

November 21, 2006

The Greenville Planning and Zoning Commission met on the above date at 6:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers of City Hall, 200 Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive.

	Mr. Len Tozer - *	
Mr. Bob Ramey - *		Mr. Dave Gordon - *
Mr. Jim Moye - *		Mr. Tim Randall - *
Mr. Don Baker - *		Mr. James Wilson - X
Mr. Bill Lehman - *		Mr. Porter Stokes - *
Mr. Godfrey Bell, Sr. - *		Ms. Shelley Basnight - *

The members present are denoted by an * and the members absent are denoted by a x.

VOTING MEMBERS: Tozer, Moye, Ramey, Gordon, Randall, Baker, Lehman, Stokes, Bell and Basnight.

PLANNING STAFF: Merrill Flood, Director of Community Development; Harry V. Hamilton, Jr., Chief Planner; Andy Thomas, Planner; Chantae Gooby, Planner; Nikki Jones, Planner and Kathy Stanley, Secretary.

OTHERS PRESENT: Council Member Ray Craft; Assistant City Manager Thom Motion; Dave Holec, City Attorney; David Brown, City Engineer; and Kyle Garner, Transportation Planner.

Chairman Tozer recognized Council Member Ray Craft.

Chairman Tozer expressed his condolences to Mr. Bob Ramey on the passing of his wife. Mr. Ramey thanked everyone for their cards and prayers.

MINUTES: Motion was made by Mr. Ramey, seconded by Mr. Lehman, to accept the October 17, 2006 minutes as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Tozer explained the procedures in addressing the Board and time limits. Chairman Tozer explained that the Planning and Zoning Commission is an advisory

Commission for City Council. City Council ultimately makes the final decision on these requests and not necessarily follows the recommendations of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

REQUEST BY WILLIAM H. CLARK - APPROVED

(This is a verbatim transcript)

Chairman Tozer: Old Business is a request by William H. Clark. Request by William H. Clark, to rezone 1.1829 acres located at the southwest corner of the intersection of Oxford Road and East Tenth Street (N.C. Highway 33) from RA20 (Residential-Agricultural) to O (Office).

Ms. Chantae Gooby: This is a request to rezone just a little over an acre from RA20 to Office. The property is located within Voting District #4. This is a copy of rezoning map in your packets. You can see that the original property that came before you to be rezoned has now been divided into two lots. It's the lot along Tenth Street that is now being proposed to be rezoned. This map also illustrates the floodway and the 100 year floodplain. This is an aerial photo of the map and this is the subject property. Pirates Cove Apartments are to the northwest and Sterling University Apartments to the east and Brook Valley Subdivision is south. The property is currently vacant. There are vacant and residential properties surrounding the subject property. The property is impacted by the floodway and the 100 year floodplain. The property is impacted by a proposed Greenway. There is a community focus area located at the intersection of Greenville Boulevard and Tenth Street and there is an intermediate focus area located at Tenth Street and Port Terminal Road. The proposed rezoning could generate a net increase of 130 trips with the majority of those trips heading to the west. This map illustrates the multi-family development within close proximity to the subject property. The Land Use Plan does recommend conservation or open space, however, it is not dimensionally specific. Your rezoning map illustrates the environmental constraints and because there is a 100 year floodplain building elevation standards do apply and construction within the floodway is prohibited. The property is currently zoned RA20 and the property is surrounded by residentially zoned property. While the Land Use Plan does recommend conservation or open space because of the potential environmental concerns, contextual recommendations are also used. One of those is to protect the interest of the neighborhood and also allow reasonable use to property owners. The rezoning map illustrates the available building site relative to environmental limitations. Under the Land Use Plan the recommendation is for residential, however, if you find that residential is not practical or reasonable the

other option relative to this request would be the office zoning in that it is the most restrictive zoning district. Then the rezoning request would be in compliance with the Plan in that the interest of the neighborhood would be protected. I also understand that there are representatives from the neighborhood are here that can better address the impact to their neighborhood. I'll be glad to answer any questions.

Chairman Tozer: Any questions for Ms. Gooby? I have a question. I've looked at a lot of requests before and I don't ever remember having one where if it looks good to us if it's in compliance and if it don't it's not. Can you kind of explain that?

Ms. Gooby: Sure. On the Land Use Plan you see that it shows green which generally illustrates some kind of potential environmental constraint or possibly a buffer and to that then you also have to use what the adjacent land uses are. In that you can see that adjacent to the green is the medium density residential. Therefore, if you take the Plan at first blush, if you will, it does show that as conservation and open space. However, if you take into account that property while it does have environmental constraints, can be built upon, you have to ask is residential appropriate. If you find that residential is appropriate then this request would not be in compliance with the Land Use Plan.

Chairman Tozer: So originally this land was zoned RA20. Horizons Plan when it was formulated it crossed over with the conservation, correct?

Ms. Gooby: Yes. You could look at the conservation/open space as a red flag to potential environmental constraints in this situation.

Chairman Tozer: What would the normal transitional zoning be to residential?

Ms. Gooby: Well in that there is residential around it there really would not be a buffer because the surrounding property is also residential.

Chairman Tozer: I'm talking about zoning application. In other areas where there wasn't a conservation zone. What would be the normal zoning adjacent to residential?

Ms. Gooby: If the green wasn't there it would all be orange.

Chairman Tozer: Which would include office?

Ms. Gooby: No. It would not.

Chairman Tozer: It would not. Any questions? Thank you Chantae. We'll go ahead and open the public hearing. Anyone to speak in favor please step forward and state your name and you have five minutes.

Mr. Phil Dixon: May it please the Commission, my name is Phil Dixon. I'm representing Bill Clark here tonight. Mr. Tozer just to address your question I would point out to you that the transition zoning that you're talking about you'll find the same zoning at the entrance to Club Pines, Lynndale, Westhaven and Belvedere Subdivisions so this is a transition. This property was zoned RA20 in 1972 when it was brought into the city. Mr. Clark actually acquired the property back in 1993 when he purchased all the remaining lots in Brook Valley. So it has been sitting vacant since he purchased it about 13 years. There are some really unique features to this particular lot. It's about 650 feet deep when he originally purchased it and it's highest point in elevation is about 28 feet and it goes all the way down to Bells Branch which is about 10 feet so there is a substantial drop and slope to the property. When we decided to divide this into two lots and create a lot of about equal size of the conservation easement area we actually picked a space that is about 16 feet in elevation. The lot that we are seeking to rezone goes from an elevation of about 28 feet down to 16 feet and the conservation lot on the back side that is not being rezoned or seeking to be rezoned goes from 16 feet down to 10 feet. I just want you to know that topography because I think it's rather significant. The lot is very heavy with vegetative covering and trees and the floodway that is a significant portion of this back part of the property is between 75 and 120 feet wide. It's an area in which you can not build. About 361 feet from the road you'll find the floodplain area and of course as you know there are modifications that sometimes you can make with grading that allows you to construct on that site but quite frankly it's just not economically feasible here. You have a very substantial amount of property here that's already a buffer. Again, the natural contours of the land also create a buffer in a way but to allay the concerns of the citizens in Brook Valley. We not only reduced the rezoning request to about half of what it was originally we also took to the City a proposal to correct this back (unclear) conservation easement area. I discussed it first with Mr. Dave Holec and then Andy Harrison, they were a little concerned about taking over the maintenance for it but we have an agreement and a decision has been made by Mr. Clark that if this property is rezoned he will convey that property to the adjoining property owner Greg and Carmon Wright to

remain in a natural state. That's significant nothing can be built on that site. It's significant because otherwise it would be a buildable lot. They reside at 102 Oxford Road, right across the bridge. The adjoining property owner to the left of this property along Highway 33 is Marjorie Harris and she has previously filed a letter with you stating that she didn't have an objection to the original rezoning request as has Tom Harwell who is immediately across from this property on Oxford Road. Each of you may recall back in 1988 Mr. Clark originally tried to rezone this property and then withdrew his request but there are many changes that have taken place since that time. East Tenth Street then was only a two-lane road, it's now a five-lane corridor, it is a 100 foot right-of-way and has been designated as a major traffic corridor for Greenville. There is also now a stoplight at the intersection of Oxford Road which helps control traffic. The original request by Mr. Clark was to rezone property on both sides of the road and that other lot is now owned by Mr. Harwell and again will remain a natural state. I think you know that we went from 2.3 acres to 1.3 acres to finally this 1.1 acre tract that we're seeking to rezone. The dividing line between these two lots is significant because there is a ridge there on which there are a lot of trees that we're trying to preserve so within this area of this lot to be rezoned is again a buffer and screen that we are trying to maintain. Also, abutting the ridge will be something that use to be called a stormwater detention basin and Mr. Linwood Stroud our engineer is here tonight, tells me the new name for that is stormwater best management practice or BMP Wetland Area and apparently that allows the nutrients in the water to be withdrawn by the plant life so you that don't have algae built-up in the Tar River. It will be a nice aesthetic feature for this lot too. For many rezoning request traffic is an issue, I think as Chantae has pointed out to you, the current design capacity for Highway 33 is twice what the traffic is on that road right now. Current ADT is 16,750 vehicles per day, design capacity is 33,500 vehicles per day, net ADT change to the east is half a percent and to the west is three-tenths a percent. Some concern was expressed by the Brook Valley Homeowners Association about us entering our lot from Oxford Road. One of the things we explored was having access from Highway 33. Your find in some of the materials I gave you that we did make contact with Steve Hamilton here in Greenville, Danny Taylor and Stoney Woolard, Washington, North Carolina office about the possibility of access from Highway 33. They will not act on any request without a formal plan for development and a site plan or a submission of a driveway application, driveway permit application. They tell me because of the proximity to the stoplight it's unlikely access would be allowed. At most we would hope for a right turn in and right turn out. They think

the best way to (unclear) traffic and I think the City Engineer agrees is probably through that stoplight at Oxford Road.

Chairman Tozer: Mr. Dixon, could you please come to conclusion.

Mr. Dixon: I would point out you that the office zoning here is the most restrictive non-residential zoning district. You have a list of the permitted and special uses. I think it's very significant when the Planning staff says to you that there's several nice neighborhoods that have the office zoning at the intersection of their entrance roads. I've already mentioned those to you. We believe this protects the entrance and request favorable consideration. Thank you.

Chairman Tozer: Thank you Mr. Dixon. Any questions for Mr. Dixon?

Mr. Randall: Yes, I have a question. We have the letter from Mr. Harwell and you mentioned the letter than came to us earlier from Ms. Harris and you mentioned that some of the land is going to be deeded off to the Wright's. Are the Wright's in support of this action?

Mr. Dixon: Here's what Mr. Clark told me. Mr. Clark told me that he had agreed to transfer that property to Mr. Wright because we were trying to find somebody who was going take it on and maintain it as a natural area and he said that Mr. and Mrs. Wright had agreed to do that conditioned upon the property being rezoned. My understand is that because of that they are not opposing this process right now so it looks to me immediately adjacent to the property, of course, it's property that Mr. Clark continues to own, he plans to convey to them. I don't think they will oppose it and then I've told you the Harris' to the left, Ms. Harris to the left and Mr. Harwell to the right are not opposed.

Mr. Randall: One other question. You gave us a letter I think it was part of your package from Rick Smiley from Brook Valley. I know part of the reason this was continued and postponed so many times was meetings, etc., etc. It looked like based on this last letter, I just read it very briefly, that you were not able to come to a

Mr. Dixon: The stale mate that we reached and Rick is a wonderful fellow to deal with he's worked very hard here as have I but I think we just reached a point where there's an impasse and it really centered around us, Bill, not willing to agree to restrictive covenants being placed on the property that would restrict the design of

the building and some of the features of the building. There were a lot of things that we did reach an agreement about quite frankly. What happened is we'd get one, two or three things resolved and then a fourth or fifth issue which would sort of (unclear) the deal. I think finally what Bill decided to do is reduce the size of the request, establish this conservation easement as a buffer and because of the topography he thought that was a suitable use for the property where as residential was not. I'm sorry we weren't able to work something out but we didn't. We spent a lot of time, I think I meet four times with the Executive Committee. Rick came to my office and we met one time and so we had some good dialogue. I think there are still a lot of things that might happen but Bill just wasn't willing to put that in the covenants.

Mr. Bell: Mr. Dixon. Did I not hear you say that it's unlikely that you will have a driveway off of 33?

Mr. Dixon: They're telling me that at most we could expect a turn in and turn out much like you see at Club Pines Subdivision on Highway 11 where you can turn in to the right and turn out to the right but you can't turn back to the left. I think my conversation with the City Engineering Office and the DOT so far say they're going to insist upon, I think, an access from Oxford Road. I think that is something the neighborhood would prefer not to have but I don't think there is any alternative if you're going to use this as an office or even residential. I think you would have to have access from Oxford Road.

Chairman Tozer: Any more questions? Thank you Mr. Dixon.

Mr. Dixon: Let me add just as a personal note, I appreciate so much your kind consideration in allowing us to continue this matter so many times it's most unusual. I know you're grateful tonight that I'm not asking for a continuance and I appreciate your patience and service. Thank you.

Chairman Tozer: Anyone else to speak in favor? Anyone to speak in opposition? Please state your name for the record and you have five minutes.

Mr. Rick Smiley: My name is Rick Smiley. I'm the President of the Brook Valley Homeowners Association. I'm also serve on the Historic Preservation Commission so I'm well aware of what it takes to come out to do this especially on such a brutal night so thank you all very much for being here. I don't do this professionally. I

work at ECU, I'm not an attorney so please forgive me if I don't make the slick presentation and I'm afraid I don't have anything like Mr. Dixon's materials. This originally came up a year ago (unclear) present (unclear) and Mr. Clark made no attempt to contact us prior to filing his petition. We contacted Mr. Clark asking him if he would give us some information about what he planned or anything along those lines. He essentially didn't want to talk about it at all. Eventually Mr. Dixon did get involved and we have met many times. Each time what we have tried to do is give him a sense of what our concerns as a homeowners association were and to offer him the opportunity to make some sort of best case presentation to the homeowners association. Please come to us, say I want to do this, I'd like to do this, I don't what to do this. I'm willing maybe to covenant for these things to make some sort of attempt to alleviate some of what we considered to be very legitimate concerns. That's been 11 months ago and Bill Clark has made no such effort. We've talked to Phil Dixon a number of times, Phil Dixon is a fine man, has made representations about, he doesn't make representations, he said that this might be possible, this might be possible, consistently when those get back to Bill Clark they are not possible. As we talked about earlier our big concern was on what type of property might be put there. Eventually when I did have one conversation several months ago with Bill Clark and he basically said I'm not willing to covenant to restrict, basically to do anything that would affect the remediation, to affect the impact on the neighborhood. He was willing to make some efforts, as you heard, with the neighboring property owners though I will point out to you that dividing the property into two parcels he has made it impossible for the neighboring property owners to oppose him to file a protest petition. That may be serendipity. Bill Clark, as I'm sure you know, has had a pattern of maximum development. This is a clear and open space is what it is called for on the Master Plan, Land Use Plan. It's currently zoned RA20. The Land Use Plan would call for a less intense zoning. He's asking for a more intensive zoning. He's saying that, one of the petitioner's burdens is to address the compatibility with surrounding zoning. He said that O is a transitional zoning. There is simply nothing to transition here. This is RA20 surrounded by RA20, there's no transition to make. The nearest commercial zoning is 1600 feet to the west. The notion that some how there is a transition in order here is specious that's not the case. He's attempting to put a zoning in here which would make it necessary to transition but currently it's all RA20. There's no reason for any transition at all. Item 3, compatibility with surrounding land uses. Once again it's residential all the way around. What's not residential is wetland or floodway. The impact on area streets and thoroughfares. Oxford Road is a residential street, always has been. They're talking about putting commercial traffic on it. Presumably they

would come out and hang a left and go up to the stoplight. In our experience people drive through Brook Valley so I'm not so sure there isn't an impact there. I wanted to call your attention to one thing I gave you, which this item here, I think is applicable under Item 5 which is other factors which address Health, Safety and Welfare of the Citizenry. A couple of years ago the Task Force on Preservation of Neighborhoods and Housing made recommendations to City Council which City Council adopted in an attempt to preserve the housing and its effect on Health, Safety and Welfare of the citizens of Greenville. On page 16, which is on the back, at the bottom it says "the city should invest in streetscape and infrastructure improvements in older established neighborhoods to include gateway and entrance signage and landscaping." The city is basically on a, has adopted as a mission to improve the gateways into neighborhoods. They think that the city has clearly said that this is an important thing. It's important to our city as a nice place to live. We have a wonderful gateway to our neighborhood. We don't need any investment by the city to maintain that. All we ask is that the city and its boards help us to preserve that gateway. Just a few things about what Mr. Dixon did say. Greg Wright is the Secretary of Brook Valley Homeowners Association. I work with him regularly, he is out of town today so he couldn't be here. He has consistently expressed his opposition to this petition, he's told me that after Bill Clark discussed deeding the property. I'm not sure that we should take his having agreeing to obtain the property in support of this. He's had 10 months, if he truly intended to covenant to do that, you know, if his goal was to, if it's rezoned I will give you this property. If it's rezoned I will support, I will do these things for Brook Valley Homeowners Association. He's had plenty of time and a very fine attorney at his disposal. We've seen nothing. Bill Clark has been not particularly responsive to our concerns.

Chairman Tozer: Mr. Smiley could you please come to conclusion.

Mr. Smiley: I'm at a conclusion. I'd love to answer any questions.

Chairman Tozer: Any questions for Mr. Smiley?

Mr. Baker: Is there any type of business that the homeowners association talked about that they would accept building on the property?

Mr. Smiley: We have, from the beginning told them that we would, something of this magnitude was not something we could decide as an Executive Board. That we would like for them to make a presentation to the homeowners as a group. We

offered to meet essentially anytime for them to do that. The homeowners themselves have never had a chance to consider anything along those lines. What we asked them to do was consider some sort of restriction on the size of the building, the type of building. Essentially what we said was we'd like to see them suggest something that was residential in character and scale. The thing that we talked about on the Board, there are nice offices that look like houses. I don't think it's at all impossible that some sort of presentation could have been made that would have perhaps won over the homeowners association. No attempt was made. Secondly, he's had offers to buy this property from him, Mr. Clark has, at a profit over what he paid for it for use as a residence. It's got market value, significant market value in its current zoning. He doesn't need a new zoning in order to somehow get a decent use out of the property. In fact when I asked him, when I did get him on the phone, I said "Mr. Clark would you be willing to sell this?" He said "the only sale I would consider is if there is one that has been appraised as if it were O". So he's already essentially marketing it has if it were rezoned.

Chairman Tozer: Any more questions? Thank you Mr. Smiley. Anyone else to speak in opposition? Anyone to speak in rebuttal in favor?

Mr. Dixon: I'll keep it brief. I guess here what it boils down to is balancing the rights of the property owner to use his property and develop it against the entrance to the neighborhood and what can you do to address those concerns. It seems to me you know if you look at the photographs you see here it's a very substantial piece of land that lies between this lot that's proposed to be developed simply as an office and Brook Valley Subdivision. The contours of the land, again, screen it. I don't see that you could even see the building from down there where Greg Wright lives or anyone else. I think you've got to realize too that along that Highway 33 corridor which is already busy but is going to get busier as we know when they open up the 10th Street corridor from the hospital over to 10th Street-Dickinson. All of a sudden that's really going to be even more a substantial major artery for traffic. I can't see many people wanting to live on that particular lot. The offer that was made, they wanted us to limit the building construction to one that was residential in character, design and scale with a pitch roof and oriented away from the neighborhood. What Bill said, he said "I'm going to be building probably to suit a tenant and I sort of got to address their concerns, I really can't limit myself there." They wanted to buy the property at its residential price and Bill said it's just worth a whole lot more than that and I don't think it's suitable for residential development.

Mr. Baker: In your discussion with Mr. Clark have you all discussed about what type of business or building that...

Mr. Dixon: He actually came up with a plan originally. They asked initially for a worse case scenario and we said 21,000 square feet, two-story building. We came back and reduced it to 15,000 square feet then 10,000 square feet and made it a one-story building. They wanted substantial berms along the Oxford Road route which would have taken away the parking and footprint of the building. They wanted a berm at the back of the building that was as tall as the building. Which didn't make a lot of sense because with the contours of the land I don't think you can see it anyway and we've got substantial vegetation. The vegetation buffer is fairly easy. (Unclear) is very easy but there were just so many things and Rick has a tough job, he's herding cats too, and he's got a lot of people with a lot of opinions. I can't say how many e-mails I've gotten. Many of them stressful but mostly saying here's an idea, here's something I want, here's something else I want, so it's like dealing a bit with an octopus. I will tell you and I believe this within my heart I believe Bill Clark intends to build an office building here that will be a nice addition to the neighborhood. I even said to him that would be a great location for a law office. I would love to have an office at that location and that would be something very compatible to the neighborhood. An insurance agent, there are a lot of things that could go there. I just don't see anybody building a home there. It seems to me we look at all these nice subdivisions around town and we see at the entrance to these subdivisions this type of development. Again, I've listed them, they're the finest subdivisions in town, the most popular subdivisions in town and I think that's reasonable. I do think that there are so many things here. I'm sure this was a wish list but they wanted us to build another entrance sign for Brook Valley and have an a sign easement. There were so many things that it just finally reached a point when Bill said "I've done all I can do. This is all I can do." I do believe that the end product is going to be something attractive. I don't believe that it's this project that's causing the concern. I think there's some people in Brook Valley that are unhappy with some things that happened in the past with projects that Bill has done. I've had people call me about Locksley Place saying the buildings are too close to the road and I'm saying what does that have to do with this project but it's just a concern that he's not been sensitive. I will say that early on I agreed to meet with the Homeowners Association and on the very day that I was scheduled to meet with them they decided they didn't want to meet. I actually thought it was a good idea because they needed time to digest it too. I did meet four times with the Executive Committee and I commend that group because they have a tough job but even if we

reached an agreement with the Executive Committee I will submit to you that there are many people in that neighborhood that are never going to accept anything. I've had several of them tell me so. They want it to stay vacant property and never developed and that's just not fair to Mr. Clark. It should be developed, he should be allowed to develop it and if you think about it he owns land on both sides of the road. One of those lots now belongs to Mr. Harwell, it was given to Mr. Harwell and he agreed to keep it in a natural state. We're talking about doing the same thing to the adjoining property here. I don't know what more buffering you could have and you would still have a lovely entrance it's not going to interfere with that. It is logical to have an entrance off Oxford Road. It will be a quick turn in and a quick turn back out. I think it's a reasonable request and I would ask that you consider supporting it. Thank you.

Chairman Tozer: Any more questions? Thank you Mr. Dixon. Anyone to speak in rebuttal in opposition? Please state your name for the record.

Mr. Smiley: I won't take up too much of your time. I fear much of the rebuttal you just heard is misleading so I'm going to go through a little bit of it. We did not ask for a berm that would be as high as the property. We asked for a vegetative buffer that would be as high as (unclear) like trees to the height of the building. The wish list, which he referred to is, he asked me what sort of things concern the homeowners association. What can we do to assuage their concerns and I said. We gave him this list, these are the type of things that we thought the homeowners association might regard as goodwill on the part of Bill Clark. We did not ask him for a worse case scenario. Why would we want to see a worse case scenario? We asked them to please present to us what you intend to do we're having a meeting on January 25th, February 15th, somewhere along those lines. The day of the meeting I was sent by runner, like one o'clock in the afternoon, a map with a big, with what he describes as a worse case scenario. He said do you want me to come and present this to your homeowners association and I said the Board, we're having our annual meeting tonight. No the Board has already set the agenda. We've already invited people. We can't at this point sit you into the agenda especially when we don't even know what it is you would intend to propose. We did tell him not to come but it was very much a last minute attempt on his part to present something which was clearly a horrible idea. He says that people have a right to use their property of course they have a right to use their property. Bill Clark can build a very nice house on that piece of property. They're people who wish to buy the property from him in order to build a house on that property. I've spoken with other commercial developers,

not commercial, but other people in the business of development, residential development. They looked at the property and said yes you could, there are some trees there, you could put a residence there. So, we're not asking him not to use the property. We're not asking him to leave it vacant for eternity. If you would like to build a house, I live 200 yards from this property, if you'd like to give me another neighbor I'm all about that. Lastly, he said that Bill Clark he is sure intends to build something nice. He's had 11 months to put that in writing. To give us some sort of assurance, in objective terms, that would be something nice, something that we could all agree that was nice. Something that is residential in character. Something that was set back from the road, something that had lighting which pointed away from the neighborhood. Something which made some attempt to buffer Oxford Road, regardless of whether or not the neighbors can see it, hundreds of people drive in and out of the front entrance of Brook Valley right along Oxford Road every day. The need to protect our subdivision is to buffer the effect, of the people on Oxford Road, from the effects of this building, to preserve our gateway. He's had a long time to suggest that he would do something nice. To covenant, that he would do something nice there and he's refused to do that. Bill Clark has developed other property in and around this area. In my opinion and the opinion of the Brook Valley's Homeowners Board, his tendency is for maximum utilization of the property. Aesthetic concerns seem to be secondary to all profit and loss terms. We do not accept that Bill Clark would build something nice certainly not on the word of his attorney when he's had nearly a year to put it in writing. Thank you so much for being patient.

Chairman Tozer: Any questions of Mr. Smiley? Thank you. I close the public hearing. Any discussion?

Mr. Randall: Sure. I think that obviously this is a gateway into a community. Bill Clark, his attorney I guess, had many meetings, has redesigned, if you will, his request, scaled it down several times, we know that from the postponements. I guess I'm looking at and it's a fairly small site, it's 1 acre. They're not going to put a 50,000 square foot office building there with thousands of people in and out everyday. It's just not big enough. The Office zoning is the most restrictive. The other neighborhoods that Mr. Dixon pointed out as well as staff pointed out have the office transition into the front of their subdivisions. I think overall generally it's in somewhat compliance with the zoning and Land Use for this property and I don't have a real issue with that. I think it's something that should be allowed.

Mr. Ramey: Mr. Chairman I recommend approval of this proposed amendment, to advise that it is consistent with the comprehensive plan and other applicable plans, and to adopt the staff report which addresses plan consistency and other matters.

Mr. Randall: Second.

Chairman Tozer: I have a motion by Mr. Ramey, seconded by Mr. Randall. All in favor: Moye, Ramey, Gordon, Randall, Baker, Stokes, Bell and Basnight. All opposed: Lehman. The Aye's have it.

REQUEST BY GREENVILLE CITY COUNCIL - APPROVED

(This is a verbatim transcript)

Chairman Tozer: New Business. Street Name Change request by Greenville City Council.

Mr. Andy Thomas: This is a street name request requested by the Greenville City Council. This is for the portions of US 264 between its intersection with Stantonsburg Road and its intersection with US 264 Alternate and Pactolus Highway but those areas that are located within the city limits of Greenville which are the two small areas that are circled here (pointing to map). Also, if that's done then Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive from Evans Street westward to its intersection with Memorial Drive. The Greenville City Council initiated the street name change at its August 10, 2006 meeting when it determined to proceed with the option forwarded to City Council for further consideration by the MLK Street Naming Ad Hoc Committee for naming the 264 Bypass/proposed Greenville Southwest Bypass in honor of Martin Luther King, Jr. Planning staff has prepared the administrative proceedings for the consideration of the street name changes. The Greenville City Code provides that a street name change for the express or implied purpose of honoring individuals, events or locations of local, state, national or international importance may be approved only by resolution of City Council. Prior to City Council's action, the Planning and Zoning Commission is to make recommendation after conducting a public hearing and that's why we're here tonight. Notice of the public hearing has been published in The Daily Reflector. It's been published once a week for the last two weeks. Notice was provided by certified mail to all adjoining property owners and the posting of signs. Again, I call your attention that US 264 is primarily within the County's jurisdiction and if the City of Greenville was to take action it would only be on those portions of the road that are within the

Greenville city limits. The Pitt County Board of Commissioners has the authority to name portion that are located outside the City's corporate limits. The North Carolina Department of Transportation deferred to the City of Greenville and Pitt County the authority to name this portion of US 264, which is a state maintained highway, as the Martin Luther King Jr. Highway. The North Carolina Department of Transportation has advised that prior to the street name change of US 264 as Martin Luther King Jr. Highway being effective, existing Martin Luther King Jr. Drive in Greenville would need to be renamed so that there is no conflict in street names in the City of Greenville. There are criteria listed in the City Code for street name changes and they are included in your packet. On this matter the Planning and Zoning Commission will be acting in an advisory capacity, much like a rezoning. The Greenville City Council will take final action on the request. Council's public hearing on consideration of the street renaming is scheduled for December 14, 2006.

Chairman Tozer: Any questions for Andy?

Mr. Ramey: Did the County Commissioner's agree to name this other portion down here? Did I read that in the newspaper?

Mr. Thomas: It was, this request was forwarded to the County Commissioners for their consideration and they voted on it also. The City is beginning the administrative procedures to start the change by acting on the request first.

Mr. Ramey: Alright.

Mr. Dave Holec: Let me just me just clarify what the County Commissioners have done already. This does require that the Board of Transportation defer to the City and County the authority to name the street. The County Commissioners voted to join with the City in requesting the Board of Transportation, Department of Transportation, to defer the street name authority to the City and the County. They acted upon that and that was forwarded to the Department of Transportation and they did defer the authority back to the City and the County. So we're, to this process and this is were now the City will be considering whether or not to name after City Council makes a determination, if their determination is favorable, then it will also require the County Commissioners to take action also. They'll have a public hearing and make a determination on the rest of it. Up to now the action by

the County has been to ask for the deferral of the authority and that was received and we're in this process now.

Chairman Tozer: Any more questions for Andy?

Mr. Moye: I had a question for Andy. Give me an estimate if you can for the length of what is now US 264 that would possibly be renamed Martin Luther King Jr. Highway. What is the length of that road and what is the length of the current section of West Fifth Street that is currently Martin Luther King Jr. Street? Just compare the length of those two if you can.

Mr. Thomas: I've been told that the portion that's currently Martin Luther King Jr. Drive is approximately a mile. An estimate is about eight miles.

Mr. Moye: Thank you.

Chairman Tozer: Any more questions for Andy? Thank you Andy. I want to go ahead and open the public hearing. Anyone to speak in favor please step forward. Anyone to speak in opposition? Please state your name for the record and you have five minutes.

Mr. Keith Cooper: Good evening. My name is Keith Cooper with the Fifth Street/ MLK Completion Committee. I stand before you tonight as co-chair of this committee. On August 10, 2006, the Greenville City Council voted along racial lines to support a resolution asking the DOT permission to rename not an eight mile stretch that you just heard but a five mile stretch, to my understanding, of the US 264 Bypass after Reverend Martin Luther King. This same resolution was rubberstamped by a very close 5-4 voted from County Commissioners. We often hear that Pitt County is a racist county. Some of us are familiar with the fact that there once were thousands of slaves in Pitt County. Additionally, Jim Crow segregation has left permanent scars on the city's landscape and relegated black folks to second-class citizenship status. Many brothers and sisters around the globe has laughed at the hypocrisy around this nation calling itself a Christian nation while holding the Bible in one hand the psychological whip of oppression, subjugation and white supremacy in the other. Do we really wish to move beyond the gloom and doom days of the Civil War where brothers foolishly fought and killed each other and this city's segregationist past? One way to do this is not to relegate King's name to the bypass when there is solid support for a logical

extension of Fifth Street within the corporate limits. In The Atlanta Journal Constitution's November 19 editorial, "King: American hero," Cynthia Tucker states, "In the decades since King's death, America has managed to segregate him and commemorations of his achievements. Even as the face of the nation's economic and political leadership changed, even as men and women such as Colin Powell, Condoleezza Rice and Oprah Winfrey showed the power of the transformation King helped to bring about, many white Americans have refused to see King as anything other than a "black leader." This statement reflects a deep rooted ignorance about King's vision of one America where people would be judged by the "content of their character" rather than the color of their skin. Public streets are public properties. Moreover, neither Ann Maxwell nor any other person in this city has a monopoly of a street. Some say that this street matter is no big deal and there's too much fuss over nothing. If this is true, why not extend the existing street and bridge the racial divide where that section from Memorial to Evans Street consists mostly of economically distressed residents, drowning in an ocean of neglect, unemployment, prostitution, drug activities, boarded-up structures and many other social plagues. Contrariwise, East Fifth Street has numerous middle class to affluent residents who enjoy well manicured lawns and elegant homes. This is not right and God will punish those who run roughshod over principles of humility, generosity and good will. A few East Fifth Street property owners said they do not want to incur the expense of changing their addresses and stationery to reflect a street name change. This is another example of hypocrisy. If rich folks on the east side don't wish to change their addresses, why should they want those dirt-poor residents on the present MLK Drive to change their addresses? Appeal to men and women of the cloth to take a moral stand on this issue, speak truth to power, and not wait on God to resolve this controversial issue since John F. Kennedy was right when, in 1961, he eloquently stated that "God's work is our work." By the way, tomorrow will make the 43rd anniversary of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, a man who accepted Reverend Martin Luther King's advice to get off of the fence of complacency and indifference and promote human and civil rights lest the country fall apart. So I would urge you to reject the resolution to bypass the dream and controversy and put this matter back in the City's hands. Finally, our committee the Fifth Street/MLK Completion Committee will be planning a boycott of all Pepsi-Cola products within Pitt County in protest of Commissioner John Minges' September 18th vote to ignore the concerns of the masses, including a consensus from the NAACP's Executive Council, which wanted to extend Fifth Street in King's honor. Minges' family has been part of the

local leadership of the Pepsi-Cola business. We also plan to picket Doc's Guns and Pawn on Memorial Drive,

Chairman Tozer: Mr. Cooper, excuse me, could you please come to a conclusion.

Mr. Cooper: Sure, since its owner, Commissioner Bowen, did not support our efforts. At the city level, we encourage people not to do business with Mayor Don Parrott's accounting firm because of the Mayor's arrogance shown on August 10th and Councilman Ray Craft's Sign's Now business on Greenville Boulevard. This campaign will be in place until further notice until the matter is resolved. Thank you very much.

Chairman Tozer: Any questions for Mr. Cooper?

Mr. Cooper: Sorry, questions?

Chairman Tozer: Thank you Mr. Cooper. Anyone else to speak in opposition.

Mr. Joshua Fischer: My name is Joshua Fischer. I'm co-chair of the Fifth Street/MLK Completion Committee. Good Evening.

Chairman Tozer: Excuse me. Three minutes please. Thank you.

Mr. Fischer: From my presence of mind and my spirit of my convictions I cannot sit still and idly allow a solvable injustice to fester on and threaten a core of racial relations in this diverse City of Greenville. I admit I'm from the west where change happens quickly. Here in the south simple changes often take decades to achieve. By joining the honorable names of Dr. Martin Luther King and Fifth Street on one street sign this lengthy and frustrating conflict could have easily avoided. I would like to present some documents by the way. Tonight we will cast votes on whether Martin Luther Kings name will be removed from the vary street where we're currently standing upon. A historical road that reaches into the diverse neighborhoods of this city. Near the hospital and city offices West Fifth Street is in fine condition. Near the university and Tar River neighborhood East Fifth Street is in tree lined and elegant. One of the most beautiful places in the city. The same can not be said for Martin Luther King Jr. Drive. The state does not do its job of maintaining the road properly. In fact, the governmental agencies in Greenville feel so uncomfortable with Dr. Kings' name remaining on a downtown thoroughfare

that they have opted to quarter him off on the outskirts of the city on an unfinished bypass that few Greenville residents use for travel.

Mr. Ramey: Just a minute please.

Chairman Tozer and Mr. Ramey: Would you back up from your microphone a little bit.

Chairman Tozer: You're getting a little bit of kickback on the mike.

Mr. Fischer: I'm a little bit emotional on this issue.

Chairman Tozer: It's okay just step back a little bit from the microphone we can hear you.

Mr. Fischer: Let me quote from Cynthia Tucker's editorial published in The Daily Reflector three days ago. I've provided you all with a copy. Quote "Maybe just maybe the entire nation is finally ready to embrace a truth that has been clear for quite some time: The Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. was not a black hero; he was an American hero. The movement that he led gave America the moral authority to present itself to the world as the standard bearer for justice and human rights." This woman speaks the truth. She continues, "In the decades since King's death, America has managed to segregate him now seems an excellent time for the entire nation to claim King's legacy." Will Greenville ever be wake up and honor this man appropriately? Will we join in the celebration of the new Martin Luther King Memorial in Washington, DC set for completion in 2008? Or will we sit here in the past and continue to rob a cultural of public recognition and public space. I predict that if we don't there will be massive protest, pickets and boycotts that could possibly earn Greenville terrible publicity. Let's avoid that risk. Do the right thing keep Dr. King and his dream alive and well in the heart of downtown. Quoting Minister George Barfield III from Kinston then I'll conclude. He offers a great quote from his essay "What Dr. King Did for White Americans". I believe Dr. Cooper provided you all with a copy of that.

Chairman Tozer: Mr. Fischer could you please come to a conclusion.

Mr. Fischer: My last point. What Dr. King did for White Americans. He says "Martin Luther King's unquestionable patriotism led him to state publicly that he

loves America too much to see her ruled by those who chose hate over love and violence over peace.” I hope you understand these words. I hope you make a correct decision tonight based on your conscious rather than in the interest of commercial people.

Chairman Tozer: Any questions of Mr. Fischer?

Mr. Fischer: I’ll be glad to answer any questions.

Chairman Tozer: Thank you Mr. Fischer. Anyone else to speak in opposition? Please state your name for the record and you have three minutes.

Mr. Ozie Hall: My name is Ozie Hall. I’m with several organizations, the West Greenville Focus Group, the West Greenville Regional Resource, Local Organizing Committee and also the Martin Luther King Memorial Committee. I have a copy of what I’m going to say. Several months ago the Greenville city officials and the Greenville Redevelopment Commission came before the Planning and Zoning Commission seeking approval of a West Greenville Revitalization Plan engineered by the Mayor, several non-African American City Council members and some consultants that would have displaced about 3,500 black residents from West Greenville. Destroyed black majority political districts, destroyed virtually all black owned businesses in West Greenville and eliminated over 100 jobs in the black community. An outright attack on the black community. The black community and the West Greenville Focus Group came before you and you decided to send the proposal back without approval. The result was a series of meetings between city officials and the West Greenville Focus Group that eliminated the disparities an open attack on the black community contained in the plan. Further negotiations led to the adoption of a final plat that was acceptable to the City and the black community. Progress was made because you sent it back. Once again the black community is under official attack. The five non-African American members of the Greenville City Council are asking you to approve renaming Martin Luther King Jr. Drive to its former name of West Fifth Street and renaming a portion of 264 Bypass in honor of Dr. King. The black community sought to extend Dr. King’s name to the entire Fifth Street. Instead of honoring the black community’s request the five non-African American members of the Greenville City Council voted to seek to take away Dr. King’s name from West Greenville after it has been there for over six years and after there had been more than a decade of struggle to get Dr. King’s name anywhere in the city. The changes proposed by the Greenville City Council

are not positive changes. They offend the black community in pretending to honor Dr. King. A significant percentage of the population of this city vehemently opposed Dr. King when Dr. King was alive and working to advance a Civil Rights agenda. Now they don't want his name attached to a street within the city. We believe that that population has diminished significantly and that there is a substantial support for naming all of Fifth Street for Dr. King. The City Council never allowed the process to go forward so that could be known. What message does this all send to the black community? It tells us that we are not respected. That these Council members have no regard for our rights, the conduct of the Council indicated no respect for the African American members of the City Council and it also tells us racism is alive and well in the City of Greenville. Renaming the 264 Bypass is one again renaming only a partial street to honor Dr. King and leaves us in the same condition that prompted protest in the first place. By sending Dr. King's name to the Bypass we bypass the opportunity to realize Dr. King's dream within the City of Greenville. Greenville City Council's action guarantee's that this issue will continue to divide this community. We urge the Planning and Zoning Commission to reject the City's proposed street name change for now and let the debate of this matter continue without adding your approval to the reprehensible conduct and manner in which the City Council has acted regarding this volatile issue. We ask you to leave it as it is. I just want to conclude by saying that the Ad Hoc Committee, if you go back and look at the report, contrary to what was stated by a city official, the fact is that the Ad Hoc Committee recommended that all of 264 including the southwest. The recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee, the proposal by the city is not exactly consistent with that proposal. If you look at the sections that exist that are identified...

Chairman Tozer: Excuse me Mr. Hall would you please come to conclusion. I gave you some additional time based on your. Please come to conclusion.

Mr. Hall: It's quite a small area we're talking about on the bypass. Only the people who pass the city are going to see that. So we thank you.

Chairman Tozer: Any questions for Mr. Hall?

Mr. Moyer: Mr. Hall. I have one question. The 264 Bypass, for what it is, as far as its current content and length seems to be, the proposal seems to be rename all that bypass for Dr. King.

Mr. Hall: The only problem with that is it's still a partial street. It's a portion of the whole bypass. The whole bypass often is going to be a circle.

Mr. Moye: Right.

Mr. Hall: So it's only going to be half a circle, number one. Number two, the city only right now has two small sections that they can change. So now we would have to then depend upon the County Commissioner's approving all the rest of it. We also have the experience in the prior naming issue, Fifth Street was originally named one of the biggest concerns was about even naming a portion of West Fifth Street near the hospital was, I guess it's Falkland or Fountain. Falkland Homeowners Association extends that whole road they opposed it vehemently. What are they going to do? They're going to oppose. You're going to get substantial opposition when you go through all those farm areas and lands that are owned by whites. We've already heard the rumbles of opposition so the question is will this thing even pass the County. What may happen is you guys may approve this, or the city approve changing the name and what we end up is two small sections of the bypass with Dr. King's name on it. The majority of the traffic is people going to Washington or passing by Greenville in either direction. In terms of to the honor Dr. King, to removing the name from the city, it's putting it outside the city.

Chairman Tozer: Mr. Holec.

Mr. Holec: Just for clarification on that. What is going to have to happen is both the County and the City are going to have to act. This action by the City Council if it determines to make the change is also going to be contingent upon the County Commissioner's coming back and approving their portions too. You can not have just the two small sections named. When City Council does its going to have a clause in the resolution, again, based upon if they approve it, which will say that it is contingent upon County Commissioner's making the action. Again, the deferral from the Department of Transportation was to both the City and County to name the street. It requires both of their actions to do that because we both only have authority on portions of it. As far as the proposed southwest bypass part, again, that's going to be, we're going to have to approach the Department of Transportation to make that name. They will not considering naming, giving authority to name a proposed street that is not constructed or to name a street that is not constructed. What's going to have to happen when that southwest bypass is

constructed then there's going to have to be an additional request at that time in order to name that too. What Council did when it took this action to go forward it took the action as much as it could at this time because it's not constructed. Usually what the Department of Transportation tell us they would consider a name change maybe three months before its opening, something in that type of time frame.

Chairman Tozer: Thank you. Any more questions for Mr. Hall?

Mr. Randall: I have a question. Mr. Hall you mentioned in there that you wanted us to reject this proposal, leave things as it is. Are you talking about the street or the street naming process?

Mr. Hall: Right. In other words to leave the existing Martin Luther King as it is now and do not approve the 264 bypass. Just leave the whole thing as it is right now. Mr. Holec mentioned in the fact the language in terms of it being both. It's not clear in any of the prior documents so I don't think we can count on the fact that we won't end up with it being done in pieces and have one get approved and one not get approved. I think that's a legitimate issue, we have a big concern about. Also, I think one of the other major concerns that we should have is the fact that if we look at this thing and say "okay we're going to make it a whole street by later maybe we'll go and deal with, what is it the southeast, southwest bypass". The fact of the matter is that right now we're only still talking about a partial street. That was the problem in Greenville. The fact that we only had a partial street. That's why any concern was raised that resulted in this, even coming to this point. Doing this defeats the original purpose.

Mr. Randall: When you're saying you want to leave it has it is, the street. That is also to continue the debate to get the whole street named.

Mr. Hall: I think if you leave it the way it is it leaves open the opportunity for the debate to continue, discussion to continue. We, our experience has been that there are quite a number of East Fifth Street area residents who supported the name change. Many were silent because you had people waiving Confederate flags. You had people who felt intimidated, people who felt threatened, who felt they could speak out because of fear of violence, retaliation, damage to their property by residents, by people who live in the East Fifth Street area. I think the way that City Council handled this matter, if they had allowed further public discussion and not had an abrupt vote but allowed the public hearing process to continue and to allow

there to be full discussion then many of those people would have had an opportunity and forum to assert themselves and speak and to share what they wanted to do. Not only that the city never sent out letters to all the residents on East Fifth Street to even ask their position on what they wanted. There was never any way to really assess how all the residents on East Fifth Street viewed the name change. We had a few vocal people from the East Fifth Street area, most won't even on East Fifth Street, who were vocal, who had been opposed to it many years ago and who were still opposed to it. Some of them were the children of someone who had a store who said he didn't like the name on the street because he would have had to change the mail and change all of these things. Then when he did once they named it, in the section that they did, he put his door on Washington Street. Went to the trouble to move his door so that he wouldn't have to be on Martin Luther King Jr. Drive. It wasn't a matter of the money, it wasn't a matter of the stationery, it wasn't a matter of any of those, it was that he did not want Dr. King's name on the street where his business was located. Just period. Whatever we want to read into that I think many people will read into that that was just straight out racism. The reality of the situation is that there were a lot of people who opposed Dr. King even having his name for a national holiday in that area. It's well documented. There are many people over there who supported having Dr. King's name. The reality is that the forum never was permitted to allow the debate to go out to a lot of those people to really be heard and to allow participation. By abruptly ending the process, the way City Council did, with a surprise vote, without the African-American members of City Council even knowing that the vote was going to occur that night, it put the community in a situation where the African-American community was unprepared in terms of its presentation. The Ad Hoc Committee was never prepared to give its presentation even identify what the report said. The City Council took some bits and pieces and misrepresented and misinterpreted the report and did what they wanted to and what we believe was an illegal vote. We believe that the way that it happened they had to have gotten together and agreed amongst each other, five members of the City Council in a meeting that was unofficial and made this decision. I know that is a serious accusation but that's what we believe happened and we believe the Department of Justice will be investigating and looking at this and making some determination as to whether or not there was in fact an illegal meeting. We would just hope that you guys would just take a look at how it impacts on the community overall and just not participate in it by basically tabling it or deciding not to approve it at this time.

Chairman Tozer: Any more questions for Mr. Hall? Thank you Mr. Hall. Anyone else to speak in opposition? Please state your name for the record and you have three minutes.

Ms. Noria Namaz: Hi, my name is Noriz Namaz. I do not represent any organization. I only represent myself and my ancestry. My grandparents came to Greenville at the turn of the 20th century. They share cropped at what was then known as Brown's Farm and is now known as Cypress Glenn, the community of Cypress Glenn. They raised their children there for awhile and their children walked the East Fifth Street corridor into Greenville to attend church and attend school at Fleming Street. Historically and personally I favor the Fifth Street and East Fifth Street names because I've had experiences where names have changed. But also historically I think that having a compound name where you can honor, keep the historic significance of the whole entire Fifth Street corridor and also give it a name that honors Dr. Martin Luther King would be appealing and a win, win situation for you and for the City Council and for the Commissioners to consider. Larger cities such as New York has done this in areas like the Sixth Street, Seventh Avenue, Avenues of the Americas, you know these streets. You know where they are, you know what they commemorate. You could do something like that with the entire Fifth Street corridor that would have a significance to the African-Americans who live in West Greenville and also to the people who live on the east side of Fifth Street. I think also ECU could benefit from this as people will look at this as being a very progressive move for the city and for the university. So that future parents who may be considering sending their children to East Carolina University knowing its history as it started out in the Jim Crow era but now has progressed and become more open minded and more affiliated with diverse groups. This could be reflected also with a compound name. However you decide to do that keeping East and West Fifth Street as East and West Fifth Street but also giving it the name like Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard or Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive along the whole entire corridor from the hospital side all the way down through to the Tenth Street intersection. I think that would be a compromise that everyone could live with. Businesses would not have to change their addresses, residences, people who live there now would not have to change their addresses. It would be no conflict of interest. The post office would know who is being addressed, whether they are being addressed at Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive or East or West Fifth Street. That's all I have to say.

Chairman Tozer: Any questions? Thank you very much. No questions? Anyone else to speak in opposition?

Ms. Rose Glover: Good evening, my name is Rose Glover and I'm a Greenville City Council member representing District No. 2. I wasn't going to speak but I just wanted to clarify what the staff had said about the Ad Hoc Committee recommending this particular area. I was Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee that was formed and with community people, with people from East Fifth Street and all. We had several meeting with just the Ad Hoc Committee. We had three meetings with the communities, the East Fifth Street communities and the West Greenville communities. The meetings were well attended and we tried to make the process as easy as possible. We also worked on trying to come up with a solution that would not cause so much controversy. As Mr. Hall said all of this was requested but this was only the number three on the recommendation from the Ad Hoc Committee. I did not take a position. I stayed neutral. I did not take a position until after the Ad Hoc Committee was resolved. Contrary to what you may have heard. The Committee was basically to try to spare the process into a good process that everybody could talk, everybody was able. The university hired and paid for facilitators, professional facilitators and they did a very good job of that. Everybody got to say whatever they wanted to say and think "I" instead of "you". It was a good process. The number one, there were three, we really didn't recommend. These were actual recommendations from the community that got the most votes every time they were talked about or put in there most. All of West Fifth Street, all of Tenth Street and all of the bypass that's including the loop. Of course we had met with the Department of Transportation, they won't even consider doing something that's not even the making yet. As we know that 264 and southwest bypass is not even been decided where it's even going to go yet. The State does not even consider a request to name something before they even start work on it. I just wanted to come and kind of clarify those things because the gentleman did say that the Ad Hoc Committee had recommended this portion. I wanted you to know that there were other streets named as well. One being all of Fifth Street, two being all of Tenth Street and three being all of 264. I just wanted you to understand that. Thank you.

Chairman Tozer: Any questions?

Mr. Randall: I have a question. Obviously you're a City Council member and as a Board we can make recommendations to you guys. This was a request from the City Council.

Ms. Glover: It was a request not from what Mr. Hall said. The two African-American people on the Council had no idea what was going to happen that night. The City Attorney said that, well actually, we knew there had to be a meeting because the City Attorney came prepared with motions and suggestions.

Mr. Randall: Right.

Ms. Glover: And everything was already done. Councilmember Ms. Dunn came with a written comment and that night that the decision was made we were only to get the report from myself and Mr. Bowers who was also on the Ad Hoc, the Martin Luther King Ad Hoc Committee which is not the same committee that Mr. Cooper is in. It was a committee formed. Does that answer your question?

Mr. Randall: I understand what you're saying. I wasn't headed in that direction.

Ms. Glover: I wanted you to know that.

Mr. Randall: I understand that.

Ms. Glover: All Ms. Council and myself voted in opposition of it.

Mr. Randall: Okay, let me rephrase. This was a request by the majority of the Council and it comes to us when, as a volunteer board, we make recommendations. How does that come into plan in your decision making? Do you think that a recommendation by this board is going to have a big affect on the City Council, the County Commissioners that this has theoretically been through the process and how it is theoretically been made official administratively?

Ms. Glover: My concern is it doesn't matter what affect it has on the City Council or the County Commissioners. My concern is the affect that it will have on the people in Greenville and how this will not bring us together being us together but continues to bring us apart. In the first place we have a big gap here that has already been studied by the university, by a professor there about Greenville is divided, black and white. That's it black and white. This proposal is going to cause

more controversy because the whole idea of it was to try to get to a point where there would be less controversy. Tenth Street is basically businesses. In Kinston Pepsi-Cola Bottling Plant is on Martin Luther King they didn't oppose it in Kinston. It's on, in New Bern, I'm sorry. Dr. Alterman who worked with us basically he's a Professor from East Carolina University in the Department of Geography who has done extensive studies, written several books, co-authored several books about street naming, Martin Luther King street naming. He was more or less helping guide the process along.

Chairman Tozer: Mr. Holec.

Mr. Holec: If I could put that a little bit with what Ms. Glover also said. Yes, there were three, this Ad Hoc Committee did make a recommendation on three options and they are the ones that she has stated. Then a majority of the City Council decided to pursue one of the options that's the option that's before you so they did have the three but the majority of the Council decided to proceed with this option. That's where they have to go through the process. One is to get the State approval to defer so that the City and County have the ability to name it and then the second is to go through the street naming process. In answer to your question Mr. Randall this is something that City Council will consider is your recommendation in addition what happens after this meeting City Council has another public hearing and will consider the input that is provided at that public hearing. Council has some additional steps to do and they get to at that time to consider your recommendation, they get to consider the factors that are listed in the ordinance as to what they consider when they consider a street name change. They are to consider other information provided by the citizens and just other information they have the ability to consider that also. The process is going to continue so there is a role that you all play. Just as a reminder that your issue is to make a recommendation on the proposed street name change and Mr. Thomas gave you there are some perimeters in the ordinance that you are to be looking at when you make that recommendation.

Mr. Ramey: Mr. Holec. If I understood you correctly if the City passes this and the County doesn't then it all falls through?

Mr. Holec: It has to be both and that's what the State said that it has to be both. That is what the action, resolution for City Council when it is considered, will have that clause in there.

Mr. Ramey: Thank you. That's what I understood.

Chairman Tozer: Thank you Mr. Holec. Any more questions?

Ms. Glover: Mr. Tozer?

Chairman Tozer: Yes.

Ms. Glover: It will be the majority of this board. Whatever you decide to do, it doesn't matter. The makeup of this board is not representative of the city. It does not represent, I mean, the makeup, even a makeup of this board, even a makeup of the Council, so whatever you all decide that's fine. We have to do a report as to how diverse our boards are. I appreciate you all for serving but just even a makeup of the board tells us that we would never have any fairness anyway. Thank you.

Chairman Tozer: Anyone else to speak in opposition?

Ms. Mildred Council: Good evening. I'm Mildred Council, Mayor Pro-Tem of the City of Greenville but tonight I'm not standing in that role I'm standing as a citizen. You know that we have various roles that we play so I have many roles, mother, wife, community leader, you name it I have many roles that I play in the City but tonight I'm here representing a resident of Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive. I live on Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive, at 410, as a matter of fact. I was here when we worked so hard to get it to where it is today and I do oppose the change. I also oppose having the bypass is okay but I don't understand and I know that government can do whatever they so choose in terms of changing ordinances and all of those kind of things. I feel that the bypass that's out in the county and the state controls that and the city controls the city street so I feel we can do both and leave it like it is. That's my opinion. My husband is not here tonight he's tied up on another, other business tonight. He could not be here but he will be at the City Council meeting to express his opinion. I'm here as a citizen tonight. I think that it, as I travel around the country I've seen it in the city and also in the county of that city so I know what can be done if the governing body so choose even the state. There's nothing in stone. It's just depends on how it's worked. It can be both so I do I not what to see a change to Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive. I'd like echo what Ms. Noria Namaz said in terms of it could be, if you wanted to use West Fifth Street and East Fifth Street and you could still have Martin Luther King, Jr. on that street. I do feel that I can be done both ways and then everybody will, that's already

has accepted change because we worked very hard many, many years ago to make that change and I was a part of that. I felt real proud and still proud today to be living on Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive. I have traveled all over these United States of America and have seen in many cities, on many highways and all across the State of North Carolina. Just about every progressive city in this state has a Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive. This is ridiculous to be in 2006 going into 2007 going backwards because Dr. Martin Luther King was a peaceful man. He was fighting for all of us to be free, totally free, and tonight I think it's up to you all to make the decision that you want to make. I'm telling you how I feel tonight. Again, I'm representing a citizen because I pay taxes in this town, many taxes, of course, so I'm just saying that I feel like and I'm speaking tonight on all the properties that we own on Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive. Not just where I live but the other properties I live on too so I'm representing four areas tonight of properties on Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive. I'm speak for all four of those pieces. Thank you.

Chairman Tozer: Any questions for Ms. Council? Thank you. Anyone else to speak in opposition? I close the public hearing. Any discussion?

Mr. Lehman: I think that Ms. Namaz was a very positive individual and had a very, very good story to tell and had a good reason for naming her part of the street what she wanted it to be. I think some of the arguments that we've had have been threatening, have been argumentative and have been (unclear) and that is not productive in this process.

Mr. Baker: I've been thinking about this and been reading about it and I was trying to keep an open mind about it. I was a little bit offended by Ms. Glover. Automatically looking at me course she can't read my mind and how I think about it to say I'm going to be racists and go the opposite of what she wants. This is a very sensitive area. I'm really sort of up in the air because if they want us to. The citizens were up to speak and if they were looking to do the bypass all together or just through Fifth Street all the way from Martin Luther King, Jr. to Fifth, all of it. I still a little bit confused. Basically what the gentleman and the lady was speaking of. I'm going to recommend that we postpone it and let some more discussion back to City Council.

Mr. Randall: Mr. Baker one thing that I was a little bit up in the air or confused too over some of the comments. Leave it the way it is in order to create some more debate about it. Also some of the comments about let's name the whole street and

other comments let's make sure Fifth Street gets named all the way. Obviously the possibility of Historic Fifth Street and Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive. You're right there are several things going on as far as what we have, kind of a yes and no thing here. I keep reading this thing and I wrote yes, no, and marked them out, going back and forth trying to make sure I understand what's going on as well.

Mr. Ramey: Mr. Chairman I don't like to be threatened. I was threatened in 43, 44 and 45 and I don't like to be threatened with boycotts or anything else. Anything that we do is a recommendation to the City Council. If the Council and I just clarified this, and if the Council passed it and the County Commissioner's don't pass it then it's all in limbo. If we vote to rename West Fifth Street back to West Fifth Street it can't be done until all of this comes to a conclusion. Every bit of it has to come to a conclusion. We just can't come and say "alright we're going to approve what the Council has said about the bypass, two small areas on the bypass". The County says "no, we're not going to do that" and then it all falls through and everything is right back where it is right now. As I see it.

Mr. Randall: Keep in mind that there again, this is a request from the majority of the City Council and the majority of the County Commissioner's. Like you say, this is almost come to the point where it's an administrative process now. Regardless of our recommendation it's likely I guess that it will go the way it's gone before.

Mr. Ramey: In all likelihood that's the way it will go. There's nothing we can do about it. We can only make a recommendation. If the Council doesn't want to listen to our recommendation they don't listen. County Commissioner's certainly don't listen.

Mr. Bell: Mr. Chairman I was actually part of the larger body that created the Ad Hoc Committee and brought the recommendation back. They did have a list of streets that wanted to consider and actually 264 Bypass, again, was one of those streets. I didn't look at the particular order as a reference. Again, the larger body chose to what street they wanted to stand behind and of course when that was lost I think the Ad Hoc Committee and City Council decided to come up with 264 Bypass. Which again has been approved somewhat by the Pitt County Commissioners. We're back to a point now where the Department of Transportation, City Council and the Pitt County Commissioner's are now trying to move forward with 264. I think that's where we are, to where we have to make a recommendation to approve or deny.

Mr. Moye: Mr. Chairman I would like to make a comment. In my opinion I think long range and in the future 264 Bypass will do more honor to Dr. King's name because it is a larger street, longer street, longer road. The traffic count on has got to be significantly higher than any street that goes through Greenville. It's being seen not only by people who maybe come from Raleigh to Washington or some place like that. It's seen by people who work out at numerous industries in that general area every single day when they go to work and when they come back from work. To me I just think that's a more visionary concept and makes more sense and I would certainly think that if it does pass that bypass is named, where we see it dead-ended right now, certainly it should be continued all the way around Greenville. That gives it, even if it's five miles or eight miles, I don't know, it's kind of academic as to what it is. It would probably become 10 or 16 miles in length and seen by people from all over the state as they travel through Greenville, around Greenville.

Chairman Tozer: Any more discussion? Personally I don't see any wisdom to postponement. I don't see what there is to postpone. It's going through the process. City Council has presented to us, a majority vote and their proposal to us to review. We've allowed public input. There will be more public input at the City Council level at a later time. Ultimately, they make the definitive decision, ours is a recommendation. I would propose that we go, of course, I can't make a motion. I would propose.

Mr. Randall: What type of motion do we need on this?

Chairman Tozer: You would have to use that standardized.

Mr. Holec: Either to recommend approval or recommend denial of the street name change. It's both in the same motion because they're both dependent upon each other.

Chairman Tozer: Do we have to use our standard.

Mr. Holec: No because this is not a land use related.

Mr. Moye: I move to recommend approval of both name changes.

Mr. Lehman: I second.

Chairman Tozer: We have a motion on the floor by Mr. Moye on both issues of the street name change and a second by Mr. Lehman. All in favor? All opposed The Aye's have it (The motion was approved by a vote of 9 to 0).

REQUEST BY NESANN PAGE WORTHINGTON – APPROVED

Chairman Tozer stated that the next item is a request by Nesa Ann Page Worthington to rezone 18.39 acres located along the eastern right-of-way of Williams Road, south of the Tyson Farms Subdivision, west of the Edgewood Mobile Home Park, and along the northern right-of-way of Greenville Boulevard from RA20 (Residential-Agricultural) to CG (General Commercial).

Ms. Gooby stated this is a request to rezone 18 acres from RA20 to General Commercial. The property is located within Voting District #2. Ms. Gooby made reference to the map included in the packet. Tyson Farms Subdivision is located to the north and Red Oak Subdivision to the south. The property is currently vacant with a variety of uses surrounding the property. The property is not impacted by the floodplain. The property is located along Greenville Boulevard which is part of the Greenway system. There is a recognized intermediate focus area near the subject property and commercial zoning would be encouraged. The proposed rezoning could generate a net increase of 6,450 trips. The Land Use Plan recommends commercial and does have a small area of conservation/open space area. Hardees Run forms the northern boundary of the subject property and there would be a 50 foot riparian buffer from the top of the bank. This area would also serve as a buffer between the commercial area and the residential area to the north. Ms. Gooby stated that the request is in compliance with the Land Use Plan.

Mr. Bell stated that he travels all the streets in town and traffic is very congested. Mr. Bell asked if he understood that the traffic would increase with the proposed rezoning.

Ms. Gooby explained that the increase of 6,450 trips would be at full build-out for this zoning district for all 18 acres. Ms. Gooby explained that the trips would be disbursed onto Williams Road and Greenville Boulevard.

Mr. Bell asked if 264 Alternate is currently designed to handle 33,500 vehicles per day.

Mr. David Brown, City Engineer, stated that was correct.

Mr. Richard Allen, representing the applicant, spoke on behalf of the request. Mr. Allen stated that the rezoning request would bring the property into compliance with the Comprehensive Plan. The request would be compatible with the surrounding uses.

No one spoke in opposition.

Motion was made by Mr. Gordon, seconded by Mr. Ramey, to recommend approval of the proposed amendment, to advise that it is consistent with the comprehensive plan and other applicable plans, and to adopt the staff report which addresses plan consistency and other matters.

REQUEST BY CHRISTOPHER A. BURNS – DENIED

(This is a verbatim transcript)

Chairman Tozer: Next request by Christopher A. Burns to rezone 73.3503 acres located along the southern right-of-way of Old Pactolus Road, along the western right-of-way of Highway 264, 1,740± feet north of the Tar River, and 590± feet east of the Riddick Subdivision from CH (Heavy Commercial) to OR (Office-Residential [High Density Multi-Family]).

Ms. Gooby: This is a request to rezone 73 acres from Heavy Commercial to Office-High Density Multi-family. The property is located in Voting District #1. This is a copy of the map in your packet. This is an aerial photo of the property. The subject area is within the bold lines. The Tar River is just to the south and the northeast is North Campus Crossing Apartments and Floral Park Subdivision to the northwest. The property is currently vacant and recently used as a sand mine. There are various commercial and retail uses just to the east of the property. The property is impacted by the 100, 500 year floodplain and also the floodway associated with the Tar River. Construction within the floodway is prohibited and within 100 year floodplain there would be building elevation standards that would apply. The property is not impacted by the Greenway system. The property is part of a recognized regional focus area where commercial activity would be encouraged.

The proposed rezoning would generate a decrease in traffic of 13,750 trips. This map illustrates where those trips would be reduced on the streets. The nearest multi-family development is North Campus Crossing and then there are some multi-family to the south across the Tar River. The Land Use Plan does recommend commercial at the intersection of Greenville Boulevard and Highway 264. The city would encourage commercial in this area due to there being a focus area there as well as the environmental constraints. The property is currently zoned Heavy Commercial and was recently rezoned back in 2004 which is in compliance with the Land Use Plan. The Land Use Plan does recommend commercial therefore the request is not in compliance with the Land Use Plan. Also, to take into consideration is the need and there are currently two student housing projects that have been submitted to the Planning and Zoning Commission that will come before you next month. Those two projects contain 750 units and nearly 3,000 beds. Those are for properties that are already zoned for multi-family. Those projects are expected to come online in the next year. I'll be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Chairman Tozer: Any questions for Chantae? Thank you Chantae. I'll open the public hearing. Anyone to speak in favor? Please state your name for the record and you have five minutes.

Mr. Jim Hopf: Thank you Mr. Chairman and Commission Members, my name is Jim Hoff. I'm an Attorney here in Greenville and I'm here on behalf of Chris Burns and Association to speak in favor of this rezoning request. I will attempt to be brief. I know you've had a long night and a ways to go yet. If I could just address first Compatibility with surrounding zoning patterns and compatibility with existing and future adjacent land uses. I would hand up at the end a letter that we have from Parkers Chapel Free Will Baptist Church which is located on the corner opposite Old Pactolus Road, Old Pactolus Highway, from this property. On the zoning map you'll see it designated as OR currently. Basically the letter is from Pastor Lorenza Stox and he asks that on behalf of himself and the 500 members of the church that the Commission approve this request for rezoning. I won't read the letter but I will give you a copy, basically their position is that OR use of the adjacent property in question would be more compatible and homogenous with the current utilization of the church property. As I mentioned, a portion of the church property is currently OR and that the church intends to come before the Commission and the Council seeking to have a portion or the balance of their property also zoned OR for future purposes. And that in their opinion the uses,

architecture and buildings that are contemplated in OR use would be more aesthetically pleasing and pleasing with the existing use of the property out there. Additionally, as has been mentioned, this subject property is in an area of a connector corridor and a regional focus area. It is our belief that rezoning this property from Heavy Commercial to OR will further the effort that we have to make our corridors, our gateway corridors, more aesthetically pleasing. More ideal as folks come into town and also recognizing the regional focus area that this use would be consistent with that sort of, the area, the importance this area has for our city. Also, I would suggest to you that as the zoning map indicates there is already quite a bit of heavy commercial in that area. It is our belief that as you come into Greenville that rezoning this property to OR would provide a nice transition as you come from the industrial and heavy commercial as you come toward Greenville and come in toward the river. Then as you enter the Tenth Street area where there are existing commercial and multi-family uses this would provide a nice transition zone coming from that part, the other side of the river, as you come into town. There was also mentioned the impact on traffic and I just want to reiterate that this would have a positive effect. This rezoning would actually decrease by significant amount the vehicle count per day in this area as a result of the use of this property which we also feel is a positive factor. I would suggest to you that we have seen and are seeing in a positive way the dynamics of that area of our city change. Particularly in light of recent development over there and that this would further that sort of positive change for that side of town, that area of town. Given the shift of dynamics of this use is a reasonable one in light of the zoning around it, the use and current zoning on the adjacent property and the request of the church and the uses they're going to make of their property. Also, again, the fact that this will provide for some mixed uses over there and we feel like it's reasonable in light of the Comprehensive Plan and the desire to have mixed use or mixed development as we go forward. I thank you for your time. I'll be happy to answer any questions at this time. Mr. Chairman if I could hand the original letter and copies for each Council member.

SEE ATTACHED LETTER FROM PARKERS CHAPEL FREE WILL BAPTIST CHURCH

Chairman Tozer: Any questions?

Mr. Ramey: I'd like to answer one question. Is this adjacent to the sand pit?

Mr. Hopf: Yes sir. It is part of the property where there has been the mining of the sand pit. Yes, it actually is a portion that abuts Old Pactolus Highway. That corner intersection there right across from Parkers Chapel Church.

Mr. Randall: Mr. Hopf I have a question. Did I interrupt you?

Mr. Ramey: No, I'm finished.

Mr. Randall: Part of our charge is to consider all uses for a potential zoning area. However, what is the intent here? Is it for multi-family, high density multi-family?

Mr. Hopf: I think, you'll notice on the application it was stated multi-family. I think the way that will probably play out, I don't presume to speak for the owner on exactly what his plans are because I haven't seen any final plans. I think the intent would be a mixed use of multi-family as well as office and other permissible uses under an OR designation.

Mr. Randall: Thank you

Mr. Moye: Mr. Hopf, let me just ask this question. The literature that we have says that there will be an increase of 7100 vehicles per day. You mentioned and I think Ms. Gooby mentioned in her presentation that there was a decrease of some number. Did I miss something? I may have.

Mr. Hopf: No, my understanding is that there will be an increase if the development is as anticipated and I think the way staff looked at was multi-family. That there would be an increase caused by that of the 7,100, 7,200 cars per day. But compared to the current zoning and if you look at the maximum development under the current zoning you would be looking at 13,000 more. It's actually a net decrease with the zoning change.

Mr. Moye: Thank you.

Chairman Tozer: Any more questions of Mr. Hopf? Thank you. Anyone else to speak in favor? Anyone to speak in opposition? I close the public hearing. Any discussion?

Mr. Randall: Very briefly. I think that it's a powerful letter from the church recommending this. This was rezoning just recently in 2004 to the commercial and there's commercial all in this area. It's very, very clear that needs to be a commercial area. With the transition that we have on this side of the Tar River coming across I don't know that transition is a deciding factor either. I swear that

whole big intersection there is mighty red on our maps and we know what that means.

Chairman Tozer: Any more discussion?

Mr. Lehman: I have another comment. You know a couple of years ago they passed the university housing out there and that was the beginning of a slippery slope that we're going to be sliding down because this is a parcel in the floodplain and it's even further in the floodplain that the other project was.

Mr. Ramey: My comment on that was Parkers Church was flooded. I happened to look down on it and saw the flood around it. That's one thing but it doesn't meet the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan says commercial there. If we're going to have a plan, it's a rule and guide to go by of course, but I think sometimes in this case we should listen to it.

Chairman Tozer: More discussion? Do I have a motion?

Mr. Bell: I motion to deny the proposed amendment, to advise that it isn't consistent with the comprehensive plan and other applicable plans, and to adopt the staff report which addresses plan consistency and other matters

Mr. Ramey: I second that motion.

Chairman Tozer: We have a motion by Mr. Bell, seconded by Mr. Ramey. All in favor? All opposed? Aye's have it (The motion was approved by a vote of 9 to 0).

REQUEST BY W & A DEVELOPMENT, LLC – APPROVED

Chairman Tozer stated that the next item is a request by W & A Development, LLC to rezone 33.7 acres located southwest of the Teakwood Subdivision, 2,620± feet west of Allen Road, and 2,340± feet north of the intersection of Frog Level Road and Dickinson Avenue from GC (General Commercial-County's Jurisdiction) to CH (Heavy Commercial).

Ms. Gooby stated this is a request to rezone 33 acres from General Commercial, which is currently located in the County's jurisdiction, to Heavy Commercial. This request is in conjunction with an annexation request. The property is currently in

addition to Oxford Park Commercial Subdivision. The section of Oxford Park Commercial Subdivision is currently partially developed and is developed as the same fashion as West Star Commercial Subdivision. The property is not impacted by the floodplain or greenways. This property is part of a regional focus area where commercial development would be encouraged. The proposed rezoning could generate a net decrease of 2,500 trips. There is some multi-family development on Allen Road but nothing is in close proximity to the subject property. The Land Use Plan recommends commercial along Dickinson Avenue. There is a buffer between the industrial and the residential area. Ms. Gooby stated that at the time that the Land Use Plan was adopted the property to the northeast to the subject property was vacant, therefore, there is an office/institutional/multi-family buffer intended to buffer between the commercial and residential. However, at the current rezoning which the property is R6A and R6, the current zoning in this area already serves as the intended buffer. The Land Use Plan recommends commercial for this area.

Mr. Todd Tripp, representing the applicant, stated that the applicant is asking for voluntary annexation in order to obtain sewer to the site. Mr. Tripp stated that access to this property would be through Taylor's Creek Drive in the existing Oxford Park Commercial Subdivision.

No one spoke in opposition.

Motion was made by Mr. Randall, seconded by Mr. Moye, to recommend approval of the proposed amendment, to advise that it is consistent with the comprehensive plan and other applicable plans, and to adopt the staff report which addresses plan consistency and other matters.

REQUEST BY CLARK LAND COMPANY, LLC – APPROVED

Chairman Tozer stated that the next item is a request by Clark Land Company, LLC to rezone 2.3578 acres located along the southern right-of-way of Charles Boulevard (N.C. Highway 43), 2,160± feet west of the intersection of Charles Boulevard and Herman Garris Road, and 3,160± feet east of County Home Road from R6 (Residential [High Density Multi-Family]) to OR (Office-Residential [High Density Multi-Family]).

Ms. Gooby stated this is a request to rezone a little over 2 acres from R6 to OR and both districts contain the same amount of multi-family density however the OR

district does contain an office option. The property is located within Voting District #5. The property is currently vacant. There are residential uses in and around the property. Ms. Gooby stated that there was recently an approved site plan that shows a street by will bisect this property and connect to Bluebill Drive. The property is not impacted by the floodplain or greenways. There is a small commercial focus area. Highway 43 is considered a gateway corridor. The proposed rezoning could generate an increase of 200 trips with the majority heading to the west. The Land Use Plan does recommend office/institutional/multi-family. The OR district is considered office/institutional/multi-family. The Land Use Plan recommends a conservation/open space area on the southern boundary of the subject property and there will be 50 foot riparian buffer required from the top of the bank. This property was rezoned R6 earlier this year. The remaining portion of this property is zoned R6. The request is in compliance with the Land Use Plan.

Mr. Randall asked if they should consider the whole area since this area is a gateway into the city.

Ms. Gooby explained that the properties are zoned RA20 and that the rezonings for the area have been in accordance with the Land Use Plan.

Mr. Linwood Stroud, representing the applicant, stated that this property is part of a 52 acres. Mr. Stroud stated that a preliminary plat has been approved and a site plan has been submitted for multi-family for the property located in the rear.

No one spoke in opposition.

Motion was made by Mr. Gordon, seconded by Mr. Baker, to recommend approval of the proposed amendment, to advise that it is consistent with the comprehensive plan and other applicable plans, and to adopt the staff report which addresses plan consistency and other matters.

REQUEST BY CHARIS PROPERTIES, LLC – APPROVED WITH STUB TO NORTH

Chairman Tozer stated that the next item is a request by Charis Properties, LLC for a preliminary plat entitled “Tull’s Cove”. The proposed development is located immediately east of the Rosewood Subdivision, northeast of the Vicksburg Subdivision, 2,155± feet west of County Home Road and 1,565± feet north of

Worthington Road. The proposed development consists of 64 lots on 15.282 acres. This property is further identified as Pitt County Tax Parcel No. 37501.

Mr. Thomas stated this is a preliminary plat for Tull's Cove. The developer is Charis Developers. The property is located to the west is Corey Road and to the south is Worthington Road. It is located 2,155 feet west of County Home Road and 1,565 feet west of Worthington Road. The property is east of Rosewood Subdivision and northeast of Vicksburg Subdivision. This property is zoned R6S, Residential single family. The property is surrounded by County zoning except for the portion of Vicksburg Subdivision that is within the city's jurisdiction. The anticipated use is 64 single-family dwellings. The Thoroughfare Plan indicates Corey Road as being a minor thoroughfare, Worthington Road as a major thoroughfare and County Home Road, to the east, as a major thoroughfare. The property is not impacted by the floodplain. This property was the subject of a recent annexation and initial zoning. This matter was considered by the Planning and Zoning Commission on May 16, 2006 at which time it was continued and later approved on June 20, 2006. City Council approved the request on August 10, 2006. Annexation was necessary because the developer was requesting sanitary sewer service. The zoning was necessary to put this property within a city zoning district. This property and Vicksburg, Section 2 are within the city's jurisdiction. Rosewood Subdivision is outside Greenville's city limits and the planning jurisdiction so the Planning and Zoning Commission will not be approving the street improvements that are shown as Tucker Road tonight. Tucker Road has been publicly offered for dedication but not improved south of Pine Drive. No action has been taken to withdraw the dedication offer. Rosewood and Vicksburg Section 1 were originally approved by the Pitt County Planning Commission. Vicksburg Section 2 was approved by the City of Greenville Planning and Zoning Commission on May 18, 2004. This submission would alter Vicksburg Section 2 by extending Greaves Street. The developer will have to secure whatever approvals are necessary from the County and/or NCDOT for the unimproved section of Tucker Road. Greenville Utilities can approve the utility network regardless of jurisdiction. The extension of Tucker Road is not mandatory for the approval of this plat but would serve to alleviate some traffic on Pine Drive. The Planning and Zoning Commission is not bound by the previous decision of the County boards. Street extensions are shown to the south and east. The property is already connected to the west. Sidewalks are provided. The Staff has requested that the developer provide a street stub to the vacant property to the north. The developer did not comply with this request. The Planning Staff feels such a connection would be necessary to provide a coordinated street system. The preliminary plat has been reviewed by the City's Technical Review

Committee. Staff would recommend denial of the plat as proposed without the inclusion of a street stub to the north in the vicinity of Lots 11-16. In staff's opinion, the plat as proposed is not in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan. It also does not meet design standards as defined in the Subdivision Ordinance. Mr. Thomas stated that some of the design standards relate the arrangement, character, their relation to existing and planned streets for public convenience and safety. Arrangement of streets in new subdivisions shall make provision for the continuation of the existing streets in adjoining areas. When new property is subdivided and it is adjacent to lands that do not have adequate access to approved public street then the new street shall be carried to the boundaries of the tract. The street arrangement within a new subdivision shall not cause hardship to owners of adjoining property in platting their own land and providing convenient access to affect the health, safety and welfare of the property owners. Mr. Thomas stated that there are some guidelines from the Comprehensive Plan in regards to objectives of mobility.

Mr. Ramey asked if he understood that staff objects because there is not a street connection between Lots 11-16.

Mr. Thomas stated that was correct and for the reasons as stated in the Design Standards for Subdivisions as well as elements of the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Mike Baldwin, representing the applicant, stated that not supplying the street stub to the north of the property the justification was that Tucker Road already provides interconnectivity to the property to the north. Mr. Baldwin stated that there would be two streets within 500 feet apart and he felt like that would satisfy the ordinance. Mr. Baldwin explained that they did not have to tie into Tucker Road and they did improve the unimproved section of Tucker Road. There are two entrances into the subdivision, one mainly to take the traffic off Pine Drive. Mr. Baldwin explained that he would like the Commission to make the decision as to whether a connection to the north is needed in that location or if Tucker Road will suffice. Mr. Baldwin stated that if the Commission feels a street stub is required he would not have a problem with revising the plat.

Mr. Gordon asked why staff was concerned with the road connection to the north.

Mr. Thomas stated that staff is concerned about providing an adequate coordinated street network to the large vacant tract to the north. Mr. Thomas stated that staff was concerned with there just being one connection to that tract.

Mr. William Keith Holly, 1116 Pine Drive, Rosewood Subdivision, stated that he is speaking in opposition to a portion of the preliminary plat. Mr. Holly stated that the extension of Tucker Drive through the unimproved roadway between 1116 and 1102 Pine Drive has nothing to do with Tull's Cove. It will not create any direct access to Tull's Cove and increase traffic through Vicksburg Subdivision. Mr. Holley asked the Commission to deny the portion of the plat that he has concerns with.

Mr. Thomas stated that Mr. Baldwin has been instructed that he would have to secure whatever approvals are necessary through Pitt County or NCDOT for improvements outside the city's jurisdiction. Mr. Thomas stated that as water, utilities and sanitary sewer are available for development this area it will become a more urbanized area. Mr. Thomas stated that both subdivisions are internal and therefore there would not been any cut-through traffic.

Ms. Jan Holly asked the Commission to deny the request because of a safety issue. Ms. Holly asked that Charis Developers not install a road connection to Pine Drive. Ms. Holly stated that there is a stub to Worthington Road and asked that be the only connection for the subdivision.

Mr. Baldwin stated that the properties to the south, west and north when developed interconnectivity will be required.

Mr. Ramey reiterated staff's comment in regards to a stub to the north. Mr. Ramey asked if he understood that Mr. Baldwin is willing to work with staff on this issue.

Mr. Baldwin stated that if the Commission requires a stub to the north that he will revised his plan.

Ms. Holly asked that the construction traffic go through a road on the other side of Tucker Road so it would not have to travel through Vicksburg. Ms. Holley again asked the Commission to deny the request.

Mr. Holec asked if Mr. Baldwin was acceptable to the amendment which would include a street stub to the north.

Mr. Baldwin stated that the amendment is acceptable.

Motion was made by Mr. Ramey, seconded by Mr. Bell to approve the preliminary plat with a stub to the north between Lots 11-16. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Mr. Ramey to the meeting adjourned at 9:15 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Merrill Flood
Secretary

Keith W. Cooper

Tuesday, November 21, 2006

Good Evening:

I stand before you tonight as co-chair of the Fifth Street/MLK Completion Committee. On August 10, 2006, the Greenville City Council voted along racial lines to support a resolution asking the Department of Transportation for permission to rename a five-mile stretch of the US 264 Bypass after Reverend Martin Luther King. This same resolution was rubberstamped by a very close 5-4 vote from county commissioners.

We often hear that Pitt County is a racist county. Some of us are familiar with the fact that there once were thousands of slaves in Pitt County. Additionally, Jim Crow segregation has left permanent scars on the city's landscape and relegated black folks to second-class citizenship status. Many of brothers and sisters around the globe has laughed at the hypocrisy around this nation calling itself a Christian nation while holding the Bible in one hand and the psychological whip of oppression, subjugation, and white supremacy in the other.

Do we really wish to move beyond the gloom and doom days of the Civil War where brothers foolishly fought and killed each other and this city's segregationist past? One way to do this is not to relegate Reverend King's name to the bypass when there is solid support for a logical extension of Fifth Street within the corporate limits.

In The Atlanta Journal Constitution's November 19 editorial, "King: American hero," Cynthia Tucker states, "In the decades since King's death, America has managed to segregate him and commemorations of his achievements. Even as the face of the nation's economic and political leadership changed, even as men and women such as Colin Powell, Condoleezza Rice and Oprah Winfrey showed the power of the transformation King helped to bring about, many white Americans have refused to see King as anything other than a 'black' leader." This statement reflects a deep-rooted ignorance about King's vision of one America where people would be judged by the "content of their character" rather than the color of their skin.

Public streets are public properties. Moreover, neither Ann Maxwell nor any other person in this city has a monopoly of a street. Some say that this street matter is no big deal and there's too much fuss over nothing. If this is true, why not extend the existing street and bridge the racial divide where that section from Memorial to Evans Street consists mostly of economically distressed residents living drowning in an ocean of neglect, unemployment, prostitution, drug activities, boarded-up structures, and many other social plagues. Contrariwise, East Fifth Street has numerous middle class to affluent residents who enjoy well manicured lawns and elegant ^{homes}. This is not right and God

will punish those who run roughshod over principles of humility, generosity, and good will.

A few East Fifth Street property owners said they do not want to incur the expense of changing their addresses and stationery to reflect a street name change. This is another example of hypocrisy. If rich folks on the East side don't wish to change their addresses, why should they want those dirt-poor residents on the present MLK Drive to change their addresses? I appeal to "men and women of the cloth" to take a moral stand on this issue, speak truth to power, and not wait on God to resolve this controversial issues since John F. Kennedy was right when, on 1961, he eloquently stated that "God's work is our work."

By the way, tomorrow will mark the forty-third anniversary of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, a man who accepted Reverend Martin Luther King's advise to get off of the fence of complacency and indifference, and promote human and civil rights lest the country fall apart.

Our committee is now announcing a boycott of all Pepsi-Cola products within Pitt County in protest of Commissioner John Minges' September 18th vote to ignore the concerns of the masses, including a consensus from the NAACP's Executive Council, which wanted to extend Fifth Street in King's honor. Minges' family has been part of the local leadership of the Pepsi-Cola business. We also plan to picket Doc's Guns and Pawn on Memorial Drive, since its owner, Commissioner Bowen, did not support our efforts. At the city level, we encourage people not to do business with Mayor Don Parrott's accounting firm because of the mayor's arrogance on August 10th and Councilman Ray Craft's Sign Is Now business on Greenville Boulevard. The selective buying campaign and pickets will be in place until further notice from our committee.

PREPARED REMARKS OF REV. OZIE LEE HALL, JR.

SEVERAL MONTHS AGO THE GREENVILLE CITY OFFICIALS AND THE GREENVILLE REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION CAME BEFORE THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION SEEKING APPROVAL OF A WEST GREENVILLE REVITALIZATION PLAN ENGINEERED BY THE MAYOR, SEVERAL NON-AFRICAN AMERICAN CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS, AND SOME CONSULTANTS THAT WOULD HAVE DISPLACED ABOUT 3500 BLACK RESIDENTS FROM WEST GREENVILLE, DESTROYED BLACK MAJORITY POLITICAL DISTRICTS, DESTROYED VIRTUALLY ALL BLACK OWNED BUSINESSES IN WEST GREENVILLE AND ELIMINATE OVER 100 JOBS IN THE BLACK COMMUNITY. AN OUTRIGHT ATTACK ON THE BLACK COMMUNITY. THE BLACK COMMUNITY AND THE WEST GREENVILLE FOCUS GROUP CAME BEFORE YOU AND YOU DECIDED TO SEND THE PROPOSAL BACK WITHOUT APPROVAL. THE RESULT WAS A SERIES OF MEETINGS BETWEEN CITY OFFICIALS AND THE WEST GREENVILLE FOCUS GROUP THAT ELIMINATED THE DISPARITIES AN OPEN ATTACK ON THE BLACK COMMUNITY CONTAINED IN THE PLAN. FURTHER NEGOTIATIONS LED TO THE ADOPTION OF A FINAL PLAN THAT WAS ACCEPTABLE TO THE CITY AND THE BLACK COMMUNITY.

ONCE AGAIN THE BLACK COMMUNITY IS UNDER OFFICIAL ATTACK. THE FIVE NON-AFRICAN AMERICAN MEMBERS OF THE GREENVILLE CITY COUNSEL ARE ASKING YOU TO APPROVE RENAMING MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. DRIVE TO ITS FORMER NAME OF W. 5TH STREET AND THE

RENAMING OF A PORTION OF THE 264 NORTHWEST BYPASS IN HONOR OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. THE BLACK COMMUNITY SOUGHT TO EXTEND DR. KING'S NAME TO THE ENTIRE 5TH STREET. INSTEAD OF HONORING THE BLACK COMMUNITY'S REQUEST THE FIVE NON-AFRICAN AMERICAN MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL VOTED TO SEEK TO TAKE AWAY DR. KING'S NAME FROM WEST GREENVILLE AFTER IT HAS BEEN THERE FOR OVER SIX YEARS.

THE CHANGES PROPOSED BY THE CITY COUNCIL ARE NOT POSITIVE CHANGES. THEY OFFEND THE BLACK COMMUNITY IN PRETENDING TO HONOR DR. KING. A SIGNIFICANT PERCENTAGE OF THE POPULATION OF THIS CITY VEHEMENTELY OPPOSED DR. KING WHEN DR. KING WAS ALIVE AND WORKING TO ADVANCE A CIVIL RIGHTS AGENDA. NOW THEY DON'T WANT HIS NAME ATTACHED TO A STREET WITHIN THE CITY.

WHAT MESSAGE DOES THIS SEND TO THE BLACK COMMUNITY? IT TELLS US THAT WE ARE NOT RESPECTED, THAT THESE COUNCIL MEMBERS HAVE NO REGARD FOR OUR RIGHTS, THAT OUR BLACK CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS ARE NOT RESPECTED, AND THAT RACISM IS ALIVE AND WELL IN THE CITY OF GREENVILLE.

RENAMING THE 264 BYPASS IS ONCE AGAIN RENAMING ONLY A PARTIAL STREET TO HONOR DR. KING AND LEAVES US IN THE SAME CONDITION THAT PROMPTED PROTEST IN THE FIRST PLACE. BY SENDING DR. KING'S NAME TO THE BYPASS WE BYPASS THE OPPORTUNITY TO REALIZE DR. KING'S DREAM WITHIN THE CITY OF GREENVILLE.

GREENVILLE CITY COUNCIL'S ACTION GUARENTEE'S THAT THIS ISSUE WILL CONTINUE TO DIVIDE THIS COMMUNITY.

WE URGE THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION TO REJECT THE CITY'S PROPOSED STREET NAME CHANGES FOR NOW AND LET THE DEBATE OF THIS MATTER CONTINUE WITHOUT ADDING YOUR APPROVAL TO THE REPERHENSIBLE CONDUCT AND MANNER IN WHICH THE GREENVILLE CITY COUNCL HAS ACTED REGARDING THIS VOLITILE ISSUE.

“What Dr. King Did For White Americans”

*For The Student Who Studies Dr. Martin Luther
King Jr.*

A Thesis On Love

Written By Minister George Barfield III

We have entered the 21st Century and we are blessed to be able to review the historical report card of the pioneers, heroes and heroines of the 20th Century. One of the events that we will focus on is, “the **Civil Rights Movement**” in America and how this movement – not only changed the lives of Black Americans but our fellow **White Americans** as well.

At the center of this movement was a 20th Century leader and visionary, the **Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.** Because of the recent events in **Greenville, North Carolina** and other cities regarding the naming of streets in his honor, we felt we needed to respond to some of the sentiments of Americans and answer the question: **What did Dr. King do for White Americans?**

As Black Americans we annually pay homage to the legacy of Dr. King. However, it is unfair and un-American to think that Blacks are on the **frontlines** but Whites are on the **sidelines**. On the contrary, Dr. King demonstrated with his **strength to love**, that the survival of America depended on **Black and White Americans** reaching the **finish line** together.

The Legacy Is Greater Than The Leader

Regarding his vision for all Americans, Dr. King passionately, humbly and unselfishly stated that he just wanted to do **God’s will**. This will called him away from a college **professorship** at Boston University in the north to a **Pastorship** at Dexter Avenue Baptist Church in the south. His unquestionable **patriotism** led him to state publicly that, **he loves America too much** to see her ruled by those who chose hate over love and violence over peace. He also reminded all Americans that from a **Bass Black** to a **Treble White** that all men are significant on God’s keyboard!

Many of our **White** brothers and sisters did not realize that Dr. King preached that the **emancipation** of Blacks would offer redemption to Whites.

Below is a brief listing of some of the blessings God sent to our fellow **White Americans** through the **Ministry and Marching** of Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.

- 1) Dr. King revealed to our fellow **White Americans** that segregation not only separated Whites from Blacks, but also separated them from the healing power of a loving God and hence, caused many of them to experience an even deeper moral and psychological bondage.
- 2) Dr. King dramatized the life of Christ to our fellow **White Americans** of the 20th Century as he walked in the footsteps of **Jesus** through his **non-violence crusade**. He used this **crusade** to disarm the evils of racial hatred, injustice, inequality, segregation and violence.
- 3) Dr. King helped our fellow **White Americans** to learn to look beyond the color of the **skin** and judge their fellow man by the content of his/her **character**.
- 4) Dr. King helped our young fellow **White American high school and college students** to realize that their destiny is tied up in the destiny of Black Americans – and that we must live together as brothers and sisters or perish together as fools!
- 5) Dr. King touched the moral consciousness of **White Americans** and caused many of them to join the crusade of the Civil Rights Movement as the ultimate act of **true patriotism and Christian love**.
- 6) Dr. King not only helped Black Americans to benefit from the Civil Rights Movement, but many of our Nation's fellow **White Americans** benefited from the political, social, economic and financial gains during this period of change in America.
- 7) Dr. King helped our fellow **White Americans** to believe in the inevitable, that one day, little White boys and girls will join hands with little Black boys and girls as sisters and brothers! Dr. King's prophetic words changed the course of **White America's** view of Black America as inferior human beings and their view of themselves as superior human beings. thus Dr. King helped our **White American** brothers and sisters to begin to embrace the truth.

Support the naming of 5th Street and Evans Streets to Martin Luther King Drive and honor this great man and Prophet of God! We will continue to March on until victory is won.

Sponsored By: ~~Professor Keith Cooper~~ – Founder
Minister George Barfield III – Co-Founder

Citizens Crusade For Change



11-19-06

CYNTHIA TUCKER

King: American hero

Maybe, just maybe, the entire nation is finally ready to embrace a truth that has been clear for quite some time: The Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. was not a *black* hero; he was an *American* hero. The movement that he led gave America the moral authority to present itself to the world as the standard-bearer for justice and human rights.

The civil rights leader, whose achievements are heralded around the world, is joining the ranks of American presidents and battlefield heroes on the National Mall in Washington. Decades after the idea was proposed by members of King's college fraternity, Alpha Phi Alpha, a memorial saluting King's life and work will be built along the edge of the Tidal Basin.

As President Bush eloquently put it last Monday during the groundbreaking ceremony: "It will unite a man who declared the promise of America and the man who defended the promise of America with the man who redeemed the promise of America."

Even as philanthropists continue to raise funds to build the monument in Washington, Atlanta has just begun planning for a museum that will highlight King's contributions to America and the world. With the purchase of a cache of King's papers this year, the city, at long last, has the momentum to raise funds for a first-class museum that could cost as much as \$100 million.

Former U.N. Ambassador Andrew Young, once a lieutenant to King, recently told a group of tourism leaders that "I'm [not] interested in a civil rights museum that starts in the '60s and ends in 2000."

In the decades since King's death, America has managed to segregate him and commemorations of his achievements. Even as the face of the nation's economic and political leadership changed, even as men and women such as Colin Powell, Condoleezza Rice and Oprah Winfrey showed the power of the transformation King helped to bring about, many white Americans have refused to see King as anything other than a "black leader."

Now seems an excellent time for the entire nation to claim King's legacy. We Americans have been only too happy to note our success in assimilating ethnic minority groups into the nation's economic, social and cultural mainstream, a track record that stands apart from much of the rest of the world.

But many Americans seem to forget that this transformation did not come about on its own. Someone had to fight for it. If King and his followers had not stood against the harsh tyranny of Jim Crow, it's quite unlikely that Condoleezza Rice, born in Birmingham, Ala., would be secretary of state.

If not for all those who bravely faced dogs and fire hoses, it's quite unlikely that Mississippi State University, in the heart of the Old Confederacy, would have a black football coach, Sylvester Croom.

If black Americans were still treated as second-class citizens, President Bush would hardly be in a position to denounce authoritarian states that limit the rights of their citizens.

King deserves to be remembered among those great Americans who helped us to become that "shining city on a hill."

His work left this a better country for all its citizens — not just those who happen to be black.

Cynthia Tucker is editorial page editor for The Atlanta Journal-Constitution.

Public Forum

Greenville not really honoring King

With regard to celebrating the life of Martin Luther King Jr., let's compare Greenville to other cities in the region.

From 1999 to 2006, Greenville allowed a one-mile stretch of Fifth Street to be named after King. People who realized that public space was dominated by white cultural figures, such as the Confederate soldier at the courthouse and major streets bearing the names of former slaveholders, asked that King's name be added to the wealthy east and west ends of Fifth Street. This caused such an uproar that white residents and mostly white governmental agencies appealed to the Department of Transportation to allow the removal of King's name from downtown. Their vision was to name an

unfinished portion of a city bypass Dr. Martin Luther King Memorial Highway. Many people cheered, and now a neighborhood will lose part of its cultural identity as its major thoroughfare is renamed again.

In Raleigh, there is a major thoroughfare in the middle of the city bearing King's name, similar to one in Chapel Hill. Raleigh also boasts the Martin Luther King Memorial Gardens. Travel to Norfolk, Va., and you will find a towering memorial to King in the middle of a downtown intersection. Venture to Atlanta and you'll find a National Historic Site devoted to King, including his tomb, statues, museums and other landmarks that honor and celebrate King's critical philosophies of equality and

non-violence.

In Washington, D.C. on Nov. 13, dignitaries, celebrities and school children broke ground to welcome the \$100 million Martin Luther King Memorial to the National Mall. Set for completion in 2008, 40 long years since King was brutally assassinated, the memorial will span across four acres and join other luminaries in American history, like Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Why can't Greenville appropriately honor this great American hero?

JOSHUA FISCHER
KEITH COOPER
co-chairs
Fifth Street/MLK
Completion Committee



PARKERS CHAPEL FREE WILL BAPTIST CHURCH

2241 Old Pactolus Road Greenville, N.C. 27834 (252) 752-1179

November 20, 2006

Lorenza Stox
Pastor

Gene Williams
Associate

Sam Harris
Music

Justin Harris
Youth

Dear Mr. Chairman and Commission Members:

On behalf of myself and the 500+ members of the Parkers Chapel Free Will Baptist Church, please endorse the current rezoning request of the property owned by Chris Burns and Associates, located adjacent to our property and south of the Old Pactolus Highway from CH (commercial highway) to OR (office and residential).

The reasons for endorsing this rezoning request include the following:

1. OR use of the adjacent property will be more compatible and homogenous with the current utilization of our church property;
2. A portion of our property located on the corner of Old Pactolus Road and adjacent to this property is already zoned OR. It is our intention in the very near future to request that the remaining portion of our property (total acreage approximately 25) be rezoned to OR; and
3. Rezoning from CH to OR will prevent economic obsolescence of our property that will otherwise occur to our church property; and
4. The uses, architecture and buildings in an OR zone will, in our opinion, be aesthetically more compatible and pleasing with our church uses.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,