

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

August 9, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr. Jennings
Mr. Griffith
Mr. Laramore
Mr. Searce

MEMBERS ABSENT

Mrs. Evans
Mrs. Pritchett
Mr. Jones

STAFF

Clarke Whitfield
Ken Gillie
Christy Taylor
Renee Blair

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Griffith at 3:00 p.m.

I. ITEMS FOR PUBLIC HEARING

- 1. Special Use Permit Application PLSUP2010000061, filed by Charles Walker, requesting a Special Use Permit to allow indoor commercial recreation in accordance with Article 3K: Section C, Item 5 of Chapter 41 of the Code of the City of Danville, Virginia, 1986 as amended at 318 Main Street, otherwise known as Grid 2713, Block 035, Parcel 000005 of the City of Danville, Virginia, Zoning District Map. The applicant is proposing to operate a facility to be used for entertainment and recreation.*

Ms. Blair read the Staff Report. Twenty-three (23) notices were mailed to surrounding property owners within three hundred (300) feet of the subject property. Five (5) respondents were unopposed to the request; one (1) was opposed to the request.

Open the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of the request was Charles Walker, pastor of Children's Ministries, Inc. Mr. Walker stated that he wanted to give their mission purpose. Our purpose is to bring a positive social venue, Christian atmosphere, to the area. We are trying to bring in some local and out of town entertainment. We are trying to offer a non-alcoholic bar to help the young contemporary Christian come and let their hair down a little bit. Everything will be Christian based with no violence, no drugs, no smoke, and no alcohol. This is an outreach ministry for our church. The only thing that I ask is an extension of the hours. Some of the churches in our district have weekend services that do not let out until 9:30 p.m. or so. We are proposing to have the teen events to be from 7:00 p.m. until 9:30 p.m. and the adults over eighteen (18) to be from 10:00 p.m. to 1:00 a.m. Everything is completely supervised. If we have to have the wrist bands for different ages, to make sure we can keep up with who is there, we can. We wanted the Special Use for when we actually bring entertainers in, but we want to use this space to have different activities as an outreach that are a little more animated than some of the local churches. We have our own version of American Idol, karaoke, open mic night, and other things to give a positive venue for the youth in this area.

Mr. Jennings asked if this is for profit, will you charge at the door?

Mr. Walker responded there will be certain events that will have national acclaimed artists coming to the City. For those events, we would have to charge at the door to pay them for actually coming to the City. These are some of the people that everybody goes to see in Greensboro and other places. We just want to bring them here. Otherwise, there will be no charge; because it is just for our church outreach. When we have things like that we just wanted to be sure that we would be able to charge admission.

Mr. Jennings asked how large is the place and how many people can it hold?

Mr. Walker responded the facility can hold approximately two hundred (200) people. We were also trying to use the facility to allow other people to come in and have birthday parties and anniversary dinners. It is an upscale place with white linen table cloths and a nice stage. We really worked hard to ensure that it would be a nice facility. We want to offer valet parking, and some of the things that we are not really accustomed to here.

Mr. Scarce asked if they are asking to extend the hours from Staff's recommendation to 9:30 p.m. during the week and 1:00 a.m. on Saturday?

Mr. Walker responded yes, the two (2) nights on the weekend.

Mr. Scarce stated Staff recommended weekdays 8:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. Friday and Saturday.

Mr. Walker stated we are asking for the extension on the weekend.

Mr. Griffith asked what about during the week, Sunday thru Thursday?

Mr. Walker responded we are saying 9:30 p.m. would be the time we would transition from the teens to the adults.

Mr. Griffith asked would that just be on the weekends?

Mr. Walker responded that would be only Friday and Saturday.

Mr. Walker stated I need to understand, is this for the activities we are charging for or is this the hours period?

Mr. Griffith responded it does not make any difference whether they are charging or not, it is just when the facility is open. Staff recommended the hours on Sunday thru Thursday would be 8:00 a.m. until 9:00 p.m. and on Friday and Saturday nights, their recommendation was 8:00 a.m. until 11:00 p.m. and you asked for 1:00 a.m. It made no distinction about whether or not you were charging, that would be the hours.

Mr. Walker asked if we did something other than a church activity would those hours still apply?

Mr. Griffith responded yes, the hours would be the same all of the time. As far as the extension, that was just a recommendation that they had made.

Mr. Walker stated I would like to extend the hours during the week because some of the events we have, even in our local churches are not over until 9:30 p.m.; even in revivals and we plan on having revivals, and different types of conferences. Closing at 9:00 p.m. would really limit the time from people getting off of work, especially with an out of town guest.

Mr. Griffith asked so what hours Sunday thru Thursday would you like?

Mr. Walker responded 11:00 p.m. would be ample time to get people in and out.

Mr. Jennings asked what is the name of the church?

Mr. Walker responded True Holiness.

Mr. Jennings asked where is that located?

Mr. Walker responded 502 South Hampton.

Mr. Scarce asked Staff does the change of hours throw up any red flags?

Mr. Gillie responded no. We based the hours on what curfew is. We did this with the other teen club that proposed to go downtown. Curfew is 11:00 p.m. on Fridays and Midnight on Saturday and Sundays. We try and close an hour before hand just to allow teens a chance to get home and not break curfew. If his operation is proposed for those older than eighteen (18), then we are not opposed to the change.

Mr. Griffith asked is that agreeable with the curfew, the idea that you would be transitioning from a younger to an older crowd?

Mr. Walker responded yes.

Mr. Gillie stated we discussed that the other day. Staff made him aware of the curfew limitations.

Close the Public Hearing.

Mr. Scarce made a motion to recommend approval of Special Use Permit Application PLSUP2010000061 with the hours of operation being Sunday thru Thursday, 8:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. and Friday and Saturday, 8:00 a.m. to 1:00 a.m. Mr. Jennings seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 4-0 vote.

2. Code Amendment Request PLCA20100000063 requesting to amend Article 8: Parking and Loading Requirements Section E Item 32 of Chapter 41 of the Code of the City of Danville, Virginia, 1986 as amended, by modifying the parking requirements for Medical or Dental Offices.

Mrs. Blair read the Staff Report.

Open the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of the request was Dr. Albert L. Payne, D.D.S. Dr. Albert Payne stated when we came before you three (3) years ago with our situation out on 58 West, it caught me off guard because I was used to one (1) parking space per two hundred (200) square feet of office space. It really surprised me when I saw the four (4) to one (1) ratio. I went to friends throughout the State asking them what their parking requirements were and nobody had anything close to that.

Mr. Griffith stated I take exception to that.

Dr. Albert Payne stated nobody has a four (4) to one (1) ratio and one (1) space for every employee. Three (3) years ago I gave you a list of surrounding areas and their parking requirements, and I give that to you again. This shows what Martinsville's requirements are, Henry County requirements are one (1) space for every two hundred (200) square feet. Franklin County's are two (2) spaces for every exam room, Roanoke is one (1) space for every four hundred (400) square feet of office space,

Salem is seven (7) spaces per practitioner or one (1) space per two hundred (200) square feet, Greensboro, NC is one (1) space for every two hundred fifty (250) square feet, and Charlottesville is one (1) space for every four hundred (400) square feet. My wife went on the internet and anywhere they had the Code requirements posted she went through and copied it. These are mainly in Virginia with some across the Country on the second page. It led us to a situation where we had to spend a lot of money to get something rezoned to add to a parking lot that is really excessive now. I am sure Mr. Gillie sees that we have a dental office with eight (8) treatment rooms and only half of the parking lot is being used because dentists work on an appointment basis. I appreciate their recommendation for a change. I think a two (2) to one (1) ratio for every three hundred (300) square feet is reasonable and obviously a big improvement. I am assuming that is one (1) parking space for every three hundred (300) square feet plus one (1) for each employee. I think that is a doable situation. Any change is going to be improvement over the existing Code. I am here to make you aware that no other place has the four (4) to one (1) ratio that I have seen.

Mr. Griffith stated there are some other areas that have higher restrictions than what we have.

Dr. Albert Payne stated I cannot argue with you, but I am just basing this on the ones that my wife got off of the internet and the fifteen (15) or twenty (20) practitioners that I have talked to across the State. I appreciate you looking at it and I feel the situation is in our favor to argue too much about it. I do think that I am a little grey haired but my son is going to be here a lot longer and have to deal with some other issues. We just purchased a building and we want to make sure we are in compliance there and it looks like we will be. I know he wants to say a few things, but I appreciate you doing this.

Present on behalf of the request was Dr. Christopher A. Payne, D.D.S. Dr. Christopher Payne stated I would like to thank you for giving me the opportunity to say a few things about the parking regulations until now and how it has affected the dentists in the area. I think we will all agree after looking into it that we need to make some changes like those that Staff recommended. In the past, one (1) parking spot per employee plus four (4) parking spots per dental chair has been the Code. The list that was given to you went from Abington to Greensboro containing about fifty (50) cities. On that list, Danville was by far the most stringent regulations of any of those fifty (50) cities. Danville was more than double of those other Cities and I just want to emphasize that I do not think this is the reputation that Danville should or want to portray because we are already an underserved healthcare provider area. We do not want to put up any unnecessary roadblocks for new dentists coming in. I have some questions about the current situations that some dentists are in. Most of the dentists in Danville are not in compliance with the existing Code and most of them are of retirement age. Once they retire and sell their building, I wonder will that new dentist be able to buy that existing facility as the Code is now. It is my understanding that there are only three (3) offices in Danville that meet the existing Code. My office and Dr. Howard's office meet the Code because we have built offices within the last two (2) years. I want to emphasize that it was a significant cost for our offices to meet the Code. We bought an old building that already had a parking plan in place drawn by LE&D for dental and when we planned to use it for dental we found that we would be the first affected by the new regulations as they were written a few years ago. In order for us to keep the building, we had to spend an additional \$75,000 dollars to reach compliance. We had to negotiate with adjacent property owners who were not selling property in order to increase our parking and we had to grade the lot and build retaining walls in order to accommodate this additional parking. We spent \$75,000 dollars for additional parking that was completely wasted. That parking expense has never been utilized since we have been there. We have been there two and a half (2 ½) years in the new office and at times I am at full capacity with eight (8) chairs and we have never come close to using those extra spots. I think this is because dentistry is by appointment. One (1) spot per employee and four (4) spots per dental chair would mean in our

situation forty two (42) parking spaces. I think about it in relation to a restaurant taking reservations for four (4) families at each and every booth at the same time. It just does not make sense. It is not possible. That would suggest that we would schedule thirty two (32) patients at the same time at 8:00 a.m. for eight (8) chairs. I can work fast and my dad is probably a little faster, but there is no way we could schedule thirty two (32) patients at the same time. Our waiting room probably holds ten (10) to fifteen (15) patients and if we only have eight (8) chairs, the only place to put that many people would be in the parking lot. I am speaking for dental offices specifically. A physician's office may be different because they have more walk-in appointments, more emergencies, colds, and unscheduled treatment. I am speaking for dentistry because I know dentistry well. I have been around it my whole life and I know dentistry is more scheduled than that. I think looking at the list that I submitted, most of those places close by require one (1) space per two hundred (200) square feet. I think that is very workable. In that scenario a four thousand (4000) square foot building would need twenty (20) parking spots. That would give room for eight (8) chairs plus eight (8) to ten (10) employees and still have some parking left over. At most, not knowing what the recommendation would be before hand, I would like to have one (1) spot per employee and two (2) parking spots per dental chair instead of four (4) spots. That would give sixteen (16) spots for eight (8) chairs and ten (10) more for the employees which would be about twenty six (26) spots. The main message is to realize we have never come close to using those twenty six (26) parking spots much less than the forty two (42) spots that the Code requires. The Code has given us sixteen (16) to twenty (20) spots more than we have ever come close to using. Some other points for the City to consider, if we would not have been able to spend that \$75,000 dollars for additional parking, we would have had to put one (1) less chair in our office. To make the math simple, if you can imagine a five (5) chair office being cut to four (4) chairs, that is twenty (20) percent of the capacity. That is twenty (20) percent of production and that can be very significant over a lifetime. Twenty (20) percent in production is going to have a significant effect on your building, your Staff, and from what I understand it is going to affect your business license. There is a lot of real estate that is available in Danville right now, but even if a location is suitable for dentistry, if it does not meet the current parking regulations it is not usable. Since the value of the property is based on the use, that is going to effect the property taxes. I feel sorry for the frustrated land and property owners trying to sell a practice suitable for dental in every way except for meeting the Code as it is written right now. Finally, one (1) spot per two hundred (200) square feet is sufficient. I would recommend at least reducing it to two (2) spots per dental chair and one (1) for each employee. This is stricter than what the other locations had, but it is very workable. As it is written, doing the math it looks like the suggestion of one (1) space per three hundred (300) square feet plus one (1) for every employee is close to that. I had not seen that ahead of time to look at it a little more, but even one (1) per two (2) spots would be a big improvement over what we have. The longer we go without changing things, the more harm and expense we are creating. I think there was a consultant that made all of these recommendations in the past and probably inappropriately linked medical and dental together. Dental is a different type of situation than medical and I think the sooner we change it the better. I would be interested to see if Staff felt that one (1) parking space per employee and two (2) per dental chair would be equally acceptable.

Mr. Scarce asked Staff what is your thoughts on the one (1) per two hundred (200) square feet?

Mr. Gillie responded I am trying to calculate the square footage of the building. When he purchased this building, the building was laid out to only use the upper level and then they finished off the lower level. It was a moved building that they renovated. The original owner said they were only going to use the upper level and the basement was going to be completely unfinished, so they did get away with less parking. As the building progressed and things changed, the parking requirements went up.

Dr. Albert Payne stated the building has seven thousand, two hundred (7200) square feet. It was advertised to require thirty six (36) parking spaces for a seven thousand, two hundred (7200) square foot building, which meant one (1) parking space for every two hundred (200) square feet of office space when we purchased it. That would have allowed us to use the entire upper and lower level. After we purchased the building, we found out more details about the requirements. It is our fault for not knowing everything about it.

Mr. Griffith asked is there one (1) doctor there?

Dr. Albert Payne responded two (2).

Mr. Griffith stated in your statement it says present Staff, one (1) doctor.

Dr. Albert Payne stated that statement is from three (3) years ago. There are two (2) doctors there and four (4) hygienists. There are six (6) practitioners. What we are saying is even with that situation, only half of the parking lot is being used.

Mr. Scarce stated if we are going to make a change now is the time to make it as liberal as we can, as long as we provide the parking spaces. We should consider some of these old offices that are closed and maybe forced to add on additional parking that may not be necessary.

Mr. Gillie stated on a seven thousand, two hundred (7200) square foot building with one (1) parking space per two hundred (200) square feet, you would have a requirement for thirty six (36) parking spaces. Staff's recommendation of the one (1) per three hundred (300) square feet would only require twenty four (24) parking spaces plus Staff. The three hundred (300) would actually require less parking than going one (1) per two hundred (200). Now, if we figure two (2) parking spaces per exam room, depending on the size of the exam room and that is questionable but I believe you said you had eight (8) exam rooms that would be sixteen (16) parking spaces plus an additional ten (10) for employees, for a total of twenty six (26). That would be less than the requirement for the two hundred (200), but this will also make it similar to an office, so if the building does close and it becomes a general office we do not have the potential for negative parking. So from our end it seems to balance out and is consistent across the board.

Mr. Scarce stated I understand that and it does seem fair to look at it both ways.

Mr. Griffith stated looking at the difference between a dentist office and a medical practice where they are not as scheduled, I can see how the dentist or that type of practice would not need as many parking spaces as someone doing lab work, where a ton of people come in at one time.

Mr. Griffith asked do you think the three hundred (300) would be enough for internal medicine or some other practice?

Mr. Gillie responded we are confident in our recommendations. Most of the other places we have surveyed do lump them together. While they say the differences between a medical and dental office are substantial, based on the research we found most places consider them very similar. We do not think it is going to create an issue. So at this point, we are still sticking by our recommendation.

Mr. Jennings asked is your recommendation one (1) parking space for every three hundred (300) square feet of office space?

Mr. Gillie responded yes.

Mr. Jennings asked is his request one (1) space for every two hundred (200) square feet?

Mr. Christopher Payne responded Staff included one (1) space for every employee. Generally, places have one (1) space for every two hundred (200) square feet regardless of how many employees they have.

Mr. Jennings asked so are you both saying the same thing?

Mr. Whitfield requested for anyone speaking to come to the microphone.

Mr. Christopher Payne stated looking at the numbers that Mr. Gillie pointed out and if you are linking medical and dental together, if the recommendation of one (1) per every three hundred (300) square feet plus one (1) for every employee is approved, I would go along with it. It is a big improvement and it would have helped us significantly with the cost we had three (3) years ago. This is something we could support.

Mr. Jennings asked is what you are recommending the same thing as what he is asking for?

Mr. Gillie responded no, he has asked for modifications to the requirements. He suggested alternate ways to approve it, but based on his last statement he is not opposed to what Staff is proposing. We are putting them together and he had asked Staff to break them up and look at dentist offices separately. Our opinion is that both of them are still similar enough and the research that we have done, other localities still consider them similar enough that we are putting them together and breaking it to the three hundred (300) square feet. We are also considering it similar to our existing office definition so if they close up and sell to another type of office we will not have parking issues. The numbers will just switch over. It does not create a non-conforming situation. Staff thinks it will be consistent across the board with what we are recommending.

Mr. Jennings asked would a different use of the property require an application for parking?

Mr. Gillie responded the use would be able to transfer because this would be the same as general office requirements. The requirements for general office and the dentist office would match. It will make it easier in the future for marketing purposes.

Mr. Griffith asked would it affect existing offices?

Mr. Gillie responded no.

Close the Public Hearing.

Mr. Laramore made a motion to approve Code Amendment Request PLCA2010000063 as submitted by Staff. Mr. Scarce seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 4-0 vote.

- 3. Code Amendment Request PLCA2010000064 requesting to amend Article 3T: Floodplain Overlay District (FP-O) of the Code of the City of Danville, Virginia, 1986 as amended, by adopting new floodplain regulations and maps in accordance with the National Floodplain Management Program.***

Mr. Gillie read the Staff Report.

Mr. Gillie stated Staff is requesting to convene a Special Meeting which can be called. We are in the process of sending out the post cards. We had hoped to have them all sent out last Friday but there was a problem with one of our machines and they did not all go out. Approximately half of them went out last Friday and the other half will go out either today or tomorrow notifying property owners that your property may be impacted. Just because you receive a post card does not mean that your building will flood, it may mean that only a small portion of your property is impacted or it could mean the entire property is impacted. As part of that, we have maps available here at City Hall. You can also go to the National Flood Insurance website, www.floodsmart.gov for more information. Danville is not the only locality that has to adopt this, Pittsylvania County does, Altavista, Gretna, basically everyone in Virginia is going through this process. We need to adopt these maps by September 29, 2010 to maintain standing in the program, so it is important that we hold this Public Hearing and make recommendations to approve those maps. That is why we are scheduling a Special Meeting on August 23, 2010 because of the importance. We wanted to make sure that any citizen impacted could come down and look at the maps. Some properties, the elevation went up, so you are more likely to get flooded; other properties the elevation went down and you are less likely to get flooded. So if you receive a card and you have questions, please contact us at City Hall or go onto the website and look up that information.

Open the Public Hearing.

Mr. Griffith asked were there pieces of property that are no longer in the floodplain?

Mr. Gillie responded there were pieces of property that are no longer in the floodplain.

Mr. Griffith asked are these people being notified?

Mr. Gillie responded they are not being notified that they have been taken out of the floodplain.

Mr. Griffith stated I am thinking that those people whose property is no longer in the floodplain and are currently carrying flood insurance, may need some notification that they may not be required to carry the insurance.

Mr. Gillie stated we have not looked at that process because we had about four hundred (400) additional properties that came into the floodplain. The number that went out was very small. I would probably guess less than twenty (20). We can go back and try to find those that came out of the floodplain. We have had some technical issues with the new floodplain maps in matching them up with our current system. The study they have done this time is much more detailed than what was done previously. We have additional areas, especially those on Arnett Boulevard, that are completely new. We can try and find those that have been taken out, but we would much rather notify someone that is potentially in the floodplain. It is not a bad idea to carry flood insurance even if you are taken out of the floodplain. These are studies on what they anticipate that water will do. If you get a storm larger than what they envision then your property may still flood. If you are carrying it now it does not hurt to carry it. We would rather someone who is not carrying the insurance to get it as opposed to someone carrying it getting rid of it.

Mr. Griffith asked is Staff's recommendation that we have a Planning Commission meeting on August 23, 2010 to have public input?

Mr. Gillie responded yes.

Mr. Griffith asked would this still go to Council on their September 7, 2010 meeting?

Mr. Gillie responded it will probably go to the September 21, 2010 meeting.

Mr. Griffith asked do they have to be adopted by September 29, 2010?

Mr. Gillie responded correct.

Mr. Griffith asked can we fit all of this into that time frame?

Mr. Gillie responded yes. We are scheduling this for a Work Session with City Council to let them know and also getting the word out as best we can to all of the property owners. We have to adopt these. We do not have a choice. The Federal Government said here it is, you are going to adopt it. So while they are going through the process, we want people to know you are going to be impacted by this whether you want to be or not. There is not a lot of dispute that can go on regarding these maps. In order for the City to maintain its standing, we have to go through this process. There is no choice in the September 29, 2010 adoption date.

Mr. Griffith asked was the Public Hearing today advertised and in the paper?

Mr. Gillie responded yes it was advertised. We wanted to in effect, get the word out as much as we possibly could. We advertised for the adoption today, and then we went back and decided to go ahead and mail the post cards to people letting them know their property is impacted. Most of the properties, about eight or nine hundred (800 or 900) of them were already impacted previously. It is just the additional property owners that are being impacted based on this new study. Their properties were still subject to flooding and a lot of them probably already knew that their properties flooded in the past. In the past the maps did not show it. The City went through and did some revised studies years ago when they did the storm water retention basin up on the corner of Orchard in Nor Dan because they were having flooding problems from the creek that runs up Arnett Boulevard. Those folks are aware of it, but now it shows on the floodplain maps. We just wanted to make sure we covered every basis that we could.

Mr. Griffith stated according to Staff we have three (3) options. We can either convene a Special Meeting on August 23, 2010 to have a Public Hearing on this, we can recommend approval as submitted, or not have a Public Hearing.

Mr. Griffith called for a motion.

Mr. Jennings asked do we have to have a Public Hearing?

Mr. Gillie responded from Staff's perspective, we feel we should. We put the ads in the newspaper like we are supposed to, but when you read that you say ok the City is adopting new Floodplain Maps and new Floodplain Ordinance. If you do not get that postcard stating that your property is being impacted and possibly your mortgage company may require you to have flood insurance, those are things someone may not know. We want to make sure we get the word out. Reading the advertisement in the newspaper may not get your attention. We are hoping by sending out the postcards, more people are going to get involved. This is not something people have much choice on, but we want to get the word out and that is why we feel you should have another Public Hearing once we have been able to get all of the postcards delivered. This will give us a chance to show them the maps, talk to them about it, and let them find out more about the program.

Mr. Jennings asked do you need a motion?

Mr. Griffith responded yes either to have a Public Hearing, recommend approval as is, or to recommend any changes, which I do not know that we can really change anything.

Mr. Gillie stated you can change the wording of the Ordinance if you do not like the way the words and the text is, other than that we are pretty much stuck with what the Government says.

Mr. Jennings made a motion to convene a Special Meeting of Planning Commission on August 23, 2010. Mr. Laramore seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 4-0 vote.

II. ITEMS NOT FOR PUBLIC HEARING

1. Request for a waiver from the requirement to install a paved driveway for an industrial use in accordance with Article 8, Section B (6) (b) at 202 Stinson Drive.

Mr. Gillie read the staff report.

There were no questions.

Mr. Laramore made a motion to approve the Waiver Request as submitted. Mr. Jennings seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 4-0 vote.

III. MINUTES

Mr. Jennings made a motion to approve the minutes from the July 12, 2010 meeting. Mr. Scarce seconded the motion. The minutes were approved by a 4-0 vote.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Gillie stated Council approved the Rezoning request on Wimbush Drive last month. They also adopted the guidelines for the Historic District changes. The Special Use Permit request that Planning Commission recommended was withdrawn by the applicant prior to City Council. They have lost their potential funding for that facility so they decided not to go through with that.

Mr. Gillie stated the Comprehensive Plan is proceeding. We are still receiving comments from the imaginedanville.org website and the danville2030.org website. If anyone is interested in giving their comments, please visit those websites and fill out the surveys. We have been getting a lot of information back which is surprising because only one (1) person showed up for the public meeting. We have already received over four hundred (400) electronic surveys. People are really using the new types of media to get their word out. If you are at home watching this and you want to put your two cents into the Comprehensive Plan, go to the Imagine Danville website, fill out the survey, and get some information to us.

Mr. Scarce asked are there going to be any more meetings regarding that?

Mr. Gillie responded yes, we are still going to have public meetings. We will be gathering public input through the websites, probably until the end of the year. We are going to the school system starting the first of the year. We are going to pass out some information to the schools to try and get them involved along with parents and other citizens. The public meetings are going to occur sometime in the spring of next year. We will go back out to everybody, but we are receiving good

input from the website. Good, bad, ugly comments, whatever you want to say, please get on the website and let us know.

Mr. Scarce asked are you going to give us any kind of feedback on what we are receiving?

Mr. Gillie responded yes. We are still compiling them. We get a couple every day. They are all anonymous, so if you are concerned that we here at City Hall know what you are saying and you do not want to tell us exactly how you feel, please be brutally honest with us. We have blocked out any way for us to track where they are coming from. We just want to know what you think. There are questions on the economy, questions on neighborhoods, parks and recreation, and every other aspect of the City. Please comment and let us know what you think. We are looking for any input that we can get.

Mr. Griffith stated there are several sections that you can fill out. You can fill out as much of or as little of it as you would like. They are mostly yes or no questions, check your preference, or rate one (1) thru five (5) your preferences, likes, and dislikes. I have gone through all of the different sections and it is very simple if you have access to a computer.

Mr. Griffith asked is there anything in the newspaper publicizing the website?

Mr. Gillie responded we can talk to them again about publicizing the website. They have been very good to work with on getting the word out. We have been going out to various civic groups and speaking and passing the cards out; the cards are available at different places just so people will remember what the website is. If you do not have access to a computer, there are public access terminals at the library and various places. Just because the survey has ten (10) questions, you do not have to answer all ten (10). The more information you give us the better off we all are, but if you just want to tell us the good and the bad that is fine.

Mr. Griffith stated there were some questions where I had no feeling one way or the other. I just skipped those questions and went on to answer something that I did have a preference for.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:56 p.m.

APPROVED