

**RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**February 1, 2010**

1  
2  
3  
4 *[Members Present: Heather Cairns, Olin Westbrook, David Tuttle, Pat Palmer, Deas*  
5 *Manning, Elizabeth Mattos-Ward, Stephen Gilchrist; Absent: Kathleen McDaniel]*

6  
7 Called to order: 1:07pm

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We'll call the February meeting of Planning Commission  
9 to order. Let me read this into the Record. "In accordance with the Freedom of  
10 Information Act a copy of the Agenda was sent to radio and TV stations, newspapers,  
11 persons requesting notification, and was posted on the bulletin board located in the  
12 lobby of the County Administration Building." Has everybody had a chance to look at  
13 the January Minutes? Any changes, additions, deletions, motions?

14 MS. CAIRNS: I make a motion to approve the Minutes.

15 MR. WESTBROOK: I'll second.

16 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Motion and a second. All those in favor of approving the  
17 Minutes please signify by raising your hand.

18 *[Approved: Cairns, Westbrook, Tuttle, Palmer, Manning, Mattos-Ward, Gilchrist;*  
19 *Absent: McDaniel]*

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Road name approvals. Do we have any motions?

21 MS. CAIRNS: I make a motion that we approve the road names.

22 MR. TUTTLE: Second.

23 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Have a motion and a second to approve the road names,  
24 please signify by raising your hand. Those opposed?

25 *[Approved: Cairns, Westbrook, Tuttle, Palmer, Manning, Mattos-Ward, Gilchrist;*  
26 *Absent: McDaniel]*

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any Agenda amendments?

2 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there is. Under Other Business there should  
3 be a item two Rule Changes. And the ordinances, the two ordinances that are in your  
4 package have been swapped out with the new ordinances that were just handed out.  
5 And those are all the changes.

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Anything else? Do we have a motion to amend  
7 the Agenda as stated?

8 MR. TUTTLE: I'd like to make a motion, Mr. Chairman, that we amend the  
9 Agenda as stated.

10 MR. GILCHRIST: Second.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Those in favor please signify by raising your hand.

12 *[Approved: Cairns, Westbrook, Tuttle, Palmer, Manning, Mattos-Ward, Gilchrist;*  
13 *Absent: McDaniel]*

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: None opposed. Case No. 10-02 MA.

15 **CASE NO. 10-02 MA:**

16 MS. ALMEIDA: Mr. Chairman, this application – property owner Nathan  
17 Branham. Location is on Lorick Road. The acreage of the site is 83.5 acres. The  
18 existing zoning is Rural. The proposed zoning request is Residential Single-Family  
19 Estate. The current zoning reflects the original zoning from September 7<sup>th</sup>, 1977 and  
20 the parcel contains approximately 572' of frontage along Lorick Road. The 2008 DOT  
21 traffic count station is number 415. Lorick Road is classified as a two-lane undivided  
22 collector road maintained by DOT. The design capacity, as you can see on page two, is  
23 8,600. The level of service is an A. The Residential Single-Family Estate is designed

1 for low to medium density rural residential development in those areas that separate  
2 more urban communities from rural areas. The subject parcel is roughly 2.3 miles  
3 northwest of the Killian Road Priority Investment Area. The Residential Single-Family  
4 Estate would allow for a smaller lot size of 20,000 square feet versus the 33,000 square  
5 foot minimum of Rural district. East of the site entrance on Lorick Road and contiguous  
6 to the parcel is the Church of God Prophecy Church. Within a half mile southeast of the  
7 parcel is Heritage Hills which is a rural subdivision. The parcel is located in School  
8 District Two. We have contacted the schools. The three schools nearest are Killian  
9 Elementary, Longleaf Middle and Ridgeview High. The school district has indicated  
10 adequate capacity for the additional students. Lorick Road is within the additional fire  
11 hydrant along parcels – a fire hydrant is located south of the parcel so it does have that  
12 capacity. Water and sewer is provided by the City of Columbia. We feel the proposed  
13 rezoning would not negatively impact public services or traffic. The proposed rezoning  
14 request we feel is compatible with the surrounding land uses and Planning Staff  
15 recommends approval.

16 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any questions for Staff? We have four individuals signed  
17 up to speak. Joseph Younan? Followed by Eddie Stan.

18 **TESTIMONY OF JOSEPH YOUNAN:**

19 MR. YOUNAN: Good afternoon. Joseph Younan with W.K. Dixon. I'm a civil  
20 engineer and a planner. With me are two of the owners. The development Mr. Nathan  
21 Branham and his father, Mr. Grady(?) Branham. It's an existing subdivision. I want to  
22 emphasize this. We broke ground and had it open for business a little over a year ago.  
23 The roads have been cut. Water and sewer have been installed. We had anticipated

1 115 lots, approximately 115 lots with the Rural type the zoning. And so on average the  
2 lot sizes are not, are hardly changing. As you can see, all the roads are in. Phase One  
3 takes you approximately 1/3 up into the property from the bottom up, and the  
4 subdivision has been sitting idle. Needless to say it's a hardship situation for them. The  
5 bank wants them to do something with it and the only way to do that is by yielding a few  
6 more lots, not that many, to make it more affordable to the consumer and to move the  
7 lots. We have dedicated approximately 30 acres from the previous design to, with  
8 emphasis on Rural development with emphasis on green space. None of that will  
9 change. The road alignments would not change. The water and sewer would not  
10 change. We're trying to get it perhaps around 148, 150 lots rather than the one, I think  
11 what we're asking for is 170 lots which is 20,000 square foot per acre but we'll never get  
12 there only because we're committed to this alignment. So a few more lots can come a  
13 long way and this can move the subdivision forward financially for the homeowners or  
14 the property owners as well as the county being able to generate tax money on it. I  
15 leave it up to Mr. Branham.

16 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Mr. Branham?

17 **TESTIMONY OF NATHAN BRANHAM:**

18 MR. BRANHAM: Hi. I appreciate y'all seeing us today. My father and I we both  
19 live and work in Richland County and always have. A lot of you I think know us back  
20 when we were mechanical contractors for 30 years. We began developing about 10  
21 years ago and when we started this project in '06 the market was for, we were looking  
22 at a market of a home around three to three-fifty but unfortunately with the change in the  
23 economy and the change in the affordability in housing we just need to drop down to

1 two to two-fifty. There's a market that the demographics show would work based on  
2 local builders as well as the national builders. And in order to add these few lots we  
3 could lower our bank, the bank has agreed we could lower the price per lot, still keep  
4 our loan in place which is really, if any of you are in the development field, it's really  
5 hard to renew your loans now. It's not the same process anymore. So we're trying to  
6 do what's best for everyone and it's certainly been tough on us. Our intent was great.  
7 We put in a bus circle, we put in walking trails. We did a lot of things to make our  
8 community a nice community. So if you would consider this it would really help us and I  
9 think it could bring possibly 140 or 50 homeowners to Richland County for paying taxes  
10 on the home and the land instead of just the raw land. We have not sold one lot since  
11 we opened the subdivision. We've had a lot of interest; everyone loves the area. They  
12 love the community, the schools. It's just a price point. That price point is just dead in  
13 sales today. If you guys would consider it we really would appreciate it.

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I have a question for you. Have you already done the  
15 stub ups on the first phase?

16 MR. BRANHAM: Yes, sir.

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: So then I would imagine those lots wouldn't change then,  
18 would they?

19 MR. BRANHAM: Yes, sir. We would going to add water stub ups in between a  
20 few of the lots and sewer stub ups between a few of the lots but the sewer mains would  
21 not, the water mains would not change.

22 MR. YOUNAN: I think we're lacking about 10 to 15 lots out of those lots that  
23 need to be added on to it, the water and sewer.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any other questions for the applicant? Thank you.

2 MR. BRANHAM: Thank y'all.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Mr. Eddie Stan followed by Kenny Roland.

4 **TESTIMONY OF EDDIE STEVENS:**

5 MR. STEVENS: I'm Eddie Stevens. I live directly across the street. I have a  
6 farm right across there, right across from the driveway or this entrance. And I,  
7 personally I hate to see additional lots put in there. At this point if you've got 150 lots  
8 you'll have 200 cars coming out there in the mornings. This is a secondary road. You  
9 can look. The road is real rough. It's not a well-kept road. Again I'm thinking, you  
10 know, 200 cars perhaps coming out there each morning right in front of my driveway.  
11 What's happening is when we got a property tax issue, it went up and I called and  
12 asked why. They said well over on Turkey Farm Road developers went in there and  
13 they built \$500,000 houses over there and there may be 50 I'll say but what happened  
14 there all of that seems to effect all the property around and our property tax just went up  
15 and up, and I'm just concerned that if we go with so many more lots what is going to  
16 built across the street from me and each one of you might think well as the developer  
17 says it's a nice area and we want to keep it that way and really I'm against, I was  
18 against it from the start because we're in a rural area as it says and all the other traffic's  
19 just going to cause more headache for everybody and I don't know if the roads can  
20 really take it myself unless somebody paves some roads and straighten them up. But  
21 then also I guess my biggest complaint is I'm afraid that if the developer, all he – well  
22 usually a developer wants to sell. In other words what he's got, he's got a problem so  
23 he may not, is he going to require that the houses be 250,000? They dropped 100,000

1 already. Are they going to drop another hundred and you have 150, you know,  
2 \$150,000 homes in there and 200 cars coming out in the morning? That's my biggest  
3 concern and I really hate to see that happen. Any questions?

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any questions? Thank you. Kenny Roland?

5 **TESTIMONY OF KENNY ROLAND:**

6 MR. ROLAND: I'm Kenny Roland. I'm the landowner. If you could bring the map  
7 back up. I own the 50 acres to the left of the subdivision now and it abuts my property.  
8 I've got a fairly long exposure to this development. As I understood it originally it was  
9 approved for 80 lots, 82 lots, I think? And now all of a sudden going to 120 to 170 and I  
10 heard the word few mentioned? That's a lot. That's a bunch. And as Mr. Stevens said,  
11 if you multiply that many lots times two for automobiles. I don't know how many of you  
12 guys are familiar with that area. The road in itself is not great but it's not a killer. What's  
13 going to happen though is when you get Lorick Road dumping onto 21 and try to turn  
14 onto 21 and then Killian which everybody's trying to get to 77 that's going to be a mess.  
15 It's starting to get crowded now. It's going to be a wreck soon. I don't wish the  
16 Branhams any ill will; business is business. They said they hadn't sold a single lot.  
17 There hasn't been a single ad run for these properties. There has not been a for sale  
18 sign on this property in a year until the last sign went up to sell the whole subdivision in  
19 mass. I've had my own business for 30-something years and you usually don't sell  
20 something unless you try real hard. That would be my answer to his initial attempt at  
21 building what we – I had no – didn't like it at the time but the 82 lot, 82 lot idea Mr.  
22 Branham had a lot of great ideas. He did really good set asides for natural areas. As I  
23 understand it since they started the subdivision and now the rules have changed for the

1 amount of land he has to set aside; am I correct in that? Has the amount of land he has  
2 to set aside per buildable acre changed at all?

3 MS. ALMEIDA: No. Not at all.

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Once he's approved, he's approved.

5 MS. ALMEIDA: Yeah.

6 MR. ROLAND: Okay.

7 MS. ALMEIDA: But that hasn't changed.

8 MR. ROLAND: Under the original approval for this subdivision there was a  
9 certain amount of green space. Are they going to be required, he says he's committed  
10 but is he required? Are they required to have the same green space?

11 MR. ALMEIDA: Mr. Younan. This was not an open space provision subdivision.  
12 It was a straight by right; correct? So there was no open space required because it was  
13 by right.

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: They didn't use any bonuses?

15 MS. ALMEIDA: No.

16 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any open space bonuses?

17 MS. ALMEIDA: That's what the engineer's telling me. No. 33,000 square feet.

18 MR. TUTTLE: So Anna just for clarity restated. There is no open space  
19 requirement under either, either zoning the existing or the proposed?

20 MS. ALMEIDA: If it's RU, correct.

21 MR. TUTTLE: It's a moot point?

22 MS. ALMEIDA: Correct.

23 CHAIRMAN PALMER: What he put up was simply voluntary on his part?



1 MR. ROLAND: Okay. So that could all go away?

2 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah. But those were, I mean, just so you know, I mean, the land  
3 is zoned a certain way and every property owner has A by right right to subdivide it so  
4 long as each lot is big enough based on whatever his current zoning is for that. We  
5 don't have a requirement for open space in Richland County. If you have land and you  
6 can subdivide it into 30 – the way it's zoned right now to 33,000 square foot lots you can  
7 do it.

8 MR. ROLAND: Okay. How many lots ultimately could he divide this into?

9 MS. ALMEIDA: In Rural, I mean, 110 lots because he's got 83.5 acres at 33,000  
10 square feet, roughly that would be a gross number.

11 MR. ROLAND: Okay. But he wants to go to 120(?). How many?

12 MS. ALMEIDA: Right. On a gross number you're looking at 181. The gross  
13 number.

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: And by that that doesn't take out anything for  
15 infrastructure.

16 MS. ALMEIDA: Correct.

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: But the best guess is is 127 at the most is the best guess  
18 with infrastructure and that kind of stuff.

19 MS. ALMEIDA: Um-hum (affirmative).

20 MR. ROLAND: Okay. So he was talking about gross and not net when he  
21 mentioned 170?

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

1 MR. ROLAND: My question to, for the Planning Commission is Town and  
2 Country dead as a planning tool for this county?

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: It's still an option on the books.

4 MS. ALMEIDA: Town and Country's [inaudible] in the new plan?

5 MR. GOSLINE: The new comprehensive plan that's been approved it did not  
6 include the Town and Country [inaudible].

7 MS. CAIRNS: But it's got the –

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: It's still a zoning application someone can apply for on  
9 the books so I guess it still is a possibility.

10 MR. ROLAND: Well the overall planning of the development – the ongoing  
11 development of Richland County we're still trying to do the clusters and then do away  
12 with some of the [inaudible].

13 MS. CAIRNS: It's an option that exists for builders. We have the green code  
14 right?

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have the green code. Town and Country's just one  
16 zoning application that people can apply for if they wish to. However it was not included  
17 in the 2009 comprehensive plan as a guide which this county wants to go to.

18 MR. ROLAND: Okay. There was, as I understood it a couple years ago that was  
19 kind of the direction we wanted to take though; am I right?

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Back when the previous comprehensive plan was passed  
21 what, 10, 12 years ago?

22 MS. ALMEIDA: When the re-write? Yeah.

23 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah.

1 MS. ALMEIDA: Um-hum (affirmative).

2 MR. ROLAND: I just ask the Commission to, I take it you guys forward your  
3 recommendations on to Council. My request is that you would take our feelings into  
4 consideration as well as if we could get everybody the voice of the street's going to say  
5 no. Everybody that we've talked to up and down that road doesn't want it. We just ask  
6 that you all consider and I would ask the Branhams and their developer to please  
7 consider us and maybe not go whole hog into this thing. Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. That's all we have signed up to speak.

9 MS. CAIRNS: I have a question for Staff. In the plans and policies it talks about  
10 how this particular parcel is – the comp plan is in a Rural area. However is it  
11 immediately adjacent to an area that we've designated as Suburban?

12 MS. ALMEIDA: You know, the lines are so somewhat vague. They're not parcel  
13 based so understand what we're working with. It is practically right there at the  
14 Suburban ring, at the Suburban edge.

15 MS. CAIRNS: I mean, if it was at the suburban edge what would be the –

16 MS. ALMEIDA: Suburban/Rural line.

17 MS. CAIRNS: Then what would be the lot size that would be, in the Suburban  
18 what's the?

19 MS. ALMEIDA: Tom? Do you want to [inaudible]?

20 MR. DELAGE: For the Suburban it would be four and with the Rural [inaudible]  
21 recommend generally. Once you get further out into the rural the traditional [inaudible]  
22 33,000 square feet? This area is literally, the floodplain is where the line is for the Rural  
23 and Suburban so it's right on the edge of it. We do bring up some talk in the

1 comprehensive plan about the transition areas and this would definitely be one of them.

2 Oh, by the way, Thomas Delage, sorry.

3 MS. CAIRNS: I'm – one of your comments confused me. I'm sorry. You're  
4 saying that the floodplain was where the comp plan changed from recommending Rural  
5 to recommending -

6 MR. DELAGE: The approximation line is right there.

7 MS. CAIRNS: I mean, it doesn't [inaudible].

8 MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion –

9 MR. MANNING: I have one question for Mr. Younan. In this reconfiguration  
10 basically you're only dealing with lot lines; correct? I mean, are you having to modify  
11 your storm drain to accept the high volume of water or is everything the same as it was  
12 previously?

13 MR. YOUNAN: All the infrastructure, drainage, sewer and water with the  
14 exception of a few cleanouts are in, [inaudible] sewer services and water services. But  
15 the main lines are all in.

16 MR. MANNING: And buffers? Are there any buffers?

17 MR. YOUNAN: The, all the green space that we've created previously for the  
18 110 lots developments are going to remain.

19 MR. MANNING: We have not been privy to that since that was coming through a  
20 Rural zoning. We just, went straight to the Development Review Team so I don't know  
21 what the layout looked like. But did it have perimeter buffers or just green space in the -

22 MR. YOUNAN: It had both. It had buffers as well as green space, walking trails.  
23 All of that was submitted and permitted and constructed when we produced the 110 lot

1 version. So we have on the ground 110 lot development and I don't think we'll get to  
2 170 or 180. I think it's going to be below 150. I mean, he can assure you, I can assure  
3 you that because we're committed to a certain layout that's already, is on the ground.

4 MR. MANNING: So basically your lot width would(?) change, not your depth?

5 MR. YOUNAN: That's right. It's a paper job. It's a surveyor's paper job.

6 [Inaudible] of the lots are unchanged. The width of the lots have been –

7 MR. TUTTLE: What's the rear setback requirement for an RSE?

8 MS. ALMEIDA: RSE? Thirty. Thirty rear, 10 side, 35 front.

9 MR. TUTTLE: And RU would be?

10 MS. ALMEIDA: Fifty rear, 20 side, 40 front.

11 MR. MANNING: Is that from the buffer or is that from the property line?

12 MS. ALMEIDA: The property line.

13 MR. MANNING: Were these buffers a non-disturbed buffer? I mean, were they  
14 – and how deep?

15 MR. YOUNAN: We had, and I can show you the layout that I generated. So  
16 mainly we were averaging 160, 170' deep lots. None of that would be changing. We  
17 had green space all around the property as you can see. None of that would be  
18 changing. We met with Geo Price the Zoning Administrator and he'd seen the layout  
19 and he contributed to this, you know, with suggestions contributed to it.

20 MR. TUTTLE: Anna, when it changes zoning since the adjacent property has a  
21 different zoning is there a buffer requirement that didn't exist before?

22 MS. ALMEIDA: Well, because it, because there's not such a significant – it  
23 wouldn't throw that residential into multi-family or high density. It would, the buffer

1 would be the same. No buffer would be required. When you're going from RU to RSE  
2 there's really – now if you went from an RU to an RS-MD, HD it would require a buffer.

3 MR. TUTTLE: Thank you.

4 MR. MANNING: The depth of that buffer do you know what that was?

5 MR. TUTTLE: I couldn't really tell.

6 MR. MANNING: It was on there somewhere.

7 MR. YOUNAN: It varies depending on where you are around the perimeter of  
8 the property. But I could [inaudible] set buffer, I remember that we had a buffer  
9 between us and south of the property. I remember that and it's showing on that drawing  
10 I think. About 20' yeah, easily.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Anna, would this [inaudible] now have to come into  
12 compliance with storm water permits?

13 MS. ALMEIDA: When was this approved?

14 MR. YOUNAN: Approved about a year and a half ago.

15 MS. ALMEIDA: It would –

16 MR. YOUNAN: We finished construction about a year ago.

17 MS. ALMEIDA: We'd have to look and see but because the infrastructure is in  
18 I'm pretty sure it would be, it would not be required to the new storm water regulations.

19 MR. YOUNAN: It stabilized - we had a final, not a final inspection but a bonded  
20 plat inspection with the county inspectors and all the sediment basis are intact. We sent  
21 our contractors there –

22 MS. ALMEIDA: It would be entitled.

1 MR. YOUNAN: - repeatedly to check on everything and freshen up the erosion  
2 control measures.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Would this then have to go through the subdivision  
4 approval process again?

5 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes, it would.

6 MR. YOUNAN: For Phase Two, sure.

7 MS. ALMEIDA: The Development Review Team.

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

9 MR. MANNING: I guess my only concern is that the buffer widths are, in places  
10 they're very ample but on that property line that runs down, it's a west boundary, when  
11 you change the zoning from Rural to Estate lots setbacks can change. I think that's  
12 something you need to address going forward. You could push that house back 30'  
13 then you're not totally protected from buffers so those are some things [inaudible].

14 MR. YOUNAN: I think we have room to beef up the buffer.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any other questions?

16 MS. CAIRNS: I just got sort of comments to, a little bit to the fellows about the  
17 density out there in what feels like a rural area. And just – I sort of mentioned earlier but  
18 just to repeat. This is something that our Code allows in terms of building to 33,000  
19 square foot lots in what we deem rural areas of the county. You know, large tract  
20 property owners have the right to just go in and subdivide into ¾ acre lots without any  
21 kind of approval. And whether that changes the rural character of the rural areas is  
22 something to address with the elected officials. That's it.

23 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you, Mr. Younan.

1 MR. YOUNAN: Thank you.

2 MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion to follow Staff's  
3 recommendations to move Case 10-02 MA forward to Council for approval.

4 MR. GILCHRIST: Second, Mr. Chairman.

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion and a second. Any other  
6 discussions? All those in favor of sending this case forward to Council with a  
7 recommendation of approval please signify by raising your hand.

8 *[Approved: Cairns, Westbrook, Tuttle, Palmer, Manning, Mattos-Ward, Gilchrist;*  
9 *Absent: McDaniel]*

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: None opposed. For everyone's information Council's  
11 meeting is February 23<sup>rd</sup> in these same Chambers. We are just a recommending Body  
12 to Council. They have final say on any rezoning matters. So I would recommend that  
13 everyone who has interest show back up on the 23<sup>rd</sup>. Thank you. Text amendments.

14 MS. ALMEIDA: Mr. Chairman, you will find, Planning Commissioners, on page  
15 seven, this ordinance, I'm sorry, the ordinance that was handed out, the corrected  
16 ordinance. This ordinance had been before you previously. Staff felt that we needed to  
17 work on it a little more before it went to Council. We deferred it at Council to clean it up  
18 a little more and Ms. Alfreida Tindal and Ms. Brenda Carter are here to answer any  
19 questions regarding the addressing and road naming.

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: And we don't have anyone signed up to speak. What  
21 were the changes that were handed to us recently [inaudible] package?

22 MS. TINDAL: I'm Alfreida Tindal, Richland County Addressing Coordinator.  
23 What we did, we really got codified more instead of being a manual type documentation



1 and that's what we made some changes on. We deleted some information that were  
2 going to a Richland County road naming and addressing manual. But there really, and  
3 the changes we made were basically, see I think you questioned something about the  
4 timeframe –

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

6 MS. TINDAL: - for addressing, and we made those changes I think for that  
7 nature. Nothing really significant. We just made some changes to codify it more.

8 MS. ALMEIDA: From what was in your packet before to the one that was  
9 handed today it is highlighted in yellow.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Can I make the request of Staff [inaudible] that we  
11 reviewed this before? We had, in our work session we talked about this [inaudible]. If  
12 we could in future issues because I know me as well as a lot of others up here put a lot  
13 of time into that actual document if we could we get a redline copy from that to the new  
14 one of what we're working from because if not we've just got to start over and we've got  
15 to reevaluate the whole [inaudible].

16 MR. TUTTLE: I had a question in relation to the definition of a building. I'm not  
17 sure where condos would fit in that if you, if I'm interpreting this correctly and we would,  
18 each unit in a condominium would be declared a different building.

19 MS. CAIRNS: It's a [inaudible]. That would yeah.

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah I had a question [inaudible].

21 MR. TUTTLE: Just wasn't sure –

22 MS. ALMEIDA: Okay.

23 MR. TUTTLE: - what –

1 MS. ALMEIDA: Mr. Price is here and he can kind of explain that a little better  
2 how he would interpret condominium.

3 MR. TUTTLE: Sorry there, Mr. Price. Come on down.

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah. Because I had that question as well because as it  
5 applies to the Building Code as well because certain things apply to buildings of certain  
6 sizes and if it's a space inside a shopping center is that a different building? What's the  
7 purpose of deeming it to be a separate building?

8 MS. CAIRNS: But remember it's –

9 MS. ALMEIDA: Condo is [inaudible] ownership really.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Under the definition of building.

11 MR. PRICE: What's your question?

12 MR. TUTTLE: Well, as it relates you could build a town home with a firewall  
13 between it. It could either be classified as fee simple where each vertical unit owned  
14 the dirt under it or you could classify the whole building as a condominium. It seems  
15 here though that if you have a building that has a wall that goes from ground up as like  
16 a firewall would then you're deeming each individual unit a separate building. I don't  
17 know what the ramifications of that are I just, it just struck me as funny because  
18 condominiums clearly fit within that definition. So does that mean that if we had 10 unit  
19 building that was deemed one building under the condominium rule would now become  
20 10 separate buildings under this definition?

21 MR. PRICE: I don't have an answer for you [inaudible]

22 MS. ALMEIDA: Right. Well, they would each have to be addressed, I mean, a  
23 unit.

1 MR. TUTTLE: Well clearly, but I think if you dig deeper apartments are  
2 addressed in a particular manner and I just didn't know if this changed things relative to  
3 that because you're defining each one as a separate building.

4 MS. ALMEIDA: I don't believe so and Ms. Tindal usually when we address multi-  
5 family it's the building has an address and then each unit has a –

6 MS. TINDAL: That's correct.

7 MS. ALMEIDA: - numerical or alphabetical.

8 MS. TINDAL: It would have a [inaudible]. Like we said before that you have one  
9 universal address and then each unit number [inaudible] so they all would have  
10 individual addresses.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: My question goes to a different issue from the  
12 commercial standpoint that if you have individual bays in a shopping center those bays  
13 are also separated by firewalls and some of those firewalls even penetrate the roof  
14 deck. So could those then be classified as individual buildings or I don't know up fit  
15 purposes, building zones [inaudible]?

16 MR. PRICE: I think what we're looking – [inaudible] would just be individual  
17 suites. If they're considered to be individual units typically there's a property line  
18 involved, kind of going back to what [inaudible] talking about for residential. We don't  
19 base it on all this between the structures. You know, if there's a property in between  
20 [inaudible] I guess then you could get condominium, townhouse type definition.

21 MR. TUTTLE: This definition would only apply to this ordinance and wouldn't be  
22 carried over into any other area?

1 MS. LINDER: It's in the general definition section so yes that term, that definition  
2 would apply to any time the word building is used – that definition would apply  
3 throughout.

4 MR. TUTTLE: Only in relation to this ordinance though?

5 MS. CAIRNS: No, no. It would be a change of the definition of building.

6 MR. TUTTLE: Throughout the Building Code as well?

7 MS. CAIRNS: Throughout Chapter 26.

8 [Inaudible discussion]

9 MR. PRICE: What are your concerns with that, Mr. Tuttle?

10 MR. TUTTLE: Like I stated earlier I'm not sure specifically. I hadn't thought it  
11 through to really understand all the ramifications but I just, I worry that if you're changing  
12 – well for instance if I'm understanding this correctly then each bay would be a separate  
13 building then my 10 unit example would require 10 different permits. I'm just, I don't  
14 know all the ramifications. That's what I need some help understanding.

15 MR. PRICE: I don't, at least from a permitting standpoint, [inaudible] from a  
16 building standpoint [inaudible] what their other requirements are [inaudible] during your  
17 plan submittal you can come in with [inaudible] building. [Inaudible] because I don't  
18 want to speak for [inaudible] because it's residential. Confuse those two.

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I think if we're talking about changing the definition of the  
20 word building for our entire Code is pretty significant because there's, you got, you  
21 know, if you increase the size of the building by 50% you get, you can do that under a  
22 non-conforming and so forth and so on. I mean, people could easily, you know, use  
23 that term building very generously.

1 MS. CAIRNS: But I think also, you know, this may – like who would have the  
2 determination. I understand you guys concern. Somebody suddenly comes in and  
3 says you've got building, you've got walls, I'm going to decide this is 10 buildings, not  
4 one. I think that the caution is warranted.

5 MR. PRICE: Can we defer this and bring this back?

6 MS. AMEIDA: No. I'd like to change it back to the original.

7 MR. PRICE: Change it back to the original. Because after reading this I do have  
8 some concern from a zoning standpoint.

9 MS. ALMEIDA: We're going to revert that definition back to the existing definition  
10 in our Code.

11 MS. LINDER: In other words there'd be no change to the definition of building.  
12 We would strike that paragraph changing the definition.

13 MS. CAIRNS: Okay. I make a motion that any amendment to this Code section  
14 not include the proposed revision to the building definition found in Section One.

15 MR. MANNING: Second.

16 [Inaudible discussion]

17 MS. CAIRNS: No. I think there's other stuff I want to ask about but just in terms  
18 of –

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I was just asking if there's any other discussion on it.

20 MS. CAIRNS: Okay.

21 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any more discussion? We've got a motion and a second  
22 to send the change in our ordinance Section 26-183 forward to Council with a

1 recommendation [inaudible] building code – with the exception of the building definition  
2 may not change.

3 MS. CAIRNS: I want to ask just a couple, I mean, I just had a couple verbiage  
4 questions on some of the other definitions. But I mean, I just think, you know, before we  
5 decide whether to send this forward with a recommendation or not the first thing we're  
6 going to do is just strike that first section or part of it unless you just want to put it all in  
7 one giant motion at end. We can -

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We can put it all in one giant motion.

9 MS. CAIRNS: Okay. I'll pull my motion then.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: All right. Any other concerns?

11 MS. CAIRNS: These are really highly technical and I apologize but under the  
12 definition address number it says the number assigned to any and then it starts to  
13 describe things. Couldn't it just say building since we have a definition of building?

14 MS. ALMEDIA: Which one are you on, please, I'm sorry?

15 MS. CAIRNS: 911 address number definition. [Inaudible] The top one.

16 MS. TINDAL: Okay, what is your question about?

17 MS. CAIRNS: It says the number assigned to any house, residence, dwelling,  
18 business, warehouse or other structure, why don't we just use the word building which  
19 we have defined?

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: What if it's to an individual lot with no structure?

21 MS. CAIRNS: Or property in a sequential manner

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay.

1 MS. CAIRNS: But I think the words house, residence, dwelling, business,  
2 warehouse, or other structure should be replaced with the word building. We've defined  
3 the word building. It just tightens up the Code, that's all.

4 MS. TINDAL: [Inaudible] there because I guess structure, dwelling, business,  
5 warehouse could be a building but a building also be a barn and we don't want that  
6 address unless they have services for 911 purposes.

7 MS. ALMEIDA: Building would be fine.

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: So your recommendation is to take out the words house,  
9 residence, dwelling, business, warehouse and substitute the word building for that?

10 MS. CAIRNS: And/or other structures, all of those, all the way until the word or  
11 property.

12 MS. TINDAL: So we're going to take out – it's going to read, the number  
13 assigned to any building and/or other structure or property in a sequential number or  
14 manner?

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: And the word structure comes out, all the way through  
16 structure and just have number assigned to any building or property in a sequential  
17 manner.

18 MS. TINDAL: Okay.

19 MS. CAIRNS: And then it's sort of the same kind of thing in 911 property  
20 address is that you say the unique house number. Isn't it that it's the 911 address  
21 number because that's the number?

22 MS. TINDAL: Yes. We probably said unique because it should be [inaudible]  
23 delete that and [inaudible].

1 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah. I mean, if you've defined something use the thing you've  
2 defined, don't go back. And then also to effectively locate a building instead of saying  
3 primary structure, business, or other dwelling – to effectively locate a building.

4 MS. TINDAL: All right. Maintain continuity [inaudible]?

5 MS. CAIRNS: Right. That's all that is.

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: What did you want to take out from the beginning of that  
7 sentence?

8 MS. CAIRNS: Where it says unique house? It should E911 address. It should  
9 say the E911 address number, roadway name. That's a property address.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay.

11 MS. CAIRNS: And it's to effectively locate a building for use with the E911.

12 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Anything else?

13 MS. CAIRNS: I think that was it.

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Does anybody else have any concerns with the  
15 language? Ms. Cairns, you may be best suited to make the motion if you want to  
16 [inaudible].

17 MS. CAIRNS: I make a motion that we send forward Section 26-183 Road  
18 Naming and Addressing with the following, I mean, with it – send it forward with a  
19 recommendation of approval with the following amendments. One is that the definition  
20 for building is not to be changed from the current definition. Two is that under Section  
21 Two E911 Address Number that the words house, residence, dwelling, business,  
22 warehouse, or other structure be replaced with the word building. And that under E911  
23 Property Address the words unique house be replaced with E911 address. At the end



1 of that sentence where it says, primary structure, business or other dwelling those be  
2 struck and replaced with the word building.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion.

4 MR. TUTTLE: Second.

5 CHAIRMAN MANNING: And a second. All those in favor of the motion as stated  
6 please signify by raising your hand.

7 *[Approved: Cairns, Westbrook, Tuttle, Palmer, Manning, Mattos-Ward, Gilchrist;*  
8 *Absent: McDaniel]*

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: None opposed.

10 MS. TINDAL: Thank you.

11 MS. ALMEIDA: Mr. Chairman, Council Members, we have before you the cross  
12 access easement ordinance. This ordinance was also before you several weeks ago  
13 and staff has gone back and reviewed and taken your concerns into consideration and  
14 we have made some minor changes and Mr. Price is here to explain and answer any  
15 questions regarding them.

16 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Mr. Price.

17 MR. PRICE: One of the issues that we have as a Staff when we adopted the  
18 latest Land Development Code we kind of combined too many issues in this particular  
19 case for access residential and commercial we just combined it, [inaudible] have the  
20 same requirements. The idea behind this is to separate the requirements for residential  
21 and commercial because evidently commercial has different needs and really we should  
22 look at it separately than we do residential. So this is our attempt to separate it.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Any questions for the Staff? No one's signed up  
2 to speak on the issue. Any discussion? Any motions?

3 MR. TUTTLE: Yeah. I actually have a question on the explanation. It talks  
4 about reducing the right-of-way width but then in Section Two the right-of-way width is a  
5 minimum 50' right-of-way. So is it going to be reduced to 30' or is it 50?

6 MR. PRICE: The way that's reading is that when, that the road that you have  
7 direct access to must be at least 50' with a 20-foot passable.

8 MR. TUTTLE: So the main road 50' right-of-way but I can come in across a  
9 parking lot or through some other mechanism?

10 MR. PRICE: At least 30', yes, sir. And that number came about from a  
11 discussion with the fire marshal on adequate fire safety.

12 MR. TUTTLE: Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: The change that was given to us had Section Two as  
14 being unchanged and the one that we were just given has everything, the access  
15 requirements are under Section, it was under Section Three in what was given to us in  
16 our packet, now it's under Section Two.

17 MR. PRICE: You can go with the one that was just given to you. In my feeble  
18 attempt to updo this ordinance while Ms. Linder was out, you know.

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: You got your law degree while [inaudible]?

20 MR. PRICE: I don't think you need a law degree to write that but she's a lot  
21 better at this than I am. So I made a number of errors that she came back in after  
22 chastising me, did the corrections and what you have before you, the second sheet that  
23 was given to you, it's the correct version.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. So what happened to your section, Geo?

2 MS. CAIRNS: It got put back where it belonged.

3 MR. PRICE: My hand was slapped and I was sent back to my room.

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any other questions, comments, concerns, motions?

5 MR. TUTTLE: I don't know what to call this. Can you give me a title? I'd like to  
6 make a motion to send this to Council.

7 MS. LINDER: It's the cross access easement ordinance.

8 MR. TUTTLE: Okay. I like to make a motion to approve the cross access  
9 easement ordinance.

10 MR. MANNING: Second.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion and a second to send forward to  
12 Council with a recommendation of approval the cross access easement ordinance. All  
13 those in favor please signify by raising your hand.

14 *[Approved: Cairns, Westbrook, Tuttle, Palmer, Manning, Mattos-Ward, Gilchrist;*  
15 *Absent: McDaniel]*

16 CHAIRMAN PALMER: None opposed. Unanimous day. Other Business?

17 MS. ALMEIDA: Mr. Chairman, we have Mr. Carl Gosline who would like to make  
18 a brief presentation on Complete Streets programs and goals.

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We're ready for your brief presentation, Mr. Gosline.

20 MR. PRICE: Brief.

21 MR. GOSLINE: Well, you have the background, all the background material.  
22 The issue before you is simply approval or if the goal statements on page 29. The  
23 committee, you know, came up with these goal statements. You can certainly edit them

1 or combine them or do whatever you wish. And the program here is I think outlined in  
2 the material supplied to you is that we want to come to the Planning Commission and  
3 the Council and get approval of whatever goal statements come out and then come  
4 back in May or so with objectives or milestones to each one of those goals. And we  
5 want to make sure that we're all talking about the policy before we start getting into the  
6 regulation. And so what they have come up with is – there is some duplication I guess.  
7 I stayed out of it. I'm just the recorder. Whatever you want to do in that regard is up to  
8 you and I'll be glad to answer any questions.

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: What does the term Complete Streets mean?

10 MR. GOSLINE: It's kind of a bad term that somebody developed. Probably  
11 some Democrat someplace up in Washington which, but the idea is that roads should,  
12 would include not just traffic but sidewalks and bicycles and landscaping and that's how  
13 they came up with Complete Streets. It conjures up something else but that's –

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: What is this term on goal number nine?

15 MR. GOSLINE: Excuse me?

16 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Goal number nine. Ensures creation of Complete  
17 Streets, Trans-network, recognizing the special needs of seniors, individual disability  
18 especially focused on access and safety. I don't –

19 MR. GOSLINE: Let me just, let me just say that I think there's four or five  
20 principles that need to be in here somehow. One is certainly serving disability needs  
21 but when you do that and you're putting more emphasis on sidewalks and trails and  
22 walkways and that kind of thing that's going to come about. You want to make sure that  
23 we include all the various stakeholders, developers, and environmental groups and all

1 that. And let's see, there's a couple other ones. But as you can see here there are  
2 some of these basic ideas that are duplicated. So it's whatever you all want to do in this  
3 regard. You can throw them out or – committee put this together so I – but you can  
4 certainly if you [inaudible].

5 MR. MANNING: Would this be compatible with some of the development  
6 guidelines that we've just –

7 MR. GOSLINE: Yes.

8 MR. MANNING: - been discussing?

9 MR. GOSLINE: They put in here that it does talk about some of the roundtable  
10 principles and we are going to meet with the roundtable of the HBA folks Wednesday  
11 afternoon.

12 MR. MANNING: I think one of the things that were just maybe as a part of the  
13 storm water was less pervious surfaces. Less pervious [inaudible]. If you were using  
14 sidewalks – somebody came in and had sidewalks on both sides of the street [inaudible]  
15 tell them you want just one side of the street?

16 MR. GOSLINE: Well, that's one way or the other way to look at it of course is  
17 maybe we should be looking at pervious material for sidewalks.

18 MR. MANNING: Right.

19 MR. GOSLINE: You know, and this is the reason why we don't want to get into  
20 all these little tiny issues because you want to determine what the county's policy is then  
21 we'll figure out how to do it. And there's volumes of stuff about how to do it.

1 MR. TUTTLE: More specifically on goal seven, are we really going to have all  
2 the effected parties involved in an implementation process? Wouldn't that be a  
3 nightmare for Staff?

4 MR. GOSLINE: You're talking about goal seven? The idea is so to make sure  
5 that we have for lack of a better term roundtable two.

6 MR. TUTTLE: No. I get that. I'm not sure should it include implementation.

7 MR. GOSLINE: Well, that would be, it certainly – part of the implementation of  
8 course is the goals and the objectives. The more, bigger part is the regulations and the  
9 budgeting and that kind of stuff.

10 MR. TUTTLE: Yeah. Maybe I was just misreading. I was worried that that  
11 would become a principle as it related to the implementation. You know, once you  
12 created the regulations then there might be some tribunal that says, hey the three of us  
13 are effected so we need to vote in the process as well whether –

14 MR. GOSLINE: Well yeah, I mean, the idea of course is to get as many people  
15 without having hundreds but representatives to work through that kind of stuff much like  
16 the roundtable did but with the Code. The difference between the past roundtable is  
17 that was focused on principle which was fine. The way that most everybody who does  
18 these programs around, you know, you want to make sure that you get all the interests  
19 involved just like you're doing Land Development Code stuff which is basically what  
20 we're going to be doing.

21 MS. ALMEIDA: All the stakeholders.

1 MR. TUTTLE: I don't disagree with that. I just worry about implementation. I  
2 don't want to see the Planning Commission circumvented in implementation or Staff  
3 overburdened with –

4 MR. GOSLINE: Well because all the regulations have to come back through you  
5 anyway.

6 MR. TUTTLE: Well, could potentially. Okay.

7 MR. GOSLINE: Law requires it.

8 MR. GOSLINE: What's, well what would you like us to do? Is there any that you  
9 want to eliminate or reword or? If your direction is to combine some of them we could  
10 do that and send you a copy before it goes to the, it'll have to go to the – well whatever  
11 committee is [inaudible] it'll have to go to, through one of the Council committees before  
12 they take action anyway so.

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Is this, I guess since you guys are putting this forward  
14 you guys have read this and this is y'all's recommendation as well, but what I hear you  
15 saying is this is just straight out of some consultant or –

16 MR. GOSLINE: No. These goals are developed by the people on the committee  
17 and they're all, you know, people involved with various aspects, disability, health,  
18 bicycling, all these kinds. So they all had inputs into the goal statements and we had a  
19 lot –

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Are you on the committee?

21 MR. GOSLINE: Excuse me?

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Are you on the committee?

23 MR. GOSLINE: I was Staff liaison.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. I'm sorry. I didn't see it. So you, would you feel  
2 comfortable in saying that you would recommend these –

3 MR. GOSLINE: I'd say –

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - [inaudible] goals?

5 MR. GOSLINE: I think we could combine some of them personally. But other  
6 than that, yes.

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Which ones you think we can combine?

8 MR. GOSLINE: I was afraid you were going to ask me. If, let me just –

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Would you feel more comfortable bringing it back next  
10 month with [inaudible]?

11 MR. GOSLINE: I would like to get – we really want to get this before the Council  
12 this month so if you think that some of these could be combined we can do that and you  
13 could, I guess you could take action to send it to the committee subject to combining  
14 some of them or something like that. Or just leave them alone and let us work through  
15 that with the County Council at their workshop. Whatever you want to do. If you have  
16 some specific ideas.

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: How would you, how would the Complete Streets  
18 program bring you the special needs of seniors?

19 MR. GOSLINE: Being one I can answer that.

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: [Inaudible]

21 MR. GOSLINE: Well, there's a lot of data that like, that over 40% of the  
22 population today doesn't have access to mass transit and won't be driving, and crazy  
23 enough women outlive the men in driving age; it doesn't surprise me. There's a whole



1 bunch of, I can give you reams and reams of statistics but that's the AARP's focus just  
2 to ensure that mobility needs, not just roads but sidewalks and trails and stuff like that,  
3 are more, get higher priority, funding and stuff like that. So –

4 MS ALMEIDA: Promoting housing near transit facilities or access to your day-to-  
5 day needs. Some of the concepts are there.

6 MR. GOSLINE: Yeah, Anna brings up another good point is this Complete  
7 Streets thing is not like a separate program or project or anything. It really, the focus is  
8 to change processes and procedures by which roads are built to make sure they're  
9 inclusive, they include, where feasible, sidewalks and trails and bikeways. It's required  
10 by the federal government, it's, and consequently for anything with federal money. It's  
11 also, the Highway Commission's taking some action in this regard and they've also  
12 allocated certain percentages of the enhancement. But a lot of the things they talked  
13 about in the comprehensive plan this idea is woven throughout there. Like higher  
14 density neighborhoods and affordable housing and all kinds of – trails, parks.

15 MS. ALMEIDA: Even if you look today in a lot of the LEED programs if you're  
16 going to be LEED certified in residential in order to get certain credits, you know, you  
17 need to be near a park facility or employment facility or some activity center and you get  
18 points for that. So really there are a lot of groups that are all working towards this goal.  
19 So these are just bits and pieces of that same, for lack of a better word, pie, in moving  
20 to this concept. As our community ages there are going to be different needs obviously  
21 that need to be met. And not only seniors but we have young people who are not able  
22 to drive or not at driving age. So it really transcends a lot from seniors to disability,  
23 people with disabilities and young people. So trying to get people out of the car,

1 walking and meeting the needs of bringing people back into inner cities. I mean, it's that  
2 entire concept. This is just one little piece.

3 MR. GOSLINE: Mr. Chairman, if I – you asked me earlier which ones I would do.  
4 As much as I hate to go against the committee's list, I would eliminate goal five, six,  
5 eight, and nine because I think they're duplicated elsewhere. Basic ideas -

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: [Inaudible] affordability of housing?

7 MR. GOSLINE: Excuse me?

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We'll just do for the affordability of housing. This  
9 increase, the cost of housing?

10 MR. GOSLINE: That's a little hard to answer. [Inaudible] you're talking about  
11 transit oriented(?) developments which we've talked about off and on; that's higher  
12 density development around transit stops which you're going to need to do if you want  
13 to have transit. But studies show that it helps the affordability a lot. It reduces  
14 tremendously the trips, travel from vehicles.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: So if there was a bus facility that was in a rural area?

16 MR. GOSLINE: Well, in the first place in order to have transit you've got to have  
17 high density and we're talking about 25 to 30 units per acre with, plus commercial within  
18 a quarter mile of the station. There's nothing, maybe some place downtown but nothing  
19 around here like that now. Maybe Sandhills. So, but that's, we can talk a lot about -  
20 one of the things that we would like to be able to do is come before the Planning  
21 Commission without any, you know, and talk to you in general about neighborhood  
22 programs, neighborhood improvement programs, general concepts of the comp plan,

1 general transportation stuff, stuff that you don't have to make decisions on and help  
2 build your understanding of all the interlinkage.

3 MR. MANNING: Complete Streets – excuse me – the complete streets program  
4 applies to corridors or residential streets or [inaudible]?

5 MR. GOSLINE: Everything. All streets -

6 MR. MANNING: All streets.

7 MR. GOSLINE: - except the freeway. You don't want –

8 MR. MANNING: And would it, how would it impact our Code right now say in a  
9 residential subdivision?

10 MR. GOSLINE: Well, Greenhill Parrish Parkway is a pretty good example of one.  
11 Most of the streets in Lake Carolina they've got, you know, walking, pedestrian service.  
12 One of the big pushes for sidewalks in particular is that when you put in sidewalks  
13 people use them and that helps health and we have a huge obesity problem in this state  
14 and just getting sidewalks in, getting people the opportunity to walk to the store.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We already require streets and sidewalks in  
16 neighborhoods.

17 MS. ALMEIDA: Uh-huh (affirmative), correct.

18 CHAIRMAN PALMER: [Inaudible] that we just currently had out off Lorick.

19 MS. ALMEIDA: Um-hum (affirmative).

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Rezoning this month. Now is there, what I'm hearing  
21 with these goals are is that there would need to be – and this maybe in our Code now –  
22 this is some of the stuff that I find to be crazy. Outside of that subdivision along Lorick  
23 Drive is a sidewalk going out like this to some guy's farm.

1 MR. GOSLINE: Well, let me just – the program is really geared for both county  
2 streets and DOT streets. Now there is no cross-section of a complete street. It's very  
3 variable and if you go up to Charlotte and drive around they use it all the time. And  
4 they'll use one alignment on one side of the road and a slightly different one because  
5 it's the land use. The issue of the sidewalks to nowhere we are discussing with DOT.  
6 They have, their problem is because the way the Code is we're requiring sidewalks.  
7 Well, they need up with lots of pieces which they call sidewalks to nowhere which is  
8 true. But in the last five years under our sidewalk program, the site plan reviews and  
9 subdivisions generated six and a half miles of sidewalk.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah, but they're all in like 30' sections.

11 MS. ALMEIDA: Well, I will add that is one principle that the roundtable is gonna  
12 bring up and discuss to take a site-by-site view of this requirement and it not just be a  
13 generic installed sidewalk. It might be a trail in some instances.

14 MR. GOSLINE: There's lots of ways; correct. There's lots of ways to look at this  
15 but the reality is –

16 MS. ALMEIDA: That is one of the principles though that we are looking at to  
17 review.

18 MR. MANNING: One of the [inaudible] on a couple sidewalks [inaudible]  
19 sidewalks of DOT and I felt like if you maintain the sidewalks up close to the road and  
20 [inaudible] and came back and they eliminated them. You know, you walk around the  
21 back of the building and come back out. Somebody needs to really strengthen the  
22 process with DOT.

1 MR. GOSLINE: Well, we're working on that and we need to find some  
2 compromise with them because they make a decent point from their side of the  
3 maintenance. Well, it sounds good when you say it fast but five-year-old sidewalks  
4 shouldn't require a whole lot of maintenance.

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Well, one of the concerns that I would have is liability. If  
6 there's a crack in that sidewalk and somebody trips on it they're going to sue DOT.

7 MR. GOSLINE: Oh, yeah. That's exactly their issue and rightfully so.

8 MS. CAIRNS: DOT has always had, I mean, any DOT, all they care about is  
9 cars. That's their creed. And what we're saying here is that we are a county, we are  
10 people, we are communities, and for that to be good we need roads that are more than  
11 just vehicles. And, you know, what impact it has on an individual subdivision is relevant  
12 however this is big picture. This is how, you know, and I mean, to me this is some of  
13 the stuff about, you know, the sidewalks are nowhere I would come back and say that's  
14 a problem with putting suburb in the farm. That's not a problem with the Code in terms  
15 of requiring sidewalks. It's a problem with the Code in terms of allowing suburbs out in  
16 the farms.

17 MR. MANNING: But that [inaudible] roads, I mean.

18 MS. CAIRNS: I know but, I mean, Garners Ferry Road is a massive road with  
19 sidewalks that get walked all the time, you know.

20 MR. MANNING: Well, I'm agreeing with you. I think we need to deal with  
21 connectivity [inaudible].

22 MS. CAIRNS: But that's what this, I mean, you know, Staff has offered that one  
23 of, you know, when this goes from this point to implementation is to try to show that

1 we've got some flexibility to recognize that we've got suburbs and we've got farms and  
2 we've got crashes occasionally between those two land uses. But to start accepting  
3 and acknowledging that we need to be more than just focused on how do we get cars in  
4 and out and going more towards how do we make communities that are going to have  
5 sidewalks and, because we have suburbs in our county. You know, we have where  
6 people want to live with sidewalks and this and I've got to give credence. Whoever did  
7 the Fort Jackson plan not only did they put in sidewalks, they put in tree lines. In my  
8 family, in my house that was a little bit of humor the morning that photograph came out.  
9 But, I mean, that's what, you know, that's where we are now. We had 40 years of the  
10 car driving the suburbs and not having sidewalks and we've got a whole lot of  
11 subdivisions and a whole lot of development that are people saying, halt, hang on, I  
12 want sidewalks; I want Shandon. I want the new stuff at Fort Jackson. That's what  
13 people are going towards, not what's it going to cost on a micro scale. It's what are we  
14 going to create on a macro scale for a community; that's what this is all about. And I  
15 don't, you know, the recommendation that we strike half the goals I think that's far too  
16 aggressive. I think that that would eviscerate what the table did, what the group did. I  
17 mean, it does seem that there is a lot of redundancy but if you look at each one of these  
18 goals each one of these goals does have something unique that's not found in another.  
19 So I would, you know, my recommendation is that we take this forward and when we  
20 start getting Code we really dig in that Code and make sure we've got flexibility. Make  
21 sure that we're looking at the big pictures. What are we doing with Richland County and  
22 where are we taking it? How much are we making this a place worth living?

1 MR. GOSLINE: One of the other things is, one of the questions always comes  
2 up is the cost and the National Association of Realtors has done several studies which  
3 find that particularly in residential areas, sidewalks and trees and stuff are much more  
4 marketable and people are looking for. Well, you did it in Greenhill Parrish.

5 MR. MANNING: I did, and I wish I could get the children to ride on them instead  
6 of [inaudible]. Got them on both sides of the road and kids ride their bike [inaudible].

7 MS. CAIRNS: Are the sidewalks right up on the curb or are they back?

8 MR. MANNING: [inaudible] back seven and a half, eight feet.

9 MR. GOSLINE: Mr. Chairman, the issue of sidewalks is a very, as Ms. Cairns  
10 said, a very complicated one. We're trying to work something out with DOT it's going to  
11 take time. Remember the principle thing with Complete Streets is changing processes  
12 and procedure. If you talk with engineers that's difficult to do. [Inaudible] lawyers just  
13 but planners of course just engineers.

14 MS. CAIRNS: And they would move every single tree in the right-of-way. Move  
15 everything other than what has to be there because of liability. But if that, if we let the  
16 engineers and the Departments of Transportation dictate what roads should be we  
17 would not have a place worth living.

18 MR. GOSLINE: On the other hand if we didn't have engineers planners wouldn't  
19 have anything to do.

20 MS. CAIRNS: Oh, I'm not saying they're without value but they need to be a  
21 player not the driver.

22 MS. ALMEIDA: But they're in the business of moving traffic from point A to point  
23 B as quickly as possible.

1 MS. CAIRNS: Not from creating communities. If you create communities that  
2 are [inaudible] and people drive faster. I mean, that's one of the things that's interesting  
3 is that engineers always want to eliminate all the trees. Well, one of the ways you can  
4 slow traffic down on a road is to have trees. It's a naturally calming mechanism to slow  
5 down, and in narrowing roads and putting in stripes. There's all kinds of passive things  
6 that you can do to eliminate speed or, you know, reduce speed and yet the engineers  
7 say, get rid of the trees, widen the roads, and then we'll just, but we'll straighten them so  
8 their safer, and then people are going to fast that when they do hit something they're  
9 dead.

10 MR. GOSLINE: On the other hand if we got rid of all the trees there wouldn't be  
11 any leaves in the gutters that we could burn or bag.

12 MS. CAIRNS: I wouldn't need to bag my leaves?

13 MR. MANNING: [Inaudible] storm drain ordinance.

14 MR. GOSLINE: What's your pleasure, Mr. Chairman?

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Got any motions from the Commission?

16 MR. MANNING: Heather made one a minute ago.

17 MS. CAIRNS: I make a motion that we forward this to County Council with a  
18 recommendation of approval for the attached goals of the Complete Streets program.

19 MR. WESTBROOK: I'll second.

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any other discussion? All those in favor of sending the  
21 complete street program goals [inaudible] Council with a recommendation of approval  
22 please signify by raising your hand. All those opposed?



1 **[Approved: Cairns, Westbrook, Palmer, Manning, Mattos-Ward, Gilchrist;**  
2 **Opposed: Tuttle; Absent: McDaniel]**

3 MR. GOSLINE: Thank you.

4 MR. MANNING: When do you expect some of this to start coming back in where  
5 we begin to deal with the actual -

6 MS. ALMEIDA: Well, our timeline, if you see on page 27, hopefully will go to  
7 County Council in March once directed to. So you might be seeing something some  
8 time in May for review.

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Anna, the rules change?

10 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes. Item two under Other Business. It was asked from Staff  
11 that Planning Commission wanted to appoint a Member to attend the zoning public  
12 hearing and represent the Planning Commission at each meeting.

13 MR. MANNING: Could you repeat that?

14 MS. ALMEIDA: It was asked to bring before you to change the rules of your  
15 Planning Commission to appoint a Member of the Planning Commission to come to the  
16 Zoning Public Hearing each month to represent you all in case there were a question  
17 from Council.

18 MS. CAIRNS: [Inaudible] that? Recommended that or?

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I made the change to the ordinance, to our rules,  
20 recommendation [inaudible] a couple months ago.

21 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah. I mean, I have some recollection.

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: And I've had some inquiry from Councilmembers as to,  
23 time to time that their information that they've gotten doesn't embody really the

1 discussion that they wanted to hear or wanted to understand better how we got to  
2 certain decisions that we got to. So my recommendation was that we change our rules  
3 to have a Member of the Planning Commission to be available at the Zoning Public  
4 Hearing which occurs the fourth Tuesday of every month -

5 MS. ALMEIDA: Correct.

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - be available to Councilmembers if they had any  
7 questions. If they didn't have any questions then there would be nothing offered but to  
8 simply be available to answer questions about our meeting.

9 MR. TUTTLE: Would that be just a I mean, would it have to be the same person  
10 or could that rotate -

11 MS. ALMEIDA: Well, that would be -

12 MR. TUTTLE: - [inaudible] representative.

13 MS. ALMEIDA: - up to the pleasure of the Commission.

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: What I had offered up since our rules call for the  
15 Chairman to represent the Planning Commission at different activities and functions  
16 would for that to be the Chairman or from time to time perhaps the Chairman couldn't  
17 make it that Chairman would designate someone to be available to answer questions if  
18 there were any which I thought would be kind of the cleanest way to do it.

19 MR. WESTBROOK: I agree with you.

20 MS. CAIRNS: I disagree with that idea.

21 MR. TUTTLE: With the whole concept or?

22 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah. I think it would be very difficult for one person to leave one  
23 of these meetings who also had a vote to then offer what the basis was for the vote and

1 the nature of the discussion. I think that as a single voting member it would be difficult  
2 to disengage from that and to offer unbiased representational view of what transpired at  
3 the meeting.

4 MR. TUTTLE: Isn't that what the Supreme Court does when they offer an  
5 opinion?

6 MS. CAIRNS: If any other Justice wants to offer their opinion differing even if it's  
7 [inaudible].

8 MR. TUTTLE: [Inaudible]

9 MS. CAIRNS: [inaudible] they can offer that as part of the opinion. They're not  
10 excluded.

11 MR. TUTTLE: Yeah. I guess the concept is from time to time at Council, the  
12 thoughts and the rationale behind a particular vote here doesn't necessarily get relayed  
13 in the same manner -

14 MS. CAIRNS: Oh, I understand that.

15 MR. TUTTLE: - as here so I guess it's just trying to empower this Committee to  
16 have a voice in that forum rather than just being on a piece of paper.

17 MS. CAIRNS: I also think that we have some very vigorous disagreements over  
18 issues and I don't think that it would be possible for that one person who had clearly –  
19 well, I mean, if we have disagreements on something and a single person goes up  
20 obviously they are not on both sides of that disagreement.

21 MR. TUTTLE: No. They're not supposed to be.

22 MS. CAIRNS: Right.

1 MR. TUTTLE: They're supposed to be representative of the vote of the  
2 Commission. You wouldn't represent both sides.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: No. Which is what we have –

4 MR. TUTTLE: I'm sorry, I'm sorry. That wasn't fair. Go ahead.

5 MS. CAIRNS: But I mean, that is my concern is that person would present, I  
6 mean, that person may have been on the non-voting side, on the losing side potentially  
7 or on the prevailing side, and I don't think it would be easy for that person, being a  
8 voting member, to be able to effectively offer what the other side's rationale was. I think  
9 that's a very difficult, it's a very difficult job to stand there and be able to offer an  
10 opposing interest's side on an issue fairly. That's just [inaudible].

11 MR. WESTBROOK: I think the Chairman represents the Commission and if he  
12 goes anything contrary to the Minutes then he's made a mistake.

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I would agree, and that's what I said before because you  
14 know our rules currently call for the Chairman to represent the Commission at different  
15 functions or whenever someone wants a representative of the Planning Commission the  
16 Chairman is to represent the Commission doing that. It would be the same thing in front  
17 of Council that the Chairman, whoever it would be from year to year, would be available  
18 to the Council as a representative of the Planning Commission and if for instance any  
19 member of the Planning Commission would read the Minutes and say you clearly  
20 misrepresented this that would be an issue.

21 MR. GILCHRIST: Only, and Mr. Chairman, only if asked by Council.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Only if asked by Council and it's not asked your opinion  
2 it's asked why did the Commission do something or what was the Commission's  
3 thinking on this.

4 MS. ALMEIDA: I will offer, and I don't know how many of you actually see the  
5 Zoning Public Hearing packet, but we, the case is listed, the vote is included, the  
6 Minutes are provided to Council. And understand Staff does not want to be put in the  
7 position at times of giving an opinion one way or another because of that reasoning.

8 MR. MANNING: So you can have the Minutes available in a week's time?

9 MS. ALMEIDA: For Zoning Public Hearing it's more than a week. Council, is it  
10 true Council usually has, if they request –

11 MS. HAYNES: Council gets a Staff Report.

12 MS. ALMEIDA: And not the Minutes?

13 MS. HAYNES: As to why it was voted against or why it was voted for.

14 MS. ALMEIDA: But not the minutes?

15 MS. HAYNES: No.

16 MR. MANNING: I think the Minutes ought to be a part of it.

17 MS. ALMEIDA: Only when asked. But they have the vote.

18 CHAIRMAN PALMER: And I understand how difficult it is because I just had to  
19 go through the process at our church of trying to relay in writing and codify something in  
20 writing is much more difficult than [inaudible] understand it in writing is much more  
21 difficult if someone has [inaudible]. But that was my thinking. I know that I've been  
22 asked by Council several times [inaudible] something. I thought it would be an

1 additional avenue that we would have as a Planning Commission to make a presence to  
2 Council and be able to answer their questions [inaudible].

3 MS. ALMEIDA: And understand not very often does Council request or ask that  
4 of Staff so just -

5 MS. CAIRNS: But I mean, would this person be required to go to all the Council  
6 meetings just in case a question was phrased?

7 MS. ALMEIDA: Apparently so.

8 MS. CAIRNS: And so are you proposing that you as Chair it would be the  
9 person, the Chairperson who would go?

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Or the Chairperson's designee.

11 MR. WESTBROOK: Designee.

12 MS. CAIRNS: And would the Chairperson be able to designee whoever they  
13 want without any limitation?

14 MR. WESTBROOK: The designee would certainly have a right to accept or  
15 reject.

16 MS. CAIRNS: Well, yeah but – I mean, honestly I think it's legitimate that I have  
17 some concern on this because certainly there are many issues that we have  
18 disagreements with and while the Chairman has been duly elected by the Commission  
19 to serve as Chairman, his designee, unless it was pre, you know, unless that's also  
20 someone elected could always be somebody that would always have one view from a  
21 similar mind. That's my concern.

22 MR. TUTTLE: But it could be for instance if there was a business reason that  
23 came up at the last minute where you couldn't attend, it could be just going through the

1 phone till he could find somebody who was available. I'm not sure it would necessarily  
2 always be -

3 MS. CAIRNS: That's okay. I mean, I understand.

4 MS. ALMEIDA: It might be also suggested that if there is an issue that is  
5 somewhat controversial between the Commission that two representatives come to the  
6 Zoning Public Hearing and are there to voice their opinion instead of just one -

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: [Inaudible] voice your opinion if you're [inaudible].

8 MS. ALMEIDA: Or to explain the tie vote or close vote, yeah.

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Well, I think that would be the role of the Chairman to do  
10 that and then if it's not said that, you know, if someone calls that into question it's  
11 certainly something that we could address. Say, hey look this - they're not - being  
12 biased in these issues and you're not supposed to be biased. That's certainly  
13 something that [inaudible] the Planning Commission.

14 MR. MANNING: And I think we as a Body have got to trust, I understand your  
15 logic, Heather, and concerns and I respect that; I'm not arguing with you, but I do feel  
16 like you know I've got to trust that all of us sitting here would go before that body and  
17 explain to them the best way what this Commission did.

18 MR. WESTBROOK: Can we bring this to a vote and move on?

19 MS. CAIRNS: I would just like to say one thing. I would like to take out the issue  
20 is that it has nothing to do with trust. It has entirely to do with the difficulty that any  
21 human has in trying to present an unbiased view that differs from what they personally  
22 believe in. That's what the issue is. It has nothing to do with trust and that's where I  
23 have problems with this whole concept.

1 MS. LINDER: Just throwing out some additional thoughts, you could change  
2 your rules that the Chairperson would be a non-voting member or you could also  
3 appoint a person on the prevailing side of a vote on a controversial issue.

4 MS. ALMEIDA: There are boards that the Chairman or Chairperson does not  
5 vote, it's a non-vote.

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: [Inaudible] because then we'd have an even number.

7 MS. CAIRNS: Right. We'd have to restructure the Board.

8 MS. ALMEIDA: Um-hum (affirmative).

9 MS. CAIRNS: But that's, I mean that – I think that's an interesting sort of insight  
10 into the whole thing.

11 MS. ALMEIDA: Adding Board members.

12 MS. CAIRNS: I mean, I would imagine that if I was the Chairperson you guys  
13 might have some concerns with my ability to present some of the reasons why things  
14 were presented and it's not bias or a trust thing, it's just a –

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I wouldn't have an issue. I would, if I thought I would  
16 have an issue I would show up at some of the meetings and see if what we're doing  
17 was biased or not biased or take a look at the Minutes, the Council Minutes and see if  
18 what you were doing was biased or not biased.

19 MS. CAIRNS: But something that would be incredibly difficult.

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Staff does it all the time.

21 MS. CAIRNS: But that's their job. They're not voting members on this  
22 Commission. I mean, if I was not a voting member on this Commission and somebody  
23 came to me and said, we would like you to be able in the capacity to go present to



1 Council what happened at the meeting, I would have no problem with that. I would have  
2 notes and I would go and I would feel completely comfortable presenting a synopsis of  
3 what occurred as a non-voting member. But as a voting member I think it's very  
4 difficult.

5 MR. GILCHRIST: Well, let me ask this question, Mr. Chairman. Can Council  
6 request us to come if they feel like they're not really sure about a vote that we've taken?  
7 Can not Council ask that there be representation from this Commission at their  
8 meetings?

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Well sure, they can and they can ask to [inaudible] our  
10 Minutes. I was, I mean, that's certainly something that I would imagine a couple Council  
11 members would do if there was nothing done here on this today. I mean –

12 MR. TUTTLE: You know, just in a different way. I've been to many of the Public  
13 Zoning Hearings in the last year and having had been to the Planning Commission  
14 meetings and now having served on Planning Commission sometimes the spirit and  
15 intent on what we've agreed to doesn't get translated and there are very basic questions  
16 that I think Council might want to ask to gain some insight and there's no mechanism for  
17 them to be able to do that. Therefore they don't have the insight. Whether it be a close  
18 vote or a unanimous vote. Many things, if you notice many of the things that we've  
19 voted on unanimously Council has rejected wholeheartedly. And it's certainly their  
20 prerogative but maybe if somebody was there to offer insight they might have a different  
21 [inaudible].

22 MS. CAIRNS: But again it's the difficulty of what – the person who goes forward  
23 to offer the insight they aren't going to have the Minutes. I'm not sitting here as a

1 Member of this Commission taking notes with the expectation that I'm going to be  
2 offering this and that's what it's like, if it was, if I was designated as the person to go to  
3 this I would be furiously writing notes as to what the public said, what the Members said,  
4 and how the discussion went. I would not go there from memory.

5 MR. MANNING: Well, like I said I think we need to have Minutes available for  
6 that person going.

7 MS. CAIRNS: And I think some of the problem with [inaudible] just the literally  
8 timing of what occurs between [inaudible].

9 MR. MANNING: And if they, Staff has given that to the Council then certainly we  
10 could have a copy of that [inaudible].

11 MS. ALMEIDA: Staff has also provided you a list of accomplishments and if you  
12 look at that –

13 MR. GILCHRIST: Thank you for that too.

14 MS. ALMEIDA: You're very welcome. There are text amendments and it has the  
15 votes and what the results were by County Council. So that's provided for you and if  
16 you see, the majority of the time Council does go with Planning Commission's or Staff's  
17 recommendations so that's been [inaudible] for you.

18 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We just need to make a decision on this issue I guess.

19 MR. MANNING: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion that we adopt a change  
20 that allows the Chairman or his designee to appear before the Council meeting and  
21 speak only at their request to provide insight as to how this Commission [inaudible].

22 MR. GILCHRIST: Second, Mr. Chairman.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion and a second. All those in favor of a  
2 rule change [inaudible] as stated by Mr. Manning please signify by raising your hand.  
3 Those opposed?

4 *[Approved: Westbrook, Tuttle, Palmer, Manning, Mattos-Ward, Gilchrist; Opposed:*  
5 *Cairns; Absent: McDaniel]*

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Do we need to wait for our Minutes to be approved for  
7 that to become part of our rules change?

8 [Inaudible discussion]

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: That's not my question. My question is do we need,  
10 before that rule change, that change to our rules becomes as part of our rules do we  
11 need these Minutes to be approved at our next scheduled Planning Commission?

12 MS. LINDER: You could certainly appear at the Zoning Public Hearing to be  
13 available.

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay.

15 MS. LINDER: Even though these minutes, I mean, you're certainly free to attend  
16 and should there be a question I would think that you would have that discretion to  
17 come to the podium.

18 MR. WESTBROOK: The effective day is today whether you have Minutes or not.  
19 Why not? We voted today.

20 MS. ALMEIDA: There might be an opposition.

21 MS. LINDER: Well, this action would not necessarily effect your proceedings at  
22 your next Planning Commission meeting but this is something that would effect  
23 somebody coming into the Zoning Public Hearing later this month. And if the Chair

1 wants to come to the Zoning Public Hearing he could certainly do so as a member of  
2 the public and if Council would ask him about the Planning Commission's decision then  
3 he would have the opportunity to voice his neutral opinion.

4 MR. WESTBROOK: Close enough.

5 MS. ALMEIDA: But are you requesting that the Chairman have a copy of the  
6 Minutes at the Zoning Public Hearing? That is going to be extremely difficult if not  
7 impossible.

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: That's only a week before we get them. We get ours in  
9 the package, the Zoning Public Hearing's on the 23<sup>rd</sup>. We get them as part of our  
10 package seven days before our meeting; right?

11 MS. HAYNES: [Inaudible] last week we didn't have them back by the time the  
12 package was [inaudible].

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: But typically we do.

14 MR. MANNING: We had it two weeks before this meeting.

15 MS. CAIRNS: I mean, that's a large part of my concern is that we're asking one  
16 person to go up there and offer from that one person's memory what happened without  
17 any notes, Minutes, nothing.

18 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I understand all that. I do; I understand that.

19 MS. CAIRNS: I think that's a significant concern which I think has been  
20 aggressively glossed over.

21 MR. TUTTLE: I'm sorry, can I understand the vote that was just taken and what  
22 was proposed?

1 MS. ALMEIDA: Six – one to approve for the Chairman and his or her designee  
2 to attend the Zoning Public Hearing.

3 MR. TUTTLE: And there was no requirement for Minutes; correct?

4 MS. ALMEIDA: Correct.

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any Other Business?

6 MR. MANNING: Just one quick thing. Next month's meeting I was hoping,  
7 Anna, that maybe we could re-visit the definitions, a couple definitions in the storm  
8 water. I apologize I didn't get the email. I was out and couldn't respond. And precisely  
9 the forestry definition and the agricultural land definition. I just kind of wanted to revisit  
10 that and if you could bring, you know, some other municipalities or jurisdictions what  
11 their definitions might be just to compare.

12 MS. ALMEIDA: Okay.

13 MS. CAIRNS: Does some of that have to do with what the assessor, I mean, do  
14 we need to look at tying this in how the assessor classifies?

15 MR. MANNING: That's a good point. Maybe it would be a good idea to have the  
16 assessor come speak.

17 MS. CAIRNS: Or just what their – I mean.

18 MR. MANNING: Or what their definition is because I'm a little bit concerned.

19 MS. CAIRNS: Procedure? I mean, I think that's maybe an opportunity to tighten  
20 up this whole phenomenon.

21 MS. ALMEIDA: Okay.

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Got a motion to adjourn?  
23

1

MS. MATTOS-WARD: I make a motion.

2

3

*[Meeting Adjourned at 2:45pm]*