The Lancaster City Planning Commission met on Thursday, November 14, 2019. Members present were Christine Collins, Rick Wilkins, Robert Lovell (representing the Park Board in place of Charles Elsea), Jan Coccia, John Sigafoons, Mayor David Scheffler, and Service Safety Director Paul Martin. Also present were Mitch Noland and Steven Wellstead of the Engineering Department, Pete Vail of the Building Department, and Randall Ullom and Stephanie Hall of the City Law Director’s Office. The meeting was held at Lancaster’s City Hall at 104 East Main Street in Lancaster, Ohio. Service Safety Director Martin called the meeting to order at 9:30 AM.

Service Safety Director Martin opened Case Number 2019.002 which is a change of zoning request for the 76.877 acre property at 2200 N. Columbus Street known as Timbertop.

Mr. Noland began by explaining that the property is currently within Greenfield Township and zoned residential, but it has been requested for this property to be rezoned in conjunction with a proposed annexation into the City. Mr. Noland noted that the properties adjacent to Timbertop are mostly zoned single-family residential, although there are commercial properties to the northeast (i.e. the old Tarhe Elementary School) and to the south across Columbus Street (i.e. Lowe’s and several residential properties). Mr. Noland then noted that the Timbertop property would be primarily accessed through a roadway connecting to Columbus Street. There is also a planned roadway extension of Hawthorne Avenue. Additionally, a street stub will be left at the north end of the property to tie into the River Valley Highlands subdivision if and when the rest of Section 13 is developed. No extension will be made to Coldspring Drive, although a City-approved turnaround would be required by City code. Mr. Noland also mentioned that a traffic study must be undertaken by the developer to determine what improvements, if any, will be necessary on Columbus Street to accommodate the traffic from this development.

Ms. Collins interjected to ask if there was information on how many housing units the developer is proposing for the purposes of conducting the study and whether that information can be provided. Mr. Noland responded that these details would be included in the study and the developer would be required to provide their own estimates, but at this point it was too early to pin down exact numbers because the scope of the study has only very recently been confirmed.

Mr. Noland continued by noting that the various City utilities (gas, water, sewer) are available to the property and will be extended through the site in accordance with the Pre-Annexation Agreement currently being negotiated by the City. Mr. Noland concluded by adding that stormwater runoff on the site generally drains into three different tributary areas.

Mr. Wellstead spoke up to note that the City’s current Land Use Plan for this property recommends that it be developed for residential use, but a deviation from this Land Use Plan may be appropriate if it is Planning Commission’s intent to encourage commercial development in this area. Mr. Wellstead also noted that the report provided to Planning Commission included a summary of allowable uses for all of the zoning districts proposed by the developer so that Planning Commission was aware of
what potential development could occur on this property if the proposed zoning were to be approved by the City.

At this point, Service Safety Director Martin asked if there were any questions from the Planning Commission members.

Mr. Sigafoss asked if anyone knew what the potential revenues to the City would be from the proposed development. Service Safety Director Martin noted that he was not aware that any such figures have been estimated.

Ms. Collins asked if the property was currently located within the City limits and, if not, was it annexing in. Service Safety Director Martin and Mr. Noland confirmed that the property is not in the City but is proposing to annex in. Ms. Collins asked if the Woodland Heights properties were also annexing in, and Service Safety Director Martin responded that they were not. Ms. Collins then asked if the property needed to be released by the County first, and Mr. Ulloa responded that the annexation petition is first filed with the County. Finally, Ms. Collins asked whether or not the City would provide utilities to the property if it was not annexed, and Mr. Noland responded that City utilities would not be provided without annexation.

At this point a member of the public interjected to note that the County had a hearing on the annexation next week, and Mr. Noland confirmed that the County did indeed have a hearing with regards to the proposed annexation on November 19 at the County courthouse. Various citizens expressed concern about being notified of this County meeting, but Service Safety Director Martin noted that the City and County were separate entities with their own notification requirements.

Mr. Lovell asked if it was possible for the annexation to be passed by City Council without the zoning change being passed. Mr. Ulloa responded that this was not possible and that City Council would have to approve zoning for the property whenever it approves annexation.

At this point, Service Safety Director Martin turned over discussion to the petitioner of the zoning change request. Speaking on behalf of the petitioner was their agent, Lemmon Development, represented by Tony Perez, and their lawyer, Winkhart & Minor, represented by Tom Winkhart. Mr. Perez gave a brief background on Lemmon Development and noted that their primary interest in the property is for the development of a senior living facility on the Commercial Neighborhood (CN) parcel bordering Columbus Street. They have ideas of what they’d like to see on the other proposed commercial and residential areas within the property, and they are currently working with other developers to come to agreements to develop the rest of the site, although no agreements have yet been finalized. During his discussion, Mr. Perez answered questions from Ms. Collins about the number of residential units they are anticipating on the property and a question from Mr. Lovell about which of their other developments would be comparable to what they are anticipating building in Lancaster.

Service Safety Director Martin asked what the anticipated sequencing of construction would be if approval of the zoning was ultimately granted. Mr. Perez responded that they would like to begin with site plan
development right away, and hopefully begin construction by the summer of 2020.

Service Safety Director Martin then asked Mr. Wellstead to give a general overview of the development process for those in attendance. Mr. Wellstead responded that we are currently only considering the zoning, and assuming the zoning and annexation are ultimately approved by the City, the developer would have to go through plan review processes through both the Engineering and Building Departments to ensure the proposed developments will comply with all City requirements. Mr. Wellstead noted that these processes take many months and that any development of this property would be well into the future. Mr. Noland also added that this property would need to go through the subdivision process, which also adds time before development can occur.

Ms. Collins asked for verification that this site was not proposed as a Planned Unit Development (PUD). Mr. Wellstead responded that this site is not being proposed with a PUD zoning overlay. At the behest of Service Safety Director Martin, Mr. Wellstead further explained that a PUD overlay allows developers additional flexibility when developing the property, but developers need to determine at the beginning of the process exactly how their site will be developed and must commit to that design if approved. Without a PUD designation, developers have the ability to build whatever kind of development they want so long as it is an allowable use and they comply with all other City requirements.

Service Safety Director Martin asked Mr. Vail if there was anything he saw in the proposal that might require the developer to go before the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA). Mr. Vail responded that there was nothing at this point, but going before BZA may be necessary depending on the site plan they submit at a later date.

Mayor Scheffler asked Mr. Perez if he could give an overview of who would be developing every portion of the property. Mr. Perez responded that they have been in discussion with several other developers, but no agreements have yet been finalized. Mr. Perez noted that they are anticipating a skilled nursing facility on the Commercial General (CG) piece that could provide 150-200 jobs. Mayor Scheffler asked how many jobs are anticipated on the CN piece being developed by Lemmon. Mr. Perez responded that it should be about 100 jobs. In response to a question from Service Safety Director Martin, Mr. Perez provided additional details about their proposed facility and what kinds of services it will provide to seniors.

Mr. Sigafouos asked Mr. Perez what he anticipated the revenues to the City would be for the developments they are proposing. Service Safety Director Martin and Ms. Collins noted that this would be difficult to calculate. Mr. Perez noted that their typical senior living facility has an annual payroll around $2 million, and Mayor Scheffler later clarified that, assuming 200 jobs with an average annual income of $45,000, the approximate income tax to the City would be $170,000.

Ms. Collins asked whether this development would result in traffic from the nearby Tarhe Trails Elementary School going through the site. Service Safety Martin and Mr. Noland both responded that traffic from the school
would not be going through this property until such time that the next section of the River Valley Highlands subdivision was developed and connected to the site. Ms. Collins expressed concern that the streets within the Timbertop property should be designed to accommodate such traffic from the school. Mr. Noland explained that the developer of the Timbertop property is not responsible for making roadway improvements, such as turn lanes, to accommodate traffic from the school, since that traffic is being generated off-site. Ms. Collins also asked if there were concerns about the site distance at the proposed roadway connection to Columbus Street. Mr. Perez noted that they have looked at the site distance at that location and the engineers will design a connection that is safe. Mr. Noland confirmed that the engineers will be looking at this issue during design.

At this point, Service Safety Director Martin announced that he would open up the meeting to comments from the public and gave a brief explanation of how this portion of the meeting would be conducted.

The first member of the public to speak was Phyllis Heister of 279 Marvel Drive. Ms. Heister asked whether Hawthorne Avenue and/or Coldspring Drive would be extended as part of this project. Mr. Noland responded that currently Hawthorne Avenue is proposed for extension but that Coldspring Drive is not. Mr. Noland did add that Coldspring Drive, however, would need to have a City-approved turnaround constructed at the end of the current street stub. Ms. Heister expressed concern that traffic from this site would cut through Hawthorne Avenue to get to Columbus Street. Ms. Heister then asked whether any apartments on the property would be subsidized or provided with tax abatements. Mr. Perez noted that they would not be.

The next speaker was Howard Blaisdell of 2220 Landcrest Drive. Mr. Blaisdell first asked for clarification on the anticipated start date of construction. Mr. Perez confirmed that they are looking at a construction start date in the summer of 2020. Mr. Blaisdell then asked if there would be future times where the public could make comments about this development. Mayor Scheffler noted that this issue still would need to go before City Council and there would be a public hearing there. Mr. Blaisdell asked if the traffic study would be completed before this issue would be voted upon by City Council. Mr. Wellstead noted that the dates on which this issue would be considered by City Council cannot be set until the request is acted upon by Planning Commission, as such we cannot answer this question. Mr. Noland then added that this question is best directed to the developer since their engineers are the ones preparing the study. Mr. Perez simply noted that the study is being worked on, and he did not provide an anticipated completion date.

Ms. Collins asked about buffering. Mr. Noland and Mr. Vail responded that the City zoning code does have certain buffering requirements that will have to be followed.

Mr. Blaisdell continued by expressing his concern about the traffic on Columbus Street and the possibility for backups and crashes on Columbus Street at the hill going down to Whittier Avenue. Mr. Noland confirmed that the Columbus/Whittier intersection was being considered as part of the traffic impact study, and he also listed all of the other
intersections that were going to be evaluated as part of the study. Mr. Blaisdell continued by confirming that he did receive notification regarding the proposed annexation being considered at next week’s County meeting. Mr. Blaisdell then asked what the developer meant when they discussed “skilled nursing” being considered for the CG piece of the property. Mr. Perez explained that “skilled nursing” was basically the next step after assisted living. Mr. Blaisdell then asked if any restriction could be put on the CG portion of the property to ensure it was actually developed as a skilled nursing facility and not potentially something else typically allowed within that zoning district. Mr. Ullom confirmed that once a property is zoned, the developer is allowed to develop it how they wish in accordance with the limitations given in the zoning code. Mr. Ullom continued by noting that it is not allowable to approve a specific zoning with the caveat that it be developed for a specific use or uses. Mr. Blaisdell noted that he had several comments/questions about the single family residential portion of the property. First, Mr. Blaisdell noted that duplexes are potentially allowable under the proposed zoning with a variance from BZA. Next, Mr. Blaisdell noted that there are various areas on the site identified as wetlands and he was wondering what the developer intended to do in these areas. Mr. Perez noted that they have wetland specialists who are looking into it and will inform them as to what needs to be done with the wetlands to comply with the applicable laws. Mr. Blaisdell pointed out there is a stream and springs in the northwest corner of the site near his property that the developers should be aware of. Mr. Blaisdell then asked about the apparent discrepancy between the number of lots allowed in this portion of the property by the code (around 154) compared to the number of lots that the developer was claiming they would build here (around 105). Mr. Perez responded that he didn’t see how 150+ lots would be feasible there and that they were looking at approximately 105. Mr. Blaisdell again reiterated his concern about the proposed commercial properties and noted that the closest commercial property that has direct access to Columbus Street is the hospital property to the west. Mr. Blaisdell then mentioned the City’s public sites and open space dedication requirements and asked how and when that would be addressed for this site. Mr. Wellstead responded that the public sites and open space issue is addressed during the subdivision process, and in cases where the required dedication cannot be calculated at the time the subdivision is platted, it is addressed prior to the issuance of the occupancy permit for the development. Mr. Noland added that this requirement will likely be addressed with a fee in lieu of dedication of open space to the City. For his final comment, Mr. Blaisdell noted that there are current drainage issues in the vicinity of his property and the properties along Bush Hill Drive, and it is his hopes that the developer will keep this in mind and do what they can to fix those issues and be a good neighbor to the adjacent homes.

The next speaker was Velma Pearson of 2202 Landcrest Drive. Ms. Pearson recounted the various drainage issues she experienced when Pulte developed the newest section of the River Valley Highlands near her property, and she did not want to see similar issues with the development of this property. Ms. Pearson then asked if there was still any plan to build a fire station on this property. Service Safety Director Martin answered that while at one time the City thought this property might be a good location for a fire station, there is no current plan to actually locate one on this property. Finally, Ms. Pearson asked if the taxes from this
development would be going to the City or County, or perhaps both. Mayor Scheffler noted that the City would get income taxes from the citizens that would live and/or work on this property. He further noted that the County would get the real estate taxes from this property, although a very small sliver of those funds do go to the City.

The next speaker was Brett Turner of 446 Hawthorne Avenue. Mr. Turner noted that the original development plan for this property showed Coldspring Drive being extended, but now the current plan shows Hawthorne Drive being extended instead, and he asked why this change was made. Mr. Perez noted that this change was made both at the request of the City and because they wanted a larger commercial piece adjacent to Columbus Street for their planned assisted living facility. Mr. Turner then asked about the proposed multi-family residential piece adjacent to his property and what kind of screening would be there and whether any of the existing trees would remain. Mr. Perez noted that he couldn't answer this question specifically at this time, but he did note that they do like to utilize landscaping and leave existing trees in place, if possible, to create a nice transition and buffer between properties. Service Safety Director Martin also added that the zoning code does have certain screening requirements that will have to be followed. Mr. Turner asked about the required setbacks, and Mr. Vail and Mr. Noland responded that the minimum setback for the proposed RM-2 zoning is 10 feet, but there are also certain screening requirements that will have to be followed. Mr. Perez added that all of their plans will be reviewed by the City and they do want to be good neighbors to the existing property owners. Finally, Mr. Turner asked when the developer might have renderings available showing what the proposed developments will look like. Mr. Perez responded that those specific details will be prepared once the initial zoning and annexation approvals are granted.

Mayor Scheffler interjected to note that prior to any construction occurring on the property, there is a lot of paperwork and review that is required by the developer, and that this zoning change request is the first in a many step process that is required before the property can actually be developed.

The next speaker was Marshall Thompson of 1705 Woodland Heights Lane. First, Mr. Thompson asked how Greenfield Township residents should be providing their input with regards to this project and whether that should be directed to the City or Township. Service Safety Director Martin noted that he is free to speak now because this meeting is a public hearing that is open to anyone in the public, not just City of Lancaster residents. Mr. Thompson continued by asking if there was any plan for the proposed development to tie into Woodland Heights Lane. Mr. Perez responded that it was not. Mr. Thompson then asked what would be required in order to make such a connection. Mr. Wellstead noted that Woodland Heights is surrounded by private property and that the developer would be required to purchase land from a willing private property owner in order to make such a connection happen. Mr. Thompson noted that there is an existing drive connecting Woodland Heights to the Timbertop Property. At this point, Brad Hutchinson, who represents the petitioner of this request, Milhoff Companies, interjected to note that this drive only serves as an emergency access and there is no public access through this area. Mr. Thompson asked about the proposed
single family lots and how large they would be and what the expected
price range would be. Mr. Perez responded that it is hard to make single
family residential work for much less than about $280,000 to $300,000
each, and the homes should be similar to those in the River Valley
Highlands. Mr. Thompson asked whether any of the existing trees
adjacent to the Woodland Heights properties will be maintained. Mr.
Perez reiterated that he does like to keep trees when possible, but at this
point it is too early to tell how it will work out. Mr. Thompson then asked
how soon until they know what the proposed development will look like.
Mr. Perez responded that the details will be determined after they are able
to identify users and get contracts in place. Mr. Thompson then asked
whether any of these details would come out prior to approvals of zoning
and/or annexation. Mr. Perez responded that they would not, and Service
Safety Director Martin added that it is hard for developers to spend time
and money on final designs without the zoning being confirmed. Mr.
Hutchinson interjected again to note that there are no woods on the
Timbertop property adjacent to the northern Woodland Heights properties,
only scrub trees. He noted that the bulk of the timber on the property is in
the northwest corner and to the south of the existing house. Finally, Mr.
Thompson mentioned concerns about the traffic on Columbus Street and
noted that drivers speed all the time.

Mayor Scheffler asked the developer to address what their plans were for
the existing home on the Timbertop property. Mr. Perez responded that
they want to save the mansion and find a use for it, but at this point they
don't have any definite plans.

The next speaker was Robert Huffman of 1580 Woodland Heights. Mr.
Huffman noted that he is an opponent of the proposed development. He
expressed concern that commercial zoning was being proposed in an area
that is almost exclusively residential and that this would have a detrimental
effect on the surrounding property values. Mr. Huffman stated that the
uses being proposed don't sound too bad, but once the zoning is changed, anything allowed within that zoning district could potentially be
developed, including more undesirable developments. Mr. Perez
responded that they invest a lot into their developments, have never sold
any of their properties, and want to remain in the area long term. They too
do not want any undesirable developments next to them, and since they
will own the entire property, they will have some control over who comes in and develops on the property. Mr. Huffman noted that he also has
concerns about the increase in traffic and it will be more dangerous for
those turning onto or out of Woodland Heights Lane. Mr. Huffman finished
by noting that it would be a shame if the existing Timbertop house were to
be demolished as part of this project.

Ms. Collins asked if CG was the only zoning designation that would work
for the skilled nursing facility that has been discussed. This issue was
researched by Mr. Vail and addressed later in the meeting.

The next speaker was Beth Ballmer of 1780 Woodland Heights. Ms.
Ballmer noted that her property is traversed by the emergency access
connecting Woodland Heights to the Timbertop home, and while it is only
intended as an emergency access, she is concerned that it can be used
by anyone and wanted to know if this drive will be maintained into the
future development. Mr. Hutchinson noted that with the new development
being proposed, this access would not be necessary because it was only installed in the first place for emergency purposes in case the entrance to the Timbertop property was ever blocked. Mr. Perez noted that he didn’t see any use for the driveway. Mr. Noland asked if this access drive was located within a dedicated easement. Ms. Ballmer replied that it was and that the easement was with Greenfield Township. Service Safety Director Martin responded that since the easement was with Greenfield Township, it could not be addressed by the City and would have to be taken up with the township. Mr. Perez again reiterated that he didn’t see a need for the access, but he couldn’t do anything about it since he isn’t party to the easement. Ms. Ballmer’s husband, Joe Ballmer of the same address, interjected to say that the community is losing something with the development of this property.

The next speaker was Chuck Hayes of 2101 North Columbus Street. Mr. Hayes expressed his concern with the traffic on Columbus Street and noted that it is terrible. Mr. Hayes asked whether some of the residences on south side of Columbus Street were in fact zoned commercial. Service Safety Director Martin and Mr. Vail confirmed that some indeed were zoned commercial. Mr. Hayes then asked if a traffic light would be installed on Columbus Street for this develop. Mr. Noland responded that this would be analyzed as part of the traffic study. Mr. Hayes mentioned his concern that the proposed jobs on this property will likely be low wage and not bring in much income tax to the City.

The next speaker was Tim Kozar of 2157 North Columbus Street. Mr. Kozar noted his opposition to the proposed zoning request and reiterated that allowing a commercial zoning could potentially open up this property to development of any commercial use allowed by the zoning. Mr. Kozar hopes the Planning Commission will consider the effect that development of this property will have on surrounding residents when making their decision.

The next speaker was Glenda Dyball of 2072 North Columbus Street. She began by noting that she is a fan of senior care facilities but not in this case. Ms. Dyball was drawn to her home because the adjacent Timbertop property is very peaceful, beautiful, and a natural habitat. Ms. Dyball shares others’ concerns about the traffic on Columbus Street. She asserted that the road is unsafe and needs lower speeds and more stop signs/flash. Ms. Dyball also has concerns that the surrounding property values will be decreased due to the commercial zoning. Ms. Dyball recounted her own personal issues with the City’s sewer systems and expressed concern that the additional sewers to be installed in this development will not be able to be adequately maintained into the future by the City.

Ms. Dyball’s uncle, Marshall Baker, who lives at the same address, also briefly noted that he too thinks the current property is beautiful and he has concerns about environmental impacts the development would have on the property.

The next speaker was Lisa Huffman of 1580 Woodland Heights Lane. Ms. Huffman noted her opposition to the proposed request. She also noted that the proposed skilled nursing facility would be allowable in a CN district and that CG was not necessary in this case. Ms. Huffman observed that
the closest commercial properties are accessed from along Memorial Drive, not Columbus Street. Ms. Huffman asked for confirmation that the Columbus/Woodland Heights intersection was being included in the traffic study, and Mr. Noland confirmed that it was. Ms. Huffman expressed concern that the votes by Planning Commission and City Council would occur before the results of the traffic study were known. Ms. Huffman also mentioned her concern that traffic is already very bad on Columbus Street and could get worse. She asserted that there are more appropriate areas in Lancaster where the proposed development could be built and it would be a detriment to the current area to change its zoning from residential to commercial to allow the proposed developments.

The next speaker was Connie Gerkin of 2214 Landcrest Drive. Ms. Gerkin noted that both her and her husband are realtors, and based on her 41 years of experience, the development of commercial properties will undoubtedly have an adverse impact on surrounding property values. Ms. Gerkin also has concerns about the existing traffic and drainage issues and is worried they will get worse with this development.

The next speaker was Diane Burnside of 1688 Quail Meadows Drive. Ms. Burnside asked if this proposed development would be connected to the River Valley Highlands subdivision. Service Safety Director Martin noted that it has been planned for the two developments to ultimately be connected when they are fully built out in the future. Ms. Burnside observed that the River Valley Highlands subdivision is a Homeowners Association community and expressed concern that another development would be connected into it. Ms. Burnside asked if the potential apartments on the multi-family residential piece would be restricted to seniors. Mr. Perez responded that they would not be. Ms. Burnside then asked if any areas of this development would have tax abatement. Mayor Scheffler confirmed that there would be no tax abatement on this property. Ms. Burnside asked again about a roadway connection between the Timbertop and River Valley Highlands properties, and Mayor Scheffler confirmed that there would be a connection between the two at some point in the future.

Ms. Huffman spoke again to briefly note that there are four possible actions for Planning Commission to take with regards to this issue: they can recommend to City Council that the request be approved as submitted, approved as amended, approved subject to modification, or denied.

At this point, Service Safety Director Martin ended the public comment portion of the hearing.

Ms. Collins asked if it would be possible for the Planning Commission to adjourn into an executive session to discuss pertinent legal issues with Mr. Ullom and Ms. Hall of the City Law Director's Office. This issue was discussed by City staff and addressed later in the meeting.

Mr. Sigafos made a motion to recommend that City Planning Commission approve the change of zoning request as submitted; seconded by Mr. Coccia.

Mr. Wilkins asked to revisit the issue of whether the proposed CG piece was necessary to build the skilled nursing facility that the development is
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anticipating. Mr. Vail noted that a skilled nursing facility was an allowable use within a CN district but it required a special use exemption from BZA within a CG district. Mayor Scheffler noted that the proposed CG piece originated from the City’s economic development efforts in an attempt to provide an area that could serve as the potential site for various, different City needs. Mr. Wilkins asked whether, given the concerns from the residents about the proposed commercial zoning, they could just go with a CN zoning since that would work for a skilled nursing facility and also limit the other types of commercial developments that could potentially go on that site in the future. Mayor Scheffler reiterated that the City’s economic development position was that they wanted to see it with a CG zoning so that, if skilled nursing did not ultimately go onto that site, it could be opened up to a wider variety of potential uses.

At this point, it was determined that an executive session to allow discussion of legal issues was permissible. Mayor Scheffler made a motion to adjourn into a brief executive session, and this was seconded by Mr. Sigafos. There was a unanimous vote to approve and the motion carried. The Planning Commission adjourned into executive session at 11:54 AM.

Following the conclusion of the executive session, Mayor Scheffler made a motion to re-open the Planning Commission meeting, and this was seconded by Mr. Wilkins. There was a unanimous vote to approve and the motion carried. The Planning Commission meeting was re-opened at 12:00 PM.

Service Safety Director Martin made a reminder that there was a motion to recommend approval of the request as submitted by Mr. Sigafos, seconded by Mr. Coccia, and asked for further discussion. Ms. Collins noted that she would not approve the request as submitted due to the CG piece that has been proposed. Mr. Wilkins asked for a comment from the developer as to whether they had an opinion with regards to the CN vs. CG debate for the portion of the property where the skilled nursing facility has been proposed. Mayor Scheffler interjected to summarize the allowable uses within a CN district and asserted that the differences between the allowable uses in CN and CG districts were negligible.

Service Safety Director Martin called for a vote on the motion. The Planning Commission voted 6-1 to recommend that City Council approve the request as submitted, with Ms. Collins the only member voting against, and the motion carried.

With nothing further for discussion, Mayor Scheffler made a motion to adjourn; seconded by Mr. Sigafos. The meeting adjourned at 12:04 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Paul Martin
Service Safety Director