



Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
September 11, 2012 1:30 P.M.
MINUTES

September 11, 2012 MPC Planning Meeting

Members Present: J. Adam Ragsdale, Chairman
Jon Pannell, Vice-Chairman
Ellis Cook, Secretary
Tanya Milton, Treasurer
Shedrick Coleman
Ben Farmer
Timothy Mackey
Lacy Manigault
Murray Marshall
Susan Myers
Rochelle Small-Toney
Joseph Welch

Members Not Present: Russ Abolt
Stephen Lufburrow

Staff Present: Thomas Thomson, P.E. AICP, Executive Director
Melony West, Finance and Systems Director
Charlotte Moore, Director, Special Projects
Amanda Bunce, Development Services Planner
Christy Adams, Director, Administration
Bri Finau, Administrative Assistant

Advisory Staff Present: Geoff Goins, City Zoning Administrator

I. Call to Order and Welcome

II. Notices, Proclamations and Acknowledgements

Notice(s)

1. [September 19, 2012 MPC Finance Committee Meeting at 11:30 AM in the West](#)

Conference Room, 110 East State Street.

2. September 19, 2012 Regular MPC Meeting at 1:30 P.M. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, 112 E. State Street.

Mr. Pannell announced that due to his moving outside of the city limits, the mayor has asked him to resign from the MPC Board as a city appointee. He is complying with that request.

Mr. Pannell left the meeting.

III. Consent Agenda

3. July 31, 2012 MPC Planning Meeting Minutes

Attachment: 07.31.12 PLANNING MEETING MINUTES.pdf

Board Action:

Recommend **APPROVAL** of the MPC Planning Meeting Minutes as submitted. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Shedrick Coleman

Second: Ellis Cook

Russ Abolt - Not Present

Shedrick Coleman - Aye

Ellis Cook - Aye

Ben Farmer - Aye

Stephen Lufburrow - Not Present

Timothy Mackey - Aye

Lacy Manigault - Aye

Murray Marshall - Aye

Tanya Milton - Not Present

Susan Myers - Aye

Jon Pannell - Not Present

Adam Ragsdale - Aye

Rochelle Small-Toney - Aye

Joseph Welch - Aye

IV. Regular Business

4. Continue Review of UZO Draft 2 - See attached memo

Attachment: August 14 Review_120809.pdf

Ms. Moore: Introduced Article 5, base zoning districts. An overview was done previously, but will be done again in event of questions. Basically, the district standards and development standards, as well as any district-wide standards will be reviewed. The uses will not be reviewed at this meeting; it will take more time. Therefore, it is being separated from the development standards and the intent of these districts.

There are approximately 40 base districts to cover 99% of all parcels within the county. The other districts will be Planned Districts and a Military Installation District for Hunter Army Air Field.

Ms. Myers: Where would we find the district abbreviations?

Ms. Bunce: Showed her Sec. 5.1 and told her that it had been corrected.

Conservation Districts

Ms. Bunce: Began review, referencing a PowerPoint presentation. She explained the Conservation district abbreviations: Conservation districts are the "C" districts; Conservation Marsh, "C-M"; and, Conservation Park, "C-P". These districts cover areas that are primarily marsh and hammock properties that have been purchased through the FEMA Buy-Out Program, historic cemeteries and some parks. She emphasized that the slide represented the typical conversion from the current to the proposed zoning districts and that some current districts could change to more than one proposed zoning district. "C-A" zoning now does not mean it will be listed as "conservation" in the UZO; some will be listed as "agricultural" zoning, depending upon character and location of the property. "C-M" almost always stays as "C-M", and conservation recreation mostly converts to Conservation Park. The Blue Sky Property off of Fort Argyle Road is an example of a Conservation district. Daffin Park is to be zoned Conservation Park.

Mr. Ragsdale: Will all public parks be C-P?

Ms. Bunce: Generally, they will be. Small pocket parks, like Chatham Crescent, would be incorporated into the surrounding residential zoning district. The C-P district is typically for larger parks.

Ms. Small-Toney: What about the squares?

Ms. Bunce: Squares will have the zoning of the surrounding area. That keeps the maps easier to look at. The concern was with the larger parks.

Mr. Ragsdale: Are squares real property or right-of-way?

Ms. Bunce: Real property owned by the city. Switched to draft and asked if anyone had any questions.

Mr. Ragsdale: Any questions? [There were none.]

Ms. Milton arrived around this time.

Agricultural Districts

Ms. Bunce: Gave an overview of the only agricultural district, A-1, that was proposed. It is intended for the more rural areas, mostly in west Chatham. It allows for a bit more variety. C-A and R-A could convert to A-1. It will allow for single family uses, some non-residential uses, churches, and any type of agricultural use. Showed example of property off of Buckhalter Road; usually larger,

underdeveloped areas.

Mr. Ragsdale: Any questions? [None.]

Mr. Mackey left around this time.

Residential Single-family Districts

Ms. Bunce: The proposed changes add more flexibility. There are six districts proposed, which the major difference is the minimum lot size required: from 5,000 square foot lots to one acre. Single-family detached is the only housing type permitted, but there are a few non-residential uses: parks, churches, and things commonly found in the residential zoning districts in the current ordinances. The district name includes a number which changes with minimum lot size, with the exception of RSF-E, which requires minimum of one acre. Currently there is a gap in the city from 20,000 square feet minimum to two acres; there is no middle ground.

Mr. Farmer: Asked about purpose statements.

Mr. Ragsdale: Asked about the RSF-5...why a district less than 6,000 square feet?

Ms. Bunce: There has been a frequency of variance requests for smaller lot sizes. The district reflects the desire of developers.

Mr. Ragsdale: What about small lot option for New Hampstead?

Ms. Bunce: The small lot standards that were developed for the New Hampstead PUD will remain unique to that development. Those standards were useful as a reference when we were developing the base districts for UZO.

Mr. Marshall: So if you wanted to do something similar to that, you'd have to go through the elaborate process of rezoning like New Hampstead?

Ms. Bunce: Other base districts will likely address, but P-D will also be an option for development that cannot be addressed by a base district.

Mr. Marshall: What about a smaller lot size than 5,000 square feet?

Ms. Bunce: Showed the RSF-5 district and the ability to go down to 4,000 square feet if the property is located on an open lane. A reduced lot size in RSF-6 doesn't work for some neighborhoods because of the development character. The front yard setback has been reduced from 25 feet to 20 feet. Also, increased building coverage to 40%, in the city, it is currently 30% maximum.

Mr. Farmer: The decision to reduce from 25 feet to 20 feet, what is the basis of that request? Was that from the homeowner's request? What about the sidewalk?

Ms. Bunce: The setback is measured from the property line; the sidewalk is in the right-of-way and not within the setback. Therefore cars in the driveway should not overhang the sidewalk. The property line starts on the other side of the sidewalk. The reduced setback gives more flexibility in placing a house on a lot.

Mr. Ragsdale: Are there any accommodations for build-to lines?

Ms. Bunce: Yes, but they exist in some of the Downtown districts. We have decided to stay with minimum setbacks, especially in the Residential districts.

Mr. Ragsdale: So, if someone wants to do a traditional neighborhood development, they'd have to go through a P-D process?

Ms. Bunce: Yes.

Mr. Thomson: This is just one grouping of residential zoning with different standards associated with each.

Ms. Bunce: Mentioned that this is just for RSF districts. Cluster development standards as an alternative to a P-D have been developed, in which the density stays the same but allows a reduced lot size and reduced setback in exchange for a percentage of open space. That may be an option without having to go through the planned development. It is in Section 8.10, which will be addressed in coming meetings.

Ms. Bunce: RSF-5 helped us to correct some of the lot size issues with older neighborhoods and allows us to classify them as conforming.

Ms. Myers: In Ardsley, are we going to let them do the carriage houses?

Ms. Bunce: We have proposed to do that and will talk about it in Section. 8.7. Most RSF districts are nomenclature changes.

Ms. Myers: What about Thomas Square?

Ms. Bunce: It will stay as it is. It's a traditional district that will be addressed shortly.

Residential Two-Family Districts

Ms. Bunce: Gave a brief overview. It is somewhat similar to the R-2 district in the county. Single-family detached and attached lot sizes are allowed. Several districts allow this currently. the density depends on the housing type. It has been proposed that rooming houses not be permitted.

Mr. Ragsdale: Townhouses are not permitted, per page 5-30?

Ms. Bunce: That is correct in the RTF district. You could do semi-attached in this district.

Ms. Myers: What about the houses going in around the Abercorn and 63rd street area?

Ms. Bunce: That would need a multi-family district; it is a series of row houses.

Mr. Ragsdale: Is that R-6 now?

Ms. Bunce: No, its RM-25 or 40.

Ms. Bunce: RTF permits a reduced lot size if there is lane access.

Residential Multi-family Districts

Ms. Bunce: Three RMF districts are proposed. They increase in intensity from RMF-1 to RMF-3. RMF-1, all of the housing types with the exception of three-four family and apartments are permitted. RMF-2 allows all of the housing types. RMF-3 allows all except for single-family detached because we introduced more non-residential uses that may not be compatible with a single-family type

neighborhood. Explained that single family is not permitted in RMF-3 because more non-residential uses are permitted.

Ms. Milton: I want to talk about older neighborhoods and areas where carriage houses are permitted. Can additions be done due to being grandfathered?

Ms. Bunce: Standards are being proposed to allow that; it's very restrictive currently in both the county and city where allowed. Reiterated that this an accessory use and discussed some of the conditions that would come with it in certain areas. It will be discussed further in Article 8.

Mr. Marshall: What is the rationale for not allowing the single-family in the RMF-3? Is flexibility being allowed as opposed to creating a hybrid?

Ms. Bunce: What is happening on an adjacent area needs to be considered. Some felt that single-family detached becomes less appropriate as the intensity of the permitted uses increases in a district. Staff will re-examine whether that use should be permitted in the district.

Mr. Marshall: If it's outside the bounds of RMF-3, he stated he does not understand; it's not impacted by this. He stated it does not make sense to him.

Ms. Bunce: She stated we need to prepare more on that and come back to you. With the current ordinance, it is difficult to calculate density based on number of bedrooms for certain districts. The UZO's approach is simpler.

Mr. Marshall: Rooming houses is one of the places where bedrooms become the creator of the problem. That needs to be a specific use with its own code and not allowed in all the others.

Ms. Bunce: We have addressed that and will continue to develop. What we have looked at are standards for the rooming house use including a certain amount of square footage per bedroom or by residence to address the density issue so it is compatible with the area it is in. Bedrooms are the issue for the use. RMF-1 is typically the less-dense areas; they don't need a wide variety of uses. RMF-3 allows uses like a retirement center.

Ms. Bunce: Spoke of coming back to that to provide a better answer.

Mr. Ragsdale: What is the RMF-2 in photo?

Ms. Bunce: An area along Abercorn near Lowe's.

Mr. Marshall: Is that area of the rezoning for the Konter property?

Ms. Bunce: It's the Holland Drive/Abercorn Area. Yes, Mr. Konter's property that was recently recommended to be rezoned is included in the RMF-2 district on the UZO zoning map.

Ms. Milton: What about the area that is left out in the middle of the RMF-2?

Ms. Bunce: Those properties are proposed to be OI, and are the post office and a hotel.

Ms. Milton: Is it an extended stay hotel?

Ms. Bunce: Yes.

Residential Manufactured Home Parks

Ms. Bunce: This is quite similar to the R-M-H districts found in the city and county. The purpose is

for mobile home parks, not necessarily for areas with manufactured homes on fee-simple lots. There is a proposed minimum lot size of five acres. The density is similar to what's permitted now. The city and county have separate manufactured home ordinances outside of the zoning ordinance. We have worked with County Building and Regulatory Services, Engineering and City Development Services to update and to put zoning-related items in the zoning ordinance.

Mr. Ragsdale: Didn't we talk about going away from the gross versus net calculations? Or was that only regarding building square footage?

Ms. Bunce: No, all density will be measured gross in land area; net goes completely away for all districts.

Mr. Marshall: How does ten to eleven units per acre match up with what we have in mobile home districts?

Ms. Bunce: It's consistent. We've proposed a minimum lot area per unit or home.

Mr. Marshall: It seems that some existing mobile home parks are much denser.

Ms. Bunce: We could review a couple to estimate the actual density and compare that to what we've proposed.

Ms. Small-Toney: There are a few off of Pennsylvania, around Hunter...

Ms. Bunce: There are some areas where they aren't permitted now and they would remain nonconforming, such as in the Tremont Area. This district is intended to apply to the conforming parks. We can double-check and do an estimation of the density to make sure what we are proposing would not make them non-conforming. We have improved some of the use standards in Section 5.11 to address appearance.

Mr. Marshall: If we develop zoning that is encouraging, there would be more mobile home development. They are a good feeder for starter homes and competitor for the stick starter home because you can move it to a bigger lot of land. I don't think that we're making density attractive to fill the need. If it discourages developers from using it, they will go elsewhere.

Ms. Milton: Are we looking at zoning mobile home parks in the city to go away? Like Ogeechee and Stiles?

Ms. Bunce: Not if they are zoned for that now. We can look those sites.

Ms. Milton: They've been there forever.

Ms. Bunce: If they are zoned for it now, it's likely that we are carrying over. If it's non-conforming, more than likely, we've not made them non-conforming.

Traditional Residential Districts:

Ms. Bunce: Showed map of the target areas are for these districts. Upwards to 80% of lots are nonconforming. Identified the Comprehensive Plan elements that support these districts. We looked at each of these neighborhoods to make sure they were given an appropriate zoning district that would allow the typical uses and lot sizes for those neighborhoods to be conforming. There were a lot of R-M and R-4 areas that will convert to one of the three T-R districts. Non-conforming commercial buildings are spotted throughout the districts on corners; for those we are proposing the TN-3 zoning district.

Ms. Myers: Are we going to allow for future development of commercial buildings on corner lots?

Ms. Bunce: They'd have to be rezoned. We've taken what is existing today; we haven't given TN-3 to anything that isn't existing commercial. TN-3 would be something available in these neighborhoods for them to request.

Mr. Marshall: Didn't we talk about this a few months ago with Thomas Square? Unless they were built initially as a commercial use, they were prohibited from being commercial use.

Ms. Bunce: In the TN-2 districts, in certain circumstances they can take advantage of the TC-1 district uses if they were on a certain corner on certain streets.

Mr. Thomson: Typically, in the Mid-town zoning district, if you're a corner lot on the first floor, you can have a non-residential use. If you are TN-2, on a corner and a purpose-built commercial building, you can get some TC-1 uses.

Ms. Bunce: And if you meet a whole list of conditions.

Ms. Myers: Some of them would be living quarters upstairs and commercial downstairs is okay?

Ms. Bunce: Yes. Some uses were removed.

Ms. Small-Toney: Transitional homes for offenders, is that a consideration to remove also from TR areas?

Ms. Moore: Confirmed that they are not permitted in TR.

Ms. Bunce: Showed photo of a typical development that is allowed under current zoning. Went through other slides. Some lots will remain non-conforming due to lot size; some have 25 foot lot widths. The use is conforming but the structure is nonconforming because it doesn't meet the development standards.

Mr. Marshall: The existing neighborhoods in which the zoning is trying to be straightened out... parking requirements when you get away from single-family houses...the size doesn't allow for the required parking...can't find anyone to afford to fix it up existing units. Is that being addressed?

Ms. Bunce: That was not addressed except for parking in the central business district of downtown, and the parking reduction areas for the Victorian District and the Thomas Square Streetcar area and a separate parking reduction for specific uses. Outside of that, there have not been proposed reductions in parking.

Mr. Marshall: I think it needs to be looked at because there is a lot of housing stock that is suffering because you can't afford to find someone to pay the rent to support the cost to fix it up as a single-family or duplex.

Ms. Myers: Could we give someone special permission rather than grant a reduction to the whole area?

Ms. Marshall: That would be an improvement but it would be a burden to staff and developers to not have blanket availability.

Ms. Bunce: Availability of on-street parking would be needed in those areas; don't want to exacerbate complaints from residents of too much parking on streets.

Mr. Marshall: I am not proposing that it needs to go to zero. There needs to be some flexibility; right now, you have to conform to new construction parking requirement is for duplex, tri-plex, or quadraplex.

Mr. Ragsdale: Let's make this a follow-up.

Ms. Bunce: Any suggestions for areas where this would be appropriate?

Mr. Marshall: Wheaton Street, south on the west side of the Truman Parkway, from the railroad track to the Truman Parkway. Huge areas of nice housing stock just sitting. It's zoned to do a quadraplex but you can't meet the parking.

Mr. Cook: Couldn't you ask for a parking variance on a case-by-case basis?

Mr. Ragsdale: We're trying to eliminate the need for variances; to reduce the burden on the individual.

Mr. Coleman: Good observation. The best places for this are the TR-2 and TR-3; that parking has always been what it was. TR-1 is heavier; those neighborhoods that didn't have parking, why push them up to some other standard that don't have any room to put in parking. It would be a hindrance to the neighborhoods being revitalized properly. Looking at what's happening in the city with these neighborhoods identified here, the opportunities are definitely in TR-2 and -3 and maybe how you allow three and four-family in TR-1 is a possibility. That's a starting point.

Mid-City

Ms. Moore: Slight edits to what was approved in 2005.

Mr. Ragsdale: Recommend to remove the word 'gross' to avoid confusion regarding gross or net.

Mr. Marshall: To leave it out, it could be challenged, pending upon the benefit of the challenger. Keep the reference to gross.

Mr. Farmer: Regarding vehicle repair, what about vehicles that have to be left overnight? Or what about places like AutoZone where people fix their car in the parking lot; how much is that allowed?

Ms. Moore: There shouldn't be any outdoor repairs done in the parking lot.

Mr. Farmer: Pep Boys has a designated spot in the back or the side, but Autozone will do it right in the parking lot.

Mr. Coleman: When it comes to vehicle repair, the building code and electrical code gives good direction as to what is allowed minor versus major to align the codes.

Mr. Manigault: There are auto places that don't have space to do a minor fix in a "Designated place". Sometimes it only takes a few minutes to do the repair. To put a restriction on that would be negative for those businesses.

Ms. Small-Toney: Is there anything to address the areas where people are selling goods from their trunks or set up on corners?

Ms. Moore: Yes, that's a temporary use. There is a permitting requirement and it is covered in UZO.

Mr. Welch: Vehicles are being displayed in the street on city street parallel Abercorn in front of J. C.

Lewis, which is problematic. How is that enforced?

Ms. Small-Toney: City Manager has noted concern.

Mr. Farmer: What if the cars are not in the street but displayed within the right-of-way?

Ms. Moore: That would be for City and County to enforce, not for zoning.

Mr. Marshall: Council passed ordinance to prevent sales in right-of-way.

Victorian District

Ms. Moore: Summarized proposed edits. The mid-city districts from 2005 are being used as a model for this area. Revisions were made based on the character of the area. Pointed out that mixed use isn't currently permitted in the Victorian District. That will be fixed. The density is from 25 to 60 units per acre permitted, but it's really more along 40 units an acre. There are limitations, such as hours of operation & deliveries, and drive-thru restrictions.

Ms. Myers: Would a business have to be on the first floor?

Ms. Moore: TN-1 doesn't prohibit commercial on upper floors, but it must be on a corner lot. There are also district-wide standards for the TN-1 district.

Ms. Myers: Why were Whitaker, Drayton, and Price deleted and just do the north/south streets in the TN-2 district?

Ms. Bunce: Explained 2007 text amendment; TN-2 is only in Mid-city, not Victorian. TN-1 is limited to Victorian. An error in the UZO draft included those three streets incorrectly; it now reflects the 2007 amendment that was approved.

Downtown Districts

Ms. Moore: The colors on the map represent the various uses for the properties. The northwest and central portions of the district are predominantly commercial. Some civic and undeveloped properties are within this area as well. The southeast portion is predominantly residential, but the entire district is mixed use varying in intensity.

Ms. Myers: Parking requirements...is this the time to discuss?

Ms. Moore: We will talk about parking later in Article 9.

Mr. Marshall: Concerned about the Traditional Commercial future land use for Trustees Garden area. Aren't we discussing changing a lot of that area?

Ms. Moore: Not the Future Land Use Map; just the zoning. This is just showing what we have now and are using for guidance.

Mr. Marshall: He just wanted to point to out that from what he understands, is what is planned there is a long way from traditional commercial. It would be more appropriate to encourage to be more compatible with what is existing downtown. He is surprised the Comprehensive Plan has it that way.

Ms. Moore: Summarized proposed Downtown districts.

Mr. Ragsdale: What is proposed zoning for Savannah River Landing?

Ms. Moore: Planned Development District; specific standards were adopted, including height.

Mr. Ragsdale: What about Madison Retail?

Ms. Moore: Retaining Light Industrial zoning that is there now since there is no master plan at this time. BC-1 would be DCDB, and various RIPBs, BG-2 would become DC or DN. RIPA will become Downtown Residential.

Mr. Ragsdale: Map: what is light color?

Ms. Moore: D-R, the least intense in terms of commercial uses. Then discussed D-N, added since draft 1 came out: allowing more commercial uses that may not be appropriate for predominantly residential areas, such as retail and office uses, personal service, restaurants. There is a district wide use condition; certain uses would have to be on a corner lot.

Mr. Marshall: Asked about rooming houses.

Ms. Moore: They would be applied but would have to meet use conditions.

Ms. Myers: Where are the 75 and 100% areas?

Ms. Moore: The D-N and D-R are 75%; the more commercial areas are 100% lot coverage.

Mr. Marshall: Why prohibit banks in D-R?

Ms. Moore: Banks aren't in that area now; commercial use. The area is predominantly residential.

Mr. Marshall: There are some vacant lots some banks have been looking at. What is it about a bank that makes it non-compatible.

Ms. Moore: Most require drive-thrus and we are not permitting drive-thrus within the D-R district.

Mr. Marshall: Banks are not a bad thing to have in residential areas.

Ms. Myers: Concern is with the curb cuts, sidewalk cuts, not typical of residential areas.

Ms. Moore: Could possibly add banks without drive-thrus. It's the design standards.

Marshall and Cook: 3:03 stepped out. Cook didn't leave. Only seven sitting commissioners.

Office Districts

There are three office districts proposed: OIT - Office and Institutional Transition, residential properties being converted into commercial use; OI - Office and Institutional, a pure office district; OIE - Office and Institutional Expanded District, for large campus-like settings, such as hospitals or college. Hours of operation are being added.

Business Districts

Ms. Moore: The limited business district would be the RB, RB-1, which is a mixed-use district; it does

allow residential. The residential feel is trying to be kept but allow for some commercial uses. The business hours would be 7 a.m. - 10 p.m., package stores are not permitted. Rooming house use would be a special use.

The neighborhood business district is proposing allowance that upper-story residential and live/work units be permitted. It would be capped at 50,000 square feet to avoid building block businesses, which would change the character of the area.

Mr. Farmer: Check Medical Arts shopping center footprint. Ensure that it doesn't exceed 50,000 sq ft. What district would RIP convert to?

Ms. Moore: B-C in the Abercorn area south of DeRenne...but it depends on the area.

Mr. Ragsdale: What about the height limitations for HAAF?

Ms. Moore: We will discuss them in the overlay district.

Mr. Farmer: Does the B-M district take into account marina owner's concerns?

Ms. Moore: All of them.

Mr. Manigault: When will we present this to Council/Commission?

Ms. Moore: We're still reviewing Draft 2 with Planning Commission, working with stakeholders...

Mr. Manigault: Mentioned that he has City Council members asking about when it will be passed.

Mr. Cook: Does B-M apply to county boat ramps?

Ms. Moore: Yes.

Industrial Districts

Ms. Moore: Most of the land in the county and city is industrial. To be proposed: Light Industrial Restricted, Transition, Light Industrial, and Heavy Industrial. The Restricted is intended to account for the areas that have some type of industrial use established in very close proximity to a residential neighborhood.

Mr. Farmer: Welding uses and industrial uses along Whitfield Avenue and Shipyard Road... would they be IL-R? What is their classification?

Ms. Moore: We will have to get back with you.

Mr. Farmer: Modern paint shops have to meet EPA standards with filters and you can't smell it. May need to reconsider where permitted.

Mr. Ragsdale: Gas stations are permitted near residential.

Ms. Moore: That is correct. Example of a retail use that is permitted in the IL district, such as the paper plant, the port; the most intense area.

5. [Article 5 Base Zoning Districts](#)

Attachment: [Article 5.0 Base Zoning Districts.pdf](#)

6. [Article 6 - Special Zoning Districts](#)

Attachment: [Article 6.0 Special Zoning Districts.pdf](#)

7. [Public Input](#)

8. [Draft 2 Question and Answer Matrix for September 11](#)

Attachment: [Draft 2 QA Matrix.pdf](#)

V. Adjournment

9. [Adjournment of September 11, 2012 MPC Planning Meeting](#)

There being no further business to come before the Board, Chairman Ragsdale entertained a motion to adjourn the September 11, 2012 MPC Planning Meeting at 3:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas L. Thomson
Executive Director

TLT/bf

Note: Minutes not official until signed.

The Chatham County - Savannah Metropolitan Planning Commission provides meeting summary minutes which are adopted by the respective Board. Verbatim transcripts of minutes are the responsibility of the interested party.