

STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
June 6, 2012

The meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, June 6, 2012, was called to order at 6:31 p.m. by Chairman Michael Rhodes in the Board of Supervisors Chambers of the County Administrative Center.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rhodes, Hirons, Apicella, Boswell, Hazard, Gibbons, and Schwartz

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Harvey, McClendon, Zuraf, and Knighting

Mrs. Hazard stated that all seven members were present.

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATION

Mr. Rhodes asked if there were any declarations of disqualification. Hearing none he stated he would move on to item 1.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Proffer Guidelines - Review and discuss new methodology and policies. (**Time Limit: September 30, 2012**) (**History - Deferred at April 3, 2012 to April 18, 2012**) (**Deferred at April 18, 2012 to May 2, 2012**) (**Deferred at May 2, 2012 to May 16, 2012**) (**Deferred at May 2, 2012 to May 16, 2012**) (**May 16, 2012 put in Sub-Committee**) (*Authorize for Public Hearing by: August 15, 2012*) (*Potential Public Hearing Date: September 19, 2012*)

Mr. Harvey stated a committee was established to meet and discuss the matter. He stated to date, the Committee had not met and staff asked for proposed dates so that a meeting could be scheduled. Mr. Rhodes asked the Committee for thoughts for meeting dates. Mr. Hirons asked Dr. Schwartz if he would be available on Wednesdays. Dr. Schwartz stated he was available on Wednesdays, Tuesdays he was not available, and next Thursday he would be at the Moss Clinic. Mrs. Hazard stated Wednesday was okay for her. Mr. Hirons suggested having a meeting on Wednesday, June 13th. Mr. Harvey stated that would be fine and staff would coordinate with the Public Information Office. Mr. Hirons suggested scheduling the meeting to start at 6 p.m. Mr. Rhodes clarified that the subcommittee would hold their first meeting Wednesday, June 13th at 6 p.m. He asked if there were any other issues on the item. Mrs. Hazard stated that Mr. Mayausky wanted some input about the Dedication of Public Land as part of the proffer process. She suggested adding Mr. Mayausky to the emails. Mr. Harvey stated he would do that and pass on an invitation to him at the request of the committee. Mr. Rhodes proceeded to item number 2.

2. Architectural Design Standards - Amend the Traditional Neighborhood Development Plan, an element of the Comprehensive Plan, to incorporate Architectural Design Standards. (**Time Limit: September 5, 2012**) (**Deferred at April 18, 2012 to May 2, 2012**) (**Deferred at May 2, 2012 to May 16, 2012**) (**Deferred at May 16, 2012 to June 6, 2012**) (*Authorize for Public Hearing by: July 11, 2012*) (*Potential Public Hearing Date: August 15, 2012*)

Planning Commission Minutes
June 6, 2012

Mike Zuraf gave an update to the Planning Commission. He stated that he would be discussing another Comprehensive Plan amendment to incorporate Architectural Design Guidelines into the Plan. He stated that a memo of framework process for seeking public input was provided to the Commission. He stated that in the framework that was provided, one of the main forms of public input that they proposed was a visual preference survey that they would conduct to gage the preferred design guidelines of development in the County. He stated that they were proposing a list of image categories and pictures that would be rated using the question format and rating scale of 3⁺ to 3⁻. He stated that they were proposing to ask demographic questions to see if the people who were taking the surveys do reside in the County or own land or a business in the County. Mr. Gibbons asked Mr. Rhodes if a motion was needed. Mr. Rhodes deferred the question to Mr. Harvey. Mr. Harvey stated that staff just needed direction from the Commission. Mr. Rhodes stated that the Commission would conclude with direction from the Commission to go forward, and asked if anyone had any input, suggestions, or comments for staff. Mr. Gibbons suggested moving this item forward. Mr. Rhodes stated it was the consensus of the Commission that they concurred with the outline and the proposals presented, and proceeded with their approach. Mr. Rhodes proceeded to the Planning Director's report.

NEW BUSINESS

None

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Harvey stated at the Board of Supervisors meeting yesterday the Board referred the issue of Urban Development Areas to the Planning Commission. He stated that the Commission had requested some guidance from the Board and the Board sent it back with general guidance for the Planning Commission to look at Urban Development Areas and make a recommendation back to the Board within 120 days. He stated they had broad items to consider; whether Urban Development Areas should be removed from the Comprehensive Plan or renamed, and possibly adjusting density thresholds. He stated that at the Planning Commission's discretion the issue would be put on the next agenda for discussion. Mr. Gibbons stated he thought the guidance was that they work through the summer. Mr. Rhodes agreed to add it to the next agenda for discussion.

Mr. Harvey gave a brief update of the discussion from the Planning Commission's Retreat. He stated that he provided a list of actions items that were generated from the retreat. He stated of the items on the list, they put an X on the ones that they believed had been accomplished. He explained the list would be provided electronically to the Commission and updated every meeting cycle, and would be updated again tomorrow and sent out. He stated that some of the items listed would be long-term projects, and there was a discussion about creating a chart and explaining the different types of traffic studies, creating a map showing major projects in each election district, and updating the online applications for specific election districts. He stated they discussed having a County-wide map, and for similar purpose, a static map was provided to the Commission for comments. He stated that the map was an example of projects in the Hartwood District, and it specifically identified active subdivisions and active commercial developments. He stated that their goal would be to post the map online. Mr. Harvey stated setting it up by individual districts would be most effective. Mr. Rhodes stated that as long as everyone had access to all the information on a by-district basis if that was the best way to present it. Mrs. Hazard stated that by it being by district, it would help any potential business or someone coming into the district to assess. Mr. Harvey stated that the map was limited to subdivision plans and site plans and did not capture reclassifications and conditional use permits. He

Planning Commission Minutes
June 6, 2012

stated that it was in the monthly report that was posted by the County Administrator, but that report was not tied to a map, it only specified the district. Mr. Apicella stated that reclassifications could have a big impact and suggested including them. Mr. Harvey recommended having the map posted and modifying it twice a year. Mr. Rhodes stated that would be a good start. Mr. Harvey stated they would work more on it to refine it and bring it back to the Commission at a future date. He stated that calling out specific light and noise impacts with reclassifications in CUP applications was something that could be done in staff reports. He stated that they would be advising the Planning Commission on matters coming up for consideration at the Board Committees, and informed the Commission that their agendas were posted online. He mentioned the issue of public hearing advertisement dates in the staff reports, and stated that as staff gets reports to the Planning Commission they would include the ad dates. He stated that the distribution of iPads and/or electronic agendas to the Planning Commissioners was still in progress. He stated the notification to adjacent property owners had been added to this year's work plan. He explained that they discussed how the Commission conducted its business, specifically looking at moving the meeting dates to the second and fourth Wednesday instead of the first and third, and also if there should be considerations to adjust meeting times or put a limit on how late a meeting could go. Mr. Rhodes stated that in order to change the meeting dates, there would have to be a by-law change with a 2/3 vote and a 30 day notice. Mr. Rhodes suggested the Commissioners think about the changes a little more deliberately. Mr. Gibbons suggested changing the public hearing to 7 p.m. Mr. Rhodes stated that issue would be related to the change of date, as well as the start time and end time. Mr. Apicella stated that his issue was with the public comments and public hearing. He suggested thinking about the sequencing of the two items. Mr. Gibbons asked did the Board of Supervisors have a 10 p.m. time limit. Ms. McClendon stated that the Board of Supervisors would take a vote at midnight. Mr. Apicella asked if the start time continued at 6:30 p.m., then 3½ hours was enough time for discussions, and if not the Commissioners should take a vote at 10 p.m. to consider continuation of the meeting. Mrs. Hazard stated that time limit would be long enough for the Planning Commission to get a gage. She stated that they should make sure the agenda worked for the Commissioners. Mr. Hirons asked how that would work in with the time limit restrictions. Mr. Hirons discussed his concern of the public hearings time limit conflicting with the length of the meeting. Mr. Rhodes stated that the Planning Commission would have to consider what was coming forward, not just that immediate agenda. He asked if there were any reactions to the 6:30 start time. Mr. Gibbons suggested not overloading the items on the agendas. Mr. Rhodes stated that the biggest challenge was the timelines. He suggested moving the public presentations and public hearings to 6:30. The Planning Commission agreed on the 6:30 start time. Mr. Harvey stated that staff recommended that the Commission start its meetings with presentations about the public and then public hearings because it became difficult when you read the minutes to see things bounce back and forth on the agenda and the conversation would get cut off and you would lose a lot of momentum. Mr. Rhodes stated that would leave two options; to start it all at 6:30 or move the start time to 7 p.m. Mr. Apicella suggested changing the night of the meeting. He stated that sometimes there were things that happened at the Board of Supervisors meeting that affected the Planning Commission. Mr. Gibbons stated that they would have to look at the scheduling of the room for the meeting. Mrs. Hazard stated that there was a lot to gain from staff not having two late nights but also there was sometimes information that needed to be shared between members, so they would have the opportunity to modify the schedule by thinking about it up-front in January. Mr. Rhodes suggested taking these items up at the next meeting. He asked that staff come back with a schedule showing the 2nd and 4th Wednesday of September and confirmation of the availability of the chambers and if all of that seemed acceptable then they would deal with a motion to address the meeting dates and the meeting times and the modifications to by-laws for both, as appropriate at that time. Mr. Harvey asked Mr. Rhodes if he would like for staff to prepare the proposed amendment to the by-laws so they would have it in writing. Mr. Rhodes stated

Planning Commission Minutes
June 6, 2012

that was a wonderful thought. Mr. Rhodes asked if there was anything else for the Planning Director's report. Mrs. Hazard stated her concern with the rezoning public hearings. She stated that the Planning Commission had asked if they could do a work session first and whether or not it was a by-law issue or an issue of State Law. Mr. Rhodes asked Mr. Harvey if once a rezoning application was complete and ready, was there a timeline that started with it. Mr. Harvey stated yes, there were two timelines involved. Mrs. Hazard stated that was just one area of concern from some of the Planning Commission members. Mr. Rhodes stated that the main item on the timing factors was that they needed to confirm when the 90 days started and then based on that the desire would be to have a work session prior to having the public hearing. He stated that the other thing that related to this was that they started to become more aware of the other opportunities to know what would be coming forward and the emphasis on a pre-application meeting.

Mr. Harvey stated he did have an answer to Mrs. Hazard's question. Section 28-204 sub paragraph B said "failure of the Planning Commission to report its recommendation within 90 days after the first meeting of the Commission after the proposed amendment was first referred to the Commission shall be deemed a recommendation of approval of the proposed amendment." He stated that was dealing with amendments to Zoning Maps, which was the same thing as a rezoning. Mr. Rhodes stated that would be from when it was first heard. Mr. Harvey stated yes, the Commission had 90 days. Mr. Rhodes stated if there was a work session first the Commission had started the 90 day clock. Mr. Harvey stated that was correct. Mrs. Hazard stated she thought 90 days was a decent amount of time and allowed the public to obtain more information. She stated she did see merits to both sides and she knew there were some rather large applications coming in and wanted to make sure the public was allowed to be there and understand it and not feel cut out of the process. Mr. Apicella stated he agreed with Mrs. Hazard, and that it had been frustrating to see a potentially significant reclassification for the first time as part of a public hearing. He stated he thought it would be good to have some general information about what was being proposed before it went to public hearing. He stated that was an opportunity to make their viewpoints known and the applicant was making comments for the first time as well. He suggested a work session would help to get the information out so everybody would be better informed before the public hearing. Mr. Rhodes asked the reaction if staff would schedule a work session and commit to the following session being the public hearing. Mr. Gibbons stated on zoning applications it usually had been submitted four or five months prior. Mr. Harvey stated that was correct. He stated typically it would take a number of months to work through the process of making sure the application was complete and also negotiating with the applicant or advising them of comments from various staff agencies. So often time it was three to four months before it would get to the Planning Commission from the time it was filed. Mr. Harvey stated the Commission may not want to have the public hearing scheduled for the next meeting after the work session because based on advertisement requirements the application was supposed to be available for the public to view when advertised. If the Commission were to have a work session and ask the applicant to make changes, they would not be able to do that because the first advertisement for the public hearings would probably run the same day the Commission would hold the work session. He suggested waiting two meetings after the work session. Mr. Gibbons stated if the application had been submitted four or five months prior, the Commissioner from the District would have time to review it with staff. Mr. Rhodes stated he recalled there was some desire of where were opportunities for the public to understand what the applications were about prior to the public hearing, so they would be more informed. Mr. Rhodes stated the Commissioners learned of more opportunities to learn about the application as it was developing, but more so for the public to not just have the one shot at the public hearing when that was the first time they heard about it. Mrs. Hazard stated the public input was important and the Commissioner whose district an application was in may have information but the other Commissioners

***Planning Commission Minutes
June 6, 2012***

may not. Mr. Apicella stated the Commissioners received their packages on Friday and the next Wednesday was the public hearing on a reclassification which could be very significant. He stated that was not a lot of days to really delve into the application and there may be other things going on at the meeting also. He stated it was less than seven days for a member who was not in the district where the reclassification was occurring to prepare for the reclassification. Mrs. Hazard asked if it could just be a staff presentation, not a discussion with the applicant. Dr. Schwartz stated he thought it would be wise to have the extra time. Mr. Rhodes reminded the Commission they would not be able to make changes because it was advertised. He stated the Commission would have to know they were going into it just to get oriented and informed and start on the next session or otherwise we would lose a month off the clock. Dr. Schwartz suggested making notes and addressing them at the public hearing. Mrs. Hazard stated she thought most applicants would be present even if they could not speak and would be aware of the questions being asked. Mr. Apicella stated he asked the County Attorney if the 90 day clock was imposed by the State or self-imposed by Stafford County. He stated the response was it was something imposed by Stafford. Mr. Gibbons stated it was State imposed.

Ms. McClendon stated the Board imposed the Planning Commission time limit in the County Code. Mr. Apicella stated he saw Mr. Gibbons shaking his head and asked staff if they would do more research to find out if this was a local imposed requirement or a State imposed requirement. He asked if they would make a recommendation on how the issue may be resolved concerning providing time on the front end so the Commission was not holding a public hearing at the first time the Commission would see an item. Mr. Rhodes stated the Commission would carry this as an item to explore a little further.

Continued after public hearings.

7:30 P.M.

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

Mr. Rhodes asked if there was anyone who would like to make a presentation to the Planning Commission to please come forward. With no one coming forward, the public presentations was closed.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

3. Amendments to the Stafford County Comprehensive Plan (the “Comprehensive Plan”) - The County proposes to amend the textual document entitled “Stafford County, Virginia, Comprehensive Plan 2010-2030,” to: amend Chapter 4 with regards to Transportation Impact Fees. The proposed amendment would eliminate reference to the current impact fee areas known as the Central West district (Area A) created in 2003 and the South East district (Area E5) established in 2005, reference to the impact fee projects and impact fee rates. The amendment would further reference a new County-Wide district with a new project list and fee rates. **(Time Limit: June 17, 2012)**

Mr. Harvey stated item 3 was an Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan specifically addressing Transportation Impact Fees. He stated staff had some handouts with highlighted text in Chapter 4 and a chart which reflected what was originally referred to the Commission from the Board. He stated

Planning Commission Minutes
June 6, 2012

some modifications had been made based on discussions at the last meeting concerning removing the fee off the map and having text reflect that. He stated in talking to Ms. McClendon, the Commission had to consider exactly what the Board referred. He stated that was reflected in the handout.

Mr. Rhodes confirmed that technical point did not compromise the ability to conduct the public hearing. Ms. McClendon stated that was correct, it did not compromise the public hearing or the Board's ability to act on the amendments.

Mike Smith, Director of Public Works, gave a PowerPoint presentation and discussed the proposed amendment. He stated the General Assembly adopted legislation which authorized impact fees in 2000 and amended them in 2007 and explained impact fees allowed the locality to raise funds to accommodate projects that were needed due to growth. The Board previously approved impact fees for two areas in the County and in 2008 counsel reviewed a county-wide impact fee with zero commercial or non-residential fees. The Board also established a citizens' advisory group which was required by the State Statute to assist the Board. He stated the Transportation Impact Advisory Committee reported their findings to the Board in August of 2009. The Board requested staff to continue the impact fee analysis and to include a program which avoided non-residential impact fees. He stated the effort was delayed until the completion and adoption of the Comprehensive Plan and establishment of the UDA locations, but had proceeded at an accelerated pace since that time. He stated the staff review team was Keith Dayton, Deputy County Administrator, Jeff Harvey, Maria Perrotte of the Budget Office, Joey Hess of the Transportation Planning Department and himself. The consultants of A. Morton Thomas Associates were used for the pricing of the road segments, William B. Allen for computer modeling, and TischlerBise for the calculations and other consulting work and advice on moving forward. He stated the information was presented to the Stafford County Board of Supervisors Infrastructure Committee for their input. He explained the basic methodology used as a travel demand forecasting model which was a big picture model that looked at the entire county. He gave a brief analysis of what elements were used in the model to calculate an estimated impact fee and how the road deterioration levels were noted based on growth. He stated once all the data was corrected, maps identifying degraded roads with a Level of Service of D, E, or F were produced. He stated any road with a Level of Service of D or worse was included and the Comprehensive Plan was used to determine the type of upgrade that was needed and a unit cost for road sections based on updated estimates. He stated occasionally the Comprehensive Plan did not show the roads for segment upgrades so staff's experience was used. He stated the first analysis included any road that was Level of Service D or worse was considered and resulted in a cost of \$524 million. He stated the County would bear \$415 million of the cost and a very rough estimate for single-family detached was \$6,000 to \$10,000. He stated the Infrastructure Committee recommended refining the project list and that was done by identifying the growth projects that would on average have a 50 percent growth rate. This allowed 50 percent of the cost to come from impact fees and 50 percent to come from County or other fees. He stated the project list was reduced from \$524 million to \$234 million and, with additional consideration from the consultant and gathering more information that had now dropped to \$206 million and was one of the recommendations. He stated the list was presented to the Board on March 20th and again on April 4, 2012. The impact fee project list had roads in many areas of the County and showed a map to the Commission and noted the roads in red were on the current list. He stated there were additional recommendations. Figure 4.4 showed the fee schedule but since the fee may be revised or updated every two years it was recommended to not have the fees on the Comprehensive Plan map, so it would not have to be updated. He stated Pages 4-16, 4-17, and 4-20 text had been modified and showed a map that did not have the fees listed. He stated staff

Planning Commission Minutes
June 6, 2012

supported the amendments to the textual document and also supported the additional amendments added based on information and comments received from consultants and VDOT.

Mr. Rhodes asked the Commission if they had any questions. Hearing none he opened the public comment portion of the public hearing. With no one coming forward Mr. Rhodes closed the public comment portion of the public hearing and brought the item back to the Planning Commission. He stated this was the item where fundamentally the Commission would be making modifications to the Comprehensive Plan and asked if there was any further discussion. Mrs. Hazard stated she would like to clarify that in Chapter 4 of the Comprehensive Plan amendment, page 4-16, it was staff's recommendation that the number of \$234 million be reduced to \$206 million. Mr. Rhodes stated that was correct. Mrs. Hazard suggested since the Comprehensive Plan was a long-term document that a footnote be added, maybe the date that the Board passed it, which stated as of July 2012.

Mr. Smith stated according to State Statute, every two years the project road list would need to be re-evaluated. The plan would have to be reviewed to see if it fit the growth model and the estimates may have to be recalculated. Mrs. Hazard stated she would still make that comment. Mr. Apicella asked if the amount needed to be included and recommended removing it. Mr. Harvey stated as long as the cost was included in one of the charts it may be okay to delete it from the text. Mr. Rhodes asked if that would just be a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Harvey stated yes, that would be a recommendation. Mr. Rhodes confirmed with Mr. Harvey that he would not have any reservations if the Commission made that recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Harvey stated he would not and if there was any issue with State Code requirements, staff would note that in the staff report.

Mr. Gibbons stated 4-12.2 on page 4-17, as of the last budget, Route 17 area collected no funds at this time and asked if that would need to be modified. Mr. Harvey stated he would recommend the Commission not recommend modifying the language at this point in time because that district was still in effect even though the rate was zero. At some time in the future the Board could set a new rate. Mr. Gibbons stated with that comment he would make a motion to recommend approval to include the comments of Mr. Apicella and Mrs. Hazard. Mrs. Hazard seconded.

Mr. Rhodes stated there was the understanding that one recommendation to move forward to the Board would be to strike the amount previously cited, which was part of the motion. Mr. Apicella stated he would like to offer a friendly amendment since it had not yet been enacted, he stated staff recommended taking the fee schedule out of Figure 4.4, but the Commission had not actually done it. So his recommendation would be to amend Figure 4 to exclude the fee schedule and to state that "the fee schedule for impact fees will be as approved by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors." Mr. Gibbons stated that was a very friendly amendment.

Mr. Rhodes stated that would be a second recommendation to forward to the Board with what they had sent to us. One was to strike the \$206 million and the other would be in Figure 4, to strike the fees and add the words "the fee schedule for impact fees will be as approved by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors." With no further discussion Mr. Rhodes called for the vote to approve the amendments to the Comprehensive Plan to go from the two specified areas to one county-wide transportation impact fee with the two recommended changes to the Board of Supervisors. The motion passed 7-0. Mr. Harvey asked if that clarification would also apply to text on Page 4-17, that talked about the fees. Mr. Gibbons stated yes. Mr. Rhodes stated yes, he thought the Commission was taking what was presented and it would include that text amendment.

***Planning Commission Minutes
June 6, 2012***

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT - continued

Mr. Rhodes stated the Commission would move back to the Planning Director's Report. He stated the Commission had gone through the retreat items and were looking for additional information concerning the rezoning application timing and the authority concerning the 90 days. He stated the Commission would discuss these items further and have draft changes to by-laws concerning meeting day and time changes. He asked if there were any other items. Mr. Harvey stated Mr. Gibbons' question was still open and Ms. McClendon had an answer. Ms. McClendon stated she would like to revise her previous statement. She stated in the State Code the Planning Commission was given 100 days to act on a rezoning application, but the Board had adopted a 90 day time limit in the County Code. Mr. Gibbons asked who determined if the application was complete; was that the Director of Planning or could that be the Planning Commission. He stated if the application came forward for review in a work session then the clock would not start until the application was complete. Mr. Harvey stated he would have to reflect on the Zoning Ordinance for issues about completeness of an application. He stated he would note in the State Statute concerning acting on an application it was similar to the local ordinance and it stated it was after the first meeting of the Commission after the proposed amendment or re-enactment had been referred to the Commission. So basically the first time the Commission would see it the clock would start, whether it was a complete application or not. Mr. Rhodes stated that was very helpful and asked if there were any other items on the Planning Director's Report. Mr. Harvey stated no.

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

Mr. Rhodes asked if there were any items for the County Attorney's Report. Ms. McClendon stated she had no report at this time.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Mr. Rhodes stated he would defer his report until the end and moved on to Other Business.

OTHER BUSINESS

4. TRC Information – Meeting Cancelled June 13, 2012

Mr. Rhodes stated the June 13, 2012, meeting was cancelled and would take motions for the approval of the minutes and suggested the Commission vote on each one individually.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

April 3, 2012

Mr. Hirons made a motion to approve the minutes of April 3, 2012. Mrs. Hazard seconded. The motion passed 7 to 0.

***Planning Commission Minutes
June 6, 2012***

April 18, 2012

Mr. Hirons stated he would allow someone else to make the motion as he was going to abstain because he was not present at the April 18th meeting. Mr. Boswell made a motion to approve the minutes of April 18th. Dr. Schwartz seconded. The motion passed 6-0-1.

May 2, 2012

Mrs. Hazard made a motion to approve the May 2, 2012, meeting minutes. Mr. Hirons seconded. Mr. Boswell stated he would abstain because he was not present at the May 2nd meeting. The motion passed 6-0-1.

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Mr. Rhodes stated in the deferral of the Chairman's Report he would just like to express the observations and comments once again, it was a repetitive and boring statement but one he felt merits discussion. He stated he thought the Commission benefits tremendously and so do the citizens of the County from the support of the staff and the work of the staff, their efforts always impress him. He stated Mr. Harvey, the Planning Director, has an ability to address anything the Commission would throw at him with such tremendous balance and professionalism was always impressive. He stated he felt the Commission had benefited tremendously from the County Attorney's willingness and Ms. McClendon's support. He stated he would like to thank all for their continued tremendous efforts.

Mr. Gibbons suggested Mr. Rhodes send a letter to the Chairman of the Board and the County Administrator concerning what was just said. Mr. Rhodes stated he would be happy to do so.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

Michael Rhodes, Chairman
Planning Commission