CITY OF ALEXANDRIA Planning Division

Zoning Commission Meeting Vol. 2 December 4, 2017



Min-U-Script® with Word Index ORICIAIA

1	
2	
3	CITY OF ALEXANDRIA - PLANNING DIVISION
4	ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
5	
6	Before Lauren A. Denham, Certified Court
7	Reporter, at the Alexandria City Hall City
8	Council Chambers, 915 3rd Street, Alexandria,
9	Louisiana, on Monday, December 4, 2017,
10	beginning at 4:00 p.m.
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

APPEARANCES:

COMMISSIONERS:

JOE BETTY STERKX
JAY LYNCH
ELLIS SAYBE
CHAD SOPRANO
DAMON BERNARD

ALSO PRESENT:

DELORES BREWER RUTH BASCO ROBERT L. BUSSEY

SPEAKERS:

CHUCK JOHNSON GREGORY UPTON MICHAEL HANKINS JOSEPH FULLER

INDEX							
EXHIBITS:							
Exhibit 1	(Land	Use	Planning	Modification)			

```
1
    MR. SAYBE:
         All right, it's 4:00, welcome everyone to
2
    the meeting of the Alexandria Zoning
3
    Commission. For those of you who were not here
4
    last week, we had a meeting scheduled for
5
    November the 27th, which we had. About halfway
6
7
    through the meeting the City requested some
    additional time to introduce some additional
8
    exhibits and information. A motion was made
9
    and carried that we recess the meeting for one
10
    week to allow the City the opportunity to do
11
    that. So that's where we are now.
12
13
          The meeting is back in session but I would
14
    ask that we do a roll call, please.
15
    MS. BASCO:
16
          Okay. Mr. Soprano?
17
    MR. SOPRANO:
18
          Present.
19
    MS. BASCO:
20
          Mr. Bernard?
21
    MR. BERNARD:
22
          Present.
23
    MS. BASCO:
24
          Mr. Saybe?
25
     MR. SAYBE:
```

```
Present.
1
    MS. BASCO:
2
         Mr. Lynch?
3
    MR. LYNCH:
4
5
         Present.
    MS. BASCO:
6
         Mrs. Sterkx.
7
    MRS. STERKX:
8
         Here.
9
    MS. BASCO:
10
         We are in quorum.
11
    MR. SAYBE:
12
          Yes. You have Mr. George White is not
13
    present?
14
    MS. BASCO:
15
          Right.
16
17
     MR. SAYBE:
          Okay. There is only one item on the agenda
18
     today, there was only one item last week, and
19
     that's the application of GAEDA to re-zone the
20
     lots on Masonic Drive, I think there were four
21
     lots, from single family residential to C-1
22
     commercial nonalcoholic, so that's where we
23
           I thought what we'd do today is we'd pick
24
25
     it up and let the City introduce the
```

```
information they requested to be allowed to
1
    introduce after a period of time, then we'll
2
    allow the applicant, through either Mr. Moller,
3
    or Mr. Upton, or whoever you chose, a rebuttal.
4
    And after that we'll take it under
5
    consideration and the Commissioners may have
6
    some questions.
7
         I'll remind you if you'd like to speak, and
8
    everyone can speak, go to the podium, state
9
    your name and address for the record. Address
10
    the Commission, please, do not address each
11
    other that is hardly ever a good idea. Having
12
    said that, Mr. Johnson are you ready to go
13
14
    forward?
    MR. JOHNSON:
15
16
         Yes, sir.
    MR. SAYBE:
17
          Okay. Please do so.
18
    MR. JOHNSON:
19
          Mr. Saybe, in connection with the motion
20
     that was made at the last meeting, the City, at
21
22
     this time, would like to introduce a short
     report that we put together last week. Some of
23
24
     the members had expressed the need for some
     clarification or more additional information on
25
```

```
the City's position. So what we did is we put
1
    together a short report that outlines the
    entirety of our presentation today. It's
3
    pretty short, it's only about ten pages. There
4
    are also some pictures attached at the end and
5
    a copy of the resolution authorizing
6
7
    expropriation of the property by the Council,
    which was voted on at the last meeting, and at
8
9
    this time I'd like to make all of that a part of
10
    the record and submit it to the Board.
11
    MR. SAYBE:
12
          I think -- do you need to see that?
13
    COURT REPORTER:
14
         Yes, sir, thank you.
15
    MR. JOHNSON:
16
         We'll just make it in globo; is that okay?
17
    MR. SAYBE:
18
          Okay. Yes, sir.
19
    MR. JOHNSON:
20
          Just the one, everything's all attached.
21
    MR. SAYBE:
22
          Yes, sir. One question that I think is
    pertinent, this is the same information you
23
     emailed to the Commissioners?
24
     MR. JOHNSON:
25
```

```
That is correct. I mailed it on Friday --
1
2
    MR. SAYBE:
         Right.
3
    MR. JOHNSON:
4
         -- to all the Commissioners and the
5
    alternate so that they would have time over the
6
    weekend and today to study it and so it
7
    wouldn't take up as much time here.
8
    MR. SAYBE:
9
         Right. Okay. Do you want to do anything
10
    else, summarize any other points or anything
11
    else like that?
12
13
    MR. JOHNSON:
         No, sir.
14
15
    MR. SAYBE:
         Okay. Thank you. Anybody else would like
16
    to speak in support of this application on
17
    behalf of the City? Or not on behalf of the
18
    City but on behalf of the City's position?
19
20
    Okay. Mr. Moller or Mr. Upton, or whoever
    y'all want?
21
    MR. UPTON:
22
23
          I have just couple of comments and then Mr.
     Moller I think --
24
25
     MR. SAYBE:
```

Okay.

MR. UPTON:

-- there may be some other comments. I'm Greg Upton, 2001 MacArthur Drive, Alexandria, Louisiana. As y'all know, this is our fourth time up here on this application for re-zoning, I represent GAEDA, the Greater Alexandria Economic Development Authority. What I guess really is bringing us to this issue we have here is that GAEDA has been under contract for a year to sell the property to Mr. Hankins or his group and the only thing holding up the sale is the re-zoning at this point in time.

I'm not going to rehash all the points that have been rehashed at the last three meetings but I just did want to just bring up one point is that your job today is to consider whether it's appropriate to re-zone under the applicable criteria set forth in the City's Zoning Ordinance Chapter 28, Article 9, section 9.38 or 9.3.8. It's not your job to recommend against re-zoning simply because you don't believe a Family Dollar should be built there. It's your job to look at the criteria established by law and to faithfully and

dutifully apply those criteria.

1

3.

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Last week a document was brought up that was called the THINKAlex Land Use Plan, and if you look at the criteria set forth in the ordinance there's two words that come out. is you have to look at it's whether the rezoning is consistent with the master land use plan, including the future land use plan and any other adoptive plans. I went back and I pulled offline all 500 and whatever pages of the THINKAlex plan and if you look in the executive summary it states in the second paragraph that each planning unit contains land uses that make essential goods and services accessible to residents. It reduces the necessity for traversing major arteries for frequent trips. Putting the access of essential goods and services closer to the residents will reduce accidents and create more integrated self sustained neighborhoods. Residents do prefer smaller scaled neighborhood level commercial and institutional uses close to homes. And that's all this is, it fits exactly within that criteria established in the THINKAlex.

Then the next criteria is compatibility and the code reads that the re-zoning must be compatible with the proposed district with the character of the neighborhood, including existing zoning and actual uses of adjacent and nearby properties. Well, it's clear in this area we're looking at commercial properties, and I don't want to say anything good about any of the commercial property, but this would be a Million Dollar investment in commercial property that I would suggest would be an improvement to that corridor.

So essentially the only other thing the THINKAlex says about, that I could find, about Masonic Drive is that it's to redevelop the areas across from the zoo. And then they have a future plan there about redeveloping the area and one of the things you see in that corridor is neighborhood businesses on Masonic Drive. So all I say is, as the applicant I think our application is consistently -- is consistent with the long range plan of the City and GAEDA would ask that y'all approve the application for re-zoning.

```
Thank you, Mr. Upton.
1
    MR. UPTON:
2
3
         Thank you.
    MR. SAYBE:
4
         Mr. Moller, would you like to speak?
5
    MR. HANKINS:
6
         I can.
7
    MR. SAYBE:
8
         Mr. Hankins?
9
    MR. HANKINS:
10
         Yeah, please. Good afternoon, Michael
11
12
    Hankins, 419 Alamo Street, Lake Charles,
    Louisiana 70601. I just want to briefly touch
13
    back on the issues. The last time we had a
14
    slide presentation and the main points were, as
15
    Mr. Upton said, that most of the properties in
16
17
    this stretch have been -- they are almost all --
    have been re-zoned with this exact application
18
19
    and request. And secondly, there were 73
20
     signatures on a petition in favor of this re-
21
     zoning. And third was the financial
     ramifications which are a million and a half
2.2
23
     dollars the first year into the Alexandria
24
     economy along with a million dollars in taxes
     over the firm term of the lease that we have
25
```

signed.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I want to clear a few things up after hearing what the City attorney said last week, and then I haven't seen the packages here but I'll speak to a little bit of what he said last These ordinances that have been passed that are essentially what the City is standing behind to request a denial of the zoning are essentially ordinances that they have created in the past six months. June 20th, I believe, was the first meeting where the ordinance was passed to allow a city to enter into negotiations for the property, at that point we had already been under contract for six months. So I just wanted to clear that up that those were not -- these are not ordinances that have been on the books, these are new ordinances that came about because of our zoning offer we had, zoning application.

Just to go through a little bit of the process, our first meeting was, I believe, back in February or March. Two hours prior to that meeting we were notified that it was -- there was going to be a request for us to pull our application. After a vote on this Board we were

able to have our application heard and we went back and changed, from input from the meeting, we went back and changed our application from a C-2 request to a C-1 request. So we've worked with the City and we will continue to do so to deal with any concerns that are, you know, legitimate and viable through the process.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Last month, six weeks ago, our zoning application was pulled for an unexplained The explanation was that they wanted to reason. talk some more about this with us and see if something -- somebody could come up with some sort of resolution, but no one contacted myself or Mr. Moller about some sort of resolution to this, so basically nothing happened. It seems like there's been a lot of stalling and delaying and we're just -- it's unfortunate that it's happened this way. Just last week I tried to call the City attorney, we had a brief conversation before it really didn't get into anything before he had to get off the phone and take another call, never got a call back.

So this has kind of been the pattern a little bit is, you know, lack of communication, misrepresenting things, it's been unfortunate

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and frankly I've done business all over the state and, you know, major metro to small towns, big parishes, small parishes, and frankly I've never been treated like this. It's a -- it's -- and the sense is we don't want you here in Alexandria and we're going to do everything we can to block your project. So that's kind of where I'm coming from when we, you know, have these conversations.

I understand the City's desire to redevelopment the Masonic Corridor, I think it's admirable, I think it's the right thing to The mayor asked me up to his office after the June 20th meeting and we had a long discussion about what could possibly be done to come up with a solution for everybody. Unfortunately we didn't get to a resolution; however, after that meeting he asked me what I thought about Lake Charles' efforts to do the same for the downtown area. He explained to me that he thought they had done a wonderful job. I told him that I thought while it was beautiful there had been no private development and that's what the City of Lake Charles was seeking. And if the City of Alexandria is

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

looking to emulate prospects, I think that's what they need to look to as far as private development. You can spend all the public money you want but at some point you have to stop spending money and let the private sector take over, and so that's what we're hoping to do here.

Another thing that concerns me about the City's position is this plan seems to contradict -- this plan for a parking lot and a pedestrian bridge seems to contradict a lot of things they've said. The parking area, we've been told that the building -- they want the buildings pushed to the front so the parking's in the back to create a smart road type situation, then we're talking about a pedestrian bridge over the road. A pedestrian bridge, you know, first is going to cost hundreds of thousands of dollars, perhaps millions of dollars. It's not a viable -- I hope that's not the plan because it's not a viable plan. To get 18 feet off the ground like you have to with a pedestrian bridge you're going to need 216 feet of ramp to get up to that height so that you are ADA compliant.

don't know how that would work, it just would be impossible. So that's not really a viable alternative for this property, and even it was they still need to seek re-zoning.

I've also had -- I've also been contested on the zoning by Mr. Kramer, a neighbor down the road with the funeral home, and while I respect his opinion he was also up here five years ago asking for that same re-zoning. The SPARC redevelopment, all these things, were still a hot button at that time and yet his re-zoning was granted while mine has obviously run into significant issues, so I can't help but wonder why.

Expropriation has been something that is now being pushed by the City, expropriation of the property, and what I would say to that is that is not something for you-all, I guess, to consider tonight. Expropriation will happen whether you vote for this zoning variance or not. For this zoning change or not. They can come in and expropriate the property and if that's what they want to do, that's what they'll do. The City can, you know, from their perspective can still get this property. I

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

don't think that that's necessarily going to happen and that's why I'm asking for you to pass the zoning variance so that we can start moving with our project, and if tomorrow they start moving forward with expropriations then so be it, then that's the case. But, you know, that's not something that has to be decided from you all that is part of the City's stuff.

I want to touch again on what Mr. Upton said. The role here is not to pick winners or losers, it's not to fulfil the administration's agenda, the role is to decide whether we conform to the zoning requirements for the zoning change as laid out. And also it's important to remember there are also state statutes about what a zoning board variance can do, essentially the state gives the city a right to determine requirements for zoning, for heights, for buffer yards, for all these things. However they require that if there is a board such as yourselves that you are -- that your decisions can be reviewed, and let me read the exact statute: "Shall be subject to judicial review on the grounds of abusive discretion, unreasonable exercise of the police powers and

excessive use of the power granted, and the 1 2 denial of due process." So what that's saying is you have to take 3 these things dispassionately and as per the 4 facts, not because the City has a plan that 5 they've had in place for a long time and now 6 they want to move forward with this and therefore we're going to take this property 8 away from a private developer who's trying to 9 buy it and do a project there. You know, we 10 talk about a lot these days about the government 11 and, you know, overreach and how big should the 12 13 government be and I think this a prime example 14 of an overreach from the administration's 15 position. So that's all I have for you today 16 and I can certainly answer any questions. 17 MR. SAYBE: All right. Could you tell me about the 18 contract? You mentioned that you --19 20 MR. HANKINS: Uh-huh. 21 MR. SAYBE: 22 23 -- you had it under contract, but when did it go into contract and is it still under 24

25

contract?

```
MR. HANKINS:
1
         I don't know the exact date, December 15th,
2
    I believe, rings a bell.
3
    MR. UPTON:
4
         I believe it was December 15th.
5
    MR. SAYBE:
6
         Is it still under contract?
7
    MR. HANKINS:
8
         Yes, sir.
9
    MR. SAYBE:
10
         Okay. And it's conditioned upon these
11
12
    rules?
    MR. HANKINS:
13
         Yeah, so at the end of my due diligence
14
    period I stated that the property was not
15
    acceptable because the zoning and the -- GAEDA
16
    has the right to, or has to, either fix that or
17
     tell me that it can't be fixed and then I can
18
     decide to move on. So when the final decision
19
     is made from the City Council, at that point I
20
     can decide whether I want to move forward with
21
     the contract whether the zoning gets changed or
22
23
     not or whether I want to let the property go at
     that point, but I can close on the property
24
     tomorrow if I decided to.
25
```

```
MR. SAYBE:
1
         Had the zoning you needed?
2
    MR. HANKINS:
3
         Excuse me?
4
    MR. SAYBE:
5
         If you had the zoning you needed --
6
7
    MR. HANKINS:
         Even without the zoning I needed I can close
8
9
    on the property tomorrow.
    MR. SAYBE:
10
         Okay. So you're in your due diligence
11
    period and what you're trying to determine is
12
    whether or not the zoning is appropriate, so I
13
    mean that's why you're still in your due
14
    diligence period?
15
    MR. HANKINS:
16
          Yes, sir. Mr. Upton can probably speak a
17
     little better to this but I have -- we are
18
     through our due diligence period and I have
19
20
     declared some issues that GAEDA now has a
     responsibility to either resolve or tell me
21
22
     they can't resolve. And that's what we're going
     through the process here of, of them either
23
     coming back and saying "Look, it's resolved,
24
25
     we've got the" -- this is GAEDA's application --
```

```
"we've got the zoning change done therefore
1
    you're good to go, " or "No, we can't get the
2
    zoning changed done, it's on you, do you still
3
    want to buy the property?"
4
    MR. SAYBE:
5
         Got you. The reason for my questions are in
6
7
    Mr. Johnson's submission there's a statement,
    and I'm going to ask him about it in a minute,
8
9
    it says "The stakeholders should note the
    current purchase agreement does not require a
10
    sale." That's in the footnote and that confused
11
    me, I thought this was all about a contract.
12
13
    But anyway, I'll get Mr. Johnson to translate it
    and --
14
15
    MR. JOHNSON:
16
          I can address that right now.
    MR. SAYBE:
17
18
          I'll let you come back, Mr. Hankins, if you
    have any --
19
20
    MR. HANKINS:
          Yes, sir.
21
    MR. SAYBE:
22
23
          -- have anything else.
24
    MR. JOHNSON:
          There's also a provision in the contract,
25
```

```
Mr. Saybe, and I don't have a copy of the actual
1
    contract in front of me, but it states that if
2
    for some reason GAEDA is not able to deliver
3
    title to the property because of some
4
5
    governmental reason or regulation, et cetera,
    then there is no contract. We are at that stage
6
7
    now. If you change the zoning of this property
    GAEDA still can't give him title to it because
8
    we're going to expropriate. The next day after
9
    he purchases it we will take it for a public
10
    purpose. And beyond the fact that -- and I told
11
12
    you at the last meeting and I don't want to
    rehash what I said yesterday and I don't want to
13
14
    respond to or insinuate insults like you heard
    Mr. Hankins do, GAEDA's mission under Title 33
15
    requires it to work with the City for
16
    redevelopment purposes. It's R.S. 33:2740.60.
17
18
    Quote --
    MR. SAYBE:
19
          I think you said 60C?
20
    MR. JOHNSON:
21
22
          60C, I'm sorry, "Provides specifically that
    GAEDA" --
23
    MR. SAYBE:
24
25
         When I looked at that paragraph it wasn't
```

exactly -- I think it was somewhere in the 1 statute but go ahead. 2 3 MR. JOHNSON: GAEDA is an economic arm of the City, they 4 should never be hostile with the City or adverse 5 to the City on a redevelopment question inside 6 the City of Alexandria, that's my point. We 7 would call for a question if --8 MR. SAYBE: 9 One second here. Mr. Hankins, did you want 10 to talk? 11 12 MR. HANKINS: Yeah, I just wanted to say real quickly, the 13 contract -- currently no expropriation has been 14 started, has been, you know, that's a whole long 15 I don't understand the contract to say 16 process. just because the City has declared that they 17 could possibly expropriate that that will not 18 allow them to declare fair title, I don't -- I 19 think that's very much not the case. 20 MR. SAYBE: 21 Okay. Well, actually I was almost hesitant 2.2 to answer questions about the contract but it 23 24 was a puzzle me because I thought that's why we

all ended up where we are, but I understand -- I

25

```
think I understand it's different views of the
1
    contract. But it is under contract to be sold
2
3
    MR. HANKINS:
4
         Yes.
5
    MR. SAYBE:
6
         -- at least right now?
7
    MR. JOHNSON:
8
         Could I read the section to you?
9
    MR. SAYBE:
10
         Yes, but let's let Mr. Hankins finish.
                                                    Are
11
    you finished, Mr. Hankins?
12
    MR. HANKINS:
13
         Yeah, I'm finished.
14
15
    MR. SAYBE:
16
          Okay.
    MR. JOHNSON:
17
          This is on Page 6 of the contract, Section
18
     19, it says "Sellers closing contingency.
19
     Buyer is aware that seller is a political
20
     subdivision of the State of Louisiana and
21
22
     therefore this sale is subject to certain
     procedures, rules, and regulations not
23
24
     applicable to transactions between private
25
     parties. Buyer is aware that seller cannot
```

legally transfer the property and therefore is 1 2 not obligated to sell the property until all procedures, rules, and regulations applicable 3 to the transaction are fully satisfied. 4 In the 5 event the procedures, rules, and regulations applicable to the transaction cannot be fully 6 satisfied, seller shall give buyer notice of its inability to satisfy the procedures, rules, 8 9 and regulations at which time this agreement 10 shall terminate and buyer will be entitled to return of the deposit." 11 12 MR. SAYBE: 13 That's pretty normal but what I'm trying to 14 figure out, and really it's not up to us to determine whether there's a contract or not. 15 16 MR. JOHNSON: 17 Correct. MR. SAYBE: 18 19 We're just here to make a decision about 20 whether the application for re-zoning is 21

whether the application for re-zoning is
compatible with the area. I just had to ask the
question because of the statement about
"Stakeholder should note that current purchase
agreement does not require sale." It was more a
curiosity than anything else because we don't

```
have any authority over that nor do I think we
1
    should be overly concerned with it.
2
         Anyone else would like to speak in
3
    opposition? Mr. Fuller, would you?
4
    MR. FULLER:
5
         Opposition to the City?
6
    MR. SAYBE:
7
         I'm sorry?
8
    MR. FULLER:
9
         You're saying in opposition to the City,
10
    right?
11
    MR. SAYBE:
12
         Yes, we're in the opposition part.
13
14
    MR. FULLER:
                  Thank you. Thank you very much, my
15
          Right.
    name is Joseph Fuller. I stay at 3512 Royal
16
     Drive, Alexandria, Louisiana. I just want to
17
     come to you today and say to you we definitely
18
     got to have some changes in how we operate this
19
     city. This group of Family Dollar already got
20
     three stores in Alexandria, they not nobody
21
     just walk off the street. And I've been
22
     fortunate enough I've been visiting those other
23
              The people are using those stores.
24
     stores.
25
     They are walking to those stores and they are
```

walking back and they are buying those goods. 1 For Alexandria to continue to grow we got to do 2 the right thing. We send a message out that we 3 are expropriating property from private people, 4 we're not going far. And this zoning board, 5 it's up to you to stand up for what you got to 6 do. All they asking is a zoning change, which the other two properties had came in before, 8 they -- it's -- it fit the neighborhood and you 9 got over 60 people that done signed it that live 10 in the neighborhood. You know my only problem 11 is it's four or three votes and Mr. Silver, 12 who's in the district, is against it. He been 13 against it since day one. 14 My thing to you is this, let's do what's 15 right. Let's send the right message. If they 16 17 want to expropriate the property let them do it but let it fall on them, not on you. 18 MR. SAYBE: 19 20 Thank you, Mr. Fuller. Yes, sir. MR. MOLLER: 21 22 Good evening, I'm Clifford Moller, Executive Director of the Greater Alexandria 23 Economic Development Authority, 201 Johnson 24 25 Street, 6th floor.

At our last meeting I distributed to the 1 Commissioner's president three documents. One 2 of them was dated January 3, 2008 that was 3 addressed to Ms. Katie McGills, and in that document we offered this property to the City of 5 Alexandria for Six Hundred and Ninety-Five 6 Thousand Dollars (\$695,000.00). That's how 7 much money GAEDA had in the property at the 8 March 19, 2009 we offered this property 9 to the Alexandria Zoo. The letter was addressed 10 to Ms. Lee Ann Whitt. March 17, 2011 we again 11 made another offer to the City to Ms. McGills, 12 and in that document we said this, "The value of 13 the property would be ascertained by an 14 15 independent appraiser who both the City of Alexandria and GAEDA would agree upon." 16 So over a period of years prior to the 2013 17 18 THINKAlex document, which I think is an outstanding document, our City did an 19 20 outstanding job in putting that plan together. I participated in it. I've been all in favor of 21 22 what goes on with the THINKAlex plan, but that

came subsequent to these documents where the City had an opportunity to purchase this

23

24

25

property. I'd like to also add, before we could

dispose of property, GAEDA having surplus properties, we would have to go through an exhaustive, exhaustive, notification program that gave notification to the world that we are selling this property.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We had to, in the last step of that process, in our board meeting, announce to the world that this property is up for sale, is there anyone interested in purchasing it. At that point anyone could have stepped forward, no one did, that is why we got to this point. We could not sell this property, we could not offer a contract to Mr. Hankins unless we went through that exhaustive process. We've crossed every T, we've dotted every I, we've given everyone an opportunity to have a shot at this property. We've cooperated with the City, we have never been in opposition to the City. Thirteen years we've cooperated with the City on many, many, many events. We've put hundreds of thousands of dollars into activities in conjunction with the City. We're not in opposition. We're only doing what our board has directed us to do and we've gone through all of the steps that were required, and anyone at anytime during that

process had the opportunity to object, to stop 1 2 it, so that something else could happen. I only say this, we -- whatever the outcome 3 we've only done what our board has asked us to 4 do. We've done the best job that we can. We've 5 done it to the best of our ability. It's not in 6 opposition and it's not in adversity, it's in just doing our job. Thank you very much. 8 MR. SAYBE: 9 Thank you, Mr. Moller. Anyone else would 10 like to speak in opposition or this is in 11 support, I'm sorry. Okay. Any questions 12 13 commissioners? Any discussion? Someone want to make a motion? We promised 14 15 them a vote and I want to deliver it today. 16 MRS. STERKX: 17 I'd like to --MR. SAYBE: 18 Somebody going to make a motion? I can't, 19 20 I'm the Chair, one way or the other. MR. BUSSEY: 21 22 Mr. Saybe, excuse me if I may, I think this 23 is a continuation of the meeting and I believe 24 there's a motion already on the floor, was there 25 not?

1 MR. SAYBE: I don't think there was a motion. 2 3 MR. SOPRANO: I had made a motion. 4 MR. SAYBE: 5 You did make a motion? 6 7 MR. SOPRANO: At the previous meeting I did. 8 MR. SAYBE: 9 But it wasn't seconded. It wasn't on the 10 floor. 11 MR. MOLLER: 12 It fell for lack of a second. 13 14 MR. SAYBE: Do you want to renew the motion or? 15 MR. MOLLER: 16 The motion passed to postpone the meeting. 17 MR. SOPRANO: 18 19 Right. 20 MR. BUSSEY: If I could say something, I'm not a voting 21 member or anything, but a lot of times 22 discussion amongst the board members will help 23 you clarify issues in your mind and clarify your 24 opinions. So if you have things that you want 25

to discuss, you want to do it openly and in 1 front of the --2 MR. SAYBE: 3 Oh, we can do it, we're here. 4 MR. BUSSEY: 5 -- public at this time, and that's what 6 Ellis is basically asking. Any discussion then 7 do it. And that's just the way the process is. 8 MR. BERNARD: 9 I would just like to say something. 10 understand everyone's hearing everyone's 11 position on this project and the -- before I --12 I am going to make a motion, before I make this 13 motion I just want to say I don't think GAEDA, 14 and I may be wrong in this, I don't think GAEDA 15 and the City's mission was ever to include a 16 dollar store in this project. And if we look at 17 present zoning and we go just by that, you know, 18 that property could be a couple of other things 19 if we look at the -- there's two businesses on 20 that same street and they can go either way. 21 And the business I'm thinking if it was to go in 22 that spot wouldn't be good either, and I don't 23 think -- I think that there's a Dollar General 24

that's less than two miles away and then less

25

than two miles from that there's a Family 1 Dollar. So I don't think that there needs to be 2 a dollar store on every corner and I do think, 3 I'm just going to express my opinion, I think 4 that dollar stores cheapen neighborhoods and 5 it's going to cheapen this neighborhood. 6 7 So I'm going to make a motion to deny the application. 8 MR. SAYBE: 9 Okay, it's been moved that the application 10 be denied. 11 MRS. STERKX: 12 I second. 13 MR. SAYBE: 14 15 A second by Mrs. Sterkx. All in favor signify by saying aye. 16 17 ALL PRESENT: 18 Aye. 19 MR. SAYBE: So that's four. Let's have a roll call vote 20 21 so we make sure that we got it correct, this has been going on long enough. Would you please? 22 23 MS. BASCO: 24 Sure. Mrs. Sterkx? 25 MRS. STERKX:

```
1
         Aye.
    MS. BASCO:
        Mr. Soprano?
3
    MR. SOPRANO:
4
5
         Aye.
    MS. BASCO:
6
         Mr. Bernard?
7
    MR. BERNARD:
8
         Aye. Yes.
9
    MS. BASCO:
10
         Mr. Saybe?
11
    MR. SAYBE:
12
          I'm Chair.
13
    MS. BREWER:
14
          I'm sorry. Mr. Lynch?
15
16
    MR. LYNCH:
          Aye.
17
    MR. SAYBE:
18
          Okay, so let the record reflect that the
19
     application's been recommended for denial by a
20
    vote of four to zero. Any other business?
21
          Okay, we have to review the minutes. I
22
     don't think we've done that. From the October
23
     or the March or whatever's the last --
24
     MS. BREWER:
25
```

```
I know I gave you -- there's been so many.
1
    I gave them to you last time, do you still have
2
3
    them?
    MR. SAYBE:
4
         I signed one set. We voted on it, that was
5
    from a previous one.
6
    MS. BREWER:
7
8
         The 27th? Okay.
    MR. SAYBE:
9
         We met on the 27th, let me find that.
10
                    (BOARD DISCUSSION)
11
12
    MS. BREWER:
          Okay, Mr. Saybe, the March 27th minutes
13
    were scheduled for October 30th, which we met.
14
    And --
15
    MR. SAYBE:
16
          But I signed some last -- was it not last
17
    week?
18
    MS. BREWER:
19
          It was the one --
20
     MR. SAYBE:
21
          Look at the -- do you have what went out
2.2
     scheduling the meeting for the 27th?
23
24
     minutes that I signed were attached to that.
25
     MS. BREWER:
```

```
I think I gave you the minutes out of this
1
    packet right here.
2
                      (BOARD DISCUSSION)
3
    MS. BREWER:
4
         He signed something last week.
5
    MR. SAYBE:
6
    Yeah, I gave you --
7
    MS. BREWER:
8
         I actually uploaded it on the website.
9
    MR. SAYBE:
10
         Here's the agenda for the 27th. Adoption of
11
    minutes from whatever the previous meeting was.
12
    I signed that, that's right. All right, so we
13
    don't have any minutes to sign?
14
    MS. BREWER:
15
          Correct.
16
    MR. SAYBE:
17
          All right. Our next set of minutes will be
18
     at the next meeting. The meeting of the 27th
19
     and this week.
20
     MS. BREWER:
21
22
          Correct.
23
     MR. SAYBE:
          All right, I got it straight in my head.
24
          All right, is there any other business,
25
```

r	
1	Commission? Okay, is there a motion to adjourn?
2	MR. SOPRANO:
3	Motion to adjourn.
4	MR. SAYBE:
5	Motion by Mr. Soprano.
6	MR. BERNARD:
7	Second.
8	MR. SAYBE:
9	Second by Mr. Bernard to signify we
10	adjourn. Folks, we have a motion to adjourn by
11	Mr. Soprano and a second by Mr. Bernard, so
12	we're going to vote. All in favor?
13	ALL PRESENT:
14	Aye.
15	MR. SAYBE:
16	Any opposed? All right, thank you.
17	MEETING CONCLUDED AT 4:45 P.M.
18	
19	
20	9 1 9 1 A
21	CHAIRPERSON
22	
23	
24	
25	