

SPALDING COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
July 26, 2005

The Spalding County Planning Commission held its regular monthly meeting on July 26, 2005 at 7:00 P.M. in Room 108 of the Spalding County Courthouse Annex. Members present were: Karen Mathiak, Chairman, presiding, Janet Bailey, Ronald Green and John Youmans. Frank Chastain was not present.

Also present were Charles Taylor, Community Development Director, Newton Galloway, Attorney, Bruce Ballard, Griffin-Spalding County School System, and Yvonne Langford to record the minutes.

Ms. Mathiak called the meeting to order, introduced the members of the Planning Commission, and invited those present wanting to address the Board regarding any matter to sign in on the appropriate form.

Application #05-15Z: Karen Martin, Owner – 1310 Highway 19/41 South (2 acres located in Land Lot 117 of the 2nd Land District) – requesting a rezoning from C-1, Highway Commercial, to C-1B, Heavy Commercial.

Karen Martin – 103 Tony Trail – Griffin, Georgia

Ms. Martin said for approximately 10 years, this property was leased to a heating and air conditioning company. The current zoning was appropriate for that particular business. It is presently leased to a lawn care business. They need outside storage which is not allowed in the C-1 zoning. The adjoining property is zoned C-1B. The two businesses share the same driveway. Both properties join at the rear to property that is zoned R-4 – Residential. On the other side, the property is vacant and is zoned C-1. Across 19/41 is Diversified Fabricators which is zone C-1, but they have outside storage, and she believes they were grandfathered. There is currently a building with a paved driveway and parking lot. They do not intend to construct any additional buildings nor will there be additional paving. The request is to get approval to store their lawn care materials and supplies in a neat and orderly fashion. Approval of this request would allow the property to be zoning equivalent to the neighboring property and businesses and would allow the current renter to expand his business and services to the citizens of Griffin, Spalding and the surrounding counties. She requested approval of the application.

Ryan Rogers – 1310 Highway 41 South

Mr. Rogers said he does not intend to build any additional storage buildings.

W. J. Fortney – 1321 Kennedy Drive

Mr. Fortney said he lives on the property behind this site. When they first located there, he hardly noticed that anyone was there. He has lived in this house for 29 years and has some concerns. His main concern is the noise factor. He does not want to hear the noise

of machines all night and on the week-ends and holidays. He talked with Mr. Taylor and was told that the zoning would allow for a type business that might have noise. He does not object to the business but does not want the noise.

Louis B. Goodsell – 1319 Kennedy Drive

Mr. and Mrs. Goodsell had sent a letter, a copy of which is attached to and becomes a part of these minutes.

Mr. Goodsell said he feels the same way as Mr. Fortney. They have concerns about the noise pollution. They have had another issue regarding noise that he thinks they have finally resolved and he is afraid this is going to bring it back again. He is concerned what the noise will do to the property values on Kennedy Drive. It might make it difficult to sell the property in the future.

Mr. Rogers said he gave his address as the business address, but he lives in this neighborhood at 1326 Kennedy Drive. He is opening this business to expand to sell landscaping materials such as pine straw, red mulch, brown mulch, rock, gravel, etc. The only extra noise is going to be a tractor running around the lot loading materials onto vehicles. They are not going to be running a backhoe 24 hours a day. His hours of operation are going to be 9-6 on weekdays, 8-4 Saturday and closed on Sunday.

Mr. Youmans said his concern about approving this application is the appearance of the business. He encouraged Mr. Rogers to keep the location as neat as possible.

Mr. Taylor said the staff recommendation is for conditional approval. The conditions are:

1. Outdoor storage shall be limited to the side and rear of the property.
2. The site will limit all lighting so any neighboring residential properties or rights of way not be affected by glare.
3. Expansion of the building would require that the building be brought into conformity with the 70' front yard setback requirement.

Ms. Bailey said she does not want this to become a junkyard. There are too many already in the county. If it is neat and orderly, she has no objections.

MOTION

Mr. Youmans made a motion to approve Application #05-15Z with the conditions as recommended by the staff. The motion passed on a second by Mr. Green with Ms. Bailey, Mr. Green, Ms. Mathiak and Mr. Youmans voting for the motion.

Application #05-16Z: Markland Management, LLC, Owner – C. Mark McCullough, Agent – 1495 Macon Road (0.93 acres, more or less, located in Land Lot 204 of the 2nd Land District) – requesting a rezoning from C-2, Manufacturing, to R-6, Planned Residential Community District.

Application #05-16AZ: Markland Management, LLC, Owner – C. Mark McCullough, Agent – Macon Road (2.18 acres, more or less, located in Land Lot 204 of the 2nd Land District) – requesting a rezoning from AR-1, Agricultural and Residential, to R-6, Planned Residential Community District.

Application #05-16BZ: Markland Management, LLC, Owner – C. Mark McCullough, Agent – Macon Road (12.99 acres, more or less, located in Land Lot 204 of the 2nd Land District) – requesting a rezoning from AR-1, Agricultural and Residential, to R-6, Planned Residential Community District.

These three applications were discussed together and voted separately.

Mark McCullough – 800 Springer Drive

Mr. McCullough said he was representing Markland Management which is Mark Moody and himself. They are the property owners. They had a site plan map of the project. The staff report explains the project well. They agree to the conditions that are recommended. Some of the neighbors are present to speak. They had a workshop to show the plans and discuss the concerns on Saturday and invited all the property owners in the area to discuss their concerns.

Ms. Bailey said she had attended the meeting they had to explain the project. The neighbors did not come, and she did not understand why.

Mr. McCullough said they are trying to market this to the mature families, the people that are trying to downsize. The homes will be one level, garden homes or patio type dwellings. The patios will be covered. They are marketing to the 55 and older age group. This will be fee simple ownership. The cost per unit will be in the \$130,000 price range. One of the complaints the neighbors will have is that this development will be close to their homes. The property is heavily wooded, and they will keep the buffer natural rather than disturbing it and replanting.

Tim Rutledge – 760 Wilson Road

Mr. Rutledge said there is visibility on the heavily wooded already. His concern is the large number of people that will be living in this small area in his backyard. You cannot market to just older people. If somebody 35 with two children wants to live there and put their children in the school, they can. The school is already overcrowded in their neighborhood. He would have no problem with three large homes on this property. You are talking about 96 homes. That is a lot of people. If they are families, you are looking at four per home. There will be a lot of traffic in and out and a lot of noise. They have that across the street where some of the homes have sold and some of them have not. Some of them have sold been repossessed. The Autumn Ridge Community is not completely developed. The schools are already full. His biggest opposition is the schools and that many families in his backyard. They moved here for the school system. It was a nice area and not over populated. If this goes in, he will more than likely sell his property, and he does not know how hard it is going to be to sell with this going in behind his house. He is a business owner in the community, and he supports his community

well. He has lived in the community for 20 years. He supports most development and does not have a problem but this is just a lot going on in his backyard.

Ross Beasley – 750 Wilson Road

Mr. Beasley said his main concern is he understands Mr. McCullough wants to rezone from AR-1 to R-6. He understands this property landlocked and knows what he wants to do. The zoning needs to stay as is. That is the way it is zoned and that is the way it should stay. Some of the worst intersections in Griffin are on Old Macon Road and driving into 19/41 especially on school mornings and school evenings. It is some of the worst traffic in Griffin. The High School is already overcrowded. They are already moving trailers in and it has only been there three or four years. He does not want 96 homes within a couple of feet of his house he thinks that it is a concept plan that will open it up for more houses. The zoning is safe the way it is. If it goes to R-6, it could go to anything. Mr. McCullough has a concept plan but that does not mean that is what they will get. The zoning could open up the door for a lot behind them. The neighborhood across the street is probably 1/3 developed. There is a lot more development to be done there. A lot more homes to be sold there. Those homes there are two-story homes that sell for \$130,000 to \$140,000. Those houses are not selling. He does not see why these would. There are a lot of houses down Futral Road that are currently being built. This is too much development in a small area to benefit anyone. The zoning needs to stay the same.

David Dunn – 730 Wilson Road

Mr. Dunn said his biggest concern is the same as those of Mr. Beasley and Mr. Rutledge, the overcrowding of the schools. The High School and Futral Road Elementary are both in an overcrowded state presently. Autumn Ridge is going to add more children to the school system. The homes that Mr. McCullough is proposing would be even more. As a homeowner and taxpayer in Spalding County, he can only think that they will have to put up another school. His taxes will go up. It is a no win situation as far as taxpayers are concerned. He received his invitation from Mr. McCullough for the meeting on Saturday a couple or three days in advance. He and his neighbors are individuals trying to make a living, and they have schedules to keep and were not able to make the meeting. He has a small home. He had it on the market for sale, and it did not sell so they took it off the market. They want to stay on Wilson Road. Futral Road Elementary is probably one of the best elementary schools in Spalding County. That is one of the biggest reasons for wanting to stay. If they keep getting overcrowded like this, who is to say they won't go somewhere else, all the way across town because of the school traffic. That is something he does not want. That is something he does not pay taxes for in Spalding County. He was born and raised in Spalding County and that is his biggest concern.

Karen Todd – 710 Wilson Road

Ms. Todd said she and her husband are both teachers in Griffin-Spalding County. She teaches elementary school and her husband teaches at Spalding High School. They can attest to the overcrowded conditions in the school system. There has been some rezoning with the elementary school. It did not affect Futral Road. They recently purchased their house. They were looking for a house they could afford with some acreage and privacy.

They found what they wanted on Wilson Road. Autumn Ridge is being built in their front yard. The houses there have not sold. Houses are being built there. If this neighborhood goes in behind them, they will have a neighborhood in front and a neighborhood behind them. Essentially, their idea of a home with acreage in the county would not be any more. This is a concern.

Joshua Todd – 710 Wilson Road

Mr. Todd said he has been teaching at Spalding High since the year after the school opened. The second year the school was in existence four or five trailers were brought in. Presently there are 300 to 400 students over capacity. 96 more homes would make the overcrowding worse than it is. The trailers were initially for ROTC, and they used it for a year and now they are classrooms. He teaches English and is in one of the trailers for his classes. The traffic is so bad with the high school kids. There is a wreck most every day. Stepping Stones is right next door also.

Bruce Ballard said this is a case where the overcrowding concerns are very valid. Futral Road Elementary is at capacity. They have a mobile unit there with two classrooms. This year they did not have to put any more mobile classrooms there but there was concern that it might be necessary. The school zoning that they changed for this year on the west side of the county had no effect on Futral Road. In addition, they did some rezoning that will go into effect for the 2006-2007 school year for elementary schools on the east side of the county. Again, it will not affect Futral Road except very minimally. They had to look at the biggest growth and expansion so they are trying to get more space on Jordan Hill where all the lots have already been approved. Mr. McCullough did contact him and said they were going to try to market this as an elderly type community. That will be great but there is no guarantee. The school system's general position is that they prefer not to drop the zoning and especially in this case because it is such a drastic change from AR-1 to an R-6. This is generally not done throughout the county. They have tried to limit the jump to something more reasonable. There is no R-6 in this area now even though the staff report says it is in accordance with the future land use map. It could definitely open the area for more growth.

Mr. Green said he likes the layout. The traffic problem is such that you do not need to be there in the early morning and early afternoon. That area of Macon Road is really congested.

Ms. Bailey said if there are going to be older people, you do not have to worry about children, because there won't be any.

Mr. Youmans said he shares the concerns that it is a pretty drastic change from AR-1 to R-6. He is concerned about the density and the density at that price. He has misgivings.

Mr. Taylor said there is a big difference between being restricted for age and marketing toward retired people. In this case, with it being marketing toward the elderly, it is their obligation to gauge the full potential impact of the development. This fits with the comprehensive plan. The future land use map shows this as medium density residential.

Does that mean you have to approve it at the highest density possible? No, the zoning still has to fit in the area and you have to determine whether the property would be marketable or developable with less density. The comprehensive plan is also a growth control plan. Growth has to be planned. The school system has to plan, the county has to plan, and the DOT has to plan. If we stick to the plan, the infrastructure should be in place when the growth reaches the full potential it can under the plan. In reviewing the development, the staff recommends conditional approval of the application. The conditions are as follows:

1. Should Amendment #A-05-14 not be approved by Spalding County Board of Commissioners this application shall be rendered moot.
2. A plan for the amenity area shall be submitted to staff for review and approval per Section 104A:Y
3. Each building shall be constructed with 30% brick, stone or stucco materials.
4. An acceleration/deceleration lane shall be provided for sight distance and traffic issues.
5. Provide a streetscape plan with decorative streetlights and tree plantings for both sides of the drive. Trees to be planted at 50-foot intervals. Trees to be hardwood species with minimum 2 inch caliper
6. Provide a landscape plan that shall be submitted to staff for approval. This plan shall detail any significant features on the property as it now exists, indicate effort to retain the existing features as much as possible and show proposed landscaping for the common area and boulevard entrance.

Mr. McCullough, on inquiry, said they have not selected the amenities that will be included. They have done this previously and then had to make an application to make a change. This one will depend on the response they get from the marketing if it is going to be the 55 and older. The homeowners will decide what amenities will be best for them. If there are more children, then they will need the playgrounds. The marketing response will dictate the type amenities that will be there. They are open to the staff or boards to approve the amenity areas.

Mr. Youmans asked if it was envisioned that this development could potentially get Section 8 monies.

Mr. McCullough said he did not. They could not afford to rent them out in this manner.

Ms. Bailey said you would have to go through a lot before you can get Section 8 especially in a new neighborhood. She deals with them and knows.

Mr. McCullough said there was concern expressed because there is presently no R-6 in the area. He is not aware of any R-6 anywhere except one on 19/41. There are apartments in the area with an even higher density than they are proposing. There is that density in the area. The reason they purchased this property was because the future land use map has set aside this tract as an area they plan to be medium density. This plan fits that use. Traffic is a big concern and the acceleration/deceleration lane was

recommended, which they support. There has been a light approved for the Futral Road – Macon Road intersection. This will do a lot to help with the traffic and slow the traffic down. Schools are definitely a concern. He had a conversation with Mr. Ballard and there is not much that can be done until the development reaches the area. They have to solve the problem rather than plan for it. Most people aren't opposed to new development and growth as long as it is not in their backyard. If you are going to allow this type use, where would you do it except in the area that you have planned for it as evidence in the future land use map? Mr. McCullough advised the board that he had purchased a tract of land on Macon Road to access this property so it is not landlocked.

Discussion was held, and the question was raised as to what is considered medium density. Mr. Taylor said as far as the future land use map is concerned, it is basically anything that is greater than one unit per acre. Low density is one unit per acre and above that would be medium density.

MOTION

Mr. Youmans made a motion to deny Application #A-16Z. The motion passed on a second by Mr. Green with Mr. Green, Ms. Mathiak and Mr. Youmans voting for and Ms. Bailey voting against.

MOTION

Mr. Youmans made a motion to deny Application #A-16AZ. The motion passed on a second by Mr. Green with Mr. Green, Ms. Mathiak and Mr. Youmans voting for and Ms. Bailey abstaining.

MOTION

Mr. Youmans made a motion to deny Application #A-16BZ. The motion passed on a second by Mr. Green with Mr. Green, Ms. Mathiak and Mr. Youmans voting for and Ms. Bailey abstaining.

S/D #05-11: Teamon Pointe – Buffington Village, LLC, Owner/Developer – 99.76 acres Teamon Road and Smoak Road located in Land Lots 231 and 232 of the 3rd Land District – 57 lots.

Rick Mitchell – 13 Foxtrot Hollow – Newnan, Georgia

Mr. Mitchell said he worked for Scanlon Engineering Service and was present to represent Buffington Village. He was present to answer any questions.

Mr. Taylor said all departments have recommended approval, and the staff recommendation is for approval.

MOTION

Mr. Youmans made a motion to approve S/D #05-11. The motion passed on a second by Ms. Bailey with Ms. Bailey, Mr. Green, Ms. Mathiak and Mr. Youmans voting for the motion.

Amendment to UDO #A-04-21: Development Standards – add provision to allow private driveways in the AR-1, AR-2, R-2, R-1A and R-2 Districts.

Mr. Taylor went over the amendment. He said this was proposed last year and went to the Board of Commissioners where it did not receive a lot of support. They tabled the amendment. The UDO review committee was trying to find a way to make the ordinance more palatable to the county in addressing the concerns. The ordinance is to allow someone who has a property to develop a private driveway into the property for further subdivision of the property. There property must be less than 30 acres, have fewer lots that those that would constitute a subdivision, and would have less than the required road frontage for a development. The property would have further restrictions that are outlined in the ordinance. The fire department is concerned, because it does not require a fire hydrant within 500’ that the fire department is looking for to protect the neighborhood. Mr. Taylor went over the ordinance, and there was a lengthy discussion. There was particular concern expressed regarding the safety with regard to 911 being able to locate the properties. There was also concern that this will be treated as a private drive and would allow a few more lots. Mr. Galloway suggested that if there is concern, Mr. Taylor could bring some examples to see how the development right, established with the private driveway, would “play out” on those lots. Mr. Youmans said there is also concern that over time the owners will want the county to take over these private driveways for maintenance. Discussion was held regarding the difficulties that can arise with the maintenance that will be the responsibility of all the property owners living on the driveway. The Planning Commission wanted information from other counties that allow this type development and to look at some property that might be developed using this criteria and to give the opportunity for future discussion.

MOTION

Mr. Youmans made a motion to table Amendment to UDO #A-04-21. The motion passed on a second by Mr. Green with Ms. Bailey, Mr. Green, Ms. Mathiak and Mr. Youmans voting for the motion.

Amendment to UDO #A-05-16: Lift from the table – Article 17A. VN Village Node – add new article.

MOTION

Mr. Youmans made a motion, seconded by Ms. Bailey, to lift Amendment to UDO #A-05-16 from the table. The motion passed with Ms. Bailey, Mr. Green, Ms. Mathiak and Mr. Youmans voting for the motion.

Mr. Galloway went over this proposed amendment. The purpose of the amendment is to include a Village Node concept in the UDO. Draft IV includes the changes that were discussed at the workshop held earlier in July. A copy of the Heron Bay Architectural Guidelines was furnished to all the members of the Planning Commission. He said he is not recommending that they be included in the UDO at the present time but gives an idea of what Minerva requires of its builders. Their restrictions exceed the requirements that are being included in the UDO. It would be difficult to enforce some of their restrictions.

Mr. Galloway went over all the changes that had been suggested at the last workshop and included in Draft IV of the proposed ordinance.

The following further changes were discussed and approved:

- No multi-family in Village Nodes of 30 acres or less.
- Delete the words “simultaneous” with regard to the development phases. It will read that the development must be proportionate development.
- Add, under the Residential Architecture, Single Family and Townhouse.
- Include historic brick under the accepted for the exterior of the buildings.
- Require three options in the requirements for the architecture requirements.
- Under the County Club Architecture requirements, delete the option for four side brick, stone or stucco.
- The word minimum to be included with all tree size designations.
- Wording in the streetscape criteria be changed to state 50 linear feet in landscape strips and medians.
- Under streetscapes, delete the Non-Residential from the Flex Space Units.
- Under the development standards for the Village Nodes, change the minimum lot width to 40 feet and add a 35’ cul de sac.

During discussion, it was noted that the following ordinances will have to be amended:

- Sign Ordinance
- Add definition of thoroughfare
- Refine the definition of public sewer
- One principle use per lot
- Define flex-unit
- Code provision to exclude Village Node from the alcoholic sales distance requirements.
- Modification of the collector street

MOTION

Mr. Youmans made a motion to approve Amendment to UDO #A-05-16 with the modifications made during discussion. The motion passed on a second by Ms. Bailey with Ms. Bailey, Mr. Green, Ms. Mathiak and Mr. Youmans voting for the motion.

Amendment to UDO #A-05-17: Lift from the table – Article 5. AR-1 Agricultural and Residential – Section 503:A (1), Article 6. AR-2 Rural Reserve – Section 603: A(1), Article 7. R-1 Single Family Residential Low Density – Section 703:A(1), Article 7A. R-1A Single Family Residential – Section 703 A:A(1), Article 8. R-2 Single Family Residential – Section 803:A(1), Article 8A. R-2A Single Family and Two Family Residential: Article10. R-4 Single Family Residential – Section 1003:A(1), and Article 11. R-5 Single Family Residential – Section 1103:A(1) – add provision for minimum size of first floor of any single family dwelling.

MOTION

Mr. Youmans made a motion to lift Amendment to UDO #A-05-17 from the table. The motion passed on a second by Mr. Green with Ms. Bailey, Mr. Green, Ms. Mathiak and Mr. Youmans voting for the motion.

Mr. Taylor said at the last meeting, at the request of Mr. Morrow, Amendment to UDO #A-05-17 was returned to the UDO review committee for reconsideration. The committee reviewed the amendment and made no changes. Mr. Morrow was at the meeting and expressed his concerns but the committee chose to return it as it was. One of the major concerns is that some house designs that are very popular in the county, such as split level, will not be able to be used. Discussion was held regarding the location of some subdivisions that are not considered to be attractive that have a lot of these house designs. The Commissioners are interested in having an ordinance to add a provision for a minimum size for the first floor on single family dwellings.

MOTION

Mr. Youmans made a motion, seconded by Mr. Green, to approve Amendment to UDO #A-05-17. The motion passed with Ms. Bailey, Mr. Green, Ms. Mathiak and Mr. Youmans voting for the motion.

Amendment to UDO #A-05-18: Article 5. AR-1 Agricultural and Residential – Section 503:C – add provision to allow Class B Manufactured home in relation to farms as an accessory use.

Mr. Taylor said this applies to very few properties in the county. The major location is Rucks’ Dairy. Mr. Rucks has mobile homes on his property for the exclusive use of his employees of the dairy. The present ordinance prevents Mr. Rucks from replacing the mobile homes. This ordinance is being tied to those properties that have a tax assessment that identifies them as “for farming use”. There are only 3 or 4 properties in the county that qualify for this assessment so it will be very restrictive. It further requires that the housing can only be used for employees of the farm, and the manufactured homes must be a minimum of 100’ from any property line.

Charles Rucks – 6209 Newnan Road

Mr. Rucks said his concern is that his farm has grown and they furnish housing for his employees. It is the only way that he has been able to maintain a labor force. Three of his employees do not drive. Even if you pay higher wages you cannot get dependable help if you do not furnish housing. He has old, single-wide trailers that need to be replaced. He has had options in the past to be able to purchase good used doublewides and upgrade the living standards with three bedrooms and a bath and a half. He has two he wants to upgrade and wants to add an additional one. Those three would be on county water.

MOTION

Mr. Youmans made a motion to approve Amendment to UDO #A-05-18. The motion passed on a second by Ms. Bailey with Ms. Bailey, Mr. Green, Ms. Mathiak and Mr. Youmans voting for the motion.

Amendment to UDO #A-05-19: Article 4. General Procedures – Section 413:G”(2)(d) – amend Urban Proximity requirements.

Mr. Taylor said Urban Proximity is part of the special exception process for selection of design criteria. There were some problems that some of the Commissioners found. Urban Proximity excludes a lot of the requirement in the ordinance for other type developments. This is to reduce the size of the development that can use Urban Proximity and it puts some of the criteria back in that is required in other designs. The UDO review committee felt that reducing the acreage size of the Urban Proximity they felt it was not necessary to require green space. The Commissioner that wanted this change is adamant about keeping the green space requirements.

MOTION

Mr. Green made a motion, seconded by Mr. Youmans, to approve Amendment to UDO #A-05-19. The motion passed with Ms. Bailey, Mr. Green, Ms. Mathiak and Mr. Youmans voting for the motion.

Amendment to UDO #A-05-20: Article 8. R-2 Single Family Residential – Section 803:A – add provision for Mill Village Infill.

Mr. Taylor said this is for a development for Ray Browning. This will expand the Mill Village in Highland Mill. This is a design that will expand the grid pattern of the Mill Village and would require the expansion of the architectural design. There are benefits from investing in old mill villages. The main thing is that if there is investment from one source there is a good chance that there will be other investments. Highland Mills has real potential.

MOTION

Mr. Green made a motion, seconded by Ms. Bailey, to approve Amendment to UDO #A-05-20. The motion passed with Ms. Bailey, Mr. Green, Ms. Mathiak and Mr. Youmans voting for the motion.

Amendment to UDO #A-05-21: Appendix A Subdivision Ordinance – Section 704 – add provision for Architectural Design Criteria and Section 706 – revise Discretionary Density Bonuses.

Mr. Taylor said this ordinance came from the UDO Review Committee. There is concern by some of the County Commissioners regarding the Conservation Subdivision being an “easy out”. It is a valid concern. This adds an architectural design into the Conservation Subdivision. The discretionary density bonuses in the ordinance were not very discretionary. One section addressed the green space being in a trust with an endowment

for maintenance stated “shall” which made it a right by the developer to increase density within a conservation subdivision if he established an endowment. The Commissioners wanted to maintain control over whether or not to give this discretionary density.

MOTION

Mr. Youmans made a motion, seconded by Ms. Bailey, to approve Amendment to UDO #A-05-21. The motion passed with Ms. Bailey, Mr. Green, Ms. Mathiak and Mr. Youmans voting for the motion.

MINUTES

Mr. Green made a motion to approve the minutes of the June 28, 2005 meeting. The motion passed on a second by Ms. Bailey with Ms. Bailey, Mr. Green and Ms. Mathiak voting for the motion and Mr. Youmans abstaining because he was not present.

MOTION

The meeting was adjourned on a motion by Mr. Green and a second by Mr. Youmans with Ms. Bailey, Mr. Green, Ms. Mathiak and Mr. Youmans voting for the motion.

Karen Mathiak – Chairman

Yvonne M. Langford - Recorder