

**PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES
DECEMBER 2, 2008
6:00 P.M.**

The Planning Commission of the Town of Rocky Mount, Virginia met at the Rocky Mount Municipal Building on Tuesday, December 2, 2008, at 6:00 p.m. with Madame Chair Janet Stockton presiding.

The following members were present: Madame Chair Janet Stockton and Vice Chair John Speidel; Planning Commission Members Derwin Hall, John Tiggle, A. Milton Arrington, and Ina Clements. Staff members present included: Town Attorney John Boitnott, Assistant Town Manager Matthew C. Hankins, Planning and Zoning Administrator (PZA) Paul D. Stockwell, and Deputy Clerk Stacey B. Sink. Let the record show that Planning Commission Member Jerry W. Greer, Sr. was not present when the meeting was called to order.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Prior to the approval of the agenda, Madame Chair Stockton commented that she had an addition to the agenda, being the change of meeting dates in June and November, 2009 due to elections, which will be discussed under new business.

- Motion was made by Planning Commission Member Clements to approve the agenda with the change as noted above, with motion on the floor being seconded by Planning Commission Member Arrington. There being no discussion, let the record show that the motion on the floor passed unanimously by those present.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

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

- November 5, 2008 – Regular Planning Commission Meeting
 - Motion was made by Planning Commission Member Tiggle to approve the draft minutes as presented, with the 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 by those present.

PUBLIC HEARING

Madame Chair Stockton recessed the meeting to hold the first of three public hearings.

(Let the record show that Planning Commission Member Greer arrived at the meeting at 6:04 p.m.)

A) Request of Keith and Donna Renick for a Special Exception from the Minimum Required Parking Spaces for a Retail Business

After being duly advertised, and in accordance with Article 26-3 of the Town of Rocky Mount Zoning and Development Ordinance, Keith and Donna Renick requested a special exception for Franklin County Tax Map and Parcel Number 2070071500 from the thirty-one (31) minimum required parking spaces for a retail business for a proposed antique store located at 345 South Main Street. The property is zoned Central Business District (CBD).

Keith Renick of 181 Round Hill Road, Rocky Mount, came forward to speak. He stated that he is the previous owner of Renick Tire. He wants to open an antique center at 345 South Main and is requesting to reduce parking from 31 to 15 spaces so that he can open up this new business.

Madame Chair Stockton opened the floor to discussion by Planning Commission members. Questions for Mr. Renick and discussion ensued:

- Mr. Renick is hoping to have four to five of the fifteen spaces located in the front of the building, with the rest being located in the back. He could probably have all fifteen spaces in the back, but he wants handicap parking in the front.
- He plans to have approximately 40 booths that will be rented out to dealers. The business will be open six or seven days a week. His business will be similar to the Blue Ridge Antique Center. His vendors will be there to load and unload and to change their stock and will be in the facility on a limited basis. Parking will primarily be needed for customers. Vendors will load and unload in the back.
- He has an easement through his mother's driveway for access to the back and traffic will come out behind the old Farmers' Exchange building.
- Mr. Renick and the Franklin County Perinatal Education Center have worked out an agreement with the County of Franklin that will allow for one way traffic around the building.
- Currently, he doesn't believe there is a need for thirty-one spaces. There would be room for thirty-one spaces, but a lot of cut and fill would be required due to the topography of the land.
- He plans to run the business full-time himself and will have additional help of one to two people.

Madame Chair Stockton opened the floor to anyone else from the public who wished to speak. Let the record show that no one came forward.

The Assistant Town Manager addressed the Commission stating that staff does not object to the request. It is a common sense application. Given the expected volume of traffic that Mr. Renick anticipates, staff thinks that 15 spaces will be adequate.

Vice Chair Speidel added that Mr. Renick has been in the building for a long time and should know how the building can be used.

The Assistant Town Manager asked Mr. Renick to confirm how traffic will flow around the building. Mr. Renick advised that the alleyway between his mother's house and his building, and behind his building to the Perinatal Education Center will be marked as one-way. Traffic will turn off of Main Street into the alleyway and travel around his building to the left.

There being no further discussion, Madame Chair Stockton reconvened the meeting back into regular session and entertained a motion:

- Motion was made by Vice Chair Speidel to recommend to Town Council the approval of the special exception for parking request for Franklin County Tax Map and Parcel Number 2070071500, with motion on the floor being seconded by Planning Commission Member Arrington. Discussion ensued. The Town Attorney asked for clarification regarding the special use exception and whether it is to be conditioned upon the use of the property as an antique store. Vice Chair Speidel questioned if Mr. Renick would have a problem with such a condition, with Mr. Renick confirming he would not. The Town Attorney advised that Planning Commission could recommend the special use permit allowing only fifteen parking spaces on the condition that the parcel be used as an antique store. If the building becomes something else, then the owner would have to come back. Planning Commission could also recommend approval without the condition. He wants to make sure that he fully understands Planning Commission's intent. Madame Chair Stockton added that she would not be concerned about the parcel moving from an antique store to some other type of retail, but she would be concerned about it becoming something different because the traffic may change. There being no further discussion, Vice Chair Speidel clarified the intent of the motion on the floor to include that the recommendation for approval of the special exception for parking is on condition that the facility be used as an antique center. A roll call vote was taken. Voting in favor of the motion on the floor were Planning Commission Members Hall, Tiggle, Arrington, Clements, and Greer, Vice Chair Speidel and Madame Chair Stockton. Let the record show that the motion on the floor passed unanimously.

Madame Chair Stockton recessed the meeting to hold the second public hearing.

B) Request of Hunters Ridge TRM, LLC for a Preliminary Plat Review

After being duly advertised, Hunters Ridge TRM, LLC requested a Preliminary Subdivision Plat Review for Franklin County Tax Map and Parcel Number 2010006101 for fourteen (14) town home lots located at the end of Member One Way. The property is zoned Residential District (R3).

Ben Crew of Balzer and Associates, located at 1208 Corporate Circle, Roanoke, Virginia and representing Tom Sells of GKS Development, came forward to speak. This preliminary plat review is for the second half of the development which they refer to as Phase 2. Phase 2 consists of fourteen town homes that are directly adjacent to Phase 1. The road from Phase 1 will continue through and access this development. The main difference between Phase 1 and Phase 2 is that Phase 2 will contain driveways. There will be one outdoor parking space in a driveway and one indoor space in a garage. The architecture will be fairly similar to Phase 1 with a combination of brick and vinyl, same patio type setup and sidewalk type access to the front of the units. In addition, he received a letter this evening stating a couple of items that were of concern to staff and he confirmed with the Commission that they had received copies of the same letter dated November 20, 2008. He advised Commission that he would like to address each of these concerns:

- The first concern listed is that the minimum required yard for interior lots is 25 feet, and what was shown on sheet three of three was the rear yards of lots 15 through 22 at 20 feet. These have been adjusted to 25 feet to meet the requirement.
- Item two concerns the approved concept plan by Jones and Jones (the original plan made in 2002) which indicates 13 units. The original development was set up to have 15 units in Phase 1 and 13 units in Phase 2 with a total of 28 units. However, Phase 1 was built with only 14 units and they want to build Phase 2 with 14 units, so the total number remains unchanged.
- Item three is regarding garbage pickup. For Phase 1, the garbage pickup is by the Town. The garbage truck comes in and each individual homeowner brings the can out. They plan to continue this for Phase 2.
- Item four is regarding the stormwater management facility and the associated easement. The easement that is shown on the plat encompasses any improvements that will be needed with the Phase 2 development. The construction documents have been submitted to the Town and are currently under review. The improvements to the impervious areas that are associated with Phase 2 will be covered by the existing easement.
- Item five is asking for the minimum required yard for each lot, stating that 1600 square feet for interior lots and 2500 square feet for corner lots is required. Both of these requirements are met on the plat.

- Item six is a recommendation for ten mile-per-hour speedlimit signs and speed humps to prevent cut-thru traffic. If it is the wish of the Commission, the developer will be happy to install signs and humps.
- The last item is noted as a concern: The first phase of the development does not have a top coat of pavement. The primary reason for this is due to Phase 2. The developer does not want the dump trucks to tear it up during the construction of Phase 2. The developer fully intends to topcoat pave at a later date. He further stated that he is happy to answer any questions that Planning Commission may have.

Madame Chair Stockton opened the floor to discussion by Planning Commission Members. Discussion ensued:

- There is no bond on the top coat. The Town doesn't bond for private improvements, only public. This is a private street that is being developed.
- The minimum yard size is not stated on the plat for each lot, but each lot meets the minimum requirements for interior and corner lots.
- The stormwater management will be the same pond that is used for the first phase. There is some minor grading that will be done along the edge and since it has been there awhile they plan to do some additional seeding and clean-up of the area.
- The Town has received some complaints about the current pond. The PZA confirmed that Mr. Hodges has come in to complain about the pond. His concern is that the pond doesn't have enough capacity to hold the first phase of the development. He came in last week and said that he hoped to be at the meeting.
- In conjunction with the Phase 2 development, Mr. Crew advised that he has gone back and looked at all of the drainage calculations for Phases 1 and 2. The calculations that were submitted prove and indicate that they are meeting state and Town requirements for stormwater management. In addition, they are planning to do some more grading to bring it up to speed in the area.
- The PZA added that there will be a couple orifices created that will release more stormwater out of the pond so it won't overtop as easy. Three eight inch orifices are planned in the release structure. Currently there is only one. This increases the capacity. The PZA confirmed that he thinks this will adequately address the stormwater issues.
- The Assistant Town Manager advised that if the Planning Commission recommends approval tonight, this will go before the Streets, Sidewalks, and Sanitation Committee of the Town Council, primarily because there is a question about ingress and egress onto two primary streets, being State Street and North Main. The existing way in and out is off of North Main on Member One Way. This would extend this street to go either way and to verify that Town Council is okay with this it will go before the Committee. Planning Commission can choose to table it tonight, or Planning

Commission could recommend approval tonight pending the approval of the Streets, Sidewalks, and Sanitation Committee.

Madame Chair Stockton opened the floor to anyone from the public who wished to come forward to speak. Let the record show that no one came forward. Discussion continued:

- The Assistant Town Manager advised that this issue was brought to staff's attention by Cecil Mason, who indicated that during the first phase of the development Town Council had expressed concerns about having an ingress and egress on both State Street and North Main.
- Staff does not have any reservations about an ingress and egress on both sides as long as traffic controls and traffic calming measures are installed, such as the speed humps, which are considerably larger than speed bumps, and the ten mile-per-hour signs.
- The buffer between the development and the R1 housing below will be trees and shrubs. There is not a buffer required.
- Tom Sells of 1899 Retreat Road, Boones Mill, Virginia came forward to address the buffer. He stated that originally there was no fence when he purchased the project. He has spent a lot of effort to get the project up to standards. He worked diligently with Aaron Burdick (the former Planning and Zoning Administrator) to get this project back and he also worked very diligently on the pond to satisfy Mr. Hodges. As he understands it, Mr. Hodges has had no complaints up until recently when he received the letter about Phase 2. There was no fencing at Member One, so he installed one. However, on three separate occasions, wind gusts destroyed the fence, so he removed the concrete and planted large shrubs that will create a natural green buffer and will reach 10 to 12 feet in height. He plans a similar series of buffers between Phase 1 and Phase 2 so that the backs of each unit will have some separation. There is a natural line of existing trees near the existing R1 homes below.

The PZA advised Planning Commission that all of his concerns have been addressed. He is reviewing the site plan and will have comments back to the engineer by the end of the week regarding everything except the entrance issue, which will go to the committee. Staff recommends that Planning Commission either table the plat or approve the plat pending the issues getting worked out by the committee. He also confirmed that the two primary issues which have not been met are the garbage and the entrance.

The Assistant Town Manager confirmed that the issue with the garbage pick-up is that this is a private road. The Town needs a written agreement from each property owner in case there is future liability. The Town needs to be able to demonstrate that it has permission to be there. Currently there is no such agreement for Phase 1.

Mr. Crew advised that the developer would be happy to work with the Town in developing an agreement for garbage pick-up.

There being no further discussion, Madame Chair Stockton reconvened the meeting back into regular session and entertained a motion:

- Motion was made by Planning Commission Member Hall to recommend preliminary approval of the plat for Phase 2 of Hunters Ridge Town Homes, subject to review by the Streets, Sidewalks, and Sanitation Committee, with the motion on the floor being seconded by Planning Commission Member Tiggle. There being no further discussion, a roll call vote was taken. Voting in favor of the motion on the floor were Planning Commission Members Hall, Tiggle, Arrington, Clements, and Greer, Vice Chair Speidel and Madame Chair Stockton. Let the record show that the motion on the floor passed unanimously.

Madame Chair Stockton recessed the meeting to hold the third and final public hearing.

C) Proposed Article 32 of the Zoning and Development Ordinance, Wind Energy Facilities

After being duly advertised, the Planning Commission reviewed the proposed Article 32 of the Town of Rocky Mount Zoning and Development Ordinance regarding Wind Energy Facilities.

The PZA opened the discussion by stating that he had presented a draft wind energy facility ordinance last month which was based largely on the Town's existing wireless communications ordinance and a model wind energy ordinance. He merged the two to create the draft Article 32 that is before Planning Commission tonight. He also included the suggestions of Vice Chair Speidel under 32-6 of factors to be considered including noise, pedestrian safety, and shadow flicker, and the draft ordinance is presented tonight for public hearing. The only other change that needs to be made would be the striking of wind generators and height regulations in each of the zoning districts. This would need to be addressed because wind generators are exempt from height regulations in each of the zoning districts.

Discussion ensued:

- Is there a standard for noise like a maximum decibel level?
- All requests for wind energy facilities will have to come before Planning Commission as a special exception or special use. Planning Commission for each unique case, could impose noise level requirements as a condition based on each unique request. Anything that is not specifically listed in the ordinance as a requirement or regulation can be added as an additional condition to approval of the special use permit. Noise is not listed anywhere

in this proposed ordinance; however, the Town does have a separate noise ordinance.

- Would it be a stronger ordinance if specifics were listed?
- The Town Attorney addressed this question, stating that he has no opinion whatsoever on this. The difficulty in drafting regulation in regards to real estate is the unique character of land. Right now we only have one wind energy facility. If they become popular item, then the Town will want to look at them on a case by case, or property by property basis. There is a noise ordinance in the Town already, throughout the Town limits.
- A wind generator that is operating at 50 decibels on a two-acre tract is different than one operating at 50 decibels on a half-acre tract. It will depend on the proximity to neighbors as to how much disturbance is made, so this is why it will need to be considered on a case by case basis.
- There are currently two wind generators at the Gereau Center.
- Grants are available to establish wind generators.
- The power company could give a credit to customers who use wind generators if they produce more than they use, and it would be difficult for the Town to regulate this. However, it would be unusual for a system to pay for itself every month. There are some months when there would not be enough wind to generate it, and here the topography is an issue. There has been a wind generator contemplated on Diamond Avenue.
- A wind generator will run continuously as long as there is wind. Generally, it will only be turned off if there are high winds and there is danger of damage. Some systems have automatic cutoff and some are manual. It depends on how much you are willing to spend.
- They can be installed using a bucket truck or crane.
- Page one, line five needs to be corrected to read "in a way."
- If someone has one of these and it is not used for 18 months then it must come down and they are given three months to decommission it.
- Why does the ordinance ask for decommissioning plans that estimate the anticipated life of the wind project, the estimated decommissioning cost in current dollars, and the manner in which the project will be decommissioned and the site restored (Article 32-5-1, item i)? Why ask for current dollars when over time the costs may rise?
- It would be difficult to project cost, but current costs could be used as a base figure to determine future costs.
- The Town would be able to remove a decommissioned facility if the owner is unable to do so?
- There is a clause in the decommissioning section (32-7-4) that requires a performance bond. The current dollar amount would be used to establish the performance bond. The amount of the bond would be different for each case depending on the size. \$5,000 would probably be adequate to ensure the destruction of the facility.
- No Rocky Mount industries currently have wind generators. Volvo in Pulaski has a turbine on the grounds of the building.

There being no further discussion, Madame Chair Stockton asked for comments from the public. Let the record show that no one from the public came forward to speak.

Madame Chair Stockton reconvened the meeting back into regular session and entertained a motion:

- Motion was made by Planning Commission Member Tiggle to recommend to Town Council the approval of the proposed Article 32, Wind Energy Facilities, with motion on the floor being seconded by Planning Commission Member Hall. There being no discussion, let the record show that the motion on the floor passed unanimously.

OLD/NEW BUSINESS

A) Old Business

1. Review of Accessory Building, Recreational Vehicle and Trailer Regulations

The Assistant Town Manager advised the Commission that based on last month's meeting minutes, he understands that the Commission had a lot of questions regarding these issues, and he will ask the PZA to address them.

The PZA stated that he has done a lot of research on the issue of what is considered an accessory structure. According to the Town ordinance, an accessory structure would require a permanent location on the ground. Without a permanent location on the ground then it would be exempt from requiring a permit. If there is a permanent location, then a zoning permit is required. This will not necessarily mean that a building permit is required. The square footage requirement for a building permit is 150 square feet, so if it is less, then a building permit is not required.

Discussion ensued:

- As long as set back requirements are met, a person could have multiple structures.
- Should the issues regarding doghouses be removed from the discussion?
- There is a practical reason for including doghouses. The Town has had complaints about a location within Town where dogs are being tied to a small shed and then being allowed to roam the property line. It is understandable that some folks may find this laughable but for those folks who are having a pitbull roam across the property line, it is a real concern.

- As long as doghouses don't have a permanent location on the ground, then they aren't regulated. However, if they do have a permanent location, then they fall under the zoning ordinance. Any accessory structure on an empty lot is not a permitted use. In order to have an accessory structure, then there must be a main structure. Any garages, sheds, or even doghouses, are prohibited on an empty lot.
- There are some gray areas as well. For instance, the lot with the dogs chained to the accessory building is an empty lot. However, a house once stood on the lot and it burned, so the accessory building is grandfathered in. This is one reason the issue of accessory structures have been brought up.
- The County of Franklin has addressed this by creating a new definition for "garage principal" which allows garages to be built on a lot without a main structure. However, permitting this may change the character of a single family neighborhood. It depends on what Planning Commission and Town Council prefers. Should accessory structures be permitted on empty lots or should they be permitted with only main structures?
- Regarding containers, the Town could develop an ordinance that allows containers on lots only if there is an active building permit.
- A container could be something that used to be a tractor trailer for instance. The wheels can be removed and the container can be placed on the ground. If the wheels are removed then it must be intended for permanent storage.
- Is it the Commission's direction that this be a permitted use?
- This is cheap storage, and some people use them to store equipment and furniture. However, some people in Town may not find them attractive.
- Does it matter if it is in the back yard or the front yard? Neighboring properties may be able to view it no matter where it is located.
- It would be reasonable to have a container for storage if there is a building project going on and storage is needed on a temporary basis.
- Staff is looking for the Commission's consensus on which direction the Town should take.
- Consensus is to remove containers from Residential Districts and the Central Business District.
- The main concern about recreational vehicles is having them parked in the front yard.
- There was general discussion about cars, the number allowed, inoperable versus operable, etc.
- The term "trailer" refers to boat trailers and the like. They are required to have current tags, a sticker, and a state boat registration.
- Should the location of a recreational vehicle matter if it is not blocking a view?
- Planning Commission could choose to limit the parking of recreational vehicles to the side yard and back yard as opposed to the front yard. Or, Planning Commission could choose not to regulate it at all.

- A public hearing would be required.
- Motion was made by Planning Commission Member Clements to table the discussion until suggestions are made, and then proceed with a public hearing at that time, with motion being seconded by Planning Commission Member Arrington. Discussion ensued. Town Council has received a few complaints on the matter. One would hope that someone would use common sense and not park a trailer in the front yard, but to actually regulate it is a different matter. Although the PZA is researching this issue and will bring it back next month for discussion, this doesn't mean that Planning Commission has to accept it. Parking vehicles on a vacant lot is a different issue altogether. It is also an enforcement issue. The Assistant Town Manager advised that part of this discussion arose when the Town was asked to enforce an issue on Bernard Road. The Town doesn't have any enforcement for this. Some of the folks were not happy with this and complained to Council members. The question is does the Town want to have some sort of enforcement for this? It is up to the Planning Commission to make a values determination. Is this something that needs to be enforced? Let the record show that Planning Commission Member Clements withdrew the motion on the floor and Planning Commission Member Arrington withdrew the second to the motion on the floor. Following the withdrawal of the motion, discussion continued about how to proceed regarding the regulation of accessory buildings, containers, and recreational vehicles. The Assistant Town Manager advised the Planning Commission that based on the withdrawal of the motion it appears that Planning Commission has no further direction for staff in regards to accessory buildings. Several Planning Commission members agreed that enforcement should be the issue. Motion was made by Planning Commission Member Hall that Planning Commission look in to the container issue, as far as it relates to having big containers. The Assistant Town Manager advised the Commission that what this boils down to is the definition of an "accessory structure." That's really the heart of this. Recreational vehicles and doghouses are issues that are related and are worth discussing, but what staff is really after is a clearer definition of "accessory structure." The PZA advised that he can address the container issue, and the fact that accessory structures are not allowed in the CBD, which would be a one line change to the ordinance, and questioned if the Commission has any direction on limiting the size of an accessory structure. Currently, the size of an accessory structure is limited to 50% of the size of the main structure. Should there be a limit to the number of accessory structures? It was the consensus of Commission that three would be a good number. Currently, the limit of 50% of the size of the main structure would apply to each building. Should the overall limit for all the buildings together be 50%? Should this be increased to 60% or 70%? It was the consensus of Planning Commission to leave the limit at 50% and to have this limit apply to the aggregate of all the accessory

structures. Planning Commission Member Hall withdrew his motion as it was the consensus of Planning Commission that adequate direction and suggestions had been provided for staff to continue researching the issue.

B) New Business

1. Discussion of Change of Meeting Dates for June and November 2009

The Assistant Town Manager stated that typically Planning Commission moves its meeting days if the meeting corresponds with an election day or a holiday. There are two dates in 2009 that could possibly need changing. One of the dates is certain and that is the November 2009 date which currently falls on the gubernatorial election day. There is also the possibility of a primary for the gubernatorial election which could fall in June. Staff asks that these meetings be rescheduled to the first Wednesday in November and June.

- Motion was made by Planning Commission Member Greer to move the meeting dates as requested, with motion on the floor being seconded by Planning Commission Member Speidel. There being no discussion, let the record show that the motion on the floor passed unanimously.

PLANNING COMMISSIONER'S CONCERNS

Planning Commission Member Hall stated that he feels that "concern" is a strong word, but in August, at the strategic planning retreat, staff asked Planning Commission members to e-mail or call with any ideas or suggestions, and he e-mailed the Assistant Town Manager and was wondering about the status of the items on his list.

The Assistant Town Manager advised that he did receive the e-mail, and the suggestion that sticks out in his mind the most was regarding improvements to the intersection near the Hub Restaurant. Staff has looked at this and will have to involve the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) with the discussion and it will be around the first of the year before he is able to approach VDOT. He further stated that he hopes this is an acceptable timeline as the Town is working with VDOT now in regards to the Uptown project.

Planning Commission Member Hall again reiterated that this is not a concern, and he just wanted to know the status.

Vice Chair Speidel added that he likes the new stoplights but if a driver is right at the line, the lights can't be seen easily because they are so close to the line. In addition, the light at Dent and Franklin doesn't always seem to trip properly and drivers may have to wait through several changes.

The Assistant Town Manager advised that the issue with the lines can be handled administratively, and he is aware of the issue at the light at Dent and Franklin. The Town has three types of sensors: ground loop sensors which rely on the weight of the vehicle, infrared which sees heat, and motion detecting which senses the motion of the vehicle. The sensor that is located at Dent and Franklin is a motion detecting sensor, so if the driver is not going fast enough then the motion may not be enough to trip the sensor. Everything is new at the light except for the sensors. The sensors were very expensive to replace and were outside the budget so they were left as the old motion detecting sensors.

Planning Commission Member Hall questioned if there has been any discussion about having a leading green arrow from the turn off of Floyd onto Main Street, with the Assistant Town Manager advising that Town Council wishes to discuss this, and it may be one of the issues discussed at the Streets, Sidewalks, and Sanitation Committee meeting. The problem has been some concerns that VDOT has. Part of the problem, too, is that the Town doesn't control all of the lights in Town. VDOT controls the two lights coming off of 220. The Town hasn't had success in the past in getting VDOT to coordinate lights, however, there is a new VDOT manager who plans to meet with the Town's police department next week to discuss the issue.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss, motion was made by Planning Commission Member Clements to adjourn at 7:44 p.m., seconded by Planning Commission Member Arrington, and carried unanimously.

Janet Stockton, Chair

ATTEST:

Stacey B. Sink, Deputy Clerk
/sbs

(This page left intentionally blank)