

**Minutes of the  
New Hanover County Planning Board  
February 5, 2009**

The New Hanover County Planning Board met Thursday, February 5, 2009 at 5:30 p.m. in the Assembly Room of the Historic County Courthouse, Wilmington, NC to hold a public meeting.

Planning Board Present:

Melissa Gott, Chair  
Richard Collier  
Sue Hayes  
Andy Heath  
Sandra Spiers  
Jay Williams  
Ken Wrangell

Staff Present:

Chris O'Keefe, Planning Director  
Sam Burgess, Principal Development Planner  
Jane Daughtride, Senior Planner  
Sharon Huffman, Assistant County Attorney

Jay Williams opened the meeting by welcoming the audience to the public hearing. Sam Burgess led the reciting of the *Pledge of Allegiance*.

Richard Collier made a motion to approve the January Planning Board meeting minutes; Melissa Gott seconded the motion. The Planning Board voted unanimously to approve the minutes.

**Item 1: Special Use Permit (S-13, 6/71; modification request 1/09) – Continued from January 8<sup>th</sup> meeting. Request by Shanklin & Nichols for Carolina Marina & Yacht Club (Tim Ward) for a major modification to an existing special use permit for a commercial marina in an R-15 Residential zoning district. The area is classified as Conservation on the 2006 CAMA Land Classification Map. The request is to allow a forklift pier approximately 190 feet long and 32 feet wide with approximately 185 foot long “T” drop zone and increase the capacity of boat storage from 41 to 81 boats on single level racks at 1512 Burnett Road. The applicant was asked to provide a site plan showing the details of his overall proposed operation.**

Jane Daughtride showed maps and photographs of the property and of the surrounding area. Ms. Daughtride provided information pertaining to land classification, access, level of service, zoning, and flood zones. Ms. Daughtride compared the approved 2005 plan to the revised February 2009 site plan. Ms. Daughtride explained that the revised February 2009 plan is substantially different than the plan submitted in January 2009 with the location of the land structures shifted but the pier elements and position remaining the same.

Chris O'Keefe stated the item is a continuation from the January meeting and provided the following revised findings of fact:

## Revised Preliminary Staff Findings

1. **The board must find that the modification will not materially endanger the public health or safety if located where proposed and developed according to the plan as submitted and approved.**
  - A. The subject property is located within the Myrtle Grove VFD.
  - B. Private water will be provided by an on-site well, and sewer is to be provided by Aqua, NC. **Sewer capacity to accommodate a marine pump-out for this location is not available to the applicant from Aqua, NC. Therefore, no pump-out is provided.**
  - C. All utilities will be underground.
  - D. The subject property is located in a 100-year floodplain VE zone.
  - E. The site is located in a Primary Nursery Area.
  - F. The site is located in SA shellfishing waters.
  - G. **Water depths are shallow in this area. At more than 150 feet off shore, mean low tide depths are only about 2.6 feet.**
  - H. **Proximity to Carolina Beach Inlet makes the area vulnerable to frequent shoaling and makes navigation more hazardous than in other waterway locations.**
  - I. **Applicant proposes that the “T” end of the dock will be wave attenuating construction, designed to reduce wake impacts in the drop zones.**
  - J. The site is located in an R-15 Residential Zoning District.
  - K. **The site is adjacent to a community beach access area for the Tucker-Burnett Subdivision to the north and single-family residential uses to the south and west.**
  - L. The site is approximately 2.9 acres in size with 240 feet of waterway frontage.
  - M. Access to the site is from Silver Ave. and Burnett Road, local streets that deliver traffic to Carolina Beach Road, a major arterial thoroughfare.
  - N. A Special Use Permit was issued in 1971 for expansion of an existing marina. The original site plan has been altered by administrative approvals over a long period of time. The current valid site plan was administratively approved in September of 2005.
  - O. This requested modification proposes elimination of the boat ramp, combination of the two piers shown on the September 2005 plan into one 24’ wide pier plus 8’ walkway, flaring to 42 feet wide with approximately 425 sq. ft. fuel attendant station and wave attenuating T-end of ~~195’~~ 185 feet. **The modification also proposes boat storage for 81 boats on racks (single layer) and addition of a maintenance shed of approximately 1160 sq. feet; shifting of the clubhouse out of the conservation overlay district; adding a 10 feet wide covered porch to the clubhouse, and increasing automobile parking for the clubhouse from 45 to 54 spaces.**
  - P. **No major boat repairs shall be performed on site.**
  - Q. The current valid site plan, administratively approved in September, 2005, shows a boat ramp with eight-foot wide by 215 foot long floating dock to the south, plus smaller floating docks north of the launch area of the ramp, and replacement of an existing four-foot wide by 190 foot long pier, plus addition of a ten-foot wide “T” end floating fuel dock approximately 70 feet long. The landward area consists of a clubhouse and parking area with 41 oversized parking spaces to accommodate boats on trailers, plus 45 standard spaces for the clubhouse.

**2. The Board must find that the modification meets all required conditions and specifications of the zoning ordinance.**

- A. The proposed location of the clubhouse facility **and maintenance building are** in a Special Flood Hazard Velocity zone, and must meet the elevation requirements set out in the flood code for such structures. No enclosures are allowed below flood elevation except under standards specified in the flood ordinance.
- B. ~~The location of the proposed clubhouse encroaches into the Conservation Overlay District. Applicant argues that exemption should apply because the original approval pre-dated inclusion of COD. However, the clubhouse has not been issued a building permit at this time and could be relocated outside the COD.~~ **Conservation Overlay District standards apply to this proposal.**
- C. **According to the Major Permits Coordinator for Coastal Management, the applicant's prior dredging proposal received objection from Marine Fisheries because of the primary nursery area impacts. A variance from the Division of Coastal Management would be required in order to dredge up to the ramp. The applicant wishes to eliminate the ramp and substantially expand the width of the existing pier in order to utilize a forklift for dropping of boats closer to the channel rather than launching from the ramp in to shallow water.**
- D. A marina requires a special use permit and site-specific site plan to operate in a residential district.
- E. **Explicit approval for dry stack storage at a marina in a residential district must be granted by a special use permit through the New Hanover County Board of Commissioners.**
- F. **Parking must meet the requirements of the current zoning ordinance for the combined range of uses of the property. The proposed plan depicts an increase in automobile parking from 45 to 54 standard spaces to serve the marina and clubhouse facilities. Pervious pavers are proposed.**
- G. **Uses within the clubhouse must be incidental to the operation of the marina.**
- H. **Buffering must meet the requirements of the current ordinance. The proposed plan shows a ~~10-ft.~~ 20 ft. buffer along property lines.**
- I. Night lighting must be contained on site per the ordinance.
- J. Stormwater permit will need to be reviewed **by both the County and the NC Division of Water Quality** ~~to determine if a new permit is needed based on proposed modification of impervious area to accommodate a forklift path.~~ **and new permits will need to be issued which reflect current state and local stormwater standards.**
- K. A new CAMA permit will be required if this proposal is approved by the county.
- L. **A new permit or site plan approval will rescind any and all prior approvals.**

**3. The Board must find that the modification will not substantially injure the value of adjoining or abutting property or that the use is a public necessity.**

- A. Marinas in Residential zoning districts require special use permits in order to evaluate and mitigate potential negative impacts on surrounding residential quality of life.
- B. The applicant intends to deliver boats to the water via a forklift. The use of a forklift was

authorized by the Board of Adjustment in January, 2007 (ZBA-793).

- C. Widening the pier structure will facilitate use of a forklift to drop boats in deeper water.
- D. Delivery of boats to the water via forklift is most often associated with dry stack storage of boats. **The applicant is not requesting to stack boats. This proposal includes allowance of rack storage for up to 81 boats in a single layer that roughly approximates a boat on a trailer, and storage is restricted to the area marked for boat storage.**
- E. Stacked storage of boats, on any sort of racks or structures, is not part of the approved site plan for S-13 (1971). The 1971 minutes of approval couched parking within the context of “larger parking spaces for cars with boat trailers.” **Allowance of single layer racks for boat storage will replace parking of boats on trailers in any designated parking area.**
- F. Applicant has formerly made application for approval of dry stack storage of boats, and was most recently denied by County Commissioners on July 7, 2008. An appeal of that decision has been filed in Superior Court but has not been calendared.
- G. ~~The applicant is not requesting approval of dry stack storage of boats as an accessory for this marina.~~
- H. Boating is not a public necessity, but increased public access to the water is an important goal in coastal counties. **This proposal promotes expanded access to the water as a private enterprise.**

**4. The Board must find that the location and character of the use if modified according to the plan as submitted and approved will be in harmony with the area in which it is to be located and in general conformity with the plan of development for New Hanover County.**

- A. The New Hanover County Comprehensive Plan classifies the site as Conservation. The purpose of the class is to provide for effective long-term management and protection of significant, limited, or irreplaceable natural resources while also protecting the rights of the property owner. Water-dependent uses are appropriate.
- B. With limited exceptions, the 2006 CAMA Land Use Plan prohibits dredging in a primary nursery areas and open shellfishing waters; therefore, removal of the boat ramp would be in harmony with the area and consistent with the land use plan.
- C. The immediate surrounding area is populated with residential uses. An industrial style forklift pier adjacent to the residential and neighborhood recreational uses may be incompatible with the character and harmony of the area in which it is located.

Staff Comments:

*After the January continuance, instruction was sent to petitioner for additions and clarifications to the site plan. A significantly revised site plan has been submitted in response to that letter, representing the applicant’s attempt to address each issue. As a reminder, the following thoughts were applied.*

1. Re-opening the existing special use permit allows for a whole case review, **including addition of conditions on undeveloped portions of the project.** For example, impervious limits by today's stormwater rules and imposition of setbacks to meet Conservation Overlay District requirements could be applied as conditions. Staff feels that these standards should be required for any improvements not currently in place in order to reduce negative environmental impacts and to bring the project into compliance with modern standards.
2. **If approved, the order should clearly specify all desired conditions and clarifications, most especially the issue of on-site boat storage and the idea of stacking boats, whether enclosed or unenclosed.** This project has been contentious with the neighborhood for many years, and there has been a long history of proposed use modifications which would change the character of the project to industrial or higher intensity commercial use in this residential neighborhood. Since the history of the project has been contentious and speculatively debated through the years, staff feels that **clearly establishing the details and intent of approval would be an important step to resolve matters and create predictability for all parties,** including any potential future modification requests, staff interpretations, or appeals to the Board of Adjustments.
3. Zoning enforcement staff has expressed a desire for a **clarification as to the county's position on use of the clubhouse for sit-down food service for members only versus the general public.** A condition on the 1971 approval requires that "sales and services connected with the operation of the club facility shall be incidental to the marina's operation." To date the interpretation has been that the clubhouse is a private club associated with the marina, and food service would only be allowed for members and their invited guests.
4. Acknowledgement of all conditions should be added to the notes on the site plan.

*Based on the revised site plan, STAFF RECOMMENDS the following additional conditions and clarifications if the modification is approved:*

1. ***Parking or storage of boats will not take place in the "Customer Parking Area."*** (Making clear the condition that boats will not be located in the parking area associated with the clubhouse.)
2. ***A building permit for the approved pier must be issued within 24 months of approval or S-13 shall expire in its entirety and shall be void and of no effect.*** (This note was not included as requested. **If the permit is reapproved under a whole-case review, a new time clock starts for accomplishing the development.** Since this proposal has lingered for many years without substantial progress, it seems appropriate to set a benchmark for keeping the new permit approval valid. Acquiring a building permit for the enhanced pier within the normal 24-month period would be a reasonable expectation.)

Sue Hayes asked why this item was being presented to the Planning Board if the issue of dry stack storage is being appealed before Superior Court.

Matt Nichols, an attorney representing the applicant Carolina Marina and Yacht Club provided a PowerPoint presentation that outlined the proposed modifications to the waterward structures including: modify northern CAMA approved pier; add small pathway to pier; eliminate boat ramp; eliminate southern pier; and improve floating docks.

Mr. Nichols then outlined the significant plan changes to the landward site plan elements since the January 2009 Planning Board meeting including: eliminating the potential for multi-level dry stacking of boats; removing the approved clubhouse from the 75 foot conservation overlay district; clearly defining the maximum number permitted boats, 81; boat storage area clearly identified; greater distance between boat storage area and both adjacent properties; specific limitations on use of forklift; major boat repairs prohibited on site; limitations on use of clubhouse facility; and hours of operation clearly identified on site plan.

Mr. Nichols compared various elements of the approved plan to the proposed plan to illustrate the additional restrictions that his client was agreeing to and the degree of oversight that the County would have over the project.

John Tinney, Wilmington resident spoke in opposition to the proposal stating that a marina was established next to his house and he was forced to move away because of the noise. Mr. Tinney stated that he spent a great sum of money on lawyers trying to enforce the noise regulations but it was to no avail.

David Ward, an adjacent property resident, spoke in opposition to the item and distributed photos of boats and water depth information to the Planning Board. Mr. Ward brought in a pole to illustrate the height of the boats that will be stored at the proposed marina; the pole was the same height as Violet Ward's house. Mr. Ward stated that the original special use permit should have been invalidated 35 years ago; that the proposal will ruin the enjoyment of the neighborhood homeowners' beach lot; the proposal will force the closure of the shellfishing area; the proposal will make it unsafe to swim due to speeding boaters and fuel. Mr. Ward stated that the lots are very narrow and that the proposed parking lot would be only 20 feet from his mother, Violet Ward's home. Mr. Ward stated that buffering will not be effective and reiterated Mr. Tinney's statement that once a marina is established, noise is virtually impossible to regulate. Mr. Ward added that the proposed marina will diminish the value of his home and make it very difficult to sell his home.

Pat Wall, Burnett Road resident spoke in opposition to the item stating that the proposal is not in harmony and not compatible with the neighborhood. Ms. Wall stated that the pier is too large and compared it to Kure Beach fishing pier. Ms. Wall stated that the proposed fuel docks are dangerous because a barge could easily hit the end of the pier with the fuel docks and contaminate the water. Ms. Wall stated that the noise generated by the forklift would be significantly amplified because of the water. Ms. Wall added that their property value will be destroyed because of the marina.

David Ward further stated that the fuel tanks associated with the proposal would be a hazard to the environment, swimmers, and for boats navigating through a busy channel that lacks wake control. Mr. Ward stated that the proposal would be unsightly and diminish their property values. Mr. Ward stated that the project is not in harmony with their neighborhood.

Matt Nichols, an attorney representing the applicant, Carolina Marina and Yacht Club addressed the neighborhood residents' concerns during the rebuttal period. Mr. Nichols that the proposal eliminates dredging by eliminating the boat ramp; eliminates dry stack storage completely; significantly limits boat repairs; restricts the clubhouse hours of operation and have indicated the hours on the site plan; restricts the use of the clubhouse; greatly reduces the number of boat trailers traversing down Burnett Road; complies with the COD 75 foot setback; eliminates all wet slips; and that the building height does not exceed allowable limits.

Tim Ward distributed a document to the Planning Board which stated that the decibel level of the proposed forklift would not exceed county noise codes. Mr. Ward stated that his proposal satisfies almost all of the conditions required or suggested by staff and the Planning Board. Mr. Ward also stated his opinion that this proposal represents a significant compromise from what he is currently approved to build. Mr. Ward stated that his research indicated that no more than 25% of the members would be likely to come to the marina at a given time so that 20 vehicles would be the most traffic Burnett Road would experience.

David Ward stated in his rebuttal that the original special use permit (1971) and the modified and approved plan (2005) show a line demarcating the front of the lot which was intended for residential uses, from the back of the lot, which was intended for the marina. Mr. Ward also stated that Silver Avenue cannot be connected to Carolina Beach Road because of wetlands. Mr. Ward stated that the fuel station will be a safety hazard and the potential for fuel spills will be hazardous to the environment. Mr. Ward noted that the photos he submitted illustrate that the water depths are less than a foot deep where the proposed dock and fuel station is to be located.

Pat Wall stated in the rebuttal period that the proposal is much too large for their small neighborhood and is not compatible and not in harmony with their neighborhood.

Sue Hayes stated that she has serious reservations about the proposed plans and that it does not appear to be in harmony with the neighborhood. Ms. Hayes recognized that Tim Ward had made numerous changes to the plan but that she felt it is not a good place for the project. Ms. Hayes stated that she intended to vote against the project.

Richard Collier stated that he does not believe that the project is in harmony with the neighborhood and probably never will be. Mr. Collier stated that the current proposed plan is much better than the September 2005 approved plan or any previously proposed plans. Mr. Collier stated that the applicant has modified his plan to accommodate the Planning Board's recommendations. Mr. Collier stated that the proposed plan meets the minimum criteria of the County; meets the intent of the ordinances; the project does have a CAMA permit and any amendment to the permit would likely be granted (whether it's a slip through of CAMA's rules

and regulations Mr. Collier could not comment upon); and a stormwater permit has been obtained.

Ken Wrangell stated that the January 2009 plan was closer in scope to the approved September 2005 plan and that he felt at the end of the January Planning Board meeting, that progress was being made in achieving an acceptable plan. Mr. Wrangell stated that the applicant's February 2009 site plan is a great plan by itself; but given the surrounding area, the plan completely encompasses a piece of land and makes it so overbearing on the existing development. For these reasons, Mr. Wrangell was not comfortable with the plan and did not think he could support the plan.

Sandra Spiers asked the applicant what size boats could the forklift accommodate and whether the dock could withstand the same weight.

Tim Ward stated that he is pricing forklifts that can lift between 15,000 to 20,000 pounds. Mr. Ward added that he currently is housing a 32 foot Boston Whaler at the pier.

Sandra Spiers stated that this is a very difficult decision to make because the Board is trying to satisfy all parties involved. Ms. Spiers asked Tim Ward to elaborate on how boats would be launched using the approved September 2005 plan.

Tim Ward explained that to launch boats using the September 2005 approved plan, he would either need to obtain a variance to dredge or he would launch boats during high tide and during low tide he would need to trailer the boats to another facility to launch.

Tim Ward responded to Mr. Wrangell's previous comment and stated that the proposed site plan was shifted back from the water (closer to the neighborhood) to accommodate for the 75 foot COD setback. Mr. Ward stated that he shifted the plan per staff's request but was comfortable with the plan prior to the change as long as he could store 81 boats.

Sandra Spiers asked Tim Ward what were his intentions for the 4,500 square foot clubhouse.

Tim Ward stated that the second floor might be used for office space; the first level would accommodate approximately 57 seats in a snack bar setting; and the third floor would be for his office. Mr. Ward stated that the site plan included those details.

Richard Collier asked staff to elaborate on the process of rescinding all of the previously approved special use permit site plans (S-13).

Jane Daughtridge stated that the 1971 plan is already voided by the September 2005 plan and that the September 2005 plan is the only valid plan to date.

Chris O'Keefe added that it is important to highlight that the 2005 plan replaced and dissolved the 1971 plan and that this plan, if approved, would replace the 2005 plan, so if in 24 months, construction is not underway on the approved plan, then the approved plan will be revoked.

Andy Heath asked the applicant if the proposed site plan included wet slips.

Tim Ward stated that the current and 2005 approved plan shows no more than ten non-permanent wetslips (tie-ups only).

Jay Williams stated the applicant has made every effort to accommodate the Planning Board's suggestions; that the February 2009 plan is better than the January 2009 plan; and that the applicant has made every effort to mitigate noise and adverse impacts. Mr. Williams stated that he believes that the project is not appropriate for the neighborhood and to approve it would set a terrible precedent and that the Board would not be able to deny another similar application without being arbitrary. Mr. Williams stated that he would have to vote against it.

Melissa Gott stated that she is concerned with the approved 2005 plan and that the February 2009 plan is more harmonious and that she would be more comfortable with the applicant constructing the February 2009 plan rather than the September 2005 plan.

Jay Williams stated that the September 2005 plan is probably not feasible given the water depths; financial impracticability of shuttling; and the difficulty of receiving a variance from CAMA to dredge.

Sue Hayes made a motion to recommend denial of the item based on incompatibility with the neighborhood.

Andy Heath seconded the motion.

The Planning Board voted 4-3 (Collier, Gott, and Spiers) to recommend denial of the special use permit.

**Item 2: Conditional Rezoning (Z-893, 2/09) – Request by Phillips Properties for a conditional district rezoning from R-15 to CD(B-1) Conditional Neighborhood Business District to allow for mixed use of approximately 12,000 sq. ft. of commercial space and a 168-unit apartment community at 7022 Market Street near the intersection of Market St. and Military Cutoff Rd. The area is classified as Watershed Resource Protection on the 2006 CAMA Land Classification Map. The project proposes to utilize exceptional design in order to exceed 2.5 units per acre.**

Jimmy Fentress, an engineer with Stroud Engineering representing the applicant Phillips Properties requested a continuance until the next Planning Board meeting because of outstanding issues which were identified during a Technical Review Committee meeting and because of uncertainties given the Market Street Corridor Study Plan. Mr. Fentress stated that one of the issues to examine is additional access.

Melissa Gott made a motion to recommend that the item be continued until the next Planning Board meeting; Richard Collier seconded the motion. The Planning Board unanimously voted to continue the item until the next Planning Board meeting.

Sam Burgess provided an update of the Technical Review Committee's (TRC) activity for the month of January.

1. **Anchor's Bend** – The TRC voted 5-0 to approve the second preliminary extension for one year with all terms and conditions remaining in effect. The project contains 205 units that will be served by public water and sewer.
2. **Pages Creek** – The TRC did not vote on the project because it does not involve a subdivision but did raise the following concerns on the 168 unit mixed use project:
  - a. Ingress and egress from Prospect Cemetery Road presented problems for future residents wanting to execute a left turn from Military Cut Off or Market Street. During vehicular peak hour periods, access would be problematic at either road due to traffic stacking issues.
  - b. Co. Fire Services expressed concerns with adequate access for emergency service vehicles coming through Prospect Cemetery Road to the project. The alley or driveway that runs from the project to Market Street can't be used due to existing parking and the width of the driveway. Concern was also expressed if a funeral was being held at the cemetery with vehicles parked along the road.
  - c. Concerns were raised about how stormwater on site would be handled in conjunction with the project being an "exceptional designed mixed use development. Several soils are marginal.
  - d. Underground utilities that may cross Prospect Cemetery Road may be compromised by heavy equipment such as an emergency service vehicle or fire pumper truck.
  - e. With the types of soils existing on site, it was questionable whether many of the Low Impact Development Techniques could be utilized.
  - f. The question was raised whether Prospect Cemetery Road was a collector Road for use in a high density project. Presently, the most right of way that can be obtained is 30' with 24' of pavement width. Collector roads need at least a 50' right of way.
  - g. A number of significant and regulated trees (11) are scattered through-out the development. Every effort should be made to save most of the trees.
  - h. The dumpster located in respect to the apartment complex needs to be shown on the map.
3. **Royal Palms Condo Complex** - The TRC reviewed and evaluated the 397 unit condo complex project but did not vote on the project but will offer concerns to the Planning Board when the petitioner files a Special Use Permit:
  - a. The project at the present time does not have sewer capacity according to the CFPUA. Capacity may be available in 2012.
  - b. The water system will need to be upgraded according to the CFPUA.
  - a. The number of residential units per building needs to be specified to confirm that the proposed density in each of the two zoning districts is appropriate.
  - b. The road connection between the project and Normandy Drive will need to be built prior to final plat approval.

- c. A revised NCDOT Driveway Permit will be required prior to final plat approval. Although in 2006 it had been determined that a TIA would not be required for the subdivision review process, the special use process requires a TIA for projects that generate 100 peak hour trips. At this point, the site plan should show a calculation of peak hour traffic or existing development compared to peak hour traffic for the proposed development.
  - c. A fire lane along the Northern property line of the project may be required.
  - a. A final plat displaying a subdivision of each unit will be remanded back to TRC for review and approval.
4. **Mass Avenue at West Bay** – The TRC voted 5-0 to deny the project for 23 lots because it is a part of the proposed Military Cut Extension corridor and presently the Military Cut-Off extension is under environmental review and right of way acquisition is set for 2012.
  5. **Parson’s Mill Farms** – The TRC voted 4-1 to redesignate the roads from public to private. One condition of approval is that the project meet any new Private Road criteria adopted by a newly formed Task Force to examine the private road situation.
  6. **Private Roads** - The County’s TRC developed a Task Force at their regular meeting on January 28, 2009 to examine the private road issue and produce recommendations to the TRC and Planning Board within several months. The ad hoc committee will consist of the following members:

Richard Collier	Tyler Newman, BASE
Sam Burgess	Anthony Law
Anthony Prinz	Chris O’Keefe
Jim Iannucci	John Tunstall
Sharon Huffman	Matt Davis

Sam Burgess stated that the TRC will meet next on Wednesday February 11, 2009.

Jane Daughtridge stated that County staff is in the process of cleaning-up and updating the zoning ordinance. Ms. Daughtridge stated that in the next six to eight months, text amendments will be introduced to the Planning Board.

Jay Williams provided some suggestions for the zoning ordinance update process.

Sue Hayes asked if staff could send a schedule of what sections of the ordinance were being reviewed.

The Planning Board and Planning Staff discussed whether to hold workshops regarding the updates and the inclusion of stakeholder groups.

Chris O’Keefe announced that there would be public meetings to learn about the Market Street Corridor Study Plan on February 18 & 19, 2009.

Chris O'Keefe also stated that Planning Staff is currently reviewing the county's small area plans to determine if the plan goals were implemented, were effective, and whether the plans need to be updated.

The Planning Board adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

---

Chris O'Keefe, Planning Director