

MINUTES

ISLANDS PLANNING COMMISSION JANUARY 19, 2010 - 6:00 P.M. The Casino Bldg, 530 Beachview Drive, SSI

MEMBERS PRESENT: Preston Kirkendall, Chairman
Desiree Watson, Vice Chairman
John Dow, Jr.
Patricia Laurens
William Lawrence
Paul Sanders
Joan Wilson

STAFF PRESENT: David Hainley, Community Development Director
York Phillips, Planning Manager
Iris Scheff, Planner III
Paul Andrews, Assistant County Engineer
Janet Loving, Admin/Recording Secretary

Chairman Preston Kirkendall 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.

MINUTES

December 15, 2009 Regular Meeting

A motion was made by Mr. Paul Sanders to approve the Minutes of the December 15th Regular Meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Patricia Laurens and unanimously adopted.

ZM1728 Wilson Creek

Consider a request to rezone from Forest Agriculture (FA) and Conservation Preservation (CP) to Planned Development (PD), property consisting of 28.820 acres located on the west side of Hampton Point Drive, approximately 1,200 feet south of its intersection with Rice Mill. The property contains 23.212 acres of upland and 5.608 acres of wetlands. The proposed project would provide for a maximum of 54 single-family dwellings and supporting uses. Parcel ID: 04-09794 (part). Robert Ussery, agent for North End Partners, LLC, owner.

Mr. Robert Ussery and Mr. Frank DeLoach were present for discussion.

The following report from staff was included in the packages for review and was presented by Mr. Phillips:

This site is shown in the Islands Future Development Area on the adopted Comprehensive Plan, and is designated as appropriate for “single family residential development” and “master planned resort communities.”

The proposed development is consistent with the pattern of development for the area, specifically lower density single-family residential uses. (There is residential development to the north and south.) It is also consistent with the adopted Comprehensive Plan and Future Land Use Map and it will not adversely affect the overall character of the area. The development will be supported by available infrastructure.

In reviewing the proposed planned development text, staff noted some minor wording issues; however, these have been resolved in a revised text. These issues involved specifications for signage and for the buffer along Hampton Point Drive, as well as the clarification about the marsh boundary noted by engineering staff. Engineering had a number of other technical and design comments, which can primarily be resolved through the subdivision review process.

This project will generate approximately 540 daily trips and will have access from Hampton Point Drive. The traffic count for Hampton Point Drive for 2002 was 1,200 and the projected count for 2030 is 2,300. Additionally, engineering notes that a deceleration lane will need to be provided and the entrance will need to be coordinated with the pedestrian trail being constructed along the street.

The site is served by public water and sewer facilities.

Based on current county averages, the project will generate 30 school age children.

In conformance with Section 1103 of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance, the following findings of fact are to be considered in making a decision on a request for rezoning:

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

The proposed use is consistent with the development of nearby property.

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

No.

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

Yes.

- 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.

No. Infrastructure is in place to support the development.

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

Yes.

- 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.

Mr. Phillips stated that staff recommends approval of application **ZM1728** to rezone from Forest Agriculture and Conservation Preservation to Planned Development, together with the planned development text and master plan.

Mr. Dow had questions about approving the text as part of the zoning. Mr. Phillips explained that the master plan and the text are part of the rezoning. The master plan is generalized. The concept plan is a representation of what might occur and is not up for approval at this time. Mr. Phillips stated that the Planning Commission is being asked to approve the density, which is not to exceed the total number of units. Mr. Dow had questions about the discrepancy in the maximum dwelling units listed by staff and that of the applicant. Mr. Phillips explained that he calculated the 2.33 units based on the gross acreage of the upland area. The 3 units per acre listed in the applicant's text might have come about by calculating the lot areas exclusive of roads, etc.

Mr. Dow expressed additional concerns about the banked mailboxes, specifically the 54 mailboxes in the right-of-way. He wanted to know if this is something new being required by the county or is it part of the applicant's marketing strategy. Mr. Hainley explained that in an effort to limit deliveries, the postal service is using this type of collection of mailboxes in all types of facilities. They started with apartments and condominiums and now they're requiring mailboxes to be banked in this manner in subdivisions. The applicant is not being compelled to put the mailboxes in a certain area but the probability is that the facility will have to be located in a certain way unless changed by the postal service. In other words, it doesn't have to be located on Hampton Point drive but somewhere within the facility. The postal service prefers that the banks of mailboxes be one of the first things you get to within the subdivision. Mr. Dow wanted to know if this would require an amendment to the Subdivision Regulations. Mr. Hainley replied no, but the house numbering code in the general Code of Ordinance may have to be altered.

Mr. William Lawrence stated that in order to help formulate plans and make sound decisions, is it possible to get current or updated information on the ADT's. Mr. Hainley replied yes. He stated that staff is in the process of developing the Long-Range Transportation Plan and have conferred with GA DOT on issues about actual traffic counts in relation to what the current model shows. Staff will receive a new model with current counts in areas around the county.

For clarification, Ms. Joan Wilson asked Mr. Hainley if he is saying that what the Planning Commission is being asked to approve tonight will allow the developers to put 54 lots on the property in question. Mr. Hainley replied yes, but not necessarily in the configuration shown.

Mr. Dow expressed concerns about the central mail location being too close to the right-of-way as noted in engineering comments, and also the language in "*Development Standards*," Section 2f referencing the DNR approved jurisdictional line. Mr. Phillips explained that the text has been amended to respond to these issues.

Ms. Desiree Watson stated that there appears to be a discrepancy in the acreage. GIS lists the acreage at 29.798 and it's listed elsewhere at 28. Mr. Phillips stated that Mr. Robert Ussery, the agent for this project, has discussed this issue with GIS. Mr. Hainley added that occasionally there are differences between GIS acreage and surveyed acreage. Mr. Phillips stated that he believes staff received a revised plat.

Mr. Ussery clarified that there was a small piece of ground on the northern side of the property that was included in the initial application, which was about an acre of land. However, in the final submission, that particular piece of property was eliminated because it was causing too many problems. When they submitted the application the number was included, which accounts for the 29 acres, but the text and the master plan were amended to reflect what was actually being proposed. They have since amended the application to reflect the master plan and the text.

Regarding the mailbox issue, Mr. Ussery stated that he initially thought that he had everything covered, but at the last minute, the Post Master came back and said, "Oh by the way, you will have a bank of mailboxes at the front gate." Mr. Ussery stated that there wasn't enough space so they really had to try and make it work. He pointed out that it is not intended to be on the right-of-way of Hampton Point Drive. It is intended to be on the drive into the project, which would be the "Wilson Tract." A notation has been included indicating that it could be within the buffer because of the possibility that a piece of the roadway or a piece of the box may end up being in the buffer. His intention is to push it back as far as possible into the property and still meet the Post Master's regulations. Again, he stated that in new neighborhoods the postal service is encouraging banks of mailboxes, as opposed to curb side delivery for every home. Ms. Watson asked if language could be added to reflect that the mailboxes would be sheltered from Hampton Point Drive. Mr. Ussery stated that he would not have a problem inserting language which says "it's not accessible from Hampton Point Drive."

Elaborating on the history of the property, Mr. Ussery stated that in 1995 North End Partners acquired 400 acres from Sea Island Company and they have undertaken several projects on Lawrence Road, i.e., Butler Plantation with 22 lots; 5 to 10 acres in size. Another project was Stillwater with 100 lots at three quarters of an acre in size. There was also a rezoning for a project approximately a year ago (which has not been started yet) known as 30 Hampton Point Drive. Those lots were approved for R-12 at 12,000 square feet.

Mr. Ussery stated that in all of these developments they have tried to have different offerings for different sorts of people because not everyone wants an estate size lot. Some people might prefer a smaller lot with a marsh view. This particular "Wilson Creek Tract" fills that slot. The density is 3 dwelling units per acre and this is after removal of the roads, the marsh, the wetlands and everything. The gross acreage that Mr. Phillips referred to is when you take the entire tract of uplands and divide it into the number of lots, which is then calculated as 2.33. The numbers are not inconsistent; it's just a different way of looking at the same thing.

Mr. Ussery stated that the 3 lots per acre is more in-keeping with what you will actually see in terms of lot size. The average lot size will be approximately 1/3 of an acre. He stated that they considered the possibility of smaller lots because of the unusual shape of the property and he feels that the zoning is consistent. Therefore, he is soliciting the Planning Commission's approval of this request.

Mr. Lawrence had questions about the type of buffer being considered in this development. Mr. Ussery stated that he had written in a 50 ft. buffer on Hampton Point Drive, which would include the county's requirements for a Type A Buffer.

Mr. Dow asked Mr. Ussery for the range of square footage per lot. Mr. Ussery stated that the smallest possible lot will be 9,000 square feet. There are a couple of lots that would be over an acre. Mr. Paul Sanders asked if the average lot is proposed at 14,520 square feet. Mr. Ussery replied yes.

At this time the floor was opened for public comment. Several area homeowners spoke in opposition to this request. Their main concerns were smaller size lots compared to most other north end residential developments and the negative impact that this would have on their property. Concern was also expressed about wetlands mitigation and traffic.

Mr. Larry Lamattina of 131 Rice Mill stated that over the last four to five years density in the area has increased. Condominiums have been built and most of the units have not sold. He stated that the concept of expanding the available building sites does not make economic sense for the developer or for the homeowners. He is asking that this request be denied.

Mr. Joe DeFoe of 136 Montrose Street stated that this type of development would decrease the property value in the area. Also, he feels that the developer has an obligation to explain the impact that this proposal would have on adjacent property. He stated that there is no need for more development space; "what's the hurry." Mr. Anthony Zirpoli of 954 Champney Street agreed and added that the density changes the nature of the development.

Ms. Claire Campbell of 907 Champney Street stated that there are approximately 77 homes currently on the market on St. Simons. There is no need for additional homes in this price range. She also expressed concerns about traffic.

Mr. Don Young stated that on behalf of RUPA and its Board of Directors, he is opposed to any variances from the ordinance. Additionally, he does not see the need to change the zoning.

Ms. Janice Lamattina of 131 Rice Mill expressed concerns about the entrance to the development being closed to the intersection of Hampton Drive, Rice Mill and other subdivisions. She stated that the intersection is not well designed and suggested that the county may need to re-configure the lanes at the intersection. She further stated that the influx of additional cars could cause more problems and make things worse for the roads as well as jeopardize their safety. Ms. Lamattina stated that there is no need to rezone property just because somebody wants to. "At what point do we stop changing the zoning."

In a brief rebuttal, Mr. Ussery stated that they are not covering up any wetlands at all in this project. There are wetlands within the area but they are Jurisdictional Wetlands and not DNR Marsh Wetlands. He stated that the schematic plan does not include the development of the Corps of Engineers Jurisdictional Wetlands. Regarding the timeline for development, Mr. Ussery stated that if they were to start today with this development it would be a minimum of two years before they could actually sell a lot. There is still a lot of work to do and just because there might not be a reason for this development today doesn't mean there won't be a reason in the future. He stated that this is long-range planning; they're planning ahead, which is what a prudent developer would do.

Regarding the comment about changing the zoning, Mr. Ussery pointed out that this property has always been zoned Forest Agricultural and to his knowledge, it has not changed. He further stated that the minimum frontage on the lots is 70 ft. as listed in the development text. The schematic plan shows a range from 70 to over 100 ft. The side yard setbacks are per the county regulations. As the developer responds with his covenants and restrictions, those may change but currently the rear setback is 7 ft., 20 ft. on the front and the 25 ft. marshland setback, which impacts practically every lot in the subdivision.

Regarding the concerns about traffic, Mr. Ussery stated that this development will actually be south of the fork in the road and he does not anticipate very many cars from the subdivision going north. Most of the traffic out of the subdivision will be going south away from the intersection.

Mr. Defoe stated that it appears that this development group is associated with the Stillwater group. He then asked why, for just 50 more houses added to the 100 plus that are already in Stillwater, do they deem it necessary to have another entrance onto Hampton Road. He suggested that they share the Stillwater entrance in an effort to mitigate the traffic problem. Mr. Ussery explained that it was the developer's initial desire to have something unique and there is enough distance to merit a separate entrance.

Mr. Paul Sanders wanted to know how the average lot size for the "Wilson Creek Tract" compares with the lots in the Montrose section adjoining this project. Mr. Ussery stated that the lot sizes in Montrose are 6,000 sq. ft. more or less and are practically half the size of the proposed lot sizes. In other words, the proposed lot sizes would be twice as big as the lots in Montrose.

For additional clarification, Chairman Kirkendall explained that because of ownership of adjacent properties, the entrance into Stillwater is not an option. Regarding the comments about changing the zoning, he stated that the property is currently zoned Forest Agricultural, and as such, it allows for 20,000 sq. ft. lots. Today, the property could be developed with no zoning change, and the applicant could have approximately 46 houses on the property. The density is already set at half acre lots. He commented that he does not like the smaller 9,000 sq. ft. lots and would rather see a minimum size of 12,000 sq. ft. with a maximum of 46 to 49 lots instead of 54. Ms. Desiree Watson agreed in terms of the density issue. She doesn't see the 9,000 sq. ft. as being consistent with the low density in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan.

Chairman Kirkendall stated that his other concern is the height. He has a problem with the 45 ft. height unless the lot sizes are kept at Forest Agricultural. Mr. Ussery stated that everything on the north end (Hampton Point, Hampton Plantation, Stillwater, etc.) is 45 ft. in height and he is asking for the same thing that the other developments have. Chairman Kirkendall stated that he concurs if the lot sizes are kept at 20,000 sq. ft.

Mr. Dow pointed out that just because this is the same developer who did two or three other projects, doesn't mean that this particular development should be viewed in the same light. It should be viewed on its own merit. He feels that the days of the larger more expensive lots in the real estate market are gone and he thinks that this developer may be ahead of the game by trying to get these particular size lots ready for when or if the market comes back. Mr. Dow then asked Mr. Ussery how many lots in concept are below 12,000 sq. ft. Mr. Ussery stated that the drawing he submitted was very schematic, but he doesn't think that there are very many. He pointed out that he could get a more accurate measurement and come back with a report on the lot sizes. The developer could possibly be a little more flexible on the number of lots if it would help. Mr. Paul Sanders wanted to know how long it would take to get a more definite plan drawn with exact lot sizes, etc. Mr. Ussery stated that he could have a report in 30 days.

Mr. Frank DeLoach, developer of this project, stated that he tried to do this project as R-12 at 12,000 sq. ft. lots but the property is an odd shape. He stressed that he is not trying to jam as many lots as he can into the real estate. This size lot is a different product than other developments on the north end and it seems to be what the market will be looking for. He stated that the Stillwater lots are three quarters of an acre and they don't need any more at that size.

There being no further comments, a motion was made by Mr. John Dow to defer this item until the February 16th IPC meeting beginning at 6:00 p.m. (to allow the developer to report back with an accurate measurement on the lot sizes.) The motion was seconded by Mr. Paul Sanders and unanimously adopted.

PP1742 Seaside Cottages

Consider approval of a preliminary plat for 5 lots with the smallest lot area of 2,604 square feet on property consisting of 14,315 square feet or 0.33 acre located at a physical address of 310 through 350 First Street on its northeast side, off Ocean Boulevard, St. Simons Island. The property is zoned Resort Residential (RR) and is served by public water and sewer. Parcel IDs: 04-03958 & 04-03959. Ernest Johns of Atlantic Survey Professionals, agent for Mitch Fulmer representing Montgomery Bank & Trust, owners.

Mr. Ernest Johns, Mr. Brian Adamson and Mr. Peter Schoenaur were present for discussion.

The following report from staff was included in the packages and was presented by Mrs. Iris Scheff:

This site is located off Ocean Boulevard on St. Simons Island, in a medium density residential area on the Future Land Use Map. The Comprehensive Plan encourages medium density single family residential uses at four or more dwelling units

per acre with higher densities anticipated for areas such as the subject site with water and sewer service.

The site is substantially developed. This request is intended to coordinate the design and configuration of the proposed lots with the five townhouse buildings soon to be completed.

The preliminary plat meets requirements for the most part in that almost all issues pointed out by staff have been addressed. Minor revisions will be required before the preliminary plat receives the Planning Commission Chairman's signature to be filed.

Engineering requested that drainage easements across the property be shown. One more drainage easement may be needed across the front of the property. A known and calculated source of off-site drainage onto the property will need to be noted and/or depicted. (A comment about possible widening of the right of way was resolved.)

This property is served by First Street, which is classed as a local street, off of Ocean Boulevard, classed as a collector street. This project is expected to produce approximately 50 average daily vehicle trips.

The residential subdivision is served by public water and sewer.

Based on averages, the project will generate three school age children. Generally, sufficient capacity appears to be available in public schools that serve the area, with the exception of the elementary school.

Mrs. Scheff stated that staff recommends approval of the preliminary plat for **PP1742 (I)**, known as "Seaside Cottages," subject to meeting all requirements, with side yard setbacks allowed by variance approval.

Chairman Kirkendall stated that if this is already built and approved, why then is it being presented to the Islands Planning Commission. Mrs. Scheff stated that the property needs to be subdivided, which is another process for making sure that the lots are defined for sale with the townhouses. Mr. Hainley explained that the Islands Planning Commission originally approved this under a site plan. It started out as a site plan rather than a preliminary plat, which he disagrees with. If it had been originally approved as a preliminary plat the members would have seen the 5 lots before they were divided and brought to this stage.

Chairman Kirkendall asked that when this was approved, were the setbacks proper and did it contain the 50% site coverage. Mr. Hainley replied yes. He explained that the variance on the side yard involves an architectural trim. The lot coverage deals with a situation that occurred during the project when there was a different engineer; they poured the area underneath the overhangs that was to remain as dirt. Even though it is not open to the sky it counted as being unpaved. Also when it was originally approved, it had the neo-traditional driveway pads. The current owners, Montgomery Bank,

expressed liability concerns among other issues. It went before the Board of Appeals and was granted the lot coverage change. The Planning Commission's issue deals with the subdivision portion.

For clarification, Ms. Desiree Watson asked if the setbacks and the size of the lot coverage have already been approved. Mr. Hainley replied yes, the Planning Commission is being asked to decide on the division of the lots, which is typically the subdivision process.

Ms. Watson stated that there is an issue on the drawing indicating a proposed detention area, but this is not shown on the plan. Mr. Hainley stated that the proposed detention is an area of depression in the rear yard. It is not a typical pond visible in most subdivisions. Under the ordinance there is a threshold that has to be met before you can have a pond and meet the water resources ordinance. The threshold on the run-off was not met so the applicant is exceeding what is required by ordinance by providing on-site detention.

Mr. Paul Andrews, the Assistant County Engineer, explained that the detention area that was designed on the site is located in the drainage easement along the rear of the property. He requested that it be shown for future reference so that it is known as an area for detention and not just the rights that's usually carried with a drainage easement.

Mr. Bill Hooker stated that he was the original architect of record. He stated that what was originally approved was a row-house project. He was told to scrub the lot lines and make it a row-house condominium with a 20 ft. front yard setback and a 7 ft. side yard setback, which made it a multi-family project without lot lines. When Mr. Hainley came on board, a meeting was held on this project and Mr. Hainley was told by staff that "everything is fine." Mr. Hooker stated that at the Board of Appeals meeting Mr. Hainley stated that there would be lot lines, and he appreciates his efforts. He feels that if this Commission approves something, the public has a right to expect that it be adhered to, rather than changed without coming back to this Commission.

Mr. Hooker agrees with Mr. Andrews that the drainage should be shown on the preliminary plat. The adjacent property owners need a recorded document that they can point to 5 or 10 years down the line when there are drainage problems. They also need to know who will be responsible for maintenance. Since this is now being called a townhouse development, there are individual lots. Therefore, each lot owner would be required to maintain his part of the easement. He reiterated that this needs to be addressed for the adjacent property owners so that they have recourse in the future.

Mr. Hooker stated that the larger problem in this case is that the site has organic soils 4 to 12 feet deep that were never removed. It was required by the structural report to be put back in structural layers with a vibratory roller. He stated that it was never done. Mr. Hooker stated that he alerted the Building Inspections Department on several occasions while the footing preparation was being done and nothing was done. He pointed out that since this is being recorded, he wants to go on record stating that this

issue needs to be addressed so that prospective buyers are protected in the future. He stated that he spoke with Mr. Adamson, the contractor of this project, in November at the Board of Appeals hearing and asked if he was aware of the report, to which he stated no. Mr. Hooker stressed that this is a very critical issue that needs to be resolved before any further work continues.

Mr. Don Myers of 1028 Beachview Drive stated that when it appeared as if the height of this property went beyond the limit, he called Mr. Hainley and asked him to please review the entire project because he thought it was too big for the lot. He stated that he lives in a five unit townhouse project, very similar to this proposed project. He never received a call back from Mr. Hainley.

Mr. Myers stated that since this was initially approved with a 2 ft. wide driveway, without the poured concrete for the patios, why is it still possible to require that there be a 2 ft. path for the car and that it not have the patios so that it is closer to 50%, in excess of 60% of impervious surface. Mr. Hainley stated that this Commission takes what the Board of Appeals granted because they affectively modified the standards to be enforced on this site plan. They in essence granted those requested variances. The Board of Appeals approved the percentage of lot coverage at 63.4 and the architectural trim on the side as part of the variances. Mr. Hainley apologized for not returning Mr. Myers' phone call regarding the height concerns, but he had spoken with him on other issues.

At this time, Mr. Hainley expounded on the height issue. He stated that the height in a flood zone starts from the height of the regulatory flood elevation and in this case it is called an AE14, which means you start from 14 Elevation. The ground in this particular area is a 9; therefore, you start counting 5 ft. up from the side of the building. That's why the mass of the applicant's development is radically different than the adjacent structures. The adjacent structures are under old development standards.

Mr. Myers stated that there had to have been a staff error that brings us to this point. Other staff errors have also been identified. He then asked how could staff errors be brought to an end to the satisfaction of the residents. Mr. Hainley explained that from the time that this project started through the process it switched architects and in the mean time, staff also internally switched processes to a more comprehensive review. He reiterated that he did not agree with the process that this project started through. It was an inherited task and he is trying to make the best of it from everyone's standpoint. Staff is trying to limit the items that give them more flexibility.

Mr. Dow asked if this process would require a sign off at the very end by a registered architect or engineer certifying that what was approved was actually done. Mr. Hainley replied yes. He stated that staff discussed with the current builder that because of the original builder's inspections staff was not involved with a number of inspections. The sign off provision is included in the proposed re-write of the Subdivision Regulations, along with a number of as-built requirements.

Mr. Dow stressed that if he is being asked to approve something, he would like to have all of the documents needed to make a sound decision. The preliminary plat does not show the retention pond. He stated that there are a number of other unanswered questions. For instance, will this development include a homeowners association or will there be individuals acting independent of one another, and if that's the case, how can they be assured that the drainage in the back is going to be maintained by five individuals. Mr. Dow stated that the Planning Commission needs better information and better answers before making a decision on this item. He stated that he would like to see the same information that is required of a site plan.

For the record, Mr. Hainley stated that the ditch in the back of the property has not yet been constructed. Staff is in the process of reviewing drawings from the engineer to enable them to be tasked to put in the drainage facilities. He stated that there will have to be a drainage easement filed in the back and it will have to be to the benefit of all property owners. Mr. Paul Sanders stated that the drainage area should clearly be put on the plat. Ms. Watson agreed, and added that she will not approve something that has a lot of question marks.

At the end of discussion, a motion was made by Mr. John Dow to defer this item with the understanding that it be placed on the February 16th IPC agenda and that the Planning Commission be provided sufficient information consistent with a site plan submission including the retention and all requirements for review so that the approval, if recorded, would reflect exactly what they approved. The motion was seconded by Mr. Paul Sanders and unanimously adopted.

TA1672

Consider an amendment to Section 705 of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance concerning the Resort Residential zoning district; to impose and identify certain uses and development standards for the district; and for other purposes.

The amendment was included in the packages for review and was presented by Mr. Hainley.

During the course of discussion, several changes were suggested by members of the Planning Commission as well as area residents. It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to conduct a workshop to discuss the proposed changes. Chairman Kirkendall advised everyone to submit their comments to Mr. Hainley in writing by February 9th. The proposed amendment and all comments will be reviewed at the next IPC workshop scheduled for February 23rd at 9:00 a.m. in the Harold Pate Building.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.