

**MINUTES**  
**MAINLAND PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**JULY 7, 2015 - 6:00 P.M.**  
**Historic Courthouse, 701 G Street**

-----

MEMBERS PRESENT:    Tim Murphy, Chairman  
                             Tom Boland, Sr., Vice Chairman  
                             Larissa Harris  
                             Jeff Homans  
                             Mary Hunt  
                             Gary Nevill  
                             John Williams

STAFF PRESENT:        Cayce Dagenhart, Planner II  
                             Karl Bursa, Planner II  
                             Janet Loving, Admin/Recording Secretary

-----

Chairman Murphy called the meeting to order and the invocation was given, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

-----

MINUTES

**June 2, 2015 - Regular Meeting**

Upon a motion made by Ms. Mary Hunt and seconded by Mr. Tom Boland, the Minutes of the **June 2<sup>nd</sup> Regular Meeting** were approved and unanimously adopted.

-----

**AGENDA - Additions, Deferrals, Deletions, Postponements, Adjustments**

In the essence of time and upon a request from staff, a motion was made by Mr. Tom Boland, seconded by Ms. Mary Hunt and unanimously adopted to rearrange the agenda to hear application **SUP3060** first.

-----

At this time, Chairman Murphy gave a brief recap of the rules, voting procedure and audience participation in discussing agenda items.

-----

**SUP3060 131 Land of Canaan:** Consider a request for a special use to allow a second dwelling unit (mobile home) on a lot as a medical hardship. The property is located on the north side of the road, approximately 530 ft. from the intersection of Land of Canaan Drive and Stafford Road. Parcel ID: 03-14627. Barbara Hutchinson, owner and applicant.

Ms. Barbara Hutchinson was present for discussion.

In presenting the staff's report, Ms. Dagenhart explained that this site is located in West Glynn on the Future Development Map and the adopted Land Use Map designates the property as Low Density Residential.

The purpose of the request is to allow a special use for a medical hardship, pursuant to *Section 704.3 Special Uses of the Zoning Ordinance*. The use of the property would not change. When the medical hardship no longer exists, the mobile home will be removed from the property. The applicant has provided a letter from her attending physician stating the need for someone to live close by in case of medical emergency.

*Section 704.3 Special Uses of the Zoning Ordinance:*

*Mobile Home in a FA District on a two (2) year basis, at the discretion of the County Commission, when a documented medical hardship exists, provided such use meets all other requirements of 704.4 except subsection (2) and (3). The applicant for the Medical Hardship shall also provide the following:*

- a) A property owner's statement describing the need, identifying the person requiring medical care and the person to provide the care, and relationship of the persons to reside in the mobile home.*
- b) A certificate of need and necessity filled out and signed by a medical doctor, describing the medical problem(s) and offering a professional opinion of need.*

*Application procedure shall be the same as that for zoning decisions pursuant to Article XI. If the medical hardship ceases to exist during the initial term, or any renewal term, of the Special Use Permit; the Special Use Permit shall expire and the mobile home shall be removed from the property. The rental of the mobile home shall be prohibited. The Special Use Permit may be renewed for one additional two (2) year period provided that the applicant presents to the Community Development Director a new certificate of need demonstrating that the medical hardship still exists.*

Ms. Dagenhart stated that staff recommends approval of application *SUP3060* contingent upon it meeting all other requirements in the Zoning Ordinance.

For the record, Ms. Dagenhart reported that staff received a letter of opposition from Chris and Kelly Kennedy of 260 Land of Canaan Drive. The Kennedy's expressed concerns about traffic, wear and tear on a non-county maintained road, and devaluation of their property. They're also concerned that the mobile home will not be removed once the Special Use Permit expires.

Upon the Chairman's request, Ms. Dagenhart elaborated on the rules for obtaining a Special Use Permit stating that the applicant is required to obtain a written statement from a doctor outlining the medical condition and the need for a second individual to live close by on a two-year basis (usually in a mobile home) in case of an emergency or to provide daily care while still allowing the applicant enough independence to remain in his/her own home. Ms. Dagenhart also pointed out for the record that staff received the written statement from the applicant's doctor. Continuing, she stated that in accordance with Section 704.3 of the Zoning Ordinance, if the medical condition no longer exists at the end of the two-year period, the mobile home has to be removed from the premises. She further explained that if, at the end of the two-year period, the medical hardship still exists, the applicant then applies to the Director of Community Development who will in turn give consent to operate the use on the property for another two-year period.

Mr. John Williams asked that at the end of the two-year period, is it the homeowner's responsibility to have the mobile home removed. Ms. Dagenhart replied yes, and failure to comply constitutes a violation, at which time Code Enforcement would intervene.

Mr. Gary Nevill pointed out that currently there is a travel trailer located on the property that is actually being used as a dwelling. He asked if the travel trailer would be considered as a secondary dwelling on this same property. Ms. Dagenhart stated that staff doesn't have any information on the travel trailer; however, if there were a travel trailer being used as a dwelling, this would constitute a zoning violation and would have to be addressed by Code Enforcement.

During a brief presentation, Ms. Barbara Hutchinson explained that the travel trailer belongs to a relative who lives in it periodically, but it is not a permanent residence. She stated that if it is a problem, she would have it removed. She also expounded on her reasons for asking for the Special Use Permit, including being unable to keep-up or maintain the five acre lot alone. Additionally, she stated that if this request is approved, her son would be living on the property to assist her.

Mr. Tom Boland asked if the travel trailer is hooked up to water & sewer. Ms. Hutchinson replied yes. The septic tank is also connected to her residence. For clarification, she pointed out the location of her residence and where the travel trailer is currently located on the property, as well as a shed that she uses for storage and a work

station previously used by her husband. She also pointed out the area on the other side of the pond where the proposed mobile home would be located.

Ms. Mary Hunt had questions about where the well and septic tank would be located for the proposed mobile home. Ms. Hutchinson pointed out the existing location of her well and septic tank.

Mr. Nevill stated that he's wondering about the actual medical hardship in this case. Ms. Hutchinson stated that she has COPD and she explained the effects of heat exhaustion that occurs with this condition. She stated that she is also grief stricken and suffers from depression as a result of losing her husband. Mr. Boland asked Ms. Hutchinson if her son resides with her now. Ms. Hutchinson replied no, her son currently lives in Gardi, Georgia and her daughter lives in Texas. She acknowledged at this time that she was not aware of the two-year time period for the Special Use Permit. Chairman Murphy expounded on the rules for additional clarification. Mr. Boland noted that the applicant also needs to consider the cost of installing a well and septic system along with the expense of moving the trailer in. Again, Ms. Hutchinson stated that she was unaware of this process and she would like to consult with her son on these issues. Chairman Murphy explained to Ms. Hutchinson that they are not trying to influence her one way or the other, but they merely want her to be aware that there are expenses involved in this process. Ms. Hutchinson stated that she understands and she appreciates their consideration.

At this time, Chairman Murphy opened the floor for public comments beginning with Mr. Michael Wilson, adjacent property owner. Mr. Wilson stated that he doesn't have anything against a medical hardship if in fact there is a medical condition. He understands that the applicant wants her son nearby to help her maintain the property; however, he stated that he does the same thing for his 86 year old mother-in-law, but he loads up his equipment and takes it over to her house. Once he has completed the job, he loads up his equipment and brings it back to his own house.

Mr. Wilson stated that he purchased property in the area and divided it among his children. They each own 15 acre tracts and have built homes on the property. He also pointed out that he absorbs all of the cost to maintain the private easement in the area. Mr. Wilson stressed that he is not trying to be mean; he just wants to protect his children's property and not allow all of their hard work to disappear. If approval is granted, he's afraid that they're property value will depreciate. If the applicant does have a medical condition and does need care, he feels that her son could live in the mobile home with her or perhaps in the travel trailer that's already located on the property. Mr. Wilson stated that there are mobile homes still located on property in the county long after hardships no longer exist. They appear to have gotten lost in the system. Apparently Code Enforcement does not follow-up after the fact and he does not want the same thing to happen in this case. He reiterated that he maintains the entire easement from Stafford Road all the way into the area.

During a brief rebuttal, Ms. Hutchinson stated that she has a deed for 130 ft. from Stafford Road, but Mr. Wilson is correct. He does maintain the entire easement and she understands how he feels, but she's not trying to demean his property.

Mr. Nevill explained that a medical hardship is to actually take care of the person in need of additional care; not the property. It appears to him that the applicant needs her son to move in to help take care of the property. Chairman Murphy stated that this could be due to her condition. He pointed out that staff does have a statement from a medical doctor acknowledging the applicant's condition, and as such, he doesn't feel that it can be disputed.

Ms. Hunt stated that Code Enforcement needs to check on the travel trailer that's located on this particular property, and the status of similar cases on a consistent basis because this is not something that should be permanently allowed on a piece of property.

Upon Ms. Hunt's request, Ms. Dagenhart read the exact verbiage that's included in the application for a medical hardship in accordance with the ordinance:

*The applicant for the Medical Hardship shall provide the following:*

- a) A property owner's statement describing the need, identifying the person requiring medical care and the person to provide the care, and relationship of the persons to reside in the mobile home.*
- b) A certificate of need and necessity filled out and signed by a medical doctor, describing the medical problem(s) and offering a professional opinion of need.*

*Application procedure shall be the same as that for zoning decisions pursuant to Article XI. If the medical hardship ceases to exist during the initial term, or any renewal term, of the Special Use Permit; the Special Use Permit shall expire and the mobile home shall be removed from the property. The rental of the mobile home shall be prohibited. The Special Use Permit may be renewed for one additional two (2) year period provided that the applicant presents to the Community Development Director a new certificate of need demonstrating that the medical hardship still exists.*

Mr. John Williams agreed with the Chairman and added that the Planning Commission is basically bound by the determination made by the doctor.

For clarification, Ms. Hunt asked if steps were being taken to improve the situation where mobile homes have not been removed after the two-year time period or within the time allotted for the Special Use Permit. Ms. Dagenhart replied yes. She believes that the problem came about when the person in the Planning Department responsible for keeping up with the list of Special Use Permits failed to update the list of open, existing or expired permits. She has been directed by Mr. Hainley to update the list

of Special Use Permits, which would in turn assist Code Enforcement in investigating expired or existing permits and removal of mobile homes as needed. Mr. Nevill commented that several years ago Mr. Hainley made a great effort to update the system to have mobile homes removed after the expiration dates because people were renting them out for additional income.

There being no further comments, a motion was made by Ms. Mary Hunt to defer application *SUP3060* to the August 4<sup>th</sup> MPC Meeting beginning at 6:00 p.m. to allow staff to obtain more information on the existing travel trailer and to allow the applicant to assess any costs involved. The motion was seconded by Mr. John Williams and unanimously adopted.

-----

**CUP3051 Miracle Care Maternity:** Consider a request for a conditional use permit for a maternity group home. The property, 100 Marsh Drive, is zoned HC Highway Commercial and is located at the corner of Darian Highway and Marsh Drive. Parcel ID: 03-03071. Mary McCray, agent for Shashicka Tyre-Hill, applicant. Property owned by Harvey W. Anderson.

Ms. Mary McCray was present for discussion.

According to the staff's report which was presented by Ms. Dagenhart, the applicant is requesting permission to operate a maternity home/second chance home at 100 Marsh Drive. The Zoning Ordinance does not specifically define "maternity homes," nor does it define "second chance homes." The closest comparison is "Care Homes" in that both are set up to care for those who are unable to have family care for them and/or are too young to care for themselves. There are currently no maternity or second chance homes licensed and operating in Glynn County.

Care Homes are a conditional use in the Highway Commercial Zoning District. The Department of Human Services (DHS) defines a maternity home as:

"Any place, in which any person, society, agency, corporation or facility receives, treats or cares for, within any six-month period, more than one pregnant woman whose child is to be born out of wedlock, before, during or within two weeks after childbirth. For purposes of these rules, services provided include full-time residential care, support and supervision for more than one pregnant youth through 21 years of age who is either admitted during pregnancy or within two weeks after delivery, and who is not related to the owner by blood or marriage. For purposes of these rules, a maternity home may only provide such services to youth admitted to the home for a maximum period of eight weeks following delivery unless providing second chance home services."

The Highway Commercial zoning district allows Care Homes as a conditional use as described in Section 713.3 of the Zoning Ordinance provided that:

“such facilities conform with the requirements of the Georgia State Board of Health, provided plans for such facilities receive the written approval of the Glynn County Board of Health and the County Fire Chief prior to the issuance of any permits for construction and operation, copies of such approval to be attached to the building permit and to be retained in the files of the Building Official and provided that such use conforms with the provisions of Section 724.3 pertaining to Care Homes.”

The applicant will be required to receive the written approval of the Glynn County Board of Health, and written approval from the County Fire Chief prior to the issuance of the business license.

Section 724.3 (2) MED Medical District of the Zoning Code pertains to Public or Private Care Homes. The requirements stated in this section are:

- a) Minimum Lot Area per Dwelling Unit: 1 acre;
- b) Minimum Lot Width: 100 ft.
- c) Minimum Front Yard Setback: 20 ft.
- d) Minimum Side Yard Setback: 15 ft. on each side;
- e) Minimum Rear Yard Setback: 15 ft.
- f) Maximum Building Height: 35 ft. or higher subject to the approval of the Fire Chief.

The building located at 100 Marsh Drive does not meet all of the requirements listed above: the parcel is .70 acres; at its smallest, the lot is 50 ft. wide; and the building was built with 10 ft. setbacks on the sides. The proposed Miracle Care Maternity is expected to serve 13 to 15 residents comprised of pregnant and parenting youth (ages 13 to 21) and the children of the parenting youths.

In conformance with Section 904 of the Zoning Ordinance, the Planning Commission should consider the following upon submission of a conditional use permit:

- a) The effect the proposed activity will have on traffic along adjoining streets;
- b) The location of off-street parking facilities;
- c) Hours and manner of operation;
- d) Outdoor lighting;
- e) Ingress and egress to the property; and
- f) Compatibility with surrounding land use.

Staff provided the following history for the Planning Commission's review:

- Ms. Tyre-Hill applied for a conditional use permit in 2012 "to allow day care for senior adults over 60 years old, other ages with a need, and respite or overnight care, with no permanent residency."
- The representative for the Ms. Tyre-Hill left the meeting before the case was presented to the Mainland Planning Commission and, as a result, the case was deferred.
- Chairman Brunson, however, permitted Mr. Massey, a spokesperson for the neighborhood, to make a brief statement. Mr. Massey said the neighborhood is opposed to the request and asks that the conditional use permit be denied.
- Ms. Tyre-Hill withdrew the conditional use permit request before the next meeting for the Mainland Planning Commission.
- At the November 7, 2012 Mainland Planning Commission meeting, David Hainley announced that the application had been withdrawn and that the business "will be used for day care only (not overnight or respite care) and is therefore a permitted use under the Highway Commercial Zoning District as a business involving the rendering of a personal service, and as such, the Conditional Use Permit is not warranted."
- Since the application was withdrawn, The Planning Commission did not make a ruling on the Conditional Use Permit.

Ms. Dagenhart stated that staff's previous recommendation was for approval, but staff would like to withdraw this recommendation and defer to the wisdom of the Planning Commission.

Referring to the existing floor plan which was distributed before the meeting, Mr. Boland wanted to know if this plan actually shows what equipment will be installed. Ms. Dagenhart replied no. The applicant's floor plan was scanned into the county's system to show the interior renovations, but staff did not receive the entire plan. Mr. Boland stated that this plan shows six showers, toilets and sinks, but there doesn't appear to be enough space for this amount of equipment. Ms. Dagenhart stated that the applicant would have to address the interior of the building. Mr. Boland also noted that the applicant is applying for a maternity home or a second chance home, which he feels are two different entities. Ms. Dagenhart stated that the applicant would also have to address this issue. However, she has been in touch with a representative from the State Department of Health and Family Services who advised that they almost consider the two uses as the same; one is just an extended version of the other.

Mr. Jeff Homans asked for clarification on the requirements of Section 724.3. Ms. Dagenhart stated that this particular section of the Ordinance addresses “Care Homes” in the MED District relative to setbacks, building height, lot area and lot width, and they are more restrictive. Mr. Homans asked if there are adequate buffers against the adjoining property. Ms. Dagenhart stated that there is open space at the rear of the property and a tree line between “The Islander Publications” and the applicant’s property. However, she is not aware of any other buffers or anything else separating the uses. Mr. Homans stated that he didn’t see a 6 ft. fence or any vegetation. Ms. Dagenhart explained that there is a question as to whether the use is an incompatible use with single-family because there has not been a determination on this type of proposed use in Glynn County.

Chairman Murphy stated that the Planning Commission is being asked to make a ruling on something that is not currently defined by the Glynn County Ordinance. Of the items that can be identified by the Ordinance, he would like to know how many does this application not meet. Ms. Dagenhart replied three. The application meets the 20 ft. setback requirement, the rear yard setback and the building height. The application does not meet the minimum lot area, the minimum lot width, and side yard setbacks.

During a brief presentation, Ms. Mary McCray, agent for the applicant, described the proposed business as follows:

“In accordance to Basic Maternity or second chance homes regulations, our plan is to provide the participants with a potential solution to their current housing issue and possibly to other challenges facing our teen parents. We will offer an intensive package of services to meet the short and long-term needs of pregnant and parenting teens. In the short-term, our home will provide a secure living environment with adult supervision as well as material and emotional support for teen parent families. We also promote a more positive long-term outcome for teen parents and their child by providing more extensive services to better prepare residents for independence. The purpose of our organization is to provide necessary logistical supports such as transportation and childcare to enable teen parents to pursue opportunities that will enrich and improve their lives as well as their families’ future.

“Although both pregnant and parenting teens are eligible to live in the home, it is common that most teens have given birth to their babies before they enter the program. The program serves primarily teens in state custody; two-thirds of the program residents are referred by local child welfare agencies and another 10% by juvenile justice agencies.

“We will offer weekly parenting and life-skills classes, regular individual therapy sessions, and weekly case management sessions. In addition, we will offer tutoring services as well as transportation to medical appointments, educational events, and group outings. We involve congregate living, in which each teen family has its own living space but shares living, dining, and kitchen areas. Our home will provide a very high level of supervision for residents, which includes staff onsite 24 hours a day and maintain

low resident-to-staff ratio - these staffing patterns are required by state law for facilities that house minors in state custody.”

Ms. McCray stated that the applicant, Ms. Shashicka Hill, wanted to provide this service because she was once a single parent and needed help. Her entire focus is to help acclimate some of the young ladies by giving them a new chance or a new start at a career, which she stated is a form of giving back to the community.

At this time, Ms. McCray introduced Master Sgt. Curtis Tapper who has been approved to open a maternity group home in Liberty County. She stressed that we need these facilities, and there is a need in Glynn County. Ms. McCray stated that we take care of our elderly citizens and we also need to take care of the young people.

Mr. Homans asked if visitors are allowed on the premises. Ms. McCray stated that the only visitors allowed are those allowed by Department of Family and Children Services (DFACS). She explained that this facility would be providing a place for the girls to stay and get an education at least for eight weeks. She stated that this facility will be partnered with other groups to move the girls into their own homes after the eight weeks. It will not be a permanent residence for the girls.

Mr. Boland pointed out that a maternity home and a second chance home are not the same. According to the definition, a maternity home is a place for young ladies who are pregnant, getting ready to have a baby or just had a baby. The second chance home is for young ladies who are in trouble with the court system and have been in the juvenile system. They are then placed in the second chance home. However, Ms. McCray stated that they are placed there only if they're pregnant. She further explained that according to their policy for this group home, they will not accept aggressive girls. They do have the right to refuse.

Mr. Boland stated that he commends what Ms. McCray is trying to do. He stated that many years ago he ran a half-way house for women, children and men and there is always the potential for violence. He also elaborated on his background as a prosecuting attorney and dealing with juveniles who are capable of causing trouble.

Ms. McCray reiterated the group's policy of not accepting aggressive girls. She then briefly expounded on the number of rooms (bedrooms, kitchen, bathrooms, computer rooms, etc.) that the facility will contain in response to Mr. Boland's concerns about the amount of space being provided for the participants.

Ms. Mary Hunt wanted to know the number of girls that this organization is initially planning for. Ms. McCray stated that according to the State, they're allowed up to 15 but they're only anticipating 10 girls. Ms. Hunt stated that if they're allowed up to 15, how many staff members are required by the State. Ms. McCray stated that there will be three staff members including a registered nurse. There will also be a licensed practical nurse in the evenings and two additional staff members, for a total of eight employees, including two on-call staff members. For additional clarification, Ms. Hunt

stated that at night there will be a maximum of 15 girls that are pregnant, an LPN, along with two other staff members. Ms. McCray stated that they're still working on the schedule and the total number of participants, but currently there will be one LPN, two certified nurse's assistants and perhaps one on-call, for a maximum of approximately 18 people in the facility in the evening. Mr. Williams stated that the floor plan that they're reviewing at this time is not the finished product. Ms. McCray concurred and stated that she was still in the planning stage when staff requested the floor plan, but she will provide a completed drawing for the Planning Commission's review.

Ms. Larissa Harris asked if there will be security on staff. Ms. McCray replied yes, as required by law. Master Sgt. Tapper, who works in security, added that they will have trained personnel, as well as on-site cameras. He stressed that safety is a priority because they want everyone to feel comfortable.

Chairman Murphy commented that as a Planning Commission, this proposal is a bit over their heads; this is uncharted waters and there are a lot of unknowns. For instance, there are no ordinances geared toward this type of facility and they are looking at 50% of the requirements for the size of the lot. Also, the setbacks are not being met. Additionally, they would be dealing with people who are incarcerated and this facility is being placed too close to an established and quiet neighborhood. Chairman Murphy pointed out that the Planning Commission does not know what this type of facility has to offer to the community and other entities should be involved to set forth the requirements. He also feels that this is something that the Board of Commissioners should review because as it stands, the Planning Commission would be setting a precedent for something unknown. As a point of correction, Ms. McCray stated that the girls anticipated for this facility will not have been incarcerated; they will be court ordered. If they decide to leave the program or the facility, the State will no longer provide them with the aid or assistance that they need.

Before opening the floor for public comments, Chairman Murphy advised Ms. McCray of her right to defer this application and continue discussions with the Community Development Department regarding ordinance requirements and restrictions relative to this type of request. Ms. McCray stated that she would like an opportunity to hear from the citizens first.

At this time, the floor was opened for public comments. It was noted that no one was present to speak in favor of this request; however, there were approximately 25 citizens present to oppose. Those speaking in opposition were Mr. Bob Massey, Mr. Joe Burkhart, Ms. Leslie Brantley, Ms. Vera Gully and Ms. June Parkinson. Their opposition consisted of possible code violations, concern for neighborhood safety, traffic safety, and depreciation of their property value. Although several citizens contend that this is a noble gesture and they commend Ms. McCray for her efforts, they feel that there may be other locations better suited to serve this facility.

For the record, a letter of opposition from Ms. Betsey Stafford of 606 Island View Drive is contained in the application file (*CUP3051*).

Chairman Murphy reiterated his concerns about setting a precedent in this case and stressed that the Planning Commission needs a higher authority to review this request and to set parameters. Ms. McCray stated that she fully understands and she agreed to provide additional information to assist in the decision making process.

At the end of discussion, a motion was made by Ms. Mary Hunt to deny application *CUP3051* due to the request not meeting all requirements per the medical district and zoning code. However, Ms. Dagenhart interjected and stated that Ms. McCray intended to request a deferral but opted to hear the residents' concerns first. Ms. Hunt stated that she would hold the motion. She expressed concerns about the number of traffic accidents that she frequently hears about on Highway 17. She also feels that this facility would put a high rate of traffic on Marsh Drive and the entire area. At the end of these comments, Ms. Hunt stated that the motion for denial stands. The motion was seconded by Mr. Tom Boland.

Discussion continued. During which time, Chairman Murphy explained to Ms. McCray that they are not saying no to the concept, but if the Planning Commission were to vote for denial of this request, he would suggest that the applicant re-start the process from the beginning with Community Development and obtain some sort of draft that meets the requirements and stipulations to avoid any guess work. At the end of discussion, the motion was unanimously adopted for denial.

Chairman Murphy allowed Ms. McCray to speak at this time. She pointed out that what she is hearing is fear among the residents. She stated that she is not trying to be derogatory about their concerns but she pointed out that this facility would be mandated by the State. Ms. McCray spoke passionately about this project. She stated that she reached out to the Planning Department and was advised that this type of request had never been done in Glynn County and there were no regulations in the ordinance. She thought it would be better to bring the proposal forward to make everyone aware of the need for this facility in accordance with the State.

Ms. Mary Hunt clarified that her motion was not based on the facility. She feels that it is needed in Glynn County and the applicant should pursue this request; however, she feels that this particular area is not the right place. She is in complete support for what Ms. McCray wants to do, but she feels that another location would be a better suited. She also feels that some of the residents did not listen thoroughly to Ms. McCray's presentation because there are some misconceptions. However, she reiterated that her motion was based on the medical setbacks and the proposed increase of traffic.

-----

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.