



**Town of Sullivan's Island, South Carolina
Planning Commission
Regular Meeting Minutes**

Wednesday, June 10, 2026

A Planning Commission Public Hearing was held at 4:00 pm, on Wednesday, June 10, 2026, in Town Hall at 2056 Middle Street. All requirements of the Freedom of Information Act were verified to have been satisfied.

Present: Manda Poletti (Chair), Charlie Cole, Gallia Coles, Hannah Dodson, Mark Howard, Garth Lynch, and Gary Visser.

Staff Members: Charles Drayton, Rebecca Fanning and Pam Otto

A. Call to Order: Chair Poletti called the meeting to order at 4:03 p.m.

B. Confirmation of Freedom of Information Act Requirements

It was stated the press and public were duly notified pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act requirements.

Public: There were three (3) members of the public present.

Media: There were no (0) members of the media present.

C. Approval of the Minutes from April 8, 2026

Motion was made by Charlie Cole, seconded by Hannah Dodson, to approve the April 8, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes, passed unanimously.

D. Public Input and Correspondence

- Tim Kelly, resident – reviewed some changes he would like to see to the ordinance before it is recommended to Council.
- Eric Dodson, resident – presented examples of seawalls that don't have buffers and do not appear to have negative effects on marshes and appear to show no scour. Stated an engineer will not certify or take liability and that would be on the homeowner. Also spoke about corrugated vinyl sheetpile as a preferred material for erosion control structures.

E. Public Hearing for proposed text amendments to Zoning Ordinance Sections 21-20 & 21-69

1. RS, Single-family residential, district uses, zoning ordinance subsections §21-20B. & D. – remove the prohibition for erosion control structures in the RS district, and create conditions wherein an erosion control structure may be permitted in the RS district.
2. RC-1 & RC-2, Recreation and Conservation, districts erosion control structure regulations, zoning ordinance section §21-69 – modify the regulations and conditions that govern the construction and repair of erosion control structures and provide separate regulations for the RC-1 and RC-2 district areas.

Director of Planning and Zoning Charles Drayton reviewed the history of the demand for ordinance change. He cited the policies and recommendations from the Comprehensive Plan and the Sea Level Rise & Resilience Plan. He went through the current ordinance as is and then reviewed the proposed changes, which includes removing the prohibition on erosion control structures (ECSs) in the RS, Residential, Zoning District, creating conditions for allowing ECSs in the RS District, creating a buffer area within the RC setback as a potential condition for the RS District ECSs, creating separate regulations for ECSs in the RC-1 and RC-2 Zoning Districts, creating conditions to allow the construction of new ECSs in the RC-2 District, removing the ban on repairing ECSs that have been damaged more than 50% in the RC-2 District, and adding environmentally-friendly BMPs, such as seawall tiles and toe protections are requirements for repairing existing ECSs or constructing new ECSs. He showed all the draft ordinance changes in a presentation. The Commission discussed the proposed amendments and asked Mr. Drayton and Director of Resilience and Natural Resource Management Rebecca Fanning questions.

Motion was made by Chair Poletti, seconded by Mark Howard, to amend 21-20 B. (7)(i)(bb) 1 in the RS District, an engineer-certified stormwater management plan to address the stormwater run-off of the property as described in Section 21-17, point source discharges should be located landward of the vegetated buffer whenever practical; alternative discharge locations may be approved where a South Carolina licensed Professional Engineer demonstrates that site conditions warrant an alternative design, passed unanimously.

Chair Poletti gave examples of when an alternative design may be necessary.

Motion was made by Chair Poletti, seconded by Hannah Dodson, to instead of “seaward” throughout the ordinances, that the proposed ordinance could say “tidal side,”

The floor was open to other vocabulary options.

Motion was amended by Chair Poletti, seconded by Hannah Dodson, to instead of “seaward,” the seaward side is the ocean side and the creek/marsh side will be considered the “marshward” side in 21-20 and 21-69, passed unanimously.

Motion was made by Chair Poletti, seconded by Hannah Dodson, to remove the language of seawall tiles as a requirement and change it to “strongly encouraged to use” on the seaward side in 21-29(C)(3)(A) RC-1 regulations, passed unanimously.

Chair Poletti gave her opinion on requiring seaward tiles, citing their weight and cost as a possible issue. She also stated the ordinance does not specify on coverage area.

Motion was made by Chair Poletti, seconded by Garth Lynch, to amend 21-69(D)(3)(A) in the RC-2 regulations, seawall tiles removed as a required condition, and changed to “encouraged to use,” passed unanimously.

Motion was made by Chair Poletti, seconded by Garth Lynch, to amend 21-69(D)(3)(C) to add to the list of materials vinyl and composite sheet pile finished and capped in natural or natural-like materials and colors, so that you don’t actually see the sheet pile, passed 6-1, with Gary Visser opposing.

Chair Poletti said an engineer she spoke to said it’s more expensive than a wood wall, but easier to put in. He also said vinyl doesn’t fail as often as wood or concrete walls. There was discussion about leaving the materials to the engineer’s decision, as well as how they look and work.

Motion was made by Chair Poletti, seconded by Hannah Dodson, to amend 21-69(E), to strike the last two lines and instead it that the “proposed structure is not expected to cause material adverse impacts to adjacent properties,” passed unanimously.

Chair Poletti said the engineer she spoke to stated that there should not be any issues with adjacent properties if designed correctly.

Motion was made by Chair Poletti, seconded by Garth Lynch, to send the proposed ordinance 21-20 as amended to Town Council with Planning Commissions recommendations for approval, passed unanimously.

Motion was made by Chair Poletti, seconded by Hannah Dodson, for the proposed 21-69 ordinance to be sent to Council with the amended changes from the Planning Commission, passed unanimously.

F. Report to Town Council regarding screening the Lift Stations

Mr. Drayton stated they are not able to find a suitable location to plant anything around the lift stations, so the Planning Commission does not recommend any changes to the current ordinances. Moveable structures and installing fake plants as options were discussed. Gary Visser and Mark Howard both support not planting or adding anything around the stations.

Motion was made by Garth Lynch, seconded by Hannah Dodson, to approve the recommendation as written, passed unanimously.

Chair Poletti thanked Mr. Drayton and Ms. Fanning for their research and help over the last two years with this issue.

G. Adjourn. There being no new business, nor further discussion, the meeting adjourned at approximately 5:18 p.m.

Motion was made by Gallia Coles, seconded by Mark Howard, to adjourn the meeting at 5:18 p.m., passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Pamela Otto, Planning Commission Staff



Manda Poletti, Chair

9.9.2026
Date

Pam Otto

From: Charles Drayton
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2026 2:03 PM
To: Tim Kelly; Pam Otto; Rebecca Fanning
Subject: RE: Erosion Control Ordinance

Good afternoon Tim,

First off, thank you for your patience! I have included responses (in **red**) to each of your questions embedded in the email below. I am happy to make time to meet with you and/or anyone that would like to discuss this matter further.

Best regards,

Charles

Charles Heyward Drayton | **Director of Planning and Zoning**

[Town of Sullivan's Island](#)

2056 Middle Street

Sullivan's Island, South Carolina 29482

T: 843.883.5752

cdrayton@sullivansisland.sc.gov

From: Tim Kelly <tkelly444@me.com>
Sent: Monday, April 20, 2026 4:24 PM
To: Pam Otto <POtto@sullivansisland.sc.gov>; Charles Drayton <CDrayton@sullivansisland.sc.gov>; Rebecca Fanning <Rfanning@sullivansisland.sc.gov>
Subject: Erosion Control Ordinance

CAUTION: > This email originated from outside the Town of Sullivan's Island. Do not click links or open attachments unless you have verified the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Town Staff,

After attending the presentation by Town's staff regarding the new ordinance for erosion control structures, I have spent some time considering the proposed language and talking with my neighbors about the circumstances. There is a group of us who have concerns and questions about the proposed ordinance, which need clarification before we can be certain of the meaning of the language. Although I understand the presentation was meant to explain the proposed options

residents have to protect their property from erosion, it was a lot to take in all at once. Quite simply, I am not clear as to what my options are for erosion protection. So, in this email I will present some ideas for consideration, and ask some simple questions. I request town staff to respond to the ideas, and to answer the questions based on the proposed ordinance language that will be the subject of the next Planning Commission public meeting. **Additionally, I would ask that you be willing to sit down with a few homeowners who share these concerns and discuss with us the practical application of the ordinance in real word situations that many of us will encounter, prior to May Planning Commission meeting. Further, I am respectfully asking that staff answer these questions within 5 business days from receipt of this email.** The purpose is so the residents most affected by the potential new ordinance have time to review these answers, ask more questions and decide how much they want to engage prior to the meeting in May. For myself and my neighbors, it is very important that the language give every potential opportunity for a homeowner to protect their property at the actual point of erosion, while not enduring undue "cost and burden" to that protection.

IDEAS REQUESTED FOR INCLUSION:

1. Request expanding the allowable materials used for erosion control structures and landscape walls to encompass any marine safe inert materials, such as *shoreguard*. (<https://www.cmilc.com/products/shoreguard-vinyl-sheet-piling>). As a reference, Shoreguard is widely used by the Army Corps of Engineers and the U.S. Dept. of Interior. **This may be discussed in the public hearing, but it has not been incorporated into the draft ordinance.**
2. In whichever ordinance is more appropriate, 21-69 or 21-20, request allowing residents bordering the RC2 Districts to protect their properties with hardened ECS's or Landscape Walls at their property lines. What homeowners want here is quite simple: the ability to protect their property edge from existing and future erosion.
3. For the numerous properties on Sullivans Island that have a current rock revetments in place, we request allowing the repair or replacement (with a hardened wall) of these structures - as has been consistently allowed for the last 30+ years. **Repair will still be allowed, and for the 1st time ever the ordinance is considering conditions for replacement.**
4. Remove buffer requirement, our useable lots are small enough as they are. Taking away up to 10 ft will leave many with little to no "yard." And as shown in the below pictures, the marsh seems very healthy without these buffers. **Buffers are widely required throughout the lowcountry and are considered a BMP for marsh management.**
5. Under proposed 21-69(E), it is a big ask for an engineer to certify for all time that the structure will never adversely impact other properties. Can this section be modified to exempt certification for extreme weather events and as mandatory suggested in the last meeting to not require it for repair projects for barriers that have already been in place and working effectively? **It has been modified to only require the engineer approval for new constructions and repairs over 50%.**

RC2 DISTRICT QUESTIONS:

The following questions are a big area of concern and uncertainty for the affected homeowners and we would like to discuss specific examples with you.

1. Many residents have existing rock revetments at their property lines that extend marsh-ward beyond their property lines and thus into the RC2 District, but not into the critical area. The revetment

lies, therefore, in a gap between private property and the critical line.) The gap areas for some of these properties are owned by TOSI, and some are owned by the State.

a. Can they repair that revetment? Yes, with the consent of the owner. Who would approve that? The Town issues permit for work within our jurisdictional boundaries. All permitted work requires prior consent from the property's owner. In the cases where the Town owns that land, we would be able to issue the permit provided the requested work met the conditions of our ordinance and the Town Council (or an entity (presumably staff) authorized to act on Council's behalf) approved the work on the Town property. In the case where the land is held in public trust by the state, state consent/permitting/involvement may be required.

b. Can they replace that revetment with a better, more dependable, bulkhead or vertical wall similar to the one at 1460 Thompson or almost all the homes near Breech Inlet? The current draft of the ordinance would allow for the replacement of a revetment located in the RC-2 District with a new erosion control structure, including bulkheads or vertical walls meeting the following conditions:

- (a) Seawall tiles shall cover the seaward face of any vertical walls which have more than 18 inches of exposure,
- (b) Intertidal shelving shall be added at the base of any vertical wall; intertidal shelving solutions shall take the form of a rock toe, rip rap stabilization, coir logs, oyster bank (similar to a living shoreline), stepped wall (the rises and runs shall not exceed eight (8) inches), or gabion baskets (cages). A living shoreline (permitted separately by BCM) may be used in substitution for the intertidal shelving requirement,
- (c) Materials shall be limited to natural products, including but not limited to: wood, coir matting, shell, rock, and calcium carbonate enriched cement,
- (d) Rock revetments shall have a slope no steeper than 2:1, and earthen berms shall have a slope no steeper than 3:1, and
 - (i) A filter layer must be included underneath the armoring material of a revetment to assure drainage and retention of underlying soil,
 - (ii) erosion control fabric of natural materials, such as but not limited to coir matting, are required in earthen berm installation to prevent erosion until plant materials have established
- (e) Marsh restoration (permitted separately by BCM) shall be required for all portions of the critical area that are disturbed by the erosion control structure work,

Who would approve that? When the work location is in the RC-2 District, it would require owner consent and Town permit approval and if encroaching into the critical area, there would be the need for a DES permit as well.

c. Can they skim the revetments like many on Conquest and Star of the West have done? Who would approve that? Skim coating seems to be a fraught practice, while we may allow it as a minor maintenance activity based upon the circumstances, there is evidence that undermining erosion is a concern for the safety and long-term efficacy of the treatment.

d. If these repairs, replacements or skimming is not allowed, what options does the resident have to protect their property when the revetment, even in an undamaged state, isn't working? ? I suppose the case in which this is relevant could occur where the revetment is under the Department of Administration's control and that office does not respond or does not condone any proposed activity. At that point the homeowner would need to consider the new solutions the Town is offering on the private property side, in the RS District.

2. In the 21-68(B) description of the RC2 area, the landward edge is stated as the SI platted property, or the critical line, whichever line includes more area in the RC2. Assuming a resident's property line is landward of the critical line, does this mean that a resident's property line is within the RC2, The resident's property line landward of the critical line would not be in the RC-2 District; it would either

set the RS-RC-2 boundary or if there was another intervening property line between the critical line and the subject property then the property line would be in the RS District. such that the new ordinance would allow an ECS vertical wall to be placed on the property line? Short answer, yes. The proposed amendment to allow ECS in the RS district would allow a landscape wall with an exposure no higher than 18 inches above grade; if the property line is located in the RC District setback area additional conditions would apply for a landscape wall in that location:

- Engineer-certified stormwater management plan to address the stormwater run-off of the property, per Section 21-17, and any point source discharge of stormwater must be located on the landward side of the vegetated buffer,
- Inclusion of a ten (10)-foot wide vegetated buffer between the landscape wall and the critical line; on properties where the existing conditions have the principal building located in the RC-District setback, then the vegetated buffer shall equal one third (1/3) of the distance from nearest encroaching element of the principal building to the critical line,
- Landscape plan for buffer area limited to plants native to the South Carolina coast, no turf grass except for pathways, and tree plantings consistent with Estuarine Ecosystem species as described in the [Sullivan's Island Native Tree Guide](#),
- No more than two (2) pathways (limited to six and a half (6.5) feet in width) may bisect the buffer area to gain recreational access to the critical area

3. Can residents build a new revetment or wall at their property line if their property line is landward of the critical line? Revetments are not considered as solutions within the RS District, but landscape walls (as discussed in the answer to Question 2, above), earthen berms, and other non-hardened ECSs would be permissible.

a. If yes, what conditions are associated with this? The conditions for landscape walls are stated in the response to Question 2, and the conditions for earthen berms and other non-hardened ECSs are:

(ii) Earthen berms:

(aa) Limited to eighteen (18) inches above natural existing grade on the toe of the landward side of the berm and twenty-four (24) inches above natural existing grade on the toe of the seaward side of the berm, and

(bb) Maintain a slope that is no greater than 3:1, and

(iii) Other non-hardened erosion control measures:

(aa) Exposure of any vertical wall does not exceed 18 inches above natural existing grade,

(bb) Constructed from natural materials

b. If not, what is the reason behind this limitation? Most of what is being requested is allowed to be built and as for the revetments, If a resident wanted to add rocks along a slope on their property they would likely not need permission from the Town. However, there are ordinances that would prevent a homeowner from removing soil from the property to create a new grade, which I do not think would be anyone's interest, but the earthen berm could be created and armored with revetment style rocks.

RS DISTRICT QUESTIONS:

1. What materials are allowed for a landscape wall? Materiality was not considered for the landscape walls located in the RS District.

2. Residents want to prevent erosion at their property lines. How can a resident protect the outermost edge of their property from erosion if the critical line is less than 10 feet from their property line?

There are a number of solutions that a homeowner can consider that do not even require a permit: planting strong-rooted, salt tolerant vegetation will stabilize the ground, placing filter fabric matting with rocks on top will hold the soil in place; coir logs, gabion cages, and oyster bags can be placed to dampen the wave or tidal energy so that erosion does not occur upland of those treatments; also a resident could consider revising their on-site stormwater management to slow down any point source emissions, spread emissions over a wider area by adding more points of emission, or return stormwater to the site by capturing it and reusing it on the property. If, under the proposed ordinance, a landscape wall is placed 10 feet landward of the critical line, then the proposed ordinance seems to allow for erosion to occur until the it eventually reaches the wall, and once usable property is lost forever. On the other hand, if a resident doesn't put in a wall now, then they risk future marsh growth/erosion walking back the the placement of a future ECS — regardless of the property line — and thus even more of once usable property is lost forever.

The town recently approved or allowed ECS's to be built and modified in disregard for the current ordinance (ex; Conquest Avenue properties and Jasper). The residents affected by this ordinance simply want to protect their property while ensuring our creek stays vibrant and healthy. Below are two EXISTING ECS's on this island. We want simple solutions available like these. This is not ugly or bad for the marsh. One has a revetment "toe" as the new language would require, one does not. Both have healthy and thriving marsh surrounding these structures. If the new ordinance language wont allow this, then we will strongly object. We shouldn't have to compromise with the staff on this basic and understandable simple request.

Which brings me to my final question:

Will you write the ordinance to allow us to create similar ECS structures and landscaping represented in these pictures? The proposed ordinance has been written to allow similar solutions to those that are shown in the pictures below. The proposed amendments would codify these opportunities in a way that is consistent with the current best management practices and better aligns our ordinance with those of our neighboring jurisdictions by encouraging a buffer along the edges of our marshes. If not, why not?

We hope we get the chance to sit down and talk to you about specific and practical implications of the plan and receiving written feedback to our questions as outlined above.

Thank you.

Tim Kelly
1456 Thompson Avenue







Sent from my iPad

Pam Otto

From: Tim Kelly <tkelly444@me.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 8:57 AM
To: Pam Otto
Cc: Todd Abedon; Mike Psenka; Kurt Polk; Samantha Ploch; Buster Blalock; Brent Faulkenberry; Steven M. Kerr; Loren Ziff; Timothy Cook; Jay Keenan; Jeremy Anspach; Betsy Carroll; Lydia Matthews; Francis Johnson; Pierre Delucy; PIERCE CAUTHEN; Lisa Pollner; Bobby Cummings; Eric Dodson
Subject: EROSION CONTROL DEVICE ORDNANCE

> This email originated from outside the Town of Sullivans Island. Do not click links or open attachments unless you have verified the sender and know the content is safe.

Pam, several other residents have signed on to the letter. Will you please forward the updated letter and alert the Committee members to the change including addition signatories.

Thanks for your help

Planning Committee members,

Twenty families who are residents of our islands back creeks have signed this letter and are happy that the Town is updating the erosion control rules for the Island. We recognize that the proposed ordinance from Staff is an improvement over the existing ordinance. We have been providing feedback to The Planning Committee and Town Staff throughout the process. These discussions have been constructive. However, we believe there are several key issues that must be addressed during the upcoming public discussions and ultimately incorporated into the ordinance. These items are not minor details — they are fundamental provisions that will determine whether the ordinance is viewed as balanced, practical, and supported by affected property owners. These concerns are critical to resident support of the ordinance.

The following changes we believe represent the modifications necessary for broad resident support:

1. Allow Eco-Friendly Corrugated Sheet Pile Systems

The ordinance should specifically allow modern, environmentally friendly corrugated sheet pile systems, including products such as ShoreGuard and similar technologies, within the RS and RC zoning districts.

These products are increasingly used throughout coastal communities because they provide structural protection while incorporating environmental enhancements that support marine habitat. Residents should not be restricted to a limited list of construction methods when newer technologies can provide equal or better environmental outcomes while protecting private property from erosion and storm impacts.

2. Revise Adjacent Property Impact Certification Requirements

The current language requiring an engineer to certify that an ECS will never negatively impact an adjacent property is unreasonable and creates an impossible standard.

No engineer can credibly guarantee that a structure will never have an effect under all future storm conditions, sea level scenarios, or changing environmental conditions. Such language exposes engineers to unreasonable liability and may make projects difficult or impossible to permit.

Instead, the ordinance should provide language similar to:

“If negative impacts or damages resulting from an installed ECS are subsequently verified to have caused harm to an adjacent or downstream property, the owner of the ECS shall be responsible for damages attributable to those impacts.”

This approach places responsibility where it belongs while avoiding an unattainable certification requirement.

3. Remove the 10-Foot Buffer Requirement

We strongly oppose the proposed 10-foot buffer requirement.

This provision effectively requires property owners to surrender additional upland property to erosion, storm surge, and sea level rise. Over time, the result is a continual landward retreat of shoreline protection structures and a corresponding loss of privately owned property.

Existing examples along Thompson Avenue and Jasper Boulevard demonstrate that marsh systems can remain healthy and productive adjacent to shoreline protection structures without such setbacks. The marsh in these areas continues to flourish despite the absence of a mandatory 10-foot buffer.

The ordinance should be based on a realistic risk-versus-reward analysis. In this case, the property loss risk significantly outweighs any demonstrated environmental benefit.

4. Allow Landscape Walls Replacing Historic Revetments to be Located Where Marsh Disturbance is Minimized

For projects involving replacement of historic rock revetments, the ordinance should allow placement of landscape walls in the location that minimizes disturbance to the marsh and surrounding environment, provided the structure remains landward of the Critical Line.

Many of the Creekside properties contain historic Army-era revetments, fill material, or shoreline stabilization features. Forcing replacement structures into a predetermined location may require unnecessary excavation, disturbance of existing fill, destabilization of existing shoreline features, and greater environmental impacts than would otherwise occur.

The ordinance should provide flexibility to place replacement structures where environmental disturbance is minimized while remaining compliant with state Critical Line requirements.

5. Focus Sea Tile Requirements Where They Provide Actual Environmental Benefit

If sea tiles or similar habitat enhancement features are required on vertical wall surfaces, those requirements should be limited to the area between Mean High Water (MHW) and Mean Low Water (MLW).

This is the portion of the structure that receives regular tidal inundation and therefore provides meaningful habitat value. Requiring installation outside of this biologically active zone imposes substantial additional costs on property owners without delivering measurable environmental benefits.

The objective should be effective habitat enhancement, not simply maximizing installation quantities. Focusing sea tile requirements between MHW and MLW achieves the environmental goal while avoiding unnecessary costs.

Balancing Environmental Protection and Property Protection

Cove Creek residents fully support protecting the marsh and preserving the unique environmental resources that make Sullivan's Island special. We do not believe the changes outlined above would harm the marsh ecosystem.

To the contrary, we believe these revisions would create a more balanced ordinance that continues to protect environmental resources while also providing property owners with

practical and affordable tools to protect their homes from documented sea level rise, chronic flooding, erosion, and increasingly powerful storm events.

As sea levels continue to rise, the marsh-side properties of Sullivan's Island face unique challenges. Residents should be given reasonable opportunities to protect their homes and investments while remaining consistent with state environmental regulations and Critical Line protections.

Finally, it is very important that Town staff represent the needs and concerns of the residents they serve. A primary objective in drafting this ordinance should be to provide residents with workable, effective, and environmentally responsible options for protecting their property.

We appreciate your continued willingness to engage with the community, and we look forward to working collaboratively toward an ordinance that both protects our marshes and allows property owners to responsibly protect their homes and property.

Tim and Melissa Kelly - 1456 Thompson Ave.

Jeremy Anspaach - 1302 Cove

Kurt Polk - 1652 Thompson Ave

Stephen and Mary Gordon Kerr - 1424 Thompson Ave

Bobby and Kristin Cummings - 1450 Thompson Ave

Buster and Judy Blalock - 1460 Thompson Ave

Jay Keenan - 1312 Cove

Loren and Mindelle Ziff - 1412 Thompson Ave

Betsy Carroll - 1308 Cove

Todd Abedon - 1658 Thompson Ave

Mike and Tam Psenka - 1656 Thompson

Nelson and Samantha Ploch - 1502 Thompson Ave

Eric Dodson - 1462 Thompson Ave

Pierre de Lucy and Jodie McLean - 405 Station 12

Tim and Kin Cook - 412 Station 14

Brent and Carla Faulkenberry - m1452 Thompson Ave

Lisa and Caleb Pollner - 3310 Jasper

Pierce Cauthen - 3202 - Jasper

Lydia Matthews - 405 Sea Breeze Lane

Francis Johnson - 3034 Jasper

Sent from my iPad

This and the
following pictures
were submitted
to the Commission
by Eric Dodson













