A meeting of the Beaufort-Port Royal Metropolitan Planning Commission was held on **September 15, 2014 at 5:30 p.m.** in council chambers of the Beaufort Municipal Complex, at 1911 Boundary Street. In attendance were Commissioners James Crower, Alice Howard, Robert Semmler, and Bill Harris, and City of Beaufort planner Libby Anderson, Town of Port Royal planner Linda Bridges, and county planner Rob Merchant.

Chairman Joe DeVito was absent.

In accordance with the South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976, Section 30-4-80(d) as amended, all local media were duly notified of the time, date, place, and agenda of this meeting.

CALL TO ORDER

Vice-Chairman Crower called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

MINUTES

Commissioner Harris made a motion, second by Commissioner Howard, to approve the minutes of August 18, 2014. The motion to approve the minutes as submitted passed unanimously. Commissioner Semmler abstained because he was not present at the meeting.

REVIEW OF PROJECTS FOR THE TOWN OF PORT ROYAL

Town of Port Royal – Annexation

Annex 547 Broad River Blvd. The property is further identified as District 100, Map 28, Parcel 100A.

The applicant is Lady's Island Real Estate Group, LLC.

Ms. Bridges showed a map of where the parcel is. The parcel is in unincorporated Beaufort County and is suburban, she said; it lies within the town's growth boundary. The property has one single-family dwelling on it at present. It's already served by BJWSA, and it will still be, whether it's annexed or not. Also, the Burton Fire District serves it. The Port Royal police department has adequate abilities to deliver services to this area. They are already delivering services in close proximity to this property. In regard to more residential development, they would offer garbage and recycling to them if they are annexed.

The applicant has requested T4 Neighborhood Center, Ms. Bridges said, and the Town of Port Royal concurs. In regard to the comprehensive plan, the future land use in the Comprehensive Plan names it Restricted Growth Sector, Conventional Neighborhood. The traffic impact analysis ordinance would carry forward if a certain amount were reached; there is also a tree ordinance with which it would need to comply for new development. In regard to stormwater management, Ms. Bridges said, it has a stormwater management and utility agreement. No

environmental issues are foreseen. Public notice was made to property owners within 400' of this area.

Commissioner Harris said Ms. Bridges had said a traffic study has to be done, so he asked if they would want fewer driveways onto Riley Road and Broad River Blvd. Ms. Bridges said one is a state road, and the other is a county road, so good planning from street design standards will look at activity and look to put in a network of streets, not a cul-de-sac. Commissioner Semmler asked if the Lady's Island Real Estate Group owns all this property, and Ms. Bridges said it did. There's one house there that they also own. Ms. Bridges said the subdivision to which Commissioner Semmler referred is Shadow Moss. Ms. Bridges said she had received no response to her public notice.

Patricia Brooks, 521 Broad River Blvd., said her property is adjacent to this one, and she asked what would happen to the wildlife there. She said that Broad River Blvd. has enough traffic, and this will cause more traffic, which she was trying to avoid by moving there.

Commissioner Harris asked what the increase in traffic would look like. Ms. Bridges said the owner has not presented the Town of Port Royal with any plans for development. In regard to density change, there definitely would be one; it would be between 2 and 2 ⅔ units per acre, and the densest lot size would be a 30' lot, so it would be around 8 units per acre by the time it was netted out

Charlie Pryor said he has two properties on Riley Road. He said Shadow Moss is building a road, and the privacy fence and a sharp curve there will create a traffic hazard. He said he's against this and thinks the traffic study should be done. **Commissioner Harris made a motion to approve the annexation of the subject property into Port Royal. Commissioner Semmler seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

<u>Town of Port Royal</u> – Zoning Request
Zone 547 Broad River Blvd. The property is further identified as District 100, Map 28, Parcel 100A. The requested zoning designation is T4 Neighborhood Center.
The applicant is Lady's Island Real Estate Group, LLC.

Commissioner Semmler asked what happens if they keep this zoned as T1; Commissioner Harris said there's no building on it. Commissioner Harris asked why it should be T4-Neighborhood Center, not a T3. Ms. Bridges said the applicant requested T4, and the applicant realized that's what his neighbors had. Ms. Bridges said there are some other zoning designations, like all the T3's. She briefly discussed T3-Edge, which she said goes by the water's edge. Suburban is a minimum lot width of 75'. The Shadow Moss lots are about 50', she said. **Commissioner Harris made a motion to recommend that the property be zoned T3; Commissioner Semmler seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

<u>Town of Port Royal</u> – Zoning Map Amendment
Amend the zoning map, correcting a mapping error, changing parcels R110 011 000 67B, 73, 68, 69, 69A, 70, 67A, 72, 71, 78, 261, 352, 80, 81, 82, 206 and 427 from T5 Main Street to T4 Neighborhood Center

Ms. Bridges said this is 3.68 acres comprised of multiple properties, just off of London Avenue. Most recently, they were zoned T5 Main Street with the new Port Royal code. T5 Main Street has higher density, mixed-use buildings that accommodate retail, offices, row houses, and apartments along primary thoroughfares in a neighborhood setting. Proposed zoning is T4 Neighborhood Center. This zoning integrates medium-density residential into a neighborhood framework that is conducive to walking and biking. The parcels are classified in the future land use map from the Comprehensive Plan as Walkable Neighborhood in a Controlled Growth Sector. Ms. Bridges showed a map with the surrounding uses. T5 Main Street zoning on Paris Avenue would remain the same. There are no environmental issues to be considered. It's an active block of downtown Port Royal and has been for 100 years, Ms. Bridges said. The building types that are allowed in T4 Neighborhood Center "match better," Ms. Bridges said.

Commissioner Semmler asked if T4 Neighborhood Center meant the bait shop could stay. Ms. Bridges said they are conforming in either designation. Commissioner Semmler said the owner did not receive notice and "has no idea this is going on." He said the owner has been a good neighbor and should be informed. Ms. Bridges said, "The rezoning will be transparent." Ms. Bridges briefly discussed the port PUD. The T5 zoning was a reaction to the lay of the land.

Sophia Prather said she owns lots 34-37. She realized there might be a concern for her because she purchased it for an investment. If it's T4, she "won't be able to sell (her) property," she feels. Ms. Bridges said T4 Neighborhood Center would allow a lot of types of specified businesses. Density-wise, she thinks the opportunities would not change. Ms. Bridges discussed the building types in T5 Main Street, and said T4 Neighborhood Center "relaxes that" and "gives the opportunity to spread that out a bit." Ms. Bridges offered to go over the businesses list with Ms. Prather. **Commissioner Howard made a motion to change the properties listed to T4 Neighborhood Center, and Commissioner Semmler seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

<u>Town of Port Royal</u> – Comprehensive Plan Update
Preliminary presentation and discussion for the state mandated update of the Town's Comprehensive Plan
Ms. Bridges explained the strategy for creation of the formal code. She said, "A workshop is a very good place to start with an update." Her goal is to be done by the end of the year, and she would like feedback from the commission.

REVIEW OF PROJECTS FOR THE CITY OF BEAUFORT

City of Beaufort – Rezoning Request

Rezoning property identified as District 122, Tax Map 29, Parcels 103F, 233, 242, 243, 244,490, and District 100, Tax Map 29, Parcel 481 (also proposed for annexation). The current zoning of the lots is "General Commercial District." The proposed zoning is "Highway Commercial District."

Ms. Anderson said this proposal for rezoning also involves a petition for annexation of one of the parcels. She showed a drawing of the lots, all of which are vacant. They are currently zoned General Commercial and the proposed zoning is Highway Commercial. She showed a zoning map with the current designations, which are a mix of General Commercial and Highway Commercial. In regard to the Comprehensive Plan, staff feels it supports a rezoning.

Parcel 481 – 23 Horton Drive – is zoned Commercial Regional District under the county's zoning ordinance, which is the most intense commercial zoning in the county code. The proposed zoning is not expected to have a greater impact than the current zoning on the natural environment. They received no public comment in regard to their notice. The biggest difference in uses, Ms. Anderson said, is their auto-orientation, which is more intense in Highway Commercial. In Highway Commercial, all types of office and commercial uses are permitted, including drive-thrus, vehicle sales and service, gas stations and car washes. The property is likely to be more marketable as Highway Commercial because of the wider range of uses permitted, including the vehicle-oriented uses.

Commissioner Semmler said, "I hate to see the auto malls pop up" on this highway. He asked about the properties surrounding the long, narrow property. Ms. Anderson said they are General Residential.

Geraldine Doe said she lives on parcel 204, which has General Commercial zoning. She is concerned about the increase in traffic. Drive--thrus could be across the street from her house. Ms. Doe said she doesn't want to "lose the neighborhood environment." She sees no purpose in changing the zoning and feels "they can already put whatever they want to" in General Commercial.

David Tedder pointed out why it is unlikely that there would be a drive-thru in this area, "though a use or two might be." On the Lowe's side of the road, on Highway 170, everything has to take access thru the rear.

Commissioner Semmler said he appreciated the comments; Cross Creek Shopping Center and Staples are on the other ends of the road. He can see all these properties developing, and if they're "not careful, (they) will have one big strip mall." Lowe's is back from the road, and there's green space there; it's the same with Publix. He thinks they can have some good things

here without a lot of tree cutting; “to continually change zoning makes a businessman’s life a lot easier,” Commissioner Semmler added. This is what Hilton Head Island did. There are many complaints about a new mall, and “they cut down a lot of trees.” He feels the current zoning is adequate, and they “don’t need to expand it just so we can have another opportunity to put in a McDonald’s.” **Commissioner Howard made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Harris, to annex 23 Horton Drive into the city. The motion passed unanimously.**

In regard to changing zoning from Highway Commercial to General Commercial, Commissioner Harris said, “No one is a giant fan of this development type,” and “Lowe’s was planned.” He thinks the zoning is adequate for what is there. The 23 Horton Drive property doesn’t seem like it belongs as Highway Commercial or General Commercial. With the other parcels, there’s enough frontage and property there that “they could all become a good development.”

Commissioner Howard said, “As they are currently zoned is adequate.” She can’t imagine drive-thru restaurants there now. Commissioner Harris asked, “If these are the businesses that want to come to Beaufort, and they are willing to spend the money to do so, should we make it easier for them?” Commissioner Howard said where Arby’s is, there is a drive-thru, and “there seems to still be a lot of space.” The same is true of where Wal-Mart is. Commissioner Harris asked if, in the Boundary Street plan, “we want it to be more pedestrian and less auto-oriented, and should more auto-centric businesses go there?”

Vice-Chairman Crower said he has some problems with putting Highway Commercial right next to the cemetery. Commissioner Semmler said Commissioner Harris had commented that there have been many stores on the property next to it, “and there’s a huge turnover.” When properties close, they stay empty for a couple of years at least, so the commission should use imagination and not rezone new properties every time someone wants to build a McDonald’s. Vice-Chairman Crower asked if they want to exempt Parcel #481, also known as 23 Horton Drive. It’s been annexed, “so it needs to have some kind of zoning.”

Ms. Anderson said 23 Horton Drive is Commercial Regional under the county zoning, and she believes the general area is zoned the same way. Commissioner Harris asked if they could be denied being Highway Commercial. **Commissioner Howard made a motion to recommend that 23 Horton Drive (parcel 481) be zoned General Commercial District. Commissioner Semmler seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

Commissioner Harris made a motion to recommend that the remaining parcels remain zoned General Commercial; Commissioner Semmler seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

<u>City of Beaufort</u> – UDO Amendment
Revising Section 6.8, "Boundary Street Redevelopment District," to provide more flexibility in development standards
Applicant: City of Beaufort Planning Department

Ms. Anderson said this originated with a request from City Council for the Planning Commission to review the Boundary Street Redevelopment District ordinance. Staff did some research, including convening a focus group; the goal was to make the Boundary Street Redevelopment District Ordinance easier to use and more flexible, and to spur investment by reducing building costs while still maintaining the goals and design intent of the ordinance. Although there hasn't been a lot of development since 2007 when the code was adopted, this is not only due to code restrictions. Yet it can be improved, and Ms. Anderson said she hopes the changes will do that. **Lauren Kelly** has been drafting the changes.

The Boundary Street Redevelopment ordinance was adopted in 2007, but in 2011 we saw the first major development, and that was McDonald's. In 2013, they had an application for an apartment complex. There have been some minor developments. A new Starbucks next door to city hall began going thru the development process at the end of 2013, and the Planning Department began to see that there were some issues with the code. Three months ago, Ms. Kelly said, the Starbucks developer, **Dick Stewart**, told them that the two-story building height requirement and the glazing requirements were cost-prohibitive.

They distilled what they had heard into modifications they could feel comfortable with now, Ms. Kelly said, knowing that the streetscape hasn't yet started but will around the beginning of next year. This has been "a target area for redevelopment for years now" and will be more pedestrian-oriented; the codes are "meant to get the best quality development that can be gotten for this area." She reviewed the proposed code changes:

1. The appeal process – Appeals are designated to go to the Planning Commission, but staff feels it might be "more accessible" for them to go to the Design Review Board, which is more familiar with this and would facilitate discussion between the applicant and the Board because of the Board's experience.
2. The SCDOT's ownership of the majority of the roads – Staff is proposing changes that allow more flexibility in regard to build-to lines for building frontages that currently aren't permitted in the SCDOT right-of-way, such as colonnades, arcades, and balconies.
3. Two-story building heights – After an in-depth discussion, they decided to propose to eliminate this requirement for the majority of the Boundary Street corridor's non-residential buildings, but ask that commercial one-story buildings have a 14' minimum first floor height requirement. A two-story overlay would still be required for buildings at Boundary Street and Ribaut Road and at Boundary Street and Highway 170.

This spurred other requirements to be added, Ms. Kelly said:

4. Frontage requirements – This regulates the percentage of building to be built along the street frontage at the setback or build-to line. Staff recommends that a minimum frontage be a goal with staff administrator flexibility.
5. Consolidated frontage elements – These elements are "how the private portion interacts with the streetscape," like a porch, a colonnade, etc. They were consolidated and clarified to eliminate confusion, so developers can look in one place for all of the standards.
6. Glazing requirements – Distinguished glazing requirements between commercial and non-commercial buildings
7. Maximum parking requirements, so as not to increase the land devoted to parking, were added to the code, which now has minimum and maximum standards.
8. The drive-thru special exception – This will have minor changes based on the Zoning Board of Appeals' work.

Vice-Chairman Crower asked what staff was looking for from the Metropolitan Planning Commission tonight. Ms. Anderson said they would need a specific recommendation at some point. Commissioner Howard said she would recommend that the commission have a workshop. Vice-Chairman Crower said, "The pieces appear interconnected," and he agreed a workshop would be "better than just saying "yes" and "no" to the changes." Commissioner Howard asked if SCE&G or SCDOT had been met with on these changes, and Ms. Anderson replied, "Not yet." Ms. Anderson asked if they wanted to do a workshop before the October MPC meeting. Vice-Chairman Crower asked Ms. Anderson if they could do that workshop at the same time as the workshop with Ms. Bridges. They decided that they would determine the date via email.

Jon Verity – chairman of the Redevelopment Commission – said he thinks the workshop will be good, and "times have changed" since the Boundary Street District was originally approved. The city has "an enormous investment in Boundary Street," and they need to have the rules and regulations, which are important, but at the same time, these "need to be looked at thoughtfully," and "the changes will be welcome." Vice-Chairman Crower said the meeting would be open to the public.

<u>City of Beaufort</u> – UDO Amendment
Minimum finished first floor height for new residential construction
Revising Section 6.5.K, "Measurement and Exceptions; Height," to require the finished first floor of all new residential construction to be elevated a minimum of 18" about finished grade.
Applicant: City of Beaufort Planning Department.

Currently, Ms. Anderson said, new residential development is required to be elevated in the Bladen Street District and the Boundary Street District; in townhouses, in the flood zone, and in

the Historic District, it's usually required to be raised. This is to prevent flooding for slab on grade, which is at risk if it is built at grade. The proposal is to raise the finished first floor of all new residential construction 18" above grade; this is consistent with the new Port Royal and proposed County Form-Based Codes.

Commissioner Howard asked, if someone adds on to an existing house, if they would have to go to the Zoning Board of Appeals. Ms. Anderson said this is only for new construction, and staff would clarify that. **Commissioner Harris made a motion to approve the amendment as submitted, with the addition that this is only for new construction, not an addition to an existing building. Commissioner Semmler seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

<u>City of Beaufort</u> – UDO Amendment
Revising Section 7, "General Development Standards," to require silt fencing during new residential and commercial construction
Applicant: City of Beaufort Planning Department

Ms. Anderson said currently the ordinance has no requirements for silt fencing on smaller construction projects. After recent rains, though, they learned that silt can wash into the streets, and then into the stormwater drains, even on small construction projects. The fencing can be staked fabric, or in areas where there are concerns about trees, hay bales can be used. It is to remain during the construction period, Ms. Anderson said. A construction drive will need to be made with gravel or stone to prevent the tracking of soil.

Mr. Tedder said he has "no problem with the idea," but he doesn't think silt fencing "makes sense." In some places, he believes, "silt fencing won't work." Using it "is going to add $1000 to a single-family dwelling," Mr. Tedder feels, so "more common sense needs to be written into it to keep dirt out of the gutters," he said. Commissioner Howard said it does say that hay bales can be used, but she worries "it could be arbitrary judgment by the staff." Ms. Anderson said on existing lots of record, the requirement could be waived. It can be tweaked, she said. Planning staff would enforce it initially, and then the building code inspectors, who are in the field, once the building starts.

Commissioner Semmler asked what construction *wouldn't* require silt fencing. Ms. Anderson said any lot where the administrator feels there would be soil disturbance would require it. With an addition of a garage, for example, whether silt fencing was required would depend on the size and location of the project. Commissioner Semmler said he trusted that the Planning Department "would use common sense and do the right things in the right places."
Commissioner Howard made a motion to adopt the silt requirement, second by Commissioner Semmler. The motion passed unanimously.
<u>City of Beaufort – Update on Council Actions</u>

- Ms. Anderson said revision to the landscaping and tree conservation ordinance had had a public hearing, and the first reading has been held; September 23 is the second reading, and it's been sent to the development community for their remarks.
- The ordinance in regard to gas station signs will have the same schedule, with a September 23 second reading.
- A public hearing was held on side yard setbacks for attached garages last week, and first reading will be September 23.

REVIEW OF PROJECTS FOR THE COUNTY OF BEAUFORT

Beaufort County – "Zoning Map Amendment/Rezoning from Lady's Island Community Preservation (LICP) District & Lady's Island Expanded Home Office District to Planned Unit Development (PUD) for R200 015 000 0051 0000, R200 015 000 051A 0000, R200 015 000 0724 0000, and R200 015 000 0725 0000 (39.09 acres, known as The Village at Oyster Bluff PUD, formerly known as The Village at Lady's Island)
Owner: Bennett McNeal / Agent: Josh Tiller

Rob Merchant said the Village at Oyster Bluff PUD on Lady's Island is a 39-acre parcel, and the proposal calls for 114 dwelling units and 5.5 acres of commercial development at the corner of Oyster Factory Road and Sam's Point Road. It is zoned Lady's Island Community Preservation District currently, and the proposed zoning change is from those districts to Planned Unit Development (PUD). In 1996, county council adopted a PUD called Village at Lady's Island with 200 dwelling units. The ordinance required that at the end of 2009, if less than 50% of the lots in a PUD were platted, it would sunset unless council took action, and when that happened, council recommended discontinuing the PUD. The property owner considered other options and worked with the Lady's Island Community Preservation Committee to come up with alternatives, Mr. Merchant said.

They have a Traditional Community plan that allows denser development within 2 miles of the intersection of Sea Island Parkway and Sam's Point Road, such as is found at Newpoint, Mr. Merchant said. The property owner has chosen to do a PUD under the current code, which is in keeping with the basic requirements of the proposed Traditional Community Plan. Mr. Merchant described the parameters of this development. He showed a map of the districts that would be adopted as part of the PUD with modifications. They found the development consistent with Beaufort County's Comprehensive Plan and the city's Comprehensive Plan in regard to the area being compatible with traditional neighborhood developments and urban neighborhoods. It's slightly denser than the types of development in the surrounding residential areas, but is consistent with nearby traditional neighborhood developments.

Staff believes this development is in keeping with the Comprehensive Plans of the city and the county, Mr. Merchant said. The impact on the interior neighborhoods should be lessened. While staff looks favorably on the overall framework, they took issue with some of the

modifications to the draft code and to some of the proposed PUD standards, feeling that they "seemed to water down the traditional neighborhood plan." They were to have porches, residential lots facing the street, and alley access, rather than alley orientation. There are no specifics about a building or frontage type. Some lots will have street access, and others will have access by the alley. It's not specifically master-planned.

Mr. Merchant said property owners were concerned about all the backyards facing Sunset Blvd., so they know they need a visual buffer or to restrict access from there, so they recommended that to the developer. The county believes that most of it is consistent with the new code, but they had concerns about some of these elements that they felt needed to be addressed.

Mr. Tedder and **Josh Tiller**, the land planner, spoke. This is "close to year 6," Mr. Tedder said, "to reinvent the PUD." They received the staff report when they came in the room, according to Mr. Tedder, and "are at a slight disadvantage." They have no problem with the buffer, so that "they aren't looking into someone's unfinished backyard." Mr. Tedder said they think they can reach agreement with staff based on previous conversations on all of the points. With Sam's Point Road being very auto-centric, they don't want the build-to line to be to Sam's Point Road. They would like the Planning Commission to provide "a recommendation that the county and applicant reach mutual agreement on the areas of concern as outlined in the September 15 memorandum." "Huge driveways are not the intent," Mr. Tedder added.

Commissioner Harris said right away he sees the house backing up to Sunset Boulevard "as a problem," and "that's the Achilles heel of Newpoint." Mr. Tedder said originally it was being built in phases along Sunset Boulevard. Neighbors didn't want that. That's why the alleyway is being created: as a concession to the neighborhood.

Commissioner Howard said there appear to be 4 access points to the development. Mr. Tiller indicated the approved access points.

Commissioner Semmler asked Mr. Merchant about the county's staff recommendations. He read a section about the county's agreement and disagreement with plans, in terms of their concurrence with code. Mr. Tedder said he "had heard this was do-able," and the county thinks that at a meeting later this week, they "will be ready to incorporate the level of detail that is missing." Mr. Merchant said the overall density, layout, etc. falls in line with the Comprehensive Plan, but county staff has concerns about what is built on the lots, and they can change some standards to correct those. "There are no fundamental flaws"; it's come down to what gets built on the lot, Mr. Merchant said, to make it a Traditional Community as opposed to a typical suburban lot. Commissioner Semmler said this was the first time they have tried to apply the community development code to a housing development, which he said wouldn't be easy, but he also thinks it can be done and applauded the "effort to make it work."

Mr. Tedder said they were asking the Metropolitan Planning Commission to endorse the modifications made by planning staff and to offer a recommendation "that the county and the applicant create the requested documents as they have set forth in here before it goes to the county Planning Commission." They need to be mutually agreeable standards.

Greg Gallagher, 143 Sunset, said he "basically has no problems." There have been people killed and injured on the street because of the traffic, he said. He had concerns about the buffer between Wallace and the proposed property in the past, but it seems to have been eliminated. The buffer doesn't seem to be a permanent one. Mr. Gallagher said he doesn't "want a wooden fence in front of me."

Donald King, Sunset Blvd., said "it's a difficult thing to do." The total property is relatively small, as are the individual lots, compared to the entire community. The lots will be 45-65 feet. He wants to keep the Sunset Boulevard area "well-done." He thinks it can work, but the small lot size will be difficult. Mr. King, too, would like to see a buffer on Sunset Boulevard for the developer's and the community's benefit. Commissioner Harris said, as they move forward, describing the buffer and how to prevent what the public is worried about will be important to do.

Nancy King said she has questions about the setbacks. There's a 50' setback on Sam's Point Road; there's none on Sunset Boulevard. She said she wants to know what kind of setbacks are involved, the distance between houses, and if "there are limits to that." Mr. Merchant said on Sam's Point Road, the PUD calls for a 50' buffer. In a T3 Neighborhood, there are setbacks adopted: building placement is 15-25' from the road with a 5' side yard setback and rear yard setback of 15'. There is currently no buffer on Sunset Boulevard, Mr. Merchant noted. The way the current standards are written, it would be the rear yard setback, which is 15', and the build-to zone is 15–25', which will push it closer to the front, rather than to the rear.

The building isn't close to the road, Vice-Chairman Crower said, "but you might have most anything else." He asked if the T3 Neighborhood and Hamlet Center were incorporated. Mr. Merchant said that's in the staff report, but not among the details they were most concerned about. Vice-Chairman Crower said he's generally leery about recommending something that is 90% finished, but if they can do it – recognizing it will still go to the county planning commission for approval, by which point it will have the difficulties ironed out – he "can live with it."

Commissioner Semmler suggested recommending approval based on the county's planning staff's recommendations and the ability of the applicant to negotiate with that. This is in the city's growth boundary, and "there's nothing to be gained by holding it up," Commissioner Semmler feels. They should "get it going. It will go through other committees and commissions and continue to grow and change."

Commissioner Semmler made a motion to recommend the application and the modifications made by planning staff favorably, with the applicant and the county to reach mutually agreeable standards for the items contained in the September 15 staff report, with the changes as suggested by the planning staff; Commissioner Howard seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

There being no further business to come before the commission, Commissioner Howard made a motion to adjourn. The motion passed unanimously, and the meeting was adjourned at 8:21 p.m.