

VIRGINIA: MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE DINWIDDIE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE PAMPLIN ADMINISTRATION BUILDING ON THE 14<sup>th</sup> DAY OF MARCH 2018 AT 7:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	SAMUEL W. HAYES		AT-LARGE
	EVERETTE PROSISE		DIST #1
	EDWARD TITMUS		DIST #2
	JOHN HARVELL	CHAIRMAN	DIST #3
	THOMAS TUCKER		AT-LARGE
	ANTHONY SIMMONS	VICE CHAIRMAN	DIST #5
ABSENT:	BUTCH CUNNINGHAM		DIST #4
OTHER:	MARK BASSETT	PLANNING DIRECTOR	
	TYLER SOUTHALL	COUNTY ATTORNEY	

---

**IN RE: CALL TO ORDER**

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**IN RE: PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND MOMENT OF SILENCE**

The Chairman asked everyone to stand for the pledge of allegiance and a moment of silence.

**IN RE: ROLL CALL**

The Chairman asked for the roll to be called and Mr. Cunningham was not present.

**IN RE: APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

The Chairman asked if there were any additions or corrections to the agenda. He said since there are none he would entertain a motion to accept the agenda as presented.

Mr. Titmus made a motion that the agenda be accepted as presented. It was seconded by Mr. Simmons and with Mr. Hayes, Mr. Titmus, Mr. Prosise, Mr. Tucker, Mr. Simmons and Mr. Harvell voting "AYE" the agenda was accepted as presented.

**IN RE: MINUTES**

The Chairman said the members have before them the minutes from the February 14, 2018 regular meeting and he asked if there were any corrections. He said since there are none he would entertain a motion to accept the minutes as presented.

Mr. Tucker made a motion to accept the minutes as presented. It was seconded by Mr. Titmus and with Mr. Tucker, Mr. Hayes, Mr. Prosise, Mr. Titmus, Mr. Simmons and Mr. Harvell voting "AYE" the minutes were accepted as presented.

**RE: CITIZEN COMMENTS**

The Chairman opened the citizen comment portion of the meeting and asked if anyone had signed up to speak. He said since there is no one he was closing the citizen comments portion of the meeting. The Chairman said he was turning the meeting over to Mr. Bassett for the listed public hearing case.

**RE: PUBLIC HEARING**

## **Planning Commission Meeting Staff Report**

File #: AP-18-1  
Applicant: James B. Cobb, Managing Member for Whipponock, LLC  
Proffer Amendment: To amend proffer conditions (1) & (2)  
Current Zoning: RR-1, Residential Rural with Proffers  
Property Location: Northeastern side of Sutherland Road and fronting on Lake Chesdin  
Tax Map Parcel #'s: 1-(4)-4A, 1-10, 1-10A, 2-1, 2-5, 2-6, 2-7, 2-8, 2-9, 2-10, 2-11, 2-12, 2-13  
Magisterial District: Namozine District  
Property Size: Approximately 391.06 acres  
Related Cases: P-05-8, Planning Commission recommended disapproval of the original rezoning on December 14, 2005 and ratified that action on March 21, 2006, and the BOS approved w/proffers March 21, 2006; AP-14-1 March 11, 2015  
Planning Commission recommended approval by a vote of 5-2 and on April 15, 2015 the Board of Supervisors denied the request to reduce the cash proffer

---

### **CASE OVERVIEW**

The applicant, James B. Cobb, as Managing Member on behalf of Whipponock, LLC is requesting to amend the original zoning proffers approved on March 21, 2006 by the Board of Supervisors as part of rezoning case P-05-8 by amending proffer conditions one (1) and two (2), which require a per lot contribution of \$5,629.00 adjusted annually on each January 1 to reflect any increase or decrease for the preceding year in the Consumer Price Index, U.S. City Average, All Urban Consumers (CPI-U) All Items (1982-84=100) prepared by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor, where such amendment would reduce the per lot contribution to a fixed amount of \$1,953.00 to be paid to the County after completion of final inspection and prior to the issuance of each certificate of occupancy. Case P-05-8 rezoned with proffers approximately 391.06 acres located on the northeastern side of Sutherland Road and fronting on Lake Chesdin. The original proffers allowed for 156 lots. The property is zoned RR-1, and is further defined as Tax Map parcels 1-(4)-4A, 1-10, 1-10A, 2-1, 2-5, 2-6, 2-7, 2-8, 2-9, 2-10, 2-11, 2-12, and 2-13. The County Comprehensive Land Use Plan places the property within the Planned Growth Area which allows for residential development for this general area of the County.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

- Application
- Location Map
- Amended Proffers
- Original Proffers
- Cash Proffer Computations Study (May 2014)

## **AMENDED PROFFERS**

The applicant has submitted Amended Proffers to amend conditions one (1) and two (2) to reduce the cash proffer from \$5,629.00 as adjusted each year for inflation to a “fixed” amount of \$1,953.00 per lot/unit. In 2004, with the County’s “Growth Committee” recommending amending the Zoning Ordinance to include provisions to allow for voluntary proffer conditions to include cash proffers, the Planning Commission did recommend to the Board of Supervisors that the Zoning Ordinance be amended to include the aforementioned provisions for voluntary proffer conditions.

As such, in 2005, after a cash proffer study was completed by the County’s consultant, Robinson, Farmer, Cox Associates, the Planning Commission recommended a cash proffer policy with a cash proffer of \$5,629.00 per residential lot/unit, and the Board of Supervisors did adopt this recommended cash proffer policy that same year. In 2008, the Board of Supervisors updated the cash proffer policy again utilizing the County’s consultant, Robinson, Farmer, Cox Associates, increasing the cash proffer amount to \$9,688.00. The cash proffer policy in place at the time of the original zoning approval (BOS approved P-05-8 w/proffers on March 21, 2006) included the capital impacts on schools, government facilities and equipment, public works, public safety equipment and facilities, and parks and recreation with the recommended \$5629.00 cash proffer amount to cover the impact that a household would have on the aforementioned capital items.

The intent of the cash proffer component of the voluntary proffer conditions is intended to help with the impact of proposed residential developments on public facilities and the need for capital improvements. When the subject residential rezoning was originally considered by the Planning Commission, in addition to the non-cash proffer conditions, the cash proffer conditions were voluntarily proffered by the applicants to help to ameliorate the impacts on related public facilities and services by aiding in the funding of necessary capital improvements in the County. The subject request to reduce the voluntary cash proffer amount does have an impact on the effectiveness of the proffer conditions on diminishing the overall impact of the residential development on public facilities and services. As was previously done in 2005 and 2008, the impact of residential development on public facilities and services was re-examined in the spring of 2014 utilizing the County’s consultant, Robinson, Farmer, Cox Associates, to re-examine the cash proffer computations to update the Board on the recommended cash proffer amount. The “cash proffer computations” study included an updated residential cash proffer amount of \$1,953.00 per residential lot/unit. The May 2014 Cash Proffer Computations study is attached for reference.

Additionally, for the Planning Commission’s reference, the Planning staff asked the County’s consultant, Steve Jacobs, Robinson, Farmer, and Cox Associates, to run the cash proffer computation model utilizing the applicant’s voluntary cash proffer amount. As reflected in the applicant’s proffer amendment request, the applicant is proffering the updated cash proffer amount of \$1,953.00. Mr. Jacobs indicated that the break-even amount for a household has a taxable value of \$240,000.00. The Commissioner of the Revenue estimates that the average home in Waterford Landing has a taxable value of at least \$400,000.00 (which is used as a comparable taxable value of the homes proposed in the subject subdivision), and as such the applicant is going to be using this \$400,000.00 taxable value to show that there would actually be a \$3,543.00 credit per household as it relates to the cash proffer study. If a lot in Chesdin Pointe were developed today, the current adjusted cash proffer amount would be \$6,655.00, which is based on the original cash proffer amount, the \$5,629.00 adjusted using the Consumer Price Index, U.S. City Average Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor (CPI-U).

**Planning Staff Recommendation:**

The Planning staff has reviewed the requested proffer amendments and with the subject residential development, there are impacts and the Planning Commission ultimately must weigh those impacts against the benefits of the development. The Planning Commission retains the ability to recommend to the Board of Supervisors to maintain the original cash proffer amount, \$5,629.00, as adjusted annually, or it may choose to recommend to the Board of Supervisors the applicant's requested voluntary cash proffer amount of \$1,953.00, which is the 2014 study cash proffer amount.

**PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION**

Since this is a zoning proffer amendment request, the standard statement regarding the Planning Commission's recommendation on this matter must be read. In order to assist, a motion statement is attached and reads as follows:

**BE IT RESOLVED, that in order to assure compliance with Virginia Code Section 15.2-2286(A) (7) it is stated that the public purpose for which this Resolution is initiated is to fulfill the requirements of public necessity, convenience, general welfare and good zoning practice I move that case, AP-18-1, Amended Proffer Condition numbers 1 and 2, as amended from those certain proffers recorded on May 9, 2006 and duly recorded as instrument number 060002251 at the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, are recommended for (approval or disapproval) to the Board of Supervisors which will consider the case pursuant to Section 15.2-2302 of the Code of Virginia, 1950, as amended.**

The Chairman asked if there were any questions for Mr. Bassett. As there were no questions, he asked the applicant if he would like to come forward and add anything.

Mr. James B. Cobb, 8135 W. Blackwater Road, Windsor Virginia said that his presentation is cut and dry. The only reason we are here again is because of some new legislation that came to life in July 2016. This has caused some Counties to relook at their proffer policy and how they are doing things. The presentation being made tonight is exactly the same as the one that was made in 2014.

After Mr. Cobb's presentation the Chairman asked if there were any questions for the applicant. As there were no questions, he opened the public hearing portion of the meeting.

Ms. Nancy Pinchefskey, 1028 Sutherland Road, Church Road Virginia said that back in 2006 the County addressed the rezoning from 5 acres to 2.5 acres. It took 7 months of this case coming before the Planning Commission and him gathering all the information he needed for a decision to be made. The Planning Commission eventually voted no to the rezoning. However when Whipponock LLC offered the \$5629 proffers, the Board of Supervisors voted yes for the rezoning. The last time we were here back in 2016, when the proffers on the other properties were lowered, those properties were not as big as this one. They were much smaller areas and they were already being developed. This property has not had anything done to it. From 2006 to 2017 nothing has been done development wise on this property. The only thing that she knows was done, involved the bonding of the road for the subdivision. The only reason the road got bonded was because someone tried to purchase land on the other side of the road. She stated that she was told by a homeowner in the area that they actually need ten more feet for that road coming out. That was something that was not brought up.

The County is going to lose a little over a half a million dollars (\$500,000) if you vote to lower the proffers. This is money that will be needed to improve the conditions in that area. The roads are deplorable because the logging trucks have torn off Sutherland and Namozine Road. Locked wheels on these trucks have actually cut groves into Namozine Road. If the County Comprehensive Land Use Plan places this property within the Planned Growth Area, Dinwiddie is going to need every single penny of the \$5629 dollars plus more to work on the road and other things that are needed. One of the reasons why the proffer was not lower on this project was because Dennis Hale (Chief of Fire & EMS) was here. He explained what a strain this 156 home development would put on emergency services. There is no Fire Station or EMS services close to this development. It was established at the last meeting with the Board of Supervisors that it would take twenty (20) minutes for Fire or EMS to reach us. We are talking about a developer who has failed to honor his word more than one time. The promise of a proffer of \$5629 dollars has not yielded one payment. Not one lot has been developed on a promise that he made. He has not done anything and he wants his offer to go away and be lowered. I really don't think it is fair for Dinwiddie, because nothing has changed or been improved concerning this development. I have a middle ground for this developer. If they want to develop and want reduced proffers for this land, why don't they come back to the Planning Commission and have it rezoned back to five (5) acres. Seventy five (75) homes would put a lot less stress on that area versus one hundred and fifty-six (156) and then maybe they could get their proffers reduced. I believe anybody who is going to buy land in this subdivision and build a \$400,000 dollar home is not going to worry about a proffer. However, I do believe they would be worried or concerned about what they could get with their \$400,000 dollar home, such as decent roads and safety services. The County will need that money to improve the road as well as getting more than two dry hydrants.

As there was no one else signed up to speak the Chairman closed the public hearing portion of the meeting. He asked the commissioners if they had any more questions. He said if there are none he would entertain a motion.

Mr. Hayes said he just wanted to make a clarification about the statement regarding roads from the citizen who spoke. He said the County's Capital Improvement Plan doesn't include roads, so any proffer whether it's one dollar or ten thousand dollars, would not apply.

Mr. Prorise made a motion and read the following: BE IT RESOLVED, that in order to assure compliance with Virginia Code Section 15.2-2286(A) (7) it is stated that the public purpose for which this Resolution is initiated is to fulfill the requirements of public necessity, convenience, general welfare and good zoning practice I move that case, AP-18-1, Amended Proffer Condition numbers 1 and 2, as amended from those certain proffers recorded on May 9, 2006 and duly recorded as instrument number 060002251 at the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, are recommended for disapproval to the Board of Supervisors which will consider the case pursuant to Section 15.2-2302 of the Code of Virginia, 1950, as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Tucker and with Mr. Prorise, Mr. Titmus, Mr. Tucker, Mr. Hayes, Mr. Simmons voting "Yes" for disapproval and Mr. Hayes voting "No" for disapproval, AP-18-1 was sent to the Board Supervisors with five (5) members in favor of disapproval and one (1) member against the disapproval.

**RE: OLD BUSINESS**

Mr. Southall said Mr. Chairman and members of the Planning Commission as requested and previously presented to you at the February meeting and previously provided to you prior to the February meeting, we do have an item on the agenda tonight to amend the Planning Commission's Code of Ethics. He said there is a memo in the packet for that.

It is also worth noting that a search of the Planning Commission's minutes in the files of the legal and planning departments did not reveal the definitive version of the Planning Commission's Code of Ethics. Only paragraphs five and six differ, but it would be suggested that the language in the attached version be adopted as the official language. Mr. Gurley, Secretary to the Planning Commission, has informed me that he believes the attached version is the correct version.

## **MEMORANDUM**

**To:** Planning Commission of Dinwiddie County, Virginia  
**CC:** Mark Bassett, Planning Director  
**From:** Tyler Southall, County Attorney  
**Date:** February 9, 2018  
**Subject:** Amendment to Code of Ethics and Standards of Conduct for members of the Dinwiddie County Planning Commission

---

### **OVERVIEW:**

Each year, at the organizational meeting, the Planning Commission reviews its bylaws, including the Code of Ethics and Standards of Conduct for Members of the Dinwiddie County Planning Commission (the "Code of Ethics"). On January 10, 2018, the Planning Commission asked that the County Attorney prepare an amendment of the Code of Ethics that removes the requirement that the Code of Ethics be read orally and in public session. Although the deletion of this language comes without the recommendation of my office, my office has complied with the request by including an amended copy of the Code of Ethics that includes the aforementioned change.

One other change recently made by the Board of Supervisors should be considered as well. Section 11 of the Code of Ethics states that the members of the Planning Commission shall: "Adhere to the principle that the public's business should be conducted in the public view by observing and following the letter and spirit of the Freedom of Information Act using closed sessions only to deal with sensitive personnel, legal or contractual matters as provided by the Code of Virginia."

Virginia Code Section 2.2-3711 gives 51 permitted areas to discuss in closed session. Many of those do not apply to the Planning Commission, but some of these permitted areas are broader than "personnel, legal, or contractual matters." One example of such an item may be discussions regarding building or cyber security under Virginia Code Section 2.2-3711(A)(19) in cases where such security discussion was not also related to a contractual discussion.

If the Planning Commission decided to amend the Bylaws and Code of Ethics to allow any closed session discussion allowed by the Freedom of Information Act, Section 11 could be amended to strike language as follows:

"Adhere to the principle that the public's business should be conducted in the public view by observing and following the letter and spirit of the Freedom of Information Act using closed sessions only to deal with sensitive ~~personnel, legal or contractual~~ matters as provided by the Code of Virginia."

A copy of the Code of Ethics with the aforementioned changes shown in strikethrough and underline is attached hereto.

**Dinwiddie, Virginia**  
**Adopted March 8, 2007**  
**Revised March 14, 2018**

**CODE OF ETHICS AND STANDARDS OF CONDUCT FOR MEMBERS OF THE  
DINWIDDIE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
CODE OF ETHICS**

Recognizing that persons who hold public office have been given a public trust and that the stewardship of such office demands the highest levels of ethical and moral conduct, any person serving on the Dinwiddie County Planning Commission should adhere to the following Code of Ethics:

1. Uphold the Constitution, laws and regulations of the United States and of all governments therein and never knowingly be a part to their evasion.
2. Put loyalty to the highest moral principles and to the County as a whole above loyalty to individuals, districts, or particular groups.
3. Give a full measure of effort and service to the position of trust for which stewardship has been granted; giving earnest effort and best thought to the performance of duties.
4. Seek to find and use the most equitable, efficient, effective, and economical means for getting tasks accomplished.
5. Adopt policies and programs that provide equal opportunity to all citizens without regard to national origin, race, color, religion, gender, age, disability, pregnancy, or sexual orientation.
6. Ensure the integrity of the actions of the Planning Commissioners by conducting official and private affairs in a way that clearly conveys that you cannot be improperly influenced in performing your official duties.
7. Make no private promises of any kind binding upon the duties of any office, since a public servant has no private word, which can be binding on public duty.
8. Engage in no business with the county government, or the school system, either directly or indirectly, which is inconsistent with the conscientious performance of the Planning Commissioners duties except as may be consistent with the conflict of interest statutes in the Code of Virginia.
9. Never use any information gained confidentially in the performance of the Planning Commissioners duties as a means of making private profit.
10. Expose, through appropriate means and channels, corruption, misconduct, or neglect of duty whenever discovered.
11. Adhere to the principle that the public's business should be conducted in the public view by observing and following the letter and spirit of the Freedom of Information Act using closed sessions only to deal with sensitive ~~personnel, legal or contractual~~ matters as provided by the Code of Virginia.
12. Avoid using the position of public trust to gain access to the media for the purposes of criticizing colleagues or citizens, impugning their integrity or vilifying their personal beliefs.
13. Make sure, when responding to the media, that a clear distinction is made between personal opinion or belief and a decision made by the Commission.
- ~~14. Review orally and in public session, at the annual organizational meeting, each of these principles.~~
15. ~~14~~15. Pledge to honor and uphold these principles, ever conscious that public office is a public trust.

**ACTION:**

**I move that the attached version of the Code of Ethics and Standards of Conduct for Members of the Dinwiddie County Planning Commission is adopted with the presented change to Sections 11 and 14 of the Code of Ethics, and that the Bylaws shall reflect this change as well.**

The Chairman asked the members if they had any questions for Mr. Southall. He said if there are none he would entertain a motion.

Mr. Titmus made a motion that the attached version of the Code of Ethics and Standards of Conduct for Members of the Dinwiddie County Planning Commission is adopted with the presented change to Sections 11 and 14 of the Code of Ethics, and that the Bylaws shall reflect this change as well. It was seconded by Mr. Simmons and with Mr. Titmus, Mr. Prosise, Mr. Tucker, Mr. Hayes, Mr. Simmons and Mr. Harvell voting "AYE", the change was adopted.

**RE: NEW BUSINESS – Home Occupation Discussion – Jamie Sherry, Dinwiddie County’s Principal Planner/Zoning Administrator**

Mr. Sherry said in front of you is a copy of Section 22-245 of the County’s Zoning Ordinance, which deals with Home Occupations. The reason for this discussion is to talk about some of the issues I have come across in enforcing the Home Occupation ordinance and some of the situations individuals are faced with when coming to the planning office to have their home occupation paperwork processed.

She said the County has issued a little over one hundred Home Occupation business licenses per each of the last ten years. That’s just to let you know this is something we deal with on a regular bases. I have noticed there is a wide variety of people who come in for business licenses. There are people who come in for craft shows, caterers, independent electrical, mechanical and plumbing contractors, massage therapist, accountants and many more.

She went on to say back in 2010 the Planning Department and the County were also trying to grapple through how they could navigate their way through the applications that were coming in. They were trying to accommodate the new economy as well as trying to keep things consistent with the purpose of the Zoning Ordinance. She told the Commissioners that is the copy that they are currently looking at.

She said she would cover just a few items in the requirements. On the front side of the hand out it basically says be a good neighbor. The residential character of the home should be intact, there shouldn’t be too much traffic, too much noise and no outside storage of goods just to name a few. All the items on the front side just address the fact of being a good neighbor. On the back side of the hand out under section C, it splits out the type of Home Occupations into two category.

Type 1, which is in the first column, applies to residential zoning districts. Type 2 is for anyone in the agricultural district and there is more leniency in our agricultural districts. The problems that I’m faced with pretty much on a regular bases are, the enforcement of the percentages within the house or accessory building used for the business. I do not necessary have the authority to go up to someone’s house and walk in to ensure they are not setting up their Home Occupation as a retail establishment in their house. However, if it was egregious enough where I thought something really bad was happening there, I could potentially go get a warrant and enter the house.



The other problem I'm also faced with involving home occupation is the number of employees the business can have. The number differs in each zoning district. What I have found concerning this problem is people having to bend the truth in order to keep their home Occupation business going. A landscaping business is one that comes to mind. Some of them have lots of employees, but with the current home occupation ordinance that number is limited. So when the individual comes in to get my signature on their home occupation business license and that number is revealed to me I have to deny it. That is the reason why some may tend to bend the truth. Later we then find ourselves having to go after them. For landscaping in particular, a lot of time these home occupations are people second jobs where they do them on weekends. We of course are not here on weekends and the only way to catch them is contacting the Sheriff. That is the reason we want to make the ordinance appropriate for the type of businesses that are now falling within this new economy or should we just leave the ordinance as it is and just step up our enforcement.

So that is why I am here tonight. I have been here about three years. This change is something that has been building. So, I've had conversation with the Planning Director and the County's Attorney as to how we can possibly improve the ordinance. I don't have any specific recommendations for you this evening. The reason I'm mostly here is to find out if this is something the Planning Commission would want staff to look into.

Mr. Tucker asked if he was to get a business license for landscaping and subcontract jobs out, are those subcontractors considered employees of mind.

Ms. Sherry said she would consider them employees unless they lived at his house.

Mr. Titmus said if you were to ask me to interpret the one employee not a permanent resident of the dwelling, I would look at it differently compared to what I've heard. My interpretation sees permanent resident as a person being at the residence all day long and not someone who shows up in the morning, gets in the boss's truck to go and do a job then returns to their truck and go home. Maybe we need to write something that specifically says one person can stay at the residence all day long and all the rest must leave and go to job sites.

Mr. Prorise asked what the driving force is to limiting a home occupation to one employee. Is it facilities at the home? Is it traffic coming to and from the home?

Ms. Sherry said she was not part of the 2010 amendment. I did do some reading of the minutes from the meetings as well as what the wording was before. The one employees was added. Before that it was no employees. I think the attempt was to allow for additional employees in the less restrictive district. I have done a lot of thinking about and some of the reasoning behind how we would word the ordinance would be perhaps allowing people to have employees but maybe not letting them come to the house. The reason for that is, if it is a tighter residential district where five or six cars are parking on a regular bases that could have an impact on parking and the residential feel of that area. So keeping them offsite by picking up employees or meeting them at the job site is a better solution.

Mr. Bassett said he just wanted to follow up on what Ms. Sherry is saying about the number of employees coming to an individual's home for home occupation. Before 2010 we did receive a few complaints about employees parking on the streets in neighborhoods more dense and that was one reason for trying to address the number of employees issue back in 2010.

Mr. Titmus asked if staff was getting a large number of applications out of residential zoning or do you feel like a lot of applications are in agricultural zoned areas.

Ms. Sherry said she believes it is evenly split.

**IN RE: COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS**

Mr. Prorise said tonight I have heard three of the most succinct presentations on a case since I've been on this Commission. Mark did an excellent job on the facts involving what happened before and what happened now. You made sure that all key point were addressed. Mr. Cobb, Whipponock LLC, did a masterful job on hitting all the right points that needed to be brought up and the right points that were germane to the issue. Ms. Pinchefskey did a masterful job of expressing her concerns without getting into personalities or things that were irrelevant. I didn't have any question because the presentations were really done well.

**IN RE: PLANNING DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS**

Mr. Bassett said next moth we may have a couple of subdivision plat that you all need to review and comment on. That will be the only real official business on the agenda. We would also like to process with what Ms. Sherry presented to you this evening. We will work with the Chairman on the upcoming agenda.

**IN RE: ADJOURNMENT**

The Chairman said if there is nothing else to be discussed, he would entertain a motion for adjournment. Mr. Titmus made a motion to adjourn the meeting and Mr. Simmons seconded it and with all members in agreement the meeting adjourned at 8:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Bassett  
Planning Director

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_  
Planning Commission Chairman

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_