

MINUTES
GLYNN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 1, 2000 - 9:00 A.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Richard Altman, Chairman
 Lamar Cole, Vice Chairman
 Perry Fields (Late)
 Hal Hart
 Iris Touw
 Jonathan Williams

STAFF PRESENT: Chuck Taylor, Director
 Cindy Olness, Planning Official
 Donna Scott, Planner II
 Deborah Taylor, Zoning Administrator
 Ellis Carter, Building Official
 Buster Reese, Assistant County Engineer
 Ed Halbig, Transportation Planner
 Lee Sutton, Planning Technician
 Janet Loving, Recording/Admin Secretary

Chairman Richard Altman 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.

SUP-1-00

Request for a Special Use Permit in a Freeway Commercial Zoning District for the location of a Telecommunication Tower having a maximum height of 222 ft. above ground; subject property consists of 10,000 sq. ft., having access via easement from the east side of Butler Avenue and generally described as a portion of the southwest quadrant of Exit 7, Interstate 95 and further described as being a portion of property owned by Lighthouse Realty, lying southwest of the I-95 southbound entrance ramp and north of property owned by Motel 6.

SBA, Inc., Applicant

Messrs. Gil McLemore, Buzz Patrick, Byron Smith, John Farley and Thomas Anderson were present for discussion.

The staff's report was included in the packages as follows:

On their web site, www.sbasite.com, the company advertises collocation space on eight towers, in Glynn County, three of which are identified as owned and/or managed by SBA. **(Enclosure 1)** is an inventory of the eight sites, site profiles and a collocation application from the web site. **(Exhibit "V" of the application package disputes this claim)** However, hard data has not been provided by SBA eliminating the possibility of collocating on any of these sites.

(Reference Article XIV, Section 1403.1A, *Glynn County Telecommunications Facilities Ordinance*)

The Planning Official notified SBA of this requirement after reviewing the initial application package on December 20, 1999. A copy of that letter is included, as **(Enclosure 2)**.

SBA is required to notify the FAA because of tower height. The Executive Director of the Glynn County Airport Commission has made this review and a finding of no impact a prerequisite of approving this application. We have received no documentation confirming a finding of no impact. (Reference Exhibit "I" page 6 and Exhibit "J" of the application package)

Should the tower fail a motel and an access ramp to interstate 95 could be affected. Both failures from an equal distance of the height of the tower and 50% of the height indicate this could cause personal injury and/or property damage to occupants of the motel or motorists on the access ramp. Consideration of a site that provides for maximum safety in the event of failure would eliminate this site. (Reference Article XIV, Section 1405.2.3 of the Tower Ordinance)

This application is made on a *disfavored location site*. (Reference Article XIV, Section 1403.2 of the Tower Ordinance)

Ms. Olness stated that staff is recommending denial of this application. SBA, Inc. has been unable to provide adequate documentation confirming that research done proves existing towers and other auxiliary structures do not provide adequate collocation capabilities. The FAA has not provided documentation of a no impact finding. Tower failure at this site could possibly impact a motel and an access ramp to I-95. The impact could result in loss of life and/or property damage to the adjoining properties.

Mr. Byron Smith, Zoning Representative for SBA, gave a brief presentation. He explained that when a client contacts SBA, a company provides SBA with a particular location that will solve their needs and problems. He stated that this site has a need for two purposes: 1) expanded coverage needed to address the demands of the public in Brunswick and Glynn County; and 2) alleviating a deficiency in an overload of frequencies on an existing tower to the east of I-95. Mr. Smith pointed out the area where the tower would be located and stated that the site would give the best results for Alltel, the best coverage and the best solution for eliminating overloaded frequencies. Photographs were presented for review. He then introduced Mr. Thomas Anderson, SBA representative.

Mr. Anderson addressed the zoning aspects of this application and elaborated on why they chose this particular site. He also addressed the criteria that the Planning Commission would use in rendering a decision. Mr. Anderson stated that they have complied with the zoning district suggested by the Ordinance for the location of a tower and they have complied with the setbacks. With respect to the four factors pointed out by staff, he stated that since submitting the application they have obtained a statement from the FAA indicating that the proposed tower would not impact air traffic in the area. The statement was not provided in the initial application but it was forwarded to staff on Friday. Mr. Anderson distributed copies of the two-page statement from the FAA, which addresses the staff's concerns.

Mrs. Iris Touw wanted to know the exact height of the tower and the amount of land leased for the tower. Mr. John Farley, representing Alltel, stated that the height of the tower would be 210 ft. Anytime an object is placed above the height of a tower it has to be cleared by FAA, which means they would be able to put an antenna pole above the height of the tower, not to exceed 222 ft. Regarding the amount of land being leased, Mr. Byron Smith stated that normally, SBA leases a 10,000 sq. ft. area. In this case, because of the curvature of the lot, it is slightly over 10,000 sq. ft.

Mrs. Touw wanted to know that if a building were located on the property next to the applicant's fence, would that off set the ability to have a tower and could they build the tower within 7 ft. of that building. Ms. Olness stated that they would just have to meet the setback requirements at that point and time.

Mr. Hal Hart expressed concerns about safety. He understands that according to the applicant's engineer, if the tower were to break it would break in half. However, Mr. Hart pointed out that some of the tower would fall out of the safety zone. Mr. Farley explained that when a tower breaks at its stressed point, it breaks in the middle, which

means that it would fall over within itself. He stated that it would not fall outside the compound.

Chairman Altman wanted to know how many other carriers would be able to fit on the tower. Mr. Farley stated that a total of four would be able to fit on the tower.

Mr. Jonathan Williams expressed concerns about coverage. He stated that when he is on Jekyll Island he is unable to use his phone. He asked if this proposed tower would help the situation. Mr. Farley stated that he was not aware of any problems on Jekyll. He pointed out that they have just activated a new tower on the south end of Jekyll, but he would drive over and investigate the problem.

Mr. Hart reiterated his concerns about safety in that the tower would be located near a motel. There was a brief discussion about the possibility of moving the tower back 90 ft. from the motel.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mrs. Iris Touw to recommend approval of this request subject to the tower location being moved 21 ft. or ½ the height of the tower from the nearest structure, and subject to any restrictions that DOT might have. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hal Hart. Voting Aye: Mr. Richard Altman, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart, Mrs. Iris Touw and Mr. Jonathan Williams. (Mr. Fields was not in attendance at this time.)

SSVPD/Postell Avenue
Addition to existing residence
Zoned Resort Residential
Wilton F. Davis, Property Owner

Mr. Davis was present for discussion.

The staff's report was included in the packages for review and was presented by Ms. Donna Scott as follows:

The applicant proposes to add a second-story room to an existing structure over the footprint of the carport. The second-story addition will comprise approximately 577 sq. ft. of space on the backside of the structure. The color will remain the same as the rest of the house.

The second-story addition will be done within the first floor footprint. No trees will be removed for this project. The applicant will need to apply for a Building Permit.

Ms. Scott stated that staff is recommending approval of this request.

Following review, a motion was made by Mr. Hal Hart to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams. Voting Aye: Mr. Richard Altman, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart, Mrs. Iris Touw and Mr. Jonathan Williams. (Mr. Fields was not in attendance at this time.)

SSVPD/Sandpiper Studio
Signage, 315 15th Street, southwest corner of
15th Street and Oglethorpe Avenue, Zoned
General Commercial-Core
Ellen Moriarty-Rogers, Applicant

Ms. Moriarty-Rogers was present for discussion.

The staff's report was included in the packages for review and was presented by Ms. Scott as follows:

The applicant is requesting approval to place signage on the front and side of the building of the business, a fine art studio. The sign on the front of the building would be to the left of the front door and would measure 28 inches by 60 inches (7.5 sq. ft.). The second sign would be placed on the right side of the building and would measure 30 inches by 60 inches (12.5 sq. ft.). Lighting will consist of antique gooseneck lamps placed by the signs. The signs are to be made by Fendig Sign Company.

Ms. Scott stated that this application has been reviewed favorably by the Building Official for sign compliance and staff is recommending approval.

Mrs. Touw stated that she looked at the building and she is sure that the signs are in compliance, but the measurements of the building should have been included in the application. In order to make the application more valid, she suggested that this information be included the next time.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Hal Hart to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Iris Touw. Voting Aye: Mr. Richard Altman, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart, Mrs. Iris Touw and Mr. Jonathan Williams. (Mr. Fields was not in attendance at this time.)

**SSVPD/Island Rock Café
303 Mallory Street, Variance-Sign
Zoned General Commercial-Core
Michael S. Teal, Owner**

Mr. Teal was present for discussion.

The staff's report was included in the packages for review and was presented by Ms. Scott as follows:

The applicant is requesting approval to place a small menu on the railing of the restaurant in order for customers to see what types of food Island Rock Café serves. The size of the sign is 11 inches by 17 inches and is covered in Plexiglas. Pictures of the building were included in the packages for review.

The applicant is also requesting a variance from Section 814.5 to:

1. Allow the type of sign as described above instead of "individually painted, cut and mounted letters or raised letters or panels with painted, routed or sand blasted lettering."
2. Allow three signs attached to the exterior of the building instead of two signs.

Ms. Scott stated that staff is recommending approval of this application and recommends sending the variance to the Board of Commissioners with a recommendation for approval.

Mr. Teal gave a brief presentation. He stated that two hardships would be created if this request is not granted. The first one is the fact that a lot of people don't know what his establishment is. The menu shows people that the establishment is a full service restaurant. The second fact is that he plans to extend the restaurant hours to 2:00 a.m. beginning March 1st so that the eating choice would no longer be the Huddle House or the Waffle House.

Mrs. Touw stated that a menu is not a sign. After conducting a survey, she stated that almost every eating establishment in the Village has a menu posted beside the door. If we are going to call a menu a sign, we would have to make all others legal, which gives them extra signs, or if we say they can have three signs, the signs are going to get

larger. Mrs. Touw asked that when the applicant received notice that his menu was a sign, were the other businesses given notice. Ms. Olness stated that it is her understanding that the Code Enforcement Division was citing a number of businesses in the Village. Mrs. Touw stated that she doesn't want to call a menu a sign because this would in turn allow businesses to have three signs. She wants the applicant to have his menu, but she just doesn't think it should be called a sign. Ms. Olness explained that under the Ordinance, we are not allowed to restrict based on content. Mr. Hart stated that perhaps the Ordinance should be changed to reflect menus.

Mr. Williams pointed out that people visiting the Village usually don't know where they're going but they do know what they'd like to do. A menu would help the visitors decide on where and what they'd like to eat. He stated that perhaps we need to examine the idea of changing the menu from a sign to just a menu.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Jonathan Williams to recommend approval of this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hal Hart. Discussion continued.

Mrs. Touw stated that with approval of the variance, the applicant would be allowed to keep his sign up. However, would this mean that staff would not cite anyone else for having a menu? Ms. Olness stated that it is her understanding that Ms. Pittman would still be citing everyone else that is violating the Sign Ordinance. Mrs. Touw stated that in this case, we are actually increasing the signage in the Village because we would not be able to turn down anyone else who came in asking for the same thing.

After discussion, Chairman Altman suggested that item #2 of the applicant's request be changed and that the motion be amended to reflect the change as follows:

- 2) Allow two signs attached to the exterior of the building plus one menu.

The amendment was accepted. Voting Aye: Mr. Richard Altman, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart, Mrs. Iris Touw and Mr. Jonathan Williams. (Mr. Fields was not in attendance at this time.)

**Site Plan/Glynn County Public Safety Complex
Located at the Golden Isles Parkway and Cate
Road, 7.6 Acres, Zoned Planned Development-
General; Glynn County, Applicant**

Police Chief Carl Alexander and Fire Chief Carl Johnson were present for discussion.

The staff's report was included in the packages for review and was presented by Ms. Donna Scott as follows:

This site is a 7.6 acre tract zoned PD-Planned Development. Glynn County proposes to construct a new Public Safety Building and Fire Station at the new realignment of Cate Road and Golden Isles Parkway. There will be a 100 ft. right-of-way along Cate Road and a 200 ft. right-of-way along Golden Isles Parkway.

The site will include 258 parking spaces, fire station and safety building site, water system, sanitary sewer and storm drainage. Parking will include 195 staff parking spaces, 22 secure parking spaces, 35 standard visitor parking spaces and 6 handicap parking spaces which are van accessible.

Glynn County will supply the water and sewer. This project has received approval for an LDA Permit.

Planning & Zoning Division, Building Inspections, Engineering, Environmental Engineering, GIS and the Fire Department, have all favorably reviewed this project.

Ms. Scott stated that staff is recommending approval of this request with the following condition:

1. Fire hydrants must be placed in front of the Safety Complex.

Mrs. Iris Touw wanted to know the square footage of the buildings. Chief Carl Alexander stated that the public safety complex is approximately 35,000 sq. ft. Chief Carl Johnson stated that the fire station is 5400 sq. ft. Mrs. Touw wanted to know if Mr. Ellis Carter would be overseeing the project on behalf of the county. Chief Alexander stated that as a result of the Department Head meeting, Mr. Carter would be playing a big part in overseeing this project.

Mrs. Touw pointed out that the site plan does not meet the requirements for the Planning Commission's approval in that it does not contain the dimensions of the buildings, which is a major factor.

Mr. Hal Hart expressed concerns about parking. He stated that all of the handicap parking spaces appear to be in the visitors parking. He suggested relocating some of the handicap parking back to the employees parking. Also, he hopes that public parking would not be restricted to sheriffs or judges parking. Chief Alexander stated that all of the parking in front of the complex is for public parking. The parking in back of the complex is restricted by an electronic fence, but all employees will be required to park in the back.

Mr. Hart had questions about towers. Chief Alexander stated that the towers would be located in a different area; however, the central 911 center will be located in the building.

Mr. Jonathan Williams wanted to know if there are plans for the City of Brunswick to be tied into the public safety system. Chief Alexander explained that all of the law enforcement agencies (city, county, sheriff's office) along with the Fire Department are combining all of the dispatchers, and all communications will come from the Public Safety Complex.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Hal Hart to approve the Site Plan for the Public Safety Complex. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lamar Cole. Voting Aye: Mr. Richard Altman, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart and Mr. Jonathan Williams. Mrs. Iris Touw abstained from voting due to the site plan not meeting the criteria. (Mr. Fields was not in attendance at this time.)

**Preliminary Plat/Raymond's Grant
5.630 Acres, 23 Residential Lots, Zoned R-6
One-Family Residential, North Harrington
Road, St. Simons Island
Harrington Partners, LTD, Owner/Developer**

Mr. Robert Jenkins and Mr. Ernie Johns were present for discussion.

The staff's report was included in the packages for review and was presented by Ms. Scott as follows:

The applicant proposes to create a 23 lot subdivision. Total area of lots will equal 4.013 acres. Total area of roads will equal 1.429 acres. The smallest lot will be lot 12 at 6,010 sq. ft. The minimum lot size for this zoning class is 6,000 sq. ft.

There is a private 40 ft. right-of-way called Raymond's Grant Trace. An LDA permit is required. The water supply will be via Glynn County Water System and the sewerage disposal will be via Glynn County Sewer.

Ms. Scott stated that the Planning & Zoning Division, Building Inspections, the Fire Department, GIS, Engineering and the Environmental Engineering have all favorably reviewed this project. She stated that staff is recommending approval of this request.

Following review, a motion was made by Mr. Lamar Cole to this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams. Voting Aye: Mr. Richard Altman, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart, Mrs. Iris Touw and Mr. Jonathan Williams. (Mr. Fields was not in attendance at this time.)

OTHER

a) Minutes

A motion was made by Mrs. Iris Touw and seconded by Mr. Hal Hart to approve the Minutes of the January 4, 2000 Planning Commission meeting. Voting Aye: Mr. Richard Altman, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart, Mrs. Iris Touw and Mr. Jonathan Williams. (Mr. Fields was not in attendance at this time.)

b) Authorize Planning Commission Chairman to request that the County Commission grant a 90-day extension, per Section 1101 of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance, regarding establishment of a District 2 Planning Commission.

Chairman Altman explained that the County Commission sent to the Planning Commission, the subject of establishing a second Planning Commission for District 2. However, this was not included on the agenda because there was not enough time allowed for advertising. The Planning Commission is allowed 60 days to respond to a request from the time that the County Commission holds its meeting. Chairman Altman stated that this is not enough time, but until this ruling is changed, he is asking for the authority to write the County Commission Chairman a letter requesting a 90 day extension. He stated that they probably won't need 90 days, but he thought he would err on the side of good judgement to make sure that they have enough time to advertise and hold the public hearing.

Mr. Ralph Jensen stated that if the item could not be placed on the agenda after the agenda had been published, then his question is how did it get on the agenda. Chairman Altman explained that when he asked staff about writing the letter he was advised that he could not write a letter requesting an extension without getting approval from the Planning Commission. He stated that at this time, they are discussing the subject of writing the letter and asking for an extension. They are not discussing the subject of the second Planning Commission.

Mr. Jensen stated that the ordinance allows 60 days for a response, but the Chairman is asking for a 90 day extension, which means 150 days from the time that the County Commission passed the resolution. Chairman Altman stated that he realizes that this is a lengthy extension, but he just wants to allow enough time for the Planning Commission to review and submit a recommendation without having to repeat the process. He stated that he has no reason to delay the subject matter.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Hal Hart authorizing Chairman Altman to write a letter requesting a 90 day extension regarding establishment of a District 2 Planning Commission. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams. Discussion continued.

Mr. Hart stated that perhaps the Chairman should request up to 90 days. Mrs. Touw stated that the review and recommendation could be done within that time frame. Mrs. Marilyn Marsh, RUPA representative, feels that 90 days is excessive. She stated that the public is likely to perceive this as a "stalling tactic," but a request for another 30 days would probably be perceived as being reasonable.

Mr. Hart pointed out that the Planning Commission has not seen anything from the County Commission and therefore we don't know what we are being asked to review. We also don't know if we are being asked to write the proposal, or if the County Attorney or the County Commissioners are going to write the proposal. He stated that the County Commissioners just said "do it." Mr. Jensen explained that the motion at the meeting was to send the proposition for a second Planning Commission to the existing Planning Commission for review. He stated that the existing Planning Commission is being asked to review the establishment of a second Planning Commission.

For clarification, Mrs. Touw explained that the Planning Commission reviews plans or changes to existing ordinances. Therefore, the subject of a second Planning Commission needs to be in the form of an ordinance or amendment and it needs to include items such as, how many members would be on the board; the length of their terms, who would appoint them, etc.

Referring back to Mrs. Marsh's comment regarding the length of the extension, Chairman Altman stated that in lieu of the 90 day extension, he would suggest asking for a 60 day extension from the time that the Planning Commission first receives the actual proposal at their regularly scheduled meeting. The Planning Commission concurred and Mr. Hart's motion was amended to this affect. Voting Aye: Mr. Richard Altman, Mr. Lamar Cole Mr. Hal Hart, Mrs. Iris Touw and Mr. Jonathan Williams. (Mr. Fields was not in attendance at this time.)

After the vote was taken, Chairman Altman asked Mr. Taylor to examine the possibility of making this a standard operating procedure on all items. (The 60 day time period would begin when the item, ordinance or request is formally presented to the Planning Commission at their regular monthly meeting.) Mr. Taylor stated that the ordinance could be amended to specifically include this time frame.

c) Addressing & GIS Operations/Jackie Magnant

Ms. Jackie Magnant, GIS Coordinator, explained the purpose and functions of the Geographic Information Systems (GIS) operations. She stated that the GIS is a computerized map that will allow the user to access, by computer, all information laws about any piece of property in the county. It will show the location of every parcel of property and the centerline of every road in the county. Once this operation is completely functional it will have numerous applications for the fire department, police department and EMS. Using this system, the emergency dispatchers will have rapid access to the exact location from where an emergency call originated, thereby determining the shortest route to the site and dispatching the closest emergency vehicle to the site.

Ms. Magnant pointed out other practical applications for the GIS in other county offices, i.e., Tax Assessors, Planning & Zoning, Water & Sewer, Board of Education, Public Health and Emergency Management for evacuation purposes.

Ms. Magnant stated that the major draw back to getting GIS functional is that the county will have to correct all street address problems. Currently, there are 212 individual address problems in Glynn County that will have to be corrected. The problems include duplicate road names, addresses that are not in numeric sequence and street addresses that still have post office box numbers. The GIS Department is in the process of putting together an Addressing Ordinance that will prohibit duplicate road names, etc. Ms. Magnant briefly outlined the process of getting the ordinance approved. She stated that a draft should be available for review in approximately three months.

Ms. Magnant thanked the Planning Commission for allowing her to explain the basic functions of the GIS operations.

The Planning Commission took a 10 minute recess. The meeting resumed at 11:05 a.m.

d) Basic Tree Care Workshops

Mr. Jeff Michel of the GA Cooperative Extension Service presented a schedule of workshops sponsored by the GA Urban Forest Council, the GA Cooperative Extension Service and the GA Forestry Commission. Dr. Kim D. Coder will present the following topics: Tree Pruning & Young Tree Training; Tree Selection & Planting Techniques; Hazard Tree Evaluation & Storm Damage Assessment; and Tree Protection & Preservation on Construction Sites. Mr. Michel encouraged the Planning Commission and staff to attend the local workshop scheduled for 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, February 8th Room 232, (Cooperative Extension Conference Room.)

e) Comprehensive Plan Strategy

Mr. Taylor stated that at the January meeting, the Planning Commission directed him to revise the Steering Committee membership to allow more participation by non-elected or appointed officials. He then presented the revised plan for the Planning Commission's review and a general discussion followed.

Mrs. Iris Touw stated that Mr. Taylor put a lot of work into this plan and she hopes the it works; however, since she really doesn't understand the details and cannot see this far ahead, she would have to abstain from voting on this item. She stated that she is not against the plan, but she really doesn't understand all of the details. Mr. Perry Fields stated that he would also abstain from voting because he was not present for the entire discussion.

Mr. Hart commented that since there will be changes as the plan moves forward, he would suggest that it be approved as an outline to use as a guide. Mrs. Touw pointed out that the By-laws state that the Planning Commission will develop a Comprehensive Plan, therefore the Planning Commission would have to be involved in some manner all the way through, which is why she doesn't understand how this is going to operate.

Mr. Jonathan Williams expressed concerns about the two abstaining votes. He stated that according to "Roberts Rules of Order," if a person abstains from voting now and the item (in this case the Comprehensive Plan) comes up again, the person abstaining could not take part in the debate or the vote at that time. Mrs. Touw explained that she is abstaining because she doesn't understand how the process is going to work, therefore she can abstain for lack of information. Mr. Fields stated that he is only abstaining

because he did not participate in the full discussion, but he doesn't have to abstain. Mr. Williams stressed that he is merely explaining the operations of "Roberts Rules of Order" as he understands it. He stated perhaps the Planning Commission should seek an explanation from the County Attorney.

At this time, Mr. Fields agreed with Mr. Hart's suggestion that this strategy plan should be approved as an outline. Thereupon, a motion was made by Mr. Fields to re-title the Glynn County Comprehensive Plan Strategy as an outline and present it to the County Commission as such. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams. Voting Aye: Mr. Richard Altman, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Perry Fields, Mr. Hal Hart and Mr. Jonathan Williams. Abstained From Voting: Mrs. Iris Touw.

f) Proposed Amendment/Parking & Lighting

Mr. Taylor gave a brief update of the Parking & Lighting Amendment. He explained that the Planning Commission Sub-Committee is in the process of revising the two amendments. A report will be given as they move forward.

**g) Consider Amending the Glynn County Planning Commission
By-laws and/or Ordinance regarding monthly meetings**

Mrs. Deborah Taylor presented a meeting schedule based on the proposition of conducting two meetings per month. She explained that this information is being presented for consideration only. No action is necessary. Mr. Fields suggested that he and Mr. Hart work as a subcommittee with staff on revising the Planning Commission By-laws to be presented at a later date for the Planning Commission's review.

There was a brief discussion regarding the ordinance and By-laws conflicting with each other. Mrs. Touw stated that if the Planning Commission wants the By-laws to stand, they can initiate an amendment to the ordinance, thereby making the ordinance come into conformance with the By-laws. She stressed that "the Planning Commission has to be strong enough and have enough independence to function independently and objectively."

At this time, Chairman Altman concurred with Mr. Fields' suggestion. (Mr. Fields and Mr. Hart will work as a subcommittee with staff...)

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.