Mr. Frost stated the number of members present constituted a quorum and called the meeting to order.

The notation motion carried unanimously indicates a consensus, with the exception of the Chairman who does not participate in voting unless otherwise noted.

EXTENSIONS:

File #S2000-65  
Case #SUB2001-00040  
O.S.R. Subdivision  
South side of Old Shell Road, 500’+ East of University Boulevard  
2 Lots / 2.0+ Acres  
Request for a one-year extension of previous approval.

A motion was made by Mr. Plauche and seconded by Ms. Deakle to approve a one-year extension of previous approval for this subdivision subject to the following condition:

1) no further extensions shall be granted.

The motion carried unanimously.

File #S99-67  
Case #SUB2001-00039  
Theodore Highlands Estates Subdivision, Eleventh Addition  
West termini of Austin Avenue and David Drive, extending Southwest to the North terminus of Westfield Road.  
59 Lots / 26.5+ Acres  
Request for a one-year extension of previous approval.

A motion was made by Mr. Plauche and seconded by Ms. Deakle to approve a one-year extension of previous approval for this subdivision subject to the following condition:

1) no further extensions shall be granted.

The motion carried unanimously.

HOLDOVERS:
Case #ZON2002-00430 (Planned Unit Development)
Azalea Heights Subdivision, Resubdivision of Lots 23, 24, 25 & 26
615 Skyline Drive West (North side of Skyline Drive South, extending from Skyline Drive West to Skyline Drive East).
A Planned Unit Development Approval to allow reduced lot widths in a single-family residential subdivision was considered.

The site plan illustrates the proposed resubdivision of the site and proposed building limits.

Mr. Frost stated that the applicant was present and concurred with the staff recommendations.

There was no one present in opposition.

A motion was made by Mr. McSwain and seconded by Mr. Vallas to approve this plan subject to the following conditions:

1) limited to the plan submitted;
2) compliance with the site coverage requirements for R-1, Single-Family Residential;
3) maintenance of the shared drive to be the responsibility of the property owners;
4) subdivision markers to be approved by Traffic Engineering Department prior to permitting; and
5) full compliance with all municipal codes and ordinances, including but not limited to the provision of sidewalks.

The motion carried unanimously.

AND

Case #SUB2002-00029 (Subdivision)
Azalea Heights Subdivision, Resubdivision of Lots 23, 24, 25 & 26
615 Skyline Drive West (North side of Skyline Drive South, extending from Skyline Drive West to Skyline Drive East).
17 Lots / 4.1+ Acres

A motion was made by Mr. McSwain and seconded by Mr. Vallas to waive Section V.D.2 (minimum width requirements) of the Subdivision Regulations and approve this subdivision subject to the following condition:

1) compliance with the accompanying PUD.

The motion carried unanimously.

AND

Case #ZON2002-00429 (Planned Unit Development)
Azalea Heights Subdivision, Resubdivision of Lots 9 & 10
608 Skyline Drive West (West side of Skyline Drive West at the West terminus of Skyline Drive South).
A request for Planned Unit Development Approval to allow reduced lot widths in a single-family residential subdivision was considered.

The plan illustrates the proposed subdivision and building limits.

A motion was made by Mr. McSwain and seconded by Mr. Vallas to approve this plan subject to the following conditions:

1) limited to the plan submitted;
2) compliance with the site coverage requirements for R-1, Single-Family Residential;
3) maintenance of the shared drive to be the responsibility of the property owners;
4) subdivision markers to be approved by Traffic Engineering Department prior to permitting; and
5) full compliance with all municipal codes and ordinances, including but not limited to the provision of sidewalks.

The motion carried unanimously.

AND

Case #SUB2002-00028
Azalea Heights Subdivision, Resubdivision of Lots 9 & 10
608 Skyline Drive West (West side of Skyline Drive West at the West terminus of Skyline Drive South).
8 Lots / 2.0+ Acres

A motion was made by Mr. McSwain and seconded by Mr. Vallas to waive Section V.D.2 (minimum width requirements) of the Subdivision Regulations and approve this subdivision subject to the following condition:

1) compliance with the accompanying PUD.

The motion carried unanimously.

NEW GROUP APPLICATIONS:

Case #ZON2002-00557 (Rezoning)
Glenn Glisson
2654 Clubhouse Road (North side of Clubhouse Road, 330’+ East of Gonzales Road).
A request for a change in zoning from R-1, Single-Family Residential, to R-2, Two-Family Residential, for a residential subdivision with reduced lot sizes and reduced building setbacks was considered.

The plan illustrates the proposed subdivision.

Many neighbors adjacent to the subject site attended this meeting in opposition to the proposed development.

Matt Orrell, Polysurveying Engineering – Land Surveying, was present representing the applicant. Mr. Orrell requested that the Commission holdover this request to allow Councilman Brooks and the developer to meet with the opposing neighbors present at the meeting to discuss the planned development and offer examples of the homes planned for development at this site.

Ben Brooks, Council representative for the subject site, was present. Mr. Brooks explained to the Commission and the opposing neighbors present that he would like to schedule a meeting to be held in their neighborhood with the developer for the proposed development present to answer any questions. Mr. Brooks felt it was always good to exchange information to be sure everyone was on the same page and if the concerns of the neighbors were not resolved to their satisfaction at the neighborhood meeting they could attend the future Commission meeting including this agenda item.

Don Stokely, 2700 Clubhouse Road, was present and raised concerns that if the property was re-zoned, anything other than residential could be built at the subject site in the future.

Mr. Boone noted that the re-zoning was subject to the accompanying PUD application, which limited the site to a single-family dwelling, and the applicant would not be allowed
to switch the use to a duplex without following due process by submitting the necessary application and reappearing before the Commission.

Mr. Brooks asked if Mr. Olsen could also attend the neighborhood meeting.

Mr. Boone and Mr. Olsen assured Mr. Brooks that the staff would be happy to assist.

Linda Tillman, Gonzales Road, was present and questioned whether the Corp of Engineers had been consulted with regard to any wetlands delineation projects applicable to this site.

Mr. Frost was not aware if the Corp had been consulted with regard to this site. However, he explained that the developer would be required to obtain all necessary permits and approvals, as well as comply with all codes and ordinances, regardless of whether or not the Commission included a restriction concerning wetlands. Mr. Frost encouraged Ms. Tillman to address this concern with the developer at the proposed neighborhood meeting.

AND

Case #ZON2002-00558 (Planned Unit Development)
Clubhouse Garden Homes Subdivision
2654 Clubhouse Road (North side of Clubhouse Road, 330’+ East of Gonzales Road).
A request for Planned Unit Development Approval to allow reduced building setbacks, reduced lot widths, and reduced lot sizes in a single-family residential subdivision was considered.

The plan illustrates the proposed subdivision.

AND

Case #SUB2002-00045 (Subdivision)
Clubhouse Garden Homes Subdivision
2654 Clubhouse Road (North side of Clubhouse Road, 330’+ East of Gonzales Road).
29 Lots / 4.8+ Acres

A motion was made by Mr. Frost and seconded by Mr. Plauche to hold over these requests until the April 18, 2002 Planning Commission meeting at the request of the applicant.

The motion carried unanimously.

Case #ZON2002-00560 (Rezoning)
MRBJ Company, L.L.C. (Jim McElroy, Agent)
2548 and 2550 Government Boulevard (West side of Government Boulevard, 240’+ North of Kreitner Street, extending to the North side of Kreitner Street, 235’+ West of Government Boulevard).
A request for a change in zoning from B-2, Neighborhood Business, B-3, Community Business, and R-1, Single-Family Residential, to B-3, Community Business, to eliminate split zoning within a retail shopping center was considered.

The plan illustrates the existing structure along with the existing and proposed zonings.

Don Coleman, Rester and Coleman Engineers, Inc., was present representing the applicant. Mr. Coleman agreed with the conditions as recommended by the staff, except condition #2 on the subdivision application requiring placement of a note on the final plat stating that Lot 4 not be developed until Eslava Creek Parkway is constructed or Eslava Creek Parkway right-of-way is vacated and Lot 4 is incorporated into Lot 3. Mr. Coleman requested that the Commission amend the condition to allow Lot 4 to be incorporated into Lot 3 or Lot 1.

There was no one present in opposition.
A motion was made by Mr. Frost and seconded by Ms. Deakle to recommend the approval of this change in zoning to the City Council subject to the following conditions:

1) dedication of sufficient right-of-way to provide 125’ from centerline of Government Boulevard;
2) development limited to the accompanying PUD, and subsequent PUD’s for development of the out parcels;
3) limited to three curb cuts for the entire site – one main entrance/exit to Government Boulevard (existing) near the center of the site, and one curb cut each for lots 2 & 3 to the Government Boulevard Service Road, to be approved by the Traffic Engineering Department and ALDOT; and
4) completion of the subdivision process.

AND

Case #ZON2002-00559 (Planned Unit Development)
D/M Subdivision
2548 and 2550 Government Boulevard (West side of Government Boulevard, 240’ North of Kreitner Street, extending to the North side of Kreitner Street, 235’ West of Government Boulevard).
A request for Planned Unit Development Approval to allow shared access between multiple building sites was considered.

The plan illustrates the existing structure along with the existing and proposed zonings.

A motion was made by Mr. Frost and seconded by Ms. Deakle to approve this plan subject to the following conditions:

1) completion of the rezoning and subdivision processes;
2) submission and approval of Administrative PUD applications for development of each out parcel (submission to include parking and circulation information for the entire site to ensure overall compliance with parking and circulation requirements);
3) limited to three curb cuts for the entire site – one main entrance/exit to Government Boulevard (existing) near the center of the site, and one curb cut each for lots 2 & 3 to the Government Boulevard Service Road, to be approved by the Traffic Engineering Department and ALDOT;
4) full compliance with landscaping and tree planting requirements for each out parcel when developed;
5) compliance with frontage landscaping and tree planting requirements for the Government Boulevard frontage; and
6) signage to be brought into compliance with new development configuration prior to issuance of any new sign permits.

AND

Case #SUB2002-00046 (Subdivision)
D/M Subdivision
2548 and 2550 Government Boulevard (West side of Government Boulevard, 240’ North of Kreitner Street, extending to the North side of Kreitner Street, 235’ West of Government Boulevard).
4 Lots / 13.2± Acres
A motion was made by Mr. Frost and seconded by Ms. Deakle to approve this subdivision subject to the following conditions:

1) placement of a note on the final plat stating that the subdivision is limited to three curb cuts for the entire site – one main entrance/exit to Government Boulevard (existing) near the center of the site, and one curb cut each for lots 2 & 3 to the Government Boulevard Service Road, to be approved by the Traffic Engineering Department and ALDOT;
2) placement of a note on the final plat stating that Lot 4 not be developed until Eslava Creek Parkway is constructed or Eslava Creek Parkway right-of-way is vacated and Lot 4 is incorporated into Lot 1 or Lot 3; and
3) completion of the rezoning process.

The motion carried unanimously.

Case #ZON2002-00556 (Rezoning)
Bruce Butler
1205 Henry Street (East side of Henry Street, 410’+ North of Duval Street).
A request for a change in zoning from R-3, Multi-Family Residential, to B-2, Neighborhood Business, for a church was considered.

The plan illustrates the proposed building and parking.

Mr. Frost stated that the applicant was present and concurred with the staff recommendations.

There was no one present in opposition.

A motion was made by Mr. McSwain and seconded by Mr. Vallas to recommend the approval of this change in zoning to the City Council subject to the following conditions:

1) the parking facility provide either a circulation pattern or turn-around, design to be approved by the Traffic Engineering Department;
2) completion of the subdivision process prior to issuance of any permits; and
3) full compliance with all municipal codes and ordinances, including but not limited to landscaping and tree plantings and sidewalks.

AND

Case #SUB2002-00041 (Subdivision)
Love of God Church Subdivision
1205 Henry Street (East side of Henry Street, 410’+ North of Duval Street).
1 Lot / 0.4+ Acre
A motion was made by Mr. McSwain and seconded by Mr. Vallas to approve this subdivision.

The motion carried unanimously.

NEW ZONING APPLICATION:

Case #ZON2002-00562
Dave Guess
1515 South University Boulevard (East side of University Boulevard, 560’+ South of Boulevard Executive Park).
A request for a change in zoning from B-2, Neighborhood Business, to B-3, Community Business, for light distribution of medical equipment was considered.

The site plan illustrates the existing structure and parking lot.

Mr. Vallas recused himself from the discussion and vote regarding this case.

With the recusal of Mr. Vallas, Mr. Frost announced that the Commission could not procedurally move forward with the discussion concerning this application because a quorum of Commission members no longer existed.

Counsel advised that Mr. Vallas would be allowed to participate in the vote to hold over this application.
A motion was made by Mr. Frost and seconded by Mr. Vallas to hold over this request to the April 4, 2002 Planning Commission meeting.

The motion carried.

**NEW SUBDIVISION APPLICATIONS:**

**Case #SUB2002-00042**

*James Haynes Homeplace Subdivision*

North side of Moreland Road, 260’+ East of Creel Road.

3 Lots / 3.8+ Acres

Mr. Frost stated that the applicant was present and concurred with the staff recommendations.

There was no one present in opposition.

A motion was made by Mr. McSwain and seconded by Ms. Deakle to approve this subdivision subject to the following conditions:

1) placement of a note on the final plat stating that Lots 1 - 3 are limited to one curb cut each, with the size, location and design to be approved by the County Engineering Department;
2) the placement of a note on the final plat stating that any lot that is developed commercially and adjoins residentially developed property shall provide a buffer, in compliance with Section V.A.7, of the Subdivision Regulations; and
3) placement of required 25’ minimum building setback lines on the final plat.

The motion carried unanimously.

**Case #SUB2002-00044**

*Oak Forest Subdivision, Revised*

East side of Dawes Road, 450’+ North of Iron Gate Way.

133 Lots / 42.0+ Acres

Mr. Coleman, Rester and Coleman Engineers, Inc., was present representing the applicant and requested that this application be held over.

There was no one present in opposition.

A motion was made by Mr. Frost and seconded by Mr. Plauche to hold over this request to the April 4, 2002 Planning Commission meeting at the request of the applicant.

The motion carried unanimously.

**Case #SUB2002-00043**

*Winn Place Subdivision*

South side of Selma Street, 270’+ West of George Street.

1 Lot / 0.4+ Acre

Mr. Frost stated that the applicant was present and concurred with the staff recommendations.

There was no one present in opposition.

A motion was made by Ms. Deakle and seconded by Mr. McSwain to approve this subdivision subject to the following condition:

1) the placement of the twenty-five foot minimum building setback line on the final plat.

The motion carried unanimously.
Case #SUB2002-00040
Lake Woods Subdivision, Second Addition, Resubdivision of Lot 27
East side of Lake Woods Drive North at its North terminus.
1 Lot / 0.5+ Acre

Mr. Frost stated that the applicant was present and concurred with the staff recommendations.

There was no one present in opposition.

A motion was made by Ms. Deakle and seconded by Mr. McSwain to approve this subdivision.

The motion carried unanimously.

Case #SUB2002-00030
Terrell Estates Subdivision
South side of Airport Boulevard, 600’+ East of the South terminus of Flave Pierce Road, extending to the West side of Lowry Road.
207 Lots / 75.0+ Acres

Bubba Baker (applicant), Baker Properties, 501 Ridgelawn Drive West, was present. Mr. Baker reported that he agreed with the conditions as recommended by the staff except condition #2 requiring the phasing to be coordinated such that lots 27-104 should not be recorded until the Dawes Road/Airport Boulevard Connector was constructed and the connection made. Mr. Baker reported that the subject property was located on Airport Boulevard just west of the entrance to the airport, with an existing trailer park on the east side, an existing mini-storage on the west side, and undeveloped land around the property. He presented to the Commission a reconfigured plan as recommended by the staff with the subdivision re-designed such that all lots were increased to the minimum 7,200 square feet standard requirement, however, the majority of the proposed lots were 55’ in width; therefore, the request for a waiver of Section V.D.2 was necessary. He explained that the plan now consisted of 203 residential lots, five commercial lots on Airport Boulevard, and some future development of the property along the proposed Dawes Road/Airport Boulevard Connector. Mr. Baker reported that there was an existing median cut on Airport Boulevard for access to the property and with the staff’s direction and recommendations the plan now allowed for access to the south to the undeveloped property and also to the east for the future Dawes Road/Airport Boulevard Connector being designed and scheduled for construction. Mr. Baker reported that he received confirmation of the delineation from Barry Vittor, Corp of Engineers, and he presented a copy to the Commission and the staff.

Mr. Baker felt the existing median cut on Airport Boulevard would provide adequate access, and pointed out that almost 40% of the developable lots on the property would be cut out at this time if lots 27-104 could not be recorded until the Dawes Road/Airport Boulevard Connector was constructed and the connection made. Mr. Baker realized that the Dawes Road/Airport Boulevard project was a high priority and understood the bids were scheduled to let out in October with the construction to proceed immediately, however, the project was not in his control.

Mr. Baker was willing to DEDICATE the additional 25’ in addition to an existing 25’ right-of-way for Lowry Road. He reported that the development timeline would be dictated by the selling market and the project would begin coming off of Airport Boulevard, and once enough lots sold another phase would begin. He wanted to keep the momentum going once development commenced. He reported there was a strong demand and need from first-time homebuyers, single families, and retirees seeking this price range and type of lot and he hoped the road would very quickly be constructed.

Mr. Baker noted that according to the engineers, the subject site could accommodate approximately 263 lots in the land area designated for the residential lots based on the 7,200 square foot minimum requirements; however, his plan included only 203 lots.
Therefore, from a density point of view, the proposed plan consisted of 77% of the maximum density of lots based on square footage.

Mr. Pat Stewart, County Engineering Office, reported that the Dawes Road/Airport Boulevard Connector should be completed within 12-18 months if the contract was to go out for bid in mid-October. Mr. Stewart reported that the necessary right-of-way required for the project was being acquired at every opportunity.

Robert Berg, Berg and Company, 2100 Government Street, was present representing a client. Mr. Berg questioned whether restrictions would apply to the proposed lots and if the proposed homes would be subject to a minimum square footage requirement. Mr. Berg also questioned why the developer proposed 55’ lot widths instead of 60’ lot widths.

Dalton Orr, 1251 Walter Smith Road, who had appeared before the Commission at several meetings in the past couple of months with concerns in regard to a previous application for Cyrus Cove Subdivision, was present and raised some of the same concerns with regard to the subject application. He was concerned because the subject area was environmentally sensitive with wetlands that gave into a flood plain. He was further concerned that the applicant was requesting a waiver of the minimum lot width requirement, due to the density in the area, and the effect this waiver would have on the entire area. Mr. Orr felt that if this waiver was granted that the developer of the proposed Cyrus Cove Subdivision would reappear before the Commission to propose for substandard lots closer to the 55’ width of these proposed lots at the subject site. Mr. Orr understood according to County Engineers he spoke with there was an area southwest of the subject site that was a floodplain with no floodway and could not be touched. He was concerned that people may be developing the subject area without really understanding the full impact that all the development in this area would have on the wetlands and flooding in the area.

Mr. Frost asked if any subdivision restrictions would apply to the proposed development site, and if any minimum square footage requirements would apply to the proposed homes.

Mr. Baker noted that the majority of the proposed lots were in the 55’ width range, however, the impact on the wetlands would be minimal since the lots met the 7,200 square foot lot size, and the developer would be required to meet all federal regulations required. Mr. Baker understood that the subject property was not located in the existing flood plain and the reason he submitted the revised drawing was to be sure there was a minimal impact on the wetlands. Mr. Baker reported that he anticipated building affordable homes to target first-time homebuyers, retirees, single families, and those who may have suffered a job loss as a result of the plants closing in the Mobile area.

Mr. Frost asked the staff why they felt the waiver from 60’ lot widths to 55’ was appropriate.

Mr. Boone felt it was the size of the lots that really drove density more so than the front footage along the streets, and explained that in examining the piece of land in its entirety, by reducing the minimum width of the lots from 60’ to 55’ you could get more houses on the street and maintain the 7,200 square foot lot sizes. He reported that the idea behind innovative subdivisions was that you actually reduced lots from 7,200 square feet to 6,500 square feet and provided the balance somewhere in open space, as the Commission saw in the previous Cyrus Cove Subdivision application. However, with the proposed plan at the subject site you had open space with no reduction in minimum lot size. Although there was a reduction in lot width, you had one house per 7,200 square feet. Therefore, there would be some clustering in that the houses were closer together, but overall there would be more common space and open space that would provide restriction of development and hopefully reduce the impact on the wetlands.

Mr. Vallas raised concerns that prolonging the development of lots 27-104, 70+ lots, until the construction of the Dawes Road/Airport Boulevard Connector placed a hold on a substantial portion of the development.
Mr. Boone explained that the staff’s concern was safety and approximately 130 lots would be restricted to one access point, which could cause a problem for a fire truck accessing the premises. He reported that the property to the south of the subject site would likely be developed within the next 24 months offering a stub out. Mr. Boone reported that it was the Commission’s discretion if they wished to push the line over to allow more lots to be developed in the initial phases, however, this would result in more lots restricted to the single access point. Mr. Boone noted that the staff preferred more than one point of access when the number of lots exceeded 100.

A motion was made by Ms. Deakle and seconded by Mr. Vallas to waive Section V.D.2 (minimum width requirements) of the Subdivision Regulations and approve this subdivision subject to the following conditions:

1) dedication of sufficient right-of-way to provide 50’ from centerline of Lowry Road (future Dawes Road/Airport Boulevard Connector), dedication to be provided with initial recording of first unit;
2) Phasing to be coordinated such that lots 38-86 should not be recorded until the Dawes Road/Airport Boulevard Connector is constructed and the connection made;
3) placement of notes on the final plat stating that Lot C-1 limited to 1 curb cut to Airport Boulevard, Lots C-2 and C-3 to share one joint driveway to Airport Boulevard, Lots C-4 and C-5 to share one joint driveway to Airport Boulevard, 30’ access easement along rear of lots C-2 through C-5 to provide access (one curb cut) to subdivision street, and Lot C-1 allowed one curb cut to subdivision street;
4) “tot lot” to be labeled as common area;
5) placement of a note on the final plat stating that maintenance of all common areas shall be the responsibility of the property owners association; and
6) that any necessary approvals be obtained from federal, state and local agencies prior to the issuance of any permits.

The motion carried unanimously.

**NEW SIDEWALK WAIVER APPLICATION:**

*Case #ZON2002-00448*

*Billy Bunch*

2858 Government Boulevard (Southwest corner of Government Boulevard and Brossett Street).

A request to waive construction of a sidewalk along Brossett Street was considered.

The applicant was not present.

There was no one present in opposition.

A motion was made by Ms. Deakle and seconded by Mr. Plauche to deny this request due to the following reasons:

1) the applicant did not provide the Engineering Department an engineering reason that the sidewalk could not be constructed; and
2) the Engineering Department concludes that the site appears to be amenable for sidewalk construction.

The motion carried unanimously.

**OTHER BUSINESS:**

*Case #SUB2002-00010*

*Sprint Center Subdivision*

1456 South Broad Street (Northwest corner of South Broad Street and an unnamed public right-of-way, extending North and West to the Central Georgia Railroad right-of-way).

1 Lot / 0.7+ Acre
Mr. Olsen reported that this subdivision application appeared before the Commission on the February 7, 2002 agenda, and the small, unnamed, unopened right-of-way was a driveway to the house from the rear. The staff had recommended dedication on both Broad Street and the unnamed right-of-way, however the Commission deleted the requirement of dedication from the unnamed right-of-way but did not change the condition that required the 25’ standard setback along both the major street and the unnamed right-of-way. Mr. Olsen questioned if it was the Commission’s intent to amend the condition as the applicant was requesting and not require the setback along the unnamed unopened right-of-way, which would not affect the Broad Street setback at all.

Mr. Frost questioned if anything currently existed within the setback at this point.

Mr. Olsen reported that a substation was all that was on the property now and part of the substation may be within the setback; however, the setback requirement would not affect the existing development, but would only relate to any new construction.

A motion was made by Ms. Deakle and seconded by Mr. Plauche to amend the conditions applicable to the above referenced subdivision approved on February 7, 2002 as follows:

1) the dedication of adequate right-of-way to provide 50’ from the centerline along Broad Street, a planned Major Street;
2) the placement of a note on the final plat stating the development is limited to one curb cut to Broad Street; and;
3) the illustration of 25’ front setback line along Broad Street frontage.

The motion carried unanimously.

**Planning Commission Members’ Quarterly Meeting**

Mr. Boone announced that he would like to schedule a quarterly meeting of the Planning Commission members to be held April 11th at 9:30 a.m. in the Chamber of Commerce McGowin Room.

Mr. Plauche announced that George Crozier, Dauphin Island Sea Lab, would like to offer a one-hour presentation concerning water quality in addition to the normal business meeting, however, Mr. Plauche had not had the opportunity to confirm Mr. Crozier’s attendance with Ms. Clarke.

Ms. Deakle realized she had a prior engagement scheduled for 9:30 on April 11th and requested that Mr. Boone consider holding the meeting at 10:00 a.m. Mr. Frost requested that the Commission members check their agenda to see if they could attend a quarterly meeting if planned for April 11th and report back to Mr. Boone.

Mr. Frost suggested that he and Mr. Boone prepare an agenda indicating topics planned for discussion and publicly announce the quarterly meeting during the public hearing session of the regularly scheduled April 4, 2002 Commission meeting, making it clear that the public could attend the quarterly meeting, but would not be allowed to speak.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

**APPROVED:** April 18, 2002

/s/ Victor McSwain, Secretary

/s/ Robert Frost, Chairman