

PLANNING COMMISSION

Demery Bishop
Tom Borkowski
Marianne Bramble
Tyler Marion, Vice Chair
David McNaughton



CITY MANAGER

Diane Schleicher

PLANNING & ZONING MANAGER

Dianne Otto, CFM

CITY ATTORNEY

Edward M. Hughes

**MINUTES
Planning Commission Meeting
January 21, 2014 – 7:00 p.m.**

Vice Chair Tyler Marion called the January 21, 2014, Tybee Island Planning Commission meeting to order. Commissioners present were Marianne Bramble, David McNaughton, Tyler Marion, and Tom Borkowski.

Mr. Marion – The first order of business is the minutes of the December 17, 2013, meeting. Do I have any discussion? [There was none.] Do I have a motion? [David McNaughton made a motion to approve as written; Marianne Bramble seconded.] All those in favor please signify. [The vote was unanimous.]

Mr. Marion – Do we have any recusals or disclosures? [There were none.]

Text Amendment – Section 14-030 & 14-050 – Historic Preservation

Ms. Otto – The Historic Preservation Commission has been going through the process and working towards having a Downtown Development Authority, it is called a DDA. One of the aspects of forming a DDA was these proposed changes to the Historic Preservation’s role. These are additions to code sections already on the books. In Section 14-030, item (D) would be added that would allow the Historic Preservation Commission, *“To employ persons, if necessary, to carry out the responsibilities of the Commission but only after first receiving approval by the Tybee Island City Council.”* It lays out a possibility but kind of pulls it back when saying it is subject to Council approval in order for them to do so. Following that in Section 14-050(P), (P) would be an addition that would read, *“The Commission may, where such action is authorized by the Tybee Island City Council and is reasonably necessary or appropriate for the preservation of a unique historic property, enter into negotiations with the owner for the acquisition by gift, purchase, exchange, or otherwise, to the property or any interest there in.”* It would expand the Historic Preservation Commission’s authority but it still has that same pull back where they have to get City Council’s approval before they would be allowed to venture into negotiations about a property. These are a couple of elements that, in aligning our ordinances with the requirements, if a DDA is formed, was necessary. This has been through the City Attorney’s office and that is why you are seeing it in ordinance form. If you don’t feel like you have enough explanation from me, this could come back, hopefully with a representative from the Historic Preservation Commission.

Mr. McNaughton – I understand the intent and I’m comfortable with this as proposed. Is there a legal reason for an ordinance to authorize the Commission to negotiate rather than the City directly?

Ms. Otto – Yes, under the Downtown Development Authority.

Mr. McNaughton – The City can’t do it; somebody else has to do it?

Ms. Otto – Not that they couldn’t. The empowerment would go to the Historic Commission subject to Council approval rather than Council embarking on their own.

Mr. Marion – There would be an official liaison.

Ms. Otto – Yes.

Ms. Bramble – I would prefer that a representative speak to it.

Mr. Borkowski – What would they be saying to you or what question would you have?

Ms. Bramble – It's the first statement, *"To employ persons to carry out the responsibilities of the Commission."* Why do they feel the need to employ someone? Everything on Tybee is volunteers on every committee.

Mr. Borkowski – I think that is a good point.

Mr. Marion – Dianne, is it appropriate to move forward and open it to the public?

Ms. Otto – Since it was advertised you should ask for public comment.

Mr. Marion – Is there anyone from the public that would like to speak to this? [There was none] At this time I will close the public hearing. We would like to have this continued until the next meeting and have someone from the Commission come to speak with us.

Mr. Borkowski – Who wanted that particular point put in there?

Ms. Otto – The Historic Preservation Commission as part of the requirements in order to form a Downtown Development Authority.

Variance – Roy Ogletree – 13 T. S. Chu Terrace

Ms. Otto – This is a Variance request for 13 T.S. Chu Terrace. The applicant is Roy Ogletree. This is consideration of a height variance request in a C-1 zone. This home was issued a permit to elevate. It had been below base flood elevation and is now under construction and being renovated to meet Tybee's 1-foot freeboard requirement. After elevating the home, the structure is now exceeding the 35-foot height limit which is island-wide. The request before you is to have a Variance approved to allow the height to exceed 35 feet rather than requiring that the roof be removed down to a 35-foot limit. In your packet are renderings of the existing prior to the recent elevation and then the proposed elevation. With the elevation of the home to 1-foot above base flood, the structure is now at 36-feet 4.1-inches which is 1-foot and 4.1-inches above the 35-foot height limit. When this project was permitted it was done with plans to reduce the height of the roof which would have removed 1-foot 8.8-inches to bring it down to 35 feet. The applicant is now requesting rather than doing that project, to allow the roof structure to remain as it is currently. There are photographs in your packet, provided by the applicant, of adjacent structures and what it looks like in comparison to those with the higher structure that it is.

Mr. Borkowski – In reading through this, there is an email that stated that the roof was going to be modified to meet the 35-foot height limit. Why didn't that occur?

Ms. Otto – It is still an open permit. If this Variance request is not approved, that would still be required under the open permit. As they have phased into the work they have accomplished getting the house elevated, are now rebuilding the stairs and doing some other work. Through this process if that request is not approved to leave the roof as it is then they would follow through with the original intent which was to reduce the height.

Mr. Borkowski – It was in the middle to keep going with construction and now it is done?

Ms. Otto – It is not done; it is ongoing. It would continue to be part of the project as permitted to reduce the roof if this Variance is not granted.

Mr. Borkowski – To reduce the roof, is it just changing the slope of the roof or cutting the top part off and putting a flat part on top?

Ms. Otto – As shown in this drawing, the area is at the peak [referring to PowerPoint].

Mr. Borkowski – It would be flattened?

Ms. Otto – Just on the top.

Mr. Borkowski – This was the understanding going in as to what was going to be done?

Ms. Otto – Yes. We would not have been able to permit a structure to exceed the height limit. It was understood that was part of the permitting to reduce it. They wanted to have consideration of not including that scope in the permit and instead be allowed to keep the roof as it is.

Mr. Marion – What they are wanting is essentially to add the pitch back into the roof.

Ms. Otto – To allow it to stay the way it is now.

Mr. Marion – What were the cost factors?

Ms. Otto – Seven thousand dollars. That came from the general contractor.

Mr. Borkowski – This was figured in to begin with?

Ms. Otto – Yes.

Mr. Marion – By granting this we would also save them a chunk of change.

Ms. Otto – Yes.

Ms. Bramble – I need to know what the hardships are.

Ms. Otto – I did explain the hardship requirement of our Article 5 Section. The explanation on the Variance application is that they “want to not cut off the roof.”

Mr. Borkowski – Your finding is not in keeping with the hardship requirement?

Ms. Otto – That is correct.

Mr. Marion – In the pictures, we have a variety of homes within the area that are varying heights and degrees.

Ms. Otto – The pictures came from the applicant and personally I can't get perspective looking at the ground up where the measurements fall. I would only take a certification from a certified professional surveyor to document these. The applicant did choose to provide these to give you some perspective of what it looks like going down that street. When the pictures were taken, I don't know if the house had been set down because it was elevated higher than it needed to be and the foundation was built and then the building was set down. I'm not sure at what point the photos were taken. They are either actually higher than they are now since it has been set down or they have already been set down so it is true. For buildings, the 35-foot height limit is measured from the average grade. Going back to where it says proposed, the surveyor has since measured the building and it is at 43.22 feet above sea level. From that you subtract the average grade that was calculated for this property before any work occurred. The calculation for the average grade was 6.875 feet above sea level. The 43.22 looks scary but that only means feet above sea level. You take out the ground level, which is 6.875, and that is where you come up with the height of the structure. The difference between the 43 and the 6.8 is 36.345 feet.

Mr. Marion – If I were an engineer and go through the neighborhood and look at each house, I could probably see a variety of varying grades consistent with the landscape.

Ms. Otto – Yes. For each of those developments they would have had their own average grade and they would have had their own measurement from which the 35 began.

Mr. Marion – We could anticipate they are going to vary within a certain realm.

Ms. Otto – Ideally if they were permitted to be built no higher than 35 feet than they should not have been built that high.

Mr. Marion – Do we have any other homes in that area currently undergoing a scenario like this or is this the only one?

Ms. Otto – It is the only one in that area. I do anticipate, likely island-wide, with what is happening with flood insurance, that others will be coming. They may be in the same situation where they have chosen to elevate and may find themselves in a similar predicament.

Ms. Bramble – Do you know how much this will affect the FEMA 2014 inspection for our point system? If we grant a Variance will that be factored into our inspection?

Ms. Otto – No. What FEMA would be looking for in this project will be the Elevation Certificate that will be prepared when it is complete. It will show that this house is now FEMA compliant. As far as having elevated above FEMA's base flood elevation, they don't care whether a Variance from Tybee is granted for height.

Mr. Marion – With the direction flood insurance is going, is there a window of opportunity, for a certain timeframe for people to be grandfathered in to any degree? In looking at a hardship, does it come down to financial aspects; is their life radically altered when it comes to this? We are going to see a fair amount of people come before us with a like scenario. Is there anything that can be put in place, in the way of grandfathering for lack of better words, to give people an opportunity to home in on where they are going with the preservation of their homes?

Ms. Otto – It is a possibility. When Biggert-Waters was brought to the forefront and people began to realize what was going to happen with flood insurance premiums as a result of that act, the Mayor endeavored to see what we could do as a City to assist people. The primary focus has been for the City to pursue all efforts to maintain our CRS rating which affords discounts on premiums for the owners. Another avenue that had been discussed was an easier or perhaps less expensive process for applicants to go through if they found themselves in this situation. Setbacks had been the primary issue that was brought up at that time because when you elevate you now have to provide the means of egress which typically they are in building setbacks. He proposed we take a look at setbacks because folks were going to be in those situations. I don't know that a time limit could be put on it because the people that own these are also facing the hardships when they sell them to new owners. When there is a change in ownership, it is going to affect insurance premiums and maybe those new owners might elect to elevate rather than just the current owners. I think it would be a benefit for all of these situations for a longer period of time that choose to go this direction. Whether it is a reduced fee for the Variance process or a simpler process that we can come up with, those are things we could talk about but there is currently nothing in place.

Mr. Borkowski – According to your findings and what has been stated in here, there is not a hardship involved that qualifies. According to the ordinance and the fact that if you grant something like this then you open a can of worms. In this particular case somebody doesn't want to abide by that for a foot and a half then somebody else comes in and it's 2.3, 3.2, 1.8, or whatever, I don't think that is fair to the other people that have been through this process before and had their buildings limited by the height requirement.

Ms. Otto – I respect your position. One thing I do in my staff reports is the findings. I am comparing the request to the codes. It is your role to determine whether you are going to recommend approval or denial despite the findings of the code.

Ms. Bramble – Did this request have to go through the Historical Preservation Commission?

Ms. Otto – I don't recall whether we sent it through or not. At this point, because it has been elevated, it has lost its historic significance.

Mr. McNaughton – If a Variance was approved then there would have to be additional setbacks for this house, correct?

Ms. Otto – The ordinance you are referring to proposes, what to me, is for new construction. If they are going to ask for a height variance they have to give setbacks and it still has to come through for a height Variance. In this situation they are not proposing any additional setbacks, they went straight up. The stairs going up are under construction and will not exceed the prior footprint of the structure so they are not giving any additional setbacks in this situation.

Mr. McNaughton – They would not be required to provide that extra setback?

Ms. Otto – Only if you mandated that. It is not part of their proposal for this request.

Mr. McNaughton – I thought from the wording it was mandated. It says, *"For height variances, in addition to other requirements, the petitioner shall be required to add two feet to each side yard setback for each one foot above 35 feet in height and have safe-guard consisting of sprinkler systems, smoke detectors and any other fire protection equipment deemed necessary at the time by mayor and council."*

Ms. Otto – If you granted this height Variance you are also granting a Variance from that Section.

Mr. Marion – Do we have anyone in the audience that would like to speak to this?

Roy Ogletree came forward and introduced himself. I am the applicant on behalf of Ms. Baber who owns the residence. I am a registered architect in the State of Georgia and a licensed contractor. What we are asking for with this Variance has less to do with the setbacks that were just brought up. It is about an existing structure built in the 1930's that they are elevating out of the floodplain. It is not a new structure where we have the latitude to change setbacks. It is not a new structure where we have a choice of only going 35 feet high. What we have is a structure that in order to meet the flood requirements of 1-foot above the AE-14 elevation, we have to go above 35 feet. We are asking for consideration of a Variance for not chopping the top off the house for that 1-foot 4 inches additional height which is only at the very peak of the home. One reason we are in this situation of even asking for the Variance, we did not state a hardship in the application, but there are actually a number of hardships against an existing property like this that I think are worth consideration. If you see the drawing [referring to PowerPoint], the finished floor elevation of 17.4, that is actually the finished floor that could have been a 15 elevation. What is driving the height in this particular structure is because of the 1930's construction with a drop beam and joist on top of it. You have a deeper structure than you might have had if it was built today where you are intending to keep the height down lower. The ductwork for the structure is underneath the house and by Tybee standards we have to keep the ductwork elevated above the base flood plus 1-foot of freeboard as well. The hardship there is that the Tybee standards themselves are contradictory between residential and commercial. There is latitude on commercial structures that you can waterproof your ductwork, which would get you out of this particular situation and then you could lower the house so you would not even be asking for a Variance on this. There are hardships here that we are dealing with in order to raise the house.

Mr. Marion – If we grant your Variance we would have to recognize a hardship. You have option A and option B. Option A was going to work and now we are going to option B which is just that, an option. With your hardships, if you could drill down a little more about the hardships that the owner would be suffering, just so we understand because we have a very strict set of guidelines that we have to follow. If one is to become a hardship, we actually need to have it justified for us. Is it a financial loss, undue hardship to the individual physically, is there going to be long-term effects that will cause undue hardships?

Mr. Ogletree – Definitely the financial hardship of having to spend \$7,000 plus to take off the top of the roof that is in perfectly functioning condition now. It is also making a flat roof which is not as good for weatherproofing. By taking that small amount off the top of the roof they are incurring costs and making the structure less sound than it would otherwise be.

Mr. Borkowski – You stated previously that you knew that cost involved when you wrote the email. You also knew about the requirements for the ductwork when you designed it, correct?

Mr. Ogletree – This was a little bit of an evolving process. The house as it stood before we raised it was about 30 inches above grade to the finished floor and very little room to even get under the house and survey what was there. The ductwork was somewhat of a mess because whoever did it didn't have any room to work and was crammed under the house. Once we were able to elevate the house we could survey better what the situation was with the ductwork. We had hopes of being able to incorporate the ductwork within the joist system which would have alleviated having to raise it as high. Unfortunately, because of the type of construction, it is balloon framed from the 30's and it has a main beam system with a joist on top of it. Once we got it up and could see what we had, we realized we can't bring that ductwork up within the joists. By that time, the ship had sailed on the process and that is when we applied for the Variance realizing we cannot accommodate the 35-foot height restriction and the ductwork to meet all the standards. If we strictly followed the FEMA requirements, it would have allowed the ductwork to be in the flood zone and be encapsulated. Tybee has a more stringent standard for that. I don't know if you would call that a hardship against the owner, but it is a hardship to deal with from a design standpoint because it is more restrictive than the FEMA standards which would have allowed us to keep the house lower.

Mr. Borkowski – You stated in your email that, *"We have decided to raise the home enough to get the ductwork underneath the beams at 13 T.S. Chu. We will modify the roof peak as required to meet the 35' height limit. See the attached two drawings showing the revision."*

Mr. Ogletree – Ms. Baber was totally on board. If it has to be done, she would do it.

Mr. Borkowski – You have already stated that in order to get permission to keep going forward and now you are changing your mind.

Mr. Ogletree – No, we're not changing our mind. We are asking permission for a Variance. The Variance had to be turned in well in advance of getting the house actually raised up to get it on the agenda. We're asking for relief on this. I think this board and the City should look at this hard because this is going to happen a lot. You are going to get a lot of requests to get houses up out of the floodplain. To penalize these homeowners that are trying to do the right thing, to me, is not very good public relations to the rest of the island to say we're going to make you spend a lot of money for something that is really an imaginary line in the sky at 35 feet.

Mr. Marion – Don't get us wrong. We're empathetic and we want to do what is right. We have a set of rules we are bound by. We can recognize things but our role is obviously to address these as they come up and Council weighs in as well.

Ms. Bramble – Are you saying that if the City of Tybee allowed you to enclose the bottom portion of the house where the ductwork is, then you wouldn't have to raise the house at all?

Mr. Ogletree – You would not have to raise it above the 35-foot height restriction.

Ms. Bramble – So enclosing the bottom, what you're saying, is permitted. We see this permitted in commercial. The ground floor is enclosed in commercial neighborhoods.

Mr. Ogletree – It is not enclosing the downstairs. It is encapsulating the ductwork so that floodwaters could not enter the ductwork.

Ms. Otto – What he is saying is accurate. Tybee, in addition to that higher standard of not allowing any ductwork below the freeboard, also adopted the five year cumulative and the 1-foot freeboard. We do have higher standards than FEMA. Because of those higher standards, our community rating number is a Class 7 because those are the types of activities that FEMA encourages along with lots of other things. Being more restrictive than their guidelines is what they want communities to do. In his case, for residential we don't allow ductwork below the 1-foot freeboard. That is not to say there are not other options. That ductwork wouldn't be pretty but it could have been relocated into the rooms upstairs. We have all seen retrofitted structures where the ductwork

on these types of homes, that at one point didn't have air conditioning, was added. It is easy and simple to take it up through the floors. We have also seen others that are slab on grade where they had to put the ductwork inside the rooms. There are options here. It is not just that the ductwork couldn't be below base flood but they chose to put it at the lowest point from which we measure the 1-foot.

Mr. Marion – The way I view the Land Development Code is essentially those who become residents and own property agree to comply with that.

Mr. Ogletree – A question came up earlier about the neighboring structures and I am a licensed professional. I did field measurements of the neighboring structures and found that a number of the structures on this street are above the 35-foot requirement, just so we are looking at an even playing field here. Ms. Otto, are the drawings included where I showed the heights?

Ms. Otto – No. They were not sealed by you, they were drawings, and I don't consider those certified. I did provide the photographs. If I understood your procedure for doing that, did you climb on these roofs and drop a line?

Mr. Ogletree – There are several different procedures. Let me pull out my heights from this paperwork.

Ms. Otto – While you are looking for that, for each lot there is an average grade calculated from which the 35-foot is measured. Without knowing the history at what point the building's 35 feet was measured, we don't know.

Mr. Marion – I understand there are other houses in the surrounding area and we recognize that. Our case in point tonight is this particular issue. Please note that we recognize there are other structures in the vicinity that are varying heights.

Mr. Ogletree – Since it was presented, I feel like it is fair to present this. Would you not agree? The structure at the Strand is quite a bit higher; it is 36-foot 2 inches before the roof even starts peaking.

Mr. Marion – Just to reiterate, we recognize given the lay of the neighborhood, there may be various structures at staggered heights. For tonight, our particular item, we want to go ahead and address this particular one. Please, respectfully understand, we realize this is an item that we will deal with periodically as time progresses. It's a very real and relevant issue. If we could just focus on this particular one. I do thank you for the pictures; they are very illustrative and helpful.

Mr. Ogletree – I do think this should be looked at to pass the fair and reasonable test. There is some common sense that should come into play on these especially when we look at the neighboring buildings that almost all are exceeding the height restriction.

Ms. Otto – The front and back of the last 2 pages is what he is referring to. They are in your packet but not in the PowerPoint.

Mr. Ogletree – I do feel, even though they weren't sealed, they should have been submitted as evidence in what we are trying to show here.

Mr. Marion – Do we have anyone else that would like to speak?

Bert Barrett came forward and introduced himself. I am a professional land surveyor. I have done all the survey work on Ms. Baber's property. Ms. Baber did not ask me to come here tonight. I'm not being paid and I'm not here on her behalf. I'm here because I know what you are going to see in the future. I served on this Planning Commission for five years. I am the guy who instigated subdivision regulations. I am the guy who instigated the drainage plans and now I regret I did that. To give you a little history on the 35 feet, this wasn't brought about because of aesthetics. It was brought about because Tybee didn't have a hook and ladder truck back in the 70's. There was a fire and they used the electric company's bucket truck and it would only go 35 feet. If there was ever a hardship, it is this case right here and it's going to be all the ones that come before you in the future and particularly within the next year. This is just the beginning. The hardship is that this lady is stuck between a

rock and a hard place. You could say the rock is FEMA and the hard place is Tybee. October the 15th is when FEMA's rules from Biggert-Waters took effect. On October 16th she hired me to do an Elevation Certificate for her because her insurance company required that she have one done. On October 18th she called me just about in tears. She said you're not going to believe that my flood insurance went from \$1,600 a year to \$9,000 a year and what can I do? I said the only thing I know you can do is jack up your house if you don't want to pay \$9,000 a year. That \$9,000 is a low figure. The house down the street from me, theirs went to \$23,000 a year. I want everybody in this room and I want all of you to think what is coming your way. Hardship in your rules, and I sat where you are sitting and had to do the same thing you're doing, has to do with the topography and the shape of a lot also. She had to bring this up to 15 feet because of Tybee's rules with freeboard. Just for a point of information, the whole roof on her house is not at 43.22. It's only about 10 feet. I did the measurement for these figures that you are seeing up there. I had to get the highest point. A roof basically goes like this [hand motions] 42.9 feet and then about 10 feet from that point on the left side it goes up. That is the one I had to use. You are going to have a lot more of these come before you. I heard the Mayor the night you had FEMA here. I wasn't here; I watched it on television. I heard the Mayor say that you folks are going to have to come up with something to help these people. I hope you have the compassion to understand what she has to go through. She is the first one. Remember, it went into effect on October 15th and I did her Elevation Certificate on the 16th. She is just the beginning. I hope that you can understand that she does have a hardship and you look favorably for her. [Applause by audience]

Charlie Kirk came forward and introduced himself. I have lived on Tybee for 40 years. I stopped by here tonight not only to support Deb Baber, but I also came by to support the historic house she lives in. I totally disagree with any comment made here tonight that the house, by raising it, has lost its historic value. [Applause] Over the last 35 years I had the pleasure of knowing her mother, father, and brother, and they were residents of that house. When I moved to Tybee 40 years ago, the whole south end of this island was filled with houses that were cloned just like hers and they have all been torn down to make room for high priced condos, townhouses, or very expensive million dollar houses down there. Her house is one of the last ones down there. Ms. Baber has invested a lot of time and money in this house. Her family lived in this house and like I said, I knew her mother, father, and brother for 35 years. I just met her probably about 6 months ago. When I heard last week that the City was asking to cut the roof off this historic house, the first thing I thought about was to talk with Cullen Chambers. Due to a tragedy this week, we have lost Cullen. If he was here tonight, and he would have been here tonight, Cullen would have said don't cut the roof off this historic house. [Applause by audience]

Natalie Strickland came forward and introduced herself. I have been a resident for 15 years. One of the things I really love about Tybee is we have real people who live here. She is a resident and she has nothing to gain. This is her family home and that is what makes us a wonderful island. We are not just a tourist location. It wouldn't be the same. I just want us to remember that is what keeps Tybee wonderful and keeps people coming here – it is the people who live here year round and work hard to live here. It is not an easy place to live, it costs a lot more than any other place, but the people are what is worth it. [Applause by audience]

Deb Baber came forward and introduced herself. I live at 13 T.S. Chu Terrace. I moved here in May of 2012 to take care of my mother and had some work done downstairs. The person that did my work put the ductwork under my house and I said I don't think that ductwork should go under there. He said it will be alright; it hasn't been alright. The ductwork needed to be moved but with this flood insurance thing it really freaked me out. I really wanted to do what was right by raising the house to FEMA standards, hopefully that would help. Other people have asked me about the process and I think it has been a really smooth process. We have agreed to cut off our roof but we were also told we could put in for a Variance and see what happens and that's why we are here. Yes, the money is definitely a hardship; I don't have any more now but that is okay. I go around the island and we do pick up our dog's poop and other dog's poop. We are good stewards of the island [applause by audience], we pick up trash. We love Tybee. I probably would never have moved down here if it hadn't been for my family but I love it here. We do want to live by the codes, but it would help me. Thank you for your time. [Applause by audience]

Kay Osborne came forward and introduced herself. My husband, Dr. William Osborne, retired and transferred here from Savannah. We live at 1508 Fifth Avenue. Deb just mentioned one of the elements of hardship that I think it is important and usually is so hushed. That is the financial difficulty being between the rock and the hard place that got described. She and her partner are retired. I have not talked with them about this – be clear about that and neither did I speak with my husband about this before I stood up. She and her partner took care

of her mother but now they have this house and they are trying to preserve a living here. They are retired educators from Macon, Georgia. I don't know about you but I know some retired teachers and they don't get a princely sum in retirement. I would like for you to consider that because it is an important fact in what happens next. Please, it is not something to dismiss. It is something we can in academic and public sessions acknowledge – finances matter. There is only so much teacher retirement that goes to your family. Thank you very much. [Applause by audience]

Bert Barrett – I lived down here for 40 years. My dad was the original zoning administrator. My dad is the guy who wrote the zoning regulations in 1971. You are right about one thing, you have some stringent rules to follow. There was one thing my dad and some other folks looked at. They put in a Variance process because they knew one shoe didn't fit all. Please keep that in mind when you make your decision. [Applause by audience]

Mr. Marion – Is there anyone else that would like to speak to this issue? [There were none.]. At this time I will close the public hearing. Do I have discussion or a motion?

Mr. McNaughton – This is clearly a difficult situation. In this particular case there were options available so it would not exceed the 35-foot. I think Council will have to figure out what to do but I don't think I'm ready to.

Mr. Borkowski – I can understand the issues that have been brought up but at the same time I feel that we have a responsibility to the other people that have come before this and did not have a hardship. I understand the financial thing but also understand the options as far as the ductwork that can be put through the house which we have in our condo.

Mr. Marion – Obviously we have closed the public portion but one of the things I think is paramount is we understand that our citizens are us and we are them. Everybody is impacted in one degree or another but a decision is made either here or at Council. I think historically we have something that has been managed well, perhaps at times controversial, but that is our 35-foot requirement. We are empathetic and sympathize 100% with our petitioner and applicant, but we do have a set of rules that we need to follow. In cases such as this, we do find ourselves referring this to Council. I would like to make a motion that we deny and move this to Council so they can weigh the decision because of how big this is and will be with others that will come before us with scenarios like this. There were options that were available, my motion is to deny as is and forward to Council.

Mr. McNaughton – Second.

Mr. Marion – I have a motion and a second. All those in favor of the denial please signify. [McNaughton, Marion, and Borkowski voted in favor / Bramble was opposed.]

Text Amendment – Section 9-050(B) – Technical Codes Adopted, Copper Wire

Ms. Otto – There has been, for a long period of time, a Tybee specific code regarding copper wire rather than aluminum. What is before you is a proposal to strike the Tybee specific code and instead follow the guidelines of the National Electric Code which we otherwise follow with this exception in place.

Mr. McNaughton – I have read these four times and I don't see any difference in the wording.

Ms. Otto – This would completely strike the ordinance.

Mr. Marion – Isn't there aluminum feeders out there that are considered safe, useable, and adequate as far as our ordinance?

Ms. Otto – There are. With this current ordinance in place they are not allowed for installation on Tybee.

Mr. Marion – Do we currently have anything that is either being built or going to be built that would have utilitarian value by utilizing aluminum feeders, such as new public buildings or anything to that extent? I have done some research on aluminum feeders and the safety factors. Compared to 30 years ago versus today, the standards have changed quite dramatically to an extent that they are more acceptable now than they were in the past.

Ms. Otto – Yes. The National Electric Code allows aluminum feeders. The striking of Tybee’s code would allow aluminum feeders and we would be equal with the National Electric Code. As your research showed, and mine did as well, the technology and advancements that have been made have negated the need for this Tybee specific. Not to say there aren’t certain ways to install them and they need to be followed correctly. The State licensed electricians, know what they are doing and they know how to do that despite Tybee’s salt air.

Mr. Marion – Is there anyone from the public that would like to speak to this? [There were none.] At this time I will close the public hearing. Do I have a motion or discussion?

Mr. Borkowski – I make a motion that we adopt as written.

Mr. McNaughton – Second.

Mr. Marion – I have a motion and a second. All those in favor please signify. [Vote was unanimous.]

Text Amendment – Section 3-060 - Bed and Breakfast (Residential), Parking for Special Events

Ms. Otto – This item was on your agenda last month but due to time constraints we did not discuss it. The proposal is within the residential bed and breakfast section and it would provide clarity for parking at residential bed and breakfasts that opt to obtain special event approval. There has been conflict about every time we have had a consideration of special events at a residential bed and breakfast about whether the guests of the inn and their guests were to be counted toward the 20 people that are allowed at the special event. What is before you is a proposal in addition to the parking required in item (5). It says there has to be one parking space per rental unit and two parking spaces for the owners. In addition, if someone opts to apply for special events at a residential bed and breakfast, they would be required to provide additional parking of four spaces, which is in addition to the one per unit and two for the owners. It also states that the number of guests on the property shall not exceed 20. Regardless of whether those guests at the special event are renting the inn’s guest rooms or if they are simply coming in for the special event, there is a total of 20 guests on the property at any time.

Mr. McNaughton – Once you are reviewed for special events, you are not required to get permission for a particular special event?

Ms. Otto – Once approved that carries on. It would take a hearing to withdraw that privilege after being approved before it could be taken away from them.

Mr. McNaughton – I understand the reason for requiring four additional parking spaces. Will that have the effect of discouraging people from using alternative ways to get people there? I worry about if this requires four additional spaces, would people just say the heck with it and I’m not going to worry about getting a shuttle, van pooling, or making special arrangements.

Ms. Otto – I don’t know the answer either but I do understand what you are saying.

Mr. Borkowski – Could you say that again – I didn’t understand it?

Mr. McNaughton – My concern is, I understand why this is being proposed. By doing that would we be discouraging people from pursuing alternative methods to get people to this special event such as some kind of shuttle, van pooling, or bicycling? If they have 4 additional parking spaces will they not consider alternatives?

Mr. Borkowski – If they didn’t have the parking places then they couldn’t have the special event, right?

Ms. Otto – They wouldn’t be able to get approval to be a special event facility.

Mr. McNaughton – That is not the issue. This is proposed and it’s not ordinance that they have 4 additional now. If it became code and required 4 additional spaces my concern would be that people would not consider cleaner alternatives for getting people to the special event.

Ms. Bramble – I don't think adding 4 extra parking spaces really should matter. If the bed and breakfast, just like Council recently did with the old Hunter House, has a parking or shuttle plan, they can present it in their application for their special event license. They could have the 4 or 5 extra cars because people are not going to carpool. Their guests will come in one car so there may be 7 extra cars that the 4 places won't accommodate. If the bed and breakfast has a plan where they can park the excess cars and shuttle them with one of our many shuttle services on Tybee that should be fine without requiring them to add 4 additional parking spaces which they probably have no room for.

Ms. Otto – Let us clarify that most recent consideration was not a residential bed and breakfast; it was a commercial.

Mr. Borkowski – I tend to agree with Marianne. I don't see where 4 parking spaces are going to make a big difference. During a special event the total number of guests on the property shall not exceed 20 people. Is there a certain number of rooms or is there a limitation on bed and breakfasts?

Ms. Otto – Yes. These residential bed and breakfasts are limited to no more than 7 guest rooms.

Mr. Borkowski – What was the determining factor for the number of 20?

Ms. Otto – That is part of the current code and has not been changed. This initial section of the code was actually written by a residential bed and breakfast that drafted this language, asked for the Text Amendment, and said that the proposed number of people would be 20; that was all that they would ever want at their small special events. That was the bed and breakfast near the nursing home.

Mr. Borkowski – If you only have 7 rooms then you are going to have 7 parking places plus 2 for the owner. Now I can understand why the 4 for the special events because you are anticipating more people coming from other places.

Mr. Marion – If we support this, this in no way will impact in any fashion on the commercial bed and breakfast or inns?

Ms. Otto – No.

Mr. Borkowski – This is in residential areas where it impacts the people that live over on Officers Row and places like that.

Ms. Otto – Yes. She did come forward and ask for special events. That was one of the times, and there were others, when these conversations led to if you are going to have special events, do you need to have extra parking. This ordinance is intended to resolve that one way or another. Either we are or we are not going to require additional parking spaces for the bed and breakfasts that want to have special events.

Mr. Borkowski – Basically this is a precedent. You are saying the 20 is already in the code?

Ms. Otto – Twenty is in the code.

Mr. Borkowski – The 4 spaces for the special event is what would be added here, correct?

Ms. Otto – Yes, and clarity on how the 20 people will be counted.

Ms. Bramble – We're talking about residential. Where are they going to get 4 spaces?

Mr. Marion – The people on Officers Row, can you refresh my memory as to how many spots they had. At one point I think the parking itself became an issue or the lack thereof.

Ms. Otto – I think they exceeded the number required by one for the units and the owner.

Mr. Marion – They had excess.

Ms. Otto – I believe by 1.

Mr. Borkowski – If you have 7 rooms and 2 parking spaces for the owners, that is 9 and when you add 4 that would be 13 in order to have special events. That is pretty hard for me to envision. What we had done with the commercial was they had to have a parking or shuttle plan for each special event to be approved.

Ms. Otto – That was Planning Commission's recommendation. That is not what Council's action was on it.

Mr. Borkowski – They didn't approve that?

Ms. Otto – They approved the request. They provided to Council parking agreements from some of the adjacent properties that said they were welcome to use their properties.

Mr. Borkowski – In essence they had the parking places required.

Ms. Otto – After your discussion, they provided additional information.

Ms. Bramble – If they make arrangements with a neighbor to sell them parking, would the neighbor have to get a license?

Ms. Otto – No. That would be if it was public parking on private property. In an arrangement like he is describing where it is business to residence, it would not require a license. They are only supplying spaces to accommodate a special event.

Mr. Marion – Essentially an overflow parking plan.

Ms. Bramble – Tom, let me rephrase it. They don't know when they are going to get booked for special events but they have the excess parking plan in place when they come before Council to get permitted for a special event. They already have this plan and certified agreements with whomever they are going to park the cars at submitted at the time they submit for the special permission.

Mr. Marion – Is there anyone from the public that would like to speak to this?

Michael Bodine came forward and introduced himself. What if you wanted to have a special event and only wanted 16 guests, how does that affect the parking problem?

Ms. Otto – You are saying that if a bed and breakfast asked for special events and stated we will only ever have 16?

Mr. Bodine – Right.

Ms. Otto – All of these are always under Special Review consideration where specific conditions can be imposed, that would be an option. Reading from the special event that the Beachview Inn was subject to, for their special events for commercial bed and breakfasts, it reads, "*A parking plan may include off-site parking arranged by the applicant or owner subject to the approval of the department.*" In this case it was the Zoning Department. It goes on that parking must accommodate 1 place for 4 persons. Is that similar language to what you are looking for to perhaps be added to this proposal?

Ms. Bramble – That really means that they don't have to add these 4 extra spaces in commercial, right? They will have to submit the parking plan.

Ms. Otto – It doesn't require, as it reads here, that they be on the property. It allows parking may include off-site arrangements.

Ms. Bramble – That is basically what I'm saying.

Ms. Otto – There is no urgency on this ordinance. If you would like that language modified and brought back to the next meeting I'm open to that.

Mr. Marion – Is there anyone else from the public that would like to speak to this? [There were none.] At this time I will close the public hearing. Is there discussion or a motion?

Ms. Bramble – I make a motion that we strike the wording that was proposed and move that upon submitting an application for special events that they submit an off-site parking/shuttle plan to Council for each special event of 20 people, whether it is used or not.

Mr. Borkowski – Second.

Mr. Marion – I have a motion and a second to approve with revisions. All those in favor please signify. [Vote was unanimous.]

Text Amendment – Section 3-160 – Protective Screening of Adjacent Property

Ms. Otto – This item is brought to you from the City Attorney's office. Frequently during Site Plan review when it gets to buffering, there have been hang ups on what can be allowed. The way the code currently reads if you don't meet the basic requirements of Section (C)(1), then you are required to have Special Review. That is an additional \$500 fee to go through Site Plan Approval and Special Review. The language you have before you came from the City Attorney proposing that this type of Special Review not be considered the Special Review that you see for other things such as residential bed and breakfasts like we just talked about. Instead it would be combined with the Site Plan and would not incur any additional fees to propose an alternative buffering to the basic requirements that are stated above. That is the first aspect of this. The second one is with that same recent commercial bed and breakfast that had consideration and, as I recall, the private laundry we considered a few months back, there was discussion about another sentence in this code. In the basic requirements there is a sentence at the end of (1)(A) that reads, "*In no instance will a street, sidewalk, or other like improvement be permissible as a buffer.*" It has been requested, and this request came after your packets went out, that it also be discussed and considered whether it needs to be revised. The history, according to the City Attorney, on that sentence was a quite old legal opinion that came out that is common to other municipalities dealing with buffering in that a street, sidewalk, or other improvement is not considered to be a buffer. For Tybee, perhaps, that does not fit well. It certainly didn't charm the folks that have been subject to it. As far as if a commercial use has a residential use across the street whether they are or are not required to still put in those basic protective screening requirements that are stated there of a fence or a wall that is 8-feet tall with a 5-foot vegetative area. Should that or should that not be required on the front of a commercial use if there is a residential use across the street. Two parts here, one I think you may have been prepped for in your packet. The second just got thrown at you. If you are not able to respond to the second one, it will come back to you later.

Mr. Marion – Do we want to split these up?

Ms. Otto – Let's start with the original intent. It simplifies combining if there is a protective screen or buffering proposal that does not meet the basic requirements, this language would allow that to be combined with the Site Plan consideration and not impose the additional cost of having a Special Review for that.

Mr. Marion – Frank and Karen Kelly and their property comes to mind. If you look at the actual size of the lot and the location of the house where the street comes up to the property line, they don't have a lot of space between the house and the street. We need to consider that there are those out there that have substandard lots and perhaps they don't have a lot of space to work. In other words, we take that into consideration and recognize these are reasonable things that will occur and we will come across from time to time.

Ms. Otto – Yes. The language, which is already in there, is that the Mayor and Council can impose conditions. It doesn't have to meet the requirement even if the applicant proposes they don't want to do this basic requirement. They say this is what I have and I would like for it to be considered adequate. The decision making at that time would be whether to accept that proposal or impose some alternative.

Ms. Bramble – This is the first aspect that we're talking about?

Ms. Otto – The original proposal that Special Review not be an expensive and separate process that it be incorporated into Site Plan Approval.

Mr. Marion – Let's say that we are looking at the front of the commercial property and there is residential across the street. Instead of the commercial property having to put up a buffer of some type, they have landscaping; this would not necessarily warrant that they have any kind of tall buffer. In lieu of the comment it could go to Council and they decide based on the property.

Ms. Otto – Yes. As it is currently written, if that were the scenario and there is residential across the street and they are not proposing to meet the buffer of the basic requirements in that front, it would again fall under the less intrusive Special Review/Site Plan Approval that they could consider. If the applicant wasn't proposing any buffering at all, they could either accept that or impose some alternative. We could strike the sentence entirely and I still think that still leaves it open whether the front needs a buffer. If you don't, perhaps it needs replaced that if residential is across the street and there is a street in between you don't have to have a buffer. I'm not sure what you want to do with that.

Mr. McNaughton – As far as a street or a buffer, I would feel uncomfortable removing that because of Pine Street, the laundry. You would have been right on those residential and that is a narrow street. If it read that there were a minimum size, for example, in no instance will a street less than 'X' feet wide, sidewalk or other, so you wouldn't have that street as a buffer in neighborhoods where there is no room.

Ms. Bramble – I'm not following you. You are saying to not use the street as a buffer, a narrow street?

Mr. McNaughton – Not use a narrow street as a buffer. I regard something like Jones or Butler is wide enough but not on many of the side streets because they are so narrow.

Ms. Bramble – I'm going to disagree with David. I would consider a street on each side as a buffer. The way I'm looking at it is they are already going to, like a bed and breakfast will present a parking plan, so people aren't going to be parking on the side of the street so it is a buffer. I would think looking at the streets adjacent is not a buffer than it is like you are building 8-foot walls all the way around the building. To me, it would look like the electric on Fourth, you look through the 8-foot and 10-foot fence and behind that you have your special event. To me it would look ridiculous.

Mr. Borkowski – It's pretty hard to envision every possible thing that could happen as far as a business and I think that is a good sentence to have in there. You are trying to define the width of the street and a lot of other factors. If you leave that in there they have to come to us and the City Council to have it waived and I think that is a good protection. It gives you options and that is a touchy subject, a commercial enterprise in a residential area. That just gives people a chance to make a decision and some flexibility.

Ms. Bramble – What exactly is the total dollar fee if a business came back again?

Ms. Otto – This comes up during Site Plan Approval of a commercial project. They pay \$500 for Site Plan Approval. The way this had read before this red addition, if they didn't meet the basic requirements they had to pay another \$500 for consideration of any buffer other than what was required.

Ms. Bramble - \$1,000.

Ms. Otto – Yes. During the discussions when we are doing Site Plan Approval, they all mesh together and it really isn't a separate process at that point when you are reviewing a site. The buffering is part of the overall plan.

Ms. Bramble – If we kept the safeguards in there, as Tom was talking about, and not consider the streets as a buffer, maybe we just need to think about just reducing the fee. One fee to encompass coming before Council to say can I use these streets as a buffer under the one \$500 fee.

Ms. Otto – Yes. That is what this would do.

Mr. Borkowski – One building might be up against the street where another could be set back further. It is two totally different situations for the residents living across the street from it.

Mr. Marion – Is there anyone from the public that would like to speak to this? [There were none.] At this time I will close the public hearing. Is there discussion or a motion?

Ms. Bramble – I make a motion to approve the wording as is.

Mr. Borkowski – Second.

Mr. Marion – I have a motion and a second to approve as written. All those in favor please signify. [Vote was unanimous.]

Text Amendment – Model Wind Ordinance for Wind Energy Facilities

Ms. Otto – This would be a new ordinance for Tybee Island. It is a model wind ordinance for wind energy facilities. This item was on your last agenda but did not get discussed due to the lateness of the hour. You have got quite a big packet, which I tried to color-code and help you through. This is not specific to any proposed City project of installing a wind turbine on Tybee. This is an ordinance that would regulate any proposed wind turbine on Tybee whether it be a City or private enterprise. The ordinance itself is a model that would need to have Tybee's municipality added into and a few other blanks filled in if we are going to move forward with it.

Mr. McNaughton – There is a section (5)(A) regarding setbacks. I have no idea how small or how big wind turbines come. Let's just say 100-foot is an average. Is there any site on Tybee that would meet the setback requirements?

Ms. Otto – I hadn't considered your question. I don't know. I would think that it would take a large amount of space for a 100-foot tower given the multiplier there to get to the setback distance depending on where it is sited. The lowest multiplier is 1.1. If it was a 100-foot turbine, that's 110 feet. I'm trying to picture properties that have 110 feet in all directions if you sited the wind turbine in the middle and none are coming to mind.

Mr. McNaughton – Maybe Paul Wolff would know but I think in considering an ordinance that would be the first thing is whether the island could accommodate these setbacks and still accommodate a wind turbine.

Mr. Marion – Do we have anyone that would like to speak to this?

Paul Wolff came forward and introduced himself. I do want to address David's question. There are all different styles of turbine. If someone, for instance, wanted to put one on a private home or private lot, there are vertical access turbines that you may have seen that look like a double helix, like a DNA molecule, that would be maybe 10 feet tall or would be 20 feet tall with the staff they are mounted on. There would be some applications for those. They tend to be very small and be in the 1 to 4 kilowatt range, I think, maybe 1 to 5 kilowatt. They would be, on average, like a small solar system in terms of power output. That is the sort of application that might be able to be installed on Tybee in a residential area.

Mr. McNaughton – What about a commercial one and I'm thinking specifically about the wind turbine that has been offered to Tybee?

Mr. Wolff – There are three possible locations that I looked at. I looked all over the island. My first choice was behind the pavilion in Memorial Park where it would be centrally located. This would have to be 165 feet. It is 150 to the top of the blades so you would have to have a 1.1 fall down zone so that would be 165 feet. It would have to be that far from either a residence or a public building and this ordinance defines public building not as office space or something that might be occupied by the owner or property owner or just part-time by a business but where public would gather. Those would be the two things that would have to be that far away. For instance, it couldn't fall on the library, the Y, City Hall, gym, any of the buildings in the park. It would have to be 165 feet away from those. That was a limiting factor and the fact that I think there would be more shadow flicker involved if it were this centrally located. Jaycee Park would be the other location. It wouldn't have as many issues in terms of shadow flicker or fall down but I don't think it is appropriate there and the wind resource

wouldn't be as good because Officers Row is so high and the tree cover is more significant. The water treatment plant was the logical choice for those reasons and the fact that we would be using all the energy that it produces so there is an economic factor as well. I just wanted to answer your question about the fall down zone and that is a good question because there aren't many lots on Tybee that would accommodate a horizontal access turbine of any size.

Mr. Marion – Given the size of what we are talking about, can you tell me specific to shadow flicker, is there a study that has been done or what is the cost of that type of study?

Mr. Wolff – There have been numerous studies done. There are lots of rumors about shadow flicker as there are about turbines in general. There are no proven or documented health issues attributed to shadow flicker. People say they trigger epileptic seizures. That has never been proven. It is a nuisance if anything. That is one reason why this ordinance includes it. The way the ordinance reads, a turbine cannot generate more than 30 hours a year upon any building off the property. That is 2-1/2 hours a month which shouldn't be a major issue. There are studies that can be done and I might suggest that if you are thinking about modifying the ordinance in any way that before an installation is completed in any area that a shadow flicker study be done. I am sure there are many companies around that do shadow flicker studies. Depending on the size of the installation, they run anywhere from \$1,000 to \$2,500 and these are engineered studies that are done and sealed. They should be submitted as part of the application process, if that is one of the requirements. Rule of thumb is that the nearest residence or occupied building should be 10 times the radius of the rotor away if no shadow flicker study is done but again it is either/or. This was generated by the Georgia Wind Working Group. It took about a year and I was one of the people involved in drafting this model ordinance. It has been reviewed in other areas. I think it is pretty comprehensive as we tried to address every possibility and as you have no doubt seen it, it is fairly complex.

Jim Vandenberg came forward and introduced himself. I'm a resident of Tybee. I have a couple of concerns about the wind turbine. I'm sure Paul has researched it quite well. I see nothing in here to restrict the number of turbines allowed on the island. Also, there is no height restriction and there is a height restriction on buildings. If we're going to put up 110-foot turbines throughout the island, this is going to take away from what Tybee is. If I were vacationing and I came to a place full of wind turbines, it would certainly distract my enjoyment and would also prevent me from coming back. Secondly, I see he does have a study on wind turbines photo sensitivity epilepsy, which I haven't read, but I do know some epileptics are sensitive to this flicker effect and can induce convulsions. If someone is walking on the beach, driving a car, riding a bicycle, this could be a problem. I don't see anything in here restricting as to where they can be placed. Could they be set throughout the whole island or are they going to restrict it to just one area of the island so they are unobtrusive and not take away from the character of Tybee? These are some of the concerns I have and should be addressed.

Mr. Marion – Is there anyone else that would like to speak on this? [There were none.] At this time I will close the public hearing. Do I have any discussion?

Mr. Borkowski – Is there any possibly of putting if offshore?

Mr. Wolff – Not at this time.

Mr. McNaughton – I would like to study this more. I suggest we continue this to our next meeting.

Ms. Bramble – I agree with David. I don't know enough about this. I came to a public meeting, several years ago, and they were talking about the grids and off-shore turbines and it was really interesting but I didn't think we would have a turbine come up this quickly. I'm with the resident that came up as there are some questions that would have to be addressed in this ordinance. Where else would you place them? There are three places and how many could we squeeze into the waste treatment plant? What do the other residents on Tybee think? I would say let us look at it a little more before we pass it on to Council.

Mr. Marion – Dianne, do we have an idea as to what kind of time frame we have?

Ms. Otto – To me the ordinance is separate, but the proposed windmill project for the City is to be considered by Council in February. It sounded like an up or down vote whether to pursue that particular project. I do think this

ordinance is needed to regulate private proposals just as Mr. Wolff referenced. Some folks are looking for alternatives, be it solar or wind, and his description of these small type structures are certainly something that will be coming as technology evolves and we should have an ordinance in place to deal with those in the future. I don't have a problem with continuing this until the next meeting. I think one thing that may be helpful is if I would Tybeeize it by inserting our municipality in these different blanks, making the table that has agricultural and industrial zones go away because we don't have such things and make it instead specific to us.

Mr. Marion – We would like to take a little more time with this. We feel it would probably be better to not throw the cart before the horse and really get something for the City to get out there.

Mr. Wolff – That is entirely your decision. That is why I wanted to get it to you early. What I am hoping to do, and this is strictly my personal inclination, is I'm probably going to try and put it on the agenda for the second meeting in February.

Ms. Bramble – My question is are they giving us a timeline, the company that is donating it?

Mr. Wolff - The offer was made at the beginning of October and I have held them off this long. I'm getting the impression they are getting a little impatient. If Council approves the acceptance, most likely it will take them another 30 to 90 days to work it through their bureaucracy and it has to be shipped and then we go through the installation process. I think best case scenario is if it passes Council at the end of February, the installation would not take place until mid-summer at the earliest if all goes smoothly.

Mr. Borkowski – How tall is a water tower?

Mr. Wolff – The cell tower by the Police Station?

Mr. Borkowski – The one at the corner.

Mr. Wolff – The water towers are in the 140-foot range. I know for a fact the cell tower up by the Police Station is 146 feet.

Mr. Borkowski – We're talking about the same height.

Mr. Wolff – Roughly. That's just the blades. The hub is 120 feet on this particular model.

Mr. Marion – I would like to delay this until our February session.

Mr. Borkowski – You could Tybeeize it by then?

Ms. Otto – Yes. I think it will read easier.

Mr. Marion – Do I have a motion to adjourn?

Ms. Bramble – I make a motion to adjourn.

Mr. McNaughton – Second.

Mr. Marion – All those in favor please signify. [Vote was unanimous.]

Meeting ended at 9:05 PM
Minutes by Jerris Bryant