

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF NOVEMBER 2, 2000

The regular meeting of the Sussex County Planning and Zoning Commission was held Thursday evening, November 2, 2000 in the County Council Chambers, County Administrative Office Building, Georgetown, Delaware.

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 P.M. with Chairman Allen presiding. The following members of the Commission were present: Mr. Allen, Mr. Gordy, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Lynch, Mr. Wheatley, with Mr. Schrader - Assistant County Attorney, Mr. Lank - Director, and Mr. Abbott - Assistant Director.

Motion by Mr. Wheatley, seconded by Mr. Lynch, and carried unanimously to approve the agenda as circulated.

The Commission took no action on the minutes of October 26, 2000 since they had just been received.

Mr. Schrader described how the agenda and hearings would be conducted.

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS

C/U #1366 -- application of MELVIN L. JOSEPH CONSTRUCTION CO. to consider the Conditional Use of land in an AR-1 Agricultural Residential District for a borrow pit to be located on a certain parcel of land lying and being in Dagsboro Hundred, Sussex County, containing 118.90 acres, more or less, lying west of Route 113, 1.2 mile north of Route 20.

The Commission found, based on a letter from David B. DuPlessis of DelDOT to C. Kenneth Carter, that the Department will not object to the Conditional Use of the existing entrance for the borrow pit; that the entrance permit is valid for the proposed use only; and that should the property change in the future, a new entrance permit will be required.

The Commission found, based on comments received from the Sussex Conservation District, that the soils are mapped as Evesboro loamy sand, Johnston loam or silt loam, and Kenansville loamy sand; that the Evesboro soils have slight to moderate limitations; that the Johnston soils have severe limitations; that the Kenansville soils have slight limitations; that the applicant will be required to follow recommended erosion and sedimentation control practices and to maintain vegetation; that the Evesboro soils are considered of Statewide Importance; that the Johnston soils are considered a Hydric soil; and that the Kenansville soils are considered Prime Farmland.

The Commission found, based on comments received from the Office of State Planning Coordination, that this parcel is located within the Rural area of the Strategies for State Policies and Spending; that in these areas State policies will be to encourage the preservation of a rural lifestyle and discourage new development; that the State feels that a borrow pit could be an acceptable use in a rural area; that the State asks the County to

table this proposal until the following concerns can be resolved: the State DNREC noted that the information provided stated that the project is to be served by an on-site well and septic system; that the State DNREC Ground-Water Protection Branch has noted that the proposed borrow pit adjoins the Stockley Landfill to the west; that this landfill has been investigated under the Hazardous Substance Cleanup Act; that ground water in the water table aquifer at Stockley Landfill has been impacted by organic and inorganic contaminants; that the direction of the ground water flow at the landfill is generally southeast toward Sheep Pen Ditch; that through an agreement between the State DNREC and the County Engineering Department, three ground water management zones have been established for the site; that portions of the zones are located at the southwestern corner of the parcel; that the DNREC Ground-Water Protection Branch has advised that the proposed borrow pit could potentially create a large ground water sink, which may alter the direction of local ground water flow, lower the water table and induce contaminant migration from the landfill; that at the present time the Branch does not know the proposed dimensions of the borrow pit or water withdrawal rates, therefore, the consequences of the operation cannot be quantified at this time; that depending on the rate of withdrawal an allocations permit may be required; that since ground water entering the proposed borrow pit may carry contaminants, considerations for discharge of this water to surface waters would be needed; that a discharge permit and a water treatment system may be needed if borrow pit water is found to be contaminated; that there are several drinking water wells in the area and no public water utilities service is in the area at this time; that most of the wells in the area draw from the water table aquifer; that these wells may be adversely impacted by the borrow pit; that the Water Allocation Branch of the State DNREC noted that a water allocation permit might be needed if the project withdraws water from the surface or the ground at a rate greater than 50,000 gallons per day; that the State Historic Preservation Office has noted that this property includes a known prehistoric archaeological site which appears to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places; that other parts of the site may contain prehistoric archaeological sites; that the site adjoins the Woodlawn Cemetery; that the State feels that a detailed hydrological investigation would be needed to address most of these concerns to evaluate the potential impacts on the borrow pit; and that the State asks that the County table this project until the issues brought forth by the State DNREC and the State Historic Preservation Office can be investigated and resolved.

The Commission found, based on comments received from the County Engineering Department, that the site is adjacent to County Landfill No. 2, the Stockley Landfill; that this site is on the State Superfund list and is regulated by the Hazardous Substance Cleanup Act; that the landfill has impacted the quality of ground water immediately below it; that a ground water management zone has been established for the landfill and properties adjacent to the site; that the ground water management zone consists of three levels of intensity; that there are two zones where the rate of groundwater pumping is restricted and one zone where no wells are permitted; that portions of the borrow pit site

occupy each of the three zones; that any activities that impact the flow of contaminated ground water, either directly or indirectly, should not be permitted; that such activities include, but are not limited to, the alteration of existing drainage patterns, excavation below the ground water table and the pumping of ground water; that any action on this application should be deferred pending further investigation by the County Engineering Department and its consultants; that sufficient information has not been included in the application to provide a proper technical opinion; that the County Engineering Department believes that it is possible to compile a project plan that is compatible with the existing landfill; and that the County Engineering Department will make themselves available to resolve these issues at the applicant's convenience.

The Commission found that a letter has been received from Brad and Caroline Hawkes, adjoining property owners, that are generally in favor of the application, but expressed some concerns relating to equipment noise and requested that if the use is approved: A) that working hours be limited to 7:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. Monday through Friday; B) increase the buffer distance to 150-feet on the west side of the proposed pit, where residences exist; C) require that the buffer be planted with evergreen trees prior to starting excavation; requesting that property lines be field surveyed and monumented; and requesting that prior to making a decision on this application the County's Environmental Consultant and possibly the State should make comments regarding the leaching of pollutants that may occur as a direct result of the project.

The Commission found that a letter has been received from Jeffrey K. Legg and Mary J. Peterson, adjoining property owners, referencing the inconvenience of increased noise levels if the project is approved and requesting the same time limits as the Hawkes letter; referencing the same buffer and survey references as the Hawkes letter; and referencing the same concerns about making a decision without input from the County's Environmental Consultants and the State.

The Commission found that C. Kenneth Carter, Surveyor, JoAnn Adams, Vice President of Melvin L. Joseph Construction, and Kenny Adams, Operations Manager for Melvin L. Joseph Construction were present and stated in their presentations and in response to questions raised by the Commission that they have no intent to locate a well or septic system on the site; that they realize that a permit is required for the discharge of water; that they have no intent to draw-down water; that they will address the concerns from the County Engineering Department and the Office of State Planning Coordination; that they have not calculated the anticipated number of truck loads that will be hauled from the site; that the Company has 11 trucks; that the parcel was purchased for continuation and service to the M. L. Joseph Construction Co; that the Company has 60 year-round employees and 100 employees in the Summer months; that the Company sells all types of soils; that when completed the pit will become a lake; that no adjoining homes are close to the property lines; that the static water line is approximately 13-feet below grade; that

no County services will be required to operate the pit; that the cemetery contains approximately 22 acres, that the borrow pit will contain approximately 105 acres; that they propose 50-foot wide buffers around the perimeter; that the pit will be approximately 1,000 feet from U.S. Route 113; that the elevation of the U.S. Route 113 is approximately 11-feet lower than grade of the site and that the pit will not be visible from U.S. Route 113; that all truck traffic can function on major highways without utilization of local roads; that the only entrance to the site will be from U.S. Route 113; that they propose to offer select fill, concrete sands, masonry sands, fill materials, and top soil from the site; that the use ties in with development of the County; that the site is completely screened from the neighbors and U.S. Route 113; that Sheep Pen Ditch is north of the cemetery; that wetlands have been delineated and create considerable buffer distance from Sheep Pen Ditch; that water may not be pumped into the Ditch; that a filtering system will be needed if any water pumping is proposed; that a monitoring well exists near the entrance to the site on the Townsend's property; that the lake will be approximately 14-feet deep; that no housing is proposed on the site; that they have no objection to any increase to the buffer widths; that they propose to excavate materials as needed; that they may haul from 50 to 100 truck loads per day; that it will take approximately 20 years to complete the project; that the site will be stabilized and vegetated per the requirements of the County and the State; that no fencing is proposed; that the entrance will be gated; that they are not sure of the actual distance from the proposed pit to the nearest home or the actual landfill; that they propose to mechanically dig the soils; and that no dredging is proposed at this time.

The Commission found that Eric Widen, Carl Widen, and Elmer Fannin were present in support of the application and supported the personal character of the applicant, the quality of the maintenance of the equipment owned by the applicant, and the cleanliness of the operation; that the business will be a benefit to the County; that they would prefer a borrow pit over commercial activities; and that there is a need for materials as projects develop in the County.

The Commission found that Blanche Foskey was present in opposition on behalf of herself, her parents, and her two sisters, and expressed concerns relating to children's safety, noise, dust, truck traffic, and the safety of her handicapped sisters.

The Commission found that Brain Page, County Historical Planner, was present and stated that the applicants have not contact his Department.

At the conclusion of the public hearings, the Commission discussed the points and issues raised during the public hearing.

Motion by Mr. Johnson, seconded by Mr. Gordy, and carried unanimously to defer action and recommend that the applicant withdraw the application and resubmit with appropriate plot information, a reclamation plan, and that the applicant should contact the County Engineering Department and the State DNREC for information on the County Landfill Ground Water Management Zone. There was a consensus of the Commission that if the applicant does resubmit a revised application, the fee may be waived.

Motion Carried 5 - 0.

C/U #1367 -- application of JEFFREY M. IRVING to consider the Conditional Use of land in an AR-1 Agricultural Residential District for a sign shop to be located on a certain parcel of land lying and being in Baltimore Hundred, Sussex County, containing 16,918 square feet, more or less, lying northeast of Road 395, 1,100 feet southeast of Road 54.

The Commission found, based on comments received from DelDOT, that a traffic impact study was not recommended and that the level of service of Road 395 will not change as a result of this application.

The Commission found, based on comments received from the Sussex Conservation District, that no storm flood hazard area or tax ditch is affected; that it may not be necessary for any on-site or off-site drainage improvements; that the soils are mapped as Evesboro loamy sand and Woodstown sandy loam; that the Evesboro soils have slight limitations; that the Woodstown soils have slight to moderate limitations; that the applicant may be required to follow recommended erosion and sedimentation control practices during any construction and to maintain vegetation; that the farmland rating of the Evesboro soils is considered of Statewide Importance; that the farmland rating of the Woodstown soils is considered Prime Farmland.

The Commission found that Jeffrey M. Irving was present and stated in his presentation and in response to questions raised by the Commission that he purchased the site approximately 3-years ago; that the parcel is improved by his home and a 1,200 square foot shop; that the site had been historically used by a contractor in the past; that he proposes to operate a sign shop from the site; that he averages fewer than 5 customers per day; that most of the work is prepared on a computer; that the only painting would be sign board edges and trim; that the business is very quiet and non-polluting; that he is not aware of any objections from neighbors; that business hours would be from 8:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. Monday through Friday; that he may be working, but the business would not be open, on weekends; that he has one employee; that he makes primarily small residential and business signs; that all work is performed inside of a building; that he would like to erect a small sign; that he will continue to live on the site; that he receives deliveries once a week by a medium sized delivery truck, no tractor trailers; that small

trash containers will be utilized, since he does not anticipate enough trash to fill a dumpster; that no outside storage is intended; that no additional lighting will be necessary; and that the majority of the sign lettering is now vinyl materials.

The Commission found that Henry Summey, a resident in the area, was present in opposition to the application and expressed concerns relating to increased vehicular traffic, noise, future expansion of the business, and that he was not aware of a previous business on the site.

At the conclusion of the public hearings, the Commission discussed the points and issues raised during the public hearing.

Motion by Mr. Lynch, seconded by Mr. Gordy, and carried unanimously to forward a recommendation to the Sussex County Council that this application be approved with the following stipulations: 1) the site plan shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission; 2) one unlighted ground sign, not exceeding 32 square feet per site or facing, may be permitted; 3) there shall be no Sunday hours; 4) there shall be no outside storage.

Motion Carried 5 - 0.

C/U #1368 -- application of STEVE BROPHY to consider the Conditional Use of land in a B-1 Neighborhood Business District for a multi-family dwelling structure (4 units) to be located on a certain parcel of land lying and being in Baltimore Hundred, Sussex County, containing 13,542 square feet, more or less, lying at the northeast corner of the intersection of Route One and Admirals Road, Lots 11 and 12 within Tower Shores Subdivision.

The Commission found, based on comments received from DelDOT, that a traffic impact study was not recommended, that the level of service of Route One will not change as a result of this application, and that the Department will not allow direct access to the property from Route One.

The Commission found, based on comments received from the Sussex Conservation District, that no storm flood hazard area or tax ditch is affected; that it may not be necessary for any on-site or off-site drainage improvements; that the site is located in an area of potential coastal flooding; that the soils are mapped as Coastal beach and dune lands, which have severe limitations; that the applicant will be required to follow recommended erosion and sedimentation control practices and to maintain vegetation; and that the Coastal soils are Hydric soils on the beach and in depressions.

The Commission found, based on comments received from the County Engineering Department, that the site is located in the North Bethany Expansion of the Bethany Beach Sanitary Sewer District; that there is sufficient capacity available for the project as submitted; that there are two 6-inch laterals provided to parcel 108; that there are no System Connection Charge credits for either parcel; that the project will be responsible for System Connection Charges; and that the current System Connection Charge rate through June 30, 2001 is \$2,159 per EDU.

The Commission found, based on comments received from the Office of State Planning Coordination, that the parcel is located in an Environmentally Sensitive Developing Area of the Strategies for State Policies and Spending; that in these areas, State policy will be to seek a balance between resource protection and sustainable growth; that the State would like to see multi-family units developed in a developing area; that this parcel is in an area already heavily developed; that for this reason, the State does not object to this application; that the site is located in the 100-year flood plain, where the State, in concurrence with the FEMA guidelines, does not recommend building; and that if construction does take place, it must meet all floodplain building and construction standards and be elevated above the base flood elevation.

The Commission found that a letter has been received from the Tower Shores Beach Association supporting the application to erect a duplex condominium of each of the lots and subject to the right of the Tower Shores Beach Association to approve the final building design; and that use of the property to construct duplexes would be consistent with buildings allowed to be constructed on similar lots in the development.

The Commission found that Steve Brophy and Steve Parsons, Attorney, were present and stated in their presentations and in response to questions raised by the Commission that this project is similar to the Buchanan Builders application recently approved by the County Council; that they propose 2-units on each lot; that the character of the neighborhood is multi-family; that the majority of the improvements in the subdivision are multi-family structures; that public sewer access is available; that the applicant has been building in the area for 20-years; that the site is zoned B-1 Neighborhood Business; that residential use is better for the community than commercial; that the units will be sold, not rented; that the units may sell for as much as \$400,000; that access will be restricted to Admirals Road; that adequate space is available for 3 parking spaces per unit; and that each lot will be developed separately.

The Commission found that Mr. Parsons submitted some suggested stipulations if the use is approved, and a copy of the County Property Map marked with the majority of the multi-family sites within the community.

The Commission found that there were no parties present in support of or in opposition to the application.

At the conclusion of the public hearings, the Commission discussed the points and issues raised during the public hearing.

Motion by Mr. Lynch, seconded by Mr. Wheatley, and carried unanimously to forward this application to the Sussex County Council with the recommendation that it be approved with the following stipulations: 1) the density of the project, if necessary, shall be subject to the County Board of Adjustment; 2) once a decision is made by the County Board of Adjustment, the site plan shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission upon receipt of all appropriate agency approvals; 3) no site preparation, site disturbance, excavation, or other construction shall be commenced until all other permits required by all other laws, ordinances, rules or regulations have been issued and the approved final site plan is recorded.

Motion Carried 5 - 0.

C/U #1369 -- application of JAMES H. CRONIC, JR. to consider the Conditional Use of land in an AR-1 Agricultural Residential District for auto restoration to be located on a certain parcel of land lying and being in Broadkill Hundred, Sussex County, containing 2.78 acres, more or less, lying at the southeast corner of the intersection of Road 233 and Road 235.

The Commission found, based on comments received from DelDOT, that a traffic impact study was not recommended and that the level of service of Road 233 and Road 235 will not change as a result of this application.

The Commission found, based on comments received from the Sussex Conservation District, that no storm flood hazard area or tax ditch is affected; that it may be necessary for some off-site drainage improvements due to the increase in impervious area and the presence of a swale alongside the road; that drainage may need to be improved to carry the increase flow of runoff during storm events; that no building or parking should be placed near the swale; that the soils are mapped as Rumford loamy sand which has slight limitations; that the applicant will be required to follow recommended erosion and sedimentation control practices and to maintain vegetation; and that the farmland rating of the Rumford soils is considered of Statewide Importance.

The Commission found, based on comments received from the Office of State Planning Coordination, that the parcel is located within the Rural area of the Strategies for State

Policies and Spending; that in these areas, State policies will encourage the preservation of a rural lifestyle and discourage new development; and that the State objects to this proposal and would rather see this type of business in a Developing or Community area.

The Commission found that James Cronic was present and stated in his presentation and in response to questions raised by the Commission that he proposes an auto restoration business for the restoration of classic cars; that traffic would be at a minimum; that he works full-time as a construction worker; that he would be working in the shop during evening hours and on Saturdays from 8:00 A.M. to 4:00 P.M. with no Sunday hours; that noise would be held to a minimum; that he does some welding, sanding, and media blasting; that all vehicles will be stored in side of the building; that there will be no outside storage of materials or vehicles; that there will be no signs; that security lighting already exists; and that he has no employees.

The Commission found that there were no parties present in support of or in opposition to the application.

Motion by Mr. Wheatley, seconded by Mr. Johnson, and carried unanimously to forward this application to the Sussex County Council with the recommendation that it be approved with the following stipulations: 1) one unlighted ground sign, not exceeding 32 square foot per side or facing, may be permitted; 2) the site plan shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Motion Carried 5 - 0.

Ordinance Amendment -- an Ordinance amending Chapter 99, Section 13, of the Subdivision Code of Sussex County, relating to notice requirements to be given to owners within subdivisions prior to alteration, resubdivision or addition.

Mr. Lank read the Ordinance and the Synopsis of the Ordinance.

The Commission found that a letter had been received from Nancy Jordan of Ocean Farms Subdivision in opposition to the proposed Ordinance by referencing that the Ordinance creates loose loopholes for changing and altering a subdivision; that it would be unfair to consumers who purchased lots under a previously approved subdivision plan; that, as written, a developer could change location of amenities; that the wording "will not increase the density of the subdivision" could permit a developer to reconfigure a subdivision in order to create lots on common areas, buffer zones and open spaces; that a developer would be permitted to completely alter a subdivision under the guise of changing lot lines and not increasing density; that the wording "entitled to receive notice" of the application and public hearings is ambiguous; and that the proposed Subsection E

brings the entire issue of changes to the subdivision ordinance back to granting permission for developers to change subdivision with ease and little regard or recourse for those who have already purchased lots or homes in existing subdivisions.

Mr. Schrader advised the Commission that the existing subdivision covenants of record for subdivisions would still prevail.

There was a consensus of the Commission that the Ordinance may be putting a lot of pressure on the Director.

Mr. Lank advised the Commission that the Ordinance provides for some discretion by the Director and that the Director may, by choice, refer an alteration or amendment to subdivision to the Commission prior to making a decision.

The Commission found that Elmer Fannin was present in support of the Ordinance, and added that some flexibility in the Ordinance would allow an individual to build on two lots; that the Ordinance would allow an individual to divide three lots into two lots; that the Ordinance would allow a developer to develop reserved lands; that wetlands delineation's change and may cause lot line relocations; that surveyor errors may be found and the Ordinance would allow for lot line corrections; that in some cases out of state landowners cannot be found or do not respond to notices or letters, thereby impacting a developer from being able to submit an amendment or alteration because he cannot get the appropriate percentage of approvals from landowners; and that since the public hearings process is not being eliminated, the Ordinance still gives everyone the right to speak in support of or in opposition to an application.

The Commission found that Ralph Jordan, John Sebastian, and John Carney were present in opposition to the Ordinance and stated that they were in support of the original version of the Ordinance considered, and still pending, that provided for a 75% approval by property owners within a subdivision prior to submittal of an application; that they questioned what the reference to overall density means; that alterations to subdivisions that reduce the number of lots impacts the fees that can be collected for maintenance of amenities and infrastructure within subdivisions and could affect homeowners associations financially; that the County Attorney should have had the opportunity to review the Ordinance; that some developers are not very considerate to homeowners and try to make alterations anytime they think they can make a profit; that the Ordinance is ambiguous; and that the Ordinance needs to include at least a 75% support of the homeowners.

Motion by Mr. Wheatley, seconded by Mr. Johnson, and carried unanimously to defer action.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

Lighthouse Christian Center of Seaford Site Plan - Road 46

The Commission reviewed a preliminary commercial site plan for a church located at the northwest corner of the intersection of Road 46 and U.S. Route 13 north of Seaford.

Mr. Abbott advised the Commission that the proposed church is 80' by 32' (2,560 square feet) with a 25' by 32' (800 square feet) pastor's apartment; that the site is zoned AR-1 Agricultural Residential and churches are a permitted use in all zoning districts; that the ingress and egress is located off of Road 46; that 100 seats are proposed for the church and that 25 parking spaces are required and that 28 spaces are proposed; that the spaces are 10' by 20' with 25' interior drives; that 8 spaces are located within the front yard setback and need a waiver from the Commission; that the site plan references the parking and driveway area to be gravel; that the Zoning Code requires 10 or more spaces to be paved; that the setbacks meet the requirements of the Zoning Code; and that the staff has received an approval from the Office of the State Fire Marshal and needs approvals from the Sussex Conservation District, DelDOT, and DNREC.

Motion by Mr. Wheatley, seconded by Mr. Lynch, and carried unanimously to approve the site plan as submitted as a preliminary with the stipulation that final approval shall be subject to the staff receiving all required agency approvals.

Georgetown East Happy Harry's Preliminary Commercial Site Plan - Route 9 and Road 319

Doug Liberman of Larson Associates was present as the Commission reviewed a preliminary commercial site plan for a pharmacy located at the intersection of Route 9 and Road 319 east of Georgetown.

Mr. Abbott advised the Commission that the site is zoned B-1 Neighborhood Business and that the pharmacy is a permitted use in this zoning district; that the proposed building is 80' by 150' (12,000 square feet) and 18' in height; that 60 parking spaces are required and that 67 are proposed; that each space is 10' by 20' with 25' interior driveways; that 19 parking spaces are located within the front yard setback and need a waiver from the Commission; that sewer and water will be provided by the Town of Georgetown; that there are no wetlands located on the site; that the setbacks meet the requirements of the Zoning Code; that the staff has not received any agency approvals; and that the site plan is suitable for preliminary approval.

Mr. Liberman advised the Commission that there is a proposed full access entrance/exit onto Route 9 and Road 319; that the developer has not meet with DelDOT as of yet; and at this time there are no known plans for the remaining two parcels.

The Commission discussed the proposed entrance/exit onto Route 9 and expressed concerns over this.

Motion by Mr. Johnson, seconded by Mr. Lynch, and carried unanimously to defer action pending comments received from DelDOT in reference to the Route 9 entrance/exit.

Linda and Carl W. Thomas, Sr.
Lot on 50' Easement - Road 336

Mr. Abbott advised the Commission that this item was removed from the agenda on November 1, 2000 since an application for a major subdivision will be required.

The Villages of Five Points RPC
Master Record Plan - Route 9 and Road 269A

Mike Lynn and Craig Hudson, developers, James Fuqua, attorney, and Jeff Clark of Land Tech were present as the Commission reviewed the master record plan for the Villages of Five Points residential planned community located east of Lewes at Five Points.

Mr. Abbott advised the Commission that the master plan references the 26 conditions of approval and the revisions required based on the conditions; that the master plan depicts how the project will be developed; and that each phase of the project will be subject to the review and approval of the Commission since the project is a residential planned community.

Mr. Clark advised the Commission that the master plan is very similar to the plan submitted at the public hearing; that 3 acres of the site has been dedicated to public use per the requirements of DelDOT and that this has reduced some of the lots in East Village to 7,500 square feet and created more open space.

Motion by Mr. Johnson, seconded by Mr. Wheatley, and carried unanimously to approve the master plan as submitted for recordation.

Subdivision #99-21--Wolfe Properties, Inc.
Time Extension

The Commission reviewed a request for a time extension for preliminary approval for Subdivision #99-21.

Mr. Abbott advised the Commission that this application received preliminary approval on October 28, 1999; that a request for a six month time extension was received on October 18, 2000 which was prior to the expiration date of the preliminary approval; that the request is made due to obtaining agency approvals; and that the Commission usually grants extensions in one year increments.

Motion by Mr. Gordy, seconded by Mr. Wheatley, and carried unanimously to approve a one-year time extension.

2001 Meeting Schedule

The Commission reviewed the proposed meeting schedule for the year 2001.

The Commission discussed the proposed dates; Mr. Allen questioned the dates in April and November and stated that he would like to see the April meeting dates on the 5th and 19th and the November dates on the 8th and 29th.

Motion by Mr. Wheatley, seconded by Mr. Lynch, and carried unanimously to approve the 2001 Meeting Schedule as amended.

VI. ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

Mr. Lank questioned the Commission if they would like to have a special meeting on November 16, 2000 for the purpose of reviewing site plans since there is a three-week layoff before the next meeting.

Mr. Gordy advised the Commission that he would not be able to attend a meeting on this date.

It was the consensus of the Commission to schedule a special meeting for November 16, 2000 to review site plans and other business items; and that no projects will be placed on the agenda that are located in Mr. Gordy's district.

Meeting adjourned at 10:15 P.M.