



Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
June 12, 2012 1:30 P.M.
MINUTES

June 12, 2012 Regular MPC Board Meeting

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

Members Not Present: Russ Abolt

Staff Present: Thomas Thomson, P.E. AICP, Executive Director
Melony West, CPA, Director, Finance & Systems
James Hansen, AICP, Director, Development Services
Gary Plumbley, Development Services Planner
Marcus Lotson, Development Services Planner
Christy Adams, Director, Administration
Bri Finau, Administrative Assistant
Charlotte Moore, Director of Special Projects, AICP
Amanda Bunce, Development Services Planner
Julie Yawn, IT

Advisory Staff Present:
Tiras Petrea, City Zoning Inspector

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

II. INVOCATION

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

IV. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Notice(s)

1. [June 26, 2012 Regular MPC Meeting at 1:30 P.M. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, 112 E. State Street.](#)

V. PRESENTATIONS

2. [Chatham County-Savannah Comprehensive Plan Revised Short Term Work Program](#)

Attachment: [Board Thomson Revised STWP Review 061212.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Tab D CHAPTER 6 Revised Short Term Work Program \(2011 - 2016\) 061212.pdf](#)

Ms. Jackie Teel reviewed the revised Short Term Work Program of the Comprehensive Plan. It is a five-year document which lays out who could be involved in the process and the cost. It is state-mandated. This process makes our community eligible as a Qualified Local Government which assists in obtaining additional funding and grants.

The comments submitted to staff from the Commission in February 2012 were constructed to revise the goals of the Strategic Plan, of which the Short Term Work Program is part of. The revised document be presented to the Commisison for review and comments. Afterwards, the Commission will present to City Council and County Commission for submission to the state.

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

General Development Plan

3. [Dairy Queen - 7102 Hodgson Memorial Drive](#)

Board Action:

The petitioner requested that this item be **withdrawn.** - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Susan Myers

Second: Tanya Milton

Russ Abolt - Not Present

Shedrick Coleman - Aye

Ellis Cook - Aye

Ben Farmer	- Aye
Stephen Lufburrow	- Aye
Timothy Mackey	- Aye
Lacy Manigault	- Aye
Murray Marshall	- Aye
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Susan Myers	- Aye
Jon Pannell	- Aye
Adam Ragsdale	- Aye
Rochelle Small-Toney	- 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 Planning Meeting Minutes

4. [May 8, 2012 Planning Meeting Minutes](#)

Attachment: [05.08.12 PLANNING MEETING MINUTES.pdf](#)

Board Action:

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

Vote Results

Motion: Ellis Cook

Second: Shedrick Coleman

Russ Abolt	- Not Present
Shedrick Coleman	- Aye
Ellis Cook	- Aye
Ben Farmer	- Aye
Stephen Lufburrow	- Aye
Timothy Mackey	- Aye
Lacy Manigault	- Aye
Murray Marshall	- Aye
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Susan Myers	- Aye
Jon Pannell	- Aye
Adam Ragsdale	- Aye

Rochelle Small-Toney	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye

Victorian District - New Construction

5. [Petition of T. Joe Duckworth | 214-216 West Henry Street | Carriage House](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
Attachment: [VICINITY MAP.pdf](#)
Attachment: [ZONING MAP.pdf](#)
Attachment: [AERIAL MAP.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Plans and Elevations.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Materials.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval of the two-story carriage house at 214 and 216 West Henry Street as requested. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Susan Myers
Second: Tanya Milton
Ben Farmer - Aye
Stephen Lufburrow - Aye
Timothy Mackey - Aye
Lacy Manigault - Aye
Murray Marshall - Aye
Tanya Milton - Aye
Susan Myers - Aye
Jon Pannell - Aye
Adam Ragsdale - Aye
Rochelle Small-Toney - Aye
Joseph Welch - Aye
Russ Abolt - Not Present
Shedrick Coleman - Aye
Ellis Cook - Aye

VIII. ITEMS MOVED FROM CONSENT AGENDA

IX. OLD BUSINESS

X. REGULAR BUSINESS

Zoning Petition - Map Amendment

6. [Zoning Request - 311 and 317 East Montgomery Crossroads - P-D-N to B-C](#)

Attachment: [Maps.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

311 and 317 East Montgomery Crossroads
Tony Montford, Owner
Robert Pace, Agent
Aldermanic District: 4
County Commission District: 5
Zoning District: P-D-N to B-C
1.65 Acres
PIN: 2-0530 -09-008 and -009

Mr. Jim Hansen, MPC Project Planner, presented the petitioner's request that the request to rezone the subject properties (311 and 317 East Montgomery Crossroads) from a P-D-N classification to a B-C classification.

It is recommended that the request to rezone the subject properties (311 and 317 East Montgomery Crossroads) from a P-D-N classification to a B-C classification be **DENIED**. Further, it is recommended that consideration for rezoning the subject properties to a B-N classification be **APPROVED**.

Board Action:

It is recommended that the request to rezone the subject properties (311 and 317 East Montgomery Crossroads) from a P-D-N classification to a B-C classification be **DENIED**. Further, it is recommended that consideration for rezoning the subject properties to a B-N classification be **APPROVED**. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Stephen Lufburrow
Second: Ben Farmer
Russ Abolt - Not Present
Shedrick Coleman - Aye
Ellis Cook - Aye
Ben Farmer - Aye
Stephen Lufburrow - Aye
Timothy Mackey - Not Present
Lacy Manigault - Aye
Murray Marshall - Aye
Tanya Milton - Aye
Susan Myers - Aye
Jon Pannell - Aye
Adam Ragsdale - Aye
Rochelle Small-Toney - Aye

XI. OTHER BUSINESS

7. [June 12, 2012 MPC Planning Meeting in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, 112 E. State Street.](#)

8. [Unified Zoning Ordinance](#)

Attachment: [Memo June 12 2012.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Attachment 1 2012 Proposed Meeting Dates.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Attachment 2 Proposed Review Schedule.pdf](#)

Mr. Ragsdale addressed the memo correlating to this item. First addressed were Items A and B. Discussion regarding absences was also addressed. **Mr. Thomson** stated absent members can contact staff to be updated so the Board can move forward.

Mr. Mackey stated he does not want anyone to get the false impression that the document has not moved because the Board cannot obtain a quorum. It has not moved because there is no consensus to move it, they are two different things. He objects to anyone that tries to blame it on a planning commissioner's attendance. That has nothing to do with this document. We had the County Chairman and the Mayor in this room with the chairman and told them we were ready to proceed and we were not.

Ms. Small-Toney suggested also that the absent commissioner contact staff or send a message stating they've reviewed the document. That would provide a running record that all have reviewed.

Mr. Farmer suggested providing a summary to the absent commissioners rather than contacting staff. Staff would have gone to them and presented the information and it will be the absent commissioner's responsibility to bring themselves up-to-date. That would eliminate question if that information was communicated to them and they should be up-to-date the next time they come in.

Mr. Thomson stated he agreed, but he is concerned that with just reading it, it will raise questions. We want them to contact us so there can be interaction and be comfortable at the next discussion in order to move forward.

Mr. Ragsdale stated it is our responsibility to do our homework if we've missed a meeting. Just don't come in blind.

Mr. Pannell asked if eight are not in attendance, will the meeting be canceled.

Mr. Ragsdale stated he understood it that way.

Mr. Lufburrow stated he has respect and confidence in his fellow commissioners. He acknowledged he does not make every single meeting, but if there is a particular section of this that needs to be addressed, it is incumbent upon me to be there for it. If he cannot be there for some reason, it's like if you miss a regular meeting and the Commission votes on

a petition . . . if you can't be there, you need to be able to trust and support the actions of your fellow commissioners and not go back and question or have to revisit during the meeting for which you are present. Extending courtesy and recognition that this body as a whole has the ability to do things with a few people being absent, we can move forward with this. When people are absent, it is incumbent upon them as a good commissioner to get up to speed and not cause the Board to revisit the same subject previously discussed.

Mr. Coleman stated we also need to be realistic about what's accomplished during these meetings. To think we will comprehensively cover everything during these meetings is not realistic. When we make an agreement to move forward, that does not mean that any member can't further go into what we've already had a consensus on and take another look and communicate concerns to staff. This is a process that is basically open at any time and questions can be submitted to staff without stopping the process from moving forward. Waiting for a concrete answer will never provide progress. Topics of concern can still be discussed while keeping the process moving. The document is much too complicated to try to vote on parts; the existing one of forty years is still not clearly understood. It is unreasonable to expect clarity from the new one right away. But we do need to get through it and rely on the public and groups to help bring out concerns so we can be forward-moving.

Mr. Marshall asked if the planning sessions are recorded.

Mr. Ragsdale replied yes and they are televised.

Mr. Marshall stated he thinks every commissioner should be able to get the recorded presentation and listen to it if you miss a meeting, rather than burden staff to provide a synopsis. Also, it is incumbent on us to vote on every part of this document that we are proposing to City Council and County Commission. We should not rely on a citizen's group. The problem is we are trying to approve too much on any given vote. We need to break it down into cohesive pieces and vote, or it's over. If eight people are here and they vote to approve something, the remaining body can't come in the next week and re-open that issue unless someone that actually voted on it re-opens it. Otherwise, it is finalized.

Mr. Ragsdale stated the problem is this is a concurrent process which the stakeholders and public are reviewing at the same time. And they will make suggestions at the same time that we will have to incorporate.

Mr. Marshall stated not "incorporate" - we have to listen to them.

Mr. Ragsdale stated we have to listen to them, even though we may change nothing.

Mr. Farmer stated he agreed with Mr. Marshall regarding with an absent commissioner to come back and make changes; it's not polite. A consensus is good in that it does move us forward and give us something to take back to the public. There is no reason to revisit it unless something comes from that parallel process, not from someone not pleased with what was said. A quorum is a quorum; it is much more difficult to amend a vote than a consensus. He also agreed it needs to be done in bite-sized pieces.

Mr. Coleman stated he thought that was what was being done. He is not comfortable voting formally on any of it. We need to get the basic premise of what is in the document

before we start formally voting. The consensus voting was to indicate we have enough to move on to the next piece, not 'it's a done deal'. Otherwise, there shouldn't be an open forum for public comment. You can't vote on something and say it's over and then say it's open for comment at the same time. We are not voting on items to move forward, we are saying we understand this enough as a board to move to the next component of the document to get through it. Then, we vote on the document because we have an understanding of how the integrated document works. The consensus should be about moving through the document, not saying each portion is complete and correct.

Ms. Myers motioned to have a quorum of at least eight commissioners for planning meetings and absent commissioners must take initiative to get updated. **Mr. Cook** seconded the motion. The motion was passed for Item B.

Ms. Milton asked if we are still incorporating public comment.

Mr. Coleman stated this Board did stop the process and we need to get off of pause. We need to move forward.

Mr. Ragsdale continued with the Item C on the memo. There was a proposed meeting calendar monthly through December for a total of six with four additional meetings added to that schedule to expedite the process.

Mr. Farmer asked if the six meetings could be scheduled and the other four be on an 'as needed' basis. We could be scheduling something we don't really need.

Mr. Ragsdale suggested reviewing Attachment 2 for the proposed schedule and topics to be discussed on the scheduled dates.

Mr. Manigault stated we are running out of time if we have to present to the City and County next year.

Ms. Moore replied this is anticipating page by page review; that's why it's lengthy.

Mr. Manigault stated he understood that but the Board is bogged down like a car in mud. He does not believe we need four additional meetings.

Ms. Small-Toney stated she is okay with the schedule because she can simply block out the time, but for some its not that easy. If we don't need a meeting, then we would simply agree to not to have it. It works better for scheduling purposes to know what direction we're going. It's better than trying to find additional time.

Mr. Pannell asked if the schedule was reasonable in staff's expectations. There is a lot of information scheduled for the meetings.

Ms. Moore replied it will depend on the questions being asked. It really depends on the Commission.

Mr. Ragsdale stated it depends on how the type of research and homework we do prior to coming to the meetings.

Mr. Pannell stated this is a commitment and 21 more meetings for the next 6 months.

Mr. Marshall stated we need to schedule more meetings that are shorter rather than fewer longer meetings.

Mr. Ragsdale stated it is his intention to go before City Council with Mr. Thomson and present this planned schedule.

Mr. Farmer stated he doesn't agree with this and wants to remove any thought of a deadline. He stated the objective should be to move forward. Let's do one meeting at a time.

Ms. Small-Toney stated its not etched in stone; they are guidelines for us to make a recommendation. Berating the issue is a waste of time.

Mr. Ragsdale added there is no date certain as to when it is to be completed.

Mr. Farmer stated he is happy with it as long as Mr. Ragsdale is not taking this to City Council and County Commission.

Mr. Ragsdale stated he is taking the process to them.

Mr. Farmer asked if the schedule was being taken to them.

Mr. Ragsdale replied absolutely and asked why not. It needs to be demonstrated to the people that put us here that we have a goal.

Mr. Farmer stated that's fine as long as they don't expect us to have it done by then.

Mr. Pannell motioned to adopt the meeting dates as presented by staff: six monthly meetings with four additional meetings. **Mr. Coleman** seconded the motion. The motioned passed for Item C.

Mr. Ragsdale continued to Item D which was to adopt a review approach. Some have suggested a page-by-page review of Draft 2. Thus, staff has suggested that stakeholder review should be concurrent with Board review and that any edits of Draft 2 by suggestion of any should be brought back for discussion and reviewed as Draft 3. Draft 3 will be forwarded for review and potential acceptance. County Commission and City Council will likely have their comments, which will roll into Draft 4, to be submitted for adoption.

Mr. Thomson asked that none get hung up on numbering nomenclature; changes and suggestions will be presented until it is complete. All of the meetings will be open for public comment.

Mr. Marshall asked how much time is expected to be allocated for each of the meetings.

Mr. Ragsdale stated it has been suggested not to exceed four hours.

Mr. Marshall suggested two hours; at one and a half hours into it, Board discussion should

stop and leave the rest for public comment.

Mr. Pannell motioned to approve staff recommendation regarding review approach of the UZO. **Mr. Coleman** seconded the motion. The motion was passed for Item D.

Discussion topic changed to status of stakeholder meetings.

Ms. Moore stated line-by-line comparisons are not being done with stakeholders. The differences will be shown in a matrix.

Ms. Small-Toney asked if the feedback would come to the Commission.

Mr. Thomson replied yes.

Mr. Marshall asked if a group does not ask for participation, then they won't get it. He stated when he repeatedly asked for a comparison to what's on the books, he was told repeatedly 'we can't do that.' Now, to hear the Chamber of Commerce asked and we're going to do it but then you say we're not going to do this part - if you're going to do any of it, why can't it be done for the whole document. Waiting for a group to hear about it, gets concerned enough to pay a lawyer, then decide to do it. He stated it floors him we are not concentrating on preparing a document that is based on what is going on now and what we are proposing to do.

Mr. Thomson replied that it is a comparison, but it is not the comparison you asked for.

Mr. Marshall asked if the comparison Ms. Moore just outlined will be done for the whole document so that everyone can have the whole benefit of it.

Mr. Thomson stated Mr. Marshall's request for a line-by-line comparison is impractical considering our time and resources and isn't really helpful.

Ms. Small-Toney stated that is what this Commission asked for and she agrees with Mr. Marshall. She stated she was one of the ones that definitely wanted to see the strikethroughs. The detail of all of this is what is going to be critical.

Mr. Ragsdale stated he recalled Mr. Marshall making a motion to that methodology and it was not supported.

Mr. Pannell stated he understood it to be voted down because staff told the Commission in order to create something like that, it would take an incredible amount of resources of staff and time, and it just wasn't doable. Unless the City and County are going to allocate resources for a staff person to do that.

Mr. Thomson stated what was proposed as an alternative is just as effective. When the presentations are seen and we start going through the documents as approved in the prior actions today, it will be seen that will be as informative though not structured as previously requested.

Mr. Marshall asked how much political clout does a stakeholder group have to have to get the MPC to spend the manpower to produce what was just described, specifically, what was

requested and you said you will do by the Chamber of Commerce.

Ms. Moore replied we were asked to compare uses for ten different sectors, in addition to other site standards, such as parking.

Mr. Marshall asked what is the smallest group that could ask of the same treatment and get it.

Ms. Moore replied that anyone could ask for that -

Mr. Marshall asked if anyone could ask for it and you're going to produce it, then why isn't it being produced. If the same or some of the man hours that have been spent since last summer producing the document that is married to the law that is on the books now, we'd have it. At first it was, we can't do it. Now I'm hearing, we can do part of it. How about let's do that part of it for everyone instead of being only for the Chamber, because they are such a big dog in this hunt.

Ms. Moore stated we are not doing a line-by-line process for the Chamber.

Mr. Marshall restated Mr. Mackey's comment that this is a political animal and if we are not careful, we won't have a document that will ever be adopted because the politics of it will kill it. He is concerned about making it adoptable.

Mr. Ragsdale stated that is the reason he is going to present this process to those adopting bodies.

Mr. Marshall stated he is not talking about the process. He does not believe Council wants to spend there time listening to how we're going to about deciphering; the challenge they want to see is what is it we're producing.

Mr. Ragsdale stated he has a purpose behind going to see them. They want to hear from us; what we intend to do and how we're going to do it and move forward.

Mr. Thomson suggested that at the next opportunity, share an example of what Ms. Moore was describing. The Chamber did not ask for this, they asked for us to review industry groups. We sat down as staff and determined the best way to communicate this. To provide the level of detail for them, this is the format we are using.

Mr. Farmer stated what is doing being done with the specified groups is understandable because it is a very pointed discussion and narrowed down. He stated he was involved on the marina process. They brought in a lawyer and talked with us; brought out some of the same things you brought. One of the first things they pointed out was there was going to be only one marina in the whole area. He assumed staff has gone back to the drawing board because he has not yet seen Draft 2, but hopefully some of the things they said were listened to. It's started off with what Mr. Marshall said: here's what is, was before and here's what it is now as it relates to uses specifically and how can we make it more effective and workable. He assumed that was done. Other groups are doing the same thing, but they are having to pay attorneys to ask the necessary specific questions. He stated he thinks what he has heard Mr. Marshall and Ms. Small-Toney say is that we are a group too. We've asked

for the same thing that we have been told that can't be done because it is too time constraining; he stated he appreciates that because it is much easier to take it to one specific group. He stated he is now hearing that, taking the time considerations out of it, it can be done and people on this Commission are asking for it. He stated he knows it is a lot, but if it can be done for independent groups; if it can be done for the part, it can be done for the whole.

Mr. Ragsdale stated the problem he thinks we have is what our task is. Our task is to forward a document to the governing bodies for them to do with what they want to do. In order for them to do that, we have to review the document. There are two different things being asked.

Mr. Farmer asked Ms. Small-Toney what is it Council wants to see from us.

Ms. Small-Toney said she cannot speak for Council, but as City Manager, what guides elected officials is what is guiding the people in the community. If we take the time to converse with the stakeholders and go into the details of what is going to be of concern to them, Council will most likely hear that and want to know that the constituent groups are satisfied. We may as well satisfy ourselves about what is in the document.

Mr. Lufburrow stated if staff has allocated resources to address this with the Chamber, it seems silly that we might look at a summary - why not just give us the whole thing. That may answer a lot of questions. We should benefit from staff's work.

Mr. Ragsdale stated he agrees.

Mr. Pannell stated he'd like to see what is being presented to the stakeholders. He asked if it is true that a comparison cannot be done.

Mr. Thomson stated the comparison requested - a page-by-page of the City and County - is not productive and would take an enormous amount of time to produce. At the end, the understanding desired would not be achieved as it would be using the method we've suggested. Mr. Thomson added that an attorney is not necessary to speak with the staff at MPC; we will speak with and assist anyone with questions.

Mr. Coleman stated the benefit of the focus groups is that they will be able to ascertain things that we would not because we are not specialized in those areas. They can bring it to staff and staff to us. We cannot do line-by-line review, but a summation will be provided. We need to move forward.

Mr. Manigault stated Council and County will be interested if we have talked with and satisfied the stakeholders.

Mr. Marshall stated, to say a document cannot be red-lined, word-by-word is not accurate. What is being done in this community by this document is being compared word-by-word. Every property owner in this community that is not going word-by-word will be in for a surprise if they are looking for something specific because it will be different from what was done before. He stated what he is asking for can be done and is partially being done, but it is being done piece-by-piece by different groups, hiring outsiders to do the work that the MPC should be doing, which is producing the document to compare what

we're suggesting to what we are living under right now. It is being done and costing thousands of dollars in the private sector to do it, but it is a public responsibility to produce to the general public what we are proposing to change. He stated he is offended that we continue to go down this road -

Mr. Ragsdale stated to Mr. Marshall that the Commission voted on his motion regarding this and it was defeated. We are not discussing this anymore. We are moving forward.

Mr. Farmer stated he thought we were discussing it as Mr. Marshall thought. He continued he appreciated Mr. Coleman's statement. He would like to see what was presented to the stakeholders; perhaps we can compromise.

Mr. Ragsdale stated that will be provided when it is completed.

Mr. Farmer stated he wanted to remind Mr. Ragsdale that the referenced motion Mr. Marshall made was defeated based on the premise, as Mr. Pannell mentioned before he left, that it could not be done. He stated he was there and he voted. Maybe it can't be done to that extent, but maybe it could be done more than it is now.

Mr. Ragsdale stated every commissioner has the purview to review the minutes. His recollection was the context was as Mr. Thomson explained today, given manpower, resources, and time.

Mr. Marshall asked if a motion was made, seconded, voted upon, and denied if it could not be brought up again.

Mr. Ragsdale replied no.

Mr. Marshall stated he was gaveled out of order.

Mr. Ragsdale replied it is a moot point. As a commission, we voted on a process, a schedule, a calendar, what would be reviewed, and now we are going backwards. It is irresponsible.

Mr. Marshall stated he is not trying to go backwards and it is not irresponsible. People are spending thousands upon thousands. He stated Mr. Ragsdale was not listening to what he has been said is one of the reasons this problem exists.

Mr. Ragsdale stated he has heard every word that has been said.

Mr. Marshall stated this time consuming process is costing thousands.

Mr. Ragsdale requested the documentation to support Mr. Marshall's statement.

Mr. Marshall asked Mr. Farmer if the real estate board has allocated money for this.

Mr. Farmer replied yes.

Mr. Marshall stated the Home Builder's Association has allocated money for this -

Mr. Ragsdale stated there is a difference of allocated and spent.

Mr. Marshall stated the Marina Association spent money for this, the Chamber of Commerce has spent money for this, SEDA had their attorney present today to talk about this. He stated he does not have access to the actual invoices, but he believes he has provided a synopsis of where the money is being spent.

Mr. Farmer stated the Commercial Council too.

Mr. Ragsdale asked if there was additional information to come before the Commission. With no response, the meeting was adjourned.

Board Action:

Ms. Myers amended her original motion to have a quorum of eight for UZO Planning meetings and absent members must contact staff for updates. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Susan Myers

Second: Ellis Cook

Russ Abolt - Not Present

Shedrick Coleman - Aye

Ellis Cook - Aye

Ben Farmer - Aye

Stephen Lufburrow - Aye

Timothy Mackey - Aye

Lacy Manigault - Aye

Murray Marshall - Aye

Tanya Milton - Aye

Susan Myers - Aye

Jon Pannell - Aye

Adam Ragsdale - Aye

Rochelle Small-Toney - Aye

Joseph Welch - Aye

Board Action:

Mr. Panell motioned to adopt staff UZO Schedule 2 as presented. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Jon Pannell

Second: Shedrick Coleman

Russ Abolt - Not Present

Shedrick Coleman	- Aye
Ellis Cook	- Aye
Ben Farmer	- Aye
Stephen Lufburrow	- Aye
Timothy Mackey	- Aye
Lacy Manigault	- Aye
Murray Marshall	- Aye
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Susan Myers	- Aye
Jon Pannell	- Aye
Adam Ragsdale	- Aye
Rochelle Small-Toney	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye

Board Action:

Mr. Pannell motioned to approve review approach regarding UZO as presented by staff. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Jon Pannell

Second: Shedrick Coleman

Russ Abolt	- Not Present
Shedrick Coleman	- Aye
Ellis Cook	- Aye
Ben Farmer	- Aye
Stephen Lufburrow	- Aye
Timothy Mackey	- Aye
Lacy Manigault	- Aye
Murray Marshall	- Nay
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Susan Myers	- Aye
Jon Pannell	- Aye
Adam Ragsdale	- Aye
Rochelle Small-Toney	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye

XII. ADJOURNMENT

9. [Adjournment of June 12, 2012 Regular MPC Board Meeting](#)

There being no further business to come before the Board, Chairman Ragsdale entertained a motion to adjourn the June 12, 2012 MPC Meeting at 1:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas L. Thomson
Executive Director

TLT/bf

Note: Minutes not official until signed.

XIII. DEVELOPMENT PLANS SUBMITTED FOR REVIEW

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.