Albemarle County Planning Commission
June 17, 2003

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a meeting and a public hearing on Tuesday, June 17, 2003 at 6:00 p.m. at the County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. Members attending were Rodney Thomas; Bill Edgerton; William Rieley, Chairman; Jared Loewenstein and Pete Craddock. Absent were Tracey Hopper; Vice-Chairman and William Finley.

Other officials present were Wayne Cilimberg; Director of Planning and Community Development; Larry Davis, County Attorney; Mark Graham, Director of Engineering; and Francis MacCall, Senior Planner.

Call to Order And Establish Quorum

Mr. Rieley called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Other Matters Not Listed on the Agenda from the Public

Mr. Rieley invited comment from the public on other matters not listed on the agenda. There being none, the meeting proceeded.

Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting – June 11, 2003

Mr. Cilimberg summarized the actions taken by the Board of Supervisors on June 11, 2003.

Consent Agenda

SUB 03-100 NORTH FORK RESEARCH PARK (ETC #1) FINAL PLAT: Proposal to extend a private road to create a 2.601 acre lot from Tax Map 32, Parcel 6A, 481.269 acres, in the North Fork Research Park. (Yadira Amarante)

SDP 03-032 FOXCHASE CLUBHOUSE POOL SETBACK WAIVER REQUEST: Request a waiver of Section 18-5.1.16, which stipulates the setbacks for pools and their aprons from property lines and adjacent dwellings. Tax Map 56, Parcel 100B (Yadira Amarante)

Mr. Rieley asked if any Commissioner would like to pull any item off of the consent agenda for discussion. Since there was no response, he asked for a motion.

Mr. Thomas moved to approve the consent agenda as presented.

Mr. Loewenstein seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously (5:0). (Finley, Hopper - absent)

Items Requesting Deferral:

SP-2002-079 Old Trail Golf Club Entrance (Sign #21 & 51) - Request for special use permit to allow a stream crossing for access to the proposed Old Trail Golf Club in accordance with Section 30.3.05.2 of the Zoning Ordinance which allows for 30.3.05.2. The property, described as Tax Map 55, Parcel 17B1 and 71 and Tax Map 56, Parcel 41, contains 2.07 acres, and is located in the White Hall Magisterial District on Rt. 250 (Rockfish Gap Turnpike) across from the entrance to Western Albemarle High School. The property is zoned R1 Residential and R6 Residential. The Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Neighborhood Density in the Crozet community. (Scott Clark) ***DEFERRED FROM THE APRIL 22, 2003 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING. REQUEST DEFERRAL TO JUNE 24, 2003.***

Mr. Rieley opened the public hearing and asked if anyone would like to speak to this application. There being none, he closed the public hearing to bring the matter back to the Commission for discussion and possible action.

Mr. Loewenstein moved to defer SP-2002-079, Old Trail Golf Club Entrance, to June 24, 2003 as requested.

Mr. Thomas seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously (5:0). (Finley, Hopper - absent)

Mr. Rieley stated that SP-2002-079 was deferred to June 24, 2003.

SP-02-080 James E. Shifflett Bridge Replacement (Sign #46) - Request for special use permit to allow replacement of a low-water crossing with a bridge in accordance with Section 30.3.05.2.1.2 of the Zoning Ordinance, which allows for water-related uses (such as boat docks, canoe liveries, bridges, ferries, culverts, and river crossings of transmission lines of all types) in the floodway. The property, described as Tax Map 7, Parcel 57, contains 15.137 acres, and is located in the White Hall Magisterial District on Rt. 628 (Simmons Gap Road) approximately 0.2 miles from the point where Rt. 628 crosses the Greene County line. The property is zoned RA Rural Areas and FH Flood Hazard Overlay. The Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Rural Area. (Scott Clark) ***DEFERRED FROM THE APRIL 22, 2003 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING. APPLICANT REQUESTS DEFERRAL TO AUGUST 5, 2003.***

Mr. Rieley opened the public hearing and asked if anyone would like to speak to this application. There being none, he closed the public hearing to bring the matter back to the Commission for discussion and possible action.

Mr. Thomas moved to accept the applicant's request for the deferral of SP-02-080, James E. Shifflett Bridge Replacement, to August 5, 2003.

Mr. Edgerton seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously (5:0). (Finley, Hopper - absent)

Mr. Rieley stated that SP-02-080 was deferred to August 5, 2003.

Public Hearing Item:

SP-2003-07 Greenbrier Service Center Amendment (Sign #43) - Request for special use permit to allow an expansion of motor vehicle sales and rental in accordance with Section 22.2.2.8 of the Zoning Ordinance which allows for motor vehicle sales and rental. The property, described as Tax Map 61 Parcel 148, contains 1.636 acres and is located in the Rio Magisterial District on Rt. 650 (Gasoline Alley) approximately 100 feet from the intersection with Rio Road. The property is zoned C-1 Commercial. The Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Neighborhood Service in Neighborhood 2. (Francis MacCall) ***DEFERRED FROM THE MAY 20, 2003 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING.***

Mr. MacCall summarized the staff report. He stated that Greenbrier Service Center was located on Gasoline Alley just off of Rio Road East. The applicant is requesting approval to amend the 1992 special use permit that allowed the rental and sale of vehicles in the C-1 zoning district. The proposal is to expand the area of sale and rental for the storage of rental trucks and trailers. Staff has reviewed this request for compliance with the principles of the Neighborhood Model and the Zoning Ordinance and does recommend approval of the special use permit with conditions. He pointed out that the approval of SP-2003-007 with the conditions would bring the site into

compliance with the current County regulations. He stated that he would be happy to answer any questions that the Commission may have.

Mr. Rieley asked if there were any questions for Mr. MacCall.

Mr. Thomas asked if staff could give a little more detail on the access to the shed.

Mr. MacCall referred to Attachment B and stated that 650 Gasoline Alley comes around the property to an end of maintenance sign. There is then a paved area that goes up on to the CSX property and is currently being used for the storage of the trailers that is noted as the 24' X 55' area for collecting used tires. The applicant plans on moving the trailers to the location shown on the plan. Staff was trying to make sure that the appropriate access to the shed was clearly defined whether it was through an easement or through access somewhere internally through the back side of the building.

Mr. Rieley stated that he had one point of clarification under factors that are unfavorable to this request which was that the site does not meet current site plan regulations. He noted that he was unable to see what specific regulations were not being met.

Mr. MacCall pointed out that the recommended conditions laid out would bring the site into compliance with the current parking requirements for any site plan of any use similar to this for these types of regulations for travel way, surfacing and curbing. Currently the site does not meet that regulation. He pointed out that the applicant was cited for a particular violation that had to do with the stormwater management facility.

Mr. Rieley asked if condition # 4 would essentially rectify this situation, and Mr. MacCall stated that it would.

Mr. Thomas asked if there was a requirement for a bio-filter to be placed on this property.

Mr. MacCall stated that the improvement for the retention area is in the middle of the plan and the redesign of that area has recently been approved. There was certain landscaping required for the bio-filter. There is a lot of traffic around the bio-filter, and staff wants that area to be delineated further away from the traffic.

Mr. Thomas asked if the bio-filter was just for this piece of property.

Mr. MacCall stated that the bio-filter was in conjunction with the car wash that had gone in just above Greenbrier Service Center on Rio Road. He noted that the issue came to a head with Zoning when they were correcting the violation. The applicants came in and actually improved the bio-filter, which deals with some joint usage.

Mr. Thomas asked if the car wash would share the expenses of the bio-filter.

Mr. MacCall stated that there was an easement that talks about the drainage easement to be platted. That is something that staff would look for an amendment to.

Mr. Thomas asked if the bio-filter was just in conjunction with the car wash and this property.

Mr. MacCall stated that the actual bio-filter was approved in conjunction with multiple site plans, but had never been followed up on by staff previously. Some grading had been done, but had never been approved to the proper state back when it was installed the first time. That was something that was being improved upon here with Engineering's review of the plan.

Mr. Thomas asked if the sidewalk was part of the Neighborhood Model that they were trying to put into force.

Mr. MacCall stated that there was a particular section that speaks to the Neighborhood Service as far as connecting adjacent parcels with either sidewalks or pedestrian pathways.

Mr. Thomas asked if he knew the cost of the sidewalk.

Mr. MacCall stated that he was not able to ascertain the cost.

Mr. Craddock pointed out that under the item of Zoning and Planning history, it indicated that they were suppose to do landscaping and it took eleven years. He asked if the applicants were different owners.

Mr. MacCall stated that they were different applicants.

Mr. Craddock noted that it took a long time to get the trees in.

Mr. Rieley asked if there were further questions. There being none, he opened the public hearing and asked if the applicant would like to address the Commission.

Dave Wyant stated that he was the engineer for Gary Hicks and his wife who were both present. He asked to clarify some of the issues that had been raised. He pointed out that they met with one of the Board members and Mr. Tucker on this. The previous owners did not complete the project after they submitted the plans. He pointed out that Mr. Hicks was trying to clean up what was here now. He felt that it was unfair to his client to say that the old plans be thrown away and use the new plans of today. That was the discussion that they had about that and the review process. He pointed out that the building caught on fire, and the cheaper route of going back was to put in a larger building in and not going back with the same sized footprint. He noted that if they had gone back with the same sized footprint that they could have avoided a lot of this process and corrected some of the other things. In looking at the twelve elements of the Neighborhood Model, a lot of the principles are not applicable including the sidewalks. He stated that the sidewalk was located on a dead end street and nobody was going to walk down there. He pointed out when people come to have their car fixed, they would either stay in the lounge or get picked up. He stated that the sidewalk was very expensive. He noted that it was a state road, but it was the only business down there with the railroad accessing the rails. The property line was not in the center, but it was in the driveway. There is an agreement with the railroad and Mr. Hicks to use the driveway. The applicant has agreed to move the trailers down below and behind the hill. He felt that was something that they have run into here. Regarding parking, 19 of the 31 parking spaces shown on the plan are due to the garage requirement. There are 6 bays and 7 employees. Therefore only 12 parking spaces are for the uhaul/rental business. Staff has noted that the rental units are not very visible from Rio Road. He pointed out that the paving was a very costly item. He pointed out that they got caught in the process when they started changing some of the Zoning items. He felt it was unfair to change the rules of the game in the middle of the game. He pointed out that previously if you had less than 350 vehicles per week, you could use prime and double seal. There is not a lot of heavy traffic on this road. It would cost approximately $42,000 just to pave the parking area. With the cost of the bio-filter, they were looking at the cost of about $90,000. Right now Mr. Hicks has exceeded the amount of the insurance money by $100,000. When you start looking at how Mr. Hicks can recover his costs, it is almost cost prohibited. He pointed out that there was a bio-filter behind the car wash that was not adequate to handle the water flow there. It was running over on to Mr. Hick's property. The bio-filter's volume of water was coming from way up on Rio Road. Therefore, Mr. Hicks was being asked to deal with a lot of water flow from other properties. He pointed out that a commercial entrance has to be put in and the parking delineated. He asked that the Engineering Department not require the road to be asphalt or curbs and gutters to be put in.

Mr. Rieley asked if there were any questions for Mr. Wyant.

Mr. Thomas asked whose property the frame shed was located on, and Mr. Wyant stated that it was on Mr. Hick's property.

Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Graham if the runoff to the bio-filter was coming from as far as Huntington Road.

Mr. Graham, Director of Engineering, stated that there was a considerable amount of off-site runoff that was coming down to this bio-filter. It was actually quite an issue between Mr. Wyant and Glenn Brooks of his office. Mr. Brooks has spent a lot of time with Mr. Wyant trying to make sure that it has been adequately addressed. He pointed out that he had no reason to believe that they did not accommodate it.

Mr. Thomas asked if there was a solution for Mr. Hicks from the runoff.

Mr. Graham stated that Glenn Brooks has indicated that what Mr. Wyant has proposed does adequately address the stormwater management.

Mr. MacCall stated that actually had been resolved with the March amendment.

Mr. Loewenstein questioned whether the sidewalk should be put in. He pointed out that it was unlikely that the sidewalk would get any use.

Mr. Rieley stated that he felt very strongly both ways about the sidewalk, but that Mr. MacCall makes a good point that this use may be different in ten years. He noted that while there was a fire and they were rebuilding, that there was also an additional use being requested as a part of the amendment.

Mr. Loewenstein felt that this use does not precipitate any greater need for a sidewalk and what they have now because of the type of use.

Mr. Craddock stated that it was sort of the same thing about the asphalt versus the double seal. He asked if there was going to be enough justification for a lot of asphalt to be placed down in that bottom where it could theoretically soak in.

Mr. Loewenstein stated that it would make the runoff potentially worse than it is.

Mr. Rieley pointed out that both of them are impermeable surfaces and the difference is durability. He asked Mr. Graham to weigh in on the relative merits of plant mix asphalt as opposed to prime and double seal.

Mr. Graham stated that the asphalt was more durable especially in situations where you have a lot of turning movements of vehicles. With that said, given the limited number of vehicles that they were talking about here, it was not like a parking lot for a retail establishment with a very high use. This is a marginal call and the applicant could probably get by with double seal.

Mr. Loewenstein asked if there was any difference in the rate of flow in the run off.

Mr. Graham stated no, because they both were impervious.

Mr. Rieley pointed out that the request was a land use decision.

Mr. Edgerton stated that to back up that decision, the applicant is fairly asking us not to burden him with the lack of performance from the previous owner. On the same vein, he felt that if there was appropriateness to this fourth condition to the land use plan that they needed to look at it from both ways.

Mr. Loewenstein noted that they have heard from Engineering that both of those are marginal calls.

Mr. Rieley stated that between the two issues, he felt that a stronger case could be made for eliminating the sidewalk than for putting a less durable material in what is essentially a valley. In his experience with prime and double seal, you have to do it again after a year and then again in a few more years. If you don't do that, then you end up with potholes particularly in situations where it gets wet. It seems that the risk to the public is greater in not having a durable material on this ground service than it is in not adding a sidewalk in a place where they were adding very little use.

Mr. Loewenstein requested that the sidewalk requirement be taken out.

Mr. Thomas concurred, but noted that he agreed with the friendly easement to make it more legal for the use.

Mr. Davis asked regarding the parking lot issue, if the intent of condition 4 was to require paved parking. He pointed out that the Zoning Ordinance also allows the County Engineer some discretion in that.

Mr. MacCall stated that the plan would come through the site plan process, and then staff could make that decision.

Mr. Davis stated that his point was that condition 4 was really a non-condition. If you were simply requiring what the Zoning Ordinance requires, then it does not need to be a condition. If the intent of it is to require that it be paved, then it has some meaning because under current Zoning the County Engineer can allow for a lesser standard than paving. He suggested that it be made clear as to what the condition means.

Mr. Craddock suggested striking condition 4.

Mr. Edgerton stated that his point was well taken that it was an administrative call, but he was uncomfortable pulling it out.

Mr. Rieley noted that this was after all a special use permit and not a site plan. If this were a site plan, then it would automatically fall within that.

Mr. Davis stated that the Commission could require it as a condition that it be paved and take that discretion away from the staff. He pointed out that the condition proposed still left that up to the staff.

Mr. Edgerton stated that he was confused because the site plan actually calls out for gravel and not asphalt.

Mr. Davis stated that the Zoning Ordinance actually changed back in February of this year to require a greater standard for new buildings or for new uses that require additional parking. This change kicks in the pavement standard to the extent that the parking is required for the new use or for the expansion.

Mr. Cilimberg pointed out that this has not gone through full site plan review yet. The site plan was referenced as part of one condition to delineate the areas of parking. Actually under the Zoning Ordinance requirements, Mr. MacCall was reminding you that was not only to address the potential for paving, but also some other improvements that are in that section of the ordinance such as curbing and gutter. The ordinance does leave it to the discretion if you don't add something that specifically requires some of those things.

Mr. Craddock asked if curbing and gutter is discretionary also.

Mr. MacCall stated that the recommendation came from Engineering. Under Attachment C, Engineering has laid out what they would recommend as a minimum. The amount of parking required is being driven by the expanded area of storage, which was the way the calculation was made. Engineering's recommendation reduced the number of parking spaces by a couple and the applicant could get around that by reducing the general display area a little bit to reduce the number of parking spaces. All of this can be worked out with the site plan. That is why the first condition was worded as generally shown for display in the area as shown on the plan.

Mr. Edgerton asked if Engineering or the applicant generated Attachment C.

Mr. MacCall stated that Engineering generated the sketch.

Mr. Edgerton pointed out that the sketch called for asphalt.

Mr. Davis pointed out that if they don't make that a condition of the special use permit, then those issues could be resolved with the site plan.

Mr. Thomas asked if they vote to remove the sidewalk, then what would be put in the place of it.

Mr. Rieley stated that nothing would be put in because the road was existing.

Mr. Davis stated that the Commission could ask to reserve that area for a future sidewalk to be constructed.

Mr. Thomas felt that was a good suggestion.

Mr. Rieley stated that the sidewalk would be within the existing right-of-way.

Mr. Davis stated that if the sidewalk was within the right-of-way, then that condition was not necessary.

Mr. Thomas moved to approve SP-03-07, Greenbrier Service Center Amendment, as requested with the conditions as recommended by staff and modified in the Commission's discussion.

1. Only vehicles for sale and rental shall be stored/displayed in the areas generally shown for display on the "Greenbrier Service Center LLC" plan dated 5/20/03. All other vehicles shall occupy an approved parking space.
2. The entrance onto the public road shall be improved to a standard commercial entrance.
3. The required parking areas and travelways around the building shall be improved to meet current Zoning Ordinance requirements at the discretion of the Engineering Department.
4. The access to the shed to the north shall either be closed off and an alternative constructed or the applicant shall obtain the proper access easement to the shed.
5. Appropriate signage shall be provided onsite to delineate the area for customer parking and the area for storage of the vehicles for sale and rental.
6. The recommended improvements above shall be approved through a site plan amendment.
7. Vehicles for sale and rental shall not be elevated anywhere on site.

Mr. Davis stated that the Zoning Ordinance allows the Engineering Department to make an independent determination as to whether or not an alternative surface treatment is appropriate.

Mr. Loewenstein seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously (5:0). (Finley, Hopper - absent)

Mr. Rieley stated that SP-03-07, for Greenbrier Service Amendment, would be heard by the

Board of Supervisors on July 9th.

Old Business:

Mr. Rieley asked if there was any old business. There being none, the meeting proceeded.

New Business:

Presentation of Development Department Reorganization (Mark Graham)

Mark Graham, County Engineer, presented the development departments' reorganization to the Planning Commission. He stated that on June 4th they went before the Board of Supervisors and made a presentation on the proposed reorganization of the development departments. This effort has been considered for quite a while by staff. There have been a number of improvements that have been done over the years trying to improve the effectiveness of the organization and improve customer service. Last year, staff made a presentation to the Board on proposed changes to the development departments for their concurrence. Those changes included the creation of a central operations center and centralized development review. Central operations would provide reception, filing, and application intake for all three departments. Centralized review would provide a one-stop County review of site plans and subdivision plats at one central location through teams of reviewers.

Internal teams were created to develop customer service objectives. The following changes was found to be needed to meet these objectives:

.

- Create a greater focus on the Board priorities to focus more fully on long range priorities – Neighborhood Model implementation, rural area planning, preservation efforts, major rezonings and special use permits.
- Create common leadership. They really needed to have one voice or one Director who could speak with consistency for all of the development review processes.
- Greater clarity and consistency in the review process. There is a need for customer focused service to make sure that all of our customer's needs are really being addressed. This creates teams of reviewers and centralizes ministerial review functions previously handled in three separate departments. One manager will oversee all review. The integrated policy direction will provide more clarity and consistency.
- Customer-focused service. There will be a single point of information and interaction for all citizens. This will allow staff to focus on improved customer service rather than internal coordination efforts.
- Operational Efficiencies. There is a need for operational efficiency to make sure that the County is getting the best bang for the buck with the resources that are being spent.
- Better prepares our operations for future challenges. There is a need for a better focus on future challenges.

It was subsequently recognized by the directors of the three departments that what was really needed was a single department with responsibility for land use in the County. In considering the creation of a single department for land use, it was determined that this department would function best by organizing around functions. The first decision made was that the development departments would be merged into a new department called "Community Development". The divisions created within Community Development were a "current development" division, a "planning" division, and an "inspections" division. Amelia McCulley will lead the "current development" division. Wayne Cilimberg will lead the "planning" division. Jay Schlothauer will lead the "inspection" division. Beyond that, the fourth division they are creating is the "administrative" division that would have the central intake, central filing, reception, staff support and the bonds currently being held for development projects. Pam Shifflett will lead this division. That division would be the true one-stop shop that they were so excited about creating. Finally, the County Engineer function will act purely independent of these three groups. Jack Kelsey will

be taking on that responsibility. The County Engineer really has to have some oversight in what the Engineer reviewers are doing over here in the current development, supporting what is going over in the community planning and the building inspections. There are a lot of interactions between these three divisions as far as Engineering. By creating this separate individual not answering to any of those three divisions, they feel that they can assure that the Engineering component is being adequately maintained. Out of Engineering and Public Works a new division was created called "general services" which would include the Capital Improvement Projects, etc. Those groups are shown on the attached organization chart. He explained the responsibilities of each division as referred to in the attached executive summary.

What happens now?

Mr. Graham stated that "general services" would begin functioning on July 1, 2003. The next step would be to start working on the transition to become a new department by July 1, 2004. The third step is that staff will start communicating the change to the community to provide the opportunity for input. He pointed out that a lot of people have questioned why the transition would take so long. The first reason is to avoid impacting other priorites of the Board's. There is a lot going on right now which includes the Neighborhood Model and four major rezonings. Staff cannot drop any of those. The second reason is that staff is trying to change the process without impacting the current operations. The third reason is that it requires physical rearrangement and space changes. Until the Police Department, etc. moves out to the new COB south, staff cannot begin to make alterations for the central operations center. The FY'04 budget does not recognize this change. Therefore, staff would have one year to prepare the budget for the new department. Between now and October, they would be working on transition plans for the operations and give the community an opportunity to see what they were proposing to do and make sure they have an opportunity for input. In November of this year, they have to prepare their FY'05 budget for this new department so that they can start operating with that budget in July 2004. Between November of this year and July of next year in 2004, they will be transitioning over into the new department. In summary, they see this change is needed to improve our processes. Staff is ready to make this happen. The directors of the three departments have talked to staff about the plan and they are excited. Finally, they plan to keep the Board and the community involved in this change. He stated that if anyone has any questions, that he would be glad to answer them. (The executive summary is attached.)

Mr. Edgerton questioned if there was a reason for putting Planning in between the Current Development/Zoning and the Building Inspections. He felt that the Inspections and Current/Zoning is more of a set thing and he saw an awful lot of need for the two to interact.

Mr. Graham stated that staff felt it was just as important for the Building Inspections to work with the Planning people. One of the things that staff was very interested in trying to gain through this is the feedback of what has actually happened out in the field and bringing that back into the policy part of this equation. He asked that they not read too much into which division is on the left and which is on the right since that is not suppose to matter.

Mr. Rieley stated that the feedback from the field inspectors was very important. He pointed out that the Commission often approves something and talks about the difference between 5 feet above treetop elevation and 7 feet above treetop elevation at some length only to drive by and see something that is 15 feet above and not 25 feet away but 45 feet away. There is no mechanism to check that or if it were checked to have that information brought back to the people who are wrestling with requirements. He felt that structurally the plan was going in the right direction. He noted that the danger of pulling the site plan review out of Planning is that connection between the long-term vision and how it is applied. Staff was correct to put a dashed line between the two. He emphasized that the dashed line should be a really bold one because that was absolutely critical that you make the connections between what the planned division is and what its actual execution is.

Mr. Graham stated that they skipped over the other dashed line between the environmental and the water protection inspection. Environment is really Engineering's water resource shop. This was switched to Planning since it was recognized that it has a very important policy duty to perform. This switch was made to recognize that staff has gone above and beyond just dealing with water issues. The issue last year in Crozet with the apple orchards and possible swale contamination is an example of this type of issue. Staff is real excited that this will provide some true environmental information for the policy making.

Mr. Loewenstein stated that one of the things that he noticed in staff's examples is a good one is that things don't always end up looking like what the Commission has worked so hard to make them look. He pointed out that he would hate to see any part of the review in the process at that point diluted in any way. Some years ago somebody was in here one night with an application and he made a very striking statement which he thought has some merit about something that the Commission should be thinking about. That is that at the end of the day if the guy on the bulldozer who has actually come up with the interpretation and that is to a certain extent true. It is incumbent on the County to make sure that things are being done in which they intended them to be done and that everyone follows the policies and principles that they were all trying to encourage and to create plans which will work within the confines of those regulations. Hopefully, anything that happens, as a result of this transition will only further improve the first construction review and the review during that phase as well. There are numerous cases that it appears that has not always been as effectively done in the past as it might.

Mr. Rieley asked if there was any further new business. There being none, the meeting proceeded.

Adjournment

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:10 p.m. to June 24, 2003.

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

(Recorded and transcribed by Sharon Claytor Taylor)