

**CAMPBELL COUNTY & MUNICIPAL PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE JULY 10, 2012 MEETING**

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Larry Barrow
Ms. Deborah Blake
Ms. Lauri Harding
Mr. Tony Pfeffer
Mr. Edward Stubbs
Mr. Michael Williams, TPO
Mr. Justin Verst, Vice Chair
Ms. Cindy Minter, Chair

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Mr. Dennis Bass

STAFF PRESENT:

Mr. Peter Klear, AICP, Director of Planning & Zoning
Mr. Daniel Hunt, Legal Counsel
Ms. Stephanie Turner, Secretary

Ms. Minter called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM at the Campbell County Courthouse at 8352 E. Main Street, Alexandria, Kentucky. Following roll call, a quorum was found to be present. Ms. Minter asked if everyone had reviewed the June 12, 2012 meeting minutes and asked if there were any additions or corrections. There being none, Ms. Minter called for a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. Barrow made a motion to approve the June 12th meeting minutes as submitted. Mr. Verst seconded the motion. A roll call vote found Mr. Barrow, Ms. Blake, Ms. Harding, Mr. Pfeffer, Mr. Stubbs, Mr. Williams and Mr. Verst in favor of the motion. Ms. Minter abstained. Motion passed.

Ms. Minter introduced case #108-12-TXA-01, Campbell County Planning & Zoning Department on behalf of the CC&MP&ZC, with a request to adopt new Subdivision Regulations and asked Mr. Klear to present the staff report and staff's recommendation to the Commission.

FILE NUMBER: 108-12-TXA-01

APPLICANT: Campbell County Planning & Zoning Department on behalf of the CC&MP&ZC

REQUEST TO BE REVIEWED: Adoption of new Subdivision Regulations

Background:

Subdivision Regulations encompass a number of issues including procedures for the division of tracts of land, specifications for the construction of infrastructure improvements, and guidance for the design of real estate development. Kentucky law provides that a planning commission, which has completed a comprehensive plan, may adopt subdivision regulations. The Campbell County & Municipal Planning & Zoning Commission (CC&MP&ZC) has an adopted comprehensive plan. For the past year, the CC&MP&ZC have held a series of working sessions to review a new set of Subdivision Regulations. This review has been completed and the final version of the Subdivision Regulations is ready for review and adoption.

Proposed Text Amendments:

Per the attachment. (See file for draft.)

Staff Recommendation:

To adopt the proposed new Subdivision Regulations.

Supporting Information/Bases for Staff Recommendation:

1. Pursuant to KRS 100.273, the CC&MP&ZC has the authority to adopt subdivision regulations.
2. The proposed Subdivision Regulations are consistent with KRS 100.281.
3. The proposed Subdivision Regulations are consistent with the Campbell County Comprehensive Plan.
4. Proper notice, in accordance with KRS 424, of the public hearing has been given.

Mr. Klear stated for the record that a complete copy of the text was available tonight, but that we were not going to go through it page by page. This text was made available on our website, as well as at our office, for public review. Staff notified interested parties of the text changes. By interested parties, we mean those elements of the private sector who deal with this document on a regular basis such as engineers, surveyors and homebuilders.

Mr. Klear stated he did want to identify the general sections of the regulations and then allow for any questions there may be for any of these areas. There are two portions of the regulations. There is the main component and then the appendices. There are six articles that compose the main component: Article 1- General Provisions, Article 2 – Definitions Used in Subdivision Review, Article 3-Procedure for Subdivision Approval, Article 4 – Design Standards for Subdivision Review, Article 5 – Procedure for Inspection and Fees, and Article 6 – Certificates Used on Final and Conveyance Plats.

Article 1 provides basic information regarding this set of Regulations. Article 2 provides basic definitions as they pertain to our Regulations. The real meat and potatoes of our Regulations are contained in Articles 3 and 4. Article 3 outlines the general procedure for the submission and subsequent approval of any subdivision. Largely, this is anything that is going to be carried out by staff on your behalf. For subdivisions that require the Commission's approval, those details are also going to be listed in Article 3. Article 4 deals more with the design element – street design, lot, blocks and those physical improvements which have an impact on overall designs of the subdivision. Article 5 is going to outline any specific inspections that go on with any public improvements. Article 6 is going to specify any certificates, seals and general terminology we want to see on our plats and cross reference with utility companies which we do on your behalf to insure the plats are properly prepared.

This brings us to the appendices. The appendices have much more detailed information. This is stuff the Commission doesn't see, but is important in the subdivision process and will be used on a regular basis. Appendices A and B contain the technical details for the layout of the streets. Appendix A is for when you are using concrete and Appendix B is for asphalt. Appendix C is very technical and specific information pertaining to street construction. Appendix D, E and F are really very general. Appendix D is for Storm Drainage; Appendix E is for Water Line; and Appendix F is for Sanitary Sewer. Our regulations state that you must consult and follow the guidelines of that specific regulating agency.

Appendices S and T are completely new for us. Appendix S outlines and details the Street Tree regulations and lists the approved street trees. Appendix T is the Transportation Management Regulations. There are times when a subdivision will affect the area in such a magnitude that it will alter the existing infrastructure of the street system. This gives us an opportunity to redesign and seek the advice of technical experts. Lastly, Appendix Z will list the changes that occur over time to the Subdivision Regulations so that we can monitor the progress over time of this document.

Mr. Klear stated that staff's recommendation was that, at the conclusion of the public hearing and after answering any questions or concerns the Commission may have, the text amendment to the Subdivision Regulations be adopted. Mr. Klear stated he is available to answer any questions the Commission may

have. However, prior to the questions starting, Mr. Klear already has two proposed changes to the text amendment.

The first proposed change is on page 2.2, line 13, under the definition of the word “cemetery”. It currently reads as: “Cemetery: A land area used or intended to be used for the purposes of the human or animal burial. A cemetery includes, but is not limited to a burial park for earth interment, mausoleum for entombment, columbarium for inurement, burial ground consisting of one or more marked or unmarked graves, and a burial mound or other burial facility.” Mr. Klear stated that the proposed change is to strike the words “or animal” after “human”. Ms. Minter asked if that was the only change. Mr. Klear corrected his statement to state they would be striking the word “the” prior to the word “human” and the words “or animal” after “human”. Ms. Harding asked if there were any animal cemeteries in this part of Kentucky. Mr. Williams stated there were. Mr. Pfeffer stated there was one in Sparta. Mr. Pfeffer asked if her question was intended to be in Northern Kentucky or in Campbell County. Ms. Harding stated in Campbell County. Mr. Klear clarified that human cemeteries are regulated, but animal cemeteries are not. Everyone seemed acceptable to this change and there were no further comments or questions.

Mr. Klear stated that the second proposed change was on page 3.1, line 9, under the section entitled “Summary of the Subdivision Review Procedure”. The paragraph currently reads as: “.... A minor division of land involves the division of five (5) buildable lots or less from the parent tract, since 1966, including any remainder or residual tract(s), and is located along an existing public street....” Mr. Klear stated he proposes we change the year from “1966” to “1982”. Ms. Minter stated she vaguely recalled the Commission’s discussion on this issue and asked Mr. Klear for an explanation for the change. Mr. Klear stated that the short version of the explanation is that the change is the result of discussions and consultation he has had with the County Attorney. While it looks like a minor change, the surveying community is probably going to be thrilled with that change.

Mr. Klear stated that those are the only two changes he has at this time. Ms. Minter asked the Commission if they had any specific questions for staff. Ms. Blake asked Mr. Klear for a clarification of the list of street trees. Mr. Klear identified Ms. Blake was referencing Appendix S for the rest of the Commission. Ms. Blake asked why we would still be listing ash trees with emerald ash borer in the environment. Mr. Klear noted that Ash trees are the second species listed on the table. Mr. Klear stated we do have green ash and white ash trees listed. Ms. Minter asked Ms. Blake why she was isolating the ash trees. Mr. Klear asked that, before Ms. Blake responds, he be allowed to explain how the list of trees was compiled. By and large, the Boone County Subdivision Regulations was used as the basis for the update of our Subdivision Regulations. The tree species listing was compiled listing non-fruit bearing trees that were not fast growing trees because those happen to not survive very well and tend to be maintenance headaches.

Ms. Blake stated that ash trees would be a burden to any homeowner that had them installed with the current issues facing ash trees. Mr. Klear stated he would propose that the two ash tree species be deleted and the text be adopted minus those two species. Mr. Verst stated he felt it would be an advisable request to have an arborist review the street tree list and see if there are any trees that need to be removed or if there are substitutions that can be made. Ms. Blake was in complete agreement. Ms. Blake advised the Commission that the Cincinnati Park System just removed 18,000 ash trees due to the emerald ash borer and is advising the tri-state public to not purchase or install ash trees due to the contamination. Ms. Minter stated she like the suggestion of having someone professional to review and sort through the list and see what is appropriate. Ms. Blake stated that UK has a conservationist who is an expert in that field and located right here in Campbell County.

Mr. Klear stated that what he recommended was that instead of removing any regulations pertaining to street trees was that the Commission approves the appendix as stated with the change of deleting the green and white ash trees. As a Commission, we will be coming back to this section of the regulations at some point in time for quality review and modifications. This section is not new; it is just new to us. It would be staff’s request at this time that you remove just the green and white ash species and keep the rest

of the species listed and approve the text. Mr. Verst stated that, based on previous experience of working with Boone County, he feels the remainder of the list is trustworthy.

Ms. Minter asked if the Commission had any other questions of staff. Mr. Verst had a question regarding the right-of-way. On page 4.24, lines 1 through 3, they currently read as: "...located within one hundred feet (100') of an intersection. The minimum width of street rights-of-way which are planned to include street trees shall be increased a minimum of 10 feet above the minimum requirements stated in Section 405.F "Public Right-of-Way Width..." Mr. Verst asked if street trees were required that meant there were an additional 10 feet of right-of-way required and that the trees will be in the right-of-way. Mr. Klear replied that was correct. This is an issue that was brought to his attention today. The public will be responsible for general maintenance. By that he means, that the limbs aren't growing into any overhead power lines and out into the street. We are talking about general maintenance not finely manicured trees. Mr. Verst asked what happens if the tree dies. Mr. Klear states the homeowner or the city could potentially replace the tree. Ms. Minter asked if there were any additional questions or comments for staff. There were none.

There being no further questions for staff, Ms. Minter asked if there were anyone at the public hearing who signed up to speak either for or against this issue. Ms. Turner presented the sign-in sheet to Ms. Minter which contained only one signature. Ms. Minter asked if anyone else wished to sign up at this time. No one wanted to add their signature to the list. Ms. Minter asked the signor to come forward and state his name and address for the record. Mr. Brian Miller, Executive Vice President of the Home Builders Association of Northern Kentucky, 2751 Circleport Drive, Erlanger, Kentucky came forward. Mr. Miller recognized the Commission for their efforts in updating the Subdivision Regulations and Mr. Klear for meeting with him and a few associates this afternoon to discuss their concerns. Mr. Miller stated that the Boone County Subdivision Regulations had been vetted quite well when they were presented for adoption and therefore there were only minimal questions and comments for the changes proposed by Campbell County.

Mr. Miller stated he appreciated Mr. Klear taking action tonight to delete the reference to "animal" remains in the definition of "cemetery". There are some unintended consequences than can happen statutorily speaking and it is not something you want to have. Mr. Miller had this problem in the past and appreciated the assistance in avoiding it arising again.

Mr. Miller stated Mr. Klear previously asked the Commission to consider a date to be changed from "1966" to "1982" and Mr. Miller just wanted to express that his position is that they would like to see the date stricken altogether.

Mr. Miller continued that there were just two additional items that he wanted to discuss. One item that the Commission may not be aware of is that the Boone County Commission is in general agreement with the HBA of N. Ky. that there are issues with the open spaces with the cluster development neighborhoods. The spaces are not working as they are put together now. There is not enough flexibility in the affrontation of those sites; and there are examples around the state where the open space design has worked. Mr. Miller stated that once this text is approved there is no reason to put it on the shelf and leave it and tell everyone else to work with it. The HBA of N. Ky. is working with Boone County Planning Commission this fall to recommend changes to the text to develop a design element that will work and be more effective. Mr. Miller stated he would like to work with staff and this Planning Commission to find solutions as to how best to define housing solutions because right now some of these housing development options aren't working out. It's not to home owner's benefit, it's not to the home builder's benefit, and no one's winning in this situation.

The second big point we had was the street tree program. Trees are beautiful. People love them. If you look at the big donut that is N. Ky., you will see that this is basically fields with windbreaks. Once people buy their home, they go out and buy trees and place them where they want them and they can do it for a lot less than the cost the developer incurs to do it during and just post construction. The developer is

going to be charged approximately \$800 to install trees on each lot and a lot more on corner lots. What does this mean here in N. Ky.? For every \$1,000 additional cost to every home, it takes about 1,600 potential households out of the picture for a particular price range. What is the unintended result of that? Well that may be one less home built, or that may be five fewer homes built. That depends on what the cost of the home is. People are going to purchase their own trees without having to include them in their mortgage. If it is a tree the person has purchased themselves, they are more likely to water and nurture the plant. You can make housing more affordable. You can lower the cost of public works. Mr. Miller asked the Commission if they would be so inclined as to remove the section on the requirement for street trees. Mr. Miller stated he would like to have ongoing dialog with staff regarding improvements to the Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Klear added as a point of professional courtesy that Mr. Miller submitted a letter of questions asking for clarification on different points within the Subdivision Regulations. Mr. Klear advised Mr. Miller and the Commission that he felt it was important to make that letter a part of the public record and that he would be drafting a letter in response to Mr. Miller. Mr. Miller thanked Mr. Klear. Mr. Verst asked Mr. Klear if the letter was going to be made part of the minutes. Mr. Klear stated it would be part of staff's file, but not the minutes. Mr. Verst asked that a copy of the letter be forwarded to the Commission. Mr. Klear stated he would forward a copy of the letter as well as a copy of his response.

Ms. Minter asked if there were any questions or comments for Mr. Miller. There were none. Ms. Minter asked if there were any audience member that desired to speak either for or against the request to adopt the text amendment to the Subdivision Regulations. No one spoke up. Ms Minter closed the public hearing.

Ms. Minter opened the floor for discussion among the Commissioners. Mr. Verst stated he really appreciated the work the Commissioners have put into this. It feels like they have been working on it for quite a while. Mr. Verst stated he did not feel that any document would ever be perfect. He thinks we could work with this one for ten years and it still would need some type of work on it. Mr. Verst stated he thinks that the Commission should approve the document as presented tonight and then perform an annual review and get comments from the public so that we don't have such a large gap between updates. Mr. Klear added that the reason the Boone County Subdivision Regulations were used as a basis for the changes to our Subdivision Regulations was not because we felt they were a higher authority, but rather because they had been through two different public reviews already. They were reviewed once in 2010 and then again last year. We wanted to utilize that experience so that we didn't have to pay a "dumb tax" basically. Mr. Klear stated there will never be one universal set of Subdivision Regulations being used throughout all of Northern Kentucky. Each community is going to have a slightly different set of values and that will play a part in impacting what is most important within the Subdivision Regulations. This does not prevent us, however, from making use of their experience thus far.

Ms. Harding asked if Mr. Miller's letter reference the issues with cluster developments he mentioned. Mr. Klear stated that the letter did not specifically list any issues with cluster developments. Mr. Klear did contact Boone County Planning Commission for comment on their plans to modify their text and they do plan to review their text this fall. Mr. Klear stated he intentionally left the text in as submitted at this time only because it was easier to allow it to remain. Mr. Klear stated he could see it being made more into a zoning classification, in which case if that were the route we chose to follow, we would have six documents to update not one. Until we determine which manner we want to handle this open space element and cluster space element, the best solution is to allow it to remain as is. Ms. Harding stated the reason she brought it out is because she was curious if there were specifics in the letter, if not then she would prefer there were specifics listed by Mr. Miller here tonight so that later there would be something we could reference.

Mr. Miller was recognized by Ms. Minter and returned to the microphone to explain that they are getting ready to go through this plan with Boone County. They have some example from around the state and they have developed a model. The issues they were having is the land calculations used to determine

what portion is primary and secondary conservation land and what are other offsets that we are able to incentivize the developer to go down this road. No one wants to go down a new model with absolutely no economic development from it. Currently, there is just not enough there for us to incentivize the Boone County model to make it profitable. Ms. Harding thanked Mr. Miller for his comments. That was exactly the kind of detailed information she was looking for.

Ms. Minter asked if anyone else had any comments or questions. Mr. Barrow stated he agreed with Mr. Verst. He stated that 98% of this document he felt was what he knows has to be in place. Until we hear from the Kentucky Coop. we won't know about the trees, but we should just approve the document as stated and then review these sections in smaller portions to fix anything we feel needs to be adjusted.

Ms. Minter thanked the Commission for all their hard work this past year to see that we have updated Subdivision Regulations. Ms. Minter asked if anyone wanted to make a motion. Mr. Verst made a motion to approve case #108-12-TXA-01 to adopt the new Subdivision Regulations with the following changes:

1. That on page 2.2, line 13, under the definition of the word "cemetery", to strike the word "the" prior to the word "human" and the words "or animal" after "human".
2. That on page 3.1, line 9, under the section entitled "Summary of the Subdivision Review Procedure" change the year from "1966" to "1982".
3. That on Appendix S, the green and white ash trees is deleted from the approved street tree list.

The basis for Mr. Verst's motion is that pursuant to KRS 100.273, the CC&MP&ZC has the authority to adopt subdivision regulations; the proposed Subdivision Regulations are consistent with KRS 100.281; the proposed Subdivision Regulations are consistent with the Campbell County Comprehensive Plan; and that proper notice, in accordance with KRS 424, of the public hearing has been given all as listed in the staff report. Ms. Minter asked if there were a second for the motion. Ms. Harding seconded the motion. A roll call vote found Mr. Barrow, Ms. Blake, Ms. Harding, Mr. Pfeffer, Mr. Stubbs, Mr. Williams and Mr. Verst in favor of the motion. Ms. Minter abstained. Motion passed.

Ms. Minter introduced case #109-12-TXA-01, Campbell County Planning & Zoning Department on behalf of the CC&MP&ZC, with a request to adopt a new Fee Schedule relating to the New Subdivision Regulations and asked Mr. Klear to present the staff report and staff's recommendation to the Commission.

FILE NUMBER: 109-12-TXA-01

APPLICANT: Campbell County Planning & Zoning Department on behalf of the CC&MP&ZC

REQUEST TO BE REVIEWED: Adoption of new Fee Schedule relating to the New Subdivision Regulations

Background:

Article 11 of the Bylaws of the Campbell County and Municipal Planning and Zoning Commission (CC&MP&ZC) provides that "The requirements for the submission of applications, requests and associated fees are set forth in the Campbell County Zoning Ordinance and the Campbell County Subdivision Regulations."

Per PZ Case 108-12-TXA-01, there is a proposal to adopt a new set of Subdivision Regulations for the CC&MP&ZC. This new set of Subdivision Regulations requires amendments and modifications to the fee schedule.

Proposed Text Amendments:

Per the attachment.

Staff Recommendation:

To adopt the amendments to the CC&MP&ZC Fee Schedule.

Supporting Information/Bases for Staff Recommendation:

1. Pursuant to KRS 100.273, the CC&MP&ZC has the authority to adopt subdivision regulations.
2. KRS 100.177 states that “Any planning commission shall have the right to receive, hold, and append funds for which it may legally receive from any and every source...for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this chapter.”
3. Proper notice, in accordance with KRS 424, of the public hearing has been given.

Mr. Klear explained that the adoption of the new Subdivision Regulations in our previous case created a situation where we did not have a one-for-one match with our Fee Schedule. The changes being presented to the Commission tonight are to insure that the Fee Schedule matches the newly adopted Subdivision Regulations. A copy of the new Fee Schedule was included in your meeting packets. There were only three pages that were affected by these changes.

Briefly, in overview, there were several significant changes in the Subdivision Regulations which led to changes on our Fee Schedule. First, there is the creation of the minimum site plan review fee of \$1,000 for site plans. It could be more, but now there is a minimum cut-off of at least a \$1,000. Second, the major site plan review fee is partially based on square footage. The square footage fee has been reduced, but our inspection fee has been increased. This is going to drop their fees substantially. Mr. Klear stated he felt this was the way it was originally intended. Third, as for the CLUR fee, the cost was increased because when we record the CLUR's at the County Clerk's office, we have seen an increase in our cost and we are just trying to recoup that cost. We have not had a fee increase since 2003. Mr. Klear stated he could not think of another public agency that hasn't had a fee increase in almost ten years. Finally, the bulk of the subdivisions the Commission reviewed last year were small subdivisions of six lots or less. Under the old process, they were processed under Subdivision Plats at a significantly higher fee. Now that we are changing the threshold of the process called Conveyance Plat. The Conveyance Plat was only for two lots with a remainder for a total of three. We are bumping that up to five lots with a remainder for a total of six which is going to be a tremendous savings to the client. That would have been a several hundred dollar fee and an additional months' wait for our customers.

Mr. Klear stated he recommends the Commission approve the Fee Schedule as submitted and he would be happy to answer any questions the Commission may have for him at this time. Ms. Minter asked if there were any questions for staff.

Ms. Harding asked how comparable these fees were to our sister counties in N. Ky. Mr. Klear replied that we were practically identical to Boone County. Kenton County is in the process of updating their Subdivision Regulations. It is not an apples to apples comparison, but we are comparable. Our fees are lower; we are not more than Boone County. Ms. Harding stated that was what she was asking.

Ms. Minter asked if there were any additional questions for staff. There being none, Ms. Minter reminded everyone that this was a public hearing and asked if anyone signed in to speak. There being no one signed in to speak Ms. Minter asked the audience if anyone wanted to speak. Mr. Miller asked to be recognized. Ms. Minter recognized Mr. Miller.

Mr. Miller stated that he has been caught unaware and has not had an opportunity to review these fees yet as they were not notified of any fee changes. Mr. Miller stated they did not receive any notification of fee changes. There are companies out there who have spent their life savings just to stay afloat. Mr. Miller's

counterpart in Georgia has had six members commit suicide in the past three years. It is pretty bad out there. If we missed the notice, we apologize, but we request notice be sent specifically to us.

Ms. Minter asked Mr. Klear to clarify if notice was given to the public. Mr. Klear stated the legal notice was posted in the paper as required by law. There was no notice mailed to any specific entity, but the legal notice was posted in the newspaper of record which constituted that legal notice was given to the public. Mr. Hunt stated he could confirm that the legal notice was posted as he has copies in his files. Ms. Minter thanked both Mr. Klear and Mr. Hunt for their information.

Ms. Minter asked if anyone else desired to speak. No one else wished to speak. Ms. Minter asked if there were any comments. Mr. Verst stated that he believes Mr. Klear is correct in that the fee schedule should be approved and we handle any specific issues as they might arise. Ms. Minter asked if there were any other comments. There being none, Ms. Minter called for a motion. Mr. Verst made a motion to approve case #109-12-TXA-01 to adopt the new Fee Schedule as submitted. The basis for Mr. Verst's motion is that pursuant to KRS 100.273, the CC&MP&ZC has the authority to adopt subdivision regulations; that per KRS 100.177 the planning commission has the right to establish and amend a fee schedule related to subdivision regulations; and that proper notice, in accordance with KRS 424, of the public hearing has been given all as listed in the staff report. Ms. Minter asked if there were a second for the motion. Mr. Barrow seconded the motion. A roll call vote found Mr. Barrow, Ms. Blake, Ms. Harding, Mr. Pfeffer, Mr. Stubbs, Mr. Williams and Mr. Verst in favor of the motion. Ms. Minter abstained. Motion passed.

There being no other cases to come before the Planning Commission, Ms. Minter requested that Mr. Klear present his Director's Report.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Klear reminded the Commission that there was on-going discussion regarding moving the location of their meetings permanently back to the Campbell County Courthouse in Alexandria. Mr. Verst submitted information to Mr. Klear who in turn submitted it to the Public Works Department for review. They will be looking to add some asphalt to the parking facility and adding a sidewalk to this side of the building to the walkway. We do not have any items on the agenda for August. We can wait until our next meeting and confirm those repairs have been made and make a determination at that time. Ms. Minter thanked Mr. Verst and Mr. Klear for their assistance in getting the necessary repairs to the handicap parking area.

Ms. Minter asked if the Commission had to make a motion to hold their next meeting at this location at this time. Mr. Klear stated it would be better to wait until we know when the next meeting will be and then proceed from there.

Ms. Minter asked if there was any other business to discuss. There being none, Ms. Minter asked for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Verst made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Barrow seconded the motion. An oral vote found everyone in favor, none opposed. Motion passed. Meeting adjourned at 8:03 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Approved:

Peter J. Klear, AICP
Director of P&Z

Cynthia Minter
Chair