

# **PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

November 19, 2007

Chairman Adam Thomas called the regular meeting of the Conway Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m., Monday, November 19, 2007. Present at the meeting were commissioners Ron Fields, Bill Graff, Sandy Mabry, Mary Etta Qualls, Todd Smithhart, Terry Sossong, Junior Storie, Chris Riggins, and Adam Thomas.

Mr. Thomas then explained the commission is an advisory board to the city council and that items are referred to the council for final action. Anyone interested in a particular agenda item should also attend the council meeting at which it is heard. Planning Commission meetings are generally divided into two halves—the first half being the Subdivision Committee report, the second half the public hearing, and possibly some discussion items at the end if needed.

Staff reports on the agenda require no action and include site plans, lot splits, mergers, and minor subdivisions filed for record. For November, site plans reported were Caldwell Toyota, 1355 Exchange Avenue; Hendrix College Apartments, 1210 Front Street; and Centennial Valley Country Club Health Club Facility, 1555 Centennial Club Drive. Lot splits, mergers, and minor subdivisions filed for record: Replat of Lot 4, Country Garden Estates Phase III; Cresthaven Subdivision Lot 91 and 92 Replat; and Calvary Subdivision.

The first item of business was the October minutes. Sandra Mabry stated the "Discussion" portion of the minutes on page 3 needs to be corrected to reflect the membership for the two teams forming the nominating committee. One team was Junior Storie and Sandy Mabry with Adam Thomas helping out the first night; the other was Ron Fields and Terry Sossong. Mr. Smithhart made a motion to approve the minutes with corrections. Junior Storie seconded the motion. It was approved 9 – 0.

Mr. Thomas then called on Junior Storie to make the Subdivision Committee report.

## **SUBDIVISION REPORT**

1. Larry Crain request for a one-year extension of the letter of credit as guarantee for sidewalk construction in Crain's Replat #2 was granted 9 – 0 on a motion for approval made by Junior Storie and seconded by Terry Sossong.
2. McDowell Properties request for a one-year extension of the letter of credit as guarantee for sidewalk construction in Hogan Professional Park was granted 9 – 0 on a motion for approval made by Junior Storie and seconded by Sandy Mabry.
3. Bobby Spradlin request for a variance to contribute \$15 per linear foot (times 315 feet total) to the general sidewalk fund in lieu of constructing sidewalk on the east side of Lot 6 West Plains Subdivision and the north side of Lot 2A Boyd Replat was granted 9 – 0 on a motion for approval made by Junior Storie and seconded by Sandy Mabry. It will be added to the punch list as item #41.

4. Watson-Rankin Associates request for preliminary plat approval of Turnbury Estates PUD Subdivision was granted 9 – 0 on a motion made by Junior Storie and seconded by Terry Sossong to approve the preliminary plat subject to the amended punch list.

**PUNCH LIST:**

**BASIC INFORMATION NEEDED ON THE PLAT**

1. Application for review and approval of the preliminary plat is needed.
2. The date of the drawing must be shown.
3. The present zoning classification of the adjoining land contiguous to the boundary of the proposed subdivision is needed. *The correct zoning is needed for Lot 4 Glenwood Place Phase III.*
4. The layout of all proposed sidewalk systems are needed, along with relevant dimensions and bearings. Sidewalks must be shown for the 5 feet behind back of curb and the sidewalks at the curb as approved by the Planning Commission.
5. Lot lines with appropriate dimensions are needed. *All dimensions must be in a readable font. Dimensions are also needed along all green spaces and along the straight part of Strathaven Drive in front of Lot 47.*

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NEEDED, BUT NOT ON THE PLAT**

6. The drainage area of all water courses above the points of entry shall be noted.
7. Where a subdivision involves property other than entire lots that have already been through the subdivision process, copies of a deed or deeds dated on a date no less than ten years prior to the filing of the plat are needed to assure that no parcels less than five acres in area are being created through this platting.

**GENERAL DESIGN REQUIREMENTS**

8. An easement of adequate width to accommodate the required floodway shall be provided on the plat. The easement shall clearly identify the easement as a "100-year Floodway". The plat shall have a note that reads as follows: "No structures, fill or obstructions shall be placed in the 100 year Floodway easement. No reshaping of the surface within the 100 year Floodway easement shall be made without the approval of the City Engineer. No fences shall be in the floodway easement." *The note must be added to the 100 year Floodway.*
9. Minimum floor elevations shall be placed on the plat for all lots less than three (3) feet above the computed one hundred (100) year flood elevation. The minimum finished flood elevation shall be established at one (1) foot above the computed one hundred (100) year flood elevation. Parts of lots 16 & 17 are within 25' of the floodway. It must be determined if a minimum floor elevation is required for these lots.

**STREET DESIGN REQUIREMENTS**

10. The maximum grades of all streets must conform to the Master Street Plan and the requirements of Table 1, Street Classification & Design Standards, City of Conway in the Subdivision Ordinance. Variances for grades up to 12% for residential and 15% for minor residential require approval by the Fire Chief and Planning Commission. *A variance has been requested for an 11.82% grade for Edinburgh Drive. The Fire Marshall has approved the grade. The Planning Commission approves this request.*
11. The minimum horizontal radii of all streets must conform to the Master Street Plan and the requirements of Table 1, Street Classification & Design Standards, City of Conway in the Subdivision Ordinance. *A request for variance has been received to allow the curves for C9, C10 and C11 inside the small Edinburgh Drive loop to be less than the required 50' radius. The Planning Commission approves this request.*

*NOTE: The Planning Commission approved the Subdivision Committee's recommendation to strike original item 12 from the punch list. The remaining items have been renumbered to reflect this action.*

12. Combinations of steep grades and curves shall be avoided. A request for variance has been received to allow a combination of steep grade and curve on the southern portion of Edinburgh Drive. The Planning Commission approves this request.
13. Cul-de-sac streets or courts designed to have one end permanently closed or streets or street loops with a single access shall have a distance no greater than 650 feet from the point of access to the nearest point of the furthest lot with the distance measured along the shortest route within the street right-of-way. Exceptions: 1. A street may be 1120 feet in length with a right-of-way of 60 feet in width and with a paved width from back of curb to back of curb of 40 feet if it meets all other cul-de-sac requirements. 2. A residential street may be 1120 feet in length with 50 feet of right-of-way and 27 feet of paved width from back of curb to back of curb if all lots provide no less than 90 feet of width at the building line per dwelling unit and it meets all other cul-de-sac requirements. A request has been made to have the loop roads to be more than 650 feet but less than 1120 feet without building a wider street or having wider lots. An emergency access route will be maintained to the rear of the loops. The Planning Commission approves this request.
14. Any cul-de-sac over 750 feet in length must have fire department approval. The Fire Marshall, Randy Freeman approves the length of the cul-de-sac with a temporary secondary access with the understanding the road shall be properly maintained and the future access will be constructed in the near future.
15. Street intersections shall be laid out as nearly at right angles as possible, with no angle of less than 75 degrees. A request for variance has been received to allow the intersection to be less than 90% at the loop on Edinburgh Drive. The Planning Commission approves this request.
16. Local street centerline offsets shall be no less than 125 feet. A request for variance has been received for the northern centerline offset of Strathaven Drive & Edinburgh Drive to be less than 125 feet from the Edinburgh Drive Loop. The Planning Commission approves this request.
17. In proximity to intersections of collector streets and above in the Functional Classification System, centerline offsets shall be no less than 250 feet. A request for variance has been received to allow the centerline offsets of Edinburgh Drive and Prince Street to be less than 250 feet. The offset distance is currently 214 feet. The Planning Commission approves this request.
18. Additional street paving and right-of-way, in the form of turning lanes may, upon consultation with the City Engineer and/or the Planning Staff, be required along arterial streets at intersections with other arterial or collector streets. The City Engineer and/or the Planning Staff recommends/does not recommend additional right-of-way and turning lanes at the intersection of Prince Street and Turnbury Drive. The Planning Commission determines additional turning lanes are required.

#### **ALLEY DESIGN REQUIREMENTS**

19. References to alleys should be removed from the development plan.

#### **EASEMENT DESIGN REQUIREMENTS**

20. Easements shall be provided for utilities where a subdivision is traversed by a water course, drainageway, channel or stream, or there shall be provided a storm water easement conforming substantially with the lines of the water course and shall be adequate for such intended purpose. Drainage easements will be required where drainage is between lots.
21. Utility easements as required Conway Corporation are needed.
22. Drainage easements as required by the City Engineer are needed.

**BLOCK DESIGN REQUIREMENTS**

23. Blocks over 1000 feet in length may require a public crosswalk within a dedicated easement of not less than 15 feet in width including a paved crosswalk not less than five feet in width to provide pedestrian circulation. *A request for variance has been received to allow a block over 1000 feet in length without a dedicated public crosswalk. A pedestrian easement is proposed along Spring Creek, which would create a distance of approximately 1300' between pedestrian accesses for the block to the east. The Planning Commission approves this request.*

**LOT DESIGN REQUIREMENTS**

24. Double frontage lots other than corner lots fronting on two streets shall not be platted except under extreme circumstances, as may be approved by the Planning Commission. *A request for variance has been received to allow double frontage lots for 1, 3, 4, 5, 6A, 14, 15 and 46. The Planning Commission approves this request.*
25. On double frontage lots, a planting screen easement of at least 10 feet shall be provided along the portion of the lot abutting a traffic artery or other use where screening is required. There shall be no right of access across the planting screen easement and such restriction shall be clearly designated on the plat and within any Bill of Assurance.
26. At the Planning Commission's discretion, a fence or wall may be substituted for the planting easement and planting screen, but access is denied in the same manner as for the planting easement with the same requirements for noting the restriction.
27. Every lot must slope to a street or to a drainage easement.

**UTILITY DESIGN REQUIREMENTS**

28. Fire hydrants must be placed so that the furthest point of a lot in a residential subdivision is no more than 600 feet from the hydrant located on the same street.
29. Fire hydrants shall be placed so that the furthest point of a lot in a commercial subdivision is no more than 400 feet from the nearest hydrant located on the same street. A fire hydrant must be provided within 400 feet from the furthest point of Lot #5.

**SIDEWALK DESIGN REQUIREMENTS**

30. Sidewalks are required along both sides of all streets. Sidewalks must meet all requirements in Table 1, Street Classification & Design Standards, City of Conway. Sidewalks are also required on the inside of the small Edinburgh Drive.
31. Sidewalks must be a minimum of five feet wide and located within the public right-of-way, with the edge closest to the street located five and one-half feet from the back of the curb. Sidewalks are not required to be constructed in a straight line, if such straight line construction would damage trees, or if an aesthetic effect is desired and the Planning Commission approves. *A request for variance has been received to allow the sidewalk to be abutting back of curb in certain areas due to terrain. The Planning Commission approves this request subject to the discretion of the City Engineer.*
32. Sidewalks shall link sidewalks of adjoining lots so as to provide a continuous "ribbon" of pedestrian access throughout the community.
33. A note on the plat states that the developer is responsible for construction of all sidewalks inside the PUD. The development plan states that the builder is responsible for the sidewalk for lot #5. This discrepancy must be resolved.
34. The property owner/developer may request a waiver from the required sidewalk construction. The Planning Commission shall review the following factors to determine whether or not to grant this waiver: (1) Pedestrian traffic generators such as parks and schools in the area. (2) The existence of a sidewalk network in the area. (3) The density of current and future development in the area. (4) The amount of pedestrian traffic likely to be generated by the proposed development. (5) Whether the terrain is such that a sidewalk is physically practical and feasible, and the extent to which trees, ground cover,

and natural areas would be adversely impacted by the construction of the sidewalk. (6) The overall need for a sidewalk to be constructed on the lot. If a waiver is granted, the owner/developer shall contribute an amount of money in lieu of construction equal to \$20 per linear foot of the required sidewalk. This money shall be deposited into a general sidewalk fund to be used solely for the addition of new sidewalks and maintenance of the existing sidewalk network. The dispersal of money from this sidewalk fund shall be at the discretion of the Conway City Council. Contributions to this fund are to be expended within two (2) years to serve a sidewalk project.

#### **EXPIRATION OF PLAT**

35. Plats will expire at the end of one year from acceptance of the Preliminary Plat unless an extension is requested and granted by the Planning Commission. Turnbury Estates P.U.D. will expire on November 19, 2008.

#### **AUTHORIZATION TO PROCEED**

36. Receipt of an approved or conditionally approved copy of the Preliminary Plat, together with an approved copy of the Improvements Plan shall constitute authorization of the Planning Commission for the subdivider to proceed with the preparation of the Final Plat, the installation of improvements, and the staking out of lots and blocks. The subdivider, after conditional approval of the Preliminary Plat, shall complete all improvements required under this regulation.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

### **Planned Unit Development**

5. Watson-Rankin Associates request for rezoning from A-1 to PUD for property located on the north side of Prince Street approximately 0.5 miles west of the intersection of Country Club Road and Prince Street and surrounded by Shady Valley Subdivision on the east side, Westminster Subdivision on the north side and Glenwood Place PUD for a portion of the west side was approved 9 – 0 on a motion to approve the rezoning with the three additional conditions stated below. Junior Storie made the motion and Sandy Mabry seconded.
  - 1) The PUD shall be constructed as presented in the final development plan, design guideline pattern book, and submitted site plan.
  - 2) Existing trees shall be protected and preserved when possible.
  - 3) Commercial and multi-family structures will require development review.

Kevin Watson, 612 Padgett Road, presented his rezoning request to the Planning Commission along with a slide show illustrating his vision for Turnbury Estates Planned Unit Development that will have three types of residential uses—38 patio/garden homes (\$200,000 range); 28 town homes, primarily two-story, in two-, three-, and four-bedroom plans (averaging between \$180 and \$200,000); and 4 estate homes (average value around \$400,000 based on minimum square footage and lot size). A pattern book will govern elevations requiring stone, brick, block, and wood exteriors—no vinyl siding. Pretty much upscale—pretty nice, high-end stuff. Not real big on some of the patio/garden homes. They're geared toward those that want really nice, but small, space and zero maintenance. They plan to keep everything earth tones so it blends in with the hillside and existing established neighborhoods such as Westminster and Shady Valley. There will be a property

owners association and hopefully this will be a destination neighborhood with neighborhood events. They plan to put a park in the area that is now a flood plain. It will be named Turnbury Park and will have a gazebo for outings and public use as well as private use to the subdivision. Edinburgh Trail which is a walking trail will be placed along the creek and up along the hillside and the landscape will include Ayrshire Pond and Turnbury Greens which will be landscaped areas throughout the development. All the patio/garden homes are adjacent to Shady Valley. A green space buffer has been left adjacent to Westminster subdivision. This first phase includes 19.9 acres of land of the total 33 acres. They do plan a second phase and will try to work with ETC that has the property to the west. It is their understanding that ETC wants to move their sign business back to Little Rock. But that is not part of this—it is something that may develop in the future. Mr. Watson stated they have met with the surrounding neighbors as well as the city's Fire Marshal.

Debbie Plopper who lives in Westminster came forward to ask about the flooding issue. She said her greatest concern is possible flooding and asked how they can be assured that they will not get flooded.

Steve Hailes was present representing Mizan Rahman, owner of the adjoining ETC property to the south and west of Mr. Watson's property. He stated Mr. Rahman has not as yet decided whether he is for or against the project stating that he had not had sufficient time in which to consider the proposal and its affect on his own property. However, what Mr. Rahman may or may not do with his property in the future is not under consideration at this time. Mr. Hailes stated they want all the easements to come from Mr. Watson's property—the 10-foot screening buffer, 15-foot utility easement for Conway Corp, and the right-of-way should be on Kevin's property. There was some discussion of creating double-frontage lots but with the current request there are none with which to deal and the entire street is coming from Mr. Watson's property.

In regard to the flooding question, City Engineer, Street Department Head and Flood Plain Administrator Ronnie Hall stated that the peak rainfall event for this site would go into the creek before the peak occurs in that creek. It's kind of a non-coincidental peak, he said. The runoff from the Turnbury side will get into the creek and clear the creek before it reaches its highest and so should have minimal effect on the height of the creek. Mr. Hall stated that he will not guarantee Mrs. Plopper that her property won't flood; but as he responded to Adam Thomas, it will not be because of this development. Water from this development will get in the creek and be gone before it reaches its peak. Mr. Hall went on to say that again this creek has also been helped by the detention ponds required in the Cadron Valley PUD. He said development of those ponds should significantly reduce the flooding potential on this creek.

### **Rezoning**

6. Travis Weaver request for rezoning from A-1 to RU-1 for property located west of 111 Lower Ridge Road was held in committee on a motion made by Chris Riggins and seconded by Terry Sossong. Vote on the motion to hold was 9 – 0. An earlier motion made by Bill Graff and seconded by Sandy Mabry was later withdrawn.

Mr. Weaver who is owner of Diamond Ice Company of Arkansas was present to speak for his request. His current ice production facility is in Conway County but he lives in Faulkner County. He makes, packages, and distributes ice to six Arkansas counties and has found property on Lower Ridge Road that he would like rezoned to RU-1 with a conditional use permit requested for an ice facility located in Faulkner County. His current production facility has 12 commercial ice machines that are combined indoors with central remote condensing units that sit outside behind the building to bring in air for the production of the ice. The only traffic would be him and his employees. He has two delivery trucks and two delivery trailers that are loaded to deliver to approximately 100 customers in six counties. The location was chosen for its easy access to I-40 and Highway 64 and 65. This location is already cut out so no additional green space would be taken from Lower Ridge Road.

The chairman called for additional speakers in favor of this request. No one came forward. He then called for those against the request and Mr. Pat Davis of 5 Hickory Hill Road came forward to speak. Mr. Davis stated his home is located on property along the ridge above this location and approximately 137 feet from the subject property line. He went on to say that he had followed the recent August and September request for rezoning about 800 feet down—the Watson request—and that he concurs with the staff report that points out the negative aspects of development along Lower Ridge Road. He agrees with residents of Azalea Loop on the problems with traffic, on sediment in storm water runoff, and the noise associated with commercial and this industrial activity. He also addressed the additional concerns of public safety that arise from the strip mining sites along Lower Ridge Road and the future impact of commercial development that could result from the rezoning to RU-1. He then submitted pictures from last year showing storm water runoff. There is no storm water sewage system in that area. Strip mining in that area has removed the green trees and vegetation—from this area in particular. Every time it rains, it flows rather heavily. And it doesn't flow briefly. Because of the inability to infiltrate into the soil for the vegetation, it continues to run. There are constant ice patches along Lower Ridge Road and so many wrecks that at times it seems like bumper pool. Residents have seen increased pressure on Lower Ridge Road to avoid the congestion around I-40. Runoff sediment has filled the open ditches and results in constant flows across the road. He is also concerned about the noise and light impact on his property and its future value. The RU-1 zoning does not address the neighbors above. It only speaks of six-fencing—lateral—and downward lighting. The previously existing buffer has been eliminated by strip mining. It is rather noisy now with the steel buildings and the business that exists down there right now and traffic going and coming in and out. That is limited to the regular business day. It is his opinion that manufacturing ice would be a twenty-four hour operation. Making ice requires exhaust fans, remote units, compressors—it sounds like a pretty good size facility that is proposed, he said. Because of these safety, and other significant factors, he asked the commission to deny the rezoning.

Marsha Chase of #8 Azalea Loop came forward to speak against the request saying she has a lot of the same concerns that Mr. Davis expressed including the fact that Lower Ridge Road at night is not well lit. They have had a lot of crime—in particular commercial burglaries—and she is concerned that something like this will attract

more of the same. She is also concerned about where the runoff from the production of this ice will go. Because of existing conditions, she does not feel a business such as this is appropriate.

Sandra Bryant of #67 Azalea Loop also spoke against the request saying her major concern is the runoff. They flood when the rainwater comes off those hills that have been dug out. The ditches have been dug out but that still does not take care of the runoff that is coming off the hills. They cannot take any more water; they can't handle what they get now.

Pat Hart who owns property on Azalea Loop spoke against the request and also asked who owns the property under discussion. The property owner is Brett Acre and Mr. Weaver proposes to purchase it contingent on the rezoning and conditional use. Ms. Hart is also concerned about the runoff in an area with no sewer. There are already two buildings on the property. Will his be an addition to those? She believes in time the area can be developed, that more density will come, and with it the sewer and other amenities necessary to develop commercial. Mr. Weaver volunteered that he does not propose buying the entire property; the part he is buying does not involve the two buildings that Ms. Hart mentioned. The 1.25 acres he wants to purchase is a portion of a larger property that has not as yet been legally subdivided. Mr. Weaver could not say the number of decibels his operation would generate. In answer to Mr. Graff's question about the likelihood that the percolation through the shale will not give adequate disposal of the water, Mr. Weaver stated his buying of the property is contingent on the perk test—that he has built that protection for himself into the agreement to buy.

Mr. Sossong asked City Engineer Ronnie Hall if there was an opportunity here to help the drainage situation at all or not. Mr. Hall stated that they probably could help the drainage and especially the mud runoff the site if they were able to incorporate a plan with Mr. Weaver as well as the entire cutout to contain the sediment. We've been trying to get those folks to keep the mud off the road, but if we could impose upon his seller additional restrictions to require some storm water pollution prevention measures and maybe some detention on that hillside, we can help the situation, Mr. Hall said. But this would have to be something the buyer requires of the seller—as a condition of sale perhaps that a comprehensive plan be imposed upon that whole five acre tract—it might encourage that owner to go ahead and do the right thing. However, Mr. Weaver said there are three different property owners. At one time he thinks it was a single property but that over time it has been divided up. This brought up the issue of a plat for the property. For anything less than five acres, a plat is required or it is considered an illegal subdivision of property. Also any new construction will be required to meet current city standards and that would require a plat.

To address Mr. Storie's query about development and amenities coming with growing density and these commercial requests being the only type the commission seems to be seeing for the area, Planning Director Bryan Patrick stated his opinion that services for the area will come eventually but that it will be driven by residential subdivision development south of Lower Ridge Road. Services such as sewer to the north of Lower Ridge Road would then become more economically feasible.

Mr. Graff then made a motion to deny the rezoning request. Sandy Mabry seconded the motion. And discussion continued with Commissioner Qualls asking what are you going to put on a piece of property like that. What can you do with something like that. At one point or another, some kind of decision has to be made about whether that's going to go commercial or residential stated Ms. Mabry. Mr. Thomas said he struggles with that being the right kind of item to build there. Mr. Graff said he thinks Mr. Hall's suggestion needs to be communicated to the people who own that property in the cutout that they come together with a plan of how to control the movement of the sediment as well as the removal of the water. And until the three or four owners in that cutout come to some agreement, then it is still going to stay status quo. Mr. Storie seemed to feel this was an opportunity to impact a portion of that property and impose conditions on it for a nicer development that might stimulate more responsible and improved development to either side of it. But what about our comprehensive plan, asked Commissioner Mabry? What about the space we're running out of north and south and every other direction? We've got a direction to go, she said; beautiful property out that way; make great residential. That spot won't, but everything else will. So are you going to go put commercial here and then just start building homes—who's going to want to live next to commercial. Chris Riggins said he just wished they could give Mr. Weaver an opportunity to withdraw his requests so he could investigate further and re-evaluate whether to proceed with this—it seems clear that he was blind to some things that he needs to talk with the planning department about. Mr. Weaver's options are to withdraw the items period, or ask that they be held in committee until next month. Applicant stated he is aware there are additional guidelines and requirements above and beyond requesting the rezoning and conditional use. He asked that it be held in committee so that he can address issues raised at this meeting, particularly the decibel levels and handling drainage. Mr. Thomas suggested that perhaps the Planning Department and City Engineer could help with what could we do with this land that would help us with those issues that we might be able to put as a condition in the conditional use portion of this.

Mr. Graff withdrew his motion. Mr. Riggins then made a motion to hold the item in committee. Terry Sossong seconded. Motion passed 9 – 0.

### **Conditional Use**

7. Travis Weaver request for a conditional use permit to produce, package and distribute ice products for property located west of 111 Lower Ridge Road was held in committee on a motion made by Chris Riggins and seconded by Terry Sossong. Motion passed 9 – 0.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **2008 Meeting Schedule**

8. The 2008 Planning Commission meeting schedule was approved unanimously as submitted by the Planning Department on a motion made by Terry Sossong and seconded by Sandy Mabry. With the exception of the meetings scheduled on

Wednesday, January 23 and Tuesday, February 19, all meetings will be on the third Tuesday of each month.

**2008  
CONWAY PLANNING COMMISSION  
SCHEDULED MEETING DATES**

<b>MONTH</b>	<b>MEETING DATE</b>	<b>SUBMISSIONS DUE</b>
January	Wednesday, January 23	Friday, Jan 4
February	Tuesday, February 19	Friday, Feb 1
March	Monday, March 17	Friday, Feb 29
April	Monday, April 21	Friday, April 4
May	Monday, May 19	Friday, May 2
June	Monday, June 16	Friday, May 30
July	Monday, July 21	Thursday, July 3
August	Monday, August 18	Friday, August 1
September	Monday, September 15	Friday, August 29
October	Monday, October 20	Friday, October 3
November	Monday, November 17	Friday, October 31
December	Monday, December 15	Wednesday, November 26

Planning Commission meetings begin at 7:00 p.m. in the District Court Building located at 810 Parkway, Conway, Arkansas. The agenda with supporting information for each meeting is posted at <http://www.conwayplanning.org/pc08/PC08.html>.

**Nominations**

- The nominating committee submitted the names of Craig Cloud (5-year term), Kimberly Gardner (5-year term), Kent Mathis (4-year term), and Richard Kirkman (1-year term), to the full Planning Commission for their approval to recommend to the City Council for confirmation to fill vacancies on the Planning Commission for the terms specified. Adam Thomas made the motion to accept these four people with the associated terms. Terry Sossong seconded the motion. It passed 9 – 0. Junior Storie volunteered to attend the City Council meeting and endeavor to answer any questions the council might have about the interview and selection process.

The meeting adjourned at 8:43 p.m. on a motion to adjourn made by Mary Etta Qualls and seconded by Ron Fields. Vote was unanimous to adjourn.