

Minutes of a Meeting of  
City of Bay Village Planning Commission  
held January 6, 2016  
7:30 p.m.

Present: Barbour, Dzienny, Foster, Lieske, Remein

Excused: Jennifer Lesny-Fleming, Dave Maddux

Also Present: Law Director Ebert, John Cheatham, Chief Building Official, SAFEbuilt, Inc.

Audience: Paul Koomar, President of Council, Councilman David Tadych, Ward 1, Marty Mace-Councilman-at-large, Conda Boyd, Al Kruzer, Dick Majewski, John Burney.

Chairman Barbour called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. Following roll call, Mr. Barbour called for approval of the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting held December 2, 2015.

**Motion** by Foster, second by Lieske, to approve the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting held December 2, 2015 as prepared and distributed. Roll Call Vote: Yeas – Mr. Barbour, Mr. Dzienny, Mr. Foster, Mrs. Lieske, Mr. Remein. Nays – None. Motion passed 5-0.

**Review of Proposed Chapter 1158 – Attached Residence District**

Mr. Barbour asked Mrs. Lieske to provide an update on what has happened specifically with Chapter 1158 since the Planning Commission’s last meeting on December 2, 2015.

Mrs. Lieske stated that the Council really appreciates how quickly Mr. Dzienny provided the bullet points from the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Commission held December 2, 2015. These bullet points were the focus of the meeting of the Planning, Zoning, Public Grounds and Buildings Committee on December 7, 2015. The meeting was public and included a conference call with consultant Paul LeBlanc who had worked with Council initially, and literally went through Mr. Dzienny’s bullet points one by one. Those comments were then incorporated into the latest version of Chapter 1158 that was put together by the Law Director and his assistant, and these comments were also incorporated into the version that was placed on first reading on November 16, 2015. Mrs. Lieske noted that the version was a red line version enabling the reader to see the comments in the right hand margin that reflect the changes.

The moratorium on construction of attached housing that had been in effect for some time was going to expire, so Council passed a moratorium for 90 more days on December 14, 2015.

Mr. Barbour clarified with Mrs. Lieske that the latest, correct version of the ordinance amending Chapter 1158 to be reviewed is the one that was emailed to the Planning Commission by the secretary on December 10, 2015. Mrs. Lieske stated that this is the correct version and is based on the comments by Mr. LeBlanc on December 7, 2015. After tonight's meeting, further thoughts and recommendations of the Planning Commission will be sent back to the Planning, Zoning, Public Buildings and Grounds Committee to be reviewed at an additional scheduled meeting.

Mr. Barbour asked the timeline for having the ordinance adopted by Council. Mr. Ebert stated that there is not a set timeline at this point. Mr. Barbour clarified that the ordinance will go through three full readings prior to passage.

Mr. Barbour noted that he would like to get input from the two members that are not present this evening before the Planning Commission makes a final recommendation.

Mr. Dzienny proceeded to review the bullet points, numbered 1 through 13, with the answers provided by Mr. LeBlanc in italics. The comments of this meeting are in bold print.

**1. Proposed Chapter 1158 – Attached Residence District – Commentary / Recommendations**

1. By establishing this district as an R-4 District, it duplicates an already repealed district. Chapter 1158 is already the Attached Residence District, and that is mentioned throughout the codified ordinances over and over. The R-4 is also mentioned throughout over and over. If we change this to R-4, Attached Residence, we will have a lot of work going through the other chapters and amending them. If we maintain it as Attached Residence District, that will not cause any problems. We will just leave R-4 alone. Attached Residence District is mentioned in Chapter 1131 as an established district.

*Mr. Leblanc agreed with the recommendation to not give the Attached Residence District the title of R-4 District.*

**Mr. Dzienny stated that any reference to “R-4” has been stricken from the ordinance.** (It was later in the meeting noted by Ms. Boyd that some references to “R-4” remain in the ordinance – the document will be checked again to be sure all references to “R-4” are removed.)

2. If a developer gets something approved and chooses not to build at that time, could they sell the property and it retains that zoning designation. Should there be language that would return the zoning change back to the original zoning if the developer fails to develop the property?

*Mr. LeBlanc stated that the zoning goes with the land. If the development falls through, the zoning remains until it would be changed by the electorate. If a developer gets zoning approved to develop a certain plan, he has to build according to the plan approved. He cannot change the density, type of unit or building materials because all of that was approved as part of the development plan approval.*

**Mr. Dzienny stated that the answer is “Yes,” it still retains the zoning unless the electorate process of changing it occurs again.**

3. Provide language to discourage townhouses or attached residences in spot places around the City that may not be consistent with the neighborhood.

*Mr. LeBlanc-There is nothing that could prohibit any property owner or any developer from asking for rezoning for any type of development. Everyone has the right to ask. But, both the Planning Commission and Council would have to approve rezoning given the locations, the compatibility and whether it was consistent with the Master Plan. All of those factors come into play. Bay Village has the unique requirement of dual approval citywide and in the ward for rezoning, which would prohibit unwanted change to get past the neighbors and the community at large.*

**Mr. Dzienny stated that he is in of about putting this language in the intent section of the ordinance. He noted he can envision someone buying a home, demolishing it, and doing the same with adjacent properties, resulting in three or four houses missing and attempting to have an attached residence district. Mrs. Lieske stated that this a concern that she has heard very frequently from residents who have expressed opposition to what could end up being “spot development.” Mrs. Lieske noted that John Cheatham originally put together recommendations that specified minimum acreage. There is no minimum acreage in this version of the ordinance. Mr. Dzienny suggested including language to discourage spot zoning in any form.**

**Mr. Foster stated that the flip side of that is you are either encouraging or discouraging development. If someone does accumulate property they still have to go through the public vote for the plan to be approved and changed zoning to be approved. Mr. Dzienny stated that he does not believe people want attached housing built in the midst of single-family residential properties.**

**Mr. Cheatham noted that in 2015 there were 40 home demolitions in the City of Bay Village. Mr. Ebert stated that is higher than normal for a City this size. Also, demolitions used to occur mostly on the lakefront to make way for more expensive homes. Now, they are occurring within the City, away from the lake. Mr. Remein noted that it is an economic issue because land is so valuable, and Bay Village is a desirable place to live.**

**Mr. Barbour asked the status of the Master Plan revision. Mr. Ebert stated that a grant has been submitted to Cuyahoga County for a new Master Plan, but there has been no word received about the success of that grant application.**

**Mr. Remein noted that the ordinance references both the current Master Plan and the Kent State Retail Improvement Strategy. He asked how that relates legally to the City. Is this something that should be adopted by City Council, or is it just recommended? Mr. Ebert stated it is recommended; it is not law. Mr. Remein asked if referencing it in the ordinance makes it come into the law. Mr. Ebert responded affirmatively. Mr. Remein stated that he would object to that. He sees nothing wrong in having it done, but it should be something for which Council makes a proclamation saying that they are in agreement.**

**Mr. Barbour asked if one of the purposes in referencing those kinds of documents is guidance. If the Planning Commission turns something down, and the developer files a law suit, the Planning Commission will be asked what kind of criteria was used in their determination. The Planning Commission will state that the ordinance provides that they can use the Master Plan as guidance and that plan didn't fit. Mr. Ebert stated that it is guidance. The Master Plan has been used as guidance for the City for a long time.**

**Mrs. Lieske asked if there is any information about the survey results. Mr. Ebert stated that the results are supposed to be in soon.**

**Mr. Dzienny asked if there is some language that could be crafted to discourage the taking down of homes to create property for attached residence district in the midst of single-family homes. Mr. Remein noted that the language of the ordinance states that consistent with the intent this district shall only be established in locations specifically identified in the current Master Plan or the 2004 Retail Improvement Strategy. Previous to that it says it may be applicable elsewhere, but the question is could that be interpreted legally to give the Planning Commission a little bit of leeway. But otherwise, it may seem to say that we have select spots that we are targeting with this and it is not intended to go in every neighborhood.**

**Mr. Ebert stated that if there is a referendum petition for the section of the Charter for rezoning and it is successful in both the ward and the City, even though the Planning Commission doesn't want it, the successful petition will take precedence.**

**Mr. Dzienny asked if the change in the ordinance to say that "it is consistent with the areas established or identified in the current Master Plan" is satisfactory with the Planning Commission. Mrs. Lieske stated that she supports Mr. Dzienny's efforts. Mr. Remein stated that he thought the original point was to provide language to discourage. Mr. Dzienny stated that this would be included in the intent section of the ordinance.**

**Mr. Barbour stated that his personal view is that the members of Council are the ones that need to draft the language. All were in agreement. Mrs. Lieske stated that to summarize, the Planning Commission will not draft the language for the ordinance. Mr. Dzienny referred back to Bullet Point No. 3: "Provide language to discourage townhouses or attached residences in spot places around the City that may not be consistent with the neighborhood." He stated that this would somehow be added into the intent section in language to be drafted by Council.**

**Mr. Barbour stated that what has to be decided as a policy matter is if the City wants to encourage this kind of development, or discourage this kind of development. That is the crux of the whole matter.**

**Mr. Ebert commented on how long this issue has been discussed. The City has never had the ability to attract developers because of the restrictions on Chapter 1158 the way it is currently written. In the past the Council agreed to disagree and could not move on rewriting the Chapter.**

**Mr. Barbour stated that his personal view has always been if the attached housing is really nice, that would be great. If they are not nice, it would be horrible. There is a certain amount of subjectivity to that. Perhaps the way to think about it is to exert as much control over what potential developers could build, and that way residents aren't left guessing when they go to the voting polls about what they are actually voting for.**

**Mr. Ebert stated that goes back to the criteria of what can and can't be built. You first have to get to the point of whether you have areas that are conducive to this type of development.**

**Mr. Dzienny stated that the meat and potatoes of this is what the contractors and developers are looking for. They want to know the size of the lot and how many units they can build on that lot. That is in the ordinance. What the Planning Commission is discussing is putting some information in for future Planning Commissions and City Councils about what is intended so they have some tools for future considerations. The requirements are in the ordinance. We are not discussing or arguing over that portion of the ordinance. We are just trying to make sure this doesn't pop up right next to our own homes.**

**Mr. Barbour stated that the only time intent comes into play is if there is ambiguity and you can't make a determination about what a statute says. If a statute is clear on its face then you never look at the intent. It is important to include intent, definitely. He stated that he does not want to leave the impression that it can absolutely prevent something from taking place.**

**Mr. Dzienny stated that in reading what the Planning Commission is allowed to do it is clear they have a lot of leeway. The intent is giving a guideline to future Planning Commissions saying this is what we were thinking in 2016. If you look at the dates of some of these ordinances, 1964 or 1973; things have changed since then.**

4. Remove language that states "or as later amended." To eliminate the problem of being asked to recommend approval for a legislation something that will basically approve a later document that we have never seen or have no idea what it is going to say.

*Mr. LeBlanc- The reference should be the "current approved Master Plan on file with the City." A new Master Plan would take precedence. If a new Master Plan is not acceptable, it will not be approved by Council.*

**Mr. Dzienny stated that language has been added stating “in accordance with the current approved Master Plan on filed with the City.”**

5. Should approval of 1158 wait on the survey that recently went out? The results of survey may impact Chapter 1158, the Master Plan, and moving forward in the community. The County Planning Commission would be analyzing the results and it would likely be early January.

Mrs. Lieske stated that this question has somewhat been resolved. The Planning Commission will meet on January 6 to make their recommendations and the results of the survey will hopefully be in by then.

6. The reference to the Master Plan should include the date of the referenced Master Plan (1999).

See answer to No. 4.

**We are still awaiting the results of the survey.**

**Ms. Boyd suggested adding “and current Retail Improvement Strategy.”**

7. The ordinance should not create targeted zoning. The ordinance should be something that can live more than 10 or 20 years; a document that can be interpreted by the next Planning Commissions to say o.k., that an area meets that criterion.

*Mr. LeBlanc- It is important to keep in mind that we are trying to keep more flexibility in attracting developers to Bay Village. We want to protect the City, but also try to make it possible and encourage developers to provide this type of housing in the City.*

**Mr. Dzienny stated that this also refers back to No. 3 – having some language that says this is what is wanted.**

8. The “Intent Section” can be used to express to future Planning Commissions that one of our intents should be to discourage tearing down single family homes and gathering up land to create an Attached Residence District. The Intent defines what they are actually wanting to accomplish.

*Mr. LeBlanc-The City has the control over the rezoning. There may be circumstances where the community would actually encourage removing houses and putting up new developments. Be very careful about putting in language that would prevent or discourage tearing down homes because there could be circumstances where that would not be an undesirable plan.*

**Mr. Dzienny stated that this is restating the same thing – the Planning Commission still has the power to stop development if they want to, and this relates back to No. 3.**

9. What are the Planning Commission's pros and cons about the acreage? There is no minimum acreage but, when you do the math with some of the requirements for the units, and the different percentages that should take care of the concerns with the acreage. Maybe a scalable restriction on acreage with the most restrictive in the residence districts.

*Mr. LeBlanc- The setback, parking and space requirements in the draft ordinance are self-regulating tools for development. You will not get intrusive developments where you do not want them. To arbitrarily pick a number could require a developer to seek a variance on property that the City would otherwise want developed. A typical townhouse development is set close to the street. Footnote No. 2 states that if more than 50% of the block is developed, the setback has to be the average of the existing setback on either side of the new development. This accomplishes satisfying the concerns of the neighbors. The density of ten per acre is comparable to a lot of communities similar to Bay Village. (Mr. LeBlanc commented on a development with 18 units per acre that worked out very nicely.) Ten units per acre is very doable.*

**Resident Jon Burney asked why there would be ten units per acre allowed in a residential neighborhood and eight units per acre in the retail business district. Mr. Burney commented further on the setback in the footnote, stating he is not sure that it should not just be the existing setback. He suggested keeping the setbacks consistent with this community.**

**Mr. Barbour stated that there has been a lot of discussion about the setbacks. There was actually had a demonstration by Ms. Boyd using Legos, which was very instructive. The setbacks were an important discussion point at the subsequent meeting of the Planning, Zoning, Public Buildings and Grounds Committee. There is some general feeling that the setbacks should be looked at intently so there is conformity with the surrounding neighborhoods. In the commercial area that may not matter. If you put in condominiums where the Malley's building is (example) the setback would be much closer. If you put condominiums on Russell Road (example), that obviously would be different. These types of developments often times have the buildings on the outside of the property with access in the center. That may be the thought process. Mr. Barbour stated his personal opinion is that it doesn't fit in many residential areas.**

**Mr. Dzienny stated that if townhomes were placed in a commercial area that would be the type of development similar to Crocker Park where the homes are close to the street. The footnote says 50% of the average of a block. When you look at a residential street like Russell, all the homes are in the same place, plus or minus a foot, which would be the setback on that street.**

**Mr. Burney stated that his understanding is Chapter 1158 is only to apply to these four or five locations. Mr. Dzienny stated that is the intent of the Master Plan, but if someone wanted to develop another area they would have to come before the Planning Commission and propose rezoning. Mr. Dzienny noted that is why he keeps pushing on the intent section so as not to go in and tear down neighborhoods. But, you also have to have a document that you don't have to come back next year and do a spot zoning for that area and give it zoning variances like they tried to do on Cahoon Road. That was 2.83 acres as**

they stated on the zoning change, and that, to me, when you spot zone that tightly you don't have a document that lives for the City.

Mr. Dzienny stated that he likes the idea of leaving the density at 10 per acre for the residential district and having someone come in to show they can fit 10 on the property. Planning Commission still has the way to show if it won't work. But, if someone is creative enough to say they can make 10 work, why not give them the opportunity to show their work.

Mr. Barbour asked if there was a specific discussion as to why there were 10 per acre in the residential and eight in the commercial. Mr. Ebert stated that the discussion was to use land for attached residences as far as what would be attractive to a developer. The issue concerning the former Shell Station property that went to the ballot and passed, is 8 per acre. That stays at 8 because that was voted on by the voters and passed both in the ward and city-wide. Regardless of what Chapter 1158 does, that stays at 8 per acre, unless revoted on the ballot. Mr. Barbour commented that this probably needs to be revisited at some point. Mr. Barbour stated that he does not believe the commercial areas have as much green space as the residential areas. Mr. Barbour noted that only 50% of a development can be pavers and buildings. That will determine the size of a development. Mr. Dzienny noted that a higher density means a smaller square footage area at lesser cost. This has always been the intent for our older population to find something smaller. Mr. Tadych stated that he continually hears about senior citizen housing. He would defy senior citizens in their seventies to want up and down housing.

Mr. Majewski stated that the reference to senior housing comes from the 1999 Master Plan, which focused on senior housing. The committee was told that the City was looking specifically for senior housing. Density bonuses were offered for specifically designed units that were ADA compliant. Many years ago, Mr. Gertz addressed City Council and told them it would not be senior housing, it would be expensive housing. The last developer that addressed Council stated that he brings a certain demographic to the City.

Conda Boyd urged the Planning Commission to think carefully about the density number and reduce it. People can come in and ask for variances. It is much easier to get a variance on green space, or the distance from the lot line, than it is to get a variance on density. Density has to be the solid number.

Mr. Majewski stated that in regard to the commercial areas, the vote by the electorate in 2010 raised the minimum density to 8 and lowered the minimum acreage to one acre. It also said that the current standards and regulations of Chapter 1158 apply to those commercial districts. Whatever is done to amend Chapter 1158, those regulations of Chapter 1158 at the time of the vote in 2010 will stay in place. The open space in the commercial districts in the new Chapter 1158 would be 60%. The old Chapter 1158 is not going away for commercial districts. The City will have to come up with another name for a new Chapter 1158.

**Conda Boyd commented about the requirements set out in the ordinance for two units per building. Ms. Boyd expressed doubt that any developer would even consider only two units, but she could see a developer trying to sell that and getting the rezoning approved and then doing the bait and switch talked about.**

**Mr. Barbour commented that he thinks what everyone is trying to do is come up with something that has enough flexibility to take into account things that we may not foresee as we sit here now, but could be favorable with changed economic conditions, and the lower cost of building materials which would make what Ms. Boyd describes as more attractive and still give the protection that residents want.**

**Mr. Burney commented on cement slab type of construction. Mr. Foster stated that it would have to be presented by this Commission. He noted that he doesn't see anything wrong with cement slab construction if it is marketable and done well. Discussion followed. Mr. Cheatham noted that slab homes are built all over the state. There is nothing that requires a crawl space or basement. Mr. Burney clarified that he was referring to slab sides of buildings, not slab foundations. Mr. Barbour noted that the requirements of the code seem to prohibit that with only 20% of any façade to consist of pre-cast masonry for trim and cornice elements only.**

**Mr. Foster noted that he does not feel that the Planning Commission should regulate style because it will change. It is a matter of taste. When you look at the guidelines it makes for a quality building; this is what we want to regulate. There is a lot of variation in Bay Village which is good.**

**Mr. Barbour stated that one of the difficulties in dealing with this type of thing is everyone has different views and a certain amount of design is subjective. The ordinance does talk about the building materials which is very compatible with what is already there. The market is going to dictate to a certain extent what these developments will look like because they want to sell them. The two bodies that are involved with this type of development: the Architectural Board of Review and the Planning Commission, will have to review the plans. If you look at the description of the powers of the Planning Commission it is extremely broad.**

**Mr. Dzienny asked if there is any chance that this type of development could ever bypass the Planning Commission. Mr. Ebert stated that it could not bypass the Planning Commission. Mr. Cheatham stated that the only thing that could happen without Planning Commission approval is that in certain, specific lots duplexes can be built. Other than that, three family or more would have to come before the Planning Commission. Mr. Barbour noted that the extension of Crestview Road recently east of the Bradley Bay Nursing Home only required approval of the subdivision of the lot. Mr. Cheatham noted that the homes are all single-family homes.**

**Mr. Ebert commented that the way the Architectural Board of Review is set up currently is for commercial properties only. It excepts one, two, and three family homes. Mr. Ebert**

**stated that perhaps Chapter 1128 needs to be reviewed in conjunction with Chapter 1158 to require these developments to be reviewed by the Architectural Board of Review.**

**Mr. Barbour stated that if the Architectural Board of Review is another avenue to address a development in a neighborhood that could be influential.**

**Mr. Dzienny asked if the Planning Commission is comfortable with the comments of Mr. LeBlanc concerning the density and the acreage, and that all of the other requirements will create the minimum setback.**

**Mr. Barbour suggested that the discussion of this part be tabled until Jennifer Lesny Fleming and David Maddux have an opportunity to be present. All of the members of the Planning Commission agreed.**

**Mr. Remein noted that if there is 45% cover, you would have ten units permitted at 900 square feet, which is 10,000 square feet, or a 20,000 square foot parcel. That would be the smallest parcel for a maximum of ten units per acre. Mr. Barbour noted that it could be two story units. Mr. Remein stated it is simple math. It is not stated but because you have different sizes of 1, 2, 3 bedrooms but the percent of coverage is 45%, there will be different allowable areas for different developments but it will still come down to simple math. Discussion followed concerning variances and the need to have a hardship reason for a variance. Mr. Dzienny noted that a developer wanted to build two homes at Clague and Wolf but did not have enough land. After being denied by the Commission, the developer acquired additional land from the state and built the two homes. Mr. Dzienny noted that coming in to say that there is not enough land to build what you want is not a hardship situation. The developer in the aforementioned situation could have built just one home on the property he had.**

- 10. The last section of Section 1158.02 states “In addition, other sites may be appropriate to provide a suitable buffer or transition between disparate uses. Properties located along arterial or collector streets in close proximity to retail and service uses may also lend themselves to the uses permitted in this district.” That qualifying condition seems kind of open ended and doesn’t seem to qualify anything. Should this be more restrictive?

*Mr. LeBlanc- Townhouses and apartments can serve a legitimate function as a buffer or transition between single family homes and commercial properties or other non-residential use. “Close proximity” should be changed to “adjacent to” due to the nature of Bay Village.*

**Mr. Barbour stated that the original discussion referred to the commercial areas and the areas immediately next to the commercial areas.**

11. Setbacks - 10-foot setback or an average of setback in areas will determine the setback for that area street. Do the setbacks need to be revisited?

See answer to No. 4.

**Mr. Dzienny stated that this goes back to having the average of 50% of the setbacks on the street.**

**Mr. Barbour stated that this is another of the issues that should have final comment reserved until Ms. Lesny Fleming and Mr. Maddux are present. Density, acreage and setbacks are the areas that need more discussion at the next meeting.**

12. The maximum height in the ordinance is 35 feet. Should the height of new construction be based on an average of the structures height on a particular street?

There will be a footnote added requiring the height to be an average of the height of the structures on a particular street.

13. Maybe language to not allow mechanical equipment on the roof of developments. The noise that is caused by the equipment can be disturbing to the neighboring residents (this comment came from the audience).

*Mr. LeBlanc – This is not an issue in commercial areas, because existing commercial areas will have similar rooftop equipment. Mechanical equipment can be required to be placed on the ground, and this can be controlled by the City*

**Section 1158.04 2 (c) (i) addresses mechanical equipment. Mr. Barbour stated that if there is a technical reason it should be discussed. Mr. Cheatham noted that if there is a high density development all that equipment on the ground will take up a great deal of space, and will cause more noise than if it is located on the roof.**

**Mr. Barbour suggested that this issue be given further discussion at the next meeting to be sure it is adequately discussed so everyone is informed about what it exactly means.**

**Mr. Barbour asked if there were any other points that the Commission members wanted to bring up at this time, recognizing that the Commission will meet again in two weeks.**

**Conda Boyd noted that the reference to “R-4” is still contained in other places in the ordinance. Mr. Ebert will have this correction made.**

**Mr. Dzienny asked that the Word file of the ordinance be sent to the Commission for ease in following through.**

**Mr. Barbour requested that the continued discussion of Chapter 1158 be tabled until the January 20, 2016 meeting of the Planning Commission. Mr. Dzienny suggested that the meeting be held only if Ms. Lesny Fleming and Mr. Maddux are able to be in attendance.**

### **Council Update**

**Mrs. Lieske stated that the end of the year for City Council consisted of removing some of the pending items that had been on the Council list of things to consider, and making the necessary financial adjustments to close the year.**

**Marty Mace has taken his seat as the new Council representative at-large, and will be a member of the Planning, Zoning, Public Grounds and Buildings Committee along with Mrs. Lieske and Mr. Vincent.**

**The organizational meeting of Council held Monday, January 4 resulted in the continuance of Dwight Clark as Vice President of Council. Chairs of the various committees will be changing slightly. The following assignments were made by President of Council Koomar:**

	<u>Chair</u>	<u>Members</u>
Public Improvements, Streets/Sewers/Drainage	Tom Henderson	Paul Vincent, Dwight Clark
Recreation and Park Improvements	Marty Mace	Tom Henderson, Karen Lieske
Finance and Claims	Dwight Clark	Dave Tadych, Tom Henderson
Services, Utilities and Equipment	Dave Tadych	Karen Lieske, Marty Mace
Planning, Zoning, Public Bldgs. and Grounds	Karen Lieske	Marty Mace, Paul Vincent
Environment/Safety/Community Services	Paul Vincent	Dwight Clark, Dave Tadych

**Mrs. Lieske will continue to serve as Chairman of the Planning Commission.**

**There being no further business to discuss at this time, the meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.**

---

Mark Barbour, Chairman

---

Joan Kemper, Secretary