

**KENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
Minutes**

Mr. Paul Darpel, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:15 p.m. on Thursday, November 5, 2015, and opened the proceedings with the Pledge of Allegiance and invocation by Mr. Hult. The meeting was held in the Commission Chambers of the PDS Building in Fort Mitchell. Attendance of members (for this meeting as well as those during the year to date) was as follows.

Commission Member	Jurisdiction	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D
		a	e	a	p	a	u	u	u	e	c	o	e
		n	b	r	r	y	n	l	g	p	t	v	c
Diane Brown	Erlanger	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	
Doug Neuspickle	Ryland Hts.		X	X	X		X	X	X			X	
Barry Coates	Covington	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X		
Gailen Bridges	Kenton Co	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Paul Darpel, Chair	Edgewood	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Tom France	Ludlow		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Joe Gray	Covington		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	
David Hilgefurd	Villa Hills		X	X	X	X	X		X			X	
Lynne Hood	Crestview Hills		X	X		X	X	X	*	X	X		
Marc Hult, V. Chair	Covington	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	
Keith Logsdon	Lakeside Park	X	X	X	X				X	X	X	X	
Joe Pannunzio	Elsmere	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Stan Porter	Taylor Mill	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		
Greg Sketch	Crescent Spgs								X	X	X	X	
Paula Rust	Kenton Cty	X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	
Jack Toebben	Fort Wright		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Jeff Bethell	Fort Mitchell	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	
Maura Snyder	Independence	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	*	X	
Joe Tewes	Bromley	X	X		X		X		X	X	X	X	
Phil Ryan	Park Hills		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	

“X” denotes attendance at the regular meeting and “x” denotes attendance at the continuation meeting. “*” denotes arrival after roll call was taken.

Also present were Matt Smith, Legal Counsel, and the following PDS staff: Mr. Andy Videkovich and Ms. Emi Randall and Mr. James Fausz.

AGENDA

Mr. Darpel proposed moving item 10 for the City of Erlanger, the text amendment, in front of the map amendment. He noted they would like to have the recommendation on the text amendment prior to the map amendment. Mr. Darpel then asked for a motion. Ms. Snyder made the motion to accept the agenda with the proposed changes. Mr. Ryan seconded the motion. All in favor by acclamation. None opposed.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

Mr. Darpel asked for any questions or comments with regard to the minutes for October. Mr. Bridges noted on page 6, halfway down where it begins with Kathy Donohue, second line, there appears to be a word missing. He stated the second line where it reads “even it has been” should probably read “even though it has passed.” He additionally commented at the bottom of that same paragraph, that that sentence didn’t make any sense to him where it reads “he further noted Dollar General already has a business operating under a small scale business. He stated he didn’t know what that should be. Mr. Smith commented that since we’re uncertain it should probably just make referenced that Dollar General already has a business operating, and not infer anything other than that he made reference to it. Mr. Ryan commented it might have meant they have strip center stores that are smaller than the independently standing store. Mr. Darpel stated that it what he felt it meant. Mr. Bridges then noted in the next paragraph, first line after “referenced and” should read “referenced the” OKI study. He further stated in the same paragraph it should be changed from “recommended improved” to “recommended improvements”, and “general” should be capitalized after “Dollar.” Mr. Darpel stated the only thing he had was on page three where it references the survey had not been performed. He stated he felt there needed to be some mention in there in response to Staff’s report that the acreage was less than five acres. He stated it did not meet the prerequisite five acres so it needs to be put in there in response to Staff’s report that it does not meet the five acre minimum for approval. He stated he would like to add that after the first sentence. Mr. Logsdon commented on the same page under PDS Staff Recommendations it should read the Taylor Mill Zoning ordinance instead of the Erlanger Zoning Ordinance. There being no further changes, Ms. Snyder made the motion to approve with changes. Mr. Ryan seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the matter found Ms. Snyder, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Tewes, Mr. Darpel, Mr. Bridges, Mr. Bethell, Mr. Brown, Mr. Gray, Mr. France, Mr. Hult, Mr. Logsdon, Mr. Pannunzio, Mr. Sketch, Ms. Rust and Mr. Toeppen in favor. Mr. Hilgefurd and Mr. Neuspickle abstained. The motion carried.

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES:

Mr. Darpel stated the receipts and expenditures were distributed. He commented that it was fairly ordinary according to what the Commission was doing. There being no other comments, Mr. Hult made the motion to accept. Mr. France seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the motion found Mr. Hult, Mr. France, Mr. Bethell, Mr. Bridges, Ms. Brown, Mr. Gray, Mr.

Hilgeford, Mr. Logsdon, Mr. Pannunzio, Mr. Sketch, Ms. Rust, Mr. Toebben, Ms. Snyder, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Tewes and Mr. Darpel in favor. Mr. Neuspickle abstained. The motion carried.

ACTIONS SINCE LAST MEETING:

The memorandum regarding the actions taken by Staff over the past month was distributed for informational purposes only.

RECENT ACTIONS BY LEGISLATIVE BODIES:

Mr. Darpel stated the three legislative items that were approved the past month were in front of the Commissioners. No action was required.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

FILE: PC1509-0004

APPLICANT: City of Erlanger per P. David Hahn, Economic Development Director

REQUEST: proposed text amendments to the Erlanger Zoning Ordinance: (1) to amend conflicting language within the IP-3 Zone (Industrial Park Three) and the IP-4 Zone (Industrial Park Four) pertaining to outdoor storage; and (2) to increase the minimum distance required from 40-50 feet, for Buffer Yard D, an area intended to provide distance and screening between two land use types, such as between industrial and residential.

Staff presentation and Staff recommendation by Ms. Emi Randall

PDS STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Regarding Request #1, Staff is providing a favorable recommendation on the proposed text amendments to amend conflicting language within the IP-3 Zone (Industrial Park Three) and the IP-4 Zone (Industrial Park Four) pertaining to outdoor storage. As to Request #2, Staff is providing a favorable recommendation on the proposed text amendments to increase the minimum distance required from 40 to 50 feet, for Buffer Yard D.

Mr. Mark Stewart addressed the Commission with regard to the issue and stated he was mainly available to answer any questions. Mr. Darpel asked if there was anything in particular that was planned or going on. He stated they do have a few businesses that are interested in outdoor storage and they also want to do this to clean up the language. He stated the conflict was discovered recently and they just wanted to clear that up.

Randy Ogdon registered to speak against the issues. He addressed the Commission and stated there are a lot of people that are not happy with the more concentrated zoning. He stated he is particularly not happy because it's in his backyard. Mr. Darpel clarified that this issue is for the text amendment and that if he wanted to, he could reserve his comments for that issue. He stated he is free to speak on the text amendment but he probably wanted his comments to appear under the map amendment.

Mr. Tim Williams then addressed the Commission as a neutral party and stated the city is actually for the issue. He stated their concern is the difference in uses and more concentrated uses, particularly the types of uses. He further stated they would be in favor of increasing the buffer. He noted one of the main issues is if the outdoor storage is increased, they want the

buffer to also increase.

Mr. Darpel then recessed the public hearing for discussion amongst the Commissioners. There being none, he reconvened the public hearing and asked for a motion on the issue. Ms. Brown then made the motion to approve Request #1 and #2 on the issue based on the testimony from Staff and the citizens present. Mr. Gray seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the matter found Ms. Brown, Mr. Gray, Mr. Bethell, Mr. Bridges, Mr. France, Mr. Hilgefurd, Mr. Hult, Mr. Logsdon, Mr. Neuspickle, Mr. Pannunzio, Mr. Sketch, Ms. Rust, Mr. Toeppen, Ms. Snyder, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Tewes and Mr. Darpel in favor. The motion carried.

FILE: PC1509-0003

APPLICANT: City of Erlanger per P. David Hahn, Economic Development Director

LOCATION: An approximate 13.84-acre area located near the intersection of Kenton Lands Road and Russell McClure Drive, approximately 855 feet north of Dixie Highway in Erlanger.

REQUEST: a proposed map amendment to the Erlanger Zoning Ordinance changing the zoning of the described area from IP-1 (an industrial park zone with a 25-acre minimum tract for development, except were otherwise permitted), to IP-4 (an industrial park zone with a 5-acre minimum tract for development).

Staff presentation and Staff recommendation by Ms. James Fausz

PDS STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

To provide a favorable recommendation of the proposed map amendment to the Erlanger Zoning Ordinance changing the zoning of the described area from IP-1 to IP-4.

Mr. Mark Stewart registered to speak on the issue. He addressed the Commission and stated he was available to answer any questions. He stated they've had a couple businesses that wish to have outdoor storage city council agreed to looking into allowing them to have that happen.

Mr. Ogdon addressed the Commission against the issue and asked if there was a site plan he could see. Mr. Darpel then asked that that be pulled up so Mr. Ogdon could see it. He then asked about what specifically was going to go in there. Mr. Darpel commented that since this was brought by the City it is not required. He then sited a concern with what could happen if the property owner decided to make a parking lot out of the whole thing. He also stated the towing company is an eyesore and he stated they can't see any buffer zone and it decreases their property values. Mr. Darpel clarified the Commission is a recommending body and they have nothing to do with the development and have no interest in the property. He stated there isn't a particular development plan to consider and they can only go with what is requested of the Commission. Mr. Ogdon stated there are many property owners in the neighborhood that are concerned with this because it does affect their property values. He stated he concerns them being in Crestview Hills since it is in his backyard. He stated once the zoning is in place, it's very difficult to get it out.

Betty Ogdon registered to speak and passed on any comments.

Mr. Eddie Kappes addressed the Commission against the issue and stated he doesn't see why it is

needed. He stated if the first text change is going to change the storage, he doesn't understand why this is needed. His stated his biggest concern is the idea of the vehicle towing and storage. He stated he feels like it's paving the way for a giant junk yard. He commented they get a bunch of noise out of there and that's his big concern.

Mr. Kevin Schuchter addressed the Commission against the issue due to the additional storage. He stated with the additional storage it will be just like a big junkyard and will increase the traffic. He stated if it's not a big deal then why is it being done.

Mr. Tim Williams, city administrator for the City of Crestview Hills, addressed the Commission and stated they are neutral on the zone change. He stated outdoor storage is already taking place there. He noted the pallet company currently does not have anything outside. He stated his concern is if the pallet company starts stacking pallets in the back of the property it will become a visual concern for the residents. He commented the nice thing about the IP-1 now is the noise is contained in the inside of the building. He further commented if the additional storage is moved outside that won't be the case. He then reiterated that they are neutral on the issue at this point but wanted to add a caveat with their concerns.

Following a discussion regarding screening and height requirements as to the existing buildings as well as items that would be stacked on the property, Mr. Darpel then recessed the public hearing for discussion amongst the Commissioners. Mr. Bridges asked if a condition can be placed on the screening of the storage. Mr. Darpel stated he wasn't sure they could place conditions on the map amendment as a map amendment is not typically conditioned. Mr. Smith stated that would be more apropos for the text. Mr. France then commented that the outdoor storage needed to be addressed in the issue that was approved unanimously since it really applied to the previous application. Mr. Darpel then reconvened and closed the public hearing. He then asked for a motion on the issue. Mr. Sketch then made the recommendation to approve the issue based on Staff's recommendations. Mr. Tewes seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the issue found Mr. Sketch and Mr. Tewes in favor. Mr. Bethell, Mr. Bridges, Ms. Brown, Mr. Gray, Mr. France, Mr. Hilgefurd, Mr. Hult, Mr. Logsdon, Mr. Neuspickle, Mr. Pannunzio, Ms. Rust, Ms. Snyder, Mr. Ryan, and Mr. Darpel voted against the issue. Mr. Toebben abstained. The motion failed. Mr. Darpel then asked for another motion on the issue. Mr. Hilgefurd made the motion to not recommend approval based on testimony heard from both cities. Ms. Snyder seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the motion found Mr. Hilgefurd, Ms. Snyder, Mr. Bethell, Mr. Bridges, Ms. Brown, Mr. Gray, Mr. France, Mr. Hult, Mr. Logsdon, Mr. Neuspickle, Mr. Pannunzio, Ms. Rust, Mr. Ryan and Mr. Darpel in favor. Mr. Sketch and Mr. Tewes voted against. Mr. Toebben abstained. The motion passed.

FILE PC1510-002

APPLICANT: City of Fort Wright per Gary Huff, City Administrator

REQUEST: a proposed text amendment to the Fort Wright Zoning Ordinance to allow three top sides of all non-residential buildings within any office, commercial, and industrial zone to be outlined with a single strand of LED lights.

Staff presentation and Staff recommendations by Mr. Videkovich

PDS STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Favorable recommendation of proposed text amendments to the Fort Wright Zoning Ordinance to allow three top sides of all non-residential buildings within any office, commercial, and industrial zone to be outlined with a single strand of LED lights, subject to the following conditions:

1. The proposed text amendments only apply to the HC (Highway Commercial), LHS, (Limited Highway Service), NSC (Neighborhood Shopping Center), SC (Shopping Center), CC (Community Commercial), and HOC (Highway Oriented Commercial) Zones; and
2. The proposed wording be changed from “business buildings” to “non-residential buildings”.

No one registered to speak on the issue. Mr. Darpel then recessed the public hearing for discussion amongst the Commission. Mr. Hult stated he feels like this would be setting a precedent and that this will probably not be the first time the Commission hears this issue. Mr. Darpel stated he doesn't see what the issue is with one single strand of LED lights. He stated he doesn't feel like he has enough information to make a determination. Ms. Rust asked if it was going to be flashing or color changing, etc. Mr. Bridges commented these will be placed on along some of the busiest highways/areas. Mr. Gray stated it is just so vague. Mr. Darpel then reconvened and closed the public hearing. Mr. Darpel asked for a motion on the issue. Mr. Toebben then made the motion to approve based on Staff's report with no conditions. Mr. Sketch seconded the motion. A roll call vote found Mr. Toebben and Mr. Sketch in favor. Mr. Bethell, Mr. Bridges, Ms. Brown, Mr. Gray, Mr. France, Mr. Hilgeford, Mr. Hult, Mr. Logsdon, Mr. Neuspickle, Mr. Pannunzio, Ms. Rust, Ms. Snyder, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Tewes and Mr. Darpel voted against. The motion failed. Mr. Darpel then requested another motion be made. Ms. Brown then made the motion to deny the proposed text amendment based on the application being too vague or undefined. Ms. Snyder seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the motion found Ms. Brown, Ms. Snyder, Mr. Bethell, Mr. Bridges,, Mr. Gray, Mr. France, Mr. Hult, Mr. Logsdon Mr. Neuspickle, Mr. Pannunzio, Ms. Rust, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Tewes and Mr. Darpel in favor. Mr. Hilgeford, Mr. Sketch and Mr. Toebben voted against. The motion carried.

FILE W-744

APPLICANT: Timothy J. and Theresa E. Schneider

LOCATION: 15173 Dixie Highway; an approximate 53-acre parcel located at the southeast corner of Bracht Piner Road and Dixie Highway in unincorporated Kenton County.

REQUEST: To waive the requirements of Section 8.3-1 of the Kenton County Subdivision Regulations; granting the request would waive the requirement that residential access points be spaced a minimum distance of 300 feet apart along the Collector Street.

Staff presentation and Staff recommendations by Mr. Scott Hiles

PDS STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

To deny the requested Waiver to Section 8.3-1 and require that proposed driveways be spaced a minimum distance of 300 feet along Bracht Piner Road

Bases:

1. Subdivision Regulations Section 8.3-1 requires that the residential access points be spaced a minimum distance of 300 feet along Bracht Piner Road and the waiver, as required, does not include the findings necessary to grant a waiver to the regulations as set forth within 3.9-2 ©, or 2, or 3, or 4, or 5.
2. Bracht Piner Road is classified as a Collector Roadway and serves as an east-west connector between southern Kenton and Campbell Counties to US 25 and I-75. Collector Roadways serve as an important component of the total transportation system. They serve both as feeders to freeways and expressways and as principal travel-ways between land use activity centers such as Piner and Morning View. The primary function of a Collector Roadways to service moderate distance traffic flow and provide intermediate land access and connections to higher and lower class roadways. Consequently, the impact of direct land service functions should be moderated and standards for curb cuts should be applied to protect Collector Roadway capacities so they may function according to design.
3. Subdivision Regulations did require driveways along a Collector Roadway to be spaced a minimum distance of 200 feet until the new regulations were adopted in March of 2015. In an effort substantiated by the need to increase efficiency, and consistency with the recommendations contained within Direction 2030, the Subdivisions Regulations requirements were amended to increase driveway spacing along a Collector Roadway to a minimum distance of 300 feet. Had the original plat to create the proposed lots been recorded by the applicants when it was originally submitted in 2005, no waiver would have been required. In addition, it is possible to comply with the current driveway spacing requirements and create the proposed lot(s). To that end that plat that was just submitted and approved September 30, 2015 showed an ingress/egress easement along an existing driveway that complied with the spacing requirements in place today. Although it is unfortunate for the applicants that their original plat wasn't recorded in 2005, and they feel that it would create an undesirable situation to comply with the current spacing regulations, the fact remains that it is possible to comply with the current regulations. Because of this, staff did not feel that the basis for their request constituted an extraordinary hardship.

Mr. Timothy Schneider addressed the Commission in favor and stated they bought the property as an investment about ten years ago. He stated they gave their daughter the two acre plot. He stated that time she was supposed to put a road on her property but the sewage system took up her whole front property and he had to give her a right of way for the driveway so that is the reason it sits where it is. He stated they planned to develop six lots. He further noted they talked about not dividing it all at one time originally. He stated in 2005 they got approval and they aren't really sure why it was changed from 300 feet to 200 feet. He said it's confusing to them because it was marked out from 200 feet and made 300 feet. He said they have a signed document that said 200 feet. He stated to put in another driveway in now they would have to go all the way around that two acres and go across to be able to put it in. He further stated this will come at a big expense as far as gravel, etc. to get to those lots when they clearly in the beginning were within the regulations when they originally got approval.

Teresa Schneider addressed the Commission in favor and stated she never knew it was a possibility that the rules could be changed. She further stated they were told not to file it at the time and she didn't realize she was playing the lottery by not having them recorded. She stated

her daughter doesn't want a driveway going behind her property for access to the other lots. She additionally stated her property values have gone down and she can't pay the bank unless these lots are sold. Ms. Schneider stated her daughter's property value has gone down. She stated when her daughter's house was built the septic system was put in before the driveway was there.

Mr. Jason Schleue addressed the Commission and stated he is the fire chief of Piner. He stated the shared driveway that would be required involves massive amounts of money to put that in in terms of a hardship. He stated with his driveway being shared, he would be in and out all night long going behind the other houses due to his line of work. He asked how they are they supposed to know what is going if it has been scratched out by staff and then correct it and two days later come back and say that's a mistake, sorry. He further stated obviously mistakes happen but that's what prompted Mr. Schneider to be here today asking for a variance to put the driveway in.

Mr. Darpel recessed the public hearing for discussion amongst the Commissioners. He stated there are certainly exceptional conditions and there is a hardship with the septic tank already in front. He stated he doesn't feel they are setting a precedent with prior plats. He further commented if it were going down from 300 to 100 feet somewhere or anything but it's going down to still meet the 200, he doesn't have a problem with it. The public hearing was then reconvened and closed. Mr. Darpel then asked for a motion on the matter. Mr. Sketch made a motion to grant the waiver based on the testimony heard and that it creates a hardship in the face of exceptional conditions. Mr. France seconded the motion. Mr. Sketch amended his motion to allow for some leeway with the location of the driveway due to topographical conditions of the area. He commented further it would have to be a minimum of 200 feet between the driveways. Mr. France agreed with the amended motion. A roll call vote on the motion found Mr. Sketch, Mr. France, Mr. Bethell, Mr. Bridges, Ms. Brown, Mr. Gray, Mr. Hult, Mr. Logsdon, Mr. Neuspickle, Ms. Rust, Mr. Toebben, Ms. Snyder, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Tewes and Mr. Darpel in favor. Mr. Hilgefjord, Mr. Pannunzio voted against. The motion carried.

FILE: SRA1510-0001

APPLICANT: Kenton County Planning Commission/Staff

LOCATION: All Kenton County jurisdictions

REQUESTS: Proposed amendments to Section 4.5 (use of aggregates within the right-of-way) and Section 4.6 (portland cement concrete infrastructure) of the Kenton County Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Darpel briefly reviewed what the purpose of the issue was to expedite the process and avoid a full formal application and he noted he would let Scott supplement it. He stated the bottom line is the regulations required the cement plants be able to have a certain mix that caused them to be able to store it in four bins. By allowing the change they are allowing a couple of the aggregates to be combined. He said the engineers took a long time to analyze this and get it right. He then stated that's the purpose of it in layman's terms. He stated the subdivision regulations committee has recommended approval on this and that's what they are asking for is approval to change the language to allow that to happen. Mr. Hiles further clarified the application and stated it allows for two of the four individual aggregates to be combined so it's four going to three but it's actually the same four aggregates.

Mayor Meyer registered to speak in favor of the issue and had nothing to add.

Mr. Darpel recessed the public hearing for discussion amongst the Commissioners. There being none, Mr. Darpel reconvened and closed the public hearing and called for a motion on the issue. A motion was made by Ms. Brown to approve based on the testimony heard. Ms. Snyder seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the motion found Ms. Brown, Ms. Snyder, Mr. Bethell, Mr. Bridges, Mr. Gray, Mr. France, Mr. Hilgeford, Mr. Hult, Mr. Logsdon, Mr. Neuspickle, Mr. Pannunzio, Mr. Sketch, Ms. Rust, Mr. Toeppen, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Tewes and Mr. Darpel in favor. The motion carried unanimously.

Reports from Committees:

20/20 Sourcebook (model zoning): – Nothing to report.

By Laws: - Mr. Hult commented they have met several times and have distributed a proposed fee increase. He stated the fee structure hasn't changed since 2007 and commented briefly on the handout. He additionally commented they feel it is relatively fair and will go a long way to fixing the discrepancy between doing the work and being compensated. He highlighted further the changes made to the fee structure. He stated it is being presented to the Commission for review and to then be voted on at the next meeting. He commented further the idea is to get the cost and application in line.

Direction 2030 Implementation: - Ms. Brown stated they had their first meeting of the implementation committee. She recommended you check out the new website to see what's going on in the county. She stated they don't anticipate meeting frequently, possibly once a quarter. She noted one of the things they are taking a look at is how to keep the public updated on implementation with reference to the Direction 2030 website. She stated some of the focus is how to manage what is going on and its' really exciting to see that going forward.

Executive: – Nothing to report.

Subdivision Regulations - Mr. Darpel stated the just passed the amendment and he didn't feel additional discussion was needed. He commented the nominating committee would need to have nominations up at next month's meeting for voting in January. He suggested Ms. Snyder to head the nominating committee. Mr. Darpel commented that Ms. Hood and Mr. Ryan would assist with that process.

Reports from Commission Members – Nothing to report.

Reports from Legal Counsel - Nothing to report.

Announcements from Staff - Ms. Randall stated she just wanted to draw attention to the continuing education requirements for planning commissioners. She outlined the requirements and commented she has the list of who has what in terms of that. She suggested if you had anything to update to let her know. She also noted there will be one issue on next month's agenda and in light of the light agenda, she suggested a continuing education video. She stated she would let that up to the Commissioners to decide. She noted another option is to check out discs from their library to view for continuing.

General Correspondence: Nothing to report.

New Business: Mr. Ryan congratulated the Covington Catholic soccer team for making it to the finals.

Public Comments: None.

There being nothing further to come before the commission, a motion to adjourn was made by Ms. Snyder and seconded by Mr. Bridges. All in favor by acclamation. The motion carried unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

APPROVED:

Chair _____

Date