

MINUTES
GLYNN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
August 19, 2003 - 5:30 P.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Perry Fields, Chairman
Mike Aspinwall
Jay Kaufman
Ann McCormick
Gary Nevill
Robert Ussery

ABSENT: Jonathan Williams

STAFF PRESENT: York Phillips, Planning Manager
Carolynn Segers, Planner II
Janet Loving, Admin/Recording Secretary

Chairman Perry Fields called the meeting to order and the invocation was given, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance. He then gave a brief recap of the rules, voting procedure and audience participation in discussing agenda items.

Upon a motion made by Ms. Ann McCormick and seconded by Mr. Gary Nevill, the August 19, 2003 agenda was approved and unanimously adopted.

Before staff's presentation on the proposed ordinance amendments, Chairman Fields advised that everyone would have an opportunity to comment either individually or via spokesperson. He explained that he does not want the hearing to turn into an "us versus them" type debate because this is an ordinance that affects all of Glynn County. Chairman Fields stressed that he wants to afford everyone a chance to speak. He then called for the first item as follows:

GC-2002-ZT10

An Amendment to the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance, Article III, Section 302, definition of "Building Height," Article V, Section 502, to remove the limitation on habitable stories; and for other purposes.

In a memorandum addressed to the Planning Commission, Mr. York Phillips explained that this issue has been discussed on a number of occasions. In late 2002, the Planning Commission sent to the Board of Commissioners a proposal consisting of a revised definition of "building height" and a recommendation that Section 502 be revised to delete the reference to the number of "habitable floors." The Board of Commissioners was to have considered the amendment at a public hearing on January 23rd but returned the proposal to the Planning Commission for additional study.

At the April 1st Planning Commission meeting, staff was advised to prepare an amendment for discussion. It was explained that the amendment is to establish the height definition as the higher of (a) ground level or (b) the FEMA base flood elevation up to an elevation of 14 ft. MSL. The amendment was included in the packages for review and copies were distributed to the audience.

At the end of staff's presentation, Chairman Fields opened the floor for discussion and public comment.

Attorney Jim Gilbert of St. Simons Island stated that he has had some experience over the years in trying to work with the existing ordinance. He stated that it is especially problematic when dealing with the historic overlay. He stated that he has also seen some very difficult puzzles unraveled because the ordinance is confusing and inconsistent in most areas. However, today's proposed language is very clear, definitive and is not subject to much interpretation. It gives everybody the same place from which to measure. Mr. Gilbert stated that he supports this proposal and feels that it should be approved.

Mr. Joe McDonough of St. Simons Island stated that he is here only to commend the Planning Commission on bringing clarity to an ordinance that he vehemently spoke against when the issue was previously reviewed. He stated that the Planning Commission has done an excellent job. The proposed language gives us a place to work from and everybody is on a leveled playing ground.

Mr. Jeffery Counts with Driggers Construction Company stated that the Driggers Company owns property in Glynn County, St. Simons Island and the City of Brunswick. He stated that the proposal is a very clear and concise change to the ordinance and it puts everybody working from the same point. He stated that he was disappointed in seeing it capped at 14 ft. but it is reasonable and affects very few people. Mr. Counts stated that he is thankful that it has come this far along and maybe now everybody can move on and work on some of the other proposed amendments.

Mr. Todd Brooks, a resident of St. Simons, stated that he is also representing the Hamby Corporation, Coast Cottages and the Villas of Coast Cottages. Mr. Brooks stated that he is in support of the ordinance as written. He stated that it is very clear and easy to interpret and should be adopted. He commends staff for the proposal and stated that it will allow for architectural creativity and quality building. Mr. Brooks noted for the record that Mr. Larry Evans also supports the amendment as written.

Mr. Buzzy Ramsey, Glynn County resident, stated that when FEMA was introduced to this area he was on the Building Code of Appeals Board. FEMA at that time caused a lot of havoc with Blythe Island and St. Simons Island residents. He stated that he supports this proposal and feels that it should be adopted as written.

Mr. Royce Hobbs, resident of St. Simons Island and President of the Golden Isles Homebuilders, stated that this amendment is a good proposal and he supports it.

Mr. Glenn Lewis of St. Simons Island stated that he does not have a vested interest in developing anything in the Resort Residential Zoning, but he is a realtor and Chairman of the Governmental Affairs Committee. Speaking for himself, he stated that he supports the proposed amendment as written.

Mr. Larry Bryson, local architect, stated that he represents several clients who have invested concerns with the outcome of this amendment. He stated that he and his clients support the amendment as recommended and request that it be approved. He further stated that from the standpoint of an architect, this proposal allows them to regain something that was lost in 1989 when FEMA was imposed, which is height in structures and aesthetic value.

At this time, Mr. Robert Ussery stepped to the podium to make his comments. He stated that when the Flood Ordinance was introduced, builders and architects were very concerned that we had lost something that we'd had for a long time. Since then, he stated that we have been saddled with the effort of trying to build something in a smaller building envelope. He agrees that we need something; we need additional height. However, he is concerned with overdoing it.

Mr. Ussery explained that we have a community standard that we have been working with for a number of years, and we have made it work. He stated that he would like to see some relief, especially in the low areas, but perhaps the 14 ft. benchmark may be a little over-stated. That benchmark raises building heights, especially in marsh areas, as much as 7 ft. Typically as a practicing architect, he stated that he has never really needed that much. He felt like if he had 3 ft. or 4 ft. in the low areas, he could make the roof work. He stated that he would like to see something with just a little lower benchmark. Instead of 14 ft. he would prefer a 12 ft. benchmark, which he stated would give them 5 additional feet to work with on a marsh front lot. He stated that overall, there would not be evidence of a big difference and it would go a long way to helping those who lost square footage or buildable envelopes in the low areas. Regarding Section 502, Mr. Ussery stated that rather than using the phrase three (3) habitable floors he would prefer to the phrase four (4) stories.

Chairman Fields disagreed with Mr. Ussery regarding the 7 ft. He stated that the elevation difference is 2 ft. In essence, what we are saying is that if the majority of Glynn County's flood plain was 12 ft., he would agree. However, the majority of the flood elevation in Glynn County is an AE-14 and this applies countywide. Therefore, the most impacted are the people who live in an AE-14 zone who don't have a 14 ft. elevation. The greatest good goes to the 14 ft. as oppose to the 12 ft. He emphasized that this is a countywide ordinance. Mr. Ussery stated that the only thing that troubles him is having to totally rely on FEMA. He feels that our ordinance should stand alone, with or without FEMA. He stated that there could come a time when FEMA either decides to change or modify their maps and we would not have anything to say about it. This could in essence change the way we measure height. Chairman Fields stated if that were to happen, it could be addressed at that time.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Gary Nevill to recommend approval of the proposed amendment as submitted. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jay Kaufman. Discussion continued.

Mr. Mike Aspinwall and Ms. Ann McCormick were both in favor of the 12 ft. as recommended by Mr. Ussery. Mr. Nevill stated that with the 14 ft., property owners would be getting back what FEMA took away.

After discussion, the following vote was taken. Voting Aye: Mr. Perry Fields, Mr. Jay Kaufman and Mr. Gary Nevill. Voting Nay: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Ms. Ann McCormick and Mr. Robert Ussery. The motion failed due to a tie vote. Discussion continued followed by a new motion made by Mr. Robert Ussery to recommend using the base elevation of 12 ft. MSL from which to measure. Also, change the language in Section 502 regarding height from three (3) habitable floors to four (4) stories. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mike Aspinwall. Discussion continued.

Ms. Ann McCormick stated she feels that the language in Section 502 should remain as it currently reads (three habitable floors). Mr. Ussery stated that with commercial structures, the Flood Ordinance currently allows things to be placed below the flood elevation; it allows a floor below the flood elevation. He stated that the ordinance should recognize that. Changing three habitable floors to four stories recognizes that fact. He stated that this change would eliminate "habitable" as a term in the ordinance and changing it to four stories would include levels below the flood elevation. However, Ms. McCormick stated that if we strike the three habitable floors it puts no limitation on it at all. She stated that it should remain as currently written with strike through lines, and she would like to offer that as an amendment to Mr. Ussery's motion. Mr. Ussery stated he would have no problem with that, and he accepted the amendment.

To recap the motion, Chairman Fields stated that the amendment is that the vertical height of the building shall be measured from the average natural grade or from 12 ft. MSL, whichever is greater, and delete the reference to FEMA.

During the course of discussion, Mr. Joe McDonough stated that FEMA impacted everybody negatively and without giving a lot of thought to what they were doing. He

stated that with the proposed amendment we are finally regaining what we lost, and to propose 12 ft. in lieu of 14 ft. does not make sense in the grand scheme of things. He then asked the Planning Commission to please reconsider and give them the 14 ft. to work with. Mr. Todd Brooks agreed with Mr. McDonough and asked that the proposal remain at 14 ft.

After discussion, the following vote was taken on Mr. Ussery's motion: Voting Aye: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Ms. Ann McCormick and Mr. Robert Ussery. Voting Nay: Mr. Perry Fields, Mr. Jay Kaufman and Mr. Gary Nevill. The motion failed due to a tie vote. It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to forward both recommendations to the Board of Commissioners acknowledging that they both failed for lack of a majority vote.

GC-2002-ZT11

An Amendment to the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance, Article VI (General Provisions), Section 619 (Site Plan Approval), Subsection 619.2 (Requirements), Subsection 619.4 (Review and Approval of the Site Plan), Subsection 619.7 (Maximum Water Limits), Subsection 619.8 (Enforcement), and Subsection 619.9 (Fee) to provide additional requirements regarding water usage and review requirements for projects located within Limited Industrial, General Industrial and Basic Industrial zoning districts.

Mr. Phillips explained that this amendment was referred to the Planning Commission by the Board of Commissioners in August 2002. The Planning Commission held a workshop and a formal public hearing to discuss the proposal. It was the Planning Commission's recommendation that this amendment not be adopted at this time. The Board of Commissioners referred the matter back to the Planning Commission for additional study.

In addition to its own review, the Planning Commission referred the proposal to the Water Resources Management Advisory Committee. No formal report or recommendation was received from the committee.

As written, the amendment is intended to: 1) provide additional information to the Planning Commission when it considers a site plan in an Industrial Zoning District where the development will use more than 100,000 gallons of water per day; 2) provide for an impact analysis when determined to be necessary by the Planning Commission and/or Board of Commissioners; and 3) require the review of a revised site plan when there is an increase in water use.

During the course of discussion, it was the consensus that the Planning Commission does not have the expertise or qualifications to make a recommendation on this issue. Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Gary Nevill stating that there is no justification for action at this time and therefore the Planning Commission recommends that no such ordinance be adopted. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mike Aspinwall and unanimously adopted.

GC-2003-16

Application by J. Thomas Whelchel, agent for the Estate of Mittie B. Hendrix, to rezone from R-6 Residential to GC General Commercial property located at 2010-2012 Demere Road and consisting of 27,000 sq. ft. with 200 ft. frontage along Demere Road.

Mr. Thomas Whelchel was present for discussion.

The staff's report was included in the packages for review and was presented by Mrs.Carolynn Segers as follows:

This request is to change zoning to permit uses appropriate for the building. The current building is the former location of the Glynn Arts Association. This non-conforming use has ceased more than 12 months and, therefore, re-establishment of a non-conforming use is prohibited under Section 607.2. The proposed use is as a heating and air conditioning shop, and redevelopment of the property is not anticipated. The character of the area is mixed use, with residential uses to the east and southeast.

The site was developed as an art school and gallery prior to a major zoning map update in 1966, at which time the property was designated R-6. During the creation of the electronic zoning map, a mapping error was created which depicted this and other adjacent properties as GC General Commercial. On more than one occasion in recent months, staff identified the property as GC zoning to the owner and others. A corrected copy of the paper zoning map and the electronic map was included in the packages for review. It is staff's understanding that the official zoning map is the paper map, and the electronic map is only a representation.

Adjacent property to the north is zoned HC Highway Commercial and developed as a convenience store. Across Demere Road to the west and southwest is Malcolm McKinnon Airport. To the east and northeast is R-6 residential zoning.

Zoning applications have been filed for adjacent properties to the southeast, located at 2000 and 2006 Demere Road, requesting a change from R-6 to OC Office Commercial.

The future land use map indicates this area as low-density residential. The subject property is located approximately 500 ft. from the end of the primary runway for the airport, and places the property within the approach zone. Development in this area is subject to Article 13 Airport Zoning Ordinance. Section 1306.2 states the following uses are prohibited in any approach or transitional zone: 1) Churches, schools, theaters and other places of public assembly; 2) Multi-family dwellings in excess of 4 units; 3) Hospitals and other institutions; 4) Any other similar uses where concentrations of people are customary. A number of permitted uses under GC General Commercial would not be permitted under Section 1306.2. Height limit under zoning is sufficient for FAA regulations for this property (FAA regulations limit the height to approximately 50 ft.).

The proposed use does not anticipate redevelopment of the property. In lieu of a general layout plan, the applicant has submitted a survey showing the existing layout of buildings on the site. In the event that the property is redeveloped, GC General Commercial allows minimum lot size of 1,875 sq. ft., no front side or rear setbacks, a 25 ft. lot width and a 45 ft. maximum building height. Given the property size and dimension, the property could be subdivided into as many as 8 lots. In comparison, Highway Commercial zoning limits lots to 6,000 sq. ft., 25 ft. front setback with 7 ft. side and rear setbacks, 60 ft. lot width and a 35 ft. maximum building height. In comparison, HC zoning would permit no more than 3 lots.

Both Highway Commercial and General Commercial would permit the proposed use, however Highway Commercial would permit more uses that would be less compatible with an adjacent residential area. Development standards for Highway Commercial are more restrictive regarding lot sizes and setbacks.

Traffic access along Demere Road has been established. It should be noted that commercial traffic to the subject property should be limited along the rear alley. Re-development of the property will require site plan review by the Planning Commission, and compliance with current development standards, including parking requirements, buffers protecting adjacent residential uses, and curb cuts.

In conformance with Section 1103 of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance, the following findings of fact were considered in making the recommendation:

- Whether the zoning proposal will permit a use that is suitable in view of the use and development of adjacent and nearby property.

Generally yes, since the property has been developed since the mid-1960s and the proposed use does not anticipate redevelopment of the property.

- Whether the zoning proposal will adversely affect the existing use or usability of adjacent or nearby property.

Unlikely, given the proposed use and renovation of the existing structure. Redevelopment of the property, however, should respect the safety needs of the airport approach zone and the residential character of adjacent property to the east.

- Whether the property to be affected by the zoning proposal has a reasonable economic use as currently zoned.

Yes, however this is somewhat limited by the current development.

- Whether the zoning proposal will result in a use, which will or could cause an excessive or burdensome use of existing streets, transportation facilities, utilities, or schools.

Under the current proposal, no. Future development, however, should respect the safety needs of the airport approach zone and the residential character of adjacent property to the east.

- Whether the zoning proposal is in conformity with the policy and intent of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

The future land use map identifies this area as low-density residential.

- Whether there are other existing or changing conditions affecting the use and development of the property which give supporting grounds for approval or disapproval.

No.

The proposed use is appropriate for the site since it will generate less traffic than retail or similar uses, will operate during traditional business hours, and may utilize the existing structure, which will lessen a change in character for the area.

The proposed zoning provides for some uses that may be less appropriate for adjacent residential areas, and some of these uses are prohibited by Article XIII. Additionally, Highway Commercial zoning has more restrictive development regulations, but permits a number of uses which are much less suitable adjacent to residential uses, particularly open yard sale of merchandise.

The proposed zoning will also provide for uses appropriate to the existing building, and would remove the non-conforming status of the building, which was created in 1966. Staff's recommendation is for approval with the following conditions:

1. Airport Commission approval is required for any site plan under review by either Planning Commission or staff.
2. Minimum Front Yard Setback of 25 ft. from Demere Road consistent with adjacent HC zoning to the north.

The Planning Commission was of the opinion that Highway Commercial would be a better zoning classification for this particular property. Mr. Whelchel indicated that he would not have a problem with changing the zoning classification. Chairman Fields asked staff if the Planning Commission could consider the HC zoning at this time. Mrs. Segers replied no because this would not be considered a down zoning. The request would have to be re-advertised due to the intensity of the zoning classification.

Mr. Mike Aspinwall expressed concerns about the number of lots that could go in with the zoning. Chairman Fields stated that the area is too crowded to have 8 units. He suggested a deferral to a time certain in order to consider a rezoning to Highway Commercial rather than General Commercial. The Planning Commission concurred; however, the applicant agreed to withdraw the request at this time and confer with staff on a resubmittal of a more appropriate zoning classification.

PP-2003-0624-1145 The Lakes, Phase I

Request by MLS Enterprises for preliminary plat approval for a 45-lot subdivision located to the west of US 82 approximately one-mile northwest of its intersection with US 17 and SR 303.

Mr. Greg Lee was present for discussion.

In presenting the staff's report, Mr. Phillips explained that the total property contained in this 45-lot subdivision is approximately 176 acres, although only approximately a quarter to a third of the site is proposed to be subdivided.

The property is accessed from US 82 and Baumgartner Road, which is a public road. Sewer service is not available. Water is not available at this time, although the county is developing plans to provide water along US 82. The applicant has requested a variance from the requirement for connecting to county water and sewer under Sections 606.1 and 606.2 of the Glynn County Subdivision Regulations. That request is pending the Board of Commissioners consideration.

The bulk of staff's comments (which was included in the packages) will be addressed during the construction plan review phase.

Staff's recommendation is for approval subject to approval of the water and sewer variance from the Board of Commissioners.

Ms. Ann McCormick was concerned about the name of the entrance road not coinciding with the name of the subdivision. Mr. Phillips pointed out that the GIS Department, who is responsible for this subject matter, reviewed the plans but did not state an objection that he is aware of. However, he would check back with them on the issue.

Chairman Fields thanked staff for including the plat review comment form from the Glynn County Environmental Health Department.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Ms. Ann McCormick to approve this request subject to the Board of Commissioners' approval of the water and sewer variance as recommended by staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gary Nevill and unanimously adopted.

PP-2003-0716-1530 Buckmeadow Plantation

Request by Richard McKinna Inv., LLC, for preliminary plat approval for a 61-lot subdivision located on the west side of the Norfolk Southern Railroad, south of the former crossing of old SR 99 (old CR 22) approximately 1, 300 ft. south of SR 99 and 4,000 ft. east of US 341 (Jesup Road).

Mr. Richard McKinna and Mr. Ray Richard were present for discussion.

Mr. Phillips explained that the total property contained in this 61-lot subdivision is approximately 45.83 acres. The property is accessed from US 341 by way of Grants Ferry Road, which was old SR 99. A portion of the right-of-way of old SR 99 exists within this property and is currently pending an abandonment request. Sewer and water service is not available. The applicant proposes to use individual septic tanks and to develop a private central water system. The applicant has requested a variance from the requirement for connecting to County water and sewer under Sections 606.1 and 606.2 of the Glynn County Subdivision Regulations. That request is pending Board of Commissioners consideration.

The staff comments (included in the packages for review) have been addressed or will be addressed during the construction plan review phase.

Staff's recommendation is for approval subject to approval of the water and sewer variance from the Board of Commissioners, and subject to the abandonment of the right-of-way for old SR 99.

Following review, a motion was made by Mr. Gary Nevill to approve this request subject to staff's recommendation. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jay Kaufman and unanimously adopted.

PP-2003-0716-1630 Ocean Road at Ocean Forest
Request by Sea Island Coastal Properties, LLC for preliminary plat approval for the relocation and extension of a portion of Ocean Road.

Mr. Bill Edenfield was present for discussion.

Mr. Phillips explained that this subdivision involves the relocation and extension of a private street previously approved and platted. The total property involving the street relocation and extension contains approximately 1.432 acres.

The street in question extends north from Forest Road off Oglethorpe Drive and Sea Island Drive at the north end of Sea Island. The existing street serves a series of dwellings known as "Ocean Cottages" along the coast. The proposed extension would relocate and extend the road a short distance to the north.

Mr. Phillips stated that staff's recommendation is for approval.

Following a brief discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Robert Ussery to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ann McCormick and unanimously adopted.

PP-2003-0717-1200 Lexington Place, Phase II
Request by The Regency Group for preliminary plat approval for a 62-lot subdivision on 35.45 acres located to the east of I-95 and north of Lexington Place, Phase I, approximately 2,000 ft. to the northwest of Harry Driggers Boulevard.

Mr. Phillip Jackson was present for discussion.

Mr. York Phillips explained that this subdivision is a continuation of Lexington Place, Phase I, which is under development immediately to the south. Another future phase would lie to the north of this development and would be immediately south of the south end of the PAWS tract. To the east is a low area, beyond which are Phases I and II of Hardwood Forest Subdivision. I-95 is located to the west of the property.

Staff's comments were included in the packages for review and have been addressed or will be addressed during the construction plan review process. Staff's recommendation is for approval.

Following review, a motion was made by Mr. Gary Nevill to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Robert Ussery and unanimously adopted.

SP-2003-0415-1600 Frederica Storage

Request by Larry Bryson, agent for Jim Watson for approval of a site plan for a climate controlled storage facility located on the southeast side of Sylvan Boulevard, approximately 150 ft. south of its intersection with Sylvan Drive.

Mr. Larry Bryson was present for discussion.

Mr. Phillips pointed out that the area is commercial and industrial in nature and a number of commercial buildings nearby have been renovated in recent times. Staff has worked extensively with the applicant and his architect to address some site design issues, which have been resolved.

Mr. Phillips stated that staff's recommendation is for approval.

Following a brief discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Robert Ussery to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gary Nevill and unanimously adopted.

SP-2003-0806-1300 Sea Island Transportation Facility

Request by Bill Edenfield, agent for Sea Island Company, for approval of a site plan for a transportation service and support facility as part of the Sea Island Support Campus located to the north of Sea Island Causeway, west of its intersection with Frederica Road.

Mr. Bill Edenfield was present for discussion.

Mr. Phillips explained that the transportation facilities currently include a data processing center, staff remote parking and the child care center now under construction. It is located on the north side of the complex, adjacent to a commercial and industrial area along Sylvan Boulevard.

Staff had previous concerns about the drainage system in relation to spills at the fueling station; however, those concerns have been resolved and staff's recommendation is for approval.

Following review, a motion was made by Mr. Gary Nevill to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mike Aspinwall and unanimously adopted.

MINUTES

Regular Meeting: August 5th

Upon a motion made by Mr. Jay Kaufman and seconded by Mr. Gary Nevill, the Minutes of the August 5, 2003 Planning Commission meeting were approved and unanimously adopted.

CHAIRMAN ITEMS

a) Election of Vice Chairman

The floor was open for nominations. Mr. Robert Ussery nominated Mr. Gary Nevill for the office of Vice Chairman; however, Mr. Nevill declined the nomination. Ms. Ann McCormick then nominated Mr. Robert Ussery. There were no other nominations from the floor and by a unanimous vote, Mr. Robert Ussery was elected Vice Chairman of the Planning Commission for the remainder of 2003.

b) Planning Commission Items

Chairman Fields stated that although this category (**Planning Commission Items**) is for information purposes requiring no official action, he has been told once again that it is listed on the agenda inappropriately. Therefore, if no one objects, he would like to forward a letter on behalf of the Planning Commission to the County Attorney requesting a response as to how this item should be labeled on the agenda. The Planning Commission concurred with the Chairman.

At this time, Chairman Fields asked Mr. Phillips to look into the possibility of staff making a power point presentation at the meetings to avoid reading the staff's report in its entirety. This would save time and it would also allow the audience to follow along with what is listed in the Planning Commission packages. Mr. Phillips concurred.

Under **Staff Items**, a calendar of ordinance amendments was included in the packages for review. Chairman Fields expressed concerns about the language proposed in the Minor Plat/Re-subdivision Process Amendment, Section 802. Mr. Phillips stated that he would re-visit the language to ensure that the intent is clear. Chairman Fields stated that he does not want the County Commission voting on something that the Planning Commission did not send to them. Mr. Phillips stated that he would try to work this out before Thursday's Commission meeting.

During the course of discussion, it was made clear that if the County Attorney suggests or makes any changes in the language of this amendment, Mr. Phillips would bring the item back to the Planning Commission for another review before forwarding it to the County Commission.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.