

City of Springboro
320 West Central Avenue, Springboro, OH 45066

Planning Commission Regular Meeting
Wednesday, January 30, 2008, 7:00 p.m.

I. Call to Order and Roll Call

Chairperson Marie Belpulsi called the Springboro Planning Commission Regular Meeting to order at the temporary Springboro Municipal Building, Council Chambers, 425 South Pioneer Boulevard, Springboro, Ohio. Ms. Belpulsi asked the Secretary to call the roll.

Present: Marie Belpulsi, Chairperson; Hans Landefeld; Chris Papakirk; Barbara Gibson; Janie Ridd; Becky Hartle

Absent: Jim Chmiel

Staff Present: Chris Thompson, City Manager; 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 Mr. Chmiel.

Ms. Ridd motioned to excuse Mr. Chmiel. Ms. Gibson seconded the motion.

Vote: Ridd, Belpulsi, Landefeld, Hartle, Papakirk, Gibson; all yes

Ms. Belpulsi asked Planning Commission for a motion to amend the agenda to allow for the appointments of a Chairperson and Vice Chairperson for the Planning Commission.

Ms. Gibson motioned to amend the agenda to allow for the appointments of a Chairperson and Vice Chairperson for the Planning Commission. Ms. Ridd seconded the motion.

Vote: Belpulsi, Landefeld, Hartle, Papakirk, Gibson, Ridd; all yes

Ms. Belpulsi asked Planning Commission for a nomination for Chairperson of the Planning Commission.

Ms. Ridd nominated Ms. Belpulsi as Chairperson of the Planning Commission. Ms. Gibson seconded the motion.

Vote: Ridd, Belpulsi, Landefeld, Hartle, Papakirk, Gibson; all yes

Ms. Belpulsi asked Planning Commission for a nomination for Vice Chairperson of the Planning Commission.

Ms. Gibson nominated Mr. Landefeld as Vice Chairperson of the Planning Commission. Ms. Hartle seconded the motion.

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

II. Approval of Minutes

A. December 11, 2007 Planning Commission Meeting

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

Ms. Ridd motioned to approve the December 11, 2007 Meeting minutes as presented. Ms. Gibson seconded the motion.

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

B. January 9, 2008 Planning Commission Work Session

Ms. Belpulsi asked Planning Commission for corrections or additions to the minutes. Mr. Landefeld noted that on page 8, the fourth paragraph from the bottom, "added" should be corrected to "asked".

Ms. Gibson motioned to approve the January 9, 2008 Work Session minutes as corrected. Mr. Landefeld seconded the motion.

Vote: Hartle, Papakirk, Gibson, Ridd, Belpulsi, Landefeld; all yes

III. Agenda Items

A.-C. Village Park Planned Unit Development-Mixed use

Background

This general background information is applicable to agenda items A-C. Specific staff comments and explanations for each agenda item is provided below.

These three agenda items are based on a request submitted by Greg Martin of Village Park Office Commons, LLC, property owners and developers, for preliminary review of the majority of the office component of the Village Park Planned Unit Development-Mixed Use (PUD-MU). The Village Park PUD-MU is located on the southwest corner of North Main Street (SR 741) and Pennyroyal Road.

This proposed project was last reviewed by the Planning Commission at the January 9th Planning Commission Work Session (a copy of the meeting minutes in draft form are included

in your packets) and earlier the November 14, 2007 Work Session (also included in your packets).

The area that is the subject of this request is approximately 22.63 acres of land on the west side of the proposed Gardner Road extending from Pennyroyal Road on the north to the proposed Anna Drive on the south. Approximately 9.34 acres of the proposed office area is located north of Village Park Boulevard; the remaining 13.29 acres is located to the south.

The office component of the Village Park PUD-MU was approved as part of the General Plan for the Village Park PUD-MU in 2004. Other office space, located on the southwest corner of Pennyroyal Road at North Main Street (SR 741) is not subject to this review/approval request.

Adjacent land uses to the proposed office area include: to the west, an undeveloped city park and the undeveloped residential component of the Village Park PUD-MU; to the north a low-density residential uses north of Pennyroyal Road in Clearcreek Township; office and retail uses proposed as part of the Village Park PUD-MU to the east; and to the south the Easton Farm.

1. As indicated in the submitted site plans, a total of 280,000 square foot of office space is proposed for a total of 15 office buildings ranging in size from 8,000 to 22,000 to 32,000 square feet. A total of 134,000 square feet of office is proposed in five (5) buildings located on the north side of Village Park Boulevard; 146,000 square feet of office is proposed in ten (10) buildings located on the south side of Village Park Boulevard.
- A. Revision to Approved General Plan
Village Park Planned Unit Development-Mixed Use, revision to minimum and maximum lot sizes for office component

Background

This agenda item is necessary to allow for a revision to the approved General Plan for the overall Village Park Planned Unit Development-Mixed (PUD-MU). That General Plan, approved by City Council along with the PUD-MU rezoning in 2004, includes language that limits lot sizes in the office component to between 2 and 8 acres. The current developer has indicated that they intend to develop the office component of the PUD-MU in a different manner from the original intent of Coffman Development Company and that only two lots—a 9.34-acre lot north of the proposed Village Park Drive and a 13.29-acre lot south of the proposed Village Park Drive—will exist. This General Plan amendment is considered a minor change; as such no City Council action is required.

Staff Comments:

No comments from staff at this time.

Greg Martin, Dan Fishbaugh and Tom Streiff of Village Park Office Commons, LLC were in attendance to answer questions of Planning Commission.

Ms. Belpulsi asked Mr. Martin if he had any question or comments. He had none.

Ms. Belpulsi explained that this agenda item would allow for the lot sizes for the Village Park phases to be changed.

Mr. Boron added that this is an administrative change to remove lot restrictions for the office component. Staff has no objections to the change.

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

Ms. Ridd motioned to approve the Revised General Plan for Village Park Planned Unit Development-Mixed Use. Mr. Landefeld seconded the motion.

Ms. Belpulsi asked for questions or comments from guests. There were none.

Vote: Hartle, Papakirk, Gibson, Ridd, Belpulsi, Landefeld; all yes

B. Concept Approval, Final Development Plan
Village Park Planned Unit Development-Mixed Use, Office Component and Pattern Book

Background

This agenda item is a request for approval of the overall concept of the Final Development for the office component of the Village Park Planned Unit Development-Mixed Use (PUD-MU). This concept approval is required to allow for the orderly development of the entire 22.63-acre office component and includes approval of the office component patternbook of January 15, 2008.

No City Council action is required on this agenda item.

Staff Comments on patternbook:

1. Pages 5, 6 and 6B. Office Development Landscaping. Per discussion at January 9th Work Session and follow-up conversations with landscaping consultant and developer, please indicate proposed density of landscaping for use in the patternbook.
2. Pages 5-6. Office Development Landscaping. Per discussion at January 9th Work Session, add note indicating "Landscaping plan is for planning purposes only. Exact building locations and site development such as parking lot configurations subject to Planning Commission review through Final Development Plan review process."
3. Pages 8 and 8B. Office Development Signage. Please provide page references on succeeding pages of patternbook.
4. Page 14. Lighting. Is no lighting hierarchy intended for the proposed office park?

Staff comments on plan:

1. Comments on fire hydrant locations have been discussed and approved.
2. Per E-Mail 1/25/08; The hydrant locations for the Preliminary Final Development Plan, Village Park PUD-MU, are approved as submitted on 1/10/08

Ms. Belpulsi asked Mr. Martin if he had any questions or comments regarding this agenda item. He had none.

Ms. Belpulsi explained that this item would allow Planning Commission to approve the pattern book.

Mr. Boron commented that the pattern book and overall concept would allow the staff to determine the long-range needs for the entire development, to insure that the utilities and roadway improvements are completed in an orderly manner as the phasing process continues.

Ms. Belpulsi asked if Planning Commission has any questions or comments.

Mr. Landefeld asked for a clarification of the terms "Composite" or "Composite or Wood Type" used on pages 9, 12 and 13 of the pattern book or for an example of a product brand name.

Mr. Fishbaugh answered that on page 12 and 13, the pattern book refers to a composite wood material. According to industry standards, it does not have a specific brand; it is a wood product, not a plastic one.

Mr. Landefeld asked Mr. Boron whether he had any suggestions for clarification.

Mr. Boron commented that he had spoken with the applicant on this issue. Staff approved concrete based products use brand names such as hardiplank, but he is not aware of any such brand names for wood products.

Ms. Gibson suggested that the word "or" be taken out of the pattern book on page 9 and "composite wood" be used.

Planning Commission agreed.

Ms Belpulsi asked for any further comments from Planning Commission.

Ms. Ridd motioned to approve the Pattern Book and Concept, Final Development Plan for Village Park Planned Unit Development-Mixed Use with the condition that staff comments are met and the amendment that on page 9 "or" will be removed from "Composite or Wood Type Fence". Mr. Papakirk seconded the motion.

Ms. Belpulsi asked for questions or comments from guests.

Vote: Gibson, Ridd, Belpulsi, Landefeld, Hartle, Papakirk; all yes

C. Final Development Plan, Village Park Planned Unit

Background

This agenda item is a request for Final Development Plan approval for the first phase of the Village Park Planned Unit Development-Mixed Use's (PUD-MU) office component. Phase 1 of the office component consists of five one-story office buildings with a total of 49,000 gross square feet.

As with the previous two agenda items, no City Council action is required.

Staff Comments

The following staff comments apply to the Final Development Plan for the first phase of the Village Park Planned Unit Development-Mixed Use office component. Phase 1 consists of five one-story office buildings with a total of 49,000 gross square feet proposed for development.

1. Water main loop as shown in general plan to be installed completely as part of Phase I.
2. Tapping 8" water main for 8" water main is not permitted. Install 8"x8" tee, cutting-in-sleeve and the valve.
3. At Station 33+77.19 install two 8" valves; one in the south leg and the other in western leg. Also install two valves where the proposed water main connects into the existing water main on the south end.
4. Is the proposed sanitary sewer pipe "Armco Truss Pipe" or SDR 35? Sanitary sewer laterals to be of the same material as the main sewer.
5. Show the size and material of the water service laterals for each building.
6. Install backflow prevention device in each building as per Section 1042.30(c) of the City's Codified Ordinances.
7. Sanitary sewer manholes to be vacuum tested.
8. Show the areas of the light and heavy duty pavement section.
9. Taper curb height of the divider from 6" to 2" in 4' or greater.
10. Construct the sidewalk in the N.E. corner, south side of the development, as part of the Phase I development.
11. Reduce the radius of the driveway off of Village Park Blvd. To 15 ft.
12. Eliminate some of the parking, north end, on the west side of building #10 to allow for a smoother curve for the driveway off Village Park Blvd.
13. Show the material for storm sewer pipe.
14. Site plan to be signed by owner of land/or duly authorized officer.
15. Will Phase I be staged development? If yes, general indication as to how staging is to proceed.
16. An "As Built" drawing showing as built location and elevations of all improvements shall be submitted prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit.
17. Please indicate plans for the proposed north-south pedestrian trail on the final development plan for phase one.
18. The right-of-ways are to be dedicated and public improvements constructed or bonded, including sidewalks, for all public streets (Gardner Road, Village Park Blvd., Anna Drive, SR 741, and Pennyroyal Road) within the Village Park development.
19. Provide association documents to be reviewed by the City. Certificates of Occupancy will not be issued until the City has approved the documents and then recorded.
20. Construct the Anna Drive extension to the south property line and record the record plan.
21. Obtain private storm sewer easements for the offsite storm sewers west of the property.
22. Provide water main and sanitary sewer easements for review. Sanitary sewer easements to be 30' wide and water main easements to be 20' wide.
23. Show the breakdown of the office area, parking spaces and handicapped parking spaces for the north and south side of Village Park Drive.
24. Tie down all building locations.
25. Check pipe slopes for the storm sewer and match tops of pipes. Also provide storm sewer calculations. Provide 2' min. cover over storm sewer.
26. Check the plan and profile text for agreement, and round the stationing to the even foot. Can future CB 8 be made shallower?

27. The existing curb along the curb cuts, at Gardner Road and Village Park Boulevard, are to be removed and replaced with depressed ODOT Type 2 curb and gutter. Specify on plans.
28. Provide elevations for each building in phase one

Ms. Belpulsi asked Mr. Martin whether he had any questions or comments on this item. He had none.

Ms. Belpulsi asked Planning Commission for their questions or comments.

Ms. Gibson asked Mr. Martin to confirm that he had no problem with the staff comments and requirements.

Mr. Martin answered that he had no problem with the staff comments; most of the comments were engineering comments.

Mr. Papakirk asked whether the internal islands would be curbed.

Mr. Martin answered that yes, they would be.

Ms. Gibson motioned to approve the Final Development Plan for Village Park Planned Unit Development-Mixed Use, Phase One with the condition that all staff comments be met. Mr. Landefeld seconded the motion.

Ms. Belpulsi asked for questions or comments from guests.

Vote: Hartle, Papakirk, Gibson, Ridd, Belpulsi, Landefeld; all yes

Ms. Belpulsi welcomed Mr. Martin behalf of the City and the Planning Commission.

Mr. Martin thanked the Planning Commission, Dan Boron, the engineering staff and Chris Thompson for their cooperation.

D. Site Plan Review, 2748 Pennyroyal Road, proposed Kingdom Hall of Jehovah's Witnesses

Background

This agenda item is a request submitted by Marvin Clark, representing South Miamisburg Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses, Inc., for Site Plan Review approval to all the construction of a 5,151-square foot building at 2748 Pennyroyal Road. The 3.0-acre site is located northwest of the corner of Pennyroyal Road and Evergreen Drive.

The property at 2748 Pennyroyal Road is zoned Clearcreek Township (T)R-1, a zoning classification that permits the proposed use. At present the property contains a single-family residence.

Adjacent land uses include Clearcreek Chapel to the north; the access drive to Clearcreek Chapel to the east along with large-lot single-family residential; large-lot single-family residential to the west; and single-family residential to the south (Royal Springs subdivision).

Adjacent zoning includes Clearcreek Township (T)R-1 to the north, east and west; and (T)R-1 and R-2, Low Density Residential District to the south.

This item was discussed at the November 14, 2007 Planning Commission Work Session. A copy of the minutes is included in your packets.

Staff Comments

1. Provide curb type (type 6) and provide the curb locations on the site.
2. Exterior lighting to be high-pressure sodium.
3. Provide location of dumpster, if any.
4. Remove parking dimensions notes on site plan, as they are not from the city's code.
5. A Certificate of Occupancy will not be provided until the 40' half right of way along Pennyroyal Road is dedicated by a record plan by the developer. Relocate detention pond accordingly.
6. Add concrete flow channels in both detention basins. Also add rip rap at the outlets. Slope to be 3:1 maximum in detention basin.
7. Use silt fencing as shown on plans and remove mulch berm note.
8. Swale behind the building to be at a min. of 2%. The storm pipes under the driveway are not approved as shown.
9. Provide 2' min. cover over storm sewer.
10. Use ODOT type 2-2A catch basins for the outlet structures for the detention basins, and provide more details on their design.
11. The driveway is to be perpendicular to Pennyroyal Road.
12. Show the material for the water service lateral. The tapping of the water main to be done by the owner at their cost, and not by the City of Springboro. Please revise note stating as such.
13. Install backflow prevention devices as per Section 1042.30(C) of the City's codified ordinances. Water meter to be installed inside the building.
14. The proposed sanitary sewer lateral to be 6 inch and the connection to the trunk sewer is to be made at the owner's cost. The City is not responsible for the connection to the trunk sewer.
15. The sanitary sewer lateral is to have a minimum slope of 2%. Provide the material and profile for the sanitary sewer lateral.
16. The concrete driveway approach to be 8" thick.
17. Provide proposed grading details and contours. Also provide additional spot elevations through out parking lot.
18. Provide storm sewer and detention basin calculations.
19. Provide headwall and invert elevation on each side of the driveway culvert. Also show headwall details.
20. Provide concrete channels between the inlet pipe and the outlet pipe in the detention basins.
21. Show the type of catch basin and pipes being used for the storm sewer.
22. Identify the use of the property to the west.
23. An "As Built" drawing showing as built locations and elevations of all improvements shall be submitted prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit.
24. Reminder, fire hydrant needed near the building, location to be approved by the Clearcreek Fire District.

Marvin Clark, representing the South Miamisburg Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses, was in attendance to answer questions of Planning Commission.

Ms. Belpulsi asked Mr. Clark whether he has any questions or comments about the staff comments.

Mr. Clark explained that due to a miscommunication he had not received the staff comments in advance of the meeting. He and his associates have reviewed the comments in the short time just prior to the meeting and do not see any major problems.

Mr. Clark did have a question about staff comment #11, requesting that the driveway be perpendicular to Pennyroyal Road.

Ms. Gibson commented that she liked their proposal. Her remembrance was that the Planning Commission preferred that the driveway be to the west, but that the applicant preferred that the drive would be farther east. She asked that staff comment # 11 be eliminated.

Planning Commission and staff agreed on the comment's removal.

Ms. Clark asked about the 40-foot right-of-way.

Mr. Sharma explained that a 40-foot right-of-way along Pennyroyal Road was standard for new developments.

Mr. Clark answered that the issue was not a major problem; the detention pond would be moved.

Ms. Belpulsi asked if there were any further questions of Planning Commission. There were none.

Ms. Belpulsi commented that at the Work Session there was a discussion about rezoning the property. She asked Mr. Clark to work with staff to complete the rezoning. She explained that Planning Commission prefers that the property comply with City zoning standards as opposed to the current Township zoning.

Mr. Clark stated that the rezoning would be no problem.

Ms. Gibson clarified that the proposals use fits with Township and City zoning, Planning Commission wished that the zoning match the City designation.

Ms. Gibson motioned to approve the Site Plan for 2748 Pennyroyal Road, Kingdom hall of Jehovah's Witnesses with the condition that staff comments are met with the exception of staff comment #11, which has been deleted. Ms. Ridd seconded the motion.

Ms. Belpulsi asked for questions or comments from guests.

Vote: Belpulsi, Landefeld, Hartle, Papanick, Gibson, Ridd; all yes

Ms. Belpulsi welcomed the Kingdom Hall to the City.

Mr. Clark thanked staff for their guidance through the Planning Commission process.

E. Planning and Zoning Code Amendment, parking requirements for restaurants

Background

Dan Boron explained the proposal; the issue is that increasingly, property owners who may propose restaurant businesses to the City may find the standards for off-street parking too strict. Staff is recommending that off-street parking restrictions be reduced, primarily in terms of fast-food type restaurants but also for neighborhood restaurants, to allow for a more reasonable standard. The proposed standard calls for 1 space/75SF of floor area plus 1 space per employee, maximum shift for drive thru and fast-food restaurants and 1 space/150 SF plus 1 space per employee, maximum shift for sit-down type restaurants. He explained that the City has a minimum and a maximum standard, this proposal affects the minimum, and the maximum is calculated based on this minimum. He added that by changing the standard, the need for applications for variances to the Board of Zoning Review should be reduced.

Ms. Belpulsi asked for question or comments from Planning Commission.

Mr. Landefeld asked Mr. Boron, using Encore Cafe as an example, what the effect would be for local restaurants.

Mr. Boron answered that there would be no problem for the Encore Cafe location. Should there be no change of use, the previous standard would be in effect. Should there be a change of use, such as from retail to restaurant, then the new standards would take effect.

Ms. Gibson commented that she felt that dividing the standards by use was a great idea. She did express concern about the increase in parking spots for drive thru restaurants. She asked whether there was a need for that many spaces. She cited an example of owners of an office building that could not build an addition because there would be not be enough room left over for the needed parking spaces. She asked whether the standards were driven by feedback of people in the industry.

Mr. Boron stated that the standards were based on feedback.

Ms. Gibson expressed concern about setting the minimum standard too high and whether property owners may not request or need that number of parking spaces.

Mr. Boron answered that the most common complaint was that the standards were too restrictive. He added that the historic district allows for a forgiveness of 50% to account for available on street parking.

Ms. Gibson asked whether there was a way to work the numbers in order to not raise the minimum but to allow for greater flexibility.

Ms. Thompson agreed that there is a fine line between not enough and too much parking.

Ms. Ridd motioned to recommend that the Planning and Zoning Code Amendments, parking requirements for restaurants, be forwarded to City Council for approval. Mr. Landefeld seconded the motion.

Ms. Belpulsi asked for questions or comments from guests.

Vote: Hartle, Papakirk, Gibson, Ridd, Belpulsi, Landefeld; all yes

IV. Guest Comments

Mike Hemmert, 115 Heatherwoode Boulevard, thanked Mr. and Mrs. Martin and Mr. Fishbaugh for their investment in the City.

V. Planning Commission and Staff Comments

A. Presentation: Hans Landefeld, bike facilities (copy of the presentation is attached)

Mr. Landefeld gave a presentation to the Planning Commission regarding bike facilities. He stressed the importance of making plans for trails as development progresses.

Mr. Landefeld explained the costs of the current automobile-centric life style: child & adult obesity, the cost for families to own multiple cars, the high cost of transporting students, traffic congestion & pollution and the wear & tear on City maintained roads.

Mr. Landefeld compared the routes that he used as a youth on his bike to the route he would have used to get from his home to tonight's Planning Commission meeting including the need to travel on higher congestion automobile routes.

Mr. Landefeld explained that there are three kinds of bike trails, on road facilities and off road or shared use paths and presented definitions and examples of each.

Mr. Landefeld reviewed the costs and impact on the City of Springboro of higher automobile use, including public school transportation and fuel costs and higher obesity rates.

Mr. Landefeld reviewed current trails and proposed plans for trails in the Miami Valley. He reported on progress made by such cities as Louisville, Chicago and New York in developing bike master plans.

Mr. Landefeld concluded by summarizing the reasons that bike trails are important to a community and benefits to the community for promoting the healthy lifestyle that bike trails encourage.

Ms. Belpulsi asked Mr. Landefeld how other cities get their trail systems started. She asked whether it should be started with the Planning Commission or Park Board or a separate committee.

Mr. Landefeld explained that it is a hodgepodge; some communities start with special committees, other cities have started small, with a trail through a park. Federal transportation dollars or Issue 2 monies have been used for roadway improvements with trail plans piggybacked on that. Other grant resources are available through the state and foundation money is also available.

Ms. Belpulsi asked whether the Planning Commission should look to create a trail system or whether a Council committee should be organized to address the issue.

Ms. Thompson explained that she has attended meetings on the subject such as one at Cox Arboretum. She stated that she felt that there would be community support and suggested asking for volunteers to help in the effort. The challenge as a Planning Commission is to continue to secure easements and right-of-ways in order to make the trails possible. She suggested soliciting input from the community and creating a Council subcommittee or an ad hoc committee created from the existing Council committees.

Mr. Landefeld commented that the Planning Commission's job would be easier once a plan is in place.

Ms. Belpulsi stated that she felt that having the issue citizen driven was important and asked for guidance in that the support should come from Council appointments.

Ms. Belpulsi asked for comments from the Planning Commission.

Ms. Gibson felt that it was a terrific idea; the term "livable community" is used so much more in today's culture and those communities who take these ideas into account are much more desirable.

Ms. Belpulsi added that when the Land Use Master Plan was completed, one of the topics that the committee was very firm on was the idea that Springboro be a walkable community.

Ms. Thompson and Ms. Belpulsi asked Mr. Landefeld to make his presentation to City Council. Ms. Thompson will contact the Clerk of Council about getting the presentation on the agenda.

Ms. Belpulsi recognized Mr. Hemmert, 115 Heatherwoode Boulevard, to speak to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Hemmert stated that he had attended a strategic planning session and stated that he agreed with Ms. Thompson that the community should be solicited for input. He added that he had received comments from residents in Fieldstone and Creekside expressed the desire to have a trail to get them to the businesses on Main Street. He stated that he felt that for recreation uses the trails would be an ideal thing for the community.

Ms. Belpulsi concluded by saying that a time for a presentation to Council would be scheduled and thanked Mr. Landefeld for his presentation.

Ms. Belpulsi presented for inclusion in the record an e-mail from Mr. Hemmert, copy attached to the record, regarding his concerns about the Planning Commission minutes of October 31, 2007 in which Mr. Hemmert asked for amendments to those minutes.

VI. Adjournment

Ms. Ridd motioned to adjourn the January 30, 2008 meeting. Mr. Landefeld seconded the motion.

Vote: Hartle, Papakirk, Gibson, Ridd, Belpulsi, Landefeld; all yes

Ms. Belpulsi adjourned the meeting at 8:05 P.M.

Marie Belpulsi, Planning Commission Chairperson

Dan Boron, Planning Consultant

Lois Boytim, Planning Commission Secretary