

MINUTES

CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE

PLANNING COMMISSION

TUESDAY, 9 DECEMBER, 2008 -- 5:30 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

Commissioners present: Commissioners Not Present:

Mr. Jason Pearson (Chairman)

Mr. Michael Farruggio (Vice-Chairman)

Ms. Cheri Lewis

Mr. Michael Osteen

Ms. Genevieve Keller

Mr. Dan Rosensweig

Mr. Bill Emory

Mr. David Neuman, Ex-officio, UVa Office of the Architect

Staff Present:

Mr. Jim Tolbert, AICP, Director NDS

Ms. Missy Creasy

Mr. Brian Haluska

Mr. Nick Rogers

Ms. Ebony Walden

Ms. Leslie Beauregard, Budget Office

Mr. Ryan Davidson, Budget Office

City Council Members Present:

Mr. Julian Taliaferro, Vice Mayor

Mr. David Brown

Ms. Holly Edwards

Mr. Satyendra Huja

Also Present:

Mr. Richard Harris, Deputy City Attorney

II. REGULAR MEETING

Mr. Pearson convened the meeting at 5:31 p.m.

A. COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS

Ms. Keller stated the Community Development Block Grant Task Force was reviewing applications; the process would get more formally underway at the December 15 meeting.

Mr. Rosensweig stated the MPO Tech Committee had not met since the last Planning Commission meeting. The Transfer Development Rights work group had not met but will meet January 29. Mr. Rosensweig noted that Mr. Farruggio had hurt himself and Mr. Rosensweig wished him a speedy recovery.

Mr. Osteen the Board of Architectural Review had met in November but he had nothing to share.

Ms. Lewis stated the City/County/UVa Affordable Housing Task Force had met and made significant changes to their report after getting feedback from the University, City, and County. A rewrite is in order to more accurately reflect the intentions of the three parties and what can be accomplished to address the affordable housing dilemma in the area. She noted the City Housing Advisory Committee has been reaffirmed and reinaugurated by City Council. She noted the Charlottesville Downtown Parking Study had been received. She challenged the Commissioners to look at the study and find how to incorporate it. She stated it contained significant proposals.

Mr. Emory had nothing to report.

Mr. Neuman mentioned that the Climate Communities Group met. There would be some special events occurring related to the three parties working together with regard to a mutual effort related to carbon footprint.

B. CHAIR'S REPORT

Mr. Pearson stated the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Committee met on December 4th and he was not able to attend; however, the Committee had considered an intergovernmental review of the Louisa Wastewater Treatment Facility.

C. DEPARTMENT OF NDS/STAFF REPORTS

Ms. Creasy stated the zoning map update was under way. Comments and inquiries had been received. The report should be forwarded in February. Staff has discussed the Planning Commission Priority Outlines. These should be ready to bring forth for discussion at the January Work Session. The Annual Planning Awards were on the February agenda so nominations should be provided.

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

There were no matters from the public.

CONSENT AGENDA

- 1. Site Plan and Subdivision approval list**
- 2. Minutes** -- October 14, 2008 -- Regular Meeting
- 3. Minutes** -- November 11, 2008 -- Pre-meeting
- 4. Minutes** -- November 11, 2008 -- Regular meeting
- 5. Minutes** -- November 25, 2008 -- Work Session

Mr. Pearson noted that items 2 and 4 were not available for this Consent Agenda.

Ms. Lewis moved to approve items 1, 3, and 5 listed on the Consent Agenda on the agenda this evening. Ms. Keller seconded the motion. Mr. Pearson called a vote by acclamation. The motion carried unanimously.

E. SIDEWALK WAIVER

1. Hartman's Mill Road

Mr. Haluska gave the staff report. The standard of review for sidewalks is found in 29-182(j)(2) of the Subdivision Ordinance: "Sidewalks shall be constructed to approved City standards on both sides of every new street; the dedicated right of way for a public street shall be sufficient to permit installation

of the sidewalks within the right of way on both sides of the street." He also cited 29-182(j)(5): "The agent or commission may vary or approve exceptions to the sidewalk requirements or other design standards that are the subject of this subparagraph. A request for a variance or exception may be made prior to or with submittal of a preliminary plat. . . In reviewing a request, the agent or commission shall consider, in addition to the factors set forth within section 29-36, and as may be applicable to the particular request: (i) whether a surface other than concrete is more appropriate for the subdivision because of the character of the proposed subdivision and the surrounding neighborhood; (ii) whether sidewalks on only one (1) side of the street may be appropriate due to environmental constraints such as streams, stream buffers, critical slopes, floodplain, tree cover, or wetlands, or because lots are provided on only one (1) side of the street; (iii) whether the sidewalks reasonably can connect into an existing or future pedestrian system in the area; (iv) whether the length of the street is so short and the density of the development is so low that it is unlikely that the sidewalk would be used to an extent that it would provide a public benefit; (v) whether an alternate pedestrian system including an alternative pavement could provide more appropriate access throughout the subdivision and to adjoining lands, based on a proposed alternative profile submitted by the subdivider; (vi) whether the sidewalks would be publicly or privately maintained; (vii) whether the waiver promotes the goals of the comprehensive plan, including the applicable neighborhood plan; and (viii) whether waiving the requirement would enable a different principle of the neighborhood plan to be more fully achieved." Mr. Haluska stated (j)(5)(i) did not factor into this application. Item (j)(5)(ii) does apply to this street. The applicant is proposing that the existing right-of-way adjacent to their site would be used as a trail path to the Rivanna Trail Foundation trail which corresponds to item (j)(5)(iii). He stated item (j)(5)(iv) did have some bearing on the development. Jordan Park is directly adjacent to this property. The applicant has been in talks with the City to donate some land for an expansion of Jordan Park. The City would use this as a passive recreation area. The proposed sidewalk would terminate at Jordan Park. There are no houses that front on the opposite side of their extension of the street. There are stormwater considerations that Engineering has reviewed and agrees with, finding that the sidewalk complicates stormwater management. Staff recommends approval.

Ms. Lewis expressed concern that staff was presenting a narrative while the applicant had not submitted anything to give the Commission a sketch or idea of the proposal. She expressed concern that the waiver would be approved and the applicant would come back with a completely different subdivision.

Mr. Rosensweig sought clarification of how the applicant would connect from the sidewalk to the Rivanna Trail. Mr. Haluska stated he would have details on it.

Mr. Pearson recognized the applicant.

Mr. Charles Young, of Sunset Lane, Richmond, stated he owned this property with his sister. He explained they wanted six affordable housing lots with one planned for wheelchair accessibility. Mr. Young stated they wanted single family homes. They were only planning to develop one-third of the property.

Mr. Tom Gale, of Roudabush & Gale, was present to answer questions the Commissioners may have about drainage.

Mr. Rosensweig wanted to know if the above ground outfall was functional. Mr. Gale thought it was functional and did not think there were any problems with it. He also stated there was enough separation between the outfall and the road where it could continue to function as it does now.

Mr. Gale stated he had asked Mr. Haluska if it was possible to pursue the sidewalk waiver to know if the drainage needed to be revised accordingly.

Mr. Emory confessed to being overwhelmed by the scope of review without having a plat to review. He thought the affordable housing idea was wonderful as well as donating park land to the City. However, this felt like putting the cart before the horse to do a sidewalk waiver before seeing any elevations.

Mr. Osteen felt having a plan would have been helpful.

Ms. Keller stated she would prefer to look at this in the total context of the proposed development. She wanted to see a pedestrian connection with the park.

Ms. Lewis concurred with her colleagues due to not having enough data. She felt like a motion to support would be heavily conditioned to the point that deferral might be better.

Mr. Pearson stated he was not as concerned with the lack of information; however, he sensed his colleagues would prefer to spend more time looking at more detailed information.

Mr. Emory moved that they defer this sidewalk application for Tax Map 26, Parcel 67 until they had more information. Ms. Lewis seconded the motion. Mr. Rosensweig thought they should clarify what information was required. He wanted a better sense of the engineering involved on the opposite side of the street and what would need to happen in order to bring that up to standard and whether a sidewalk would make that more difficult or not. Mr. Rosensweig also wanted more information on what happens at the terminus of the sidewalk should a waiver be granted. Mr. Osteen wanted to see how the parking would be laid out as well as wanting more information on the implications of the proposed property trade. Ms. Creasy called the roll. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Pearson called for a brief recess, whereupon the meeting stood recessed at 6:22 p.m.

Mr. Pearson reconvened the meeting at 6:33 p.m. 104109

III. JOINT PUBLIC HEARINGS

F. JOINT PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Charlottesville Capital Improvement Program FY 2010-2014: Consideration of the proposed 5-year Capital Improvement Program totaling \$71,252,849 in the areas of Education, Economic Development, Neighborhood Improvements, Safety & Justice, Facilities Management, Transportation & Access, Parks & Recreation, Technology and General Government Infrastructure.

Mr. Davidson gave a PowerPoint presentation on the CIP.

Ms. Lewis wanted to know why the new sidewalk projects were on hold. Ms. Beauregard stated quite a few current CIP projects had been put on hold this fiscal year as they got a handle on the economy.

Mr. Rosensweig sought clarification of whether state funds would be lost if McIntire Road Extended, Meadowcreek Parkway Interchange, and JPA Bridge were pushed back to 2011. Mr. Tolbert stated there

was no guarantee; however, he was concerned that if the City waffled, the state would find other areas needing monies.

Mr. Huja wanted to know where the revenue sharing could be found. Ms. Beauregard explained that was the transfer from the General Fund into the Capital Project.

Mr. Pearson opened the public hearing.

Mr. John Cruickshank, of 700 Spring Lake Drive, Earlysville, spoke as a representative of the Piedmont Group of the Sierra Club. He stated the organization believed that taxpayer money should be used to help Charlottesville achieve its goal of becoming a more sustainable community. He felt the Meadowcreek Parkway and the interchange at Route 250 projects did not support the City's environmental sustainability goals and commitments.

Ms. Pat Napoleon, of 700 Lyons Avenue, read a prepared statement against the plan for the mutilation of McIntire Park. She felt the Parkway proposal was being driven by County politicians and developers.

Mr. Steven Bach, of 1208 Meriwether Street, noted he was a local member of the Sierra Club and endorsed Mr. Cruickshank's remarks. He felt sidewalks should be a higher priority while the Meadowcreek Parkway should be lower. He asked that they cut the funds for the Parkway.

Mr. Daniel Bluestone, of 501 Parkhill Avenue, was concerned about the timing of the funding for roadwork. He felt the Parkway construction plans should be rethought in this time of fiscal crisis.

Mr. Stratton Zalitus, of 704 Graves Street, thought the Meadowcreek Parkway would be not only a waste of money but also would be spending valuable public money on something that would harm the City. It would create a bypass of the main retail area and turn City shoppers into County shoppers while destroying the Park and increasing traffic in Charlottesville.

With no one else wishing to speak to the matter, Mr. Pearson closed the public hearing and called for discussion from the Commissioners.

Ms. Keller noted that working on the CIP was one of the stated duties of the Planning Commission, yet they get it at the end stage. She expressed a desire to initiate a dialog between the Commission, the City, and City Staff.

Ms. Lewis agreed with Ms. Keller. She agreed they could be more involved during the year. She thanked Ms. Beauregard and City Council for refining the process which had improved since her first year on the Commission when it simply rubber stamped the CIP.

Mr. Emory echoed Ms. Lewis's comments that once upon a time the Planning Commission was not involved in the Comprehensive Plan. He noted economic times were hard and the budget needed to be cut, but was concerned that monies for the park and sidewalks were decreased. He stated his inclination to register a discontent vote against this Capital Improvement Program.

Mr. Rosensweig echoed some of Mr. Emory's sentiments. He noted that most of the goals of the Comprehensive Plan for Parks and Recreation necessitate the acquisition of more parkland. He suggested recommending to Council inclusion of some money for acquisition of parkland.

Ms. Keller stated she had considerable difficulty with a budget that includes funding for McIntire Extended and the Meadowcreek Parkway. She felt it was a flawed plan based on 1960s and 1970s planning principles.

Mr. Huja asked to be recognized. Mr. Pearson noted the Commission was in discussion and sought the consensus of the Commissioners. Ms. Lewis noted the policy has been that Council members participate in the question period, but once the public hearing closes, comments from Councilors may have undue influence over the decision of the Commissioners, who are appointed by Council. Mr. Brown agreed with Ms. Lewis that Council asks the Planning Commission to make recommendations to City Council, not for the combination of the Planning Commission and City Council to make recommendations to City Council.

Mr. Emory noted the need to keep the funding stream going of top priority items.

Ms. Lewis wanted to know the implications of not approving the CIP at this time. Mr. Tolbert stated the Commission had several options: to recommend it as is; to recommend Council not take it as is; to recommend Council consider a CIP that changed some priorities. Mr. Tolbert also noted that Ms. Beauregard did need to put together a CIP with numbers and projects that will go to Council shortly after the first of the year.

Ms. Keller moved approval of the CIP as presented exclusive of the match for the Meadowcreek Parkway and McIntire Extended with an increase in expenditures for sidewalk repair and construction and an increase in funds for acquisition of parkland. Mr. Emory seconded the motion. Mr. Pearson sought clarification from Mr. Tolbert if the motion is consistent with the nature of the recommendation he made to the Commission. Mr. Tolbert confirmed it was. Mr. Rosensweig wanted to clarify that the Meadowcreek Parkway was now called McIntire Road Extended and the interchange is called the Route 250 Interchange. Ms. Keller accepted a friendly amendment to use the proper nomenclature. Mr. Tolbert noted the amount budgeted for sidewalk repair is the amount study has shown to do all of the repair required. Ms. Keller amended her motion to increase expenditures for sidewalk construction. Mr. Osteen wanted to know if monies had ever been set aside for parkland acquisition or if this was a new line item. Ms. Beauregard believed it to be a new item. Ms. Lewis noted that her multipart motion last year included a recommendation from the Commission that some of the Economic Development Strategic Initiative fund, which currently has a balance of \$4.3 million, go to acquisition of parkland and payment of infrastructure and utility upgrades to compensate for the density that they have zoned the City to accommodate. Ms. Lewis stated she would again support that sentiment. Ms. Lewis stated she could not support the denial of matching funds for the Route 250 Interchange and the McIntire Road project as she had served on the Joint Steering Committee and believed that project should move forward. Mr. Osteen noted a motion of so many parts would have any one part alienating a particular voter. He stated he would not take a stand against the acquisition of parkland but he did think this was the appropriate year to create this fund. Mr. Pearson stated he was in support of the motion as crafted. He echoed Mr. Rosensweig's statements that acquisition of parkland does represent economic development activity and does so in both the short and long term. Ms. Creasy called the roll. The motion passed, 4-2; Ms. Lewis and Mr. Osteen voted against.

Mr. Pearson noted the presence of the class of the Neighborhood Leadership Institute. Ms. Creasy explained that the Neighborhood Leadership Institute provides the citizenship with a City Government

101 to learn about the different aspects of the community and to try and grow the community members in order to expose them to different things they may want to join as future community leaders.

2. SP-08-06-09: (100, 102, 104 Oakhurst Circle and 1616 JPA) An application for a special use permit for the property at 100, 102, 104 Oakhurst Circle and 1616 Jefferson Park Avenue. This is a request to allow for increased density from 21 units per acre to 32 units per acre and a reduced front yard setback from 25 feet to 12 feet. The submitted site plan proposes the conversion of the two existing apartment buildings and one single family dwelling to a 27 room bed and breakfast, and the renovation of one existing building which will have five apartments and a new building with 36 units. This property is further identified on City Real Property Tax Map 11 as parcels 1, 2, 3 and 4 having approximately 450 feet of frontage on Jefferson Park Ave and 170 on Oakhurst Circle and containing approximately 55,755 square feet of land or 1.28 acres. The zoning of this property is currently R-3 with Historic Overlay and general uses called for in the Land Use Plan of the Comprehensive Plan are for Two Family Residential.

Ms. Walden gave the staff report. This public hearing item was deferred from the July 22nd, 2008, meeting due to concerns by Commissioners and neighborhood residents about the traffic impact on Oakhurst Circle. The applicant has since acquired 1616 Jefferson Park Avenue in order to provide the Bed and Breakfast a drop off onto JPA and try to reduce some of the traffic impact on Oakhurst Circle. Other changes in the plan include a three guest room increase in the bed and breakfast and an increase of six units in the proposed apartment building. Although the units have increased, the density request has remained the same because of the land acquisition. The density increase amounts to 15 additional units on the site. The development would front on Jefferson Park Avenue. This development is harmonious with those existing patterns of development. Staff feels the density increase is reasonable and appropriate. The Bed and Breakfast is a by-right development. The applicant has also been working with City Staff for some time on the proposed intersection realignment, which will provide noteworthy improvements in pedestrian/bicycle safety. The realignment will require acquisition of City right-of-way and would not occur unless the Special Use Permit is approved. Staff recommends that this realignment and land acquisition be a condition of the Special Use Permit. The applicant requests a reduction in the setback to 12 feet due to concerns of the Board of Architectural Review that there be space between the historic structures and the new development. A site plan conference was held on May 7 with three members of the public attending. Residents were concerned about the number of bedrooms in the Bed and Breakfast, the potential increase in density and increasing the vehicular travel on Oakhurst/Gildersleeve Wood; they were pleased with renovating the historic structures. Before the last public hearing, there were two letters of opposition and seven members of the public attended in opposition of the development. Since that public hearing, the developer has met with the neighborhood. The president of the Neighborhood Association submitted a letter endorsing the project. The UVA Office of the Architect submitted a letter endorsing the intersection realignment. One letter had been received from a neighbor in opposition of the plan and was forwarded to the Commissioners. Staff believes this is a quality development with many good practices that promote sustainability including renovating historic structures, reusing water, pedestrian and bike-friendly improvements, and attempts by the applicant to decrease automobile traffic. Staff recommends approval with the following conditions: the owner has proposed to provide bicycles for residents and B&B guests; the realignment of the JPA intersection and associated land acquisition proposed by the applicant -- if the re-alignment is not approved by the City, this SUP is of no effect; reduction of the setback as proposed on the site plan;

that those units attributed to the increase in density be limited to two-bedroom units as currently proposed; and at least ten points on the City's LID Worksheet.

Mr. Pearson reminded the public and the Commission that the Commission could not discuss the issue of the number of rooms proposed in the Bed and Breakfast.

Mr. Osteen noted for the record that he owns 122 Oakhurst Circle and that he lives on Gildersleeve Wood. He did not think this would prejudice his decisions on the matter. He noted he attended both Neighborhood Association meetings with the developer.

Mr. Rosensweig noted that since the last meeting he had met with the applicant in NDS.

Ms. Lewis noted she had also met with the applicant with NDS staff present.

Mr. Pearson noted he had met with the applicant as well.

Ms. Keller noted she had met with the applicant in City Hall.

Mr. Emory noted he had been present with Ms. Lewis when she met with the applicant.

Mr. Rosensweig sought clarification of the condition the units attributable to the approved increase in density be limited to two-bedroom units. Ms. Walden stated the application says they will do two-bedroom units and density is calculated as units per acre.

Mr. Pearson recognized the applicant.

Mr. Neal Deputy, of Neal Deputy Architects, thanked the Commissioners for their help. He provided a history of the project. He noted there were three primary issues from the July public hearing: how to mitigate perceived traffic congestion noise from the bed and breakfast; was there reason to change the underlying zoning; and how to get neighborhood support. A less intense use is now proposed to help mitigate the traffic concerns through putting all check-in and deliveries at 1616 JPA. He felt the Comprehensive Plan supported the project. He felt the addition of 1616 Jefferson Park Avenue and the removal of traffic from Oakhurst to JPA addresses the neighborhood concerns. Mr. Deputy thought the neighborhood would be improved by the rehabilitation and restoration of the historic structures.

Mr. Pearson opened the public hearing.

Ms. Jane Foster, of 6 Gildersleeve Wood, stated she had been opposed to this in July but was present in support of the project.

Ms. Gail McIntosh, of 9 Gildersleeve Wood, concurred with Ms. Foster.

Ms. Nina Barnes, of 12 Gildersleeve Wood, read a prepared statement expressing her concerns including beautification of the neighborhood and safety. She felt this area needed special attention. Neighbors were complaining about the harsh lighting from parking garages and entrances on JPA; Mr. Deputy has said he will talk to the neighbors so this doesn't happen. She expressed concern about excess traffic on the narrow lane-like streets of Oakhurst Circle, Gildersleeve Wood, and Valley Road.

With no one else wishing to speak to the matter, Mr. Pearson closed the public hearing and called for discussion among the Commissioners.

Mr. Osteen stated the neighborhood concern had been due to the differing ideas of a bed and breakfast. He felt the applicant had done a great job of addressing the issues. He did not feel the traffic problem was totally solved but it was being mitigated. He felt approval should be conditioned with the exact number of bedrooms listed in the submittal.

Ms. Lewis felt the project had improved with the acquisition and incorporation of 1616 JPA. She appreciated the applicant working with the neighbors. Ms. Lewis stated the applicant had done his best to minimize any potentially adverse impacts to the neighborhood and community in general. She thanked Ms. Walden for all of her work on this.

Mr. Rosensweig echoed Ms. Lewis's sentiments that this was one of the better staff reports given with the most complexities. Mr. Rosensweig thought this was an example of an applicant and a neighborhood determined to work together and a model of how development should happen. Mr. Rosensweig stated he would support the project with the conditions outlined by Staff and amended to reflect Mr. Osteen's ideas.

Ms. Keller stated she was also prepared to support this as an exemplary project. She felt this project, with the addition of the building on JPA, had gone to great lengths to mitigate any effects.

Mr. Pearson clarified for the public that LID referred to Low Impact Development strategies. These strategies are generally designed to replicate the predevelopment hydrologic regime through a combination of small scale distributed practices; measures that can be considered include green roofs, rainwater harvesting, and water quality swales.

Mr. Osteen moved to recommend approval of this Special Use Permit application for increased density of 32 DUA at Tax Map 11, Parcels 1, 2, 3 and 4 referred to as Oakhurst Inn & Apartments with the conditions outlined by staff, including the owner providing at least four bicycles for use by the B&B guests and residents; realignment of the JPA/Emmet intersection as indicated on the site plan provided that the land acquisition for the proposed JPA Avenue right-of-way improvements is approved by City Council; reduction of the front yard setback to 12 feet as laid out on the site plan; that the applicant achieve at least 10 points on the City's LID Worksheet; and including the proposed development and distribution of units and bedrooms to include 36 new apartments, 33 of them two-bedroom, three of them one-bedroom, and the continued use of 104 Oakhurst Circle for five one-bedroom apartments on the basis that the proposal would serve the interests of the general public welfare and good zoning practice. Mr. Rosensweig seconded the motion. Mr. Tolbert suggested a Commissioner might make a friendly amendment that it be referred to as the conceptual site plan since this is not presented as a preliminary. Mr. Pearson offered that friendly amendment. Mr. Osteen and Mr. Rosensweig accepted the friendly amendment. Mr. Rosensweig noted that Mr. Farruggio had been concerned about the intermingling of the bike lane and sidewalk; by the time this comes for site plan approval, there will need to be a creative solution. Mr. Osteen noted he also had some site plan issues that were not relevant to this Special Use Permit: the location of the bike racks, a gravel parking space which needs to be eliminated, and mailboxes at the corner of Oakhurst. Ms. Lewis dittoed the concerns about the pedestrian and bike lanes. Mr. Pearson noted these comments were being provided as insight into the issues that will be scrutinized when the site plan comes before the Commission. Ms. Creasy called the roll. The motion carried unanimously.

3. ZT-08-11-41: (Development review process) An ordinance to amend and reordain Section 34-160, and Article VII Site Plans, Division 2 Procedures of the Code of The City of Charlottesville, 1990, as amended (Zoning Ordinance), to amend site plan review procedures including additional advertisements, shorter review timeframes for site plans with affordable housing, addition to the required number of submitted plans and revisions to preliminary and final site plan content requirements.

Mr. Tolbert gave the staff report. On October 6, City Council passed a zoning initiation resolution asking the Planning Commission to study revisions to the process for zoning submittals to allow the Commissioners to focus more of their time and Staff time on more strategic issues, to streamline the site review process while maintaining adequate oversight, and to provide incentives for affordable housing.

Mr. Pearson sought clarification that Mr. Harris would integrate a clause into 34-801 to review whether these changes are working. Mr. Tolbert believed that was the intent.

Mr. Pearson opened the public hearing. With no one wishing to speak to the matter, Mr. Pearson closed the public hearing and called for discussion among the Commissioners.

Ms. Lewis felt the improved notice to owners within 500 feet was a great move.

Ms. Keller agreed the notices were improved. She suggested that "site plan" as shown on page 9 be two words. She wondered if the word "erected" in Section 34-828(d)(1) should be "installed." Mr. Harris suggested instead the phrase "or installed" be added. She suggested additional wordsmithing.

Mr. Pearson noted any motion should include the notation of Mr. Tolbert's change to 34-827 eliminating the text regarding 11x17 inch plans as well as the change to 34-801.

Ms. Keller thought site plans should be a staff function. She thought this would make the meetings go more smoothly. She wholeheartedly endorsed the proposal.

Ms. Keller wanted to know how to word a motion with the all of the revisions. Mr. Tolbert suggested "so moved" as they had the it. Ms. Keller so moved. Mr. Osteen seconded the motion. Mr. Pearson seconded Ms. Keller's comments as he had been a strong advocate of these changes. Ms. Creasy called the roll. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Lewis moved to wish everyone a happy holiday and to adjourn to the second Tuesday in January. Mr. Osteen seconded the motion. Mr. Pearson called the vote by acclamation. The motion carried unanimously, whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 9:18 p.m.