

RZ-015-004 – Rezoning application of Jimaki Witherspoon to rezone ±0.84 acres from R-15, Moderate Density Residential/Agricultural District, to R-15S, Moderate Density Residential/Manufactured Housing/Agricultural District.

Andy Rowe – Presented the report.

Jerry Holt made a motion to approve and Jim Barnett seconded the motion.

VOTE: 7 AFFIRMATIVE 0 NEGATIVE MOTION CARRIED

Charles Deese – This will go to county council on April 13, 2015.

SD-015-004 – Deerfield Creek (formerly Providence Estates) – Subdivision application of Union Lancaster, LLC, for a proposed subdivision which will consist of 41 lots on a 59.45 acre tract of property.

Elaine Boone – Presented the report.

Ronald Pappas – We’ve had some dialogue with Mr. Catoe on this, what is the latest with him regarding the capacity to bond or provide....

Elaine Boone – He said they basically wouldn’t do any bonding. When Mr. Water’s has the last lift of asphalt down they could make any corrections that they had then. That will include any damages to Cedar Lane, Vance Baker Road, or Legacy Park Blvd.

Ronald Pappas – How are we going to monitor this?

Elaine Boone – We could have Jeff Catoe check it.

Ronald Pappas – It would be good to have some type of chronological history. I’ll leave it up to Mr. Catoe to monitor that.

Penelope Karagounis – I would recommend you put that in a form of a condition if all the commissioner’s feel the same way. That needs to be stated so we can provide direction because it wouldn’t be the planning department but public works that would be maintaining those files.

Mr. Bill Waters – Bill Waters, Union Lancaster, LLC, 7620 Baltusrol Lane, Charlotte NC 28210. My telephone number is (704) 451-1020. Once we do the subdivision we have to leave one inch of asphalt off and that will have to be bonded once a certain percentage of the subdivision is complete and before you can even put that coat on anyway. I agreed with Jeff Catoe to include that in the bond; that we would resurface Cedar Lane. I’ve committed to all of our traffic to come down Cedar Lane into Vance Baker. We’ve met out there and it’s a newly built street and its 22 feet wide and all that sort of thing. The reason I’ve objected to the traffic impact analysis is because I think the ordinance states it’s required on all subdivisions that have more than 100 car trips at peak hours.

According to the South Carolina traffic studies, it states only 40 lots create 90 trips at peak hours. I feel like we would be spending money for nothing. We are going to have

to fix the street anyway. I might add that the people who owned this before hand had 222 lots that had already been approved in that subdivision where it is left off. It was not required in that one. The first developer spent too much money on this project and they went broke. We are conservative and want to try and make it work and make a nice neighborhood to add to Lancaster County.

Ronald Pappas – Do we have anything in the record of what he just mentioned from Mr. Catoe?

Elaine Boone – That was more of a verbal thing, Jeff Catoe, myself, and Mr. Waters met one morning at the project and was discussed between the three of us. It was my understanding that Cedar Lane would be the truck entrance, construction traffic entrance. There was no discussion about resurfacing the entire road again; it was just any damage to the road and not a complete resurface. I want to clarify that.

Mr. Bill Waters – Jeff inspected the road and he thinks the road is in good shape and won't deteriorate under the traffic anyway because it is a newly built road. Where the other road goes out to Tilley Morris, it's sort of a piece mill road. Cedar Lane has been built in the last ten years.

Charles Deese – I know it was mentioned it was just a verbal thing but can we not produce that in writing along with those photographs?

Mr. Bill Waters – Jeff more or less made it very plain he wasn't going to release the other bonds until that was done; he controls that. I took it that it was sufficient.

Elaine Boone – We can always hold permits, that is the last leverage.

Penelope Karagounis – Just to clarify, the traffic impact analysis as Mr. Waters stated, did not trigger the need for one; but this commission stated it as a condition and that is why we went back and asked about doing a technical memorandum. The issue is more of the technical memorandum. That is something that this board needs to decide if they want to omit that as well. We had already voided the traffic impact analysis based on the condition that this board had set.

Elaine Boone – We do have a memo from Brent Cowan who also met with us that morning. He is Mr. Waters engineer with the The Isaacs Group; so we do have something in writing.

Mr. Bill Waters – Or I'll put something new in writing, whatever you want.

Ronald Pappas made a motion to approve with the following conditions: letter of confirmation from Jeff Catoe to clarify what his specific agreement is with the applicant.

Penelope Karagounis – Do you want the letter back in front of this commission?

Ronald Pappas – I want to make part of the approval so I want it part of our decision tonight.

Penelope Karagounis – So you want that in the actual note section like we've done before? We can attach a letter to the preliminary plan.

Ronald Pappas – That is correct.

Elaine Boone – What about the variance, the connectivity?

Charles Deese – Was that not approved last time with the condition that the....

Penelope Karagounis – We have to restate it because it is a new preliminary plan.

Ronald Pappas made a motion to approve with the following conditions: letter of confirmation from Jeff Catoe to clarify what his specific agreement is with the applicant regarding the status of the road upon completion and be attached to the findings of this commission and to the preliminary plan; also the traffic impact analysis and technical memorandum be omitted; and the variance requests are approved; Jim Barnett seconded the motion.

VOTE: 7 AFFIRMATIVE 0 NEGATIVE MOTION CARRIED

UDO-TA-015-002 – Proposed text amendment to the Lancaster County Unified Development Ordinance by Lancaster County to amend the text of Chapter 4 Conditional and Special Exception Uses, Section 4.1.7 Convenience Centers, Subsection 2.

Nick Cauthen – Presented the report.

Gary Holland – 8728 Collins Road, Indian Land SC – (803) 547-2614. I am asking you tonight to deny these text amendments – TA-015-002, TA-015-003 for the following reasons. It is a bad idea logically, environmentally, and politically. Who would think moving facilities of this nature with the potential impact like they pose closer to residential districts is a good idea. Environmentally, who in this room would volunteer to have a convenience center within 500 feet of their home? That is like ten times the length of this room. What about 100 feet from your property? That would be twice the distance or the length of this room. There are probably no volunteers who would take that. The argument has been stated that these facilities are cleaner than a land fill. At least land fills are required to daily cover the garbage with six inches of dirt. They have extensive vermin, noise, and water impact controls. Politically, with all the fuss going on in Indian Land about variances for convenience centers; who thought the timing was good for this type of government action. Number 2, instead of changing the convenience centers setbacks to match that of solid waste transfer facilities; Lancaster County should think about changing the solid waste facility setbacks to match that of the convenience

center. Number 3, the public works department has stated there are nine convenience centers in operation at present in remote areas and they do not get many complaints from these sites. That is great but maybe the fact that they are in remote areas and are at least 500 feet away from residential use and district, helps that fact. If these setbacks are reduced to 100 feet or even 200 feet from an existing residence; the complaints I believe will increase. Number 4, I know that with laws and ordinances words matter. I noticed that the description of the residential areas is going to be changed. The present law states facilities 500 feet from existing residential use or district; whereas the proposed change states the active waste handling area – 200 feet from a residence. There is a big difference here and it's not just 300 feet. This was done on purpose. Mr. Willis at the February 05, 2015 Planning Commission Workshop stated the wording needed to change so the regulation is not as restrictive. I noticed that in the screening regulation Section 4.1.7.4 that the original wording "residential use or district" is being retained and kept. Number 5, the application states that changing the law would make it conform to Section 4.2.8. Chapter 4 of the UDO deals with Section 4.1 Conditional Uses and Section 4.2 Special Exception Uses. A Convenience Center is by law a Conditional Use Facility. A Solid Waste Transfer Facility is a Special Exception Use Facility. Mr. Willis at the February 05, 2015 Workshop stated that he did not want you to change the classification of the Convenience Center to a Special Exception Use Facility because that would require a BZA public hearing. If I understand that correctly, he wants you to vote to change the Special Exception Use setback regulation without the Special Exception Use public hearing. Number 6, good planning is to change the site to fit the law rather than change the law to fit the site. According to the application the reasons for the proposed change is due to problems with finding a site for such a facility. The planning staff report states that current law severely restricts the location in which such a facility is possible. This is what conditional use regulations do; they restrict the use based on a list of reasonable conditions. Often these conditions are put in place to protect the community at large from offensive facilities such as a convenience center.

Jerry Holt made a motion to deny and Ronald Pappas seconded the motion.

Jerry Holt – We talked about this briefly at our last workshop and one of the unfortunate circumstances now is that we do know that in Indian Land the County is undergoing a search for a new site to locate a center which we lost because of transfer of ownership of land. I've gotten a great deal of calls from residents in Indian Land on this particular issue and they are concerned that with this change a new site could end up in a situation where its very close to some residents. People don't know if it's their backyard or someone else's backyard; and there is a great deal of opposition to this change in Indian Land. As we discussed in a prior meeting, timing is very unfortunate on this because it would seem that in order to allay the fears of the residents who are opposing this change right now; at the very least, what we should do is to announce where the new site is going to be. Then people would know whether they have a legitimate concern with this particular change in the text amendment. Given the fact that we do have a great deal of opposition, the points that were just raised as well as the points in many of the other calls that I've received and I think that we have all received a number of emails from people who are in opposition of this change; I would say that one course of action for this board

should be to suspend any activity on this until a site is announced for Indian Land. Then maybe it would get a better reception. Given where we are right now I think that there is clearly too much opposition to this change; if we were going to take action tonight I clearly think that this board should deny the proposed change.

Ronald Pappas – I don't feel there is enough justification here to move this forward this way. I think we can do a much better job in how we specifically identify and select any given potential location for one of these types of centers. I think we need to explore that further.

Steve Willis – 522 Briarwood Road, Lancaster SC 29720 – (803) 285-3600. We hope to close on the site we are looking at in the Panhandle area hopefully within the next two weeks. My concern is what happens in the future particularly from Lancaster South. We own very few of the convenience sites out there now; most we have is year to year leases and some of them are just simply a hand shake agreement. As indicated we don't get too many complaints and those are right in the middle of residential areas; some of the ones that we lease from are actually on residentially zoned property due to they were old and grandfathered in. As we move forward my concern is what happens when virtually everything south of Lancaster is R-40 something and trying to locate a site; certainly would not have any objection to continuing it for 30 days and hopefully by then we will have a site. I'm willing to go on the record and state that the site we are looking at in the Panhandle meets the current regulations as they exist today.

Charles Deese – At this point I think I will take off my chairman's hat and put on District 3's hat and ask this question. If we deny this, are we doing the right thing? Or could we not continue this? I can understand the county not advertising who or where the property is that they are interested in; simply because other people will jump in front of you and we all understand that. If we deny it tonight, then we go back through the entire process again. We can continue it for 30 or 60 days. If we table it then it will have to come back in 30 days. Now I'll put my chairman's hat back on and state that we have a motion to deny it and a second.

Jerry Holt – If the board would consider continuing this until after the announcement of the site, assuming the deal does close; I would be willing to withdraw my motion to deny and offer a motion to continue so we could build on that first. I think it is important to keep in mind that regardless of the action that we do take tonight; we don't shut down the county because there is a process. If the county identifies a site that does not conform with today's regulations, they can still go to the BZA board. I will withdraw my motion to deny and offer a motion to continue until after such time the intended site in Indian Land is announced and then we would reconsider this particular change in the UDO.

Jim Barnett – Do we need to put a number of days on that?

Jerry Holt – Let's what until after the deal is announced and closed.

Jim Barnett – What if this drags on for six months?

Charles Deese – Then it won't get passed for six months.

Ronald Pappas – I also withdraw my motion where I seconded Mr. Holt's.

Jerry Holt made a motion to continue until such time that the county has confirmed ownership of the property; Ronald Pappas seconded the motion.

VOTE: 7 AFFIRMATIVE 0 NEGATIVE MOTION CARRIED

PDD-26 (U.S. Trust-Collins Road) and/or Ordinance 959 – Clarify issues with regard to Lancaster County Ordinance #959 and PDD-26 with respect to the 411 acres Collins Road development site, also known as the Queensbridge Development.
Penelope Karagounis – Presented the report.

Gary Holland – 8728 Collins Road, Indian Land SC – (803) 547-2614. In the last month you have been presented with two versions of Ordinance 959. The version from the February 05, 2015 Workshop looks almost identical to Mr. Wren's reconstruction proposed ordinance correction. The second at the February 19, 2015 version is in your packet tonight. My wife and I are opposed to the February 19th version and ask you to not approve this version for the following reasons. This version is not accurate. Section six exhibit B states the attached maps are approved. You have been told these maps contain the planning department's approved stamp. Upon close inspection you will see that they do not; the attached maps were ruled incomplete by the planning department in May of 2014. Number 2, it's been stated that the exhibit B maps include a reference to your January 21, 2014 conditional approval. These attached maps do not include those conditions in the following areas. A – Your conditional approval required all stub-outs to be removed and they are not. B – Mrs. Blake's property is shown with a 40 foot disturbed buffer rather than the required 50 foot undisturbed buffer. C – Mr. Holland's property is shown with a 40 foot undisturbed buffer rather than the required 50 foot undisturbed buffer. Number 3, in June 2014 Lancaster County hired a contract attorney Mr. Michael Wren to research, validate and reconstruct the 2008 approved ordinance. This February 19th version in our opinion makes significant changes to his recommendation. Number 4, February 19th version makes a reference to Queensbridge which was not in existence in 2008 and is still a non-existence subdivision today. We don't think you should tie this 2008 ordinance correction to Queensbridge. Number 5, this version in our opinion violates ordinance 960 development agreement by adding the number of model home permits and by removing the welcome center permit. Ordinance 960 article 3, section 3.01 vested rights to develop basically states that the developer is guaranteed the right to develop the property under specific laws and land development regulations set forth in the December 2008 ordinance. Also according to the development agreement this guarantee is enforceable through litigation. Number 6, the change made in Section 20 Model Homes is an attempt to redefine the boundaries of the 2008 PDD-26. The tax map numbers added to the section are only for those located within the proposed Queensbridge subdivision and not the entire 411 acre PDD. Number 7, If the proposed boundary change is approved then all of the model home and sales office permits must be built within the Queensbridge subdivision. Number 8, February

19, 2015 version according to Mr. Weaver is a negotiated insignificant change to PDD-26. But we argue that this action was never to be about negotiating changes, significant or otherwise. Mr. Wren our contract attorney stated on September 16, 2014 the new draft ordinance for PDD-26 is intended to clarify and enact the language from the third reading version by County Council in 2008. We don't think this action before you tonight is about Queensbridge, Pulte, or the Holland's. It is about validating and reconstructing the third reading document from December 1, 2008 and recording it. The February 19th version in our opinion does not accomplish that goal. My wife and I ask you to approve and send to the County Council the version which was presented to you at your February 05, 2015 Workshop. This is the same version that the Planning Department originally mailed to all stakeholders and adjacent property owners on January 27th with the statement "the proposed ordinance is solely to clarify the original language in the 2008 version". The February 5th version is a simple clarification of the 2008 council approved ordinance and does not contain any of the more recent changes requested by Pulte's attorney. Last year Pulte brought into question your authority to act on matters such as this. Thank You

Wanda Rosa – 86614 Arrington Road, Indian Land SC. I am also the President of the Indian Land Action Council and as such I had sent a letter back in February regarding this issue. I'm a pretty simple person and I don't go into the weeds too much but I know one of the things I've lived by is a thing worth doing is worth doing right. It seems to me in my humble opinion that there was a mistake made and I've seen a lot of mistakes since I've sat through a number of meetings. People who are dealing with them today have to take care of issues that happened in the past; decisions were maybe quickly made. I might as a side note state that I am so pleased to see how far we have come in the last number of years with people really trying to do right by the citizens of Lancaster County. You have a lot of wonderful people here and I applaud that. My feeling still is that the original 2008 version; had it not been somehow lost, would have been the rule of the land. If anything else needed to be changed, those changes would be dealt with on an individual basis. Too often you try to reconstruct things and it's well this isn't the original, we don't have it; if we can do it right, let's just do it right the first time and move on from there.

Waylon Wilson – 15117 Legend Oaks Court, Fort Mill/Indian Land SC 29707. I made a commitment to myself that I wouldn't appear before this commission again but since I've brought up this issue in 2012, I think it needs bearing again. I want to be assured that this particular PDD the county will implement the requirements of the development agreement for this PDD. One being that a million dollars – July 01, 2018 or the time when the first building permit for residential dwelling unit application is made; that is when it is due to the County. I would like for this commission to have this in their notes so there is some mechanism, or the records somehow, that triggers something when a building permit is issued for a residential unit for this PDD; that the county gets their money. That is why I'm interested in the master plan. This PDD granted agricultural benefits for tax credits and they are paying next to nothing to the county in property taxes because of their agricultural credit. I see no way a PDD unless it's defined in the master plan for agricultural use, that it can be awarded the benefit of agricultural tax credit.

Therefore, I'm asking this body to somehow and whatever means it takes to get the appropriate parties with the Assessor's office, the county manager, to see that the five year rollback of change in property taxes from agricultural credits to something else is done; and that the 2015 tax roles will be adjusted so that property owners of this development pay their fair share to the county.

Hubie Tolson – 520 East Front Street, New Bern NC, 28560 – 252-670-9370. There have been three errors made in Lancaster County and they have been terribly costly to me. One was the failure to record the 2008 ordinance that we spent years and many many dollars gaining approval for. The second was the recordation of an improper ordinance and the third was the placement of conditions of the approval of a site plan submitted by Pulte. Those conditions were contrary to my zoning and very costly to me as well. The delays associated with these matters cost me hundreds of thousands of dollars; possibly millions of dollars. A further delay may crater a potential sale of some of this property that would make the damage many million of dollars. I agree with some of the comments that were made earlier. The ordinance that was present in 2008, that was heard three times and approved by county council should be the law of the land. Because of the errors that were made I was held hostage and negotiated and agreed to increase the buffer size of Mr. Holland's property line. I was further held hostage to increase the buffer dimension of his neighbor's line and agreed to do so to settle the matter that just won't seem to ever end. I'm not quite sure what the desires of some of the speakers are but I do know that I've agreed to a 50 foot undisturbed buffer for Mr. Holland and his neighbor to save a very large and costly transaction. If it's not approved, the damages will be substantial. If it's not approved I will look to this board and county council to reinstate the initial 2008 language, which was a 40 foot buffer and only undisturbed in the case of Mr. Holland's particular property and not his next door neighbor or no one else. I encourage this body to move forward with the correction that was last submitted, rather than an earlier version which I want to make clear that I'm happy with and that we will resolve the matter should it make the third reading through county council; and not earlier versions as Mr. Holland requested. Mr. Holland has gotten exactly what he wanted and I'm not quite sure why that doesn't seem to be satisfactory since he got ten more feet of buffer than he deserved in the 2008 ordinance. I am fine with that if we can move forward. If we can't move forward then I'm not. I would ask this board to move forward. I've suffered almost a year of delays as a result of these errors and I would like to put it behind me and move forward with responsible development of the parcel without further delay.

Penelope Karagounis – I wanted to bring these to your attention regarding Section 16 – Buffers under (d). It is stated along the property line of the PDD that is adjacent to Lancaster County tax map number 10 at 60.04 and tax map 10 at 60.02, there shall exist a fifty foot undisturbed buffer. Those two properties are the Holland and Blake property. The exhibit that Mr. Weaver attached was one of the first ones and we have a copy of the approved preliminary plan; that will be added for county council.

Charles Deese – That does show the fifty foot buffer?

Penelope Karagounis – Yes sir, we have that and he has that information. I'm not sure why it was not provided.

Ronald Pappas – I would like some clarification from Mr. Wren.

Michael Wren – I'm an attorney here on the behalf of Lancaster County and I reside in Columbia, SC. My address is 1312 Whitaker Drive, Columbia, SC 29206.

Ronald Pappas – If you could address some of these comments.

Michael Wren – I would be happy to and thank you again for your time and consideration of this. After the issue came to light we spent a vast amount of time looking at how to resolve the issues that existed with respect to PDD-26 and the underlying Ordinance 959. What that resulted in is, in form and fashion, the document that is before you this evening. The key issue was specific to the language under what is now identified as Section 16 – Buffers. It does indeed clarify that and in fact if nothing else ironically, the original and I say original, the 2008 ordinance, as was indicated by I believe earlier by one of the speakers; actually did simply contain the forty foot undisturbed buffer language solely to the parcel of property I understand owned by Mr. Holland. So there is a change in the sense of what was read in 2008 and what is before you this evening. Ironically what that does I believe actually goes a little beyond perhaps and shows that there is to be a fifty foot undisturbed buffer as to the two parcels which were addressed by the Planning Commission in January of last year. Indeed the idea or the issue about does this document fairly capture everything, I contend it does. In the preface to the ordinance we tried to explain that; this is a clarification and that indeed this ordinance in the form that is captured, does not change the decision of the Planning Commission that was rendered in January 2014. It just doesn't touch it. The decision was made and all parties have consulted with the County and the voices have been heard if you will and as I understand it with exception of some of the issues raised, this allows this matter to go forward to closure. I hope that addresses in summary fashion.

Ronald Pappas made a motion to approve and Vedia Hatfield seconded the motion.

Jerry Holt – It's not clear to me at this stage why this is in our lap. When the application that was based on PDD-26 came to the Planning Commission in January of last year we approved the application with conditions. My understanding and Mr. Wren just reiterated that regardless of the action that we take tonight with this purposed clarification of PDD-26; it does not change the decision nor does it affect the applicant's ability to again, take us to court based on that decision. It confuses me a bit as to whether or not this is really a planning commission issue. We reached our decision based on what we thought was "the version of PDD-26" at the time that we addressed the application. Right now it appears to me that this is a county council issue. PDD-26 probably went through the Planning Commission back in 2008 and went to county council and then there was a failure in that process. We are not making any changes nor am I aware that the council is considering make any substantive changes to PDD-26. So it's not clear to me what our standing is in

this particular application. If we vote in favor of these changes what does it matter and if we vote no we don't like these changes, what happens next either way?

Charles Deese – Our vote tonight is to either approve or deny this to county council. When it leaves here it goes to county council to be finalized. Is that correct?

Penelope Karagounis – That is correct. It's a clarification of the ordinance.

Charles Deese – We are not voting on the PDD itself. We are looking at it as it is written. We are making a recommendation to county council, whether we recommend denial or approval.

Jerry Holt – The packet that was presented to us to vote on that is going to the council, I think we've acknowledged it does contain erroneous maps.

Charles Deese – She does have the right maps that will be added to it.

Jerry Holt – But we can't see what those maps are so we don't know that they are the right maps or the ones that conform to.....

Penelope Karagounis – You've approved it already, January 2014.

Jerry Holt – Are those the maps that end up being attached to what goes to county council?

Charles Deese – It shows the fifty foot undisturbed buffer.

Penelope Karagounis – He has it in the actual ordinance. The text is there but it's very important to have those maps. He just attached the one and I have another copy of the actual recorded seal which shows the fifty foot. It has been done.

Jerry Holt – But the map has changed since we took action because when we identified the stretch of the fifty foot undisturbed buffer we identified two segments of lots because they were divided by a stub-out; going from lot number such and such to another one and then from Y to Z on the other section. My understanding is now that configuration has changed and the lot numbers don't conform to what we voted on back in January of last year. How do we reconcile that since this has been a dynamic process?

Penelope Karagounis – As you remember Mr. Holt at the workshop Mr. Weaver stated because of the way developments work; they might change the lot numbers so he references specifically the tax map numbers. So if tomorrow Mr. Holland sells his property we know that it is not the Holland property, we know it's that specific tax map number. That has been identified on the preliminary plan. They had fifteen days to make those changes. Pulte, ESP Associates made the changes and we have copies of it and again, I do apologize for not having the actual approved master plan for the Queensbridge. We have a digital copy in our office. I will make sure that goes to Mr.

Weaver tomorrow morning and county council. Based on the ordinance, that information that is in the document today is correct; we just need to attach the approved recorded preliminary plan that is vested for two years.

Jerry Holt – So with this proposed change, nothing has been conceded, nothing has changed since the action of the Planning Commission in January of last year as it pertains to this issue? Our ruling on the application with the conditions for approval still stands?

Penelope Karagounis – That is correct and also the deletion of stub-outs from the preliminary plan.

Ronald Pappas made a motion to approve and Vedia Hatfield seconded the motion.

VOTE: 7 AFFIRMATIVE 0 NEGATIVE MOTION CARRIED

Penelope Karagounis – This will go to county council on April 13, 2015.

New Business: UDO Advisory Committee has changed the name to UDO Review Committee. At the February 05th Planning Commission Workshop Mr. Charles Deese, Chairman, appointed two other commissioners to serve on this committee. Mr. Tommy Dabney, Mr. Jerry Holt, and Mr. Charles Deese will serve on the UDO Review Committee.

This concludes the cases from the February 17, 2015 agenda. We will now take a brief 10 minute break starting at 7:45 pm. The Planning Commission meeting will start back at 7:55 pm with the cases from the March 17, 2015 Planning Commission Agenda.

Respectfully Submitted,



Charles Deese
Chairman



Penelope Karagounis
Planning Director