The Owensboro Metropolitan Planning Commission met in regular session at 5:30 p.m. on Thursday, November 13, 2014, at City Hall, Commission Chambers, Owensboro, Kentucky, and the proceedings were as follows:

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ward Pedley, Chairman
Fred Reeves, Vice Chairman
David Appleby, Secretary
Brian Howard, Director
Terra Knight, Attorney
Steve Frey
Wally Taylor
John Kazlauskas
Larry Boswell
Beverly McEnroe
Irvin Rogers
Larry Moore

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

CHAIRMAN: Call the Owensboro Metropolitan Planning Commission November 13, 2014 meeting to order. We will begin our meeting with a prayer and pledge of allegiance to the flag. Mr. Boswell will lead us.

(INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.)

CHAIRMAN: I would like to welcome everyone. Anyone wishing to speak we ask that you come to one of the podiums and state your name and be sworn in. We welcome your comments and questions.
Commissioners, if you will, speak into the microphone. We have people at home that like to watch these commission meetings. So if everyone will speak into the microphone, they can hear better at home.

The first item on the agenda is to consider the minutes of the September 11, 2014 meeting.

Commissioners, you have a copy of the minutes in your packet. Are there any additions or corrections?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: If not the chair is ready for a motion.

MR. APPLEBY: Motion for approval.

CHAIRMAN: We have a motion for approval by Mr. Appleby.

MR. FREY: Second.

CHAIRMAN: Second by Mr. Frey. All in favor of the motion raise your right hand.

(ALL BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT RESPONDED AYE.)

CHAIRMAN: The minutes are approved.

The commission did not have a meeting in October so there were no minutes.

First item on the agenda.

MR. HOWARD: I'll note that all rezoning changes heard tonight will become final 21 days after
the meeting, unless an appeal is filed. If an appeal is filed, then we will forward a copy of the record of the meeting along with the information on the rezoning to the appropriate legislative body for them to take final action. The appeal forms are available in our office, on our website and on the back table.

----------------------------------------------

GENERAL BUSINESS

ZONING CHANGES

ITEM 3

518 Elm Street, 0.100 acres (rescheduled from the October 9, 2014 meeting)
Consider zoning change: From R-1T Townhouse to B-4 General Business
Applicant: Audubon Area Community Services

MS. KNIGHT: Will you state your name for the record?

MS. EVANS: Melissa Evans.

(MELISSA EVANS SWORN BY ATTORNEY.)

MS. EVANS: I would like to point out that the screens on the podium up there for you all and the ones out here, apparently City Hall has been having some malfunctions.

CHAIRMAN: I was informed they're not working.

MS. EVANS: We have it on the computer down here if anybody wants to see, you can come over and look at the computer, but they're not on the big
screens for you to actually see the maps.

PLANNING STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

The Planning Staff recommends approval subject to the findings of fact that follow:

FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. Staff recommends approval because the proposal is in compliance with the community’s adopted Comprehensive Plan;

2. The subject property is located in a Central Residential Plan Area where general business uses are appropriate in limited locations;

3. The proposed use as a parking lot conforms to the criteria for nonresidential development;

4. The proposal is a logical expansion of existing B-4 General Business zoning to the north;

and,

5. At 0.100 acres, the proposal does not significantly increase the extent of general business zoning in the vicinity and should not overburden the capacity of roadways and other necessary urban services that are available in the affected area.

MS. EVANS: We would like to enter the Staff Report into the record as Exhibit A.

CHAIRMAN: Is anyone here representing the applicant?

Ohio Valley Reporting
(270) 683-7383
MS. SMITH: Michelle Smith, service coordinator for Audubon Area.

CHAIRMAN: Let's find out if we have any questions from the audience. We will bring you back, if we have any comments or questions.

Is anyone here that would like to speak in opposition or have any comments or questions on this application?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: Any commission members, do you have any comments or questions?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: If not the chair is ready for a motion.

MR. ROGERS: Motion for approval based on Planning Staff Recommendation and Findings of Fact 1 through 5.

CHAIRMAN: We have a motion for approval by Mr. Rogers.

MR. APPLEBY: Second.

CHAIRMAN: Second by Mr. Appleby. Any comments or questions on the motion?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: All in favor of the motion raise your right hand.
(ALL BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT RESPONDED AYE.)

CHAIRMAN: Motion carries unanimous.

Next item, please.

ITEM 4

316, 324 Hill Avenue, 0.42 acres (rescheduled from the October 9, 2014 meeting)
Consider zoning change: From R-1B Single Family Residential to R-3MF Multi-Family Residential
Applicant: Professional Properties & Construction; Mike & Marilyn Wells

MS. EVANS: The Staff's recommendation on this item is for denial. So with a denial recommendation we do read the entire Staff Report into the record.

PROPOSED ZONE & LAND USE PLAN

The applicant is seeking an R-3MF Multi-Family Residential zone. The subject property is located in an Urban Residential Plan Area where Urban Mid-Density Residential uses are appropriate in limited locations.

SPECIFIC LAND USE CRITERIA

(a) Building and lot patterns – Building and lot patterns should conform to the criteria for “Urban Residential Development” (D6).

(b) Existing, expanded or new sanitary sewers – Urban Mid-Density Residential uses should occur only where sanitary sewer systems exist or may be expanded, or where new systems may be properly established.

(c) Logical expansions – Existing areas of Urban
Mid-Density Residential uses may be expanded onto contiguous land. An expansion of this use should not overburden the capacity of roadways and other necessary urban services that are available in the affected area.

(D) New locations near major streets – In Urban Residential, Professional/Service, Business, and Rural Community plan areas, new locations of Urban Mid-Density Residential uses should be “major-street-oriented” (D2).

PLANNING STAFF REVIEW

GENERAL LAND USE CRITERIA

Environment

* It appears that the subject property is not located in a wetlands area per the US Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service dated March 6, 1990.

* The subject property is not located in a special flood hazard area per FIRM Map 21059CO138 D.

* It appears that the subject property is not within the Owensboro Wellhead Protection area per the GRADD map dated March 1999.

* The developer is responsible for obtaining permits from the Division of Water, The Army Corp of Engineers, FEMA or other state and federal agencies as
may be applicable.

URBAN SERVICES

All urban services, including sanitary sewer, are available to the site.

DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS

The subject properties are currently vacant. Walgreen's and Jimmy John's, which is under construction, just recently completed, are located across the alley to the east of the subject properties. There is also one property located across the alley to the south zoned B-4 General Business. The other uses surrounding the subject properties are single-family residential. The applicant proposes to construct a 2-story 4-plex on the subject properties. The subject properties are located along Hill Avenue, a local street.

SPECIFIC LAND USE CRITERIA

The applicant’s proposal is not in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed use as multi-family residential conforms to the criteria for urban residential development. However, the proposed R-3MF Multi-Family Residential zoning is not a logical expansion of R-3MF Multi-Family Residential zoning, as there is no other Multi-Family Residential zoning in the vicinity. With the exception of the B-4 General
Business zoning that fronts along Frederica Street all properties in the block are zoned R-1B Single-Family Residential. The nearest multi-family zoning on the west side of Frederica Street is located nearly a half mile away. As a proposed 4-plex, the use could overburden the capacity of roadways and other necessary urban services that are available in the affected area as this is a single-family residential area. The subject properties are located on Hill Avenue, a local street, and are not major-street-oriented.

PLANNING STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

The Planning Staff recommends denial subject to the findings of fact that follow:

FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. Staff recommends denial because the proposal is not in compliance with the community’s adopted Comprehensive Plan;

2. The subject properties are located in an Urban Residential Plan Area where Urban Mid-Density Residential uses are appropriate in limited locations;

3. The proposal is not a logical expansion of existing R-3MF Multi-Family Residential zoning;

4. The proposed use as a 4-plex could overburden the capacity of the roadways and other
necessary urban services that are available in the
affected area; and,

5. The subject properties are not
major-street-oriented.

MS. EVANS: We would like to enter the Staff
Report into the record as Exhibit B.

CHAIRMAN: Anyone here representing the
applicant?

MR. SULLIVAN: Yes.

MS. KNIGHT: Mr. Sullivan, state your name for
the record, please.

MR. SULLIVAN: I'm Mike Sullivan. I'm a local
attorney.

MS. KNIGHT: You're sworn as an attorney.

MS. SULLIVAN: Good evening. I represent
Professional Properties & Construction, the applicant,
who is here tonight, via Gary Cecil and Mike Wells.
The property owner at the time is also here.

Does everybody have our proposed Findings of
Fact that we tendered with our application?

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. SULLIVAN: A couple of things I wanted to
address about the Staff's Report. They mention that
there was no other B-4 in the block, but I'm not sure
what the block is. Just so you know, and it's on our
property drawing that was submitted with our application, there is a building behind the subject property, I call it behind, to the south of the subject property that faces on Booth Avenue that is zoned B-4. That is the Burton Realty house that some of you all may be familiar with. Also across Hill Avenue, right across Hill Avenue just to the east is that building that used to be Condo Accents that now, I think, it has a yoga studio in it and may have an embroidery shop in it that is zoned B-4.

In addition to Jimmie John's, which is right across the alley from it and in addition to Walgreen's, which is essentially adjacent to it as well, this property is you could say surrounded by people on almost every side. I think it's significant that that be recognized.

Another thing about this property that actually I didn't know until five or ten minutes ago is that the structures on, these are vacant lots right now. The structures that used to be on these properties were duplexes. So while it might have been zoned single-family residential, there were duplexes on these two lots that we're trying to rezone at this current time.

Another thing I would like you to have
available, I think it was tendered to the staff. I
don't know if you've seen it. I don't know if we've
got copies for everybody, but we wanted you to see the
proposed 4-plex that my client wants to construct on
this site. You'll see it's, I don't hesitate to say,
topnotch is what they plan to do.

MS. EVANS: All the planning commissioners
were mailed a copy of the elevation drawing. They
were not mailed a copy of the actual floor plan, the
interior, but there were a copy of the elevation
drawing to see what the outside of the building would
look like.

MR. SULLIVAN: This one is colored and it does
have the floor plan on the back. I've got copies. If
you don't care, I'll pass them up here.

We know what the zoning ordinance says. We
know that there are four criterias that have to be
looked at in the comprehensive plan to determine
whether or not our application is in compliance with
the comprehensive plan. I think that really what
we're talking about here is why is it not in
compliance with the comprehensive plan. It's not
because there isn't a contiguous multi-family use. If
we had a duplex located right next-door, we would have
a contiguous multi-family use, and I dare to say that
the Staff may be up here recommending rezoning.

Where do we go from there? We can't change what the adjoining properties are. Where does my client go from here, and why do we think you ought to approve this application?

You can approve this application and you're given discretion to approve this application, even though it's not in compliance with the plan, and you know this, if certain circumstances exist, and they exist here. That is the facts related to this rezoning show that the existing zoning classification is inappropriate and there have been major changes of an economic or of a social nature within the involved area not anticipated by the comprehensive plan that substantially alter the basic character of the involved area.

Also, I think if you look at it what you see is you've now got Walgreen's here. That's happened in the last few years. Jimmy John's just happened right next to it. You've got B-4 behind it. You've got B-4 across the street. Having a single-family residential structure located right next to all of this B-4 use, I dare say isn't appropriate at this time. If having a multi-family use in this location right next to all of this business use, would actually be a good buffer use
between the existing single-family residential and
this more intent B-4 that's all on Frederica Street
and behind this property and across the street from
this property. It would actually serve as a good
mid-intensity use to blend from the B-4 to the
single-family residential.

We put in detail and explain why we think we
satisfy from evidentiary standpoint a finding that
although it's not in compliance with the Comprehensive
Plan you ought to approve this rezoning. You've got
that discretion. I think our proposed findings are in
the record. I'm not going to reread them. I think
you've seen them.

We're here to answer any questions that you
have, but we'd ask you to approve the application.
Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Anyone in the audience have any
comments or questions of Mr. Sullivan while he's up
there?

Would you step up, sir.

MR. SPALDING: My name is Randy Spalding.

(RANDY SPALDING SWORN BY ATTORNEY.)

MR. SPALDING: My concern is the traffic on
the street. There's at least two residents, myself
and one other, that all have small children. With the
added traffic with Jimmy John's, whether it's their employees don't have parking, and then additional four units. You've got to figure one or two cars apiece. That's an additional eight cars on that street every day living there.

The two properties, Jimmy John's and the Walgreen's, all have their back to the property. They're facing Frederica. There's an alley in-between them which is also being used as a drive-thru for Jimmy John's. I don't know where there's parking or where they're going to park.

MR. SULLIVAN: Again, these are two lots. The parking will be off street for these 4-plexes, and they will access via the alley that is in-between Jimmy John's and the property.

MR. SPALDING: The one that the restaurant uses for their drive-thru.

CHAIRMAN: Sir, when you need to speak, would you speak into the mike so the recorder can get what you're saying.

MR. SPALDING: Yes.

MR. SULLIVAN: The people who live, who would live at these 4-plexes would come in the alley located to the east of this property to access their off-street parking. I understand this gentleman's
concern about Jimmy John's and about Walgreen's and about all the traffic that is running through there, but I don't think when you look at how these two lots are proposed to be used and how they could be used as is, that you would see a significant and how they're going to have the off-street parking developed on this property. I don't think that you will see a substantial increase in traffic because of this proposed use.

MR. APPLEBY: Is the off-street parking in the rear?

MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN: Commissioners, will Mr. Sullivan is up, do you have any additional questions or comments?

Yes, Mr. Reeves.

MR. REEVES: I have really struggled with this one because I have a great sensitivity to this property, right to do with this property, but that extends also to the neighbors.

I called Mr. Howard about a week ago and asked him a question. I normally don't go to a site, but because I was struggling with this paperwork I went to look at the site. I grew up in this community at that time that neighborhood was evolving. I generally think of that, and you may or may not disagrees, that
neighborhood typically evolved from Frederica on the
east to Lewis Lane on the west bounded by Ford on the
north and Booth on the south. I drove that
neighborhood to see if there are other multi-family
homes in that area. I believe I found one that's
bounded in that area for sure. One is right on the
border of it. I asked Mr. Howard to let me know, did
those, were those multi-family units put in there
prior to zoning impacting the development of the land.
One of them is an apartment complex right next to the
Lutheran Church on Ford. Then there is a 4-plex right
close to Sutton School on Lewis Lane down there. I
remember when those were built specifically.

Mr. Howard, did you find out about that?

MR. HOWARD: I looked through our records and
talked to Jim Mischel in our office. We have find no
evidence that those were approved through the Planning
process. They appear to all predate zoning
regulations.

MR. REEVES: The other question I asked
Mr. Howard was: If the lot next to the Episcopal
church, Trinity Episcopal, if that were a vacant lot
now, and I'm not sure you can answer this, but if that
were a vacant lot, would the Staff be making the same
recommendation if somebody wanted to do multi-family
on that lot?

MR. HOWARD: This was a good question because it is kind of an apples-to-apples comparison. As Mr. Sullivan stated tonight, surrounding this property is commercial zoning and things like that. Right next-door to the apartments is Trinity Episcopal Church that's zoned P-1. The one difference is that Hill Avenue is classified as a local street. One of the criteria for a new location is supposed to be major-street-oriented. Ford, which is where those apartments are located, is classified as a major collector roadway. Under the hierarchy of street classifications, that would count as major-street-oriented. So based on that, we could apply that criteria D and likely been able to recommend approval of it because of the classification of that roadway.

MR. REEVES: I guess the struggle I'm having is knowing that once we open the door to multi-family rezoning west of Frederica in that neighborhood, then it could have a multiplying effect down the road. There's some very nice, all very nice homes in that area that I'm not sure that those folks want to have an apartment complex scattered here and there in that neighborhood impacting their way of life. I haven't
made my mind up on this one yet. I'm anxious to hear
what others have to say and the applicant and this
gentleman right here. That's my big concern is, this
is the door opener right here.

MR. SULLIVAN: Now, I'm going to say something
and these guys up here who know the zoning ordinance
like the back of their hand are going to probably tell
me I'm wrong. Speak up if I am.

I don't know if the door is already open
because you've already got B-4 crawling into this
neighborhood. I mean there's a B-4 behind them.
Could we have rezoned this B-4? Is that in compliance
with the plan? Is it a logical expansion because
you've got B-4 on a couple of sides of it already?

MR. HOWARD: Mr. Cecil and I looked at various
options over time. Based on our discussions, no, I
don't think we would not have been able to recommend
B-4 because of the way the language is in the
comprehensive plan for that. In that block front on
this side of Hill Avenue, there's no B-4 past the
alley in the criteria they're talking about if you go
across an alley that you have to meet certain
parameters. So we wouldn't have been able to do that;
however, we could have been able to recommend, I
believe, based on the Comprehensive Plan, a rezoning
to P-1, which would allow them to have done office
space on the main level and apartments upstairs
because the language in there. As you all know, the
Comprehensive Plan is very flexible in what it allows.
The P-1 zoning we could have supported because the
language in there, one of the criteria is a buffer
use. That's one of the things that you discussed	onight. That this multi-family residential could
potentially serve as a buffer. That's one of the
criteria for P-1; unfortunately or depending on which
side you are here. It's not in there for multi-family
so we couldn't apply that.

MR. SULLIVAN: Fred, the only reason I bring
that up is, the door is already open. You're
concerned that, oh, there might be a creep into the
single-family residential. It can already happen via
P-1. That's the only reason I brought that up.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sullivan, if you could stay, I
want to ask other commissioners member.

Mr. Kazlauskas.

MR. KAZLAUSKAS: Mike, I'm somewhat confused
and I want you and the staff to help me out here.
You said that these residences were duplexes.
When I was a young police officer, I made several
calls to these houses and I knew them as
single-dwellings, single-family dwellings. What I understand that these were duplexes in violation of the zoning ordinances.

MR. HOWARD: Maybe. If they were duplexes, Mr. Reeves asked about some of these other properties. They predated zoning. If they predate the late 1970's, as construction and use as a duplex, they would not be illegal. They would be what we would call an existing nonconforming use. But tonight is the first I've heard about them being duplexes. I don't know that they were or were not.

MR. KAZLAUSKAS: I know the times that I made some calls there were single-family dwelling living there.

My other concern, I think we're all concerned about this, is the building, let me say to you that this is a very attractive building. It certainly would look very good on those two places, on those two lots, but I'm concerned about the parking also. If you built this building, is there criteria about how much parking has to be made available, and is that room there for parking to be available?

MR. HOWARD: Sure. Yes, there is a parking requirement. If they are two or three bedroom units, which I believe these would be, the minimum parking is
two spaces per unit. So at four units you're looking at eight parking spaces required. Then there would be about maybe, I guess, an additional three spaces for spillover. So you're probably looking at about 10 or 11 parking spaces that would be required. We haven't seen a site plan. They may be able to better answer, can you actually physically put all of that on the property. We haven't seen a site plan.

MR. KAZLAUSKAS: Is there a footprint that would -- I mean that's a big concern.

Coming to the meeting tonight I drove down there and, of course, Jimmy John's was open, their first night open, and traffic was unbelievable, you know. So I can understand why people would be concerned about the traffic problem on that corner.

The addition to traffic, and I'm concerned about the footprint with all these parking spaces in the back also. So I don't know if that's appropriate.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sullivan, you want to respond?

MR. SULLIVAN: I would like Mr. Cecil to describe the circumstances with you and the footprint and the lot size and how the parking spaces could fit.

MS. KNIGHT: Mr. Cecil, would you state your name for the record, please.

MR. CECIL: Gary Cecil.
(GARY CECIL SWORN BY ATTORNEY.)

MR. CECIL: I think if you look at that floor plan, it's going to show that the building itself is about 50 feet wide. When you combine these two lots, you end up with 100 foot wide lot. So there's essentially 25 feet on each side of this from the lot lines.

I've given you my copy, and I don't remember if it's on there or not, but the depth of the lot is close to 150 feet. The building itself can't be more than 70 feet, if I'm not mistaken. While we have not generated a site plan, we do not have that available. Had I realized that would have been a concern, we would have done it. To fit ten parking spots on this property with that building is going to be pretty easily done.

MR. HOWARD: I'll just add, on the property identification it looks like the lots are about 180 feet in depth.

MR. KAZLAUSKAS: I guess my next question would be to Staff then.

If you've got to have 10 to 12 parking spaces, do we have to have a buffer zone, trees, hedges and additional spots/space?

MR. HOWARD: Depending on where it's located,
and depending on where the adjoining residences are, and depending on where the allies are. There are several factors that go into this. The only buffering that could potentially be required would be a three foot tall continuous element, which is typically achieved by a row of bushes with a tree every 40 feet. So there certainly could be a requirement, but it's not the ten foot wide buffer that would be required if say between residential and industrial or commercial.

Mr. Kazlauskas: Without a footprint this is difficult for me to grasp in my mind; although, I like the looks of the building.

Chairman: Mr. Boswell, you have a question?

Mr. Boswell: Yes, I do.

The concern that I have, I also share the concern everybody else does about traffic patterns, but the neighborhood itself as far as how it would impact the neighborhood for the future.

You've got 4 units and let's say you've got 12 parking spots. Based on what I'm reading so far, and Staff may be able to help me with this, that particular R-3MF zone is principally permitted, according to our zone information and our laws. I'm trying to understand if it's principally permitted based on the scheduled zones. Is the reason that
we're not, we're wanting to deny it is because of the
carender about the traffic patterns as well as the
neighborhood itself, the streets and so forth? That's
part of what is being stated as far as why it's to be
denied.

MR. HOWARD: If I could maybe clarify that in
some capacity.

Right now the property is this zoned R-1B
Single-Family Residential. In that zone multi-family
uses are not a permitted use. So they're required, if
they want to do a multi-family project, to rezone to
R-4DT or R-2MF or R-3MF. Those are zones which allow
multi-family residential. So they're proposing to go
R-3MF. If they were successful in R-3MF zoning, then
their project would be a principally permitted use in
that zone.

The biggest hang up, as far as why Staff
couldn't recommend approval of it, is because it
doesn't meet the specific criteria of the
Comprehensive Plan because it's not a logical
expansion and it's not major-street-oriented on Hill,
which is a local street.

MR. BOSWELL: But the land use criteria, what
concerned me about what I read here was that it says
that it could overburden the capacity of roadways.
Well, could and will are two different issues. How do we know that it could and could overburden the capacity of roadways? It's mentioned two or three different places. It just seemed to me that, do we have any facts based on information that says that that is a possibility?

MR. HOWARD: I think it all has to do with scope, the scope of the project. If you were asked my opinion, do I think that a 4-plex in general would overburden the capacity of roadways, I would say, no. But at four-tenths of an acre, they can probably squeeze more units on that property and then that could potentially overburden the capacity of roadway. A lot of it is based on the scope of what's being proposed and the scope of what's built. That's why we put that statement in there that way. Just because you all, whether you -- say you recommend approval of this. You all as a Planning Commission cannot stipulate that it's limited to one specific use. So that's why we have to put a statement in there and phrase it that way, because we can't say what's only limited to a two-story 4-plex.

MR. BOSWELL: I guess this question will be directed to maybe Mr. Sullivan or Mr. Wells.

Is there any anticipation that you could add
on to this 4-plex at some point in time?

MR. CECIL: I think we probably maxed out our
budget with this one. I don't see us having any
extra. I think for that matter you run out of land
use for more sparking if the footprint grows much
bigger.

You know, when we were looking at this and we
considered rezoning P-1 and doing professional space
on the main level and then two/three bedroom, two bath
units on the upper level, we were going to be required
to have 13 parking spots to make that happen. So
either way whether you approve this multi-family
re zoning or we come back and, okay, maybe we do P-1,
we're going to have the same number of parking spots
for either building.

Are you more likely in a P-1 to have more
traffic and in and out on a daily basis use?
Mr. Sullivan, I'm not sure how many people in and out
of the your parking lot on a daily basis, but I would
think that a P-1 would actually burden the property
even more.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Reeves.

MR. REEVES: I want to go back to
Mr. Boswell's question.

The concern I have with that is, as I
mentioned earlier, if we rezone this one, then every likelihood -- there's a number of deteriorated properties around there that could be taken down. We could just as easily instead of having one 4-plex there now, ten years from now have ten 4-plexes there. That would probably overburden the road. That's my concern is that threshold. I realize those B-4's are there. They may also predate zoning. I'm not sure. They're classified as B-4 right now.

My concern is how many of these can you get into a neighborhood before you begin to overburden streets, adding traffic in there and so forth, and impact the value of those homes that are in what is now a very nice contained residential neighborhood.

MR. APPLEBY: I think you've got to realize too, as he was saying, more than likely, according to Brian, they could recommend a professional use on that. You could have a dental office, which you have a tremendous turnover. You could have a beauty shop that could go in under professional use, and I can tell you they have a lot of traffic. At what point do we cross that threshold?

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Frey, you have your hand up.

MR. FREY: For either Mr. Sullivan or Mr. Cecil.
Are these going to be for sale or for rent?

MR. CECIL: We haven't looked at any type of condo association so we're going to keep these as rentals.

MR. FREY: As far as the price ranges will go, are you looking high-end?

MR. CECIL: There will not be any Section 8. We expect, you know, 1,200 to $1,500 a month. We're not talking about a low-end rental by any means.

MR. FREY: If I voted to approve this and the commission did, somebody comes further down the street, it would come up and it would be grandfathered in since we approved this one, because it is a buffer between business and residential. We could then vote to potentially not approve another one on the other block?

MR. HOWARD: That's a question without a lot of information. If it was right next-door to it, it's going to meet the criteria of a logical expansion. If it's three houses down and you've got three single-family lots in-between, then probably not because that really isn't a logical expansion. You're leapfrogging over three single-families. There's a lot of what ifs there that we would have to look at.

MR. FREY: Thank you.
MR. BOSWELL: If that happened though, if that occurred, then that would set a precedence that would be hard to turn down another approval at some point in time?

MR. HOWARD: It's possible, yes. Again, depending on where it is and the scope and several things that you all would look at.

MR. KAZLAUSKAS: If it was right next-door, we would be mandated?

MR. HOWARD: That's right.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Moore.

MR. MOORE: You mentioned the fact that these lots did have duplexes.

MR. SULLIVAN: That's based on what Mike Wells told me. I want you to be clear of that.

MR. MOORE: What kind of time frame is that occurring? Here recently or years?

MR. WELLS: I'm Mike Wells, the owner of the property.

MS. KNIGHT: Sir, let me swear you in please.

(MIKE WELLS SWORN BY ATTORNEY.)

MR. WELLS: I don't know exactly how many years. I've owned the property probably seven or eight years. There were two buildings on, there's two lots involved in this. On each lot they were both, I
don't know if they were pre-approved before the zoning, etcetera, but they were marginal properties. I tore them both down and the property has been vacant ever since. I never rented them as apartments.

In both of the residences, they were separate apartments. One of them was a very large structure. One had a single-family residence, but it had an apartment upstairs. The other was a true duplex.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Wells, is your business located on Hill Avenue?

MR. WELLS: It's on Booth.

CHAIRMAN: It's on Booth?

MR. WELLS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Your residence, where is your residence?

MR. WELLS: I live on Griffith Place West, in that neighborhood.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. WELLS: I own two buildings on Booth Avenue, both of which are zoned commercial. I've always admired these lots and thought they had a lot of potential.

CHAIRMAN: Commissioners, anyone have any more questions of Mr. Wells or Mr. Sullivan?

Mr. Moore.
MR. MOORE: Let me ask Mr. Howard.

Does that make a difference then if they were duplexes at one time?

MR. HOWARD: I think if it was documented that they were duplexes, if it were documented that they were duplexes that were either approved appropriately through planning or predated zoning, and they hadn't discontinued that use for more than 18 months, you could certainly argue that there is an existing nonconforming use of multi-family on that property.

We did not have that information. We could not document that. We didn't in our office. Plus, if there's been a discontinuance of that for certainly longer than the 18 month grandfather period.

Could it have? Potentially. Would it in this instance? I would say, no, because it doesn't meet those criterias.

MR. MOORE: Thank you.

MR. SULLIVAN: There was one thing I just wanted to add again. I always, Terra and Brian, if I'm wrong, correct me.

This fear of the slippery slope, you cited two reasons that this may not fit, that multi-family may not fit here in a single-family lot. One was the logical expansion issue. The other was the street
orientation issue.

If somebody ten years from now wanted to rezone the lot right next to ours multi-family, while he might have a logical expansion ground, there still might be a street orientation issue; is that right?

MR. HOWARD: The way it reads you have to satisfy the criteria that are applicable. So in this instance it would either be that it's a logical expansion. If it's not a logical expansion, then you jump to, is it a new location? The new location is the major-street-orientation. We would look and say, it's a logical expansion because it's right next-door to it. The new location wouldn't apply because it is a logical expansion already.

MR. SULLIVAN: I think this is a unique situation because you do have those alleys adjacent to it that the other lots don't. They've got an alley behind them, but not one right next to them like this one does.

CHAIRMAN: Anyone in the audience that would like to ask questions?

Yes, ma'am.

MS. KNIGHT: Ma'am, would you state your name for the record, please.

MS. McDANIEL: Cindy McDaniel. I live at 339 Ohio Valley Reporting
(270) 683-7383
Hill Avenue.

(CINDY Mc DANIEL SWORN BY ATTORNEY.)

MS. Mc DANIEL: I just would like to know what is your target demographic? Are you looking at young families with children? Are you looking at middle age, elderly or what?

MR. CECIL: I actually live right here in this same area. I have young kids. Our target is obviously people who want to be in town. Sutton is a great school, and this is in the Sutton district. Am I going to say you can't live there because you don't have three kids? Of course not.

You know, I think our target is people who can afford a nicer rental or maybe a professional that's in town for a shorter period of time. Not necessarily looking for a specific family. For that matter, we can't discriminate. If they can pay the rent, we would have to rent to them.

MS. Mc DANIEL: You also said you're maxed out on your budget. You don't plan on doing any more expansion. Okay. What if it is sold to another corporation, company, an individual, ten years from now, he can expand it if he's got some land to put four more units? Now, what's that going to do to our sewer system and roadways and the congestion? You
couldn't have gotten emergency vehicles down that street the past few days. There's no way. And they're wanting to add more? If we had gone with a professional building, maybe it would have been different.

If any of you all have been on those street, I know you said you had been, there's no way could an emergency vehicle gotten down that street. I almost didn't get out to go to work. My driveway was blocked. Once I got out it was a fight to go in either direction.

So we don't need any more traffic. The street is not in that good of a shape as it is. Will our sewers handle? Because with three bedrooms, so you're talking four people max in an apartment. Will the sewers handle that much more? Not the way it exist now I don't believe it would.

CHAIRMAN: Anyone like to comment on that question, about the traffic issue and it growing? Anyone?

Mr. Sullivan, I think you've already addressed that. You've pretty well said everything on the traffic issue.

This gentleman over here, you were up earlier. Do you have any additional questions of Mr. Sullivan
or Mr. Cecil?

MR. SPALDING: No, sir.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Anyone else in the audience have any more questions or comments?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sullivan, do you have any more?

MR. SULLIVAN: I can't answer the sewer question. I think somebody else up there could.

Addressing this lady questions about sewer capacity,
I'm not aware of there being an inability of the sewer system to handle these houses. I'm not an expert on that. Well, actually your all's finding said that sewer capacity would be okay.

MR. REEVES: I have question.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. REEVES: For this lady right, if you don't mind please, could I ask you a question?

MS. McDaniel: Sure.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Howard, I believe you said if they had applied for P-1, it would have been recommended for approval. So if they were to develop this with professional on the first floor and residential on the second floor, would you be less or more concerned about the traffic and the
infrastructure with the sewer?

MS. McDANIEL: Probably just about equally concerned. If it was professional only and you don't have apartments on top of it, maybe it wouldn't be quite so bad.

MR. REEVES: We've already established they could have an apartment on top. So they could have a beauty shop and a dentist. Which concerns you more as a resident on that street? For families living in that building or two families living in that building with two professional businesses on the first floor.

MS. McDANIEL: Probably the four families because you're going to have much more traffic with kids and we watch traffic, and I think Randy can attest to it also. They don't know what the speed limit is on that road. You really have to watch your kids. If you've got kids in those buildings, sooner or later something is going to happen. Yes, I'm concerned about families. I'm concerned about noise, congestion, what it's going to do to our property value.

MR. REEVES: Thank you for your participation.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Anyone else have comments,

Commissioners?
Yes, Mr. Kazlauskas.

MR. KAZLAUSKAS: On Findings of Fact Number 4, to address what this lady was talking about. It says, "The proposed use of a 4-plex could overburden the capacity of the roadways and other necessary urban services that are available in the affected areas."

To me that means it could affect that sewer system. I know for a fact that that is part of the old combined sewer system out in that area that is centrally located. RWRA is contingent to alleviate the flooding. They've done a good job, but I do know for a fact that if you have a hard rain, it's better than it was ten years ago, but those sewers have not been improved since they were laid, what, 100 years ago.

So the capacity has not been improved. They might have done some work on the lining of them, but the capacity of those sewers have not been improved. Hill Avenue is a very narrow street.

CHAIRMAN: Anyone else?

MR. APPLEBY: Just one comment. I think we don't want to lose sight of the fact that some form of development is going to take place on these lots. Be it multi-family, single-family or, in my opinion, the worse application would be professional based on the amount of traffic that professional generates. You've
got to realize that there is some development that's
going to take place on those two lots.

CHAIRMAN: Commissioners, anyone else have any
comments?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sullivan, any additional
comments?

MR. SULLIVAN: No.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Cecil?

MR. CECIL: No.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Wells?

MR. WELLS: No.

CHAIRMAN: If not the chair is ready for a
motion.

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to make
a motion for approval based on the applicant's
findings that the proposed rezoning conforms to the
criteria for Urban Residential Development; that the
existing, expanded or new sanitary sewers, the
proposed rezoning will occur where sanitary sewers
exist; that it will not overburden the capacity of
roadways and other necessary urban services in the
affected area; and that the existing zoning is
inappropriate and that there have been significant
changes in the area that has changed the character of
the neighborhood; that this proposed use is more appropriate and provides a buffer between existing commercial and residential properties.

CHAIRMAN: We have a motion for approval by Mr. Appleby.

MR. ROGERS: Second.

CHAIRMAN: We have a second by Mr. Rogers.

Comments or questions on the motion?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: All in favor of the motion raise your right hand.

(BOARD MEMBERS IRVIN ROGERS, LARRY MOORE, BEVERLY McENROE, DAVE APPLEBY, WARD PEDLEY, WALLY TAYLOR, LARRY BOSWELL AND STEVE FREY RESPONDED AYE.)

CHAIRMAN: All opposed.

(BOARD MEMBERS JOHN KAZLAUSKAS AND FRED REEVES RESPONDED NAY.)

CHAIRMAN: Eight to two. The motion carries eight to two.

Next item, please.

ITEM 5

1121 Moseley Street, 1.538 acres
Consider zoning change: From I-1 Light Industrial to B-4 General Business
Applicant: Hayden Development

CHAIRMAN: State your name for the record?
PLANNING STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Staff recommends approval subject to the findings of fact that follow:

FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. Staff recommends approval because the proposal is in compliance with the community’s adopted Comprehensive Plan;

2. The subject property is located in an Industrial Plan Area where general business uses are appropriate in very limited locations;

3. The proposed use as a commercial development conforms to the criteria for nonresidential development;

4. The proposal is a logical expansion of existing B-4 General Business zoning in the vicinity to the east and south of the subject property, as well as the existing B-5 Business/Industrial zoning to the southwest; and,

5. At 1.538 acres, the proposal does not significantly increase the extent of general business zoning in the vicinity and should not overburden the capacity of roadways and other necessary urban services that are available in the affected area.
MR. HILL: We would like to enter the Staff Report into the record as Exhibit C.

CHAIRMAN: Anyone here representing the applicant?

MR. MASON: Yes.

MS. KNIGHT: State your name for the record.

MR. MASON: James L. Mason, commercial real estate broker.

(JAMES MASON SWORN BY ATTORNEY.)

MR. MASON: I represent the owner, current owner of the property, as well as the co-applicant. His name is William T. Cottrell. He is co-applicant on this.

MS. KNIGHT: Sir, did you say you were the applicant?

MR. MASON: No. I represent the applicant, co-applicant.

MS. KNIGHT: Are you an attorney?

MR. MASON: No. I'm a real estate broker.

MS. KNIGHT: I'm required to give you the provision about representing a third-party when you are not an attorney.

MR. MASON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN: Does anyone in the audience have any comments or questions on the application?
CHAIRMAN: Commissioners, do you have any comments or questions?

MR. MOORE: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, sir, Mr. Moore.

MR. MOORE: I drove by this lot, this area. There is a building being constructed on this site at this particular time. If it is being built and this zoning doesn't change, does it make any difference what's going to go in there?

MR. HOWARD: The lots where the building is being constructed is actually the lot to the east. On the corner of Sweeney Street. That's basically a wholesaler I believe is going in on that site. This lot is vacant at this point.

MR. MOORE: All right.

CHAIRMAN: Any other questions, Commissioners?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: If not the chair is ready for a motion.

MR. BOSWELL: I make a motion, Mr. Chairman, for approval based on the Planning Staff Recommendation and Findings of Fact 1 through 5.

CHAIRMAN: We have a motion for approval by Mr. Boswell.
MR. FREY: Second.

CHAIRMAN: Second by Mr. Frey. Any comments or questions on the motion?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: All in favor of the motion raise your right hand.

(ALL BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT RESPONDED AYE.)

CHAIRMAN: Motion carries unanimous.

Next item, please.

ITEM 6

301 East 9th Street, 0.397 acres
Consider zoning change: From I-1 Light Industrial to R-3MF Multi-Family Residential
Applicant: Cohen-Esrey Affordable Partners, LLC; MPD, Inc.

PLANNING STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Staff recommends approval subject to the condition and findings of fact that follow:

CONDITION:

Approval of a Development Plan prior to any construction activity to address all site development requirements.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. Staff recommends approval because the proposal is in compliance with the community’s adopted Comprehensive Plan;

2. The subject property is located in a
Central Residential Plan Area where Urban High-Density Residential uses are appropriate in general locations;

3. The proposal meets the goals of the Germantown Redevelopment Plan to revitalize the area; and

4. The proposed use as an apartment building meets the goals of the Comprehensive Plan to provide a wide variety of types of housing suitable to a wide range of people.

MS. EVANS: We would like to enter the Staff Report into the record as Exhibit D.

CHAIRMAN: Anyone here representing the applicant?

MR. JAYNE: My name is Clint Jayne.

(CLINT JAYNE SWORN BY ATTORNEY.)

MR. JAYNE: My name is Clint Jayne. I'm the developer/partner with Cohen-Esrey Affordable Partners. I'm here to answer any questions that Staff may have or board members may have.

CHAIRMAN: Anyone in the audience have any comments or questions on the application?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: Commissioners do you have any?

Yes, Mr. Boswell.

MR. BOSWELL: Just curious. This may be a
premature question. In the Staff Report, there is mention about off-street parking at some point in time. Do we have any sense at this point where that off-street parking may be?

MR. JAYNE: Absolutely. I don't know that there was a parking plan included in this site. We are having a municipal ordinance signed by the mayor that will convey a portion, the green space immediately to the east of that building and up to what is I believe the southern walking trail border.

There is an existing parking lot currently in that area. The city is going to convey additional property that would develop really that parking, existing parking lot, that will provide us with enough area to meet the parking ordinance based on the 28 unit count.

MR. BOSWELL: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Reeves.

MR. REEVES: I just want to say this is a very exciting project. It's going to be a great use of a historical building downtown. I know a number of developers have looked at it over the years. I'm glad to see that somebody is finally going to do something.

Thank you very much.

MR. JAYNE: Thank you. I appreciate that. We are really, I have to be honest with you, emotionally
invested in it. I think it's a great building. It's been a delight working with Brian, as well as MPD. He's been very cooperative. He's made the Staff completely available. We are in the process of having the building listed on the National Register of Historical Places. They've already been there for a site visit. Our general contractor has been there for a site visit. Today an architect was there walking the floor. We're very excited about it and look forward to a successful project. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Anyone else?
Commissioners, anyone else?
(NO RESPONSE)

MR. APPLEBY: Is chair ready for a motion?
CHAIRMAN: Chair is ready for a motion.

MR. APPLEBY: Make a motion to approve based on the Staff's Recommendation with the single condition and Findings of Fact 1 through 4.

CHAIRMAN: We have a motion for approval by Mr. Appleby.

MR. REEVES: Second.

CHAIRMAN: Second by Mr. Reeves. Comments or questions on the motion?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: All in favor of the motion raise
your right hand.

(ALL BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT RESPONDED AYE.)

CHAIRMAN: Motion carries unanimous.

MR. JAYNE: I would like to say, thank you so much. I would like to also express my gratitude to Mr. Howard and his Staff during the zoning application. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir.

MINOR SUBDIVISION PLATS

ITEM 7

11250, 11285 Indian Hill Road, 9.129 acres
Consider approval of minor subdivision plat.
Applicant: Lucia M. & Roger L. Cunningham

MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, this plat comes before you as an exception. You've got a 9.1 acre parcel right now and they're proposing to split off the one acre road frontage lot on Indian Hill Road. That leaves the remainder, which is already under 10 acres, out of compliance with the three to one requirement, but it is a large parcel. They have added a notation to the plat the this property cannot be further subdivided without meeting the regulations of the subdivision ordinance and zoning ordinance. With that since they're only gaining one additional lot, and really the lot won't be able to be further divided unless they were to put in a public or private...
street meeting public improvement specification, which
means a paved street with curb and gutter, there's
really little chance that this property will be
further divided, we would recommend you consider it
for approval.

CHAIRMAN: In commissioners have any questions
or comments?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: If not the chair is ready for a
motion.

MR. KAZLAUSKAS: Motion to approve.

MR. BOSWELL: Second.

CHAIRMAN: We have a motion for approval by
Mr. Kazlauskas and a second by Mr. Boswell. Comments
or questions on the motion?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: All in favor of the motion raise
your right hand.

(ALL BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT RESPONDED AYE.)

CHAIRMAN: Motion carries unanimous.

Next item, please.

ITEM 8

2886 Newbolt Road, 1.431 acres
Consider approval of minor subdivision plat.
Applicant: Marvin E. & Mary L. Bittel

MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, this plat comes
before you as an exception to the 3 to 1 requirement
of the subdivision regulation and zoning ordinance
requirements. They're creating what's known as your
typical flag lot.

In conversations with the application, the
reason that this parcel is being proposed to split in
this manner is because of some topography issues
there. Basically I think there are two locations on
this site which would be good home sites. They
requested that this be created for that purpose.

We've added a note on there that the property won't be
further subdivided without meeting the subdivision
regulations. They've gone with a narrow frontage
because the property is farm and they don't want to
encumber the farming area, the tillable acreage, any
more than necessary.

So with the notations on there and the
understanding that it won't be further, this and the
parent parcel won't be further subdivided without
meeting those subdivision regulation, we would
recommend that you consider it for approval.

CHAIRMAN: Commissioners, comments or
questions on the application?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: If not chair is ready for a motion.
MR. MOORE: Move to approve.

MR. FREY: Second.

CHAIRMAN: Motion for approval by Mr. Moore. Second by Mr. Frey. All in favor of the motion raise your right hand.

(ALL BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT RESPONDED AYE.)

CHAIRMAN: Motion carries unanimous.

Next item, please.

ITEM 9

8119, 8135 Highway 456, 26.704 acres
Consider approval of minor subdivision plat.
Applicant: John D. Pruden; David B. Pruden; Gary A. Pruden

MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, this plat comes before you as an exception. Because of the resulting 2.293 acre parcel is out of compliance with the 3 to 1 requirements; however, you had an existing lot there that they're putting a division line basically down the middle. The remainder of what was the say 5 acre parcel that was there is being consolidated back into the farm tract, the parent parcel. So they're not creating any new developable lots with this subdivision. Since they're really just decreasing the size of one, but it still meets the minimum road frontage requirement, minimum acreage requirements, we would recommend that you consider it for approval.
CHAIRMAN: Commissioners, any comments or questions?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: Chair is ready for a motion.

MR. BOSWELL: Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN: Motion for approval by Mr. Boswell.

MR. APPLEBY: Second.

CHAIRMAN: Second by Mr. Appleby. All in favor of the motion raise your right hand.

(ALL BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT RESPONDED AYE.)

CHAIRMAN: Motion carries unanimous.

Next item, please.

-------------------------------

NEW BUSINESS

ITEM 10

Consider approval of August 2014 and September 2014 financial statements.

CHAIRMAN: Commissioners, do you have any comments or questions on the financial statements?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: If not the chair is ready for a motion.

MR. KAZLAUSKAS: Move to approve.

CHAIRMAN: We have a motion to approve by Mr. Kazlauskas.
MR. TAYLOR: Second.

CHAIRMAN: Second by Mr. Taylor. All in favor of the motion raise your right hand.

(ALL BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT RESPONDED AYE.)

CHAIRMAN: Motion carries unanimous.

ITEM 11

Consider approval of 2015 Filing Dates and Deadlines

MR. HOWARD: Each member of the commission was mailed two copies of our filing dates and deadline sheet. We typically approve those in November. The reason for two sheets is that one is the typical filing deadline. The Board of Adjustment meets the first Thursday and the Planning Commission meets the second Thursday of every month. We have also included on there various dates for the quarterly work session.

The other option, the Plan B is for the April and October meetings, altering the dates so that the Planning Commission would actually meet the same night as the Board of Adjustment. It would just meet immediately after the Board of Adjustment meeting.

The reason that we are proposing that as a potential alternative is during the October meeting, which is during fall break, we didn't have a quorum at the Planning Commission. In years past we've looked
at spring break and fall break as possible reasons to
double up on the meetings, and we've done it in the
past. We haven't done it for the last few years, but
since we had the quorum issue in October I thought we
would give you a couple of options and see what you
all thought was the best way to serve our public
through Planning Commission and Board of Adjustment
meetings. It's really up to you all as far as when
you would like to meet, but we want to give you the
options.

CHAIRMAN: Commissioners, do you have any
questions on the filing dates?
(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: If not the chair is ready for a
motion.

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, I recommend the
alternate calendar with the meetings combined on the
April and October dates to avoid that conflict with
spring and fall breaks.

CHAIRMAN: We have a motion by Mr. Appleby.

Is there a second on that motion?

MR. BOSWELL: Second.

CHAIRMAN: Second by Mr. Boswell. All in
favor of the motion raise your right hand.

(ALL BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT RESPONDED AYE.)
CHAIRMAN: Motion carries unanimous.

ITEM 12

Comments by the Chairman

CHAIRMAN: Commissioners, November 19th in the Commerce Center, third floor, the Public Improvement Specification Meeting, we will be holding a meeting on updating our bonding amounts and also on the sidewalk issue. It's a very important meeting. I would recommend any of you, anyone that can attend to attend that meeting. That will be November 19th, third floor of the Commerce Center at 2:00. There will be information there. I would recommend that you attend that meeting.

MR. BOSWELL: What is the time of that meeting, Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN: Two o'clock.

MR. REEVES: Could Mr. Howard send us out a reminder on that?

MR. HOWARD: I'll be glad to send out an e-mail in the morning for information about the meeting.

MR. REEVES: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: That's all.

ITEM 13

Comments by the Planning Commissioners
CHAIRMAN: Anyone have any comments?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: If not next item.

ITEM 14

Comments by the Director.

MR. HOWARD: I'll just make one quick introduction.

I would like to introduce Mike Hill. He was up earlier tonight and read one of the Staff Reports into the record. Mike came on board about a month ago as a new Associate Director of Planning. Certainly like to introduce him. He comes to us from Louisville, Kentucky. Originally from Indiana.

Then I also would like to recognize that Melissa is now our Senior Planner as well. We have had two new promotions or hirers within the Planning Department since we last met.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir.

We need a motion for adjournment.

MR. APPLEBY: Move to adjourn.

CHAIRMAN: We have a motion by Mr. Appleby.

MR. TAYLOR: Second.

CHAIRMAN: Second by Mr. Taylor. All in favor of the motion raise your right hand.

(ALL BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT RESPONDED AYE.)
CHAIRMAN: We are adjourned.
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