Albemarle County Planning Commission
January 11, 2000

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a meeting and public hearing on Tuesday, January 11, 2000 in the County Office Building. Members attending were: Mr. William Finley, Chairman; Mr. William Rieley; Mr. Jared Loewenstein; Mr. Dennis Rooker; Mr. Rodney Thomas; Ms. Tracy Hopper; Mr. Pete Craddock. Other officials present were: Mr. Wayne Cilimberg, Director of Planning & Community Development; Ms. Margaret Pickart, Design Planner; Mr. Greg Kamptner, Assistant County Attorney.

Mr. Cilimberg called the meeting to order.

The Commission welcomed new Commissioners Pete Craddock and Tracy Hopper.

Mr. Cilimberg opened the floor for nominations for Planning Commission Chairman for the year 2000.

Election of Officers

MOTION: Mr. Rieley nominated Mr. Finley to continue as Chairman. Mr. Rooker seconded the motion. Mr. Loewenstein moved that the nominations be closed. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, with Mr. Finley abstaining from the vote.

Mr. Finley thanked fellow Commissioners for allowing him to serve as Chairman in 1999, and complimented the group for being high-caliber.

Mr. Finley opened the floor for nominations for Vice-Chair.

MOTION: Mr. Rieley nominated Mr. Rooker for Vice-Chair. Mr. Loewenstein seconded the motion. Mr. Thomas moved that the nominations be closed. Ms. Hopper seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, with Mr. Rooker abstaining from the vote.

Set Meeting Time, Day, and Location for 2000

MOTION: Mr. Loewenstein moved, Mr. Rooker seconded approval of a meeting time and date of Tuesday, 6 p.m., in the same room in the County Building.

Adoption of Rules of Procedure

Mr. Loewenstein asked Mr. Kamptner if there were any changes in the Rules of Procedure for this year. Mr. Kamptner responded that there were not any changes.

Mr. Kamptner reported that he had attended a class conducted by a national expert on parliamentary procedure. Mr. Kamptner explained that he learned from this class that the "second" of a motion is intended just to further the process to debate, and is not necessarily a second vote of support for the motion itself. He added that if the discussion starts before a motion is seconded, that is acceptable. The fact that the debate starts negates the need for the second. Mr. Kamptner further explained that the purpose of a second is to prevent the "outlaws" for bringing matters before the body; the purpose of the second is to prevent a lone outlaw from putting matters to debate; once the debate starts the purpose of the second has been accomplished. "We want the second, because that provides a guarantee, but don't feel like there's been a procedural error that your action is going to be in jeopardy because there wasn't a second to a particular motion." He noted that the person who seconds the motion does not have to support that motion; they are just supporting that the matter be debated.

Mr. Rooker asked about Item 3(c) regarding matters not listed on the agenda, which includes language that states "the Commission shall neither engage such a speaker in a dialogue nor engage in discussion on the matter raised by a speaker." He asked if that sentence is necessary, as it seems to preclude the Commission from discussing something that might be raised by the public and is not on the agenda.

Ms. Hopper asked if there was a procedural reason for this.

Mr. Kamptner replied that the rationale is because the matter is one not on the agenda, it may be an issue that the Commissioners have not been advised on; the intent of having this forum is so the speaker can provide information, the Commission can listen to it and direct staff to act further if they feel it is warranted.

Mr. Loewenstein said he is more comfortable receiving the information from the speaker, and having time to have staff research the item and inform the Commission.

Mr. Kamptner added that in the past, there have been occasions where Commissioners have asked for clarifications on the speakers concerns.

Mr. Rooker said he did not disagree with this as a matter of practice, but was just questioning whether it should be a hard rule.

Mr. Thomas mentioned that during the Rio Road/Catholic School discussion, Mr. Bishop in the audience came forward with concerns about dynamiting; Commissioners pulled the item back up and discussed the item.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that that item was handled as an "Old Business" item.

Mr. Finley asked about the 5 (I) "Motion to Reconsider" language, stating that Robert's Rules of Order indicate that someone on the affirmative side needs to make the motion.

Mr. Rooker commented that Robert's Rules of Order apply when the provision in question is not specifically dealt with in the standing rules of procedure.

Mr. Finley asked if there could be a second motion to reconsider in the event a previously approved motion was reconsidered and denied.

Mr. Kamptner said that the rules allow that to happen. "If the motion to approve fails, then that has the effect of being a denial."

Mr. Rooker suggested adding the phrase "at that time" at the end of "Matters not Listed on the Agenda" paragraph "C".

MOTION: Mr. Rooker moved, Mr. Loewenstein seconded the adoption of Rules of Procedure with one change: the addition of the phrase "at that time" at the end of "Matters not Listed on the Agenda" paragraph "C". The motion passed unanimously.

Approval of Minutes – December 7, 1999, December 14, 1999, and December 21, 1999

The Commission moved, seconded and unanimously approved the minutes of December 7th as presented; the Commission moved, seconded and unanimously approved the minutes of December 14th as presented; the Commission moved, seconded and unanimously approved the minutes of December 21st as amended.

Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting – January 5, 2000

Mr. Cilimberg presented a review of the January 5th Board of Supervisors meeting. Mr. Cilimberg noted that the Board held a work session on the six-year secondary road plan, and will go to public hearing with the recommended priorities as provided by the Commission, which were provided to the Commission by staff. Mr. Cilimberg said that the Board discussed how to deal with unpaved road projects that get right-of-way donated years ahead of the project being done; there was no decision to change procedures, but there are some things the county wants to do to make the public more aware of what those projects entail, especially for the residents along those roads. He mentioned that the six-year plan will go to public hearing in February. Mr. Cilimberg said the Board also discussed long-range capital needs and the CIP; they began a review of that with the County Executive's office, and will continue that for the next few months.

Other Matters Not Listed on the Agenda from the Public
None were offered, and the meeting proceeded.

Prior to discussion and vote on the Consent Agenda, Mr. Rieley announced he would not participate in the vote because of his professional involvement with one item on the Consent Agenda.

Consent Agenda:

Review of Batesville Agricultural/Forestal District – Proposal to conduct a review of the Batesville Agricultural/Forestal District. The District, which is contained within Tax Maps 70, 71, 84, 85 and 85A, consists of 23 parcels and a total of 915.93 acres. The District is generally located west of Batesville and Miller School Road (State Route 635) and east of Castle Rock Road (State Route 691). Properties in the District are designated as Rural Area in the Comprehensive Plan and are zoned as Rural Areas District.

Addition to Chalk Mountain Agricultural/Forestal District – Proposal to add 48.06 acres to the Chalk Mountain Agricultural/Forestal District. Property, described as Tax Map 98, Parcel 11, is located across from the intersection of Thackers Lane (State Route 804) and Monacan Trail Road (State Route 29). The property is designated as Rural Area in the Comprehensive Plan and is zoned as Rural Areas District.

Addition to Moorman's River Agricultural/Forestal District – Proposal to add 81.45 acres to the Moorman's River Agricultural/Forestal District. The property, described as Tax Map 41, Parcels 8, 8B, 8C, and 8D is located between Browns Gap turnpike (State Route 680) and Watts Branch. The property is designated as Rural Area in the Comprehensive Plan and is zoned as Rural Areas District.

Addition to Jacob's Run Agricultural/Forestal District – Proposal to conduct a review of the Jacob's Run Agricultural/Forestal District. The District, which is contained within Tax Maps 18, 19, and 31, consists of 1,017.26 acres. The District is generally located along Earlysville Road (State Route 743), Link Evans Lane (State Route 764), Markwood Road (State Route 664), Buck Mountain Road (State Route 665), and Reas Ford Lane (State Route 660), near Earlysville. Properties in the District are designated as Rural Area in the Comprehensive Plan and are zoned as Rural Areas District.

SDP 99-150 Kenwood Library Preliminary Site Plan – Critical Slopes, Parallel Parking and Curvilinear Parking Requests – Proposal to construct a library of 6,600 square feet, which includes requests to allow grading on critical slopes, construction of curvilinear parking and construction of parallel parking. The property, described as Tax Map 92, Parcel 1, is located in the southeastern side of Route 53, approximately 1 mile south of the entrance to Monticello (Attachment A). The property is zoned Rural Areas (RA), and Entrance Corridor (EC), and designated as Rural Areas 4 in the Comprehensive Plan.

MOTION: Mr. Loewenstein moved, Mr. Rooker seconded approval of the Consent Agenda as presented. The motion passed unanimously, with Mr. Rieley abstaining.

Public Hearing Items:

ZMA 99-14 Hydraulic Dental Center – Request to rezone 1.23 acres from Residential (R-4) to Residential (R-10) to allow the construction of professional offices. The property, described as Tax Map 61 Parcels 36 and 36A1 contains 1.23 acres and is located in the Rio Magisterial District on Hydraulic Road [Route 743] across from Albemarle High School. The Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Urban Density, recommended for 6.01 to 34 du/ac in Urban Neighborhood 1.

SP 99-67 Hydraulic Dental Center – Request for a special use permit to allow the construction of professional offices in accordance with Section 17.2.2.11 of the Zoning Ordinance which allows for professional offices.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that there is a request for deferral of both items to January 25, 2000; in some discussion between staff and the applicant, it was determined that there was some further work with proffers and conditions that would be advisable to prepare for review by the Commission and the Board. He explained that because the items have been advertised, public comment should be solicited prior to vote on the deferral with the knowledge that there will be a public hearing on January 25t^{h} if deferral is granted.

Public comment was invited.

Mr. Dwayne Jones, a resident of Oak Forest subdivision, which is directly behind the Hydraulic Dental Center, addressed the Commission. Mr. Jones expressed his discontent with the way the current property is being utilized; he added that he is concerned about the proposed new construction because there are already deficiencies in their current property. He explained that he moved to Oak Forest in 1995, and began conversing with the Hydraulic property owners regarding issues of public nuisance and criminal nature. Mr. Jones said that the parking lot which abuts adjoining properties has caused tremendous erosion to the Oak Forest neighborhood, including flooding. He stated that he raised the flooding issue in 1998, but the property owners have still made no improvements to the lot – there has been no paving of the lot, and no drain basins put in.

Mr. Jones continued that he has dealt with the county police department because of the consumption of alcoholic beverages, trespassers, loud music, etc. in the parking lot. "It's not uncommon to have the Albemarle County police chasing people through that property into the Oak Forest neighborhood." Mr. Jones added that there have been peeping toms looking in his own windows. He stated that in 1995 and 1998, he has contacted the property owners and expressed his concerns via letter. Mr. Jones said that he and other Oak Forest residents have suggested erecting a fence line, but no action has been taken; the Oak Forest neighbors have even offered to help pay for such a fence. He said he would be happy to provide letters that he has sent for the benefit of the Commission.

Mr. Loewenstein suggested that letters be furnished to Mr. Cilimberg so that they could be distributed to the Commission.

Mr. Rieley asked Mr. Jones to illustrate on the site plan where his property is, and which parking lot is hosting the problematic activity. Mr. Jones pointed out on the map where the parking lot lies, and showed the boundary which borders his home; he said there are three homes that abut the parcel planned for development. He said there is approximately 64 feet of space between his property line and the gravel parking lot border.

Mr. Loewenstein suggested that Mr. Wade look for the location of the parking lot prior to the January 25th meeting.

Mr. Rieley agreed that staff should look into it.

Ms. Molly Dameron addressed the Commission, stating that the parking lot abuts her yard. She explained that people have come out of the parking lot and spanked their children in her yard. Ms. Dameron asked the property owners to build a fence, and even offered to help build it, as her husband is a builder. She said that she has had people sitting in her back yard while waiting for the dentist. "I just have an issue with constantly having the public directly in my back yard." She stated that the home was built in 1982, and she still owns the home, even though they

are living in another part of the county. Ms. Dameron said if they decide to sell the home, it will be difficult because of the situation. Ms. Dameron said she hoped a fence could be erected.

Ms. Hopper asked Ms. Dameron if she had spoken with the property owner regarding the new construction.

Ms. Dameron said that they have not mentioned anything about the proposed new construction.

There being no further public comment, the matter was placed before the Commission.

Mr. Finley clarified that a public hearing will be opened during the January 25th meeting.

Mr. Rieley asked for an expanded version of the site plan. Mr. Cilimberg agreed.

Ms. Hopper suggested that the applicant and the homeowners utilize mediation to resolve their differences.

MOTION: Mr. Rooker moved, Mr. Rieley seconded approval of deferral of action on ZMA 99-14 and SP 99-67 to January 25th, 2000. The motion passed unanimously.

Work Session:

Historic Preservation Plan

Ms. Pickart presented the staff report, noting that the recommendations of the plan appear in pages 3-7 of the plan. She stated that the Historic Overlay District ordinance will not be addressed in detail at this meeting; separate work sessions and hearings will be held for the ordinance after the plan is addressed. Ms. Pickart mentioned that two members of the Historic Preservation Committee – Jim Edmonds and Bessie Carter – were in attendance at the meeting. Ms. Pickart reported that staff is suggesting that a public hearing be scheduled for the Historic Preservation Plan after this work session.

Mr. Finley said that he agreed with many of staff's comments about the plan, including Mr. Kamptner's comments in his November 19, 1999 memo.

Ms. Pickart said that Mr. Kamptner's comments all seemed very reasonable, and seemed to be in line with things already recommended.

Mr. Finley mentioned that Mr. Keeler's comments were also very valuable, and he also liked the comments from the Farm Bureau.

Mr. Rooker asked if staff comments had been incorporated into the Historic Preservation Plan draft.

Ms. Pickart replied that they have not yet been incorporated.

Mr. Finley asked if they would be before the public hearing.

Mr. Cilimberg responded that it was up to the Commission. "If you feel, as we do, that they are acceptable, we can have those incorporated for the hearing…we didn't want to go make any changes because you really haven't had any discussion of any of those things that are included as comments."

Mr. Rooker said the comments by Mr. Kamptner and the Zoning Department seem to be mandatory to incorporate; other comments are just issues raised.

Mr. Loewenstein suggested incorporating legally mandatory items, and other things could be more fully discussed when the public hearing arises. He added that some comments were just suggestions by staff.

Ms. Hopper stated that all of Mr. Kamptner's comments need to be incorporated, while others are more discretionary.

Mr. Loewenstein said that some of the comments made by Zoning are just questions that can't be resolved easily.

Mr. Rooker mentioned the comment regarding expansion of uses for historic properties, and asked Ms. Pickart if there had been any decision about including expansion of uses in the Historic Preservation Plan.

Ms. Pickart said that staff feels the recommendation to expand uses is a good one, but there has not been any further discussion on how to implement that.

Mr. Rieley commented that the implementation itself has its own open process, which requires additional time and effort. "I strongly support making amendments to the ordinance that acknowledge this important aspect of utilizing our historic properties. It obviously has to be done carefully and prudently. I'm wholeheartedly in favor of the strategy."

Mr. Cilimberg said there is recognition in the plan of what needs to be examined, adding "there's always that question of other ways to provide economic use of property that has historic significance."

Mr. Rieley noted, "The fact that Monticello and Ash Lawn are non-conforming, now the fact that Pine Knot is emerging and is non-conforming and require a ZTA to do business…clearly signifies that it's a matter that needs to be addressed."

Mr. Cilimberg mentioned that at their January 18th meeting, the Commission would be considering a special use permit for the addition to gift sales at the Monticello property.

Mr. Loewenstein said that a number of comments are really questions that will have to be answered during the public process. "I personally want to hear what [the public] has to say, but I think many of the issues that have been highlighted by staff are valid."

Mr. Rooker asked what the public availability of the plan would be prior to the public hearing. He asked if it would be possible to put the plan on the website.

Mr. Loewenstein mentioned that it is on the website now, but the draft needs to be updated.

Mr. Cilimberg said that as soon as the advertising occurs for the hearing, there will be a packet with the plan available for the public.

Mr. Loewenstein emphasized that there needs to be time in between the advertising of the hearing and the time it takes place to get all comments possible to the Commission. "This is a complex issue that's going to take some time to think through."

Mr. Rooker mentioned that it would be helpful in the advertising to indicate that a copy of the plan is available at the planning office and on the website.

Mr. Rieley suggested that Ms. Pickart might be available during rezoning hearings before the Commission in which there could be historic issues. "We have had important, very interesting historic sites utterly ignored because they had no standing. If somehow that language could be specified in here as a goal, I think it would be very helpful."

Ms. Pickart agreed, adding that some other recommendations in the plan would also make that easier by making more information available.

Mr. Rooker asked where things stand regarding staffing for implementing the plan if it is approved.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that the staffing would be contingent on the decision regarding the zoning ordinance; the Planning Department has made a request for additional staff in the next fiscal year to cover a variety of demands, including the Historic Preservation Plan. "I think as we get into the specifics of the ordinance, we begin to see more of the effect that has – not only on our staff, but on the other [development] departments as well. Sometimes the assessments have to be made on more specifics." He added that the Planning Department's request will be considered by the County Executive's office and the Board in the very near future.

In response to Mr. Finley's question regarding the order of how the plan would be implemented, Mr. Cilimberg replied that the plan would advance from the Planning Commission to the Board, who would then in turn handle it with a work session and possibly public hearing; once they adopt the document as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan, the next step would be the actual ordinance review with the Commission and the Board.

Mr. Rooker mentioned that the Mountain Protection Plan was approved as part of the Comprehensive Plan, but the ordinance was never approved.

Mr. Finley asked how Commissioners wished to proceed.

Mr. Rooker responded that he would be comfortable setting a public hearing date to advance the plan as long as the Commissioners received an updated draft before that meeting.

Mr. Rieley agreed, adding that the comments fall into several categories – with legal comments needing to be incorporated as is; staff comments are wide-ranging. He said he would feel comfortable having staff incorporate interpretations of nebulous comments to be hashed out in the public hearing.

Mr. Cilimberg asked Mr. Loewenstein if there could be another committee meeting.

Mr. Loewenstein replied that there could be. "I would like to see the Commission members get the revised copy more than one week in advance of the plan. It's a lengthy document with a lot of complexity to it, and I think we're going to need a couple of weeks at least to incorporate that." He added that staff can append any comments that have been made before it goes to public hearing.

Mr. Cilimberg said that what comes out of the Historic Resources Committee meeting, including the incorporation of Mr. Kamptner's comments, will be considered the final draft. It will then be distributed to the Commission and available to the public; when the document is available, the advertising will be done for the public hearing.

Mr. Finley asked how long that process would take.

Mr. Cilimberg said that it would take at least several weeks, given that the committee has to reconvene.

Commissioners agreed that the process seemed logical.

Mr. Finley said, "I know that the Farm Bureau comments dealt with the ordinance, but the ordinance kind of evolved out of the plan. I hope the committee will also look at these comments."

Mr. Loewenstein commented that the Farm Bureau has met with the committee periodically, and has been in touch with the committee throughout the process.

In response to Mr. Finley's question, Mr. Loewenstein clarified that the final draft would be sent to the Commission with a public hearing date attached.

Mr. Rieley thanked the committee and staff for their work.

Mr. Finley thanked the reviewers for their comments also.

Old Business

Mr. Loewenstein reported that he, Mr. Thomas, and Mr. Finley attended the Legislative Budget Update dinner last week, hosted by the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission. Mr. Loewenstein said that it was an enjoyable and informative session, and added it was valuable to hear the concerns from surrounding districts in the TJPDC.

Mr. Thomas said it was enjoyable, and complimented the work of the delegates and Senator Couric. Mr. Thomas stated that he had also attended the first Jefferson Area Eastern Planning Initiative Committee meeting. He described that meeting as a total success, with almost 60 people in attendance – 2 or more representatives from each county in the Planning District. Mr. Thomas described a 50-year-out goal-setting session that was part of the meeting, and added that the committee will meet at least once a month for 18 months. He said one major topic was transportation such as light rail, buses, etc., adding that greenways were also discussed at length.

Mr. Finley commented that the legislative dinner was a delightful evening.

New Business

Discussion of Committee memberships

Mr. Rieley mentioned that once he joined the Design Standards Handbook Committee, they stopped meeting.

Mr. Finley asked if the PDR Committee would continue meeting. Mr. Cilimberg said that it may. Mr. Finley asked if the Communication Tower Task Force would meet again. Mr. Cilimberg said that it may.

Ms. Hopper asked who serves on the committees. Mr. Cilimberg said that for all committees except the CIP Technical Committee, the membership is comprised of other appointed representatives of either government or citizen representatives. He explained that the CIP Tech. Committee is a staff committee with one Commissioner, whose purpose is to review CIP project requests.

Mr. Finley asked if the DISC Committee would meet again. Mr. Cilimberg said that it would.

Mr. Loewenstein asked Mr. Cilimberg to review the frequency of each committee's meeting.

Mr. Cilimberg said that the CIP Technical Committee meets several times during the summer into the early Fall, usually on a Thursday/Friday afternoon, after all the CIP projects have been submitted.

Mr. Finley commented that the committee is very important. Mr. Cilimberg said that staff likes to consider the Planning Commission as a liaison between the technical review and the priority recommendations that the Commission has to make to the Board; he noted that the Commission does not have to – by law – make a recommendation in between the technical review and the Board vote.

Mr. Cilimberg said that the Planning & Coordination council meets every two months, with the next meeting in February. He said that the Bypass Design Committee has not met in some time, and was uncertain as to when they would meet again, because there are issues related to the bypass that are beyond the committee's work.

He reported that he was unsure whether the Communication Task Force would meet again. He asked Mr. Loewenstein about the Court Facilities Study Committee.

Mr. Loewenstein said, "We're more or less back to square one…we're going to be working for some time, I think." He added that the committee meets every other week, adding that there was a well-attended public meeting recently whereby public comment was received.

Mr. Rooker mentioned that most of the public comment pertained largely to protecting the historic aspects of Court Square and surrounding properties. He said that the public felt that before a design consultant moves forward with a project to incorporate city and county facilities, that a look be taken at existing properties in the area to see whether or not preserving what structures exist now that are suitable for use.

Mr. Thomas asked what the time frame is for the study.

Mr. Loewenstein said they want to move quickly, but there is a good deal of work ahead. He noted that this is a combination of city and county courts, and mentioned that the current situation with the courts is "awful," and fixing the problems will have significant fiscal implications. "Hopefully it will be a reasonably positive process, because the situation in the courts themselves need to be fixed pretty badly."

Mr. Finley asked if the item would go to referendum.

Mr. Cilimberg commented that it is in the CIP.

Mr. Cilimberg said that the DISC Committee is meeting fairly regularly now, a couple times a month; the Fiscal Impact Committee meets the second Tuesday of each quarter; the Historic Preservation Committee will meet at least one more time; the Meadowcreek Parkway Design Committee will meet more regularly, a few times a month; the Purchase of Development Rights Committee will probably.

Mr. Loewenstein offered to serve on the CIP Technical Committee.

Ms. Hopper volunteered to serve on the DISC Committee.

Mr. Craddock offered to serve on the CIP Technical Committee; Mr. Loewenstein agreed to withdraw his service and defer to Mr. Craddock. Mr. Craddock agreed.

Mr. Rieley hesitantly offered to serve on the Bypass Design Committee.

Mr. Rooker noted that the MPO Technical Committee was not on the list, explaining that federally funded road projects in the area are brought before the committee. Mr. Cilimberg said he would place the committee on the list.

Commissioners agreed to serve on committees as follows:

Bypass Design Committee – Mr. Rieley
CIP Technical Committee – Pete Craddock
Communication Tower Task Force – Mr. Finley
Court Facilities Study Committee – Mr. Loewenstein
Design Standards Handbook Committee – Mr. Rieley
Development Areas Initiative Steering Committee – Ms. Hopper
Jefferson Area Eastern Planning Initiative Committee – Mr. Thomas
MPO Technical Committee – Mr. Rooker
Meadowcreek Parkway Design Committee – Mr. Rooker
Purchase of Development Rights Committee – Mr. Finley

Mr. Cilimberg mentioned that nameplates were in the works for the new Commissioners.

Mr. Cilimberg said that he and Mr. Kamptner have discussed having the new Commissioners attend an orientation meeting, to be set up through the County Attorney's office. He offered to have other Commissioners attend if they want a "refresher."

Mr. Cilimberg said that there is a registration form in Commission packets for the Virginia Certified Planning Commissioners program. Mr. Thomas said it was very beneficial, and the instructor – Mike Chandler – was quite informative. Mr. Cilimberg said that the program is highly recommended, and there has been a waiting list in the past. The county covers all costs.

Mr. Craddock mentioned that Mr. Chandler has hosted a seminar through the Virginia Political Leadership Institute, and is a good facilitator.

Mr. Cilimberg distributed a preview of an upcoming Resolution of Intent for several Subdivision Ordinance text amendments.

Mr. Kamptner said that there are some technical provisions that need to be included in the minutes of the December 21st meeting; he agreed to furnish them to Ms. Golden for inclusion. He requested that the Commission reapprove the minutes subject to Mr. Kamptner making any Freedom of Information Act corrections to the minutes regarding the Calvet matter.

MOTION: Mr. Craddock moved, Mr. Rieley seconded reapproval of the minutes based on Mr. Kamptner's comments. The motion passed unanimously.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.