

Oakwood, Dayton, Ohio

August 3, 2011

The planning commission of the City of Oakwood, State of Ohio, met this date in the council chambers of the City of Oakwood, city building, 30 Park Ave., Dayton, Ohio, 45419, at 4:40 p.m.

The Vice Chair, Mr. Andrew Aidt, presided and the Clerk, Mrs. Cathy Gibson, recorded.

Mr. Aidt apologized for the delay and explained Chairman Jeff Shulman is out of town; they wanted to include him in this meeting and are trying to reach him on speaker phone.

Upon call of the roll, the following members responded to their names:

MR. JEFFREY B. SHULMAN ..... PRESENT (By phone)  
MR. ANDREW AIDT ..... PRESENT  
MRS. HARRISON GOWDY ..... PRESENT  
MRS. E. HEALY JACKSON ..... PRESENT  
MR. STEVE BYINGTON ..... PRESENT

Officers of the city present were the following:

Mr. Jay A. Weiskircher, Assistant City Manager  
Mr. Robert F. Jacques, City Attorney

The following visitors registered:

Lisa Kell, 247 Volusia Avenue  
Brad Judge, 1201 E. David  
Thomas Routsong, 494 Lookout  
David Montgomery, 2700 Kettering Tower  
Martha Haley, 400 Irving Avenue  
Neal Gittleman & Lisa Fray, 217 Rubicon Road  
Don Kiley, 1204 E. Dorothy Lane  
Jenny Falter, 225 Rubicon Road  
Richard Oaks, 1397 Jackson Road  
Mark Risley, 151 Aberdeen Avenue  
Challon Roberts, 125 Mahrt  
Kathleen Weaver, 201 E. Schantz  
Jane Balquedra, 414 Irving Avenue  
R. & S. Conard, 416 Irving Avenue  
B. Miller, 6 Glendora  
Bruce Balsing & Martha Shapiro, 1300 Robert Dickey  
Al Barkolo, 210 Heritage Point Drive  
S. Wreth, 2515 Far Hills Avenue

It was moved by Mrs. Gowdy and seconded by Mr. Jackson that the minutes of the commission meeting held July 6, 2011 be approved as submitted and the reading thereof be dispensed with at this session. Upon a viva voce vote on the question of the motion, same passed unanimously and it was so ordered.

Tabled application #11-3, the request by Routsong Realty, Ltd. to amend the Major Site Development Plan previously approved in May, 2010 for the southeast corner of Oakwood and Irving Avenues. The approved plan provides for demolition of the existing funeral home and construction of an 8,130 s.f. commercial/retail building on the site, including parking. The applicant is requesting to relocate the approved drive-thru from the north side to the south side of the building necessitating a shift in the building to the south, a slight reduction in the square footage of the building and a loss of two (2) parking spaces at 6 Oakwood Avenue and known as lots 148, 149, 150 and 153, was presented.

Mr. Weiskircher referenced a PowerPoint and reviewed a sketch and renderings of the Council approved May, 2010 plan - 8,130 s.f. building, Tudor architecture, 43 parking spaces, drive-thru on the north side of the building and special use for outdoor seating. The amended plan is for an 8,088 s.f. building, Tudor architecture, building shifted to the south, 41 parking spaces, drive-thru relocated to the south, special use for outdoor seating and letter of intent from Saxby's Coffee as a prospective tenant assuming this

amended plan is approved. He reviewed the proposed rendering of the amended plan. Mr. Weiskircher indicated at the June 1, 2011 meeting, the commission expressed concern with the dumpster location, pedestrian access, light spillover and pedestrian safety and pointed out those issues on the site plan. He reviewed renderings, proposed site plan signage and parking spaces. In regard to the dumpster location, rather than relocate it next to the building which would prohibit tenants from having a rear access door, the applicant proposes to leave the dumpster at the SEC of the site. He pointed out the pedestrian access areas, raised pavement and in lieu of landscaping on the Irving side of the building a sidewalk. In regard to light spillover, the applicant plans to extend the fence by the alley. Mr. Weiskircher reviewed the proposed signs that will assist with pedestrian safety.

Mr. David Montgomery, Pickrel, Schaeffer & Ebeling indicated their full team is in the audience and noted Mr. Weiskircher did a very thorough job on reviewing the issues. He noted the applicant does appreciate comments, there has been a good dialogue and they have addressed various issues on the site from input received at the June meeting, this plan accomplishes those goals. Mr. Montgomery had one point of clarification in that the pedestrian access off Oakwood Avenue will be stamped, not raised concrete due to plowing issues. They believe this plan will be functional and provide pedestrian safety. He noted Mr. Routsong continues to obtain interest from prospective tenants and if the plan is approved, he plans to move forward with the project. Mr. Aidt opened the public hearing for comments.

Mrs. Barb Miller, 6 Glendora, one block east, indicated in this historic district and at the gateway to Oakwood, neither plan fits. Although she doesn't want to see the property sit vacant, to the north there are three vacant store fronts and given the national economy, she doesn't want this corner to have an empty parking lot. Mrs. Miller expressed concern that this drive-thru/parking lot doesn't welcome foot traffic, children, parents with strollers, has a potential noise impact and the traffic at this corner is already congested. She can't imagine how this will compound the traffic and asked the commission if they want a parking lot as the entrance to Oakwood. Mrs. Miller believes this belongs in Centerville, not Oakwood and asked that the commission be consistent and deny the application.

Mrs. Kathleen Weaver, 201 E. Schantz Avenue, is a couple blocks from this property and questioned the changes to the plan. She indicated this is a residential business area and the plan says nothing of the residential area. She questioned a drive-thru next door to a residential property, which the applicant owns, but believes it will impact property values and the neighbors.

Dr. Robert Conard, 416 Irving, is also concerned with the traffic congestion and believes the turn off from Irving will create a great traffic impact as will traffic from Brown at this entrance to Oakwood. He indicated the commission has met many times on this project and he doesn't believe there is any great difference between this and the original plan rejected by the Planning Commission, the only change is the drive-thru. He wondered what would encourage a change in vote. There were no other comments.

Mr. Byington explained a no vote at this meeting doesn't stop the project, but means that Plan A may proceed so this evening they are deciding between A and B. Mrs. Jackson questioned whether the one tenant will move in if the drive-thru is only on the south. Mr. Routsong concurred. Mr. Aidt questioned the walk pavement stamping. Mr. Routsong indicated it will be treated concrete with embossing for texture, not paint and they couldn't have it raised due to plowing needs. Mr. Byington referenced the aerial view of the site and the position of the drive-thru window lining up with the abutting rear yards. Mr. Routsong indicated it is at that location due to stacking, maximum number of cars. Mr. Byington wondered if it could be further back based on noise concerns. Mr. Routsong indicated there is vegetation, fence and a concrete wall between the drive-thru and the neighbor on the corner. Mr. Montgomery indicated they will have the speaker at a low volume and based on internal counter/preparation areas this is the best location. Mr. Byington understood the work flow and stacking but doesn't believe vegetation/fencing will eliminate all the sound. Mrs. Gowdy asked if there are noise regulations in case the "squawk box" gets too loud. Mr. Weiskircher indicated the city has a noise ordinance.

Mrs. Jackson referenced concern with the parking space at the rear of the building just around the corner from the drive-thru and the impact of the pedestrian walk at the corner. Mr. Routsong indicated people will have to pay attention, when you exit the drive-thru there will be visibility to cars parked and those spots in the rear will probably be for employees. Mr. Montgomery referenced the site plan and pointed out the signs at the exit of the drive-thru in regard to pedestrians. He indicated customers will have to use

diligence. Mr. Byington asked if they considered a site design with the drive-thru on the south but the building closer to Irving so as to be more pedestrian friendly. Mr. Kiley indicated they did review that but there was concern with the parking next to the drive-thru, then the south of the lot would be too congested and less pedestrian friendly. Mr. Richard Oakes, traffic engineer, further explained when you exit the drive-thru you have to look to the left; however, if the building was closer to Irving, then there would also be two-way traffic to deal with, worse angles for sight distance problems. Mr. Oakes indicated that would have also caused problems from Oakwood Avenue and parking in front. Mr. Oakes respectfully believes the plan before them, in his opinion, doesn't have safety issues. Mr. Shulman questioned the two-way traffic. Mr. Aidt explained they were comparing alternative plans.

Dr. Conard wondered where a car entering off Oakwood Avenue would go if there is no parking available until they get to the rear where cars are exiting from the drive-thru. Mr. Aidt noted the vehicle could wait until the car passes and then turn around. Mrs. Gowdy asked, since there is more parking than required, whether one parking spot in the rear, immediately adjacent to the dumpster, could be removed and designated as a turnaround area. Mr. Routsong agreed he could give up one parking spot, however is sensitive to parking since he started with 56 spots and there are fewer now. Mr. Montgomery explained there are traffic control signs within the lot. The commission reviewed the sketch of the sign wording and location. Dr. Conard asked a procedural question, if the vote is made and Mr. Routsong agrees to remove a parking space, then will the new plan need to be returned and the matter tabled. Mr. Jacques explained under the ordinance, the commission can approve, deny or approve with conditions an application as part of the motion. Mr. Aidt indicated it was tabled last time due to the various issues the commission asked they review, not just one minor issue as the one parking space.

It was moved by Mr. Shulman that they approve the amended plan. Mr. Jacques asked for a motion to close the public hearing.

It was moved by Mr. Byington and seconded by Mrs. Gowdy that the public hearing be closed. Upon a viva voce vote, motion passed.

Mrs. Gowdy suggested approval be subject to one parking space being removed for easier turnaround access at the rear of the building near the dumpster. Mr. Shulman agreed to amend his motion to include that condition.

Mr. Byington explained this hearing is to decide on the merits of one plan versus another, not to hear that the drive-thru isn't wanted because the Neighborhood Business District permits such a use. In reviewing both plans, he doesn't believe either is perfect, both have flaws. He has looked at safety concerns for pedestrians and vehicles, and although he'd prefer to see the building closer to Irving he understands concern with the drive thru and parking. He doesn't like that this plan has the drive-thru closer to the residential area. He didn't like how Plan A addressed the corner; it was too congested and unacceptable. Mr. Byington noted in reviewing the two plans, he prefers B. He realizes this has been a long process, they have had a lot of good comments and dialogue, it's difficult to compromise and make everyone happy. Mr. Shulman clarified that Plan A is not at issue today that has been approved. He indicated if they deny Plan B, then it's up to Mr. Routsong to determine whether to proceed with approved Plan A. Mr. Shulman asked Mr. Byington if he disagrees with Plan B. Mr. Byington responded no, he was reviewing his decision making process. Mrs. Gowdy indicated she doesn't like either plan but between B and A, B is her preference.

Mrs. Jackson indicated today's vote is only on Plan B and she hasn't see any compromises. She knows staff has worked very hard but doesn't feel this plan will work in the neighborhood or for pedestrians, especially in this historic district. She believes the plan caters more to cars than pedestrians and based on the new UD dorms scheduled to be built along Brown, there will be even more pedestrians. Mrs. Jackson doesn't believe the stamped concrete will speak to children and she has not read anything that the success of this project is only evident with Plan B. She feels retail is successful if it fits in the neighborhood and she doesn't agree with the Routsong team. Mrs. Gowdy agreed and wished that Mr. Routsong would have considered the neighborhood the first day of development. Mrs. Jackson indicated there will not be a tenant if they deny the application and she agreed with why the commission originally voted against the application. Mr. Aidt compared A and B and believes B is better for vehicular circulation and pedestrian access. He indicated they've tried to make this the best plan, unfortunately Plan A was approved and now

they compare the two. Mr. Aidt explained this is the way retail is now done with parking in the front and although he would prefer from an aesthetic and pedestrian access not to have parking in the front; this is how the experts are doing it. Mrs. Jackson believes the entrance to Oakwood will now look like the entrance to Kettering. Mr. Byington indicated this is not the time to discuss or review whether a drive-thru is desirable, since it has already been approved and is not part of this hearing. Mrs. Jackson never understood why this was not considered a new application, but an amended one. Mr. Jacques indicated it's the same proposed use, just reconfiguration, not substantial enough change to justify a new application. Mr. Aidt suggested these concerns be discussed by the commission at a future meeting date. Mrs. Jackson believes Plan A was approved but flawed and now the tenant won't move in unless there is an amended plan. Mr. Shulman suggested they also condition approval on the understanding that if Plan B is approved it is in lieu of Plan A. Mr. Jacques indicated the approved plan will be noted in the books.

Therefore, it was moved by Mr. Shulman and seconded by Mr. Byington that tabled application #11-3, the request by Routsong Realty, Ltd. to amend the Major Site Development Plan previously approved in May, 2010 for the southeast corner of Oakwood and Irving Avenues be approved based on the amended plan which provides for demolition of the existing funeral home and construction of an 8,130 s.f. commercial/retail building on the site, including parking. The applicant is requesting to relocate the approved drive-thru from the north side to the south side of the building necessitating a shift in the building to the south, a slight reduction in the square footage of the building and a loss of two (2) parking spaces, and a special use for limited outdoor seating at 6 Oakwood Avenue and known as lots 148, 149, 150 and 153 and subject to eliminating the parking space immediately adjacent to the dumpster.

Upon call of the roll on the question of the motion, the following vote was recorded:

MR. JEFFREY B. SHULMAN .....	YEA (By phone)
MR. ANDREW AIDT .....	YEA
MRS. HARRISON GOWDY .....	YEA
MRS. E. HEALY JACKSON .....	NAY
MR. STEVE BYINGTON .....	YEA

There being four (4) yea votes and one (1) nay vote thereon, said motion was declared duly carried and it was so ordered.

For the record, Mr. Jacques explained that during previous meetings on this matter, Mr. Byington recused himself since he lived down the street from the property in question. However, Mr. Byington participated in today's meeting since he has moved to another property in Oakwood and there is no conflict.

Application #11-6, the special use by John & Jennifer Falter to vary the rear yard green space requirement for the installation of a wood patio in the rear of 225 Rubicon was presented. Mr. Weiskircher referenced a PowerPoint presentation and pointed out the location on the site plan, sketch of the wood patio and several photos of the proposed patio location. He explained the wood patio is only 8" off the ground so is treated like a patio rather than a deck. There is approximately 45% rear yard green space remaining where 50% is required.

Mr. Aidt opened the public hearing. Mrs. Falter indicated she had nothing to add. Mr. Byington extended apologies as he and his dogs travelled up her drive to visit the site. Mr. Aidt asked if it will be constructed like a deck. Mr. Weiskircher concurred. There were no other comments.

It was moved by Mr. Byington and seconded by Mrs. Jackson that the public hearing be closed. Upon a viva voce vote, motion passed.

#### SPECIAL USE STANDARDS

- A. The proposed use at the specified location is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.  
PRELIMINARY STAFF FINDINGS: The Comprehensive Plan recommends that improvements in residential areas be compatible with and complement existing neighborhood character. The proposed improvements seem to be consistent with that objective.  
PLANNING COMMISSION FINDINGS: Sustained.
- B. The proposed building or use will not adversely affect or change the character of the area in which it is located.  
PRELIMINARY STAFF FINDINGS: This side of the block of the 200 block of Rubicon

Road is characterized by small rear yards and what is being proposed is not inconsistent with how other property owners have tried to maximize use of the limited rear yard space available. The rear yard is already enclosed on three sides so the proposed wood patio will not be seen by the adjacent neighbors to either the south or the west, and is only partially visible by the neighbor to the north.

PLANNING COMMISSION FINDINGS: Sustained.

- C. That the establishment, maintenance or operation of the special use will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, morals, comfort, convenience or general welfare.

PRELIMINARY STAFF FINDINGS: Except for a reasonable level of noise to be expected when the wood patio is in use, the special use will not be detrimental to the public welfare.

PLANNING COMMISSION FINDINGS: Sustained.

- D. That the proposed use will not be injurious to the reasonable use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted, or substantially diminish and impair property values within the neighborhood.

PRELIMINARY STAFF FINDINGS: The proposed use of this space is typical of residential areas around the city and should not be injurious to the reasonable use and enjoyment of other properties in the immediate area.

PLANNING COMMISSION FINDINGS: Sustained.

- E. The proposed use at the specified location will not significantly adversely affect the use and development of adjacent and nearby properties in accordance with the regulations of the district in which they are located. The location, size and height of proposed buildings and other structures, and the operation of the use will not significantly adversely affect the use and development or hinder the appropriate development of adjacent and nearby properties.

PRELIMINARY STAFF FINDINGS: The proposed use will have no adverse effect whatsoever on the use and development of other properties in the immediate area.

PLANNING COMMISSION FINDINGS: Sustained.

- F. That the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of any proposed structure will not be so at variance with either the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of the structures already constructed or in the course of construction in the immediate neighborhood, or the character of the applicable district as to cause a substantial depreciation in the property values within the neighborhood.

PRELIMINARY STAFF FINDINGS: The materials being used and the appearance of the wood patio are consistent with residential applications.

PLANNING COMMISSION FINDINGS: Sustained.

- G. That adequate utilities, access roads, off-street parking and loading facilities, drainage and/or other necessary facilities, have been or are being provided at the applicant's cost.

PRELIMINARY STAFF FINDINGS: All improvements associated with the wood patio are being provided at the applicant's cost.

PLANNING COMMISSION FINDINGS: Sustained.

- H. That adequate measures have been or will be taken at applicant's cost to provide ingress and egress so designed as to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets and avoid hazards to pedestrian traffic.

PRELIMINARY STAFF FINDINGS: The proposed wood patio will have no impact on either pedestrian or vehicular traffic in the area.

PLANNING COMMISSION FINDINGS: Sustained.

- I. That the special use shall, in all other respects, conform to the applicable regulations of the district in which it is located, except as such regulation may, in each instance, be modified by Council pursuant to the recommendations of the Planning Commission.

PRELIMINARY STAFF FINDINGS: Except for the special use, the application complies with all other requirements of the R-5 zoning district.

PLANNING COMMISSION FINDINGS: Sustained.

Therefore, it was moved by Mr. Byington and seconded by Mrs. Jackson that application #11-6, the special use request by John and Jennifer Falter to vary the rear yard green space requirement for the installation of a wood patio in the rear yard of 225 Rubicon Road, and known as lot #673 and pt 674 be approved based on plans and information previously submitted and in compliance with all applicable city rules and regulations.

Upon call of the roll on the question of the motion, the following vote was recorded:

MR. JEFFREY B. SHULMAN ..... YEA (By phone)  
MR. ANDREW AIDT ..... YEA  
MRS. HARRISON GOWDY ..... YEA  
MRS. E. HEALY JACKSON ..... YEA  
MR. STEVE BYINGTON ..... YEA

There being five (5) yea votes and no (0) nay votes thereon, said motion was declared duly carried and it was so ordered.

Mr. Weiskircher indicated there are two pieces of legislation. The first relates to permitting a coffee shop in the Far Hills Business District only to apply for a special use to serve beer and/or wine based on standards staff has developed. Those standards relate to number of bar seats, operating hours, 70% of gross revenue, live entertainment, no advertising signs, etc. so as to not be an exclusive bar. Mrs. Gowdy reiterated this is only for Far Hills not Oakwood Avenue. Mr. Weiskircher concurred, this special use would only be permitted in the Far Hills Avenue Business District. Mr. Aidt indicated the use is a coffee shop with a minor use to sell beer and/or wine. Mr. Byington questioned the liquor license procedure. Mr. Weiskircher explained that is controlled by the state and there are two licenses left in Oakwood. The state obtains comments from the city, not neighbors, when a request is made. Mrs. Gowdy noted this would only be for beer and/or wine, no hard liquor. Mr. Jacques indicated it's inherent that they'd have to obtain a state license. Mrs. Jackson wondered how they came up with 18 seats and 70% gross revenue. Mr. Weiskircher indicated city staff based the calculations on square footage so it wouldn't become a predominant bar area.

Mrs. Jackson asked if they should consider the number of people. Mr. Weiskircher explained the fire code controls that. Mr. Aidt noted part of the special use procedure gives the commission the ability to add conditions if there are issues/concerns. Mr. Weiskircher explained over the years staff has developed performance standards and when someone is interested in a project, they are told up front of those standards and then the applicant determines whether they meet the requirements. Mr. Byington suggested the alcohol percentage be 49%. Mr. Weiskircher indicated there was nothing magic about the 70% number but added alcohol also costs significantly more. Mr. Byington wants to assure that the alcohol use remains a minor part of the coffee shop business. Mr. Aidt suggested that council deliberate the percentage. Mr. Aidt opened the public hearing for comment.

Mr. Al Barkolo, 210 Heritage Pointe Drive, explained he works in real estate and has watched Select Start create a friendly business environment in Oakwood. He has been there numerous times and although he is not an alcohol consumer, he believes this will assist them in a well-rounded business operation. A place to relax, meet, have a beverage, use of the meeting room in the early evening, etc. Mr. Barkolo indicated there are very few places in Oakwood for a quiet business environment and he commended Select Start on the job they've done so far. He asked the commission recommend this and believes they want to remain a coffee shop that serves other beverages.

Ms. Martha Shapiro, 1300 Robert Dickey, grew up in Oakwood and indicated there are very few quiet places to go, especially a spot to play cards, work on your computer or go for a business meeting. She isn't certain about the 70% given the cost difference between coffee and alcohol.

Mr. Bruce Balsing, 1300 Robert Dickey, indicated the idea of this coffee shop is to be a community gathering place. He indicated there are currently only five seats at the bar. In regard to cost, they plan to provide only select beer and wine choices. This is a place for adults, not kids, a high end relaxing coffee shop. He indicated they have an upstairs conference room that church groups have used. Mr. Balsing explained they have no intent to be a bar but a coffee shop similar to an European coffee establishment. Mr. Byington explained when the city writes legislation they have to look at the entire community needs, not just one applicant.

Mr. Shulman questioned the impact on the other coffee shops in Oakwood. Mr. Mike Morgan, Central Perc, indicated this won't impact their business especially since he wants to close up and go home at night. Mr. Shulman asked how many liquor permits there are. Mr. Weiskircher indicated only two available. Mr. Weiskircher explained this is only the legislation; the applicant will still have to apply for a special use and if granted, make application to the state for a license. There were no other comments on

the following legislation:

TO AMEND EXISTING SECTION 702.3, SPECIAL USES, AND TO ESTABLISH NEW SECTION 901.19, COFFEE SHOPS SELLING BEER AND WINE, OF THE OAKWOOD ZONING ORDINANCE TO PERMIT SUCH SHOPS AS S SPECIAL USE WITHIN THE COMMUNITY BUSINESS DISTRICT AND TO ADOPT REASONABLE DESIGN AND PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR OPERATION OF THE SAME.

Therefore, it was moved by Mrs. Gowdy and seconded by Mrs. Jackson that the aforementioned ordinance be recommended to city council for its review and adoption, with additional review on the proposed percentage standard.

Upon call of the roll on the question of the motion, the following vote was recorded:

MR. JEFFREY B. SHULMAN ..... YEA (By phone)  
MR. ANDREW AIDT ..... YEA  
MRS. HARRISON GOWDY ..... YEA  
MRS. E. HEALY JACKSON ..... YEA  
MR. STEVE BYINGTON ..... YEA

There being five (5) yea votes and no (0) nay votes thereon, said motion was declared duly carried and it was so ordered.

Mr. Weiskircher explained the next proposed ordinance is housekeeping as it relates to what constitutes a majority vote by the Planning Commission. He indicated the majority vote requirements are inconsistent, i.e., in some instances it is a simple majority of members present while in other instances three (3) affirmative votes are required. Mr. Jacques indicated this relates to concern where there might be a deadlock vote, two to two and one recusal then no action and automatic denial.

TO AMEND SECTIONS 1003.5 (B), PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION, 1004.5 (B), PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION, AND 1013.8 (A), PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION, OF THE OAKWOOD ZONING ORDINANCE TO CLARIFY PLANNING COMMISSION VOTING PROCEDURES AND HARMONIZE THE SAME WITH EXISTING SECTION 1001.1, PLANNING COMMISSION ESTABLISHED.

It was moved by Mrs. Jackson and seconded by Mrs. Gowdy that the aforementioned ordinance be recommended to city council for its review and adoption.

Upon call of the roll on the question of the motion, the following vote was recorded:

MR. JEFFREY B. SHULMAN ..... YEA (By phone)  
MR. ANDREW AIDT ..... YEA  
MRS. HARRISON GOWDY ..... YEA  
MRS. E. HEALY JACKSON ..... YEA  
MR. STEVE BYINGTON ..... YEA

There being five (5) yea votes and no (0) nay votes thereon, said motion was declared duly carried and it was so ordered.

There being no other business, it was moved by Mr. Aidt and seconded by Mr. Byington that the planning commission be adjourned. The public meeting concluded at 6:25 p.m.

---

VICE CHAIR

ATTEST:

---

CLERK