Albemarle County Planning Commission
April 24, 2001

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a meeting and a public hearing on Tuesday, April 24, 2001 at 6:00 p.m. at the County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. Members attending were: Dennis Rooker, Chairman; William Rieley, Vice-Chairman; Jared Loewenstein, Tracey Hopper, Rodney Thomas; William Finley, and Pete Craddock. Other officials present were members of the Planning Commission of the City of Charlottesville: Nancy Damon, Kathy Johnson, Herman Key, Marshall Slayton, Eldon Wood, Tim Supler and Ken Schwartz. Also attending were: David Benish, Michael Barnes, Greg Kamptner, and Wayne Cilimberg, Director of Planning and Development.

Call to order and establish quorum.

Mr. Rooker called the meeting to order and established a quorum.

Other Matters Not Listed on the Agenda from the Public.

Mr. Rooker asked for other matters not listed on the agenda.

Mr. Bob Watson pointed out that at the last meeting the commission discussed the rural areas section of the comprehensive plan. He believes that, based on the DISC committee process, input from the various stakeholders is important. He suggested the formation of an Ad hoc focus group to include the Piedmont Environmental Council, the Farm Bureau, CALAC, and others.. Periodically during the process the group would meet to discuss policy formulation ideas.

There being no further business, the meeting proceeded.

Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting – April 18, 2001.

Mr. Rooker asked Mr. Cilimberg to review the meeting.

Mr. Cilimberg said that the Board took up three items previously reviewed and approved all with conditions. Keswick was approved with conditions as recommended. They approved the two permits at Panorama farms with conditions that were modified according to the commission's request. They approved five towers associated with the emergency communications plan with conditions as recommended. Additionally, they changed the Klockner Stadium area to a residential area, allowing for a special use permit.

Mr. Rooker suggested examining condition #5 in the Spring Hill application for accuracy.

Deferred Item:

a. **ZTA-2000-10 Appeal of Waivers, Modifications or Variation** – Ordinance to amend Chapter 18, Zoning of The Albemarle County Code, Sections 4.2.5 Modification of regulations; Section 4.10.3.1 Exceptions – excluded from application; Section 4.12.7 Required off-street loading space; Section 4.17.5 Modification, waiver or variation; Section 4.18.07 Modification, waiver or variation; Section 5.1 Supplementary regulations; and Section 32.3.10 Waiver, variation; substitution. The amendments are regarding appeal of waivers, modifications or variances by the Planning Commission to the Board of Superviros and regarding waiver standards in Section 4.2.5 Modification of Regulations. (Wayne Cilimberg) ***DEFERRED FROM THE APRIL 10, 2001 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING.***

Mr. Cilimberg presented the staff report.

Mr. Rooker pointed out that the language change was something that he had originally brought before the commission. He does not disagree with staff's recommendation of the proposed language to adopt tonight. He would like his original thought to be considered when dealing with the substantive provisions of the critical slopes waiver.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that there was a hearing on the original item, but he did not recall if there was a hearing on the item at the last meeting.

Mr. Rieley said that they had.

Mr. Rooker asked if there was anyone from the public that would like to speak on this issue.

Mr. Chuck Radkin supported the Chair's proposal and asked that it be considered with critical slopes issues.

Mr. Rooker asked for additional public comment, there being none, he opened discussion.

Mr. Thomas moved for approval.

Mr. Loewenstein seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Work Session – Joint City/County Planning Commission Meeting

a. Southern Environmental Law Center Presentation of Design Concept for Route 29/Hydraulic Road Interchange.

Ms. Damon called the City Planning Commission to order.

Each of the commissioners identified themselves.

Mr. Bruce Appleyard, SELC, Transportation Language Planner. In the report Mr. Kulash proposes an interchange with Route 29 passing below Hydraulic Road, leaving businesses intact. This intersection is absolutely necessary to save the area from congestion, improve service and performance, and encourage alternative forms of transportation. VDOT has recognized this improvement in their studies. This is the best plan for relieving traffic at this intersection. This intersection is already performing poorly at level of service E. They recognize that with this improvement, level of service improves from an E to a B by the year 2010.

Mr. Rieley pointed out that, according to Mr. Kulash's report, the interchange would be level of service F by 2005 if left unchanged.

Mr. Appleyard stated that according to a study done by the Sperry site developers, by 2003 it will be a level of service F.

Mr. Rooker pointed that the study went out to 2010 but did not go to any specific dates in between.

Mr. Appleyard presented the design. He pointed out that both roads came together at ridges. They tightened up the geometry to avoid encroachment, and provided pedestrian refuges to allow people to cross the intersection.

Mr. Supler asked if that was pending the building of the new road.

Mr. Appleyard said that was the complementary road improvement.

Mr. Supler asked if the figures given are assuming that road is completed.

Mr. Appleyard stated that this is how VDOT analyzed the intersection. They did not take into account the connector road. This is simply a good starting point. Widening the road would not result in the type of improvement sought.

Mr. Rooker simply widening the road would not improve the circumstances for pedestrians or cyclists.

Mr. Appleyard said that was true. There is a decaying effect in the other approaches in terms of signal clearing times. This design is much freer flowing and can actually help businesses.

Ms. Damon asked Mr. Appleyard to show the through traffic. She asked if there would be signals on Hydraulic Road.

Mr. Appleyard said there would be two coordinated signals. The signal cycle times would be much quicker.

Mr. Rooker verified that the signals really just coordinated the left-hand turns.

Mr. Appleyard said yes, the biggest impact is to coordinate left turns. The right-hand turns would be free flowing.

Mr. Thomas asked about access onto 29 North.

Mr. Appleyard pointed out that there is a right-turn lane, onto a ramp, which provides access onto 29 North.

Mr. Slayton said it would cut out cut-through traffic.

Mr. Appleyard pointed out that there is only about 20 seconds of time to make the turn at that light.

Mr. Slayton said he gathered that the design does not include the see-through down to the lower level.

Mr. Appleyard said it did not. He reminded the Commissioners that VDOT's design showed the businesses having disappeared and no pedestrian walkways.

Mr. Rooker said he was on the design advisory committee for the interchanges several years ago. At that time, VDOT's plan was said to be the least disruptive design possible.

Mr. Appleyard asked for questions.

Mr. Hal Hepner asked how one would get back to get to the hotels on Route 29 if you missed the ramp at Hydraulic.

Mr. Appleyard said that they could use one of the median breaks, make a left turn on to Route 29, and another right turn to come back to the ramp.

Mr. Hepner said that the whole block would be affected.

Mr. Appleyard recommend signage before the ramp.

Ms. Damon asked about projected cost.

Mr. Appleyard replied that the consultant's estimate was 20-35 Million dollars.

Ms. Damon asked how traffic would be handled while construction is underway.

Mr. Appleyard said they would have to detour of some traffic

Mr. Slayton reminded him of Virginia Beach where they have two-lane, two-way access roads. He asked if that was considered as an option.

Mr. Appleyard said that was a classic boulevard design. It would require more right-of-way.

Mr. Slayton pointed out that traffic at the hotels would be those who were not aware of the traffic pattern.

Mr. Appleyard said that the businesses that rely on visibility and impulse access would have proper signage and visibility from the ridge.

Mr. Rooker stated that today you have to make a U-turn.

Mr. Slayton pointed out that most of the Holiday Inn's traffic comes from the North.

Mr. Hepner said he is not sure how far access will go down, but it would not be good for either hotel or Krispy Kreme.

Mr. Slayton suggested having a road behind those businesses that would connect them.

Mr. Appleyard pointed out the current pattern to get into Krispy Kreme from the South which requires traveling north on the southbound lanes.

Mr. Rooker said there are some trade-offs. This new plan would facilitate getting over there from the other side, while it may make it a little more difficult to get into the correct lane if you do not know where you are going.

Mr. Appleyard stated that the points raised are helpful, we could probably have a better-designed left turn lane.

Ms. Elizabeth Kutchai pointed out that a traveler looking for the Holiday Inn would be in the right lane rather than the left and would have to cross several lanes of traffic to make the U-turn.

Mr. Appleyard said there would be a sign indicating the site of the Holiday Inn.

Mr. Thomas gave an example of the design.

Mr. Rooker said that motorists have become accustomed to looking for those signs when they travel.

Mr. Rieley stated that by 2010, if this intersection is dysfunctional, it's bad for all the businesses.

Mr. Appleyard said that people are already avoiding this intersection.

Ms. Hopper asked for the projected cost of the VDOT plan.

Mr. Appleyard said he did not know.

Mr. Rooker said in 1994 it was 15 million dollars, but is probably double in today's dollars.

Ms. Hopper asked if he had any idea when it would be addressed.

Mr. Appleyard stated that VDOT did not grant funding. They have asked VDOT to examine the proposal.

Mr. Rooker said there have been references made to city corridor study in which consultant recommended a grade separated interchange. He asked Mr. Appleyard if he had looked at that plan.

Mr. Appleyard said that they had. He said that Route 29 traffic would overwhelm the suggested traffic circle.

Mr. Rooker asked if the circle was on Hydraulic or Route 29.

Mr. Appleyard said it was on 29 with a much bigger footprint.

Mr. Rieley said that design is called a tabletop roundabout, England has almost completely abandoned the idea due to inefficiency.

Mr. Appleyard said it is difficult for pedestrian crossing as well.

Mr. Finley asked if lanes of 29 would remain open during construction.

Mr. Appleyard stated that construction time would be lengthened without a detour, but it could be done.

Mr. Rooker said that the road is usually not completely closed during construction.

Mr. Appleyard showed the potential alignment for the Hillsdale Drive connector. The old movie theater and the car wash would have to be eliminated. The connector road is made for access, not mobility.

Ms. Damon asked how far along the planning was for the road.

Mr. Appleyard said that they are only looking at the initial connection at this time.

Ms. Damon asked him to show the City/County line.

Mr. Appleyard thanked the commissioners for their attention.

Mr. Supler asked for the build-out time of the plan.

Mr. Appleyard said it would be 2-3 years with traffic facilitation.

Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Appleyard if he is saying the Meadowcreek Parkway would not be necessary.

Mr. Appleyard stated that this intersection would not be demonstrably improved by the building of the Meadowcreek Parkway and the Western Bypass. It would remain virtually unchanged with both roads built.

Mr. Rooker pointed out that the Parkway traffic would be traveling to Rio Road rather than Hydraulic. Studies show that the parkway would pull in additional traffic from Interstates 95 and 81.

Mr. Appleyard said that dollar for dollar, this is the best plan for this intersection.

b. Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment for the Town Center at Hydraulic Road and Seminole Trail.

Mr. Michael Barnes gave the staff presentation.

Mr. Rooker said that in the past there have been requests that were much more specific in what they were proposing to do with the property. As he understands it, this plan just says regional service.

Mr. Benish said that they have made the initial proposal to outline intent from a conceptual scale. The applicant intends to submit a rezoning request. Typically policy is to do a comprehensive plan amendment first.

Mr. Rooker asked what the rezoning was asking for.

Mr. Benish stated they were asking for planned development at this point in time. It would be difficult at this time to implement the full concept of their plan.

Mr. Rooker asked if the current PD plan would be permissible under the current comprehensive plan.

Mr. Benish said that certain planned developments would be, but they would have to be consistent with the current intent of the Industrial Service designation.

Mr. Rooker said that the current plan would not be permitted as a PD.

Mr. Benish said it is not consistent with the industrial service designation.

Mr. Supler asked if that was all because of the residential addition.

Mr. Cilimberg said that the industrial designation is oriented to research and development. Commercial activity is only a support use. North Fork Research Park is an example of planned-use industrial.

Mr. Rooker asked if staff is of the opinion that this plan requires a Comprehensive Plan change.

Mr. Cilimberg said yes. This applicant has brought forth a master plan concept.

Ms. Hopper asked about creating a different zoning classification altogether as an option.

Mr. Cilimberg said if your are talking about zoning, there are a lot of ways to approach zoning property, that may not necessitate creating a new zoning district.

Ms. Hopper said that if this was designated as regional in the comprehensive plan then the type of vision there might be for this property might not be described well enough as a regional area.

Mr. Cilimberg said that might be an approach the commission could take.

Mr. Benish said that previously they wound up using an existing designation, but tailored it to the use. The Commission would establish specific expectations for development in that area.

Mr. Rooker reminded staff of previous discussions of the need to have public improvements in front of development. He asked if the current transportation network would be able to handle that development. With induced traffic, what road improvements be necessary.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that staff gave a number of questions to be discussed in the applicant's traffic study.

Mr. Benish said that it had been submitted and they will begin that process with submittal of that traffic study tomorrow.

Mr. Rooker stated that the property is in the designated growth area. The transportation improvements in that area today are sub-standard for this kind of development. The traffic study should not just address the intersection, but should also address the city and local streets.

Mr. Cilimberg said they had asked for all of that information.

Mr. Benish turned the discussion over to the applicant.

Mr. Frank Cox, Cox Company, part of planning and design team for the project. He also introduced Chuck Fancher, John Dalman and Randy Kemp.

The project being offered is a project that has been examined for the last 24 months. 62 acres are subject to the comprehensive plan amendment, the remaining 20 acres are currently owned by Sperry. At the time of the original application, there was no opportunity for connectivity. Over the past couple of years they have examined some key issues. Over the last twelve months the laundromat has been placed under contract and the Blockbuster piece was purchased to facilitate access onto Hydraulic Road. The applicants have since an agreement with Sperry for all of the property, making for a total of 60 acres. During the planning phase, traffic investigations were essential. They have been meeting extensively on this issue and have examined virtually every intersection in the adjacent area.

Mr. Rooker asked if there was a summary of the report and requested a copy.

Ms. Damon asked for one for the city as well.

Mr. Cox said they have contacted commissioners and board members. They have met several times with County staff. The applicant is asking for regional service, but they are really interested in a new designation that allows the neighborhood model. Have attempted to develop a plan that reflects the things that were criticized about what was lacking in previous plans.

Mr. Cox pointed out several items in the concept plan.

Mr. Rooker asked for the area of the green space.

Mr. Cox said it was little over an acre. One of the key components in this project is the mix of uses within the same structure. The yellow buildings represent upper level residential units, 3-4 story structures, with apartments or condominiums.

Mr. Slayton asked for the number of units.

Mr. Cox said 300-400 units. They have also done a concept with up to 600 units.

Mr. Supler asked if the units would be for rent or sale.

Mr. Cox answered either or depending on the market.

Mr. Key asked about affordability.

Mr. Cox said they are still waiting on the residential market analysis.

Mr. Key said that given the upper-scale nature proposed, is it really realistic.

Mr. Cox stated that they are looking at $1,000 to $1,500 dollars per month. In an effort to comply with the neighborhood model, the applicant has created on-street parallel parking and parking garages.

Mr. Rooker asked if they were proposing public or private roads.

Mr. Cox said that they had done first accepted town center road system accepted by VDOT. It was an extremely arduous process. The applicant's have a certain timeframe in which to capture 40 or 50 renters and his advice was to build the roads and set them up as private roads.

Mr. Rooker stated that in the plan he is looking at, on the third page, it says 594 units, with a total area 640,000 square feet.

Mr. Cox said that they have adjusted downward.

Mr. Loewenstein asked that, given that the market summaries are not complete, how did you arrive at the capacity to your land uses.

Mr. Cox said they held several privately conducted meetings with various entities. They are also based partially on experiences in Mid-Atlantic region.

Ms. Kathy Johnson asked if that was where they had derived the (inaudible) capacity.

Mr. Cox said it was.

Mr. Fancher stated that he and his colleagues saw conditions in this community where there was a mindset and a search for a different way of doing development. This is an environment in which we can come in and match that need. This is a mixed use development, not a big-box complex. There is also a market here that is underserved.

There are some impacts that fall out of this. There are not major detrimental impacts to traffic on Route 29. There are other impacts. There are other retailers that are not in this community, which causes residents to shop elsewhere. It offers an appealing option to retailers to locate in the area, keeping tax dollars here. The development proposes a new and different residential alternative. As new retailers look to Charlottesville, the other shopping centers will upgrade.

Mr. Thomas asked about children.

Ms. Kutchai asked where children would play in the development.

Mr. Fancher remarked that residents would likely not be families. They expect more singles, couples, and students.

Mr. Rooker asked if it was possible to build without the big-box component.

Mr. Fancher stated that the way malls and shopping centers come about, they have anchors. The developer has to include it to attract the other retailers. They have placed it to the back and structured the other areas.

Ms. Damon pointed out that the concept of new urbanism is that people live, play and work in the same area. Her thought is that people who can afford to live in the residential units would not be working in the retail areas. It seems that it would still generate quite a bit of traffic. The people that live there will go someplace else to work.

Mr. Fancher said that he thought that there would be some units renting to 3 or 4 students, as well as singles and couples.

Mr. Cox pointed out that the project does incorporate 300,000 square feet of office space, with up to 400 people employed in the area.

Ms. Johnson said that when she thinks of big-box she thinks of Target, K-Mart, etc. She asked if that was the intention, or would that be something like a Hecht's.

Mr. Fancher said they were thinking of a department store on one end and a big-box type store on the other, with one grocery store.

Mr. Supler asked what the existing Sperry building would become.

Mr. Fancher said they hope to have a chance to incorporate it into the development at some point. We have set the stage for a super-block concept that creates a grid system through the property and at key intersections.

Mr. Loewenstein asked for the size of the amenities area for residents.

Mr. Fancher replied that it was about two acres.

Mr. Watson said that he saw no ingress or egress out toward Commonwealth Drive.

Mr. Fancher said that they do not own that land, but there is an existing partial street, so if they provide for connection, there is the rationale to create connectivity.

Mr. Thomas asked if in future planning they have any plans to help with the enlargement of the intersection.

Mr. Fancher replied that there would be the need to some changes made to the intersection to redistribute traffic.

Mr. Rooker said that Mr. Fancher had mentioned earlier that their plan dovetailed with Mr. Appleyard's road improvement approach. He asked if they have studied that interchange.

Mr. Cox stated that they have spent time in discussion with Bruce. Their initial evaluation is that the proposal is not incompatible. He can't say that everything will be precisely compatible with his ideas once they are fleshed out.

Mr. Rooker asked for the distance from the South side of the property to the North side. He asked if the traffic study indicated the need for traffic lights at Hydraulic Road.

Mr. Cox said there would be a need for one.

Mr. Finley asked for the impact on County revenue.

Mr. Fancher said the County would realize increased revenues.

Mr. Finley asked if he had any projections.

Mr. Fancher said they had not done any projections yet. He expects there to be substantial tax revenue with 80 million dollar improvements done to the property.

Mr. Rooker pointed out that there was a comment earlier about children. He added that one of the principles of DISC is open space. He asked if it was possible to incorporate more green space in the plan.

Mr. Fancher answered that they could not without violating the scheme.

Mr. Rooker pointed out that DISC was intended to be a mixed-use development.

Mr. Fancher replied that it was a mixed-use with a large residential component.

Mr. Rooker said not necessarily more components than you have in this plan.

Mr. Fancher stated that the development would have to have density, along with the parking structure, to have the intended result.

Mr. Rooker pointed out that there is a lot of parking on the north side. Perhaps the applicant could build a parking garage there and leave more open space.

Mr. Fancher said if they put structure in here, that would defeat the concept for the grocery store and big-box outlet.

Mr. Fancher said that there is a studied approach to determine Market capacity.

Mr. Rooker asked about the timing sequence of the phase on north side.

Mr. Fancher replied that phase would be done initially.

Mr. Rooker asked if he was suggesting that the north and south ends would be developed simultaneously.

Mr. Fancher replied that was correct.

Mr. Slayton asked about the buffer between the development and the residents on the north side. He verified that it would be just their lots and the trees.

Mr. Fancher said that was correct.

Mr. Thomas pointed out that there are mostly apartment buildings behind the site.

Mr. Slayton stated his concern for potential noise.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that some of that depth is vegetated swale.

Mr. Benish said that there is also an elevation difference.

Ms. Kutchia as what the tax impact would be to the city.

Mr. Fancher replied that the taxes would not go to the city. But, as business is increased our neighbors will experience increases as well. This site is a portal to city of Charlottesville and the County of Albemarle. It makes statement about both localities.

Mr. Rooker asked if Mr. Fancher's company has done a similar development.

Mr. Fancher said that they had not developed a property like this, but they have done large developments in the past. This is a major endeavor in scale and contact for us.

Mr. Thomas asked if he had any statistics about the generation moving into these areas.

Mr. Fancher said that he did not, but in his experience they fill up in every project.

Mr. Slayton asked what percentage of the residential units they saw being filled by students.

Mr. Fancher replied that they were working with a number of residential developers. They also have received calls from a number of student housing developers. His judgment is that the student component will be very much a normal market place, with a minority of students.

Mr. Slayton verified that Mr. Fancher envisioned a small percentage of students, and mostly graduate level.

Mr. Fancher said there would be mostly graduate, not undergraduate.

Mr. Rieley stated that he thinks this proposal does a lot of the things the DISC model promotes. He also believes it raises some serious questions. Particularly, it seems like a contradiction the statement that there would be very little negative impact on 29, simply a redistribution. If this facility provides new shopping opportunities, it would seem to represent additional trips.

Mr. Fancher stated that it represented new retailers, not trips.

Mr. Rieley stated that he was having difficulty understanding how people coming to these new retailers would not generate new trips.

Mr. Fancher replied that the retailers are those that aren't in this market at this time. Retail is a minority part of this project. The traffic is already on Route 29, frequenting the other shopping facilities.

Ms. Damon expressed concern about the feasibility study, how much shopping can people do. How did you determine that it would not be overbuilt, and would not kill other businesses.

Mr. Fancher said they looked at the amount of money taken out of the market and spent elsewhere. Currently that amount is over $300,000. We know that can translate into support for the retail.

Ms. Damon verified that Mr. Fancher did not think this was more retail than this area can support.

Mr. Fancher stated this development would attract retailers that are not in this market, that have been trying to get in here and have not been able to.

Ms. Damon asked if any of their previous projects had failed.

Mr. Fancher stated that there was a project in Fairfax County that did not develop as expected. The energy that he anticipated was not there.

Ms. Damon pointed out that the development is calling for 16 theaters, but we have had 19 here and 5 theaters have closed.

Mr. Fancher said he has some experience with AMC, a major competitor to Regal and Carmike. The consumer prefers a large theater complex with stadium seating. The theater industry is currently evolving from the small theaters to larger ones.

Mr. Wood stated that one thing that pops out for him, is that entire space has been blacktopped. He hope that the County will look for breathing space for the area itself.

Ms. Hopper said that was something she would like to see as well. She stated her desire to see more open space created on the north side.

Mr. Fancher replied he was at a loss on that. With the reality of the retail, he does not think it is possible.

Ms. Hopper asked if Sperry was interested in selling anymore of its property.

Mr. Francher said that Litton has sold to Northrup. Northrup is holding everything because they don't know they're future.

Ms. Johnson stated that she hoped they would be producing jobs that are paying a living wage. She hopes it will give gainful employment and present a living wage to Charlottesville and Albemarle citizens.

Mr. Fancher agreed.

Mr. Slayton suggested they consider pocket parks. They create the airiness people are looking for without compromising development.

Mr. Fancher pointed out some areas in the plan that would serve that purpose.

Mr. Schwartz said he is quite encouraged to hear the collaboration between the commissions. He thinks there will be many other areas of collaborative discussions. One issue is the key element of connectivity within the individual property and to adjoining properties. There are connections to neighborhoods, but no connections to commercial developments to the east or west.

Mr. Rooker said that Mr. Schwartz had some good points. There was a pedestrian study done for the 29 north, which included pedestrian overpasses in the long-range plan. There is one planned in this area.

Mr. Fancher said that connectivity helps everyone.

Mr. Rooker asked if there was any point of access to Commonwealth Drive.

Mr. Fancher said there was not.

Mr. Rooker asked about some kind of pedestrian access from the area.

Mr. Fancher said that there was some plan currently being developed.

Mr.Rooker suggested a pedestrian bridge across the swale.

Mr. Cilimberg pointed out that one responsibility is looking out beyond this project and identifying those things that may or may not be the responsibility of this project.

Mr. Rieley stated that this is a remarkable opportunity to work together.

Mr. Rooker said that he hoped this was just the start of the process.

Mr. Rooker thanked Mr. Fancher.

c. K-Mart Property Plans.

Mr. Jim Tolbert said that he has absolutely nothing to say about it. They have had no meetings in well over a year with the developers of K-Mart.

Mr. Rooker asked if they had expressed any opinions about the extension of Hillsdale Road.

Mr. Tolbert said they had not.

Mr. Benish asked if the concept was for an expansion or for a change in use.

Mr. Tolbert replied that in their only conversation they had dealt with expansion.

Mr. Benish he verified that the plans would be more ministerial.

Mr. Tolbert said there would only be site plan reviews that would come under the Planning Commission.

Mr. Cilimberg said that there is a real interest in things like Hillsdale Drive. Whenever we get the opportunity to discuss K-Mart property, we should do that.

Mr. Rooker thanked everyone for attending. He asked for the City commissioners advice and consultation on these and other issues.

Old Business

Mr. Rooker asked for any old business, there being none, the meeting proceeded.

New Business

Mr. Rooker asked for new business.

Mr. Thomas discussed his attendance at the public meeting at Grace Episcopal Church. He expressed the public's concerns regarding the location and concealment of the planned tower for the public safety system.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

_____

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

Recorded and transcribed by Lynda Myers, Recording Secretary