



CITY OF PALATKA PLANNING BOARD MINUTES February 3, 2015

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Daniel Sheffield at 4:00 pm. **Other members present:** Earl Wallace, George DeLoach, Charles Douglas, Jr., Anthony, Harwell, Anthony Harwell and new member, Tammie Williams. **Members absent:** Joe Pickens and Joseph Petrucci. **Also present:** Planning Director Thad Crowe, Recording Secretary Pam Sprouse and City Attorney Don Holmes.

Motion was made by Mr. DeLoach and seconded by Mr. Harwell to approve the minutes for the December 2, 2014 meeting. All present voted affirmative, motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Sheffield read the appeal procedures and requested that members divulge any ex-parte communications before each case.

Election of Chairperson and Vice-chairperson:

Motion made by Mr. DeLoach and seconded by Mr. Harwell to re-elect Daniel Sheffield as Chairperson. All present voted affirmative, motion carried.

Motion made by Mr. Wallace and seconded by Mr. Harwell to elect Joe Pickens to remain as Vice-chair. All present voted affirmative, motion carried.

Mr. Crowe updated the Board as to the status of the Code amendment to the Planning Code Chapter regarding the Planning Board's responsibilities and duties have been approved at first reading by the City Commission with no discussion and he expects it to be adopted at their next meeting.

OLD BUSINESS:

Case 12-44 Board review of specific design for a wall mural previously approved as to location and content.

Location: 520 St. Johns Ave

Applicant: Lee Conlee Mural Committee/John Alexander

Mr. Crowe explained that this part of an ongoing program of the Conlee Mural Committee. The proposed is a mural series on a single wall on this building. He reminded the Board that the theme and location of multiple murals including this one (named Veterans) was previously approved by the Board at their August 2012 meeting, with the requirement that the applicant provide the specifics as each mural was ready for design and installation. He added that the mural series are a departure from downtown murals, which depict events or people that are associated with the City's past and help to foster a sense of community pride and interest in local history. These murals have no local content. However they do represent a theme that is obviously important to the community and resonates to those citizens and their relatives and friends who have served. Staff supports the proposed murals with the following exception: no inclusion of text other than titles in the murals as the definition of mural (known as a wall graphic in the Sign Code) means; "a large wall decoration that depicts a scene, picture, illustration or design with

no written message, word, insignia or logo. The Board has provided some leeway in the past to allow for mural titles and limited text. In this case, Staff has advised the Applicant that they will not recommend the inclusion of text other than titles or limited subtitles, as that takes away from the primarily graphic visuals of murals. Mr. Crowe suggested that it would be preferable to have any text in the form of an eye-level plaque along the building columns that is separate and distinct from the murals. Also, Staff recommends that the Persian Gulf panel be similar to other panels, in that it should have one primary graphic, as opposed to the three panels shown in the mock-up which creates somewhat of a jarring contrast to the other one-panel murals. Also, Staff has asked the Applicant to explore the dates proposed for the Afghanistan war, as currently shown it is not clear if this war is “officially” over. In addition, he said the Applicant has indicated there would also be a World War I mural on the left end building panel. At this time, Staff has not received the mock-up and will defer any recommendation on this panel to the meeting, should the Applicant provide additional exhibits. He recommended approval of the request.

Mr. Sheffield suggested that if a motion to approve were, couldn't the Board give discretion to review the WWI panel to Staff as the Board is not reviewing the artistic effect of it. Mr. Holmes agreed that would not be a problem, and if there were some dispute between Staff and the applicant, the Board could resolve that.

Mr. Douglas asked if the applicant proposed to list the names of those veterans from this community and once the murals are up, who is responsible for maintaining them. Mr. Crowe replied that only the names of those missing in action were proposed to be listed. The maintenance agreement between the building owner and the Snyder Mural Committee, if there were an issue with the mural is not maintained it would become a code enforcement issue.

Motion made by Mr. DeLoach and seconded by Mr. Harwell to approve the request as recommended by Staff, and to allow staff to approve a future panel for WWI as well as the date change and correct the spelling of Afghanistan. All present voted affirmative, motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS:

Case 15-01: Administrative request to designate HD (Historic District Overlay zoning) for east side of N. 2nd Street between Reid St. and St. Johns Ave. (Century Block).

Mr. Crowe advised that the owner of this property was in agreement with this application and that this would enable local historic designation, in the form of the Historic Zoning Overlay. The 100 block includes four buildings with the following addresses from south (St. Johns Ave.) to north (Reid St.): 122-126 St. Johns Ave. (Moragne Building), 107-109 N. 2nd St. (Snow Building), 111-115 N. 2nd St. (Bailey Building), and 117-119 N. 2nd St. The Historic Preservation Board has recommended approval of this designation at their October, 2014 meeting. (An additional related request, which does not come before the Board, was a request for recommendation from the Historic Preservation Board and City Commission for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places, both of which were granted). He added that these are architecturally significant buildings. These buildings stand on their own as a grouping of structures, in essence a “mini-district” due to their separation from vicinity historic buildings by a four-lane road and multiple vacant properties, as well as their mostly similar construction year (1885). This group of buildings is the last intact remnant grouping of the Victorian-era riverfront district – after the turn-of-the-century commercial development shifted from a clustering oriented to the

river to more of a linear pattern along St. Johns Ave. It should also be noted that the owner has made considerable progress in sensitive interior demolition and securing of the structures, except for the Snow Building (107-109 N. 2nd St) which only now has the front façade remaining due to structural failure. The developer intends to use this latter property as a type of urban plaza where people can pass through and there can be mini markets and public type activates associated with that development. He added that our regulations for historic districts do not govern interiors, the only thing the Historic Preservation Board would look at should this building be reconstructed only the exterior alterations and elevations. Staff supports this nomination as an effort that is separate and distinct from a downtown historic district.

Mr. Sheffield asked if the owner would be restricted from rebuilding the Snow Building if it were designated locally. Mr. Crowe replied that no, the owner would be able to rebuild and the regulations do not govern interior work.

Mr. Douglas asked if there are any contingencies such as a reverter clause in the agreement if the property were to come back to the city. Mr. Crowe advised that by law there is a provision for demolition of buildings if an owner can demonstrate practical or economic hardship. Mr. Wallace stated that in his opinion, he believes this designation will add value to the buildings. Mr. Harwell commented that with being an Architect, he believed that the only real value is in the construction and the antiquity of the buildings.

Motion by Mr. Harwell and seconded by Mr. Wallace to approve the request as presented by Staff. All present voted affirmative, motion carried.

Case 15-02: Administrative request to rezone properties located generally between Morris St. to the east, Kirby St. to the south, CSX railroad to the west, and Crill Ave. to the north from R-3 (Residential Multi-family) to PBG-1 (Public Buildings and Grounds) and amending the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map from RH (Residential High-Density) to PB (Public Buildings).

Mr. Crowe explained that Staff is presenting this application as an administrative action, as opposed to an action by the property owner, since most of the properties are owned by the City and the multi-family zoning inhibits the public/private usage of the properties. Essentially the longstanding uses currently there do not fit the multi-family land use and zoning. Staff believes that it is appropriate to consider clubs and lodges as quasi-public uses, as they are utilized for public assembly, public service and the halls are often rented out to the general public for events such as weddings, meetings, dances, etc. Staff believes that the public FLUM and zoning designations are more appropriate for these types of quasi-public uses. This is why the Lions Club is applying for this companion item, a Zoning Code text amendment that would allow clubs, lodges, and fraternal organizations by right in the PBG-1 zoning district, along with the currently-allowed churches. Mr. Crowe stated that this application meets applicable future land use amendment and rezoning criteria and recommended approval of the amendment of Future Land Use Map category from RH to PB, and rezoning from R-3 to PBG-1.

Mr. Harwell asked Mr. Crowe if the intention was to allow these existing uses. Mr. Crowe replied yes, this would be a map amendment dealing with these specific properties, essentially making them conforming uses.

Motion made by Mr. DeLoach and Mr. Wallace seconded the motion to rezone those properties as presented by Staff to PBG-1(Public Buildings and Grounds). All present voted resulting in 6 yeas and 1 nay (Mr. Harwell), motion carried.

Motion made by Mr. DeLoach to amend the Comprehensive Plan designation to PB (Public Buildings) to those properties as presented by staff. All present voted resulting in 6 yeas and 1 nay (Mr. Harwell), motion carried.

Case 15-03: Administrative request to amend Zoning Code Sec. 94-149 (C-2, Intensive Commercial), Sec. 94-161 (DR, Downtown Riverfront district) and 94-162 (DB, Downtown Business district) revising downtown overlay design standards.

Mr. Crowe recommended tabling until next month's meeting to allow staff more time to prepare the report.

Motion made by Mr. DeLoach and seconded by Mr. Douglas to table this case until March 3, 2015. All present voted, motion carried unopposed.

Case 15-04: Administrative request to amend Zoning Code Sec. 94-153 (PBG-1, Public Buildings and Grounds district) to allow clubs, lodges and fraternal organizations.

The American Legion is applying for this Zoning Code text amendment to allow clubs, lodges, and fraternal organizations by right in the PBG-1 zoning district, along with the currently-allowed churches. Staff supports this request as the public FLUM and zoning designations are quite appropriate for these types of uses. These uses are generally utilized for public assembly and the halls are often rented out to the general public for events such as weddings, meetings, dances, etc. Staff believes it to be logical to include clubs, lodges and fraternal organizations in PBG-1 and recommended approval.

John Poitevent 269 River Dr., East Palatka, asked what specifically would change, if this item is approved, in terms of properties. He also asked if there were any properties zoned PBG-1 along the riverfront. Mr. Crowe advised that this request is considered to have a limited impact. He said there is a limited number of properties across the City zoned PBG-1 (for mostly public type uses, including the Health Dept. and public buildings) and that this change would allow for additional uses of those buildings and none of the property along the riverfront is zoned PBG-1.

Mr. Harwell asked if it was possible to build a building by a private organization for those uses allowed in the PBG-1 zoning district. Mr. Crowe answered yes, that the zoning does allow for quasi-public uses, such as hospitals, institutions like nursing homes. Discussion took place regarding whether land ownership played a role in the allowance of these uses. Mr. Crowe advised the Board that property ownership did not have any bearing on the zoning and allowable uses. He said that zoning concerns itself with character and function. Mr. Harwell stated that a big concern of his would be that some private organization could come in and build on public property. Mr. Crowe replied that this could only happen with City approval (which could happen now in any zoning district). Property ownership is not germane to zoning or public safety. What the Planning Board has to consider is the use and the characteristics of the use, public safety and the impacts of the use, not whether it is owned by one entity or another. Discussion continued regarding concerns for City owned property becoming developed for

private use. Mr. Crowe reiterated that if there is ever a building built on a piece of City owned property (for public or private use) it would go before the City Commission, that this Board does not deal with ownership issues but use issues. Mr. Holmes stated that this is just another zoning category and the read permitted principal uses and structures from the Zoning Code Section 94-153 for PBG-1 (Public Buildings and Grounds): public buildings serving the city, county, state or federal government, museums, schools, hospitals, libraries and community centers. churches - including rectories or similar uses, nursing homes, colleges and ancillary uses - including student residences, administrative offices, and sports facilities also the following conditional uses can be considered; homes for the aged or orphans, and similar uses as well as community residential homes. Mr. Crowe added the request is just to add clubs and lodges to that list. He read from the Zoning Code the intent of the district. He explained that a quasi-public use does not have to be open to all members of the public, it can have a specific congregation or a specific user group, but however they generally do have an element of public access. Mr. Douglas asked if it would help matters if it were to be allowed under the conditional use section. Mr. Crowe replied that there are a couple of reasons he is recommending an allowable use, mainly that he is interested in reducing red tape wherever he can and the problem in some of the older areas of the City is that when they come in under conditional use the code compels them to meet all parking landscaping and code requirements, which are a lot of hoops to jump through. New construction has its own set of code requirements. Mr. Holmes said that he believed there was some confusion with the word "public" in the title of the zoning category. He asked Mr. Crowe where clubs, lodges and fraternal organizations are currently allowed now, regardless of ownership because what is being talked about is not a zoning district but rather issues pertaining to what groups the city would agree to rent property to. Mr. Holmes stated that Staff is only proposing to add to the uses already allowed in the PBG-1. These are uses that are currently allowed in other districts, and unless the Board finds that there is an inherent conflict with the proposed uses and the uses that are already allowed in this zoning designation, then basically it is just a matter of opening up a segment of uses that can be placed in this category. Mr. Crowe said that these uses are currently allowed in R-3 (Residential multi-family) and commercial districts.

Motion made by Mr. DeLoach. Mr. Sheffield passed the gavel to Ms. Williams and made the second to approve the request as submitted by Staff. Discussion: Mr. Douglas asked Mr. Holmes if adding the uses for clubs, lodges fraternal organizations consistent with the council's interpretation of what is currently allowed in the PBG-1 category. Mr. Holmes replied that he did not see anything inherently inconsistent with any of the other use already allowed in that category. Question called: A Vote resulted in 4 yeas and 2 nays (Mr. Harwell and Mr. Wallace). Motion passed.

Case 15-05: Request for a conditional use to allow for an alcohol serving establishment within 300 feet of a church (in association with a restaurant and ship's store within the riverfront park).

Location: 301 River St.

Applicant: City of Palatka/Jonathan Griffith Special Projects Manager

Mr. Crowe explained that this request is for alcohol sales at the future Riverfront Park ship's store, with package sales and on-premises sales within an intended 150-seat maximum restaurant. The building's design was previously approved by the Historic Preservation Board. The land use and zoning categories allowed the proposed use as a customary accessory use to a marina. The building site is in the interior of

Riverfront Park, a community park facility, and is more than 300 feet from the nearest residence to the south (on River St.) and around 400 feet from the church (to the north). He added that the park improvements and this store have been designed to be compatible with surrounding uses through placement several hundred feet away from residences and the church, along with extensive plantings. As required by historic district regulations (the southern park is within the South Historic District) the building itself was reviewed and approved by the Historic Preservation Board in two separate public hearings, with extensive public input received and processed. He corrected the record with an revised seating capacity of the restaurant of 200 seats. Staff recommended approval with the following conditions:

- The development must be in keeping with the submitted site plan,
- The development must meet all applicable standards of the Municipal Code, including the Alcoholic Beverage Code.

Mr. Sheffield asked if in the staff report, the area depicted in red on the site plan for the ship store/restaurant was the only area being considered for the conditional use, not the whole riverfront parcel. Mr. Crowe replied that was correct, the request is specific for that specific location. Mr. Holmes stated that could be a specified condition that the conditional use only covers the footprint of the building should the Board decide to approve the application.

Motion was made by Mr. DeLoach and seconded by Ms. Williams to table this request to allow the Board members time to review materials that had not been received by some Board members. Mr. Douglas asked if the Board could take a recess to allow for review of the staff report and allow the public a chance to hear the case as they have made themselves available for this meeting. Mr. DeLoach withdrew his motion. Meeting recessed at 5:20 and reconvened at 5:41 pm.

Mr. Hartwig, 542 West River Rd. Bostwick stated that he is a member of the First Presbyterian Church, a past member of the Session (a ruling body of the church) and a registered landscape architect practicing in this area. He expressed opposition for himself and on behalf of the Presbyterian Church, stating that they believe it is a conflict of interest and an invasion of the zoning code. He asked the Board to deny the request and to protect the property rights of those surrounding this use.

George Head, New Pastor at First Presbyterian Church 123 S. 2nd Street, spoke in opposition of the request, citing concerns of putting alcohol too close to the Church and to the children in the Church's play yard, as well as, the children at the riverfront park. The members of the Church want to be good neighbors but have adamantly expressed their opposition to this request. The church holds AA (Alcoholics Anonymous) meetings there and he does not believe it to be a good thing for the members of the meetings, the children or even the congregation, to walk out the front door of the church to face that kind of activity, he believes it to be a better fit somewhere else. Mr. Sheffield asked if they were opposed to the restaurant or alcohol. Mr. Head replied that he believes that the members of the church are adamant about keeping it a park, open and beautiful - a place where you would want to take your family.

Mr. Phillips, 109 Karen Court, Palatka, Pastor of Grace Fellowship Church located at 2400 St. Johns Ave., asked the Board to respect the 300 foot distance restriction between a place that provides alcohol and a place of worship that was put in place by the City, to respect the quiet, solemnity and the dignity of what goes on at a place of worship. Mr. Holmes stated, as a matter of clarification, to the references

that perhaps the City is breaking some rule by considering the allowance of an alcohol serving establishment within 300 feet of a church, which is not accurate. He said that there is a framework within our code that has been in place since the ordinance was adopted. The ordinance specifically allows alcohol serving establishments within 300 feet of each other or a church on a case by case basis, if the criteria that are established for the granting of the conditional use are met. This is not the first conditional use for an alcohol serving establishment or for a church within the distance restrictions or vice/versa and that granting one or the other does not mean you have to grant the next, because each time the Board is obligated to look at those criteria that were established in advance, The Board's job is to apply the facts of each case to the criteria that are there and then decide if a conditional use should be granted.

Mr. Robert Browning, 225 River Dr., spoke in opposition, stating that until we agreed to build the hotel and the Georgia Pacific education building the riverfront had never looked better, it was really inviting. The park is becoming a smaller and smaller bit of green space. He wanted to know when it is going to stop, when would this community stop covering the beautiful thing we have in Putnam County and covering it with concrete.

John Poitevent asked what the distance would be between the church and the proposed building and what the zoning is on that property. Mr. Crowe advised that the zoning is REC (Recreational) and the distance from building to building is approximately 400 ft. but the conditional use distance is measured from property line to property line. Mr. Poitevent stated that he concurred with his church members concerns of the alcohol being so close to the church and also the AA (alcoholics anonymous) meetings as well as the music and possible outdoor entertainment noise. Mr. Crowe clarified that this request does not come with a noise variance.

Applicant Jonathan Griffith explained that the City has negotiated with Palatka Boathouse Marina to operate the restaurant, ship store, the water taxis, the bathhouse and restrooms. Everyone is aware the park has been plagued with vagrants because the City does not have a policing presence there and it is not a simple as putting an officer down there. Best management practices have taught him that one should replace bad behavior with good behavior. A current trend (used for some time, especially in larger cities) is to program the recreation and open space, not just with active recreation but balanced with commercial enterprise. This brings in good behavior. The City is requesting a conditional use for the sale of alcohol at the request of the restaurateur who worked with a small business development consultant to develop a business plan that would work. What they were advised is that they needed at least a 150-seat restaurant with the ability to sell liquor, wine and beer or else they would not be able to sustain the water taxis, restrooms, bathhouse and docks. Mr. Holmes pointed out that the staff's recommendation referred to beer and wine and asked if Staff was able to support the request with additional alcohol sales. Mr. Griffith stated that he forwarded an e-mail notification to the Planning Dept. adding the sale of liquor and increasing the seating capacity to 200 seats, at the business owner's request. Mr. Crowe said yes he would support that and that in terms of zoning, the type of alcohol is not differentiated, it is all considered under the term alcohol.

Mr. Michael Czymbor, City Manager, reiterated Mr. Holmes advice that the Board must base their decision on the 11 specific criteria for each conditional use request. In an effort to make this area a destination place, in order to do that, one of the amenities necessary is this particular conditional use to

sell alcohol as part of an overall business plan. It is considered a critical component, as all of the working parts have to be moving together.

Mr. Browning asked who was going to own the building and operate the restaurant. Mr. Griffith stated that the City would own the building and that there is a draft operational agreement in place with the Boathouse Marina.

Mr. Pointevent asked what the City's interest in putting this facility here stating concerns of less and less public space. Mr. Griffith stated that critical mass for compatible commercial businesses is needed. The revitalization plan is looking at clustering restaurants in the downtown area and having someone operate the dock, ramps and park area and be a policing presence. The City will own the building not the restaurant business. The City ends up with restrooms, bathhouse for the boaters and end up with something that is nice for the citizens and those visiting Palatka.

Bob Griffin, 309 River St. stated that he has endured more than six months of construction noise, and said he supports the city's efforts of trying to develop something more there. He asked if there were any other required zonings that would be required to fill this draft agreement, particularly the fuel facilities for the marina, and asked where the fuel tanks would be. Chairman Sheffield reiterated that that is not the matter before the Board for consideration. Mr. Griffith responded that the underground storage tanks would be located in the center of the boat parking lot.

Discussion took place noise and parking and designs. Mr. Douglas asked if new construction for new restaurant would have to meet parking requirements. Mr. Czymbor advised that with regards to noise, the City has a noise ordinance that would govern that and there is an ordinance regarding alcohol on Sundays and that this establishment would have to abide by the ordinances as would any other similar business establishment. Mr. Crowe advised that would be correct, and that had been addressed. Mr. Griffith reviewed the elevation plan approved by the Historic Preservation Board and stated that if any changes are proposed, they would go back through the Historic Preservation Board. Mr. Harwell stated the environment being created and with regarding adverse effects to public interest, he believed it important the architecture be considered by the Planning Board. Mr. Crowe advised that the Boards should not and do not overlap, design review board in this case is the Historic Preservation Board. The Planning Board focuses on land use and zoning. With conditional uses this board would look at the buffering and zoning related site plan issues and not architectural issues. To have two Boards review design aspects would counterproductive. He also advised that the Code required one parking space for every four seats and allows that parking to be within 600 feet, and Staff has determined that together with available public parking this use would meet this requirement.

Mr. Phillips asked for a list of the criteria the Board must consider for the request. Mr. Holmes advised that a list of criteria for a conditional use review can be found in the Municipal Code Sec. 94-3(4).

Mr. Harwell stated that he agreed with a lot of what the people here today had to say as well as Staff, but believes overall it is a far better thing than it is a negative thing and believes it will all work out in the end as a benefit.

Motion made by Mr. Harwell to approve the conditional use to approve the request to include a maximum of 200 seats and allow for onsite consumption and package sales of liquor would not be

allowed. Mr. Sheffield passed the gavel to Ms. Williams and seconded the motion. Discussion: Mr. DeLoach stated that he has not always agreed with everything that has gone on downtown but progress is progress and he liked to see change. The City and the Blue Crab Festival (he was chairman for many years) have worked well with the Church and the Church has been a good neighbor to the City and the City should listen to what the Church has to say, and be a good neighbor to the Church. The question was called, and the vote was three yeas (Mr. Sheffield, Mr. Douglas and Mr. Harwell) and three nays (Mr. Wallace, Ms. Williams and Mr. DeLoach). Motion failed due to a tie vote.

Mr. Sheffield asked if there was a compromise or another vote that could be made that would satisfy the church. Discussion continued: Mr. Griffith stated for point of clarification that the building is approximately 400 feet from the Church and that if the allowance of alcohol were not approved the rest of the planned facilities may fall through. Mr. Wallace stated that he was opposed to packaged sales period, but has no objection to onsite consumption in general. Mr. Douglas reminded the Board that in the recent past, the Board considered another alcohol serving establishment within 300 feet of a church that had concerns and the Board was able to work out a compromise with additional restrictions such as buffers and vegetation so the establishment could serve alcohol and the Church was satisfied that the use would not conflict and would want to be consistent in the application in the decisions it makes in regards to conditional uses. Mr. Holmes stated that his concern is that the Board base their decisions upon the criteria listed and not whether there should be development on the riverfront or not, whether there should be a restaurant there or not, whether private industry is being competed with or not but the criteria set forth.

Mr. Sheffield re-opened the discussion to the public.

Mr. Douglas asked if the Church could meet with Staff to possibly come up with some buffering that may satisfy the church.

Mr. Browning stated that the Church is adamantly opposed to the sale of alcohol at this location. He added that a group from the Church could sit down with staff and try to find some common ground.

Mr. Poitevent stated that he came in with an open mind but had come to be opposed. He stated that he understands that a restaurant of that size needs the alcohol provision to succeed, but that is the real problem. He believes that it is very clear that it is incompatible with what is around it.

Mr. Hartwig stated that he did not believe that this was a compatible use and that any amount of landscaping, sound requirements or limited use is going to solve the problem with this non-compatible function.

Motion made by Mr. Douglas and seconded by Mr. Harwell to approve the alcohol serving establishment request without package sales. Mr. Douglass commented that as the downtown develops, there will be a lot of similar requests and fears a precedent be set that could severely hurt the development of the downtown core. He urged the Board members to reconsider. Mr. DeLoach stated that the Board is here to serve the citizens of Palatka that were there in that neighborhood, it is against their wishes and desires. With the previous request that was mentioned, the Board was able to come to a compromise and if that were the case with this request, he would have no problem voting for the request. Mr. Griffith wanted to clarify for the board that consumption is limited to the building and the deck not

the whole of the property and there for the consumption is 400 feet away from the church. Question called: A vote resulted in three yeas (Mr. Sheffield, Mr. Douglas and Mr. Harwell) and three nays (Mr. Wallace, Ms. Williams and Mr. DeLoach). Motion failed due to a tie vote.

With no further business, meeting was adjourned at 7:00 pm