

**MARIEMONT PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**REGULAR MEETING HELD APRIL 8, 2019**

The Mariemont Planning Commission met Monday, April 8, 2019. Mr. Vianello called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. Present were Mr. Brown, Mr. DeBlasio, Ms. Reed, and Mayor Policastro. Also, in attendance was the Building Administrator Don Keyes.

Mr. Vianello explained that this is not an entirely new meeting, but rather a continuation of a previous meeting for Mrs. Monger.

Mr. DeBlasio moved, seconded by Mr. Brown to accept the minutes as written for March 20, 2019. On roll call; five ayes, no nays.

The first request was from Joyce Monger of 3921 East Street, Mariemont, OH 45227 to subdivide parcel 527-0020-0023-00 from its current size and shape into two smaller and different shaped parcels.

*Finding of the Building Commissioner:* The eastern portion of the Monger property, known as number 527-0020-0023-00 has been consolidated into one lot 130.27 feet x 130 feet in size. This lot is proposed to be divided into two lots of irregular shape to allow two houses to occupy the space. The proposal has changed from the earlier meeting on this issue. The new layout provides the code-specified setbacks from the proposed property lines for a house design that can fit into the divided property space. Both properties would be larger than the minimum required lot size of 6750 square feet.

Mr. C. Francis Barrett, Legal Counsel for Ms. Monger, had made a request, based on an article in the *Town Crier* to recuse Mr. Brown from participating in this particular issue. Mr. Vianello denied that request, stating that he has always found to be honorable, honest, hard-working, and straight-forward. He could see no reason for Mr. Brown to be recused.

Mayor Policastro asked if there should be discussion about Mr. Barrett's request to recuse Mr. Brown. He said he found it highly offensive and not at all funny. Mayor Policastro said Mr. Brown has been a Councilman for years. For anyone to write such a letter, he said he definitely protests. Mr. Barrett said the request was not meant to be offensive in any way, shape, or form. When a person takes a position or a family member takes a position on an issue to be heard by the Planning Commission, which is a quasi judicial body, it creates a conflict of interest. When a family member of the commission takes a position in writing, it reflects a conflict of interest that he felt needed to be brought to the attention of the Planning Commission.

Mayor Policastro said we are all neighbors and friends so that could mean we should take everybody out. Mr. Brown said that his wife, Deborah, is a person of her own mind. She wrote the letter in the *Town Crier*. It is her opinion; it is her reflection on a given circumstance. He said he did not participate in the writing of it or influence it in any way. Mr. Barrett thanked Mr. Brown for his statement. Mr. Vianello reiterated that the decision had been made not to recuse Mr. Brown.

Mr. Vianello asked if there were members of the Planning Commission or anyone else in attendance who would like to make any comments.

Mr. Brown said he mentioned in the first meeting on this issue that there are two elements under consideration here before we can render a decision. One, of course, is the legal aspects of whether or not Mrs. Monger would be in compliance of all the legal requirements for

the subdivision of this property. The second aspect of this speaks to the interpretation and purpose of our zoning code. He had read that during the first meeting and, as a refresher, he would like to read part of it again. It is the first paragraph in the zoning code and it sets a guideline by which decisions would be rendered. Section 151.002 states, "The purpose of this chapter is to maintain a high standard of community development and the principles of town planning, to protect and preserve property, to promote the stability of property values, and to protect real estate and natural features and other distinctive characteristics of the site from impairment or destruction of value for the general community welfare."

Mr. Brown went on to say that Sentence 6 of that paragraph states, "To conserve, protect, and enhance the historic resources of the village."

He then referred to Section 151.024 of the Code of Ordinances, under Powers and Duties of the Planning Commission. Section H, Paragraph 1, under Subdivision of Land. which says, "Subdivision of land may be granted according to provisions in § 151.041 and § 151.075(H)(2)(n); provided, that the proposed subdivision will be consistent with the intent and purpose of this chapter and will not be materially injurious to properties in the immediate vicinity."

Mr. Brown said that he believes what they are telling us here is that we are to bring a value judgement as to whether or not what we are here to decide has merit or value based on how it will affect the neighboring properties.

Mr. Vianello said we should keep that information in the back of everyone's mind telling us what is governing this process and what we should be looking for. He then gave permission for citizens in attendance to make statements, limited to three minutes.

Ms. Jeanne Boone, 6972 Thorndike Road, Mariemont, Ohio 45227 said she is Mrs. Monger's neighbor and has lived next to her for 26 years. She said she is not happy with this proposal and thinks it will negatively affect her property, as well as all the property on the street. She said Mrs. Monger has always talked about how much she loves her house, saying it is her dream house and that she never wants to leave it. She has preserved the historic detail of it such as the gravel driveway, the stone pathways. She built a lovely arbor. She talked about making it into a B&B one day. Mrs. Boone said what Mrs. Monger is asking to do now is like a total blindside to her. She thinks if the positions were reversed, Mrs. Monger would be furious that I was going to put a house in front of this property.

Mr. Barrett objected to that statement, saying Mrs. Boone should not be speaking for someone else. Mrs. Monger said she never stated that she one day planned on making the house a B&B.

Mrs. Boone continued by saying she was not able to attend the last meeting, but understood that some of Mrs. Monger's friends came to speak on her behalf. She wanted it known that not all of Mrs. Monger's friends were for this proposal, but out of respect for their friendship, they are not speaking against it. She is convinced their property values will drop, including the value of Mrs. Monger's current home. Mrs. Boone said she was on the Architectural Review Board (ARB) for 10 years. She took seriously what

she was charged to do when she was on the ARB. They governed over the Historic District only. The Planning Commission is to protect our home values, to protect the aesthetics of our Village, to protect the history of our Village, and, as Mr. Brown just read, to preserve and enhance it. She believes if this was happening at the house next to any members of the Planning Commission, they would all be against it. They would all agree this is not going to make their property values better. This is not going to make things more lovely and aesthetically pleasing. It will not enhance the Village. It will take away from the historic character of that home.

Mr. Vianello asked Mrs. Boone what made her say that her property value will decrease. She replied that she sees that home as a beautiful Victorian home with a lovely grassy lot in front of it. If you put a house in front of there, it is going to demean that home. Who wants a house in front of a house for your next door neighbor? Mrs. Boone said that she is sure whatever Mrs. Monger builds will be very aesthetically fine. It is where it will be. It is going to detract from our home values, because it is a house in the front yard of another house.

Ms. Reed asked Mrs. Boone if she had seen the plans Mrs. Monger had presented at the previous meeting. Mrs. Boone said she does not need to see the plans. She is certain the architect is an excellent architect and she is sure that whatever he comes up with is going to be lovely.

Mr. Vianello showed Mrs. Boone the new plan and asked her if she would object to seeing it next door to her. She said she would not object to it if it were the only house on the lot. Mr. Vianello said he does not understand why she sees that as objectionable and he would like to know why she would object to it and why she believes her property values would decline.

Mrs. Boone said that anyone with an aesthetic eye who values beauty and values layout and values history, is going to look at that and say that it looks like somebody plopped a house in the front yard of a beautiful historic home. They would not want to live next door to that.

Mrs. Reed said as a Real Estate agent, it is her professional opinion that the proposal will increase surrounding property values. She said the new construction will probably be the most expensive house on the street when it is finished and higher end homes bring values up.

Mrs. Boone asked what will happen to the value of the existing home when there is a house in the front yard. Ms. Reed said that property value would go down, because she is giving up half the land. Mrs. Boone said it is aesthetically not pleasing.

Mr. Brown said that Mrs. Monger said the plan she presented is merely a suggestion of what she might build. She is not saying this is what she is going to build. Mrs. Monger agreed, but said she would like to start building soon. She said the plans have changed and the house has gotten smaller. It will take up less land.

Mr. Vianello said he wanted to summarize. The sketch that had been shown is somewhat similar to the house that Mrs. Monger will build and her intent is to live in this new home and sell the other home. Mrs. Monger said that is correct.

Mr. DeBlasio asked Mrs. Boone if she owned that property would she do what Mrs. Monger has proposed. She said she would not, because she is a good neighbor and it would ruin the aesthetics. Mayor Policastro asked if we have any other houses in front of houses in Mariemont. Mrs. Monger said there is not going to be a house in front of a house on these lots. The setback made sure of that. Mr. Brown said anyone looking at the plan can see that the frontage of the property has been divided by half. Mayor Policastro said we have had cases like this where the houses did not line up and we have turned them down.

Mrs. Boone asked if she would have another chance to speak. She said she did not get notice of this meeting until last Friday. According to the Code of Ordinances, she is supposed to get at least six days' notice.

Ms. Rachel Votaw, of 3914 East Street, Mariemont, Ohio 45227, said she has lived at her address for 39 years. She spoke to the Planning Commission at an earlier meeting, but said she would like to address the commission again. The street she lives on is a charming cul-de-sac that adds to the overall character of the Village. Building a new house will change the character of this street. First, a new house will not only obscure from full view the existing and arguably historic structure, but will probably reduce it to an afterthought on the street. The large front yard which gives the house much of its character will be gone. To be honest, she cannot understand why Ms. Monger would want to live in a house in which her view will be the diminished remains of her former home. Also, a new house will change the nature of the street by its mere existence. A new house, no matter how well intentioned the design, will never fit in with existing houses because it is new. It will not have the patina of age of the existing houses nor will it have mature landscaping and mature trees for decades. It will stick out and look added on. Her house on its lot in almost any other neighborhood in Cincinnati would not be worth nearly as much as it is in Mariemont on our charming street. If the street is not as charming, her house loses value. She knows she was willing to pay more for less house to be on this street. If the street is not appealing, her house will not be appealing either. She thinks it is the duty of all of us in Mariemont to look at the Village as not just ours while we are here, but as ours to preserve for future generations to love and enjoy. To change a neighborhood for now and forever for the expediency of one person seems extremely short-sighted.

Mrs. Votaw then read a statement from her husband, Jim Votaw, which said, "I have lived at 3914 East Street for thirty-eight years. My biggest concern is property values and what will happen as a result of this new construction. Can anyone really say? I doubt it. But is that not a concern for the Village as a whole with every new construction that occurs? Doesn't the Planning Commission exist for just such concerns; the concerns of the village versus one individual. Having lived in the same house for so long, the charm of our cul-de-sac is also a big concern. I recall when the Village announced that they were planning to build curbs on our section of East Street years ago. At that time Ms. Monger had no problem opposing the project because she and her husband had field stones stacked up forming a makeshift curb that they liked better. Her concern was for herself versus the good of the entire street. Ms. Monger, at the last meeting, had numerous friends speak on her behalf. None of these speakers live on our cul-de-sac. No one from our cul-de-sac spoke in support of this new construction other than one person who has only lived in his house for approximately two years. I would ask Ms. Monger's friends who spoke previously to think how they might feel if Ms. Monger was planning on doing this

build directly across from their homes. It is easy to support this build when you won't have to look at it every day. Thank you.”

Mr. Ken Scarborough, 3918 East Street, Mariemont, Ohio 45227, was given permission to speak. He said his house is directly across from Mrs. Monger's house. He said he wanted to echo the concerns of those who had already spoken. He said he had looked through the Village of Mariemont Code of Ordinances and looked at the part of the zoning code (151.002) that Mr. Brown had referenced. The last few words in the paragraph, “For the general community welfare” were kind of left off at the end there. He said he is not opposed to the building of new homes in Mariemont. What he is concerned about is the curb appeal of his home and how it would affect property values. There may be some questions about property value and he cannot say for sure that his property value would go down. He said what he is looking at are the parallel driveways right in front of his house and the destruction of property and about 20 trees that currently provide a nice protected field near the end of the cul-de-sac. Once those are gone, what he will be left to look at are the recent steel poles and electric lines that went in as part of the Duke Energy project. He is concerned about the loss of curb appeal. He understands that the two houses will not be one in front of the other, but they certainly will overlap to some degree and look somewhat strange. He is concerned for the folks at the end of the street who cannot come to these meetings due to illness, especially the Coates who live at the very end of the street. He wondered if anyone had taken the time to reach out to them to see what they think about this. He said when he bought his house 20 years ago, he bought it because of the way it looks now and it is not going to look that way when this project is finished. Curb appeal does affect property values. Curb appeal and landscaping can significantly affect the price of a home. He said when this is all said he done, we will see. Losing the trees will affect the way the end of the street looks. He said he would encourage those who have not done so to go and stand in front of the property and see how it would look with the trees gone.

Mr. Vianello said Mrs. Monger is going to plant more trees. It was determined at the last meeting that some trees will have to come down due to construction issues, but she does intend to plant more trees there making the appearance of this home more aesthetic than he thinks her neighbors even understand or realize. He encouraged everyone to spend time with Mrs. Monger reviewing the plans to understand her intents.

Mayor Policastro said it takes a good 10 to 15 years to get the trees halfway back to what was there. Mr. Vianello said he understood that.

Mr. Joe Stoner, 6924 Miami Bluff Drive, Mariemont, Ohio 45227, said he is the President of the Mariemont Preservation Foundation. He said he spoke at a previous meeting about this same issue. He wanted to emphasize that the proposed subdivision at 3921 East Street is legal. In a courtroom they would say that they stipulate that. There is no question about that. That does not mean that the Planning Commission must approve it. It only means that they may approve it. Otherwise there would be no point in any of us sitting here. The Building Commission has certified that it is legal according to setbacks. The code stipulates that it has to go before the Planning Commission for a reason and that they may or may not approve it. The words ‘may’ and ‘must’ are not synonymous. The code says land can be subdivided provided the subdivision will be consistent with the intent and purpose of this chapter and will not be materially injurious to properties in the immediate vicinity. We just heard that. Again, “may be granted” is the important phrase and only if it is not materially injurious to existing neighbors. Property values is a material interest. He understands the new house will not totally obscure the view of the old house, but it is impossible for it to not partially block it. He said he is a photographer and he is always looking at the aesthetics of things. There is no way even if you put the nicest house in the world in front of that

house it is going to make it look good. John Nolen, the famous land planner hired to plan Mariemont, was so impressed with the house that he even changed the streets around and kept a photo of the house in his notebook. It does have historic value and aesthetic value and there is no way building a house in front of it will improve that. It is our duty to preserve it for future generations, long after Mrs. Monger is gone and long after we are gone.

Ms. Reed asked if Mr. Stoner would prefer that it be torn down. She said the house is not registered as historic. It is zoned Residence B. That is part of our decision. If we do not approve this, it would be legal for Mrs. Monger to tear it down and put apartments there. None of us want to see that. If it is not considered historic, it is not a protected property and it is Residence B.

Mayor Policastro said it would still have to come before the Planning Commission. Mr. Brown said eventually it would get through. Mayor Policastro said eventually we could change the law. Ms. Reed said we could not do that on Mrs. Monger's property. Mr. Stoner said that he is asking that the Planning Commission not approve it. He said he is grateful for the people who came before who preserved things for us and he would like to do the same for future generations.

Mr. Vianello said Mr. Stoner had stated, "not be materially injurious to properties in the immediate vicinity". He asked how Mr. Stoner sees this as being "materially injurious". Mr. Stoner said it would cause a reduction in property values and when you lose money that is injurious. Mr. Vianello said the loss of property value is only an assumption. He said he thinks the property values would go up. Mr. Stoner said he was just using common sense.

Mr. Bob Van Stone, 4050 Lytle Woods Place, Mariemont, Ohio 45227 said based on the last discussion, if you are a homeowner, you look at risk. If there is a risk property values could go down, that is still a risk. That is a risk these people are not wanting to take. He said he personally does not want to see this lot subdivided. If the commission chooses to subdivide this lot, he thinks there should be a contingency that anything done on those two properties has to go in front of the ARB. That will give these folks some level of protection. Plans can change and there is no guarantee the plans that were presented will be what it is. He thinks going in front of the ARB would be a way to abate the risk to these folks. Once again, he does not think the lots should be subdivided, but if they are, these folks should get some level of protection.

Mr. Barrett said he just wanted to give the issue some perspective. Mrs. Monger has lived in this property for many decades. She desires to stay on the property. She intends to build the house and live in that house herself. Therefore, it is in her best interest to preserve the house she currently lives in so it can be sold to a well-qualified person who can continue to maintain it. She has decided to downsize and stay on the property. He thinks her desire to stay in the neighborhood has been lost here. Secondly, he said that the property is zoned Residence B. It is already plotted as three separate building sites. She has the right to build a house on each one of those separate lots. The property is over half an acre. Since it is zoned Residence B, she could put two four-family apartment buildings on those lots. As far as the trees are concerned, she and her late husband planted most, but not all, of them. She desires to keep as many of those as possible and to plant new trees. That is something she voluntarily did to make the neighborhood

better. As far as the standards are concerned, it has been determined it is legally permitted. The only question is whether it is materially injurious. The key word there is 'materially' injurious. You have to have strong evidence of that. There is speculation. Risk does not count. The speculation that property values may go down does not count. There has to be some hard evidence, something material, and he submitted that there really hasn't been any hard evidence. He thinks the Village is coming out far ahead than it would be otherwise.

Mrs. Monger, 3921 East Street, Mariemont, Ohio 45227, said some of her neighbors indicated she had some ideas about what she wanted to do with her property, which were not true. She said that was upsetting, because no one has really seen the plans. She had offered numerous times and asked her neighbors if they would like to see what she would be doing and nobody accepted the offers. They want to come here and complain, but they don't want to find out what is really going on. As far as aesthetics, she feels it is a personal thing. She likes to think her aesthetic is worth preserving and that is what she is going to build – something that is really beautiful. That may not be something her neighbors agree with. She cannot put that value on them. She is not worried about the aesthetics at all. As far as future generations go, her children and grandchildren live in Mariemont. That is the future for her and she is doing what she thinks is right for them as well. She does not think she is harming the old house in any way. She believes when she is done with the landscaping on the entire property, before she sells it to any buyer, she is going to put trees in, because that will get her a higher property value. She thinks it will look better than it does now. Her late husband was in charge of the yard. Some people might consider her yard to be a little wild. She thinks the new landscaping will look nicer. Some people might say, "Poor Tom", but Tom would want her to be doing what she is doing, because Tom would want her to be happy. She said they built the home together and there is nothing she is going to do going forward that would harm the old house and the new house is going to be really beautiful. The lot will be cut in half, but it is going to be divided in such a way that the old house will have road frontage and the new house will have road frontage. She has actually staked out which trees could be kept. The field is going to be exactly the same. There is a large burning bush that is in front of the house and that bush will stay. She said this is really personal to her and she cares about every one of those trees, because her late husband planted many of them. She had a vested interest in this whole project. She is offended that people would say she doesn't care and that the aesthetic won't look good. She has no plans to do anything other than what is shown in the picture she gave to the Planning Commission. She is going to shorten the new house so that it meets the size of the old house. She is doing it that way because she cares about what happens on the property. The setbacks are all within compliance. Those who have spoken against it don't really know what the plan is. She hired a very good architect who had experience working in the Village. Her very first conversation with him was to let him know that the home she raised her family in was preserved. She has approached this from a positive point of view. If she just wanted to make money on the property, she could build a bunch of houses. Those lots are available for that right now. She came to the Planning Commission with a plan that was going to be better than anything else and would require them to work together.

Mr. Brown said he would like to take issue with what Mr. Barrett considers to be material injury to the properties. He seems to want to rule out the major concerns of all the adjoining property owners. He isn't really sure there is anything in our code that specifically outlines or defines what material injury is. He believes the risks to these property owners are real and worth considering. He asked Mrs. Monger about her plans to eliminate the back section of the new house. He said he is not sure that they still have a correct calculation for the setback from the existing house to the property line on that northeastern corner of the house. Mrs. Monger said that, according to Mr. Keyes, the setbacks are in compliance. She can only go with what she had been told and Mr. Keyes has told her the plan is OK. Mr. Brown said the reason he is questioning it is that the architect has shown a dimension across the back lot of 39.67 feet. He believes the

minimum requirement width for a lot is 40 feet. Mrs. Monger said that was a mistake on the drawing and the architect is changing that. Mr. Brown asked if he changes it by moving the line south, what does that do to that setback. Mrs. Monger demonstrated for Mr. Brown how the line could be moved to meet the requirement. Mr. Vianello said that Mr. Keyes had told him that the drawing had changed. Mr. Keyes said the drawing showing the setbacks plus and minus. He spoke with the architect who agreed to fix the plan. Mr. Brown said we don't know it will be correct, because now it seems we don't have accurate drawings.

Mr. Vianello said he agreed with Mr. Van Stone that the Planning Commission should stipulate that ARB review plans before a final approval is given. They should also stipulate the requirements in our building codes must be met in order for the Planning Commission's vote to be valid. He likes Mr. Van Stone's idea to get input for other citizen groups because of all the controversy on this issue. If it helps to alleviate some fears, he would be in favor of that. He also would be in favor of stipulating it must meet our building code requirements.

Ms. Reed asked if this would now go before the ARB. Mr. Vianello said it would if there are any changes or modifications to the plan, as Mr. Van Stone had suggested.

Mayor Policastro said that we don't really have the final plans here. We would be making history, because the Planning Commission had never OK'd anything without being able to review the final plans. Mrs. Monger said they have the footprint. Mayor Policastro said we have the right to make the judgement. Mrs. Monger is telling us this is what it is going to look like, but we have never approved anything that way. Mr. Vianello said that Ms. Reed proposed we get the ARB involved. Mayor Policastro agreed. Mr. Brown asked about getting other citizen groups involved. Mr. Vianello said that would be the ARB. Ms. Reed said we have already had three meetings about this so people could come in and give their opinion.

Mr. Vianello asked if we had a proposal from any of the members of the committee. Mayor Policastro asked if that meant there was to be no more discussion. He said everyone keeps dismissing the importance of aesthetics, like they mean nothing, but this property is right next to one of the neatest little parks we have. He thinks aesthetics mean a lot and that is why he wants to see the final plan. Mr. Brown said Mrs. Monger has presented an evolving design. The point Mayor Policastro is trying to make is that we really don't know what is going to be submitted. Mr. Vianello said that until we either grant or deny Mrs. Monger's request to subdivide the property, she is not going to expend any other funds with the architect. We need to make a decision on that request and then she can provide a much more detailed plan that can be sent to the ARB and they can take a look at it. That does not negate the Planning Commission from dealing with the point at hand, which is the property lines. Mr. Brown said the argument that was being raised about aesthetics is whether or not it is proper to put a house there. Is this the right move for this property? Ms. Reed said that is what we are voting on. Mr. Brown said we may be voting on it, but he doesn't hear us talking about it much. We are running it off to the ARB. Mr. Vianello said Ms. Reed's proposal is something he could support. We vote on it and send it to the ARB to get their architectural review on the final document of what is going to go on that property. Mr. Brown said what we are voting on then is if the house is going to be allowed on that property. Mr. Vianello said that is correct.

Mrs. Boone said the Planning Commission should not take a vote at this time due to the fact that she is an adjoining property owner and she was not informed of this meeting the required six days in advance. She said there was no sign on the property saying there was a zoning meeting. Mr. Vianello said we can and will vote this evening. This matter has been heard at previous meetings. Mr. Keyes said he believed it was a continuation of a previous meeting. He didn't realize there would be people who would make a fuss about it. Since it was a continuation



of a previous meeting, he believed 48 hours of notice would meet the requirements and no sign was needed. He said if the decision is that this is not a legal meeting, he will put a sign in the yard and schedule another meeting for next week.

Mr. Vianello said if there is another meeting, it will be for a simple vote. There will be no discussion. It will be a continuation of this meeting. He said he has heard a number of things that bordered on the ridiculous. He would like to make a proposal to vote this evening and we can stipulate that the ARB will review the final structure that Mrs. Monger will propose. We will be voting on whether we are going to approve the split of the properties as she has requested. Mr. DeBlasio seconded the motion. On roll call: three ayes, two nays, with Mayor Policastro and Mr. Brown dissenting. The motion carried three to two.

Mr. Vianello said the Village Council can certainly overrule this body. Mayor Policastro said Council could not do that. Only a negative outcome can be overturned.

Mr. Keyes said he would like the Planning Commission to do one more thing, which is to make a decision to approve the plan that has been finalized with accurate boundary dimensions. That has been brought up. The dimensions have moved. People have said on a couple of occasions the boundary dimensions were wrong. They have been changed, even since the last meeting, so a decision needs to be made saying the drawings will be modified so that the boundaries are correct before it is registered.

Mr. Brown said he wasn't sure what they were being asked to vote on. Mr. Keyes said the minimal property dimension is 40 feet. The current drawing shows 39.67 feet. He wants to make sure everyone understands we are to make sure that modifications show 40 feet and the other setbacks and dimensions are correct before the property gets registered. Mr. Brown asked if Mr. Keyes would do another calculation on the side yard that he is concerned about. Mr. Keyes said he would.

Mr. Brown moved, seconded by Mr. DeBlasio to vote to verify the subdivided lot has the required dimensions and setbacks before it is registered. On roll call: five ayes, no nays.

The meeting adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Ms. Shelly Reed, Secretary