



Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
February 2, 2010 1:30 p.m.
MINUTES

February 2, 2010 Regular MPC Board Meeting

Members Present: Shedrick Coleman, Chairman
Michael Brown
Ellis Cook
Ben Farmer
Stephen Lufburrow
Tanya Milton
Susan Myers
Jon Pannell
Jon Todd
Joseph Welch

Members Not Present: Adam Ragsdale, Vice-Chairman
Lacy Manigault, Treasurer
Russell Abolt
Timothy Mackey

Staff Present: Tom Thomson, Executive Director
Melony West, Systems and Finance
James Hansen, AICP, Director, Development Services
Marcus Lotson, Development Services Planner
Sarah Ward, Historic Preservation Planner
Bri Finau, Administrative Assistant
Christy Adams, Director, Administration
Shanale Booker, Administrative Assistant/IT

Advisory Staff Present: Robert Sebek, County Zoning Administrator

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

II. INVOCATION

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

IV. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Notice(s)

1. [February 23, 2010 Regular MPC Meeting at 1:30 P.M. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, 112 East State Street.](#)

V. PRESENTATIONS

2. [MPC Sustainability Initiative - Sarah Ward](#)

Attachment: [02 02 10 MPC Sustainability Initiative Info \(4 pages\).pdf](#)

Sarah Ward acknowledged the contribution of Bethany Jewell.

The presentation highlighted future plans of the MPC Sustainability Initiative and what has been accomplished. The office is growing towards more sustainability. The MPC has partnered with Sustainable Georgia.

External planning decisions are being made with sustainability in mind. Multiple disciplines are in force to implement Smart Growth and sustainability in the community. This will in turn educate the public.

Future participation and monitoring are planned to determine successes and to identify areas in need of improvement. The results, as acquired, will be presented to the MPC Board.

VI. ITEM(S) REQUESTED TO BE REMOVED FROM THE FINAL AGENDA

Zoning Petition - Map Amendment

3. [233 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard \(SCAD Museum B-C to B-C-1\)](#)

Board Action:

The petitioner has requested that this item be withdrawn from the Agenda.

- PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Jon Todd

Second: Ellis Cook

Michael Brown

- Aye

Shedrick Coleman

- Aye

Ellis Cook

- Aye

Ben Farmer

- Aye

Stephen Lufburrow	- Aye
Timothy Mackey	- Not Present
Lacy Manigault	- Not Present
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Susan Myers	- Aye
Jon Pannell	- Aye
Jon Todd	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye

4. [533 East 38th Street \(East Broad Lofts - BN and R-4 to PUD\)](#)

Board Action:

It is recommended that the request be continued to February 23, 2010 MPC Meeting. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Stephen Lufburrow
Second: Jon Todd

Michael Brown	- Aye
Shedrick Coleman	- Aye
Ellis Cook	- Aye
Ben Farmer	- Aye
Stephen Lufburrow	- Aye
Timothy Mackey	- Not Present
Lacy Manigault	- Not Present
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Susan Myers	- Aye
Jon Pannell	- Aye
Jon Todd	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye

The Consent Agenda consists of items for which the applicant is in agreement with the staff recommendation and for which no known objections have been identified nor anticipated by staff. Any objections raised at the meeting will result in the item being moved to the Regular Agenda. At a 12:30 briefing, the staff will brief the Commission on Consent Agenda items and, time permitting, Regular Agenda items. No testimony will be taken from applicants, supporters or opponents, and no votes will be taken at the briefing.

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

Approval of MPC Meeting Minutes and Briefing Minutes

5. [Approval of January 12, 2010 MPC Meeting Minutes and Briefing Minutes](#)

Attachment: [01.12.10 MPC BRIEFING MINUTES.pdf](#)

Attachment: [01.12.10 MPC Meeting Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:

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

Vote Results

Motion: Jon Todd

Second: Stephen Lufburrow

Michael Brown - Aye

Shedrick Coleman - Aye

Ellis Cook - Aye

Ben Farmer - Aye

Stephen Lufburrow - Aye

Timothy Mackey - Not Present

Lacy Manigault - Not Present

Tanya Milton - Aye

Susan Myers - Aye

Jon Pannell - Aye

Jon Todd - Aye

Joseph Welch - Aye

Authorization(s)

6. [Authorize the Executive Director to Execute three American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 \(ARRA\) Contracts FY 2010 with the Georgia Department of Transportation](#)

Attachment: [Contract Approvals for CORE MPO Funded Studies - 02.02.10 MPC Meeting.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve Executive Director to execute contracts as written with the Georgia Department of Transportation. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Jon Todd

Second: Stephen Lufburrow

Lacy Manigault - Not Present

Susan Myers - Aye

Michael Brown - Aye

Shedrick Coleman - Aye

Ellis Cook - Aye

Ben Farmer - Aye

Stephen Lufburrow	- Aye
Timothy Mackey	- Not Present
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Jon Pannell	- Aye
Jon Todd	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye

7. Authorize the Chairman to sign the authorizing resolution to submit the 2011 5303 (Transit Planning) grant application to the Georgia Department of Transportation.

Board Action:	
Authorize action.	- PASS
Vote Results	
Motion: Ben Farmer	
Second: Jon Todd	
Michael Brown	- Aye
Shedrick Coleman	- Aye
Ellis Cook	- Aye
Ben Farmer	- Aye
Stephen Lufburrow	- Aye
Timothy Mackey	- Not Present
Lacy Manigault	- Not Present
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Susan Myers	- Aye
Jon Pannell	- Aye
Jon Todd	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye

VIII. ITEMS MOVED FROM CONSENT AGENDA

IX. OLD BUSINESS

X. REGULAR BUSINESS

Zoning Petition - Text Amendment

8. Text Amendment to the Chatham County Subdivision Ordinance (Bonding)

Attachment: [staff rpt.pdf](#)

Mr. Todd motioned to remove this item from the Consent Agenda to the Regular Agenda. Ms. Myers seconded the motion. Having no objections, the item was moved the Regular Agenda.

Mr. Hansen stated it is a request to amend the subdivision ordinance from the County Engineering Department.

Ms. Suzanne Cooler, representing the County Engineer, stated many developers and/or banks have defaulted on subdivision project construction. The County has no recourse; the bonds have not been valid. It has occurred mainly on the westside; the County has not accepted the improvements because of faulty construction. The current writing of the subdivision regulations allowed those builders and developers to continue to sell lots in the subdivisions although the development improvements were not to County standards. The revised Chatham County Subdivision Ordinance (Bonding) is presented before the Board to reduce, if not, eliminate these problems. The basic premise is to not allow recording of all of the lots in the subdivision with a bond but to set aside 40 percent of the lots as collateral that cannot be platted nor built upon. The proposed amendment also restricts buildings in a subsequent phase if the preceding phase is not closed-out in accordance with County standards.

Mr. Lufburrow stated he understood in reading the proposed amendment that a maintenance bond will need to be posted equal to 100 percent of the cost of the improvements in any scenario. It states this is to assure the maintenance of the required improvements; that is a change from the completion of the project. He asked does this modify the expiration of the bond until the County provides final acceptance and releases it? Will there still be situations that the developers can default and the bond cannot be collected?

Ms. Cooler stated the best way to solve the situaion was cash bonds. That would make developing in the County cost-prohibitive. The proposed amendment gives incentive for closing out the project.

Mr. Lufburrow asked if the options were to do all of the improvements and have them inspected and accepted by the County and plat all of their lots. Or, if they have none or partial accepted by the County, only 40 percent can be platted until it is 100 percent?

Ms. Cooler stated that was correct.

Mr. Lufburrow asked about 703.04(b) Maintenance and Warranty Agreement; he said though it is referred to, it does give language as to what the agreement is and what the developer would have to agree to.

Ms. Cooler it has not yet been worked out; it was decided to leave as it currently is in the Engineering Policy, not specifically in the Ordinance. The details have not been finalized.

Mr. Lufburrow stated it is difficult to agree to accept an agreement without knowing what the agreement will contain.

Ms. Milton asked Ms. Cooler if they were working in conjunction with the Home Builders Association.

Ms. Cooler stated yes and they also worked with the County Attorney, the County Manager, and staff from Building Safety and Regulatory Services.

Mr. Brown asked if any discussion regarding the proposed change of the Home Builders and other jurisdictions outside of Chatham County and the unincorporated areas?

Ms. Cooler stated no. There was no mention that this should be adopted County-wide though all agree something needs to be done.

Mr. Brown asked if it would be the intent of the MPC staff to recommend that to also be adopted outside of the unincorporated areas?

Mr. Thomson replied no.

Ms. Milton stated she feels more information is needed before voting can take place. She made a motion to continue. Mr. Farmer seconded the motion.

Mr. Brown stated it is a construction fulfillment issue and if the County staff believes this is a good avenue for them.

Ms. Milton withdrew her motion to continue.

Ms. Cooler stated that at this time only recommendations are being given to the County Commission; adoption is not taking place. The document would have to be finalized for adoption to take place. It would also have to go through public hearing.

Board Action:

Jon Pannell motioned to remove item from Consent Agenda. Tanya Milton seconded the motion, with none opposed. After hearing the item - PASS on the Regular Agenda, the motion was to approve staff recommendation.

Vote Results

Motion: Stephen Lufburrow

Second: Tanya Milton

Michael Brown - Aye

Shedrick Coleman - Aye

Ellis Cook - Aye

Ben Farmer - Aye

Stephen Lufburrow - Aye

Timothy Mackey - Not Present

Lacy Manigault - Not Present

Tanya Milton	- Aye
Susan Myers	- Aye
Jon Pannell	- Aye
Jon Todd	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye

9. [Amend Section 8-3182 Procedure For Amendment \(Notification\)](#)

Attachment: [staff report city 2-10.pdf](#)

Mr. Todd motioned to remove this item from the Consent Agenda to the Regular Agenda. **Ms. Myers** seconded the motion. Having no opposition, the item was heard on the Regular Agenda.

Mr. Brown and **Mr. Todd** requested for the Board to notification of staff's procedure.

Mr. Hansen stated that this is a request to amend the City and County procedure to amend the Zoning Ordinance. They are almost identical. The State statute requires newspaper notification of general circulation in the county. Existing ordinances include individual notification of property owners within 200 feet of the proposed zoning property. The concern in relation to the Unified Zoning Ordinance is that there are 90,000 properties or more; all of which will be affected by the new zoning ordinance. Expanding to the 200 foot radius around those properties for individual notification will conservatively yield approximately 600,000 to 700,000 notices. If an error is made in the notification procedure, grounds for challenging the entire ordinance adoption could be made, based on improper or lack of notification. Staff proposes to have the newspaper notification as the legal requirement. However, staff also fully intends to notify and inform the public through such means as the website (www.unifiedzoning.org), a future blog site for comments and responses, a Facebook page, neighborhood and homeowner association meetings, along with media venues and public service announcements. The SAGIS website will indicate current and proposed zonings and uses on a particular site. The goal is to simplify and clarify the legal procedures that must be adhered to regarding notification.

Mr. Hansen described how the proposed change would only impact publicly initiated projects larger than 3 acres in size (which would include the UZO project). Any publicly initiated requests for less than three acres and privately initiated zoning requests will follow the existing statute of notification of property owners within 200 feet of the proposed zoning.

Mr. Brown stated Mr. Hansen's review is helpful but feels it should be more inclusive. He stated to focus only on the legal notification it would appear to be a restriction as to what will be dispersed to the public. He said with a large scale zoning, someone will say they were not notified; all avenues of communication should be utilized. There should also be central location for zoning education for all.

Mr. Pannell suggested staff notify the public of the avenues that will be utilized.

Mr. Hansen stated the intent is to be as transparent as possible.

Mr. Lufburrow stated one reason for doing this is to avoid legal ramifications especially since this would be done on such a massive scale. Did the MPC staff consult with the County or City attorneys?

Mr. Hansen replied yes, both were consulted.

Mr. Lufburrow stated the cost also has to be considered in attempting to mail all regarding the new zoning ordinance.

Mr. Hansen stated the cost is important, but not as important as doing it correctly from a legal standpoint.

Mr. Farmer stated he feels it would be important information to the property owner, even if they are out of town or don't live here. This was a needed massive undertaking that may cost \$310,00 to notify by certified mail, or \$45,000 by regular mail. At least all that may be possibly affected will be notified; we have to be very careful if we start doing less than more.

Mr. Todd stated the only way to be absolutely sure all were notified would be by affidavit or signature receipt. Anything beyond that to give the public the idea that a guaranteed method of notification would be a falsehood.

Mr. Lufburrow stated all aspects of zoning is changing; though the use may not change but the terminology will change, which is changing the zoning. All will have to be notified either by mail or by staff recommendation of State statute.

Mr. Pannell states he agrees with staff recommendation. Do we really need to spend \$350,000? Staff recommendation is still in accordance with state law and staff will do more than what is required.

Mr. Hansen clarified the recommended change will apply only to publicly initiated changes on parcels greater than three acres. All privately initiated requests will still adhere to the standards we have today.

Mr. Lufburrow stated if cost is not an undue burden, he suggested accepting staff recommendation and still sending notification via regular mail. Though we may not be able to prove receipt by the property owner, we would be following the current procedure and avoid legal issues because certified mail would not be required.

Mr. Hansen stated notification is not sent via registered mail currently. It would cost approximately \$45,000 regular mail. However, some properties have quite a few adjoining properties within the 200 foot radius. This will yield

approximately 600,000 to 700,000 written notifications; this does not include production costs.

Mr. Lufburrow stated that would be a decision County Commission and City Council to decide if they want to bear that expense. It should not be a requirement.

Mr. Farmer stated he recognized the cost issue and perhaps it should not be required for all within 200 feet. The mail notification should go to just the property owner, which would significantly reduce the cost. He recommended an education forum to educate the public, even though there may be only a zoning change but not a use change.

Mr. Thomson requested to continue in order for MPC staff to consider all recommendations and return before the Board with a new proposal.

Board Action:

Ben Farmer motioned to remove item from the Consent Agenda. The motion was seconded by Susan Myers, with none opposed. After hearing item on the Regular Agenda, the item was motioned to be continued until the February 23, 2010 MPC meeting. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ben Farmer
Second: Susan Myers
Michael Brown - Aye
Shedrick Coleman - Aye
Ellis Cook - Aye
Ben Farmer - Aye
Stephen Lufburrow - Aye
Timothy Mackey - Not Present
Lacy Manigault - Not Present
Tanya Milton - Aye
Susan Myers - Aye
Jon Pannell - Aye
Jon Todd - Aye
Joseph Welch - Aye

10. [Amend Section 11-2.7 Hearing Procedure \(Notification\)](#)

Attachment: [staff report.pdf](#)

Mr. Pannell moved to remove this item from the Consent Agenda. Ms. Milton seconded the motion. Having no opposition, this item was moved to the Regular

Agenda.

Due to the discussion on the previous item, this item was continued.

Board Action:

Jon Pannell motioned to remove item from the Consent Agenda. The motion was seconded by Tanya Milton, with none opposed. After hearing the item on the Regular Agenda, the item was motioned to be continued to the February 23, 2010 MPC meeting. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Jon Pannell

Second: Tanya Milton

Michael Brown	- Aye
Shedrick Coleman	- Aye
Ellis Cook	- Aye
Ben Farmer	- Aye
Stephen Lufburrow	- Aye
Timothy Mackey	- Not Present
Lacy Manigault	- Not Present
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Susan Myers	- Aye
Jon Pannell	- Aye
Jon Todd	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye

11. [Text Amendment - Chatham County Zoning Ordinance \(Women's Shelters\)](#)

Attachment: [stf rpt.pdf](#)

Mr. Hansen presented the petition to the Board. The current County ordinance does not allow women's shelter or transitional housing by right in certain zoning classifications. The petitioner is proposing to opening a shelter for women in a County area. The proposed amendment will allow this with conditions.

Mr. Brown asked if men's shelters are allowed anywhere in the unincorporated County.

Mr. Hansen replied no and he was not aware as to why not.

Ms. Tracy Opra, representative of The Elizabeth House for Women, stated they tried to be as simple as possible for approval.

Mr. Brown stated it is inequitable that the City can provide shelter zoning needs for its constituents but the unincorporated County does not.

Mr. Lufburrow suggested for staff to recommend to County to consider men's shelters as well.

Mr. Hansen informed the Board that the Unified Zoning Ordinance revisions do propose that transitional housing be allowed in unincorporated areas as well.

Board Action:

Approve staff recommendation. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Susan Myers

Second: Stephen Lufburrow

Michael Brown - Aye

Shedrick Coleman - Aye

Ellis Cook - Aye

Ben Farmer - Aye

Stephen Lufburrow - Aye

Timothy Mackey - Not Present

Lacy Manigault - Not Present

Tanya Milton - Aye

Susan Myers - Aye

Jon Pannell - Aye

Jon Todd - Aye

Joseph Welch - Aye

Zoning Petition - Map Amendment

12. [Rezoning Request for 199 E. Lathrop Avenue-Rezone from R-4 to RB-1](#)

Attachment: [Aerial Map.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Zoningmap.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Taxmap.pdf](#)

Attachment: [EXISTING R-4.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Proposed RB-1.pdf](#)

Attachment: [staff report.pdf](#)

Mr. Lotson presented the petition before the Board. The purpose of the request is to demolish the buildings currently on the site and build a three-bay retail leasable unit. There is a mix of residential and non-residential uses in the area; the immediate area of the subject property is zoned R-4. The revitalization plan of 2004 was conducted and it was reviewed in 2006 by request of the Mayor and City Council. City Council approved a number of the recommended changes to decrease incompatibilities and protect residential

areas. The petitioner's property is outside of the area and the size being under a quarter of an acre is marginal for commercial use. A number of variances would be needed to be used for commercial properties. The properties behind the petitioner's is residential.

Mr. Pannell asked what are the commercial properties in the area?

Mr. Lotson stated many are zoned light industrial. The size of the subject property as a commercial use is a concern because the standards of a commercial building will be different from a residential building. The petitioner would require variances.

Ms. Jan Fox, petitioner, stated the proposed building plans can be modified if necessary. In regards to parking, there are fourteen slots. The two houses next to the property are in negotiations for acquisition and demolition and the West Savannah Plan allows demolition of old homes for parking.

Ms. Fox continued that A Fox Construction is dedicated to the revitalization of West Savannah. They are light residential contractors and one of the forerunners for building infill houses in Savannah and West Savannah. They are vested in rebuilding Savannah. The approval of the rezoning request will allow them to use a light commercial building in an area that may induce economic growth.

Ms. Milton asked if they have met with the residents of the area?

Ms. Fox stated they have met with the President of the West Savannah Community Organization. They have not gone door-to-door; the homeowners have received regular notification.

Ms. Milton asked what were the plans for the location?

Ms. Fox replied it is a light commercial strip with three retail spaces. Businesses that would have moving traffic, such as a mail business or alterations.

Ms. Milton stated if the petitioner is no longer there, then someone could come in and make it something else.

Ms. Pam Oglesby, president of the West Savannah Community Organization, stated the petitioner met with them. The Organization did not request the petitioner to meet with the homeowners; they chose to make the decision for the area. They had only one with reservations. Ms. Oglesby stated they are in favor of the petition because the three residential houses are in poor condition, two of which have been condemned by the City. The condemned houses are next to the petitioner's property and they are currently trying to acquire those properties, as the owner is willing to sell. The petitioner communicated their plans to the Organization. The Organization believes the petitioner's request is in harmony with the West Savannah Revitalization Plan. The zoning does not allow alcohol.

Mr. Wallace Bell, architect, stated they are not looking to demolish the entire building but to do some reconstruction to the existing structure. They plan to move the parking to the adjacent lots. If the adjacent properties are obtained by the petitioner, that may alleviate some of the variances that may be needed otherwise.

Mr. Lufburrow stated the petitioner is in the process of acquiring additional property. He stated the petition at this point may be premature. That would have a greater impact on the Commission and perhaps City Council if everyone knew you would require fewer variances due to having the option of additional property to work with.

Mr. Farmer asked if they are truly in negotiation for the adjacent properties because parking is a big variance.

Ms. Fox stated the building can be altered to accommodate the parking. She stated they are in negotiation for acquiring the adjacent properties.

Ms. Gloria Edwards, vice president of the West Savannah Community Organization, stated none the residents have been asked about any changes in the neighborhood. There are senior citizens in the block and it would be a disservice to them. Ms. Edwards stated she does not believe the residents would want this in their neighborhood.

Mr. Todd stated he does not believe there is sufficient room for the request.

Mr. Brown the goal may be accomplished if the petitioner communicated with the neighbors, work with the West Savannah Community Organization, and if the developer is creative about buffering, site plans, and parking.

Mr. Lufburrow stated he is concerned about approving the petition, having City Council adopt the petition request, for it to be returned to the MPC for several variance requests in order to develop the property. He stated he does not see how this could be accomplished without many variances.

Mr. Coleman stated it is the responsibility of the petitioner that after moving through zoning, to meet the development criteria of the property. If variances are required, the Board has the right to deny any variance request because it is a totally different petition that stands on the merit of the validity of the variance requests. It also gives the neighborhood an opportunity to express the impact of the variance in their neighborhood. The decision of the Board today will not be tied to something later.

Mr. Brown stated he thinks it would make more sense not to take an action today and explore other business zonings that are less intrusive and not needing of variances.

Mr. Farmer stated to continue would be good in order to speak with the

neighbors.

Mr. Brown requested the petitioner to return to the Board the following:

1. Review the R-B-1 zone and any other commercial zone to make sure it is appropriate for the area and not intrusive;
2. Determine if thresholds for site and parking can be made for what the alternate zone is;
3. Meet with neighborhood representatives and the stakeholders in the area to be certain all are in agreement and understanding.

Board Action:

Continue to the February 23, 2010 MPC meeting and present requested information to the Board. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ben Farmer

Second: Stephen Lufburrow

Michael Brown	- Aye
Shedrick Coleman	- Aye
Ellis Cook	- Not Present
Ben Farmer	- Aye
Stephen Lufburrow	- Aye
Timothy Mackey	- Not Present
Lacy Manigault	- Not Present
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Susan Myers	- Not Present
Jon Pannell	- Aye
Jon Todd	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye

Victorian District - New Construction

13. [414 East Duffy Street](#)

Attachment: [Aerial Annotated Location.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial Annotated Heights.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Photo Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Window Specs.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Elevations and Plans.pdf](#)

Attachment: [1916 Sanborn Map.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Ms. Ward presented the petition before the Board. They are requesting new construction of a two-story single family residence located at 414 East Duffy Street. Two two-foot side-yard setback variances are requested from the five-

foot minimum standard. The variance request is consistent with the blockface.

Board Action:

1. Approval of new construction with the following conditions: a. Elevate the foundation height to 30” and place behind the exterior building wall; b. Provide materials and section for porch railing; c. Indicate how corner boards will intersect with central band board; d. Provide materials for false shutters or eliminate; and e. Proposed windows are vinyl; resubmit for MW Jefferson 200 or 100 series. 2. Approval of the 2’ side yard setbacks from the 5’ side yard setback requirement. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ben Farmer

Second: Joseph Welch

Michael Brown	- Aye
Shedrick Coleman	- Aye
Ellis Cook	- Not Present
Ben Farmer	- Aye
Stephen Lufburrow	- Aye
Timothy Mackey	- Not Present
Lacy Manigault	- Not Present
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Susan Myers	- Not Present
Jon Pannell	- Aye
Jon Todd	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye

XI. OTHER BUSINESS

14. [2009 End of Year Report](#)

The 2009 End of Year Report was presented to the Board members. It highlights the organizational goals and staff accomplishments for the MPC in 2009.

Mr. Thomson encouraged the Board to read the printed presentation.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

15. [Submittal](#)

There being no further business to come before the Commission, the February 2, 2010

Regular MPC Meeting adjourned at 3:55 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Thomas L. Thomson
Executive Director

/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.