

decorative shrubs and ground cover as approved by the City Arborist, along the eastern (front) building façade to soften the visual impact of the building.

8. Any exterior lighting shall be directed downward and away from adjacent properties.
9. Conditional Use approval shall expire two (2) years from the date of approval, if no building permit for the proposed building has been issued by that date.

List: 1, 2, 3, 4 optional, 5, 6, 7 optional, 8 optional, and 9.

Commissioner Miller asked if option one limits future use of property. Mr. Martin explained that it would, but it would be open to any C-H zoning and that it would need to follow standards.

There being no further questions for staff, Chairman Miller opened the public hearing portion of the case.

Speaking in favor of the request:

- Bill Kent – 2214 N. Patterson

Mr. Kent was present to answer any questions that the commissioners had. Commissioner Hightower asked if the conditions were suitable with applicant. The answer provided was yes by applicant. Mr. Kent provided the intent of the building use, which was to move equipment out of the elements.

No further questions for Mr. Kent.

Speaking in favor of the request:

- David Frazier – 571 W Hwy 37

David Frazier explained that the equipment storage would be beneficial due to the current stage of storage inventory wrapped outside. Mr. Frazier considers its current stage to be unsightly and that it would benefit against the elements.

Commissioner Roundtree asked if Mr. Frazier had considered a storage facility on the property and if Cowart had enough square footage. Mr. Frazier explained that if there was a unit currently on the property, it would not be sufficient for the amount of inventory. He stated that Cowart was sufficient. Commissioner McCall asked if unloading and loading would be continued and it was explained by Mr. Frazier that the process would include unloaded crates at the new location.

No further questions for Mr. Frazier.

Speaking in opposition to the request:

- Demaris Bradford – 2518 Rolling Rd.

Ms. Bradford explained that surrounding properties are medical related and that an industrial warehouse would be detrimental to her property. She voiced her concerns stating that the building would be unsightly and does not match what is currently there.