



CITY OF OLMSTED FALLS
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 4, 2019
7:30 PM
COUNCIL CHAMBERS

Commission Members Present: Brett Iafigliola, Gary Pehanic, Garry Thompson, Peter Carpenter, Michelle Hawkins, Cornel Munteanu, and Dave Fenderbosch. Also Present: George Smerigan, City Planner and Andy Bemmer, Law Director. Audience: 3

Chairman Brett Iafigliola called the public meeting to order at 7:31 p.m.

1. **Planning & Zoning Case # 17-2019** - A request by Clint Williams, owner of 9807 Columbia Road, PP# 291-13-013 and 291-13-014 for the following variances in order to convert the former church building to a commercial use: a use variance to Section 1240.02(b)(1) to permit 424.6 square feet of land zoned D-3 to be used for accessory parking for a commercial operation; a variance of 10 feet to Section 1240.09(b)(2) to permit an accessory commercial parking lot to be located 0 feet from the side lot line in lieu of the required 10 feet; a variance of 15 feet to Section 1252.05(a)(2) to permit an accessory parking lot to be 0 feet from the side lot line abutting a D District in lieu of the required 15 feet; a variance to Section 1270.07(d) and Section 1270.10(f) to permit the parking lot and driveways to be gravel in lieu of having a paved surface as required; a variance to Section 1270.10(g) to permit the parking lot and driveways to be constructed without curbing; a variance to Section 1270.10(k) to permit the parking lot to be constructed without pavement markings; a variance to Section 1274.01(d) to waive the requirement for screening the entire length of the common lot line between a C District and a D District; a variance to Section 1274.01(e)(2) to waive the requirement for screening between the accessory parking lot and the street right-of-way; and a variance to Section 1274.16(c) to permit the use of light fixtures that are not full cut-off fixtures.

Ken Martin indicated that he is present tonight to represent Mr. Williams as he is unavailable this evening.

Mr. Iafigliola administered the oath to Mr. Martin.

Mr. Martin stated that at the corner of Sprague Road and Columbia there is the old Westview Methodist Church constructed in 1845, which was one of the first public buildings in the area. It was constructed in the Western Reserve style and was added to in 1885 with a one-story front section, the tower next to the front door was also added at a later time. Historically the property sat on three acres of surface and currently it is 19,000 square feet which is approximately ½ an acre, so over the years the property has shrunk, due to Sprague Road widening. This piece of land is extremely narrow and long as it runs from Columbia Road to the river and by virtue of today's building code this property is unbuildable. There was a home behind the church which was demolished due to ill repair and that has afforded this property a degree for parking. In

Mr. Williams foresight he has indicated that he would approach the neighbors to see if they would be willing to sell a portion of their parcel, which is marked on the drawings as a triangular area. With this purchase of property, the vehicles would enter from Columbia Road and exit onto Sprague Road. He is proposing parking for 11 cars on the site. He indicated that parking spaces one through four are located at grade level of the rear door as well as spaces 5 through 10. Anyone coming to the building for pedestrian use will enter through the rear door rather than the front door as the front door has six steps to enter. The narrowness of the site makes it difficult to develop which is the reason for the variance requests.

Mr. Martin indicated that there will be a six-foot-high fence that will extend from the Belford's property to the end of the property in order to provide privacy for the Belford's, at their request and meets the zoning code.

Dennis Belford, 9795 Columbia Road, stated that he lives next door to this project. His biggest problem that he has been having with the project is the lack of communication. We had no idea what bushes, fences or anything else that would be installed and that is what we wanted. We made a deal with Mr. Williams that seems to have been slightly altered.

Susan Prehoda, 9737 Columbia Road, stated that in all fairness if anyone could do something nice to this property it would be Clint Williams, as we all know he has restored the Grand Pacific Junction and is a masterpiece. She is hoping that he will do the same thing to this property. It has been neglected for many years and she is hoping it will be aesthetically appealing with attention to detail to enhance its charm with landscaping and gardens as he has done with Grand Pacific Junction. It is the gateway to Olmsted Falls and an area that we should be proud of. However, she has had people mention to her over the years that it is the ghetto of Olmsted Falls and that hurts her feelings. She is sorry to see all the trees that have been removed but she does realize that the property is a configuration that would be difficult to deal with and the state it was in was not acceptable and have dealt with that for many years. She is happy to see that something is being done to the property. The plans show nice lamp posts as well as a white picket fence so she believes it is leaning towards an aesthetically appealing project. In all fairness, regarding the gravel driveway, all the surrounding properties are paved, the gas station, repair shop and Gibbs, she understands Gibbs is not in Olmsted Falls but it is in the area, the Gallery, the dog clinic, the insurance company they are all paved. They may not be striped with specific parking areas but she does believe that adds to some appeal versus a gravel driveway that will have weeds growing. She believes that would some what shabby and does not feel it will help the area. She stated that handicapped individuals would have a difficult time on gravel if they were to need wheelchairs. The other businesses have invested quite a bit of money into their properties and this area if finally looking less like a ghetto. She does sympathize with the Belford's because she knows in a lot of cities buffering is required between commercial and residential and the reason is to keep noise levels, pollution and lighting down so the resident can have a home he can live in and feel comfortable in. She can also see the Marathon and U-Haul lights from where she lives out of her windows so it is not very appealing in that respect. She believes the Belford's are due some respect,

they purchased their home and made improvements, and are only asking for some creature comforts and their home is supposed to be their castle. The privacy issue for them as well as the lighting and she is also not clear on the lighting variance that is being requested. There is some historical value to the property. The architecture structure being an "A" frame and is one of the oldest in this area and has always been talked about in her neighborhood that it was part of the underground railroad but we could not find a lot of documentation regarding that. We did hear that from the Lutz's who lived there for many years.

Mr. Smerigan indicated that he will attempt to review all the variances being requested. The first one is as a result of the purchase of property from the Belford's Mr. Williams is requesting to place the accessory parking over the commercial line onto the residential property. The Commission can grant a use variance to permit that request, the Commission would permit 424.6 square feet of residential land to be used for commercial parking. This is a very small variance and with the property owner's consent. This site is long and narrow and will be difficult to meet all the code requirements in order to convert this historical church building to a commercial use. Some variance to the code is reasonable given the configuration of the property and placement of the building. He does not have any issue with the use variance to permit the parking.

Mr. Iafigiola asked if Mr. Smerigan had any general comments as he would like to review each of the variances at a later time. Mr. Smerigan indicated that as previously stated the property was clearly run down and believes this is a good opportunity to repurpose the building. The property is zoned for commercial use so the proposed uses are reasonable and appropriate. As indicated by one of the residents this is the entryway into the city so we should be doing what we can to make it appropriate.

Mr. Smerigan stated that the second variance request is regarding the code required 10-foot setback from commercial parking to a side lot line. In this case the parking lot goes to the side lot line and over therefore the applicant is requesting a variance that would permit him to move to a zero setback as opposed to the required 10-foot setback. If you are to install parking this is probably the only reasonable way to given the location of the building and the drive already on the site.

Mr. Smerigan indicated that the third variance request is related to a setback for accessory parking. This is basically the same issue to the second variance but this setback is located in another code section related to side yard parking. This section of the code requires a 15-foot setback from a D district and the applicant is at zero feet.

Mr. Smerigan indicated that the fourth variance which is 1270.07(d) and fifth variance which is 1270.10(f) are requests to permit the parking lot to be gravel rather than paved. Our code requires that parking lots be paved, curbed and spaces be painted. He stated that 1270.07(d) and 1270.10(f) deals with paving and 1270.10(g) deals with curbing, 1270.10(k) deals with pavement markings. Sections 1270.10(g) and 1270.10(k) all four sections relate to paving, curbing and striping the parking lot. The request by the applicant is to install a gravel parking lot without curbs and striping.

Mr. Smerigan indicated that the code requires that where commercial property abuts residential property you have to screen the entire length of the connection. The applicant is proposing a board on board fence but only for a portion of the lot because at the rear of the lot there is no commercial activity taking place so screening all the way to the river line does not make sense in the applicant's opinion.

He stated that the next variance is to waive the requirement for the accessory parking to the street right-of-way which is now on the south side of the property. The code requires landscaping and screening between the parking lot and the street but in this case there is a grade change and it does not make a great deal of sense to enforce that requirement.

The last variance is from the lighting code which requires full cut-off fixtures in order to prevent any glare to neighboring property owners. The applicant is requesting decorative lamp posts that he has uses at Grand Pacific Junction in order to be consistent. These are not cut-off fixtures and will glow and cast light.

Mr. lafigliola indicated that Mr. Belford previously stated some frustrations. Mr. Belford indicated that he learned about the screening this evening. He was concerned about the screening and does hope to work those issues out. He is not asking that they screen all the way down the property but does want the privacy that he previously had prior to the applicant removing all the trees and shrubbery. Mr. lafigliola stated that the applicant proposes a new six-foot-high board on board fence 16 feet in length. He asked Mr. Belford if he is requesting that the length be extended. Mr. Belford indicated that if you were at his property you would see the private area behind the garage and one of the things that drew him to the property was that the back yard was gorgeous. He has a nice 30-foot grass section area that goes all the way down to the river the lot was wooded and dense and he could not see Sprague Road or the U-Haul trucks. He measured the area and it is 70 feet from the end of the fence. Mr. Belford indicated that now that this area is open more garbage from the gas station will end up on his property. He indicated that he would be happy with 46 feet from the end of the proposed fence.

Mr. lafigliola asked Mr. Belford if he was looking for additional fencing from the back of the garage towards Columbia which would be to the west. Mr. Belford stated that his concern is what is on the drawing is not what was agreed to with Mr. Williams. On the page he signed with his wife the base of the triangle states 9 feet and if you look at the front page of the new drawings the base indicates 10.34 feet. Mr. Martin indicated that the 9 feet is technically from the property line and if you enter the property going east you go in at a different angle than the property line and with that different angle the length becomes technically an additional 1.34 feet which is on Mr. Williams property. Mr. Belford stated the whole property was surveyed and down by the end of the church driveway there is a peg indicating where his property is. The agreement with Mr. Williams was from that peg 110 feet down to the property line, following the stake perfectly. We agreed to go up 25 feet and then from that point in 9 feet. Mr. Martin indicated that Mr. Belford is correct and when this project starts Mr. Belford, his wife and Mr. Williams will go through the same procedure, and will place the stake where Mr.

Belford indicates regardless of what the drawings show. He will revise the drawing to reflect this point.

Mr. Belford indicated that his concern is when individuals exit their vehicle to go into the building. He is not concerned about trampling but because it is going to be a gravel driveway if someone falls and lands on his property then he is responsible for them falling on his property.

Mr. Iafigliola asked if he would like to discuss the fence. Mr. Belford indicated this is what he means about no communication. If we had the fence, we would be happy. Mr. Iafigliola stated we could carry the fence line, instead of stopping at the garage, all the way through to the end of the first parking space. Mr. Martin indicated that is the intention. Mr. Belford stated that that the previous conversation was that shrubs would be planted because the applicant did not like fences so he was not installing one. Mr. Iafigliola asked if the fence was installed would that satisfy Mr. Belford's concerns. Mr. Belford replied yes.

Mr. Martin indicated that he still has to appear before the ABR board and will have to discuss where the fence should end. The problem is that we need to be on the upper surface to create any type of barrier and he would strongly suggest that we use the same planting materials that has been offered at the front of the property between the parking lot and Belford's property. The type of planting being discussed grows at 3 feet per year and would solve Mr. Belford's visual problems. He believes these should be planted on top of the hill on the applicant's property but is unsure if the applicant would agree. Mr. Belford stated that if the applicant wants to put something on top of the hill that is his choice.

Mr. Iafigliola asked what the term cut off light fixture means. Mr. Smerigan indicated that it means the bulb of the light fixture is hidden from view by the shape of the fixture and the light would be directed downward. Mr. Iafigliola asked the reason the applicant was proposing this fixture. Mr. Smerigan indicated that he is matching the fixtures that he used in the downtown area, which in downtown it may be appropriate because they are all commercial properties, but in this location, there are adjacent residential properties. The cutoff fixture provision in the code is to protect the adjacent residential properties from glare. Mr. Martin indicated that these are clear element lenses with 79-watt filament lightbulbs. Mr. Iafigliola asked how bright they would be. Mr. Martin indicated that in normal lighting like this you would be using LED lights that would simply glow the whole parking lot, these are nothing close to that. Mr. Belford stated that the only light that would affect his property is the one behind the church. Mr. Martin indicated that there would be a six-foot-high fence to block the light. Mr. Belford indicated that he likes the lights and has one similar to the proposed lights in his front yard. Mr. Smerigan indicated that the light fixture will be 9 feet in height and will not cast a great deal of light. Mr. Thompson indicated that if the light is on all evening it could become an issue. Mr. Martin indicated that Mr. Williams always puts his lights on timers.

Mr. Iafigliola asked why the applicant is requesting a gravel drive. Mr. Martin indicated that Mr. Williams likes to use gravel. He stated that in his opinion it is an environmentally friendly product. There are two gravel lots on Orchard Street. He stated that a comment was made by the city engineer indicating that there could be some overflow that might end up on Sprague Road, but in this case the apron is at least 20 to 30 feet of concrete so this material will not overflow into or onto Sprague Road. There is also an existing gravel drive and this would be a continuation of that product.

Mr. Martin indicated that the French restaurant a brick surface was installed so that handicapped individuals could get out of their vehicle and into the building, this could potentially solve the issue and still maintain a gravel lot. Mr. Iafigliola indicated that 95% would remain gravel and this one spot would have hardscaping. Mr. Martin replied correct and gives easy access to a ramp.

Mr. Smerigan indicated that while he is supportive of the other variances and believes there are legitimate practical difficulty reasons for those variances, but he is not supportive of a gravel parking lot. The code requires paved parking for a reason. We make residents pave their driveways and he does not see a commercial business not having a paved lot. At their next meeting the Commission will see a proposal for a commercial operation across the street from this and if gravel parking is allowed on this side of the street how will you require paved parking across the street. He understands the historical character of the church but there are many historical buildings in this city that have paved parking lots and he does not see that as a basis for waiving the parking lot requirement. He believes this is the entry to the city and the facility should be done in a first-class manner and he does not feel that will be what happens if we permit a gravel parking lot. Mr. Martin indicated that would be a problem and he would need Mr. Williams permission to remove that from the proposal. Mr. Smerigan indicated that it is the Planning Commission's decision whether to grant the variance.

Elora Garcia 9750 River Road, stated that it sounds like Mr. Williams wants to go towards the look of Grand Pacific Junction. In the Grand Pacific Junction there are walkways that are the nice old red brick. During discussions about a paved lot why not consider the brick pavers whether it's the ramp as it is a smaller parking lot.

Mr. Smerigan indicated that the code section states that all parking spaces and driveways shall be improved with concrete, asphalt or other material approved by the commission. So, if the commission wanted to approve brick pavers or something of that nature clearly the commission can. Obviously, the intent is for the parking lot to be improved.

Susan Prehoda, 9737 Columbia Road, stated the red brick idea is nice and she does realize it is on a grade and ice could be a problem during the winter. As far as the historic buildings in the city here that have paved parking it is Grand Pacific Junction except for the wedding gardens where he has a graveled lot. She has a portion of her driveway that goes down a grade and it has gravel and she knows that the gravel keeps moving down when it rains so there is a bit of maintenance and the weeds can grow through. That is what would make it shabby looking if it's not maintained properly. She

stated that if Mr. Williams wants this to look like the Grand Pacific Junction then the asphalt would be the proper way to make it look more polished. All the other businesses in the area have been complying with that requirement as well so how would they feel about it as they spent a lot of money to put their lot in. As the other resident indicated this is not a big area to pave. The gateway situation is all about aesthetics and she doesn't know if it matters what company leases the building, they will lease a building that they like but this is our city and this is property in our city and we want our city to be nice no matter who moves in. That is where she feels this is the gateway to the city and is the first thing you see for Olmsted Falls and now, we have the over pass that states Olmsted Falls and our end of town has improved a lot and needs to keep moving in that direction.

Mr. Belford indicated that he grew up in Berea and always looked to Olmsted Falls as the city on the hill and every time we came to Olmsted Falls and it was his goal to move and live in Olmsted Falls. He moved in 16 years ago and he is attracted to the charm of this city and likes what Mr. Williams did downtown and will hopefully like this project when finished. He hopes that during the Commission's consideration of all these variances that we keep the charm of this town in mind as that is what drew him here and what draws others here. Where he works people say that Olmsted Falls is a great town. He and his neighbor's want to keep that charm. He gets along with Mr. Williams and he is excited about what he is restoring.

Mr. Pehanic asked if the parking lots on Orchard existed or were installed because of the wedding chapel. His point is that we are discussing improving a parking lot and if there was no parking lot before and it was approved as gravel and now we have a gravel parking lot and we are saying it should be asphalt to improve; but is unsure if we can compare the parking lot at the wedding chapel to this one. Mr. Martin stated that the wedding chapel parking lot is brand new. Mr. Pehanic stated that is his point, they were approved to be gravel and now we have a gravel driveway and we are saying that the improvement should be concrete or asphalt. Mr. Smerigan indicated that the lots on Orchard were installed prior to his time with the city so he cannot speak as to what approvals were granted. He will say that since he has been with the city, we have required all parking lots to be paved and we have required driveways to be paved for single family residences. Mr. Pehanic asked how would you maintain and plow gravel during the winter without having the gravel flowing onto the right-of-way because there is always that possibility as it seems that could cause a problem.

Mr. Munteanu stated that from what he understands the gravel area is basically the driveway beside the church to the house that has been demolished. So, basically 11, 12, 7, 8, 9, 10, none of these spots are currently existing in gravel. Mr. Martin replied he was correct.

Mr. Thompson stated that he was the council liaison when the wedding garden and parking lot were proposed and we had the same discussion. Ultimately, at that point in time the Planning Commission approved the gravel parking lots. The wedding garden was partially there which was permitted to expand. The Commission had a similar discussion regarding asphalt or concrete and Mr. Williams indicated that he would not

do use those products, so the Commission determined that a gravel parking area was better than no parking area at all. Mr. Martin stated that Mr. Williams has removed trees for other people's benefit, he has come to an agreement with the next door neighbor's to purchase a portion of their property, installed a brand new roof on this structure, will replace all the windows with wood windows, which no one does anymore, and of course we will see the Mr. Williams improvements to the building. We have seen that Mr. Williams has maintained his properties well and above anyone else so there is no expectation of him or his organization not performing what he has done in the past 20 years. We are talking about a building that was built in 1845 located at the south entry to Olmsted Falls which will make every building beyond it more historically significant automatically.

Mr. Thompson stated that he agrees with Mr. Belford, if this was a much bigger parking lot he would have some concern and the gravel kind of fits with the historic aspect of the building. He certainly would not want to see concrete. The pavers are a great idea but those cost money and grass tends to grow in between them as well, there is a lot of maintenance on pavers and there are not easily plowable. He does not have any concerns over the proposed gravel and understands what is coming down the other side of the road but that will be more commercial and he can make the distinction because that will be a new building and new construction not the revitalization of an old building.

Mr. Fenderbosch indicated that he understands that it is porous material but wouldn't drains solve some of the problems. Mr. Martin stated that everything is pointing towards the river. The drawing indicates that the water will flow to the center, it will not flow out towards Sprague Road and will exit at the bottom of parking spaces 11 and 12, which is the lowest part of the property.

Mr. Thompson stated that the sewer district now requires all residents to pay \$5.00 a month for the water that comes from impervious surfaces. A gravel driveway is considered an impervious surface by the county and most of the water runs off rather than soaking through. Therefore, tax wise it does not make any difference to Mr. Williams whether it is paved or gravel as he will pay the same fees based on the square footage of the lot.

Mr. Iafigliola moved to **grant** a use variance to Section 1240.02(b)(1) to permit 424.6 square feet of land zoned D-3 to be used for accessory parking for commercial operations; Mr. Thompson **seconded**. Poll: 7 ayes; 0 nays. **Motion carried**.

Mr. Iafigliola moved to **grant** a variance of 10-feet to Section 1240.09(b)(2) to permit an accessory commercial parking lot to be located 0 feet from the side lot line in lieu of the required 10-feet; Mr. Thompson **seconded**. Poll: 7 ayes; 0 nays. **Motion carried**.

Mr. Iafigliola moved to **grant** a variance of 15 feet to Section 1252.05(a)(2) to permit an accessory parking lot to be zero feet from the side lot line abutting a D district in lieu of the required 15 feet; Mr. Thompson **seconded**. Poll: 7 ayes; 0 nays. **Motion carried**.

Mr. Iafigliola moved to **grant** a variance to Section 1270.07(d) and 1270.10(f) to permit the parking lot and driveways to be gravel in lieu of having a paved surface as required; Mr. Thompson **seconded**. Poll: 6 ayes; 1 nay (Pehanic). **Motion carried**.

Mr. Iafigliola moved to **grant** a variance to Section 1270.10(g) to permit the parking and driveways to be constructed without curbing; Mr. Thompson **seconded**.

Mr. Iafigliola indicated that 1270.07(d) provides for permanent edging such as curbs, which he assumes will be concrete or asphalt, or embedded rot resistant timbers. He assumes that there is some way to dress up the curbing of this lot even with gravel to prevent it from looking scattered and asked Mr. Martin if he had any objections. Mr. Martin indicated that something could be used to define the edge. Mr. Iafigliola indicated that he believes that would answer some of the concerns of the residents. Mr. Pehanic indicated that based on this agreement the motion would need to fail. Mr. Bemer asked if Mr. Martin would like to withdrawal this variance request or have the commission vote and deny the request. Mr. Bemer indicated by withdrawing the request the applicant is accepting the fact that there shall be some type of curbing and ABR can address what material will be used. Mr. Martin indicated that he is withdrawing this variance request.

Mr. Iafigliola moved to **grant** a variance to Section 1270.10(k) to permit the parking to be constructed without pavement markings; Mr. Thompson **seconded**.

Mr. Thompson indicated that his concern is if spaces 1 through 4 are open gravel they will not be defined; therefore, the drawing indicate the spaces but someone pulling in there will not be aware that there are four spaces they will park however they want to park. Mr. Martin indicated that under those circumstances it is appropriate to place markers to define limits of parking spaces. In other words, if you want to say nine feet, you can place a marker that is three feet high with a reflector. Poll: 6 ayes; 1 nay (Thompson). **Motion carried**.

Mr. Iafigliola moved to **grant** a variance to Section 1274.01(d) to waive the requirement for the screening the entire length of the common lot line between the "C" district and "D" district with the condition that a six foot in height board on board fence be placed beginning at the northwestern edge of parking space #1 along the property line continuing east for a total of 130 feet without the return to the garage; Mr. Thompson **seconded**. Poll: 7 ayes; 0 nays. **Motion carried**.

Mr. Iafigliola moved to grant a variance to Section 1274.01(e)(2) to waive the requirement for screening between the accessory parking lot and the street right-of-way; Mr. Thompson seconded. Poll: 7 ayes; 0 nays. Motion carried.

Mr. Iafigliola moved to **grant** a variance to Section 1274.16(c) to permit the use of light fixtures that are not full cut off fixtures as shown on Page 4 of the applicant's submittal drawing; Mr. Munteanu **seconded**. Poll: 7 ayes; 0 nays. **Motion carried**.

Mr. Smerigan indicated that there is also the lot split/consolidation consideration that he would ask the Commission take action on. He would recommend approval subject to final approval by the city engineer. Mr. Iafigliola asked if Mr. Belford had any objections to the split and consolidation. Mr. Martin indicated that he does have to revise the drawing to indicate 9 feet versus the 10.84 feet. Mr. Belford indicated that he has no objection to the lot split and consolidation if the 10.84 is revised to reflect 9.00 feet. Mr. Smerigan indicated that he would suggest the following stipulations, the first one being the revised drawing to 9.00 feet and subject to final signature by the city engineer.

Mr. Iafigliola moved to **approve** the lot split and consolidation as shown on Page 6 of the drawing dated August 13, 2019 with two conditions: (1) final approval by the city engineer and (2) in the northwest corner of the property there is a dimension labeled at 10.84 feet which shall be revised to 9.00 feet and any other corresponding number that may change due to the change of those numbers; Mr. Munteanu **seconded**. Poll: 7 ayes; 0 nays. **Motion carried**.

COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT – No Report

OTHER BUSINESS – Mr. Smerigan indicated that there will be approximately four items on the next agenda. He would like to make the Commission aware that he will be unavailable to attend either of the October meetings. He will also be unavailable for any reviews of applications for the second meeting in October as he will be out of the area. He indicated that if the Commission chooses to schedule a meeting in between the first and second meeting he would be available. Mr. Iafigliola indicated that the Commission will hold one meeting in October that being October 9th at 7:30 p.m. All Commission members agreed.

Mr. Pehanic indicated that he will not be in attendance at the September 18th meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – Mr. Pehanic moved to **approve** the minutes of June 19, 2019, as amended; Mr. Thompson **seconded**. Poll: 7 ayes; 0 nays. **Motion carried**.

Mr. Munteanu moved to **approve** the minutes of July 17, 2019, as amended; Mr. Pehanic **seconded**. Poll: 7 ayes; 0 nays. **Motion carried**.

ADJOURNMENT: Mr. Iafigliola moved to **adjourn**; Mr. Thompson **seconded**. Voice Vote: 7 ayes; 0 nays. **Motion carried**. Meeting adjourned at 9:47 p.m.

Planning & Zoning Commission Clerk

Date

Planning & Zoning Chairman

Date