

relate to this site. To do that you would have to come out of the site and then turn left and then turn right, which is probably not a movement that you would want to encourage.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that in a case of new development within a larger area of existing development and existing traffic circumstances what typically has happened in the past with proposals that there be some kind of contribution towards ultimate improvements. Right now they have \$15,000 on the table now. So the question is whether or not that is significant to deal with future transportation improvements in the area, whether they be pedestrian or with the road system. He stated that he did not think putting a right turn lane onto Route 20 is substantially created by this proposal. He felt that contribution towards improvements that are necessary in the pedestrian and road system is very much contributable to this development. The question is what the proper amount is.

Mr. Rieley asked staff to bring some suggestions next time on that issue.

Mr. Edgerton stated that the Planning Commission will discuss this item, Pantops Park, again on December 13, 2005.

**In summary**, the request was deferred to the December 13, 2005 Planning Commission meeting due to an advertising error. In lieu of a public hearing, the Commission held a work session to discuss the proposal and provided feedback to the assist the applicant and staff with outstanding issues.

#### ***Work Session.***

#### **Dickerson Road Affordable Housing Project Pre-Application Work Session** – (David Benish)

George Ray, applicant, submitted two attachments. (See Attachment A and B)

Ms. Joseph asked if there had been a change made since the staff report, and Mr. Ray replied that some changes have been made.

Mr. Benish summarized the staff report. (See Attachment C)

- This is a pre-application work session to discuss the Dickerson Road Affordable Housing Project proposal for the 200 (+/-) units on 22 acres off of Dickerson Road adjacent to the airport and the Hollymead community.
- The Commission held a work session on this proposal in February and staff provided a brief summary of what they felt was the findings of that. Also, the minutes from that meeting are attached in order that the Commission can decide whether they agree with staff's summary. Staff summarized the Commission's answers to the five questions raised previously. Those questions spoke to whether this is the appropriate location for residential. The area in the Comp Plan is shown for industrial. So there was a concern about the conversion from industrial land use to residential. That type of change from the Comp Plan usually requires a Comprehensive Plan Amendment process to be reviewed and the Commission was concerned about the length of time that process would undertake. Therefore, the Commission had some discussion about how to deal with that. They also had questions about the mix and the design of the development. Staff tried to summarize the Commission's direction at that meeting. This type of review process does not require specific recommendations or actions. Therefore, the Commission is only providing direction to staff. He asked if the Commission had any questions about staff's summary or the minutes because they could go over that.
- The minutes indicated that the Commission did feel like additional information on the proposal would be important from the applicant.
- The applicant has continued to craft the proposal.
- One of the issues that the Commission had was how the commitment was going to be made to affordable housing. The applicant has worked on that issue. Ron White from the County's Housing Office is present. The applicant has been working with Mr. White about those concepts.

- Staff had hoped that a market analysis would be available from the Places 29 process, which would really help us further discuss the issues regarding the need for the demand for industrial land. That is not completed as of yet.
- Staff is prepared to walk the Commission through the Comp Plan to talk about the inventory of industrial land. Staff has provided some numbers on the inventory to the Commission previously. The summary of that is that we probably have significant capacity in the short term of 5 to 10 years, but over the long term of the plan there may be some question as to this pattern of piece mill erosion of our industrial land designation.

Mr. Edgerton noted that on that point that one of the things that has come out of recent conversations here is that the land values have gotten so high in the 29 Corridor areas that even if the zoning is there it is irrelevant because you can't afford to buy the land for that use. There is nobody that is willing to spend that kind of money for industrial property.

Ms. Joseph asked if he was saying that they were willing to spend it for residential, and Mr. Edgerton stated that was correct and they were hearing this over and over again for residential and retail.

Ms. Higgins noted that it was the supply and demand issue.

Mr. Benish pointed out that staff is still trying to investigate that and feels that the market analysis might help target what sort of demands there are for these types of land uses and what are the right price points for those. Also present is Bob Marry from the Thomas Jefferson Partnership for Economic Development. He may be able to speak to some of those issues if the Commission wants to ask some questions. Susan Stimart and he have spoken with Bob about this issue. As he recalled Mr. Marry did recognize that there are some pricing issues with certain types of industrial land. By the same token there are other industries that would potentially pay that price depending on what product that they were going into. For example, the UREF Fontaine Research Park and that sort of end of development potentially may have a need for a location that this might provide an opportunity for. But, he would let Mr. Marry speak to that. He felt that staff has found that for certain types of industries that the County has priced itself out of the market competitively in other areas. But, how far that covers the range of things that are permitted in Industrial Services is the question. Industrial Service includes Light Industrial, which is basically a business district or an office park. Ron White is also present for questions. The main reason for the work session was for the applicant to provide more information, and then they could get back to the question of how to address this as a process moving down the road.

He distributed the early from the Places 29 process that included the framework of a. b. and c, which were reviewed by the public. Two of those, framework a. and c., did include this area as a low density residential area. There are four maps in the packet. The first map is the existing conditions. Framework a. and c. show it as low density land. Framework a. shows more protection of the environmental areas, such as the stream valley areas. Framework b. shows it as an employment designation with a small retail area located there. Framework c. shows a little more basic low density. (See Attachments)

The consultants will review this area and look at the findings in the future to come up with a more detailed recommendation. Option b. is intended to reflect what would be an employment type of designation, which would be consistent with this Comprehensive Plan. The middle option more reflects what is in the Comp Plan now.

In the staff report the prior concept map was included because staff was not able to coordinate getting this proposal in the packet because Mr. Ray was out of the country. Staff was not able to coordinate it and what Mr. Ray is passing out is different.

George Ray stated that he was one of three partners of the limited liability company that is proposing this project. He presented a power point presentation to walk the Commissioners through the proposed project. The purposed of the presentation is to obtain feedback and direction from the Planning Commission. Since the February 1, 2005 work session, they have been working on incorporating the Commission's comments. They have been working with staff and Ron White on this proposal. The

purpose of this second work session is to get some direction and feedback on how the Commission would want them to proceed with this project.

The name of their LLC is Sugaray and the principals are Suzanne Jessup Brooks, who is present tonight. The others include Mike Gaffney and himself. They have had discussions with two builders to provide the housing product that they would show them tonight. One is Gaffney Homes, who helped them on Glenwood Station with an affordable housing product which has been very successful. They have also had some discussions with Ryan Homes. They feel that they have a very strong affordable housing component for this project. He felt that they would be able to build a better product for less money than many of the area builders due to their type of production. They have had a scale model built by an architecture student at the University of Virginia. He presented the model which displayed each of the proposed products shown on the colored renderings. Mark Keeler, the owner of Tara Partners, was present to comment on the site plan. The project manager, Marilyn Young, was present as well as his wife, Jane. They have named this project Willow Glen. The objective, much like Glenwood Station is that they want to deliver a quality product in which all of the condos, single-family residences and townhouses all relate to each other. He felt that there ought to be a relationship between the architectural elements. Ms. Young will go over the affordable housing components proposed for this project.

They have proposed 210 units on 23 acres, which was 8.99 units per acre with a combination of townhouses, condominiums or flats, and single-family houses. They held a series of focus groups, which included some fire fighters and teachers. They found that the fire fighters and police officers in particular did not want to live in attached housing. They have used that for a couple of things. One in trying to provide some diversity for the community, but also to reduce the density and to put a product within the project that might be of interest to those particular civil servants. He reviewed the proposal.

Marilyn Young stated that they know that the affordable housing target is for the 15 percent to be affordable. In our community with the approximately 200 units that is 30 units out of the total. As they are looking at the targeted market for who is going to qualify for the assistance, they know that there has been a lot of talk about the work force component that are people that are needing housing, which are people who are important to the community. This would include the active and retired law enforcement, fire fighters, teachers and civil servants in the County. The question is how do they go about getting enough money and how do they get the assistance. So this is what the developer and the builders are proposing to do here. She felt that it was a real testimony to their commitment to affordable housing to be willing to be this specific this early on. They have a lot of work to do in order to know how much this project will cost to deliver and how long it is going to take and what the product is going to be. They have made this commitment to offer these specifics at this point in time and are looking for a \$10,000 write down from the cost of the lots on those 30 that are going to be affordable lots.

Ms. Joseph stated that she was clarifying that what they were offering was 15 percent of all of the units in the affordable range. Right now what she was explaining was what affordable means.

Ms. Young stated no, that this was the target of what the program is going to be, and they have to figure out where the money is going to come from.

Ms. Joseph asked if 15 percent was what their affordable component is.

Ms. Young stated that was correct. What they wanted to talk about was what was affordable and how do you determine who qualifies and those sort of things. There are no easy answers. She thanked Mr. White for being present and that they would appreciate any clarification that he could add. This is a significant offer from the developer and the builders to talk about. What is the cash or contribution that the builders and developers are going to be offering to help make it affordable? Given the cost of the land and development, it is a real tough nut to crack. Given the amount of money available to the County, it is a struggle meeting these targets for any developer. So they are proposing to do it two different ways. To have a direct write down of \$10,000 on the cost of a lot to the builder, which will come right off the top or returned to the partners in this development? Then to get another \$300,000 that is going to come from

a surcharge on the remaining lots. Basically, they would be helping to create a fund or a pool of monies that could be used according to criteria that is yet to be developed.

Mr. Edgerton asked if they discount the price of the lot to the builder, how they are going to control whether he adds that price back in to his assessment.

Ms. Young stated that it would be part of the contract to the builder.

Mr. Edgerton stated that this would deal with the first sale, but not the resale.

Ms. Young stated there have to obviously be other things that are going on. The assistance programs through the County and PHA and others, there are all sorts of criteria for appreciation payback and how much profit sharing or interest carry, whatever. There are a lot of things to think about. But, this is the basic structure of it. The current assistance structure that they have right now, it is her understanding that these County and Piedmont Housing Alliance programs and other state and local money would serve those people with median incomes up to 80 percent of the area median. They would like to expand that program a little bit, and would talk a little more about why they feel they need to expand it. But, to look more to the VHDA guidelines, which moves according to the household size to 100 to 115 percent of the area median. She presented the power point presentation noting that there are a lot of things to think about in formulating these programs. They need to work collaboratively with the County to come up with solutions to solve all of these problems about the structure of the program. HUD uses the household size in their calculations. The average household size in Albemarle County is somewhere around 2.6 percent. With those adjustments it will reduce the number of people who would otherwise be eligible. VHDA starts with the average County income, but each agency does it differently. She reviewed the various assistant programs including the County's down payment program noting that it was very difficult for many persons to qualify. Therefore, either the criteria have to change or somehow there has to be some other type of pot of money. They are hoping that they can work with the County to try to fill some of that gap. She stated that they were trying to focus on as low as they can go down. When you look at those income levels it is probably going to be 70 to 100 percent that is going to be the meat of the market for new construction. Possibly for existing construction they could reach down further. Given new construction as a practical matter it is going to be tough.

Ms. Joseph asked if the proposal was for 15 percent affordable and the rest would all be at market.

Mr. Edgerton stated that 7.5 would be affordable by the definition because the definition as it stands is 80 percent or less.

Mr. Ray stated that if it was the will of the County that they take the whole pot and direct it to 80 percent or less that they would do that. But, they keep hearing that there are people who cannot afford housing who make more than 80 percent of the median income. They are throwing it out there, but if they don't like it they will adjust it to something else. They want to work with the County. This is just one of their ideas.

Mr. Edgerton asked if in the focus group if they found they could deal with the greater than 80 percent.

Ms. Young stated that if you take someone who is a mid-grade employee if you look at those HUD guidelines that many times they will exceed. She guessed the question they have to ask is how well they are servicing their house to work towards their target right now.

Ms. Joseph asked if they realize when someone comes in for a rezoning for residential and a special use permit is that our expectations are that 15 percent are for affordable housing regardless. She was really surprised because when this was presented for an affordable housing project that it was going to be something different than what they normally see. That is what they normally see.

Ms. Young pointed out that they were working under the VHDA guidelines.

Ms. Higgins stated that it would be how they arrived at the number of units that need to fall in that category. They understand what it takes to get in that category. But, affordable housing has been defined by the County as the 80 percent. So that would account for the whole. That is a target and does not mean that every development has to be 15 percent. Some have been approved with less.

Ms. Joseph felt that when this was presented as an affordable housing project that there certainly would be more than 15 percent of the units offered would be in the affordable range.

Ms. Higgins stated that they would require it across the board.

Mr. Edgerton stated that this proposal was one-half of what the Comp Plan was proposing.

Ms. Young stated that they would go back and look at the price points. They obviously are in the conceptual stage here. They are trying to work with the County and the goals that they understand with working with the work force that a lot of people who don't qualify at that 80 percent with the conflict what somebody can afford at those levels. There just is not a product. They are trying to deliver a product as opposed to proffers that is something that they are not always seeing here. Before you get to the rezoning, she asked to speak to Places 29 plan c. She noticed on plan c that there is a lot of high density right along 29. She does not live two blocks off of 29 and they get a lot of road noise. She asked that the Commission reserve their judgment on whether their proposal fits in with the proposed Ruckersville Parkway at this point.

George Ray stated that the impression that he got was that the 15 percent was a defined and that the County did not want more than 15 percent because there is a down side in concentrating too much affordable housing in one area.

Mr. Edgerton stated that was exactly correct, but that the difference was a huge gap in their definition of affordable and the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Ray stated that if they wanted them to put all of the units into the \$185,000 or less that they will do that. He felt that they felt that they had come up with a good idea to include the group of persons who could not afford a house in the County such as the firefighters, school teachers, etc. that go to Waynesboro to buy a house that were not included in the group of 80 percent median income. This need would be in addition to the people with 80 percent or less. If it does not work, then they will modify it. He stated that he could not put \$600,000 in a pot and help both groups. But, if he had to do 15 percent affordable, then he did not know how to do it. It depends on whose guidelines that you use. For 16 foot wide townhouses the builder feels they can sell that for \$200,000, and they will come up with a way to wipe that down either by writing down the lot to the builder or making a cash contribution from the other pot, they will figure out a way to make those affordable at \$185,000. The second part of that proposal was for the ones that cost \$235,000; they would come up with a private pot of money that does not have government restrictions and do some down payment assistance for people who make above the 80 percent of the median income. In order to do that they would buy a different priced house and would qualify to buy the different price house. They would still be subsidizing their acquisition. They could also donate it to Piedmont Housing Authority and take a tax write off, which they could then put back into a bigger program for that and let them administer it. He noted that they don't know how to administer it.

Ms. Joseph asked where they would find houses for people to buy.

Mr. Ray stated that it would be restricted to this project. They would be putting the money up and they would be restricted to spend it on this project. They would be giving the money for affordable housing, but would restrict it to being used for their project.

Mr. Thomas stated that the affordable housing would be paid for by the higher price housing.

Mr. Edgerton pointed out that a school teacher would not qualify for this affordable housing.

Mr. Ray noted that it would almost have to be a two person income.

Mr. Edgerton stated that if there was a single entry work force there would be nothing available.

Ms. Higgins pointed out that the buying power would be limited based on the increasing interest rate.

Mr. Ray stated that those are all legitimate concerns. The challenges are the rising interest rate, the length of the approval process and the construction cost escalation. When the full impact of rebuilding the Gulf coast hits he did not know what was going to happen to some of these projects. Those are all things that they are going to try to address. This is a legitimate attempt to build as quickly as possible affordable housing in Albemarle County. He could not emphasize enough that they were offering to work with the County staff and Ron's office to come up with something that is workable. He pointed out that if what they proposed tonight would not work, then they would figure out another way that would work.

Ms. Joseph stated that there were a couple of other issues that they should discuss. The first is the layout and the industrial land. The proposed layout looks great. The industrial land aspect of this is something that she is very concerned about because of where this is located, because of all of the roads that connect because it is near the airport, because there is the nuisance factor and the factor of convenience for someone that does have an economic use on the property. So that is the kind of thing that they also need to talk about not only what their target rate is in affordable housing, but also the other aspects. She pointed out that she was getting very tired.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that there were some fundamental questions regarding this. The Commission has an idea of what the applicant would like to pursue. In order for this to happen there are some other things that have got to happen. The Commission has to give some direction on how they would like to see that occur if at all. The first point is that this is industrially designated in the Comp Plan. So there is not an application that can be made right that is consistent with the Comp Plan that is any where close to what they are proposing to do. So if you want to change the plan the question is what you have to see in order to make that change beyond what you have seen tonight. As an example, as to the employment aspect of the land use that is there now and what is the mechanism that you want to look at that. Is it on its own as a review or is it part of what they are doing right now as part of Places 29. Places 29 will be a comp plan change. In fact, when you had Mr. Wood's proposal for additional area the Commission told him to change the Comp Plan and they would like that to be looked at concurrently with Places 29.

Mr. Edgerton stated that he would like to continue down that route. It makes a whole lot more sense to look at the entire region rather than a specific area.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that Places 29 as Mr. Benish mentioned will look at the need for industrial land versus other land. That is part of the analysis and is part of what ultimately comes out as the options for dealing with this particular area will be reflective of that. He felt that the three scenarios that were laid out for the public were just for reaction. Next they will submit some real scenarios for consideration. By early March that is what is going to be before the public. Unless the Commission is directing staff to be pursuing this independently of that, then their best recommendation is that they be looking at Places 29 as kind of a land use approach to this area while the applicant is looking at how they might want to be structuring a project provided the plan gets changed.

Mr. Ray stated that what they would be requesting is that the Commission allows them to go to the site plan stage and let them start preparing the site plan. They would ask that they consider the Comprehensive Plan Amendment and rezoning at the same time simultaneously. Some of the things that scared them are the rising interest rates and some of these costs that they are going to have, which is going to make a project like this more difficult. He would suggest that they came to the Planning Commission in February of this year, which was before the Places 29 project began. He noted that he was in the public sector for 20 years and these things always have a habit of dragging out. He pointed out that they were offering an affordable housing project and would work with the County any way that they can, but they need their help with part of the help being an expeditious review of the project. Otherwise, he feared that it would become more and more complicated.

Ms. Joseph stated that she could buy into that if they had not come in and seen them last February. But, it has been a long time since February since they've come back again.

Mr. Ray stated that they had done a lot of work since February.

Ms. Joseph stated that this project was not any different than what Mr. Wood is doing.

Mr. Ray stated that they were in line first.

Mr. Thomas stated that he had always been worried about the industrial property around the County, specifically in depleting all of the LI zoning. He asked if this stays LI what type of use they would put in.

Ms. Higgins stated that it was zoned RA, but was shown in the Comp Plan as Industrial Service. She noted that if there was a rezoning before the Commission, the question would be if they would rezone the property consistent with the Comp Plan. She felt that would be a very difficult thing to do because of the residential context, the input you would get next door, etc.

Ms. Joseph agreed because they were currently working on Places 29 and were trying to look at this and how it meets the regionally. When they look at this regionally she hoped that the County was looking at what is happening in the rest of the County too and how whatever they do in this area will affect the other areas.

Mr. Edgerton stated that he would not be surprised if Places 29 does not come back with another recommendation other than Light Industrial for this area. He favored allowing the consultants to sort out this mess.

Ms. Higgins stated that if this was a comp plan amendment before the Commission without Places 29 going on she felt that they were all saying the same thing. She felt that was a meaningful way to tilt. If there was a rezoning request for light industrial it would be hard to deny it, but it would possibly be difficult too. But, maybe this is more compatible. She felt that there were a lot of rezoning uses that could be request that the neighborhoods would be very much impacted by.

Mr. Morris stated that when he originally read this he had built up false assumptions on his part. But, the applicant is proposing to locate a 200 +/- affordable housing project on approximately 22 acres. After he read through this he was curious to know how the applicant was planning on doing it. When they started talking about the 15 percent instead of the 100 percent, he felt that was logical but he misinterpreted it. He felt that was where the balloon was burst for him because he made false assumptions based on what he read. He apologized, but that was where he was coming from.

Mr. Benish asked if there were any questions for Mr. Ron White, County Housing Director.

Ms. Joseph stated that it was very important for the Commission to know what is going on in Albemarle and felt that it was very important the next time that they discuss this for Susan Stimart to be here.

Mr. Benish stated that Ms. Stimart's function is to help promote partnerships to implement the County's neighborhood model and not in charge of the economic development for the County. But, she certainly was versed in what is happening. The last thing that he wanted to clarify was with the Wendell Wood process that they went through. What they have agreed to with Mr. Wood's proposal was that they would come back at strategic times during the Places 29 process. The earliest strategic time was after they would get the economic information to vet it in full and at the time that they would have some sense from the consultant with what the proposals would be either by charrettes coming out in that February or March time frame. The question would be how much public vetting of those that you would want, which would dictate the earliest possible time that they could bring this back to you. That would be the first opportunity that they would see a consultant recommended series of proposals and some public feedback on those. He felt that was where the March/April window was, which was how they were planning to proceed with

Wendell Wood's proposal. That does not mean that they were committed to an action. Mr. Wood is recommending that 225 acres be amended in the Comp Plan from Industrial Service.

Mr. Edgerton pointed out that he had heard that project has gone away and gone to Nelson County.

Mr. Benish pointed out that he had not withdrawn the comprehensive plan amendment.

Ms. Joseph asked if staff was proposing that you bring this along the same tract when that information is obtained.

Mr. Benish stated that during the work session with Mr. Wood they had discussed coming back to the Commission before an adoption of the Places 29, which was at the next strategic point if there was additional information that they could further discuss that issue.

Mr. Rieley stated that this was different than Mr. Wood's project because there was a considerable amount of design work and quite specific proposals from the place mix as well as the design of the site and the buildings.

Ms. Higgins pointed out that the comp plan amendment has to go through before the rezoning.

Mr. Rieley stated that it seemed that there should be a mechanism to forward a proposal that is specific as this into that process so that it can be evaluated. Because it is not as if the whole County is a blank slate and they are not looking at previously developed sites as if they are a blank slate. He did not see any reason why a piece of property that has a concrete proposal on the table can't be put into the mix as it might have some influence on the direction.

Mr. Cilimberg asked if he meant by in the mix as being a part of the Places 29 review.

Mr. Edgerton suggested that they take the proposal to the consultants and tell them this is what they want to do.

Ms. Joseph felt that it made perfect sense to do that.

Mr. Rieley did not think it can or should come with a recommendation particularly, but he did not see any reason why a specific proposal can't be evaluated within that context and considered. They may find that it is a good fit or they may find that it is not. Or they might find that it is partially a good fit.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that our approach with dealing with a project like this somewhat like Mr. Wood's would be to show the consultant what is being proposed.

Mr. Rieley stated that he would absolutely agree.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that it was not something that they would hold out and say let's see what you come up with and then we will compare it to this. They would want them to see it, understand it, evaluate it and consider it as part of what they are coming forward with. That gives them an early look at how they see that fitting. That may allow them to move on with this project and not have to wait for further approvals in the Places 29 process.

Mr. Rieley stated that in addition they also in the Crozet Master Plan requested changes. They requested that they take a chunk of area out and put it in somewhere else. Therefore, what they adopt may not be what the consultants will bring back to us.

Ms. Higgins asked if they were saying that it would be considered concurrently.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that what they were saying was to give the consultant what the applicant has developed, evaluate it and have them provide their thoughts regarding that in context of the bigger picture

of the recommendations that are going to be coming forward with for this winter meeting and bring that to the Commission and let them see how they see it fitting. Then the Commission will make a decision whether to move forward with the rezoning application with the understanding that the comp plan amendment may actually be something that happens later.

Mr. Morris agreed.

Ms. Higgins stated that they would potentially consider the rezoning without the comp plan amendment.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that they could go ahead and basically do them concurrently with the understanding.

Ms. Higgins asked if the applicant should just put a request in now for a comp plan amendment.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that this would be much more expeditious. He pointed out that he did not think there was any application that could be put in now for a comp plan amendment change that would go any quicker than having it evaluated as part of the Places 29 discussions that were going on right now because they have the resources to look at.

Ms. Joseph pointed out that the market study was very important.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that there is a process going on right now and changes will result out of that.

**In summary**, the Planning Commission held a work session on Dickerson Road Affordable Housing Project. The applicant gave a power point presentation and reviewed the proposal, particularly the affordable housing components of the project. The Planning Commission reviewed and discussed the proposal and provided the following comments and suggestions to the applicant on how to proceed with their request:

- There were many unanswered questions related to the applicant's mechanisms for providing affordable housing, whether the proposal met the 15 percent target and how it would be administered.
- The proposal should be forwarded to the consultant to be evaluated and considered as part of the Places 29 regional review. The specific proposal would have some influence on the direction of the study and possibly allow the applicant to move forward and not have to wait for further approvals in the Places 29 process.

***Old Business:***

Mr. Edgerton asked if there was any old business.

- Next week Mark Graham will be present information on the Hollymead Town Center runoff to the lakes at Forest Lakes.

Mr. Edgerton asked if there was any further old business. There being none, the meeting proceeded.

***New Business:***

Mr. Edgerton asked if there was any new business. There being none, the meeting proceeded.

***Adjournment:***

With no further items, the meeting adjourned at 10:30 p.m. to the next regular meeting on November 29, 2005.