer reported on City Council meeting actions.

CONSENT ITEMS:

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Vacation 812
1147 to 1161 West Division Street
Applicant: City of Springfield

Mr. Hosmer stated that this is a request to vacate right of way located at 1147 and 1161 West Division Street. The applicant, City of Springfield, is requesting to vacate the right of way to facilitate the development of intersection improvements at Division and Commercial Street. The entire right of way will be returned to properties on the north. Easements for existing utilities have been retained. The request for vacation meets the approval criteria. Any person objecting may petition the City Council to review the request to vacate by filing an appeal within 15 days with the City Clerk from the date the resolution was passed by the Planning and Zoning Commission. Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Doennig opened the public hearing.

No speakers.

Mr. Doennig closed the public hearing.

Mr. Jobe motioned to approve Vacation 812 (1147 to 1161 West Division Street). Mr. Rose seconded the motion. Ayes: Doennig, Coltrin, Ogilvy, Shuler, Broekhoven, Thomas, Rose, and Jobe. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Cox.

OTHER BUSINESS:

Rules of Procedure
Citywide
Applicant: City of Springfield

Mr. Hosmer and Mr. Woodman proposed discussion on any proposed changes to the Rules of Procedure for the Planning and Zoning Commission and request that the Commission members submit their comments by e-mail and the full documents will be reviewed later.

Mr. Doennig requested that changes be made gender neutral.

Mr. Jobe noted he would like the Commission to stand with his e-mail statements from King Coltrin. See below.
| King: | 2.4 Quorum Five (5) members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. This rule seems to make sense as it requires a quorum to conduct business. This is common among most kinds of boards or commissions. Under section 2.5 below you would have to have a unanimous vote of the 5 attending members.  
2.5 Action by the Commission Five (5) votes shall be required to either approve or disapprove any action on which the Commission has final authority and to approve or amend any plan or policy. In the event the five (5) votes cannot be obtained, the item is automatically tabled and voted on at the Commission’s next scheduled meeting. If five votes are not obtained after three such votes, the item shall be deemed denied. On actions on which the Commission acts as a recommending body to the City Council or to any other governmental body, a majority of those present at the time the vote is taken shall prevail. In the event of a tie vote, the item shall be automatically tabled.  
I am not an attorney, but it seems to me that the highlighted sentence above should end after "which the Commission has the final authority". If we are not the final authority why would it be different that any other item just because it is a plan or policy? The council will still have to do their job and can overturn what we do anyway.  
Am I alone in this thought?  
Thanks |
| Britton: | I agree. I would also add that my review of the P&Z rules of procedure did not turn up any section in which "plan" or "policy" is defined, so it's unclear to me when that rule would apply to an action other than where the commission has final authority. I don't see any need for this five-vote procedure other than when the commission has final authority. |