

**MINUTES
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR DOCKET
TUESDAY, JANUARY 15, 2002 -- 7:30 P.M.
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

The Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission was held on this date with the following members present:

Mr. Herman Key, Chair STAFF PRESENT:
Ms. Cheri Lewis Mr. Jim Tolbert, AICP, Director
Mr. Craig Barton Mr. Ron Higgins, Planning Manager
Ms. Kathy Johnson-Harris Ms. Lisa R. Kelley, Deputy City Attorney
Mr. Eldon Wood Ms. Jinni Benson, Neighborhood Planner
Mr. Kevin O'Halloran Ms. Missy Creasy, Neighborhood Planner

CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS ALSO PRESENT:
Mr. Blake Caravati Mr. Pete Anderson, Office of the Architect
Mr. Maurice Cox
Mr. Kevin Lynch
Ms. Meredith Richards

Mr. Key called the meeting to order at 7:36 p.m.

1. MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY THE PUBLIC NOT ON THE FORMAL AGENDA

There were no matters raised by the public.

B. MINUTES

Mr. Key asked if there were any changes or additions to be made to the December 11, 2001 minutes. Ms. Lewis would like the second paragraph on page 7 to reflect that the rest of Ms. Kelly's answer was that the application has submitted may not have met the letter of the law but that it would be deemed to abide by the spirit of the requirement. Ms. Kelly said that, if she "recalled correctly, that an accurate way to say it is that our ordinance is unclear what is meant by a resident counselor and that we have not, in the past, interpreted that requirement to mean somebody actually living in the home on a 24 hour a day basis." Mr. Key noted the change and asked for other changes. Mr. Wood stated that Mr. Anderson is not part of the staff and that should be changed. Mr. Key noted the change and asked for other changes or corrections. There being none further, Mr. Key asked if there were a motion to approve. Mr. Barton so moved. The motion was seconded by Ms. Lewis. It passed unanimously.

C. JOINT PUBLIC HEARING

Mr. Key stated that they were waiting on one more councilor to arrive to continue the Joint Public Hearing. The Commission could not determine how to progress until such time as one would arrive. A quorum was met at 7:43 p.m.

1. ZM--01-12-21: A petition to rezone from R-2 Residential to M-1 Industrial, Lot 4 at 1205 Carlton Avenue, adjacent to Jotz Plaza. The general uses allowed in the R-2 zoning are single and two-family dwellings. This property is further identified on City Real Property Tax Map Number 57 as parcel 164, having 42.6 feet of frontage on Carlton Avenue and containing approximately 5,689 square feet of land or .13 acres. The general uses called for in the Land Use Plan of the Comprehensive Plan are for one and two-family residential at a density range of seven to twelve units per acres, but at the border of Industrial uses.

Mr. Higgins presented the report. The property is actually a small vacant lot. He referred everyone to the map on the far left. A site plan was filed that day as a refinement of a preliminary the property owner and applicant, Mr. Chuck Lewis had had his engineer and architect working on for awhile to figure out how to complete Jotz Plaza. Mr. Higgins referred again to the map, pointing out a large red chunk of land as being Jotz Plaza, which is also known as Kathy's Produce. Mr. Lewis has been working to complete that project and demolished the building this past year in order to allow for an "L" shaped wing to be completed on the railroad, or north, side of the property. He has owned all the land from the railroad to Carlton Avenue. Referring to the map again, Mr. Higgins stated that the lot outlined in black was the lot in question. All the land he currently owns, except for this lot and one other, was zoned M-1 Industrial and has been Industrial in some form since the 1930s. Having had problems with the project, the architect and the engineer suggested to the applicant that the building be pushed back and connected to the Kathy's Produce warehouse. In doing that, they would encroach on a lot that lies right on the gap in the Land Use Plan between Residential to the west and Industrial to the east. The applicant applied to rezone that vacant lot.

The staff report details the zoning of the area. There is B-2 Neighborhood Commercial zoning on the two south corners of Carlton Avenue and Carlton Road. East of Carlton Road is Industrial Commercial, all of which is relatively new. Jotz Plaza has three

industrial lots. Chestnut Street is all residential zoning. There is a very solid single family neighborhood enclave in North Belmont.

There are descriptions that talk about the zoning and what could be allowed. Staff also talked about circulation and access. All of the lots run on Carlton Avenue. The intent is to combine these lots so that the development will front on Carlton Road.

Mr. Higgins stated that he needed to caution the Planning Commission about that this was a rezoning hearing. The rezoning needs to stand on its own. About half the vacant lot would be encroached upon by buildings and the other half would be used as a slope and landscaping are between the residential and the commercial.

Staff has reviewed the project. The current vacant lot has four or five trees on it. A couple of those can be saved as far as the development. A mixture of gravel and grass lends the lot to use for parking by tenants in the area.

The Land Use Plan has this parcel sitting right on the boundary between Industrial and Residential. As a transition parcel, it could go either way.

Staff reviewed the request and feel that it is consistent with the Land Use Plan of the

Comprehensive Plan in the immediately adjacent area. The rezoning would permit a

more viable development of the corner property at Carlton Road and Carlton Avenue.

Therefore, staff recommends approval.

Mr. Key called the applicant forward to give his perspective.

Mr. Chuck Lewis stated that what he was hoping to do was complete the shopping center. They are hoping to get a bank on the corner of Carlton Road and Carlton Avenue. A company might do a pizza restaurant there. He is hoping that the project can be a little

shopping center that that side of town really needs. He hopes that what they would do would not bother any neighbors.

Mr. Key asked if anyone was signed up for public comments. There were none. He then called for anyone in the public who would like to, to speak to this matter. There being none, that portion was closed. He then opened the floor for questions and comments from the City Councilors and the Commissioners.

Mr. Wood inquired about the ownership of the rest of the block, being 1201, 1203 and 1205. He asked if Mr. Lewis owned that property also. Mr. Higgins informed him that, no, those homes were owned by other folk. Mr. Higgins then went on to state that he had spoken with the people in the second house. Their only concern was that they didn't want to lose the house at 1205. They had no problem with the eventual development of that corner.

Mr. Barton inquired if all owners in a 500 foot radius had been notified. Mr. Higgins stated yes and that a lot of them had called expressing concern over the size of the proposed rezoning. When Mr. Higgins explained to the callers that it was only that lot, they felt better. Mr. Higgins had also received a phone call from the President of the Neighborhood Association who had walked the neighborhood and had not found anyone expressing objection to the proposal.

Mr. Barton then asked if there were a small residential structure on the lot. Mr. Higgins told him there was not. The lot in question is actually the vacant lot that went with 1205.

Mr. Key asked if there were more questions or thoughts regarding the proposal. There being none, he asked for any motions. Mr. Wood moved that the request to rezone be granted.

Mr. Tolbert asked to interrupt to inform the Commission that the attorney's office had advised that there was a new form for the motion that needed to be used when they were going to recommend approval of a rezoning so that it would be in language the state would like used.

Mr. Wood then moved that the Planning Commission recommend the approval of ZM--01-12-21, an application to amend the City zoning map to rezone property from R-2 to M-1 on the grounds that the public necessity, convenience, general welfare or good zoning practice requires this amendment.

Ms. Lewis asked if there would be multiple choice between those options or would they be required to recite all the purposes. She was informed by numerous people at once that all of the form must be stated. Mr. Higgins then informed the Commission that a clause in state law had been found that says a motion has to include that particular language.

Mr. Key asked if there were a second to the motion. Mr. Barton seconded the motion. Mr. Key then called for discussion.

Ms. Lewis stated she was inclined to vote favorably seeing that the lot had been vacant and most compelling is that, on the Comprehensive Plan, it lies between the boundary of two-family residential and the industrial zones. She thinks that Mr. Lewis's plan to enhance this neighborhood is needed. This doesn't really impact any adjoining properties.

Mr. Key called for any other discussion. There being none, he had Mr. Higgins call the question on the motion, which had been made and seconded to rezone from R-2 to M-1. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Key then called for the next item on the agenda.

2. ZM--01-12-22: A petition to rezone from R-2 Residential to B-2 Business the property at 209 Monticello Road (S&S Market Property). The general uses allowed in the R-2 zoning are single and two-family dwellings. This property is further identified as City Real Property Tax Map number 58 as parcel 281, having approximately 78 feet of frontage on Monticello Road, 50 feet of frontage on Graves Street and containing approximately 4,290 square feet of land or .10 acres. The general uses call for in the Land Use Plan of the Comprehensive Plan are Commercial uses.

Mr. Key recognized Mr. Higgins to present the report. Mr. Lewis also owns this property. Mr. Higgins referred the Commission to the middle set of maps. The S&S Market has been a Commercial use since it was constructed in 1950. The site has also been known as Phil's Grocery. A small commercial piece adjacent as been known as Holloway's Vacuum Cleaner Repair, which was built, in the late '40s, early '50s. It may have started as a barber shop. When Mr. Holloway purchased his site in 1981, he realized it was a commercial building sitting on an R-2 lot and successfully petitioned for rezoning to B-2. Mr. Lewis has since bought that building and the S&S Market Building and has discovered the same thing.

The Land Use Plan shows that is commercial at that intersection. Graves Street is all residential. The application is simply to make the zoning conform to the use conform to the Land Use Plan.

Staff recommends approval because it does conform to the Comprehensive Plan and the existing and proposed use is compatible with that intersection.

Mr. Key again recognized Mr. Lewis for comments.

He stated that they hoped to clean that up and put something of value in that area. It is a good location and he believes they can clean it up and make the neighborhood better.

Having no one signed up for public comment, Mr. Key asked if anyone present wanted to comment. There being none, that portion was concluded.

Ms. Johnson-Harris asked Mr. Higgins if he had had any feedback from the neighborhood on this proposal. Mr. Higgins stated that he had presented it to the Neighborhood Association. They felt it was an obvious request and had no concerns although they did wonder what else it could become. He further stated that he had explained to them that due to the setback, the existing building could not be torn down and rebuilt. They had no objection.

Ms. Johnson-Harris then asked about possible uses for the parcel. The applicant stated that the Holloways are still in the small building. Possible uses for the S&S building are a bank, a coffee shop. He went on to state that the Belmont area is changing with a mix of young people and old people so there are a great many things that could go there.

Mr. Barton commented that he was inclined to vote with the staff recommendation largely because this would bring the property into line with both its existing use and the projected use with the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Barton then moved that that the Planning Commission recommend the approval of ZM--01-12-22, an application to amend the City zoning map to rezone property from R-2 Residential to B-2 Business on the grounds that the public necessity, convenience,

general welfare or good zoning practice requires this amendment.

Ms. Johnson-Harris seconded the motion.

Mr. Key called for discussion. There being none, he recognized Mr. Higgins to call the vote. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Key then called the next item on the agenda.

1. Closing of a portion of 10 1/2 Street NW: A petition to close that portion of the 30 foot right-of-way of 10 1/2 Street NW north of Main Street, 120 feet south

from the dead end.

Mr. Higgins was once again recognized to present the report. This portion of 10 1/2 Street is a small dead end adjacent to University property, a couple houses, a small mosque and some parking lots that are being combined. This site was on the agenda this past year. It was called the Ten Center and was approved July 11th. If this were vacated, the applicant could work access to the property differently. Mr. Woodard, who owns the property to the north sent a letter of support of this closing as did Mr. Levin on behalf of the University Medical Center. Mr. Woodard's support was on the contingent upon being able to have the potential for future access. The applicant submitted a letter confirming that they fully intend to provide access.

The staff report points out issues related to closing streets such as whether property would be split down the middle or whether a parcel would become landlocked. A condition of site plan approval was that the lots be combined to eliminate the possibility of land-locking a parcel. A utility line is in the right-of-way, so an easement may need to be retained. Any utility lines that are to remain in that right-of-way require a 20 foot easement. The staff is suggesting that a pedestrian easement be provided.

The staff recommend closing the right-of-way with the conditions.

Mr. Key called on the applicant to speak.

Bill Chapman, of Tilman Road in Albemarle County, is a partner of Neil Deputy, the architect. They recently bought the proposed Ten Center project property. They want to fix the dead end, which is full of trash and long grass, a kind of dangerous zone. They want to fix it up so that access is still available to Mr. Woodard and UVa.

Mr. Key called for questions or comments from the Commission.

Ms. Lewis wanted clarification of Exhibit A as to which property the applicant had purchased. Mr. Higgins read off to her Parcels 42, 43, 44, 41 and 40. They are five parcels that are being combined.

Mr. Wood asked if it was presently City property. Mr. Higgins told him that it was City right-of-way.

Mr. Wood then asked if there were any problem in meeting the request that came from Woodard. Mr. Higgins stated that he did not believe there would be. The applicant will allow access for the adjoining owners.

Mr. Wood then asked who would end up being owners of it. Mr. Higgins stated that they don't own it but they will end up owning it, making it part of their taxable property. Mr. Wood asked if that meant they would be responsible for maintenance. Mr. Higgins

said yes. Mr. Barton then asked if they would be responsible for liability. He was also told yes.

Mr. Barton then asked if the 20 foot easement required by the existing gas line sufficient to provide vehicular access. Mr. Higgins said it could.

Ms. Lewis asked for an explanation of "dedicated but unaccepted." She was told that it had been set aside but never built to City standards to be accepted into its system. That means it is not being maintained as a street.

Ms. Lewis said she was confused about what happens by the Planning Commission closing a street that it would become theirs. Mr. Higgins told her that under state law when you vacate land that has been dedicated for a public purpose, such as a road, the property reverts to adjoining owners. Mr. Higgins also stated that they could go to the opposite owner and acquire their half from them and add it to their parcel.

Mr. Toscano asked if that was the intent here or did the University of Virginia get half of it. Mr. Higgins stated that, under the request, UVa would get half of it but he believed the plan that they had worked out was for the applicant to acquire UVa's half.

Mr. Barton asked if the proposed assessment of \$6 a square foot is for the entire right-of-way of just the half. Mr. Higgins said it related to the entire right-of-way.

Mr. Wood asked if the Ten Center was no longer in existence as a proposed project. Mr. Higgins said that they were pursuing all of the conditions of approval from July.

Mr. Lynch sought clarification about whether, if the southern part of 10 1/2 Street would still be public right-of-way, wouldn't this proposal give them additional access to their property. Mr. Higgins explained that they already had access to the project.

Mr. Lynch then asked if anything more were known about the transaction with the University. The applicant explained that the University wanted to see the project happen and wanted to give their share to the applicant. Mr. Barton said that he thought it

should be in writing. Ms. Lewis stated she was confused. The closure seems like a way for the City to transfer title to a public piece a land to a private developer without actually selling it outright. She found it hard to believe that two other cooperative owners are just going to, free of cost, deed the property to the developer. Mr. Higgins said the right-of-way was being closed for right-of-way purposes. He feels the issue is should this be a public road and should this be vacated for any reason. Staff answer is it should be vacated; it doesn't have to be a public road.

Mr. Toscano wanted to know the approximate value of the improvements that would go on the piece. The applicant stated he did not know how to put a value on making it a fixed up road.

Mr. Barton had a question for the City Attorney about the letter from Mr. Woodard asking for an easement in perpetuity. If the Planning Commission were to grant the closure, could they make it contingent upon the easement or include the easement. He asked if that were part of their purview. Ms. Kelly stated that she thought from their standpoint it would be preferable to focus on the items on the street closing policy that is in the packet. If they looked at this strictly as a sale of public property, when the City sells public property to a private entity, it often attaches conditions such as how they want the property to be used in the future. She thought that one of the things they should be focusing on was looking at the area in general and seeing if there were a public benefit either in terms of recommending a price that should be obtained from the person requesting that would be served by granting this. The request could also be seen as being not supportive unless the applicants work something out with the person ahead of time as to what he is seeking.

Mr. Wood asked if item six on the policy of street closing would be a problem for the Commission. Ms. Kelly felt that Ron could better address the question, but one thing the Commission could consider is if this isn't planned for future use as a city street, is there some other access that they could potentially see down the road wanting to utilize this

to connect up to. Mr. Higgins said there were no plans for it as an extended street.

Ms. Johnson-Harris asked if Mr. Key were ready for a motion. He was.

Ms. Johnson-Harris moved that the portion of 10 1/2 Street NW be closed with the guidelines as recommended by staff. Mr. Key asked for a second, which Mr. Wood supplied. Mr. Key then called for discussion.

Mr. Barton stated that the recommendations by staff are general and he would like the dimensions of the pedestrian and vehicular easement be more specific. He recommended that said easement be a minimum of 21 feet. Mr. Key asked if this were acceptable as an amendment to the motion. Mr. Wood said it suited him. Ms. Johnson-Harris also gave acceptance to the amendment.

Mr. Key stated that the motion was to close the portion of 10 1/2 Street NW and retain a 21 foot easement that would be constructed along the center line as it currently exists. With the motion having been made and seconded, Mr. Higgins called the question. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Key called for the next item on the agenda.

3. ZM--01-09-13: A petition to rezone from R-2 Residential to R-Planned Unit Development (PUD) the property on the north side of Madison Avenue behind the Red Cross building. This would allow for 16 single family detached residences on the site. The general uses allowed in the R-2 zoning are medium density single and two-family dwellings on moderate sized lots at a density of seven to twelve units per acre. The property is further identified on City Real Property Tax Map number 37 as parcel 85 having approximately 2.23 acres of land. The general uses called for in the Land Use Plan of the Comprehensive Plan are single and two-family dwellings in a range of seven to twelve units per acre. This item was deferred from the October 9, 2001 public hearing.

Ms. Creasy reported that Mr. Hickman is planning to construct 16 single family detached dwellings in a mixture of one and-a-half to two story dwellings with three to four bedroom mixture. This 2.23 acre property could theoretically have up to 24 units.

However the lot only has street frontage on Madison Avenue.

Ms. Creasy said staff has reviewed this request and recommends conditional approval. Conditions consist of items that are site plan oriented that are listed in the packets. The 16 foot width of the asphalt must be maintained for it to be acceptable.

Mr. Key asked for questions and comments from the Councilors and Commissioners.

Mr. Tolbert clarified that City Council agreed to change the street standards to allow 18 foot streets with no on street parking and accept them as public streets.

Mr. Barton asked of it were currently proposed to be 16. Mr. Tolbert said Missy Creasy recommendation was that they be 18 feet and be public streets.

Mr. O'Halloran inquired about how a private street was made public and if that were commonly done with PUD's. Mr. Higgins said there was only one PUD in the

city that had private streets.

Mr. Barton expressed concern over the dead end streets shown on the plan. Mr. O'Halloran felt the way it was proposed now the streets could theoretically be connected. Mr. Cox seconded Mr. Barton's comments. The applicant said that the residents don't want connected streets. He would like to see it here because the project is only four houses deep. The neighbors like the atmosphere.

Ms. Johnson-Harris made the motion that the Planning Commission recommend the approval of ZM--01-09-13, from R-2 to R-2 PUD as recommended by the staff on the grounds that the public necessity, convenience, general welfare or good zoning practice requires this amendment.

Ms. Lewis seconded the motion.

Mr. Key called for discussion.

Mr. Wood asked about the extent of properties this change to PUD would apply and if it would include the Red Cross building. He was told that it did not by Mr. Higgins.

Mr. Barton thinks it is a great development but he would vote against it only because he wants to see the streets connected. Mr. O'Halloran agreed in principle but practically speaking could not see benefit by that.

Mr. Wood asked if the Fire Department had looked at the plan and given any opinion on it. Mr. Tolbert informed him that they had participated in the site plan.

A motion having been made and seconded, Mr. Key asked Mr. Higgins to call the question. Mr. Barton gave the only no vote, all others voted in favor.

D. SITE PLANS

Ms. Jinni Benson brought forward the site plans for Rugby-McIntyre Apartments at 611 Rugby Road. A by-right development is being requested. The site plan shows 75 units and has been submitted as a by-right non-conforming development. Staff reviewed the plan and agreed with the developer that because they were not required to comply current City code regarding certain standards, they would comply with the standards for those units that were to be new or modified. They have met the requirements and have agreed to provide additional landscaping and recreation. Staff recommends that the site plan as submitted is in compliance and should be approved.

Mr. George McCallum, one of the trustees of the land trust that owns the property, and a lawyer in Charlottesville, represents the beneficiary of the land trust. The plan is not before you because the property owner are asking for it but rather two neighbors have asked for the CPC to review it.

Mr. Key called for comments from the public.

Mr. Morton Roberts, of 1826 Wayside Place, is one of the people asking for review of the site plan. He spoke in opposition of the site plan because of control of storm water drainage and the noise level.

Mr. Phillip LaMar, 1825 Wayside Place, spoke in opposition of the site plan. Although only two showed up, he feels that a large number of people from their small neighborhood are in opposition.

Mr. Key recognized Ms. Benson to address the concerns.

Ms. Benson stated that in regard to drainage the site plan does show improvements to the drainage from what it currently is.

Mr. Key inquired about the legal requirement. Ms. Benson stated that the legal requirement was that they not increase the run-off. Mr. Higgins said that it might be misleading to say that they are not required to comply with drainage because of the

grandfather clause. Every site plan that comes in is required to comply with draining provisions.

Ms. Benson had no response regarding the noise concern. The applicant reviewed the acoustical consultant's report. It reported values of noise lower than the City noise ordinance.

Mr. Barton was disconcerted that the noise issue was not really addressed.

Mr. Wood asked if a visual barrier on three sides was being provided. The applicant said yes.

Ms. Lewis was convinced that these are improvements that are by-right and the applicant has met the requirement addressing the storm water issue. She also appreciated the neighbors concern about the noise level, however she feels the City noise ordinance will govern if the units prove to be extremely noisy in operation. She stated she would be inclined to approve it.

Ms. Lewis then moved that the Planning Commission approve the by-right as submitted by the applicant. Ms. Johnson-Harris seconded the motion.

Mr. Key called for any other discussion. There being none, he recognized Mr. Higgins to call the question. The motion passed unanimously.

E. LIST OF SUBDIVISIONS AND SITE PLANS APPROVED ADMINISTRATIVELY

Ms. Lewis made the motion to approve the plans as approved administratively by staff. Mr. O'Halloran seconded the motion. It carried unanimously.

LIST OF SUBDIVISIONS APPROVED ADMINISTRATIVELY

12/1/01 TO 1/1/02

1. Boundary Line Adjustment, Lots 1B & No new lots

2B "Locust Grove"

700 Grove Avenue Gabriel & Liora Laufer

File No. 1265 Preliminary & Final

LIST OF SITE PLANS APPROVED ADMINISTRATIVELY

12/1/01 TO 1/1/02

1. File No. 167 Merchants Tire Facility 1321 Long Street

Change to old CVS

2. File No. 908 Martha Jefferson Hospital Lexington Avenue access

Cancer Center Addition at Taylor Street

3. File No. 648 TLC Ballroom and Conference Gleason Street

Center - Old Mattie Graphics

Building

4. File No. Dogwood Housing Ltd. 224 9th Street, SW

T-01-000006 - Offices and Apartments

5. File No. 1246 Meadowcreek Center - Michie Drive

Region Ten Facility –

Landscape Improvements

6. File No. 1256-A Blue Ridge House - 100 Burnet Street at

Outbuilding Addition Elliott Avenue

LIST OF ENTRANCE CORRIDOR (ECH) DISTRICT ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

12/1/01 TO 1/1/02

1. File No. 167 Merchants Tire Facility 1321 Long Street

Change to old CVS

F. COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS

Ms. Lewis has yet to attend a meeting of the Board of Zoning Appeals. This month's meeting has been cancelled.

Ms. Johnson-Harris stated that the CIT meeting of the school board has not met. She was invited to the federation meeting on the fourth Thursday and planned

to attend.

Mr. O'Halloran stated that the two committees he is on have not met since the last meeting.

Mr. Barton reported that the Board of Architectural Review met earlier that day. He had to excuse himself from two items on the agenda.

Mr. Wood stated that there had been no committee meetings.

Mr. Anderson had no special report.

G. CHAIR'S REPORT

Mr. Key stated that his committees would be meeting the next day. The Park Committee was considering leash requirements. Two areas would have specified off-leash times and a time that the leash had to be on the dog at all times.

H. DEPARTMENT/STAFF REPORT

Mr. Tolbert stated that the meeting Thursday night at the Jefferson School at 7 was cancelled over scheduling conflicts.

He also informed the Planning Commission that Ms. Damon's father was in the hospital out of state. He will be sending a card from the Planning Commission.

Staff has been thrilled with the attendance level at the Zoning Committee meetings.

The packets include information about the Planning Commission Institute. Project Status Reports were included in the packets.

Mr. Higgins presented the ballots for the Annual Planning Awards in the categories Outstanding Neighborhood Effort, the Outstanding Plan of Development, the Outstanding Citizen Planner, and Outstanding Example of Access of the Disabled.

Ms. Lewis made the motion to have a Joint Public Hearing on February 12, 2002 with City Council as needed and adjourned the meeting. It was seconded by Ms. Johnson-Harris. The motion carried unanimously.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

James E. Tolbert, AICP, Secretary

APPROVED:

Herman Key, Chair