

Mr. Gibbs: Next item on the agenda is PZO-2014-12 requested by Paul J. Hogan, PE, Councilman, District IV for an ordinance to amend the Code of Ordinances, Appendix A, Sec. VI.C.[IV.] C-3., 1.c.Special permit uses to provide that approval of special permits for barrooms, night clubs, lounges and dancehalls shall require a supporting resolution of the Council. Mr. Hogan.

Mr. Hogan: Thank you Mr. Chairman. This one follows along the same logic. If someone has a residential property next to C-3 and in the middle of all this residential property, they can come to this Commission and get a barroom put next to their house or a night club or a lounge. With those activities being such high intensity, that should be a decision in the end should be ultimately be placed upon the elected representative of that community. These examples that I have here you have the list of those that already require a supporting resolution and some of those that do require a supporting resolution are less intensive than these. So adding these to those that do require a supporting resolution is in order and I ask for your support.

Mr. Gibbs: Can I ask a question on this one too please. Just for the record.

Mr. Hogan: Yes sir.

Mr. Gibbs: I'm not real sure I can think of a scenario where we would all agree to a barroom in a residential area. We just had it come in front of us and it failed miserably. #2 if we did vote for that, it still has to come in front of you guys and you have the ultimate say.

Mr. Hogan: No it don't, just yall.

Mr. Gibbs: That's fine. I just know that this group, it would have to be so compelling for us to even think about putting a barroom in a residential area that again, these ordinances are killing me.

Mr. Hogan: I can tell you that they will be coming back before you get off of this Commission.

Mr. Gibbs: I'm sure of that, you and I are going to be together for another couple of years.

Mr. Hogan: Yes.

Mr. Gibbs: You got it. Thank you Mr. Hogan. This is a public hearing for PZO-2014-12 is there anyone else in the audience that care to speak for or against?

Mr. Foster: I see everyone's point, I see Paul's point I see your point, the point that we have to look at we now have a good board, will it always be this way? Will we always have people that look out for the people or people that will do what we think is right or in the future what will we have? I kind of see both points on this one. It's just not now, we have to look at what we're going to do in the future.

Mr. Gibbs: Mr. Foster and I totally understand what you're saying, we're asked to be on here at the pleasure of our Councilman or Councilwoman. I put a lot of credence in the Council person that appoints us, because they've been elected by the constituents in their district and they're well thought of or should be, then we're going to be reasonably confident that they are going to appoint somebody on the Commission that probably have common ideas and would probably be a good person for this Commission. I just don't see it really going rogue like it's turning out to sound like this Commission would go rogue. I just don't see it.

Mr. Foster: Not this Commission.

Mr. Gibbs: Or the one's in front of us or the one's behind us. We've heard stories, but they are individual stories it wasn't the whole Commission. This thing has really gotten blown out of proportion. I'm sorry it just has. Anyway, this is a public hearing for PZO-2014-12 is there anyone else in the audience that care to speak in favor or against? Seeing none, cast your vote please.

YEAS: Loupe, Foster

NAYS: Gibbs, Booth, Frangella, Galliano

ABSENT: Pierre

Mr. Gibbs: That fails with Mr. Foster and Mr. Loupe voting yes.

---