

**City of Springboro**  
**320 West Central Avenue, Springboro, Ohio**

**Planning Commission Regular Meeting**  
**Wednesday, January 27, 2010, 7:00 p.m.**

**I. Call to Order and Roll Call**

Chairperson Marie Belpulsi called the Springboro Planning Commission Meeting to order at the Springboro Municipal Building, 320 West Central Avenue, Springboro, Ohio.

Present: Marie Belpulsi, Chairperson, David Vomacka, Hans Landefeld, Chris Papakirk,  
Barb Gibson, Janie Ridd  
Absent: Becky Hartle

Staff: Chris Thompson, City Manager; Alan Schaeffer, City Attorney; Dan Boron, Planning  
Consultant; Raj Sharma, City Engineer; Elmer Dudas, Assistant City Engineer; Lois Boytim,  
Planning Commission Secretary

Ms. Belpulsi asked Planning Commission for a motion to excuse Ms. Hartle.

*Mr. Landefeld motioned to excuse Ms. Hartle. Mr. Vomacka seconded the motion.*

**Vote: Landefeld, Papakirk, Gibson, Ridd, Belpulsi, Vomacka; all yes**

**II. Appointment of Planning Commission Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson**

*Ms. Gibson moved to appoint Ms. Belpulsi as Planning Commission Chairperson. Ms. Ridd seconded the motion.*

**Vote: Belpulsi, Vomacka, Landefeld, Papakirk, Gibson, Ridd; all yes**

*Ms. Ridd moved to appoint Mr. Landefeld as Planning Commission Vice-Chairperson. Ms. Gibson seconded the motion.*

**Vote: Belpulsi, Vomacka, Landefeld, Papakirk, Gibson, Ridd; all yes**

**III. Approval of Minutes**

**A. December 16, 2009 Planning Commission Work Session**

Ms. Belpulsi asked for corrections or additions to the minutes.

Mr. Papakirk asked that the minutes reflect that he did not take part in the discussion of the General Plan for the Lytle Five Points Office Park due to a conflict.

*Ms. Ridd motioned to approve the December 16, 2009 Planning Commission work session minutes as amended. Mr. Papakirk seconded the motion.*

**Vote: Gibson, Ridd, Belpulsi, Papakirk; all yes, Vomacka, Landefeld; abstain**

**B. December 16, 2009 Planning Commission Meeting**

Ms. Belpulsi asked for corrections or additions to the minutes. There were none.

*Ms. Ridd motioned to approve the December 16, 2009 Planning Commission meeting minutes as submitted. Ms. Gibson seconded the motion.*

**Vote: Ridd, Belpulsi, Papakirk, Gibson; all yes, Vomacka, Landefeld; abstain**

Ms. Belpulsi welcomed Mr. Vomacka to City Council and to the Planning Commission.

**IV. Agenda Items**

**A. General Plan, Lytle-Five Points Road Office Park PUD-B, Planned Unit Development-Business**

Background Information

This agenda item is based on a request filed by Skip Shafer, doing business as CS Five Point, LLC, for General Plan approval for an approximately 6.29-acre site located on the south side of Lytle-Five Points Road approximately 500 feet east of the intersection of Lytle-Five Points Road and North Main Street (SR 741). The property bears Sidwell No. 04081010060.

This item was last discussed at the December 16, 2009 Work Session at which time the applicant was directed to address a number of issues with the General Plan, provided a sample General Plan and submit a revised General Plan at the January 13th Planning Commission Work Session or January 27th Planning Commission Business Meeting.

The applicant proposes to rezone the entire 6.29-acre site from the current O-R, Office-Residential District, to PUD-B, Planned Unit Development using the B-2, Local Business District as a basis. The rezoning of the property is pending before City Council at this time.

Rezoning together with General Plan review and approval are the first stage in the three-stage PUD review and approval process. Approval by both Planning Commission and City Council is required.

Final Development Plan review and approval by Planning Commission is the second stage in the process followed by Record Plan review and approval by both Planning Commission and City Council.

The site is presently vacant.

Adjacent land uses include single-family residential within the Woodland Greens subdivision both in Clearcreek Township and Springboro; undeveloped land to the south and east; and to the north common space (detention area) within the Settlers Walk PUD to the north of Lytle-Five Points Road.

Adjacent zoning includes (T)R-1, Clearcreek Township Rural Residence District to the east (both in the Springboro and Clearcreek Township portions of the Woodland Greens subdivision); O-R

District to the south; B-1, Highway Business District to the west; and PUD to the north for the Settlers Walk PUD.

### Staff Comments

1. Incorporate improvements included in December 10, 2009 memorandum from City of Springboro traffic engineering consultant's review of the applicant's traffic impact study for the development of the 6.29-acre site.
2. Revised architectural concept drawing needed; plans reviewed at the December 16, 2009 Planning Commission Work Session indicated unacceptable use of EIFS below 8-10' above grade.
3. Revised architectural concept drawing needed; plans reviewed at December 16, 2009 Planning Commission Work Session do not reflect necessary screening of roof-mounted mechanical equipment from adjacent residential areas; likewise suggest that all mechanical equipment (e.g., including ground-mounted) be screened from adjacent residential areas.
4. Are no additional unifying signage standards intended for the proposed PUD, per the December 16, 2009 Planning Commission Work Session discussion? For example, the applicant has furnished a lighting hardware design for Planning Commission consideration but nothing to date has been proposed on signage save for the proposed "ground signs by others" on the proposed General Plan and a separate development sign graphic.
5. For the overall landscaping standard, provide the species, size, spacing, and number of specimens proposed.
6. Regarding the landscape buffer adjacent to the east property line, Planning Commission shall determine the minimum buffer requirement under the terms of a PUD and whether the proposed 20' area is acceptable. At a minimum whatever is approved needs to be extended to the south to screen the parking area on the southeast corner of the lot. Also the applicant needs to provide an explanation on the "10-foot natural buffer to remain undisturbed along the eastern boundary to preserve existing natural tree line." If this is the intent shouldn't the dripline be used to define how much of a buffer is needed? Also how will the preservation of this area be impacted by regrading of the site? Is no regrading proposed for the area?
7. Is no internal landscaping proposed for the site?
8. Recommend moving the "Lot 1" parking area to the south/rear side of the building. Also the internal circulation on that site, as discussed at the December 16th Planning Commission Work Session, needs to be revised to provide better circulation and traffic/pedestrian safety relative to the proposed daycare/school use.
9. Remove jug at north end of the private access road.
10. Provide a public access easement over the proposed private drive.
11. Provide erosion and sedimentation control plan for during and after construction.
12. Revise label from Richards Run Creek to Pleasant Valley Run.
13. The total area shown in the title block (6.289 acres) does not match the "total site area" (5.99 acres).
14. Remove the lot lines as shown for lot 2 thru 5. The only permitted buildable lot to be split off is lot 1. Show the length and bearing of the lot lines for lot 1 accordingly. Revise the lot numbers to be building numbers. Lot 1 can remain as such, but also show it as building 1.
15. Revise the "Open/Green Space" to read "Pervious Area". Submit documentation to confirm 54% on-site green space calculation, what it includes (e.g., areas between buildings and parking areas) and not.
16. Provide a total maximum building area for any one building; also indicate maximum number of stories per building.
17. Move the cul-de-sac to the south to provide improved traffic circulation.

18. Remove the first two parking stalls on Lot 1 and also the two parking stalls nearest to the private drive on lot (building) 5.
19. For lot 1, information regarding employees and number of children for the daycare must be submitted in order to determine the number of parking spaces required.
20. The water main and sanitary sewer shall be public utilities. Provide easements accordingly. The water main, sanitary, and storm sewer are not approved as shown. The layout and design shall be reviewed at the Final Development Plan stage.
21. Dedicate the additional right-of-way along Lytle Five Points Road as shown.
22. Relocate existing catch basin at the intersection of the private road with Lytle-Five Points Road to the east side of the drive. Tie into the existing 24" storm sewer on the north side by adding a manhole.
23. Clearly show building setbacks from property lines along the lot 1 boundary.
24. Add a five foot concrete sidewalk along the frontage of Lytle Five Points Road. Back of sidewalk to be located at the proposed right of way line.
25. Clearcreek Fire District: Provide one (1) additional fire hydrant at the intersection of the proposed private drive and Lytle Five Points Road, located on the south side of the intersection, per 2007 OFC

Skip Shafer of CS Five Points LLC was in attendance to answer questions of Planning Commission.

Ms. Belpulsi asked Mr. Shafer whether he had reviewed the staff comments and whether he had any questions for staff or the Planning Commission.

Mr. Shafer presented Planning Commission with a revised plan that addressed some of the staff comments.

Mr. Boron commented that the new plan was received by some of the City staff this afternoon but had not been seen by the Planning Commission or the public. He added that Planning Commission had received about twenty five comments about the plan that was received by staff on January 7th and is on the agenda.

Mr. Boron explained that should Mr. Shafer prefer that Planning Commission review the new plan, it would be without the benefit of comments. Reviewing the new plans would necessitate the item be tabled until February.

Mr. Boron explained that the new plan that Mr. Shafer submitted includes significant changes and staff has not had the opportunity for a thorough review. He added that Planning Commission has accepted revised plans when those plans are generated based on a lot of feedback from the engineering department. There has been no discussion on these plans.

Mr. Shafer commented that the revised plans do address some of the twenty five staff comments, but the current plans can be reviewed.

Mr. Boron agreed that it would be extremely confusing for Planning Commission to make a recommendation to Council without clarity about which plan is being referenced.

Ms. Belpulsi agreed. Planning Commission is prepared to address the plan that they have been reviewing for the past several weeks along with staff comments. The new plan has not been seen by Planning Commission. She stated that it would not be fair to Mr. Shafer or the Planning Commission to act on a plan that they have not seen. She asked Mr. Shafer whether he would like

Planning Commission to act on the plans that were originally presented. Planning Commission cannot comment on the new plan.

Mr. Shafer withdrew the amended plans.

They were returned to him.

Mr. Shafer offered to address the staff comments one at a time.

Regarding staff comment #1, Mr. Shafer stated he did was not sure what the December 10th memo referred to and wanted to wait to comment on those recommendations. He and his traffic engineer had spoken to the City traffic engineer and staff and he was unclear about what the finalization was for that study.

Ms. Belpulsi asked Planning Commission also to comment on each staff comment as they are reviewed to avoid confusion.

Ms. Ridd asked why Planning Commission would spend any time on the current plan when Mr. Shafer has new plans.

Ms. Belpulsi stated that she was not sure what was in the new plans, but would suspect that they address some of the staff comments.

Ms. Ridd asked if it was Planning Commission's intention to have Mr. Shafer comply with these comments and then if staff determines that the new plans meet that then they are good.

Mr. Boron commented that that is typically the practice, but not when there are this many comments.

Mr. Shafer stated that he hoped to get on the same page and address the comments that were made. Regarding staff comment #1, he commented that he was not sure what the signalization is for the traffic improvements to be done and would like to reserve comment.

Regarding staff comment # 2, Mr. Shafer stated that his design criteria had included the use of EIFS, but his plan would never supersede the City's codes. He stated that he would comply with all City building codes. He did not make a notation that EIFS could not be used.

Mr. Boron commented that Mr. Shafer's statement could apply to many of the staff comments. He added that staff has worked with Mr. Shafer at length and that the staff comments need to be reflected in submitted drawings or statements in a submitted plan. He added that it would be very difficult to resolve the General Plan's referral to Council if these items keep being kicked down the road. Staff asked for specific plans to be revised. If Planning Commission should recommend the General Plan, the drawings submitted to City Council need to show what has been approved, not with this many comments attached. This is an extraordinary number of comments for a General Plan. Staff is asking and suggesting to Planning Commission is that these plans be revised and resubmitted to staff for distribution to the members of Planning Commission.

Mr. Shafer stated that his problem is that he received the comments last Friday. He added that it is difficult to make revisions from Friday to today.

Mr. Boron commented that these comments were those that were made at the Planning Commission meeting, December 16th.

Ms. Belpulsi commented that these comments are not anything new; Planning Commission has been discussing this thoroughly with Mr. Shafer for quite a while. These comments were made by members of Planning Commission and were agreed to. She added that the last time Mr. Shafer was here, she specifically asked whether Mr. Shafer understood what the Planning Commission was requiring and he answered yes. It has to be documented.

Mr. Shafer commented that the City code states that EIFS cannot be reused below eight to ten feet and his design criteria states that it can be used as a base. He asked whether he should submit something stated that EIFS cannot be used below eight feet.

Ms. Gibson answered that EIFS should be stricken from the accepted materials in those areas. She added that she is the one who asked Mr. Shafer to remove EIFS from the accepted materials and he agreed. She added that she also suggested that he take it out even above that, but stated that that would be fine, as long as EIFS is not used in the base. She stated that Mr. Shafer keeps referring to the fact that the City regulations don't allow it, but nowhere on the plans does he say that. The first statement should be "anywhere on the design criteria that differ from the City zoning regulations, they supersede". She does not see where Mr. Shafer acknowledges that. She added that it is very simple on the EIFS; he said that he would take it out.

Ms. Belpulsi added that Mr. Shafer is making the process very difficult if he is not going to do what the Planning Commission has asked him to do. She asked him to move on the staff comment #3.

Mr. Shafer commented that he is confused and asked if Planning Commission wanted a statement from him stating that he would comply with the zoning code. He added that zoning code specifically indicates that rooftop screening is required.

Mr. Boron explained that he had given Mr. Shafer an example of Village Park PUD. The idea was that when Mr. Shafer has prospective users for the other four or five buildings or lots, the same standards would be given to them to quicken the process to go through Planning Commission for subsequent buildings. If Planning Commission approves the General Plan, that is the idea. The revised plans need to be submitted as that part of the package that is referred on to City Council if it is favorably recommended on Council.

Mr. Shafer stated that he thought that that type of detail would be found in the Final Plan, not the General Plan. He stated that the buildings were done as a footprint, not as specific architectural drawings.

Mr. Boron answered that the buildings were a template and used the Village Park pattern book as an example.

Alan Schaeffer, City Attorney, explained that the plans had been reviewed by the Planning Commission in December, the twenty five comments relate to that plan. What the Planning Commission is asking for is revised plans that address the issues. Mr. Shafer has submitted a plan that addresses some of the issues. He stated that it is up to Planning Commission, but to go through all twenty five of the comments on a plan that is a duplicate of the one from December is a meaningless exercise. Planning Commission needs a revised plan showing that he has dealt with the comments.

Mr. Schaeffer commented that Burkhardt Engineering has done plans that show comments such as the ones requested by Planning Commission for the screening of the roof mounted mechanical systems and will apply to all of the buildings.

Mr. Shafer suggested that this item be tabled to give him time to submit the revised plans so that Planning Commission can review the changes. He added that some of the plans ask for a great amount of detail and asked when Planning Commission would look at these items; in the General Plan or in the Final Plan. He did not think that the General Plan would include a lighting plan. He stated that he does not have the architectural plan for the buildings; he thought that would be in the Final Plan. He will try to work it out with staff.

Ms. Belpulsi asked Planning Commission for their input on tabling the item.

Mr. Vomacka commented on Mr. Shafer's comment about the level of detail required in the plans. He stated that he does not see the level of detail required in Mr. Shafer's plans. He stated that Mr. Shafer did provide a light standard which is totally out of compliance with the City's guidelines and regulations.

Mr. Shafer answered that he did not receive any comments on the lighting standards. He asked Mr. Vomacka if he was talking about the pole lighting coming in the project.

Mr. Vomacka answered that the City requires full cut off luminary on all high sodium lights to a certain level of illumination.

Mr. Shafer stated that he did look at those and it is the same as a fixture that is just to the south of the site on SR 741.

Mr. Vomacka restated that it does not comply with the City's regulations and asked Mr. Boron for clarification.

Ms. Gibson asked what project Mr. Shafer is speaking of.

Mr. Shafer answered that it is a new building connecting to the Tipton property; they have this same light on that site.

Ms. Gibson stated that she is concerned about the lighting since this site falls in the area of the airport, if the light is not shielded at all. She wondered whether they have strict guidelines, with no upward light. She stated that she agreed with Mr. Vomacka, that she wasn't sure that it complies with the City's lighting standards.

Mr. Vomacka suggested that Mr. Shafer look at the lighting at Ledgestone Office Park, they have very good exterior lighting.

Mr. Shafer stated that he will comply with the City's regulations and that this light did come from the development that he mentioned.

Ms. Belpulsi commented that given the amount of issues with this plan, she suggests that the item be tabled until the next meeting.

Ms. Ridd motioned that the item be tabled. She added while the new plan may address many of these issues she asked that the design criteria be changed to reflect other requirements of Planning Commission.

Ms. Gibson seconded the motion and commented that the design criteria include the maximum building square footage of 48,880 square feet and maximum building height. She asked that the plans note the maximum size per building in addition to the maximum total square footage.

Mr. Landefeld asked for some assurance that before the next time this item is brought before Planning Commission, staff has a chance to thoroughly review it and is bringing it to Planning Commission with a pretty good sense that the issues have been addressed.

Ms. Gibson suggested that the item stay at work session.

Ms. Belpulsi agreed and recommended that if there are this many issues with the next plan, then Planning Commission will not discuss it at a regular meeting. The issues are too significant.

*Ms. Ridd motioned to table the discussion of the General Plan for the Lytle-Five Points Office Park PUD-B, Planned Unit Development. Ms. Gibson seconded the motion.*

**Vote: Ridd, Belpulsi, Vomacka, Landefeld, Gibson; all yes, Papakirk; abstain**

Mr. Schaeffer clarified that because the General Plan discussion has been tabled by the Planning Commission, he suggested that it would be highly unlikely that there would be a vote by the City Council on the rezoning of the property until the General Plan has been approved.

Ms. Belpulsi agreed that the item would probably be tabled by City Council.

**B. Record Plan, South Tech Section 18, Right-Of-Way Dedication, extension of West Tech Road**

Background Information

This agenda item is a request for Record Plan approval for the right of way dedication of West Tech Road located in the South Tech Industrial Park. In 2009, the city extended West Tech Road approximately 750 feet to the southwest in order to open up additional land for economic development in the South Tech Industrial Park. This dedication will cover the roadway extension. Approximately 0.7 acres of right of way is being dedicated. This record plan is currently under review, and as such all staff comments will be corrected on the record plan prior to city council approval.

**Staff Comments**

No staff comments at this time.

Mr. Dudas reviewed the item for Planning Commission.

Ms Belpulsi asked for questions or comments from Planning Commission or staff. There were none.

*Ms. Ridd motioned to approve the Record Plan, South Tech Section 18, Right-Of-Way Dedication, extension of West Tech Road as submitted. Ms. Gibson seconded the motion.*

**Vote: Ridd, Belpulsi, Vomacka, Landefeld, Papakirk, Gibson; all yes**

**C. Record Plan, Springboro Municipal Building, lot consolidation**

Background Information

This agenda item is a request for Record Plan approval for the Springboro Municipal Building site. In previous years, the city purchased the properties located to the east (office building) and to the west (car wash) of the city building. These properties are being combined with the existing city property to create one lot containing approximately 3.2 acres. Also, 0.6 acres of right of way along S.R. 73 is being dedicated. This record plan is currently under review, and as such all staff comments will be corrected on the record plan prior to city council approval.

**Staff Comments**

No staff comments at this time.

Mr. Dudas reviewed the item for Planning Commission.

Ms Belpulsi asked for questions or comments from Planning Commission or staff. There were none.

*Ms. Ridd motioned to approve the Record Plan, Springboro Municipal Building, lot consolidation. Mr. Landefeld seconded the motion.*

**Vote: Papakirk, Gibson, Ridd, Belpulsi, Vomacka, Landefeld; all yes**

**D. Record Plan, Edwards Drive, Right-Of-Way Dedication**

Background Information

This agenda item is a request for Record Plan approval for the right of way dedication for a portion of Edwards Drive. The city completed roadway improvements to Edwards Drive in 2009. Additional right of way is being dedicated to cover the area needed for this roadway improvement. The right of way being dedicated is 259 square feet. This record plan is currently under review, and as such all staff comments will be corrected on the record plan prior to city council approval.

**Staff Comments**

No staff comments at this time.

Mr. Dudas reviewed the item for Planning Commission.

Ms Belpulsi asked for questions or comments from Planning Commission or staff. There were none.

*Mr. Landefeld motioned to approve the Record Plan, Edwards Drive, Right-Of-Way Dedication. Mr. Papakirk seconded the motion.*

**Vote: Gibson, Ridd, Belpulsi, Vomacka, Landefeld, Papakirk; all yes**

**E. Town Center Overlay District Review, Certificate of Substantial Compliance, 95 Edgebrook Drive, National Bank & Trust, sign package**

Background Information

This agenda item is a request from Ken Brightman, Abbott Sign Company, agent for the property owner, National Bank & Trust Company, formerly Community National Bank, for a finding of Substantial Compliance with the Town Center Overlay District Design Standards to allow the installation of a sign package for the property located at 95 Edgebrook Drive. The property fronts North Main Street (SR 741), Edgebrook Drive and West Eleanor Drive.

The property at 75 West Eleanor Drive is located in the Town Center Overlay District. As such a finding of substantial compliance from both the Architectural Review Board and Planning Commission are required.

As indicated in the application and support information, the applicant proposes to reface an existing ground sign on North Main Street; reface existing directional signage throughout the site; install new signage on the elevation facing North Main Street; and rebrand the ATM on the west elevation.

**Staff Comments**

No staff comments at this time.

Mr. Boron reviewed the item for Planning Commission. He stated that the item has been approved by the City zoning inspector and the Architectural Review Board.

Ms Belpulsi asked for questions or comments from Planning Commission or staff. There were none.

*Mr. Vomacka motioned to approve the Town Center Overlay District Review, Certificate of Substantial Compliance, 95 Edgebrook Drive, National Bank & Trust, sign package. Mr. Landefeld seconded the motion.*

**Vote: Papakirk, Gibson, Ridd, Belpulsi, Vomacka, Landefeld; all yes**

**F. Town Center Overlay District Review, Certificate of Substantial Compliance, 85 West Central Avenue, Stan's Haircut Company, wall sign**

Background Information

This agenda item is a request from Stan Clark, business owner of Stan's Vintage Cuts, to install a wall sign on the front elevation at 85 West Central Avenue. The property at 85 West

Central Avenue is located in the Town Center Overlay District. As such a finding of substantial compliance from both the Architectural Review Board and Planning Commission are required. As indicated in the application and support information, the applicant proposes to install a 16-square foot sign on the West Central Avenue (SR 73) side of the building.

The signs have been approved by Dan Fitzpatrick, Zoning Inspector, for compliance with the Sign Code of the City of Springboro; the Springboro Architectural Review Board made a motion to recommend approval of the sign package to the Planning Commission at its Monday, January 11th meeting.

### **Staff Comments**

No staff comments at this time

Mr. Boron reviewed the item for Planning Commission.

Ms Belpulsi asked for questions or comments from Planning Commission or staff. There were none.

*Ms. Ridd motioned to approve the Town Center Overlay District Review, Certificate of Substantial Compliance, 85 West Central Avenue, Stan's Haircut Company, wall sign. Mr. Vomacka seconded the motion.*

**Vote: Landefeld, Papakirk, Gibson, Ridd, Belpulsi, Vomacka; all yes**

### **V. Guest Comments**

Ms. Belpulsi offered to answer any questions of the guests about the General Plan for the Lytle-Five Points Office Park.

Paul Van Maldeghem of 1860 West Tamaron Court asked about the City Council process, what would be next.

Mr. Boron explained that that is up to the applicant. He stated that if there is a submission that meets the spirit of the discussion tonight, he will provide copies to the guests. The next meeting is February 10th in a work session environment.

Mr. Van Maldeghem asked if there would be a third reading at the next Council meeting.

Ms. Belpulsi answered that generally Council approves a rezoning at the same as the General Plan. She added that Council would have to vote to table the item.

Mr. Schaeffer commented that the item is on the agenda. Council would have to motion to remove the item from the agenda.

Ms. Belpulsi stated that there would be a recommendation to table the third reading until these issues have been settled.

**VI. Planning Commission and Staff Comments**

Ms. Gibson asked to be excused from the February 24th Planning Commission meeting.

Ms. Thompson clarified that she anticipates that the item for the General Plan for Lytle Five Points Road will not come back to Planning Commission unless staff and the City planner's opinion is that the comments are reasonable and controlled in number.

Ms. Gibson suggested that the applicant return to work session.

Mr. Landefeld noted that the Planning Commission packets included minutes from the first two meetings of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee. He commented that at the last meeting two groups of students did presentations that laid out possible trail plans for the City.

**VII. Adjournment**

*Mr. Landefeld motioned to adjourn the January 27, 2010 Planning Commission Regular Meeting at 7:40 P.M. Mr. Vomacka seconded the motion.*

**Vote: Landefeld, Papakirk, Gibson, Ridd, Belpulsi, Vomacka; all yes**

---

Marie Belpulsi, Planning Commission Chairperson

---

Dan Boron, Planning Consultant

---

Lois Boytim, Planning Commission Secretary