

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
JULY 1, 2008  
6:00 P.M.**

The Planning Commission of the Town of Rocky Mount, Virginia met at the Rocky Mount Municipal Building on Tuesday, July 1, 2008 at 6:00 p.m. with Madame Chair Janet Stockton presiding.

The following members were present: Madame Chair Janet Stockton, Vice Chair John Speidel; Planning Commission Members Derwin Hall, John Tiggle, A. Milton Arrington, Ina Clements, and Jerry W. Greer, Sr. Staff members present included: Town Manager C. James Ervin, Town Attorney John Boitnott, Planning and Zoning Administrator (PZA) Paul D. Stockwell, and Deputy Clerk Stacey B. Sink.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Madame Chair Stockton requested a change in the order of the agenda items. Specifically, she requested that the public hearing regarding Christopher Hatman's request be moved from the second public hearing to the fourth public hearing.

- Motion was made by Planning Commission Member Tiggle to approve the agenda with the noted change, with motion on the floor being seconded by Vice Chair Speidel. There being no discussion, let the record show that the motion on the floor passed unanimously.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Prior to the meeting, the Planning Commission members received the following draft minutes for review and consideration of approval:

- June 3, 2008

- Motion was made by Planning Commission Member Arrington to approve the draft minutes as presented, with the motion on the floor being seconded by Planning Commission Member Clements. There being no discussion, let the record show that the motion on the floor passed unanimously.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

Madame Chair Stockton recessed the regular meeting to hold the first of four public hearings:

A) Request of M & L Holdings for a Rezoning of Approximately One Acre from Residential District R-2 to Central Business District (CBD)

After being duly advertised, M & L Holdings requested a rezoning of approximately one acre for Franklin County Tax Map and Parcel Number 2070022900, commonly known as the Wolfe Medical Building, from Residential District R-2 to Central Business District (CBD).

Madame Chair Stockton opened the floor to anyone wishing to speak in regards to this request, noting that no one had signed up on the sheet indicating that they wished to speak.

Jim Lovell and Jeannie Martin, representatives of M & L Holdings located at 235 Claiborne Avenue, came forward to speak. Mr. Lovell indicated that M & L Holdings purchased the building in November and that most people know the building as the Wolfe Medical Group. It has also housed Prenatal and Family Services and CASA, and now it houses Earth Environmental Consultants. The property is currently zoned Residential, but for the past fifty years it has operated as business district property, and the purpose of this request is to get the proper zoning on the property.

Madame Chair Stockton referenced an e-mail received from Tony and Shellie Leete, owners and innkeepers of the Historic Claiborne House Bed and Breakfast, which indicated that they have no objection for M & L Holdings to rezone the property from R-2 to CBD (see copy attached).

Vice Chair Speidel questioned the projected use of the building. Mr. Lovell explained that there are currently four apartments upstairs. The downstairs houses Earth Environmental Consultants, and Family Services has also signed another one-year lease. He is hoping for additional tenants in the back part of the building where CASA is located. The use of the building will stay commercial and, more than likely, professional.

The PZA advised the Commission that the property is located between High Street and Claiborne Avenue. The property has continued to be used as a medical office building or other commercial use since the adoption of the zoning ordinance. The current zoning of R-2 means the use is a non-conforming use. The applicant is requesting the change in zoning to make the current use in conformance with the Town's Zoning and Development Ordinance. Other adjacent and adjoining properties in the area are also zoned CBD, including Angle Dining, the Claiborne House, Red Clay Restaurant, and the Methodist Church. The rezoning would bring the property into the same zoning classification as its neighboring properties. It would also be useful for the current owners to submit a revised parking plan for the building, reflecting the Town's current parking regulations.

Madame Chair Stockton questioned if the PZA had spoken to Mr. Lovell and Ms.

Martin about the parking plan, with the PZA indicating that he had. Mr. Lovell also indicated that he will be addressing the issue.

Let the record show that no one from the public came forward to speak in opposition to M & L Holdings' request.

Madame Chair Stockton reconvened the meeting back into regular session.

There being no further discussion, Madame Chair Stockton entertained a motion:

- Motion was made by Planning Commission Member Arrington to recommend to Town Council the approval of the rezoning request of M & L Holdings of approximately one acre for Franklin County Tax Map and Parcel Number 2070022900 from Residential District (R-2) to Central Business District (CBD), with motion on the floor being seconded by Planning Commission Member Clements. There being no discussion, let the record show that the motion on the floor passed unanimously.

Madame Chair Stockton recessed the meeting to hold the next public hearing:

B) Request of James R. Girty, Jr. for a Waiver from the Town of Rocky Mount Subdivision Ordinance, Article 8-3(L) Requiring CG-6 Curb and Gutter

After being duly advertised, James R. Girty, Jr. requested a waiver from the Town of Rocky Mount Subdivision Ordinance, Article 8-3(L) requiring CG-6 curb and gutter fronting Byrd Lane, for Franklin County Tax Map and Parcel Numbers 2040052900 and 2040053100.

Madame Chair Stockton opened the floor to anyone wishing to speak in favor of this request.

Deanna Stone, an attorney at Rhodes, Ferguson & Stone, located at 305 South Main Street, came forward to speak, indicating that she represents James Girty and his family. She stated that Mr. Girty owns two parcels totaling 2.7 acres on the east side of Byrd Lane. Planning Commission members received a proposed subdivision plat prepared by Compass Point Land Surveying. On the plat, the current dividing line is just above the proposed Lot 1 line, and is currently assessed at \$9,000. The current value of Lot 2 upward, which is 1.8 acres, is assessed at \$20,300. Mr. Girty would like to divide this property into four parcels to obtain the best use of this property. The largest track will be close to one acre in size and is Lot 4. The other three lots are at least one-half acre or more in size. The property fronts on Byrd Lane on the west and has approximately 550 feet of road frontage. There is also a cemetery currently located on the proposed Lot 4, and the property adjoins Byrd Cemetery. Ms. Stone provided the Planning Commission members with a copy of the Tax Map showing parcels 529 and 531

highlighted in red. She pointed out to Planning Commission that across the street from Mr. Girty's parcels there are approximately ten other parcels. In addition, Ms. Stone stated that Mr. Girty is asking for a waiver of Article 8-3(L) for curb and gutter and Article 8-4(B) for sidewalks; however, she does not feel that these articles apply but was advised by Town staff that the waivers are necessary. The reason that she feels the articles do not apply is that in looking at the purpose of the Town's Subdivision Ordinance, which was adopted in 2002, the ordinance was "to provide for harmonious and ordered growth of the Town for the coordination of streets and subdivisions and developments of land with the *existing* or planned streets and rights-of-way." The first waiver request is for Article 8-3(L) which is concerning street design. She stated that Mr. Girty is not designing a street, as the street is Byrd Lane and is already in existence. Mr. Girty has no control over the grade of the street and whether or not it meets Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) standards. Therefore, she does not think this ordinance applies, but in the event that Planning Commission thinks it does apply, she is asking for a waiver from it. She further added that in order to install curb and gutter, Mr. Girty would have to cut the existing pavement, install the curb and gutter and pave over to it, and then patch the pavement. There would also be a need for drop inlets, and Mr. Girty currently does not have easements from any of the adjoining property owners. There is an existing home belonging to Mr. Frederick Taylor, and if curb and gutter were installed, it would run to his property, then break, then continue to the cemetery. It will be hard to install curb and gutter at the cemetery because some of the graves are at the street and would require relocation. Ms. Stone also provided the Planning Commission a portion of a curb, gutter, and sidewalk study prepared for the Town by the engineering firm of Thompson & Litton in 1999 and pertaining to Byrd Lane. The study divided the Town into four quadrants with the purpose of identifying the necessary design facilities required for the upgrade of 40 streets within the Town to a standard cross-section of asphalt roadway, curb and gutter, and sidewalk. Regarding Byrd Lane, the study stated that curb and gutter would not improve drainage and it also recommended that any sidewalk be placed on the opposite side of Byrd Lane from Mr. Girty's property because most of the parcels are located on the west side of the road, and a sidewalk on the west side could also be tied into a sidewalk on Pendelton Street. The bottom line is that the study did not recommend a sidewalk on Mr. Girty's side of Byrd Lane, nor did it recommend any curb and gutter be planned on Byrd Lane until the Bland Street Extension occurs, and that hasn't happened yet. Ms. Stone further pointed out the projected expense of installing curb and gutter and sidewalks on Byrd Lane, which in 1999 was approximately \$298,200. She concluded by stating that in granting this waiver, the Town will not adversely effect the health and safety of the people living in the neighborhood, and, in fact, the waiver would be characteristic of the existing neighborhood. The waiver is not detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property or improvements to the neighborhood. New homes will be built which will add to the neighborhood. And finally, the waivers are not in conflict with the comprehensive plan.

The PZA advised the Planning Commission that the first request would waive the requirement for curb and gutter along Byrd Lane. Curb and gutter will channel the runoff from Byrd Lane through stormwater pipes to adequate receiving channels. If the curb and gutter were waived, stormwater from the road will flow into a natural drainage ditch. The curb and gutter would not connect to any existing curb and gutter along Byrd Lane. If a waiver is approved, it may be worthwhile to require that a statement on the plat indicate that the property owner is responsible for a pro rata share of the costs of curb and gutter according to the property's street frontage whenever the Town of Rocky Mount decides to extend curb and gutter along Byrd Lane.

The PZA further advised that the second request would waive the requirement for a sidewalk along Byrd Lane. The sidewalk would not connect to any existing sidewalk. If a waiver is approved, it may also be worthwhile to require that a statement on the plat indicate that the property owner is responsible for a pro rate share of the costs for a sidewalk according to the property's street frontage whenever the town of Rocky Mount decides to extend sidewalks along Byrd Lane.

Vice Chair Speidel questioned the Town Attorney regarding the "pro rata" share clause. Specifically, he questioned if the clause would transfer with the ownership of the property. The Town Attorney confirmed that the condition would run with the property indefinitely.

The Town Attorney also stated that he remembers the study, and Town Council decided that it would not be practical due to the cost. There are a number of streets in Town that are not conducive to curb and gutter because of the topography, and a piece-meal approach is not feasible.

Let the record show that no one else from the public came forward to speak in regards to Mr. Girty's request.

Madame Chair Stockton reconvened the meeting back into regular session.

There being no further discussion, Madame Chair Stockton entertained a motion:

- Motion was made by Planning Commission Member Tiggle to recommend to Town Council the approval of the waiver request of James R. Girty from the Town of Rocky Mount Subdivision Ordinance Article 8-3(L)(3) requiring CG-6 curb and gutter for Franklin County Tax Map and Parcel Numbers 2040052900 and 2040053100, with motion on the floor being seconded by Planning Commission Member Clements. There being no discussion, a roll call vote was taken. Let the record show that the motion on the floor passed unanimously.

Madame Chair Stockton recessed the meeting to hold the next public hearing:

C) Request of James R. Girty, Jr. for a Waiver from the Town of Rocky Mount Subdivision Ordinance, Article 8-4(B) Requiring CG-6 Sidewalks

After being duly advertised, James R. Girty, Jr. requested a waiver from the Town of Rocky Mount Subdivision Ordinance, Article 8-4(B) requiring sidewalks fronting Byrd Lane, for Franklin County Tax Map and Parcel Numbers 2040052900 and 2040053100.

Deanna Stone came forward, again representing Mr. Girty, and asked that Planning Commission consider her previous statements. She again mentioned the study which recommended the sidewalk be built on the opposite side of Byrd Lane.

Let the record show that no one else from the public came forward to speak in regards to Mr. Girty's request.

Madame Chair Stockton reconvened the meeting back into regular session.

There being no further discussion, Madame Chair Stockton entertained a motion:

- Motion was made by Planning Commission Member Clements to recommend to Town Council the approval of the waiver request of James R. Girty from the Town of Rocky Mount Subdivision Ordinance Article 8-4(B) requiring a sidewalk for Franklin County Tax Map and Parcel Numbers 2040052900 and 2040053100, with motion on the floor being seconded by Planning Commission Member Clements. There being no discussion, a roll call vote was taken. Let the record show that the motion on the floor passed unanimously.

Madame Chair Stockton recessed the meeting to hold the last public hearing:

D) Request of Christopher Hatman for a Rezoning of Approximately 4.31 Acres from Residential, Agricultural District (R-A) to Business, General District (GB)

After being duly advertised, Christopher Hatman requested a rezoning of approximately 4.31 acres for Franklin County Tax Map and Parcel Number 2080001300 from Residential, Agricultural District (R-A) to Business, General District (GB).

Madame Chair Stockton stated that there were several people who signed up to speak regarding Mr. Hatman's request.

Christopher Hatman, of 2405 Franklin Street, came forward to speak, stating that he is currently attempting to purchase the property. It is currently zoned Residential Agricultural and has been vacant and abandoned for many years. In regards to maintenance, it is overgrown. He plans to put a tow facility there and has no plans for a junkyard. He currently tows for the State Police, the Town

Police, and also the Franklin County Sheriff's Department and the general public. He has been doing this for about two years. He has drawn a diagram of what he would like the property to look like and this has been submitted to the Planning Commission. On the property line, he would like to have a row of trees. The lot on one side is over 900 feet long and on the other side is 700 feet long. The driveway will lead to a fenced-in lot of approximately 200 feet by 200 feet, with a 40 feet stick-built garage. The purpose will be as a storage facility for insurance companies for approximately one week at a time.

Madame Chair Stockton questioned Mr. Hatman about the number of vehicles he intends to store on the property. Mr. Hatman advised that typically he has between two and fifteen vehicles. He has not exceeded fifteen vehicles because usually if the cars are not picked up within two weeks they are sold to Shredded Products. There will not be a stockpile of vehicles. He plans to keep it well landscaped and all of the environmental laws will apply.

Madame Chair Stockton asked Mr. Hatman to further explain his landscaping plan. Mr. Hatman advised that currently there is a vacant building on the front of the property that has for years been used as a place to drink and do drugs. He plans to tear this building down and then create a manmade pond. He also plans to plant pine trees and to leave most of the existing trees. The back of the fenced-in compound will be approximately 200 feet from the neighboring back property and there will be 25 feet on each side.

Planning Commission Member Clements stated that she sees no lights on the diagram and is wondering what kinds of lighting Mr. Hatman intends to use. Mr. Hatman stated that he will have standard building lights including lights on the building and motion-detecting lights. There will be a gate at the end of the driveway that will be remote-activated, and there will be flood lights that sense motion.

Planning Commission Member Clements also questioned Mr. Hatman about what proffer he intends to put between the driveway and Mr. Stockton, who lives next door. Mr. Hatman stated that there will be a row of pines all the way back on the property line in addition to the trees that are already there.

Madame Chair Stockton stated that she knows Mr. Hatman intends to store cars, and one of her concerns is the gravel lot. She questioned why Mr. Hatman has chosen to leave it as gravel. Mr. Hatman stated that he was advised to leave the lot in gravel for approximately one year until the lot is settled. After that, he intends to pave it.

Planning Commission Member Tiggle questioned if Mr. Hatman currently has a lot in Town, with Mr. Hatman confirming that he uses a lot at 770 Cornell Road near Franklin Heights. He also owns the Carlot across from 40 West Food Fare.

Planning Commission Member Hall confirmed with Mr. Hatman that the maximum time any car would be on his lot is two weeks. Mr. Hatman advised that he would keep a vehicle until the insurance company either picks up the vehicle or releases it. He charges \$25 per day for storage so this usually occurs fairly quickly.

Planning Commission Member Greer questioned if the PZA had looked at Mr. Hatman's other lot in the Town, with the PZA stating that he had no knowledge of the other lot. Mr. Hatman confirmed that he currently has eight cars stored on the Cornell Road lot and there are two cars that belong to the man he rents the lot from. The Cornell Road lot is also gravel.

Ralph Hall, of 750 East Court Street, came forward to speak. Mr. Hall stated that his property will butt against the back of Mr. Hatman's property. Right now his property is a cow pasture and he has a spring on the property. The nature of wrecked cars is that they leak fluid and the fluid will go into the ground. It will go into his spring and feed into Pigg River which goes throughout the Town. He is totally against this request. Not to speak ill of the dead, he thinks that the Town saw, through the Donny Hutchinson fiasco at the ice plant, what allowing something like this in Town can become.

Madame Chair Stockton called Denver Hall (of 155 East Court Street) to the podium to speak. Let the record show that even though Denver Hall had signed up to speak, he declined to speak at this time.

Ron Deanhofur, of 610 East Court Street, came forward to speak. He stated that he is concerned about the traffic. Will Mr. Hatman be bringing in cars 24 hours per day, will it be all hours, or only during the day time? He is also concerned about property value in the area. His property is at the back of the property in question, and it borders Mr. Hall's and Mr. Perdue's property. He is concerned about the same spring, and fluid leakage leaching into the ground and ending up in the Pigg River.

Phillip Nester (of 220 Cornell Road) came forward to speak, stating that he is a licensed surveyor in the Commonwealth of Virginia and has been practicing since 1982 in Franklin County, has owned his own business since 1987, and became a Town resident when Franklin Heights was annexed. The Perdue family has been here for much longer and he wants to state upfront that he is speaking on behalf of the Perdue family in opposition to the rezoning request. The Perdue family feels very strongly that the application has been so poorly prepared that the exact nature of the intended development can not be determined. In reviewing the application for the Perdue family, he made a few assumptions, one of which was confirmed tonight, in that the property is planned to be used as an impound and storage yard. The application proposes both residential and commercial use on the property with the request to rezone it to the GB District. The information that he heard tonight said that on the front piece of the property, the existing building will be removed and a pond will be installed. His questions are: *Where are the*

*proposed residential uses? What type of residential uses are being proposed? Single? Multiple? Subsidized? None of these issues have been addressed, and the application does not provide specific details of the proposed residential use. The application also requests a 40 feet by 40 feet garage to be located 80 feet from the front and behind a fenced-in, gravel lot. A garage is not specifically listed as a permitted use in the GB District. Is the garage going to be a one story building? What type of construction? What is the façade going to be? To combine residential and commercial uses in the GB District, the permitted use is specific that the residential use must be a second floor residence above the proposed commercial use. It does not allow the utilization of residential and commercial uses in different buildings on the same piece of property. The application has a check mark that says parking spaces are provided and street rights-of-way are shown. The sketch that was attached as a concept plan does not show any parking spaces, nor does it show any rights-of-way on East Court Street. The applicant presented that it is going to be a towing, storage yard where he is going to store vehicles temporarily that he has picked up from accidents. That means the vehicles are going to be damaged and inoperable. There is a significant environmental risk from fluids from those vehicles, and storing those vehicles on a pervious gravel lot is not the proper thing to do. The surface needs to be impervious so that the fluids can be controlled and properly contained, and to prevent them from soaking into the ground, ending up in the existing water table. The applicant has indicated that he will have somewhere between two and fifteen vehicles in the lot at any one time. Article 19-3-13 and Article 19-3-85 of the Town's Zoning Ordinance specifically defines an automobile graveyard as one in which more than five inoperable vehicles are on the lot. Those code sections also refer to Virginia Code § 33.1-348 and that code section specifically says that the provisions for an automobile graveyard shall begin with the first day that the vehicle is placed on the property. Automobile graveyards and junkyards are not a permitted use in the GB District. They are allowed within the Town limits only as a special exception in the M2 Industrial District. The application and the concept plan also do not provide sufficient information to determine compliance with screening and transition yard requirements, entrance grade requirements, and more critically VDOT site distance requirements that are mandated by Article 31 in Town Code. It also does not provide any information to determine if the traffic impact guidelines that are mandated by Chapter 5-27 of VDOT regulations are met. East Court Street may become one of the main access corridors to the proposed whitewater recreation park. The location of this type of facility along this corridor could have a negative impact on the view and a significant detrimental impact on the viewshed from Bald Knob. The proposed impound lot should not be considered as a permitted use. It should be considered as an automobile graveyard which is allowed only in the M2 Industrial District. The subject property and all adjoining properties located on the south side, including the Perdue property, is zoned Residential Agricultural. Properties on the north side are zoned R2, and the comprehensive plan encourages light residential uses for this property. The M2 Industrial zoning that is required to operate an impound lot is not compatible with the existing zoning nor the future land uses envisioned by the*

comprehensive plan. It is not in harmony with the Zoning Ordinance, and it will have a detrimental impact on the surrounding properties. The Perdue family respectfully requests denial of this rezoning request.

Madame Chair Stockton opened the floor to questions or comments by the Planning Commission. She also added that she received a letter from Mr. Clyde Perdue (in opposition to the request) and she would like this noted for the record (see copy attached).

The PZA added that the proposed use is not in the future land use plan, and it is not in harmony with the neighborhood character or the surrounding properties. It could have a detrimental effect as an entrance to the future whitewater park and on any future planned development in the area.

Let the record show that no one else from the public came forward to speak in regards to Mr. Hatman's request.

Madame Chair Stockton reconvened the meeting back into regular session.

There being no further discussion, Madame Chair Stockton entertained a motion:

- Motion was made by Planning Commission Member Tiggler to recommend to Town Council the denial of the rezoning request of Christopher Hatman of approximately 4.31 acres for Franklin County Tax Map and Parcel Number 2080001300 from Residential Agricultural (RA) to General Business (GB) District, with motion on the floor being seconded by Planning Commission Member Clements. There being no discussion, a roll call vote was taken. Let the record show that the motion on the floor passed unanimously.

## **OLD/NEW BUSINESS**

### A) Old Business

#### 1. Proposed Strategic Planning Retreat Confirmation

The Town of Rocky Mount Planning Commission Strategic Planning Retreat will be held on Thursday, August 14, 2008 at 5:30 p.m. at the Franklin Center. A catered meal will be provided.

### B) New Business

#### 1. Election of Officers

- Motion was made by Planning Commission Member Tiggie to retain the same slate of officers as the current slate, with motion on the floor being seconded by Planning Commission Member Clements. For the record, Madame Chair Stockton identified that the current officers are Chairman, Janet Stockton and Vice Chairman, John Speidel. There being no further discussion, let the record show that the motion on the floor passed unanimously

2. Proposed Amendment to Article 30 of the Town of Rocky Mount Zoning and Development Ordinance (RPUD)

The PZA advised the Planning Commission that it has come to the Town's attention that Article 30 of the Zoning and Development Ordinance does not provide provisions that a "planned" development not have lots individually sold and built. As the whole concept of a planned development is to have a single developer with a "planned" concept for development of residences and amenities, there should be a feature in the ordinance requiring that lots not be sold individually. He offered the following proposed amendment to Article 30 of the Town of Rocky Mount Zoning and Development Ordinance for Planning Commission's consideration for a public hearing:

30-14. *Selling of Lots*

30-14-1. Vacant lots in an RPUD may not be sold. All units are to be constructed by the same builder/developer in accordance with the approved final development plan and any approved proffers.

Discussion ensued:

- What if the money runs out? Would it have to be put on hold?
- According to this provision, the entire development could be sold but individual lots could not be sold.
- A planned development occurs when Town Council rezones a proposed development to RPUD.
- RPUD allows for higher density residential uses, more lots, smaller lots, and the clustering of houses. It usually comes in with a total concept plan. Everything is shown up front, regarding housing sizes, exteriors, amenities, green spaces. It comes in as a package deal.
- The open space moves from the developer to the home owners association according to the declarations of the properties. Once the plan is approved, then the plat goes to record and behind that, a declaration is attached regarding the control and maintenance of the common areas. This makes each property owner a member of an association, and the association is set up to provide revenue and pay expenses. It normally occurs when the developer is out of the picture or when a specific number of lots have been sold.

- Currently the vacant lots can be sold individually or all of the remaining lots could be sold to a single successor developer.
- Anyone owning an unimproved lot would be considered a developer.
- The purpose of this request is to maintain the uniformity of design, and the character and content as originally proposed.
- Most RPUDs across the state have a concept that specifies the roof pitch, the kind of siding, the amount of brick, the size of driveways, etc. The Town's Ordinance is missing a critical part that other localities have which is that if the developer falls on hard times, the lot can't be sold to an individual who builds whatever type of house he wants. This opens the Town up to a break in what RPUD is supposed to be, which is a cohesive, similar product. This forces the developer to build the houses as promised.
- The proposed Article 30-14 could be worded to include a provision that states, if lots are sold, the house built must conform to the planned houses.

Staff will consider Planning Commission's discussion and recommendations and will draft a new proposed amendment for Planning Commission's consideration at the August meeting, before going to public hearing. *[Let the record show that the Planning Commission also requested to continue the discussion of the proposed change in meeting structure (discussed during the June meeting) at the Strategic Planning Retreat.]*

## **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to discuss, motion was made by Vice Chair Speidel, at 7:12 p.m., to adjourn, seconded by Planning Commission Member Arrington, and carried unanimously.

---

Janet Stockton, Chair

ATTEST:

---

Stacey B. Sink, Deputy Clerk

/sbs