

**Parkville Planning & Zoning Commission  
November 10, 2009, 5:30 p.m.  
City Hall Boardroom**

**Minutes**

**ITEM 1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Katerndahl called meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

**ITEM 2. ROLL CALL**

Members present:

Dean Katerndahl, Chairman  
Marvin Ferguson  
Keith Cary  
Bob Lock

Judy McRuer, Vice Chairman  
Lonnie Scott  
Pam Scott

Members absent:

Bryant Lamer (with prior notice)  
Mike Nall (with prior notice)

Also present:

Sean Ackerson, AICP, Assistant City Administrator / Community Development Director  
Dorrit Bender, City Hall Receptionist  
Jay Norco, City Engineer  
Approximately 10 audience members

**ITEM 3. GENERAL BUSINESS**

**Item 3(A) Approval of Revised Planning & Zoning Meeting Agenda.**

Chairman Katerndahl asked for a motion to approve the revised agenda as presented.

**Alderman Ferguson moved to approve the agenda as published. Commissioner Lonnie Scott seconded. Motion passed 7-0.**

**Item 3(B) Approval of Planning & Zoning minutes from October 13, 2009 meeting.**

Chairman Katerndahl asked for a motion to approve the Minutes as presented.

**Commissioner Lonnie Scott moved to approve the minutes of the October 13, 2009 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting as published. Commissioner Lock seconded. Motion passed 7-0.**

**ITEM 4. PUBLIC HEARING** (all items have previously been tabled and will remain tabled until a motion to remove an item is passed. See comments following descriptions of each item)

**Items 4(A) An amendment to Chapter 463, Section 463.060 to revise the regulation of temporary signs. Case No. PZ09-05. Staff requests that this item remain tabled.**

Item remained tabled.

**Items 4(B) An application to rezone all of Tract A and all of Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6, Bell Road Industrial Park, a subdivision in Parkville, Platte County, Missouri, containing 5.98 acres, more or less, from “B-2” General Business District to “B-4” Planned Business District. Said property is generally located at the southwest corner of 45 Highway and Bell Road in Parkville, MO. Case No. PZ08-22. Previously tabled and will remain tabled until a motion to remove an item is passed. Staff requests that this item remain tabled.**

Item remained tabled.

**Items 4(C) A proposed preliminary development plan for Parkville Market Place with item (B) above. Said preliminary development plan proposes approximately 45,000 square feet of retail and restaurant, 285 parking spaces and related amenities. Case No. PZ08-23. Previously tabled and will remain tabled until a motion to remove an item is passed. Staff requests that this item remain tabled.**

Item remained tabled.

**Items 4(D) Application to rezone four tracts as follows: 39.7 acres, 2.79 acres and 4.8 acres, all more or less, from County “AG” Agriculture District to “B-2” General Business District; and 43.9 acres from County “AG” Agriculture to “R-4” Multifamily Residential District. Said property is generally located north of River Road, west of Thousand Oaks and east of Brush Creek. Case No. PZ09-11. The applicant has requested that this item be removed from the table.**

Chairman Katerndahl deferred to Director Ackerson to provide input on the new and revised application regarding the rezoning before calling on the applicant. Mr. Ackerson repeated the rezoning information from Item 4 (D) above, stated the Commission had in their packets for review the applicant’s concept plan, ownership verification, the public notices that were posted, and letters for R-4 zoning and excerpts from City Engineer, Jay Norco.

Katerndahl asked for questions for Ackerson prior to calling on the applicant.

Pam Scott questioned floodplain discrepancy in floodplain depictions between application and floodplain map. Ackerson called attention to exhibits included in packets and identified floodplain as identified by FEMA and summarized process needed to amend projected floodplain. Scott questioned what happens if the City approves development in the floodplain. Ackerson summarized City adopted floodplain regulations, restrictions on development in the floodplain and requirement of applicant to demonstrate that the property is out of the floodplain. Scott stated that it appeared that a large section of the proposed application is in the floodplain.

Further questions and discussion to resume after applicant’s presentation.

Chairman called on applicant to present. Ted Derks, 19 West Concord, General partner of Platte Purchase introduced himself. He stated that the property had been owned since 1994. He stated that they had made similar application last year but withdrew it because of confusion over the floodplain and lack of detail of the perception of getting utilities. He stated that Sam’s Survey prepared the flood elevation lines on the application and if there was any difference it

just has to be worked out. He stated the correct way to address floodplain is to set elevation sites, but he was not sure if Sam's did that.

He stated the application included 91 acres. He stated there was a perception that all the property was in the floodplain, but a little less than 20 acres, give or take, are located in the floodplain. He stated there were only about 12 to 13 acres between the creek and where the proposed buildings would be in the floodplain. There is seven acres in two little pieces down by the sewer plant. He said only one of the buildings was proposed near the floodplain and only 4 to 5 feet of fill would be needed to take it out of the floodplain.

The plan is his idea of what the property should be zoned as. He clarified ownership since 1974 and summarized his qualifications. He believes the proposed plans are the highest and best use to which he believes he is entitled. He stated you have to look at what is for sale and what is in demand. They don't plan on doing this right away, but want it rezoned for down the road when things change.

He summarized that from the east side the proposed R-4 zoning, that they proposed 108 units on 44 acres equaling 2.5 units per acre. He said they have about 23 to 24 acres of free space behind it to the west. It was all set on second bottom ground outside the floodplain. They did this so as not to have to disturb all the ground. They bunched the buildings together and left the rest free ground. There will actually be more behind that since Barth won't build behind them. It's the most economical and would disturb fewer trees. He felt the City Master Plan called for development that would require grading the entire site, increase erosion and tree removal and cost the City more.

He summarized the proposed B-2 ground as 81,600 feet of building on 19 acres. The building would be less than two acres covering less than 10% of the site. He noted that the parking proposed exceeds City requirements. He said that the demand would be great for anyone wanting visibility along the highway. Nothing else makes economic sense since it is not the highest and best use. He felt institutions like churches, schools and business that wanted to be seen would locate there. He stated that the buildings would be one story with one exception and that would be a 2 story.

They are proposing filling the site by the sewer plant and putting a small building on it. They do not have a present need, but have a few ideas. He felt these sites are not good for anything else and might work out some day.

He stated they have talked with the Parks Department (County) about making a deal. They want to buy and he wants to sell. They might acquire some of their land on the other side of the creek and they want land on the east. They might also need a small building down there. He stated they would not make a deal with the Parks Department unless this is rezoned.

The Master Plan (City) calls for single-family. He travels around the country and sees a lot of sound barriers. He stopped in Overland Park and measured one. They are concrete and steel with an I-beam every 17 feet. They are typically 9 to 18 feet tall in three feet sections. He stated the Commission wouldn't know anything about construction but stated that in each mile there is about 2,500 cubic yards of concrete. In today's prices that is about \$250,000 in concrete plus additional costs for forming. Every 17 feet there is an 8" to 9" steel I-beam probably 18 feet long. There is probably 5,000 feet of I-beam per mile. These costs have to be paid by government. The former Mayor of Merriam works for Johnson County and they are being pressured by the EPA to put up sound barriers on the east side of Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad. Someone has to pay and it is a mistake. Building single-family near the interstate is a dumb idea.

He stated that utility providers are anxious to provide utilities because business is slow. They have provided letters saying so (none submitted for the record). Roads do not exist but will be built later.

He thinks we will see things are bigger and better than they were envisioned. He stated the State of Missouri owns the land for an interchange at River Road. He stated it would not be hard for the State to put in an interchange, which would change the dynamics. There are a lot of interchanges being put in around the state. The demand from Kansas could cause it. Right now there is nothing going on, but that will change. There is nothing mentioned in the staff report or the Master Plan about an interchange. He added that he had spoken with the Platte County Parks Department, but would not make any type of deal with them unless this is rezoned and approved by the City of Parkville.

Commissioner Scott asked about businesses wanting to be seen from the interstate. She questioned why the businesses were low-rise, how they would be seen and whether they would need large signage and attention getting devices to compensate. Mr. Derks responded by suggesting she drive around the interstates to see the examples. He stated the plans were conceptual and might work for a church, school, the American Angus Association and others. The buildings will be different than what is shown on the plans. Each buyer will want something different.

Chairman Katerndahl stated that he disagreed about the interchange, but if it were going to be built we may need to reconsider the Master Plan. He felt the application might be premature if there were to be a major change in infrastructure. Mr. Derks responded by saying that they have waited since 1974 and questioned how long they needed to wait. He said the future is not what we envision but that it will be much more intense. He gave the example of motels on I-29. He stated that the interchange was favorable when someone considered a casino down there.

Katerndahl pointed out that there were existing areas already zoned commercial and that it was in better location. Mr. Derks acknowledged this was a less desirable location, but felt you had to be optimistic.

Commissioner Bob Lock stated he was not clear on the issue with the floodplain. Mr. Derks responded by saying he was not sure either. He just called Sam's and they said everything is okay. The lines (floodplain elevations) are not necessarily correct, but it does not matter. There are more precise studies to follow and he is banking that the elevations are higher than they show because of fill added during the construction of I-435. He had a land planner oversee the fill to make sure they were out of the floodplain. They stopped when they thought they were to the floodplain. Now they show one field has a foot more and two have a foot less. He doesn't really know but has to rely on the professionals he hired.

Aldermen Ferguson stated that the elevation could vary and that he would have to comply with the existing floodplain at that time. He stated it could vary. Mr. Derks agreed.

Commissioner Scott questioned what would happen in the event the floodplain as depicted by the feds (FEMA) is correct and he loses two of the business buildings. She wanted to know how it would affect his development. Mr. Derks questioned why he would lose two buildings. Scott said she had drawn the FEMA floodplain delineation over the drawings submitted. Mr. Derks was betting Sam's depiction was more correct than FEMA. He stated he'd done this since 1967. Floodplain is a major problem in selling real estate and the FEMA lines are not dependable. He stated that even though the County had paid a great deal of money to Butler Associates or somebody that it didn't help.

Seeing no other questions for the applicant, Chairman Katerndahl called for public comments. Seeing none, he closed the public hearing and moved on to discussion. He called on Assistant City Administrator Ackerson.

Ackerson stated he wanted to address a few points. He stated the Commissioners might remember that the potential interchange was specifically addressed in the City Master Plan through the Transportation Plan. He stated that the City had met with MoDOT who had no plans for an interchange today and that they had no plans for one in the future. He stated that it was explained that per MoDOT at the time they constructed I-435 that they did obtain ROW in the general configuration of the interchange. This area was used as a stock pile and borrow area during construction. Ackerson did not believe MoDOT had not completed plans or a design for an interchange. It was his understanding that their engineers based it on estimation at the time.

Ackerson stated that since that time, MoDOT's position was that the interchange, if built, would be built at the expense of the City. This was considered in the Master Plan process. As part of the planning process for the Master Plan, they evaluated whether there could be enough critical density to fund and support the interchange. Ackerson stated that only one of four corners around the interchange was developable. What was concluded was that shy of a casino or new, big manufacturing plant or some single use that would warrant the interchange that its construction was not likely. He stated that there was not dense enough land use to warrant the interchange.

Ackerson addressed a comment that only single-family uses were projected in the Master Plan. He called the Commission's attention to the staff report asking them to look at summarized land use projections starting on page 3 of 6. He summarized projections on two general areas. On the north end, he said the projections were primarily for single-family supported by other uses. It does not call for exclusively single-family uses. He said it does allow for clustering as shown.

Ackerson summarized projections for the two small parcels to the south. He stated they were generally projected for preservation uses because of their location, but that a small area was projected for mixed-use residential neighborhood to serve the area. He summarized residential uses and supporting institutional and civic uses. He stated the primary conflict between the application and the Master Plan was the inclusion of commercial zoning. He stated that the area was not projected for high intensity uses in part because the infrastructure planned for the area was not projected to serve commercial centers or high density residential uses. He called the Commission's attention to a summary of transportation and infrastructure projections in the staff report submitted.

Ackerson addressed the assumption that sound barriers would be needed. He questioned the assumption that development was not appropriate for single-family development because it would require sound barriers. He felt that the argument, if true, would lend more to not allowing residential development at all. Otherwise, we would be making that distinction that if it's not single-family, the noise is okay. He stated that the projections were made knowing that the area was close to the interstate. He pointed out other residential development close to the interstate. He said a primary consideration of the projections was the location of the creek and the elevations that substantially separate this area from the interstate. He said this is unlike other areas where development is pushed right up to the interstate.

Ackerson stated that other findings were summarized in the staff report. He stated that staff concluded that without an amendment to the Master Plan – both the land use and transportation projections – the application should not be approved as proposed. He stated it was based on

three primary concerns – the concern for development within the floodplain, the inconsistency with the infrastructure projections and inconsistency with the land use projections for the area.

Chairman Katerndahl called for question of staff.

Commissioner Pam Scott asked whether the City's Master Plan would need to change. She presumed that there would be repercussions as to what else would happen in the area. She questioned whether the Master Plan has been modified since its approval. Ackerson responded that there have not been any changes. He stated that since annexation of the area there had not been any significant changes in projections until the adoption of the current Master Plan in 2009. Generally, he advised that if they are inclined to approve the application, that they first address the projections in the Master Plan. He did not recommend they approve the development first and then let it dictate projections for the rest of the plan. He said there are some exceptions, like a use that would generate major jobs and revenue that might warrant considering major amendments to the plan. He stated he didn't feel this application warranted changing the plan.

Alderman Ferguson questioned whether there was any R-4 zoning in the area. Ackerson stated that the property is zoned AG now and that the City equivalent is single-family zoning. Chairman Katerndahl asked whether there was any multi-family nearby. Ackerson called their attention to an aerial photo of the area and summarized existing zoning in the area stating that the only nearby multifamily residential area was located to the north in plans approved for 45 Park Place. He stated that there was no multi-family zoning or development approved south of that and that development was planned to be served by infrastructure to the north. He stated that the prior land use projections for the area (from the prior Master Plan) included limited non-residential uses around the sewer plant. The current plan concluded that the area was more appropriate for residential mixes and that if commercial uses were to be introduced they would be done so as part of a planned neighborhood service node like approved for Thousand Oaks (subdivision).

Ackerson stated that the proposed development plan was not binding on the rezoning because the proposed B-2 and R-4 districts are not planned districts. The plan demonstrates that the area could be developed in some manner, but because the plans are not tied to the zoning they could be changed to something completely different from what is shown in the concept plan.

Katerndahl stated that this was one of his primary concerns. He felt it could affect all the area properties in the area. He felt the application was very premature. He felt a concept plan that won't necessarily be what we will end up getting seems premature.

Commissioner Scott said we had not really addressed the extension of Brink Meyer (Road). If extended, River Road would need a lot of work to carry major traffic. Ackerson stated that the Master Plan projected an extension of Brink Myer Road to River Road. The only other projection in the system is a connection through the proposed development area is a connection through Thousand Oaks. He summarized the reasoning and need for connectors to improve area connections and the ability to build more arterials in the area. He stated the need for more local connections and stated that was the reason why this subject area was not projected for higher-intensity uses. He summarized floodplain, floodway and development in the area and stated that development on the subject site would have to generate enough traffic to warrant high infrastructure improvements. He stated that it was determined that this was inappropriate since the development could obligate the City to improvements without having any other critical density to offset the cost to the community for those improvements.

Mr. Derks held up a sketch (no copy submitted for the record) and stated that it was the plan for the interchange. He stated Sean was not there, but he was. He negotiated with them (the State). It's graded, they own it exactly, and they intend to do it. In the Carter years it got knocked out. He stated that the decision to do it was not at the local department office that Sean visits. Rather, it is at the Governor's office or the politicians or the pressure is where the decisions are made. They had thought about campaigning for it. He had connections at one time but they are not in office now. They own all of it up the road about five miles. It (the interchange) is ready to go except for the pavement.

He stated they were one of the only ones that promoted annexation into Parkville with Mayor Quisenberry. He stated they didn't go in for zoning after that. He said they did meet at the old City Hall, Sean was there every Wednesday morning forever to discuss connecting a road that would connect a north road to River Road. At that time there was a discussion of a Master Plan. Derks stated that he has never been involved with any Master Plan and questioned why he was not invited. He stated that David Barth had never been involved either. He stated they are entitled to have the property zoned and have waited a long time. Chairman Katerndahl clarified that they are not entitled and that is why the City has a Planning Commission and Board of Aldermen. Mr. Derks stated that he appreciated the Commission's consideration.

Mr. Derks stated that he and the Parks Department (County) have made a deal and would like to move ahead. He said zoning is a concept and that you have to shift around.

Chairman Katerndahl thanked Mr. Derks for his comments and asked for a motion.

**Commissioner Pam Scott moved that the application not be approved. Commissioner McRuer seconded. Chairman Katerndahl summarized the motion and asked for a roll call vote. Katerndahl clarified that voting aye was voting not to approve the motion. Chairman Katerndahl – Aye. Vice Chairman McRuer – Aye. Robert Lock – Aye. Alderman Ferguson – No. Lonnie Scott – Aye. Pam Scott – Aye. Keith Cary – Aye.**

Chairman Katerndahl clarified that the motion to not approve the application passed 6 to 1. Ackerson clarified that the Commission's recommendation will proceed to the Board of Aldermen for consideration on December 1, 2009.

## **ITEM 5. REGULAR BUSINESS**

**Item 5(A) Application for a change in a previously approved preliminary development plan in a "B-4" District. Case No. PZ09-13A. The applicant has requested that this item be removed from the table.**

Chairman Katerndahl stated that 5A; B and C are all related and would be considered together. He called on the applicant to explain the project. He stated that the applicant would also be presenting materials that had not previously been seen.

Representative for APEX, as well as Christian Brothers Automotive, Patricia Jensen of White, Goss, Bowers, law firm, introduced the people in the audience associated with the APEX project, some of who may be speaking on behalf of Christian Brothers Automotive. They were: Curtis Kane with Christian Brothers Automotive in Houston; Scott Snow the franchisee and Platte County resident; John Pepper, of John Pepper, Inc. current land owner; Steve Warger, Harrington Cortelyou, engineer on the project; Jim Bowers, White, Goss, Bowers, et al, her partner, and Jim Farley, Farley Law Office, additional legal council.

Ms. Jensen went over a brief history of the project and details of the current plan. Using a power point presentation (submitted for the record), views of the site, buildings and the interior design of the establishment were identified. Ms. Jensen also summarized the history of the development to date, including: rezoning to B-4 and approval of a preliminary development plan on March 10, 2003; approval of a revised preliminary development plan with details of a Bank of America on September 6, 2006; and approval of a revised preliminary development plan showing the bank and two other buildings on March 7, 2006.

Ms. Jensen reviewed the details of the current applications, stating that no changes would be made to the previously approved bank site as it was not part of the current application and was under separate ownership. She showed renderings of the proposed site improvements stating that along with the Christian Brothers store, they would also improve the access to 45 Highway. She identified a retaining wall and stated that trees would be planted in front of the wall to soften the view, but felt it would be very compatible with other similar walls in the area. She showed elevations and renderings of the building exterior and interior. She showed a rendering of the proposed retaining wall.

Chairman Katerndahl asked how the elevation would change with the widening of 45 Highway. Director Ackerson understood that the elevation change would be nominal, but did not know a specific elevation.

Ms. Jensen showed sites that have been built and in operation in Shawnee and Liberty that further helped describe the buildings, proximity to hotels, and retaining walls used in the construction. She pointed out the quality of other surrounding development in the area.

Ms. Jensen summarized an agreement between the property owner, John Pepper, Pat Kelly (owner of property at the southwest corner of 45 and Bell Road) and MoDOT to signalize the intersection of 45 Highway and Bell. The improvements are to be made at the time of widening of 45 Highway and they have signed an agreement to provide their portion of the necessary funding.

Ms. Jensen stated that they (applicants) agree to all staff's identified conditions.

Curtis Kane, Director of Property Facility Development, Christian Brother's Automotive, 15995 North Parkers Landing, Houston, TX, summarized their mission and the nature of their business. Points made included: routine corporate inspections of each facility; requirements for property maintenance; standard profit margins; requirements for the franchisee to be on site during business hours; limited business hours between 7:00 am to 6:00 pm; no use of monument signs; investment in the community; expected sales of \$850,000 to \$1.1 million in the first year, with four year sales reaching \$2 million per year. He stated they would not do body work or heavy engine work and that no cars would not be stored outside overnight. He added that the owner would be required to be on site 40 hours per week, 5 days a week. There would not be any type of quick lube or major transmission or engine or rear end overhauling. The company would be doing brakes, struts, line ups, flushes and parts replacement. He said no boring, grinding or milling would take place on the property. Their company slogan is "honesty, integrity with excellence". This is a faith based business.

Chairman Katerndahl called on staff to present the staff findings and recommendations. Director Ackerson summarized the materials submitted to the Commission. He noted that one of his recommended conditions had been revised to correct an error related to an agreement with MoDOT. He stated a revised letter was provided to the Commission at the beginning of the meeting. The revision clarified that if improvements to Bell Road and 45 are not made with the

widening of 45 Highway the improvements will be the responsibility of the property owner / applicant.

Ackerson summarized findings in the staff report. Points made included: the use was allowed in the B-4 District; the proposed development is consistent with the intent of district; the use is generally compatible with the surrounding residential uses; care has been taken or is required to be taken to minimize area impacts; the proposed plans are generally consistent with the previously approved plans. He called attention to staff's recommended conditions in memos submitted by him and City Engineer, Jay Norco.

Concerns addressed by the Commission included: how will the project be viewed when approached on 45 Highway; is the retaining wall unnecessarily high, and could the building have been located differently; how will the current vegetation and additional trees enhance the site.

Commissioner Pam Scott summarized her concerns about the wall, questioned the height of the wall and the ability of the vegetation to screen the wall. She suggested changing the elevation of the site by lowering the building and shifting the retaining wall to the back of the site. She stated it would also help further reduce the impacts to abutting neighbors.

Steve Warger, Harrington and Cortelyou, 911 Main Street, Kansas City, Missouri, summarized the intent of the development design. Discussion between Commissioner Scott and Mr. Warger ensued. Commissioner Scott asked the applicant to consider re-grading the site to lower the development closer to the elevation of 45 Highway. Commissioner Katerndahl requested that staff work with the developer to voluntarily lower the site elevation. Ackerson stated that it would be voluntary unless made a condition of approval.

Ms. Scott also recommended that the previously approved Parkville Connections project also include traffic from APEX and Christian Brothers, if approved.

Although this was not a public meeting, time was granted to Harry Sievers, resident and president of the Melody Lane Home Owners Association. Mr. Sievers was concerned about: noise levels and times of the day and night that dumpsters will be serviced; storm water runoff and drained; City obligation to pay for improvements not funded by the developer; MoDOT delays on 45 Highway construction and the impact to traffic and traffic control; and damage to trees on the City property due to construction under the drip line of the trees. Sean Ackerson attempted to address these concerns, stating that noise had been addressed, stormwater and drainage studies are required prior to construction, and that MoDOT will have at least 2 lanes open during widening of the highway. Mr. Sievers thanked the commission for the opportunity to speak.

Ackerson stated for the record that mitigation required as a result of removal of trees on the northern portion of the site was still required. He stated that this mitigation is shown in the current plans.

**Alderman Ferguson moved to approve 5A and 5B, the application on behalf of Christian Brother's for the revised preliminary development plan for APEX Plaza and final development Plan for Christian Brother's automotive as submitted. Seconded by Commissioner Lonnie Scott. Chairman Katerndahl summarized the motion and asked for clarification that the motion was subject to all staff conditions. Aldermen Ferguson confirmed. Katerndahl called for a vote. All ayes with the exception of Commissioner Pam Scott. Katerndahl asked the record to show 6 ayes and 1 nay. Motion passed.**

**Item 5(B) Application for a final development plan for Christian Brothers on Lot 2A of APEX Plaza. Christian Brothers Automotive. Case No. PZ09-13B. The applicant has requested that this item be removed from the table.**

See discussion with 5(A) above.

**Motion to approve with Agenda Item 5(A) above.**

**Item 5(C) Application for a final plat of Lot 2A of APEX Plaza. Christian Brothers Automotive. Case No. PZ09-14. The applicant has requested that this item be removed from the table.**

See discussion with 5(A) above.

Katerndahl called for a motion on the plat. **Alderman Ferguson moved to approve the application for replat of Lot 2, APEX Plaza as submitted. Seconded by Lonnie Scott. Katerndahl summarized the motion asked for clarification that the motion was subject to all staff conditions. Aldermen Ferguson confirmed. Katerndahl called for a vote. All eyes. Motion passed 7 to 0.**

Ackerson stated for the record that the application would be considered by the Board of Aldermen at their November 17, 2009 meeting.

**ITEM 6. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

None

**ITEM 7. OTHER BUSINESS**

Chairman Katerndahl announced the dates of the next Planning & Zoning Commission meetings, along with the Board of Aldermen’s future schedule.

**ITEM 8. ADJOURNMENT**

**Aldermen Ferguson moved to adjourn. Commissioner Lonnie Scott seconded. Motion to adjourn passed 7-0.**

**Meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.**

Submitted by: \_\_\_\_\_ 11-26-09  
Dorrit Bender Date  
Department Assistant

*Information on these items is maintained at Parkville City Hall and is available for viewing during normal office hours. Planning Commission decisions are recommendations forwarded to the Parkville Board of Aldermen meeting unless otherwise noted. Inquiries on items contained herein can be made by visiting Parkville City Hall at 8880 Clark Avenue, Parkville, or by calling the Community Development Department at (816) 741-7676.*