

January 8, 2018

Mr. Roger Friedmann – Chairman
Mr. Rich Barrick – Vice-Chairman
Mr. Tom Kronenberger – Member
Ms. Anne Flanagan – Member
Mr. Bill Mees – Secretary
Mr. Steve Roos – Alternate

Item 1. – Meeting called to Order

Mr. Friedmann called the regular meeting of the Zoning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, January 8, 2018.

Item 2. – Roll Call of the Board

Mr. Mees called the roll.

Members Present: Mr. Barrick, Mr. Friedmann, Mr. Kronenberger and Mr. Mees

Members Absent: Ms. Flanagan and Mr. Roos

Staff Present: Harry Holbert and Beth Gunderson

Item 3. – Approval of Minutes

Mr. Friedmann stated the first order of business was to approve the December 11, 2017 meeting minutes.

Mr. Friedmann asked for any corrections to the December 11, 2017 minutes.

Mr. Kronenberger moved to approve the December 11, 2017 meeting minutes.

Mr. Mees seconded.

All Voted: Yes.

Item 4. – Old Business

2017-17MA
Greenberg Farrow
7860 Montgomery Road
Major Adjustment to a PUD

Continued to February 12, 2018 per the applicant's request.

Item 4. – New Business

2018-01P1
Andrew Harvey, Cincinnati United Contractors
10791/10801 Montgomery Road
PUDI

Mr. Holbert presented the case and case history in a Power Point presentation. Mr. Holbert described the property in question noting the ISR. He pointed out the adjacent zoning districts. Mr. Holbert showed the aerials of the front and rear lots prior to their consolidation. He said the

owner did submit to Hamilton County Recorder's Office for a lot consolidation without zoning approval and Hamilton County did not refer them back to the Township.

Mr. Holbert showed photos of the existing conditions on the lot noting the golf carts are parked in the front, in the required parking, on grass and they are not screened.

Mr. Holbert then noted a parking plan was submitted for only part of the consolidated lot, no landscape plan was submitted and no lighting plan submitted. He said the applicant did not address the non-conformities of the lot.

Mr. Holbert said staff has spoken to the owner many times regarding the parking of the golf carts and they are continually parked in areas in which they are not permitted by the zoning resolution.

Mr. Holbert then reviewed the conditions staff recommends should the Board decide to approve the request.

The Board asked questions of Mr. Holbert.

Mr. Mees asked if the first two conditions are items the property should already be in compliance with.

Mr. Holbert answered yes, saying that staff sends notices of violation, the owner abates, then comes into violation again. He noted making it a condition of a PUDI approval would give it more teeth.

Mr. Mees asked if the streetscape buffer is required.

Mr. Holbert answered no, because it is grandfathered, noting the Board could add a streetscape buffer requirement as condition.

Mr. Mees asked if the property was before the Board because of the consolidation.

Mr. Holbert answered that is correct.

Mr. Barrick asked if there was a parking plan on file from a previous case.

Mr. Holbert pointed out the parking that was approved for the building in the front.

Mr. Barrick asked if the Board should require a parking plan and if there is no information on parking requirements for the rear part of the lot.

Mr. Holbert answered yes.

Mr. Barrick asked Mr. Holbert to elaborate on the streetscape requirement.

Mr. Holbert explained.

Mr. Mees asked if the golf carts are considered inventory or vehicles that need a parking space.

Mr. Holbert said the owner says they are classified as vehicles, however, as far as zoning, it is unclear. If it is classified as inventory of merchandise they would have to be screened. He said zoning would permit them without screening as long as they are parked behind the building.

Mr. Friedmann asked if the applicant was present and wished to speak.

Mr. Andrew Harvey, of Cincinnati United Contractors, 7143 E. Kemper Road, Cincinnati, OH 45249, addressed the Board.

Mr. Carl Wesley, the property owner, of 10801 Montgomery Road, Cincinnati, OH 45242, also addressed the Board.

Mr. Harvey said the hatched area in the back is where the golf carts would be stored. He said he did the calculations and there is adequate parking on the consolidated lot. Mr. Harvey then pointed out the parking stalls and said the parking is more conforming consolidated versus the two separate lots.

Mr. Mees asked if the number of parking spots would accommodate the number of parking spaces both buildings need.

Mr. Harvey answered yes.

Mr. Mees commented that doesn't speak to anything about parking of the golf carts.

Mr. Harvey answered correct.

Mr. Wesley stated the State of Ohio requires him to have a new car dealer's license because a very small number of his products are required to be titled vehicles by the state. He said the majority of the carts they sell do not fall under that category.

Mr. Barrick asked for clarification on if there was a setback in the southwest from the parking to the property line.

Mr. Harvey answered no parking was added and noted they are using existing pavement.

Mr. Friedmann asked what the use of the back building is.

Mr. Harvey answered it is currently used as a warehouse for storage. He said the first notice of violation received by the owner was for the change of use of the back lot which was formerly medical office. He said they had to go for PUDI approval because the ISR exceeds .50.

Mr. Friedmann asked if there are cell towers in the back of the property.

Mr. Harvey answered yes saying the zoning resolution exempts cell towers.

Mr. Friedmann asked how many cell towers there are.

Mr. Wesley said he thinks there are three of them, although one may be on Wendy's property.

Mr. Friedmann asked if there was anyone present from the public who wished to comment on the case.

No response.

Mr. Friedmann closed the floor to comments and the Board discussed the issues brought before them.

Mr. Mees asked if the property would be more or less compliant with zoning resolution provided the applicant complied with the conditions suggested by staff.

Mr. Holbert said the existing plan does not comply with drive aisle requirements and he cannot tell from the submittal if the parking stalls are a compliant size. He noted if they have added parking stalls, they would also be required to add interior landscaping. He said the Fire Department needs to inspect the rear building due to the change of use to make sure it meets fire code requirements.

Mr. Mees said he is still confused about if the golf carts are inventory that have to be screened or if they are vehicles that need a compliant parking stall.

Mr. Holbert said the code is unclear as to how to deal with this type of vehicle. He looks at it as more of a vehicle that has to be stored as the carts are not large enough to need a full size parking space.

Mr. Mees asked what other things were needed to make it comply with the Zoning Resolution if the carts are considered inventory.

Mr. Holbert said screening would be required.

Mr. Kronenberger noted the submittal is not a very comprehensive plan.

Mr. Holbert agreed the submittal is minimal and noted there are no outside agency comments submitted. Mr. Holbert stated this is a PUDI and will not go before the Board of Trustees.

Mr. Friedmann commented to the applicant that, before the Board considers this, they may want to submit a more detailed proposal. He said if the applicant wants the Board to go ahead and vote that is fine.

Mr. Harvey said when the rear property was purchased the owner hired a lawyer to do the consolidation, noting he is not trying to change anything on the property. He seeks a PUDI in order to have the property be compliant with zoning. He is not sure what else the Board would want to see.

Mr. Friedmann said Mr. Holbert pointed out insufficient items.

Mr. Brian Doll, of Cincinnati United Contractors, 7143 E. Kemper Road, Cincinnati, OH 45249, addressed the Board. Mr. Doll said the proposal is not changing anything, besides the use of the former doctor's office which changed to storage.

Mr. Friedmann said the Board doesn't know if the lighting is compliant.

Mr. Doll said he requests to continue in order to prepare a more detailed plan.

Mr. Friedmann made a motion to accept the continuance request for Case 2018-01P.

Mr. Kronenberger seconded.

Mr. Mees called roll.

Mr. Barrick – AYE

Mr. Friedmann - AYE

Mr. Kronenberger – AYE

Mr. Mees - AYE

2018-02Z

Reztark Design Studio LLC

8663, 8727, 8755 and 8765 Montgomery Road

Zone Change

Mr. Holbert presented the case and case history in a Power Point presentation. Mr. Holbert explained the request is for a zone change from “B” Single Family Residential to “EE” Planned Retail District to allow for new car display and storage. Mr. Holbert noted the applicant prepared an answer to the staff report, but there was still some question about the signage which he will address.

Mr. Holbert described the property in question.

Mr. Holbert said the parcel in question, which the applicant requests a zone change for, would, if approved, be consolidated with the rest of the Mercedes development. He then showed current conditions and surrounding properties and zoning districts.

Mr. Holbert said the proposed parking lot would be cut into the hill side and noted the topography. He then reviewed the parking plan and showed how the stall sizes could be adjusted to be compliant. The layout they have can work, he said, but needs to be manipulated to meet the zoning resolution. He said the landscape plan exceeds the requirements of the zoning resolution.

Mr. Holbert showed a rendering of an overview of the whole site with landscaping. He then showed the rendering and noted the proposed signage, and showed the proposed elevations.

Mr. Holbert explained how signage is calculated and measured. He said the applicant had informed him they would have a sign base made up of a preferred material.

Mr. Holbert said the proposal includes the renovation of the interior of the existing building and would reduce the footprint of the building. The standalone sign would be removed and a blade sign attached to the building.

Mr. Holbert reviewed the lighting plan stating the current lights do have glare but the proposed lights will not. He said all existing lights would be replaced with the new LED lights that would cut down glare.

Mr. Holbert reviewed the staff report. He said in his letter, the applicant referred to storage, which is why Mr. Holbert addressed it as such in his staff report. He said the applicant has since clarified the proposed lot is not a vehicle storage area, rather, it is a parking lot that the public will have access to and will have traffic in and out.

He said a privacy fence is proposed to match the existing fence.

Mr. Holbert said some of the minimum setbacks noted in the staff report would not apply since it is a parking lot not a vehicular storage area.

Mr. Holbert showed the rendering of the sign the applicant will post and said the owner will also train employees not to use the keys to honk the horn to find cars.

Mr. Holbert reviewed the suggested conditions noted in the staff report should the Board decide to recommend approval of the request.

The Board asked questions of Mr. Holbert.

Mr. Kronenberger asked why Mr. Holbert does not mention the signage in the conditions.

Mr. Holbert explained.

Mr. Barrick asked for clarification on Mr. Holbert's suggested condition regarding the tree caliper.

Mr. Holbert explained.

Mr. Barrick asked about the lighting plan being compliant as a condition.

Mr. Holbert said the lighting plan is already compliant.

Mr. Barrick asked if there was any history of a proposal for this lot to be part of the Mercedes dealership before.

There was discussion about the history of the lot since the house was torn down. It was decided there had not been a prior formal submittal to Zoning Commission for this lot to become part of the dealership.

Mr. Friedmann asked if the applicant was present and wished to speak.

Mr. Joe Trauth, attorney representing the owner, of 1 E. Fourth Street, Cincinnati, OH 45202, addressed the Board and introduced architect Gene Allison and property owner David Peterson.

Mr. Trauth said the proposal is a request for a double letter zone for the limited purpose of passive parking. He said there would be no curb cut on Montgomery Road, landscaping is well above the requirement, there would be lots of buffering and an eight feet fence to screen the development from the residential properties. Mr. Trauth said there will be 43 percent non-paved areas. He said all of the site lighting will be replaced with LED shielded lighting.

Mr. Trauth stated that compared to an office building, which would have curb cuts on Montgomery Road and other intrusive features, this is a very passive use on the site and since it is a planned use it sticks. He said what people want is for the site to remain undeveloped. He said the adjacent site has been used as an auto dealership since the 1960's. Mr. Trauth noted the owner wants to be as good a neighbor as possible. He pointed out the driveway around the service area closest to the neighbors will be completely eliminated.

Mr. Gene Allison, the architect, of Reztark Design Studio, 601 Main Street, Suite 200, Cincinnati, OH 45202, addressed the Board. He added that the application asked for a sign variance but

he is committed to working with staff on the right plan for signs. He said the proposal includes an additional 132 parking spaces which will organize the site to be more balanced and efficient.

Mr. Friedmann asked about the sign calculations.

Mr. Allison said they would need a variance for the number of signs and square footage but, because of the way staff measures the signs, the calculations will be a little higher than noted on the submittal.

Mr. Mees asked for clarification on the elimination of the service drive.

Mr. Allison pointed it out on the plan and explained the new plan.

Mr. David Peterson, the property owner, of Mercedes Benz Cincinnati, 8727 Montgomery Road, Cincinnati, OH 45236, addressed the Board. He explained the new plan and flow of traffic. He said this is an attempt at a master plan for the entire site. He went on to speak in detail about the intent of the plan and addressed some of the concerns neighbors had brought to his attention.

Mr. Kronenberger asked about the "please do not honk" sign and asked for clarification on what else the applicant had considered to reduce noise.

Mr. Peterson said there will be another service drive in the front and cars will then go inside. He said the additional area will not add any noise.

Mr. Kronenberger said he is talking specifically about employees going out and locating vehicles by honking horns noting, with the additional parking, cars will be even closer to residents.

Mr. Peterson said there are training and technical remedies to that problem.

Mr. Kronenberger asked about the location of fence and where it ends on the west side.

Mr. Allison clarified the location.

Mr. Mees asked about the height of the proposed site lighting poles.

Mr. Allison said there would be a two foot base with 13 feet pole matching the existing light poles.

Mr. Mees asked for clarification on a comment in the staff report.

Mr. Holbert clarified.

Mr. Peterson spoke again about the light poles. He said he would be happy to change the plan to have the lights waist high in the rear.

Mr. Friedmann asked if there was anyone present from the public who wished to comment on the case.

Mr. William Wood, 8801 Montgomery Road, Cincinnati, OH 45236, addressed the Board. He said he is a resident of 54 years. He said lighting is a concern and asked, with 132 additional parking stalls, how many more cars would be coming in and out.

Mr. Peterson said the parking stalls will be for inventory of new cars only.

Mr. Wood asked if they would be permitted to double park. He also suggested making the light poles shorter, more like ten feet tall.

Ms. Patricia Blondin, President of Wellington Glen Condominiums, of 8825 Montgomery Road, Cincinnati, OH 45236, addressed the Board. Ms. Blondin said some of the condominium residents have decks eight feet up so with this plan, instead of greenery, they would see the wall. She gave credit to the applicant for listening to neighbors' concerns. She said overall the residents do not want the zoning change. She said if it goes through, the residents would like landscaping on their side of the fence to block fence. She gave handouts to the Board and applicant expressing neighbors' requests should the zone change be approved. She then reviewed those items for the Board. Ms. Blondin pointed out the plan showed very little landscaping on the north side of the wall. She also asked about the location of the fence in a drainage ditch. Ms. Blondin said she would like ongoing monitoring of the situation to make sure neighboring residents are satisfied.

Mr. Friedmann asked for clarification on an item on her handout.

Ms. Blondin clarified.

Dr. Karen Dyehouse, of 7742 Highgate Place, Cincinnati, OH 45236, said her property abuts the property in question. She said she has met the owner and he does seem genuine. She said she is Chief of Staff at Jewish Hospital and she does not have time to learn zoning laws so she retained an attorney.

Attorney Tim Mara, of 312 Walnut Street, Cincinnati, OH 45202, addressed the Board. He said he represents Dr. Dyehouse and her husband. He stated the effort by the applicant to minimize impact to their home is insufficient. He then went on to say his clients and others have put money into their homes. He said the lot in question is currently zoned residential and is noted as residential in the land use plan, therefore, it should remain as such. Mr. Mara then went on to note specific sections of the Zoning Resolution and argue his point. He said his clients urge the Board to reject the proposal.

Mr. Jeff Carle, along with his wife Karen Carle, of 7748 Highgate Place, Cincinnati, OH 45236 addressed the Board against the proposal. Mr. Carle said he is concerned about the integrity of the large trees adjacent to the development. He said the fence that exists is not structurally sound. Ms. Carle said the fence is in bad shape and is an eyesore.

Ms. Susan Meyer, of 7749 Highgate Place, Cincinnati, OH 45236, addressed the Board saying the fence is backward and the finished side faces the Mercedes dealership.

Mr. Carle noted improvements he's done on his home and said if the Board lived near the dealership they'd have the same concerns.

Ms. Carle said the owner had said he purchased it knowing he'd have to comply with Mercedes standards. She said he should not have agreed to that when the lot is still residential, noting it is not their problem. She complained about hearing cars being delivered at night and other sounds. She explained the view they have of the dealership and why the trees do not block her view.

Ms. Rebekah O'Brien, of 8817 Montgomery Road, Cincinnati, OH 45236 addressed the Board against the proposal. She distributed a photograph to the Board saying it is what Montgomery Road really looks like. She said she is appalled at the owner saying he needs this; she needs her property value. She asked why this is moving so fast so corporate America can sell another Mercedes.

Mr. Tom Mueller, of 7736 Highgate Place, Cincinnati, OH 45236, addressed the Board against the proposal. He said he put a lot of money into his house and even though this will not affect his home a lot it will affect his neighbors. He said he doesn't understand how this process can move so quickly.

Ms. Jane Mueller, of 7725 Highgate Place, Cincinnati, OH 45236 addressed the Board regarding the Land Use Plan calling for this property to be residential. She asked, if this goes commercial, what would stop other properties from going commercial. Ms. Mueller said she is against the project.

Ms. Marilyn Schweikert, of 7730 Highgate Place, Cincinnati, OH 45236, addressed the Board against the project. She explained some history of the site and the house that was torn down. She also said she is concerned about setting a precedent saying just because the house was razed doesn't mean it should be rezoned to commercial.

Mr. Gene Wood, of 8801 Montgomery Road, Cincinnati, OH 45236, addressed the Board against the project. He spoke about woods being removed in 1961 to make way for Borcharding Buick and said this should be stopped.

Mr. Pat Ashcraft, of 8807 Montgomery Road, Cincinnati, OH 45236, addressed the Board and gave handouts to the Board. He said the problem is the car dealership is in the middle of a residential area. He said it doesn't work and the neighbors do not want it there. Mr. Ashcraft said no matter how much effort the owner makes, the neighbors will be affected. He stated the site is too small for a car dealership and should be moved.

Ms. Marguerite Stowe, of 7743 Highgate Place, Cincinnati, OH 45236, addressed the Board. She spoke about the lights from the dealership being intrusive on her property. She said the lights have never been shielded even though that was promised.

Ms. Barbara Schenck, 8706 Appleknoll Lane, Cincinnati, OH 45236, addressed the Board. She said the landscaping on paper is very deceiving. She said this is not the right place for a car dealership noting for them to keep expanding it despite the Land Use Plan does not work. Ms. Schenck said the meeting tonight began by making it sound like this is a done deal. She said it is not the neighbors' problem that a dealership does not fit on this site. Ms. Schenck said the property should not be rezoned.

Mr. Trauth said Mr. Mara failed to say that the Land Use Plan is from 2002 and is out of date. He said the property in question is now on the zoning map as "OO" Planned Office which would be much more invasive. Mr. Trauth said the zoning across the street is also already "OO" Planned Office District. He said the proposal is compatible with the current Land Use Plan and noted the property owner has the right to utilize his property even though the neighbors want to keep it as a golf course.

Mr. Carle asked for clarification on the Land Use Plan.

Mr. Ashcraft said he agrees Mr. Peterson has the right to use his property as long as it does not infringe on the rights of the neighbors.

Mr. Friedmann closed the floor to comments from the public.

Mr. Friedmann entertained a motion.

Mr. Mees made a motion to consider Case 2018-02Z.

Mr. Barrick seconded.

The Board discussed the issues brought before them.

Mr. Kronenberger said the Board has to consider the Land Use Plan. He said the neighbors must realize that land use plans are not static and do change over time. Additionally, regardless of what the Land Use Plan is, courts seem to be willing to approve zone changes. He said he happens to believe it will be difficult for that land to remain undeveloped residential forever. He said the Board tonight must look at the Land Use Plan, which even if it is old, states the lot should be residential.

Mr. Barrick said the Land Use Plan does evolve. He said he appreciates all the comments heard from the neighbors and the tough job of the Board is to strike a balance. He said there was a comment on an alternative use for this as an office and based on the land use plan that is compatible but would be more invasive. He said his biggest concern is the buffering noting that this is a transitional property and, while he appreciates everything that has gone into the plan, he doesn't think it is quite there.

Mr. Friedmann stated the owner has the right to make an economic use of the property. He said he doesn't think there will be a use for this lot that fits in the "B" residential zoning and if the lot came back as "O" office the residents would find that much more troubling. He said he has had trees cut down near his house also, but you can't keep an owner from using his property just because you don't want it to change. Mr. Friedmann said he understood moving the fence in so the landscaping could be on the neighbors' side and he would think the applicant could satisfy that. He spoke about ways to reduce the noise. He said he is a little bit concerned about people saying they did not know about the project and that it came about very quickly.

Mr. Trauth asked for a moment to confer with Mr. Peterson.

Mr. Peterson addressed the Board saying he is troubled by commentary regarding the tacky fence which he did not build and being referred to as corporate America. He said he would like to find someone to sit with him to find a way forward. He said he will do whatever he can to accommodate the neighbors.

Mr. Friedmann asked if Mr. Peterson was requesting more time.

Mr. Peterson said he would like a little more time.

Mr. Mees withdrew his motion to consider Case 2018-02Z.

Mr. Kronenberger seconded.

Mr. Friedmann moved to continue Case 2018-02Z until after the owner has had the opportunity to meet with the adjacent residents.

Mr. Mees seconded.

Mr. Mees called roll.

Mr. Barrick – AYE

Mr. Friedmann - AYE

Mr. Kronenberger – AYE

Mr. Mees – AYE

Mr. Friedmann suggested a five minute break before beginning the third case.

2018-03P2

Jim McFarland, Permit Solutions

7916 Montgomery Road

PUDII

Mr. Holbert presented the case and case history in a Power Point presentation. Mr. Holbert reviewed the site characteristics and explained the request was for interior and exterior site improvements with a side by side drive thru.

Mr. Holbert showed the existing property layout in an aerial view and the proposed site plan. He pointed out where the parking lot may not meet the setback requirements and an issue with the drive thru. He spoke about the elevations proposed saying the project does not appear to meet the preferred material requirements.

Mr. Holbert showed the proposed signs and renderings of the proposal. He then showed the menu boards proposed for the drive thru which would also require a variance since a drive thru is not permitted in the overlay district.

Mr. Holbert reviewed the suggested conditions noted on the staff report if the Board is inclined to recommend approval of the proposal.

The Board asked questions of Mr. Holbert.

Mr. Barrick commented the site is continuing a non-conforming use because the drive thru exists now.

Mr. Holbert answered correct.

Mr. Barrick asked for clarification on the drive thru set up.

Mr. Holbert explained the set up noting the stacked parking should be for ten cars in the drive thru, five cars in each drive thru lane.

There was discussion about where you start counting the stacked parking. Mr. Holbert said it starts from the menu board where people stop their cars to order.

Mr. Barrick asked if the setback not being met off Montgomery Road was a preexisting condition.

Mr. Holbert said yes it already exists.

Mr. Mees asked for clarification of parking lot setbacks depending on types of stalls.

Mr. Holbert explained.

Mr. Friedmann asked if the applicant was present and wished to speak.

Mr. Jim McFarland, the applicant representing McDonald's, of Permit Solutions, 1755 Third Street, Suite 175, Columbus, OH 43215, addressed the Board. Mr. McFarland said he sent Mr. Holbert a civil drawing showing the stacking. He said the side by side drive thru is being proposed to reduce cars stacking out into the right of way. He said the side by side is designed to handle the stacking of eight cars. He said, with the addition of the side by side drive thru, there will be a reduction of two parking stalls.

Mr. McFarland then addressed some of the other concerns brought up in the staff report. He reviewed the signs proposed and noted the wall sign is still 64 square feet.

Mr. McFarland said they will comply with the required landscaping. He said he can provide clarification on materials and landscaping before the Trustees meeting.

Mr. Mees asked the applicant to point out the materials on the elevations.

Mr. McFarland did so and stated he could provide more details for the Trustees.

Mr. Barrick said the Trustees may like to see more preferred materials.

Mr. McFarland asked what the preferred materials are.

Mr. Holbert explained.

No one was present from the public to comment on the case.

Mr. Barrick said it shows three cars in the stack zone in each lane for a total of six but it does look like it could be stretched out to accommodate four in each for a total of eight.

There was discussion about the traffic pattern and access to the Mattress Firm.

Mr. Barrick asked Mr. Holbert if there was enough area to be compliant with landscaping requirements.

Mr. Holbert explained the requirements and his thoughts on the landscaping.

Mr. McFarland asked for clarification on the review process.

Mr. Friedmann closed the floor to comments and the Board discussed the issues brought before them.

Mr. Mees made a motion to consider Case 2018-03Z with all of the recommended conditions in the staff report and the addition of a condition that the preferred building materials be required.

Mr. Kronenberger seconded.

Mr. Barrick suggested adding the extra stack position.

Mr. Mees said he is not sure that gives them what they need to merge before the curb.

Mr. Mees called roll.

Mr. Barrick – AYE

Mr. Friedmann - AYE

Mr. Kronenberger – AYE

Mr. Mees - AYE

Mr. Friedmann said the case will be heard by the Board of Trustees at a date and time to be determined.

Item 5. – Trustees Report

Mr. Kronenberger made a motion to review the current Zoning Resolution, Appendix and Land Use Plan.

Mr. Mees seconded.

Vote: All AYE.

Mr. Holbert reported that Mr. Mees had been re-appointed by the Trustees to another term on the Zoning Commission.

Item 6. – Date of Next Meeting

Mr. Friedmann noted the date of the next meeting is Monday, February 12, 2018.

Item 7. – Adjournment

Mr. Mees moved to adjourn.

Mr. Kronenberger seconded.

All voted yes.

Meeting adjourned at 10:22 p.m.

Minutes Recorded by: Beth Gunderson
Planning & Zoning Assistant