

## Zoning Commission

1 **Rezoning Application #ZON-21-03**

May 11, 2021

### LEGAL NOTICE

2  
3  
4  
5 Notice is hereby given that the Orange Township Zoning Commission will hold a public hearing on  
6 Tuesday, May 11, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. to consider the following application and discussion:  
7

8 **Rezoning Application #ZON-21-03, Plan 4 Land, LLC**, Requesting to rezone one (1) parcel totaling 2.27  
9 +/- acres from a Farm Residential District (FR-1) to Single Family Planned Residential District (SFPRD)  
10 to allow for three (3) single family homes. The subject property is currently owned by Heather M. Phillips,  
11 Bruce W. MacCready, Robert G. MacCready and Scott G. MacCready and is located at 5576 South Old  
12 State Road, Lewis Center, OH 43035 with parcel number 318-210-01-022-000.  
13

14 *\*Please note, there will be an opportunity for members of the public to speak during the hearing via*  
15 *ZOOM. Statements made or written in any chat rooms shall not serve as public comment. If you would*  
16 *like to speak, please limit your comments to three minutes.*

17 *If you would like to share any comments or have any questions in advance of the hearing, please email*  
18 *our office at [orangezoning@orangetwp.org](mailto:orangezoning@orangetwp.org) as we will forward these to staff and our board members.*

19  
20 The hearing will be held virtually using electronic means and can be accessed by the public on the internet  
21 on the Zoom application at

22 <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83215416602?pwd=bjUzN2ZPbGRXWmN4TVpXRElOMnRSdz09>

23 During the hearing the public may submit questions and comments to the Board by sending messages  
24 to Development and Zoning Director, Michele Boni via the Zoom meeting chat room.

25 Because the ZOOM attendance capacity is limited, if you do not plan on providing public comment, please  
26 consider watching on our Orange Township YouTube Channel where it will also be streamed here:  
27 <https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCIBwuLlPzVT0PPx3xF1M7iQ> .  
28

29 This application is available for examination **by appointment only** from April 27<sup>th</sup>, 2021 through May 10<sup>th</sup>,  
30 2021, inclusive, Mondays through Fridays, excluding legal holidays, during the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 4:30  
31 p.m. at the Orange Township Administrative Offices, 1680 East Orange Road, Lewis Center, Ohio 43035.  
32 Please contact Michele Boni at 740-548-5430 ext. 3125 or [orangezoning@orangetwp.org](mailto:orangezoning@orangetwp.org) to schedule an  
33 appointment. You can also email [orangezoning@orangetwp.org](mailto:orangezoning@orangetwp.org) to request our office to email you the  
34 application.  
35

36 After the conclusion of the hearing, the matter will be submitted to the Orange Township Board of  
37 Township Trustees for its action.  
38

39 Michele Boni, Development and Zoning Director is the person responsible for giving notice of the hearing  
40 by publication.

41 *Adam Pychewicz, Chairperson*  
42 *Michele Boni, Orange Township Zoning*  
43

44 *Publish one time on or before Saturday, May 1, 2021 in the Delaware Gazette.*

45  
46 Roll Call: Adam Pychewicz, Dennis McNulty, Christine Trebellas, Leslie Pierce, Ciara Harris  
47

48 Township Officials Present: Michele Boni, Development and Zoning Director  
49

## Zoning Commission

50 Mr. Pychewicz: We're here tonight to discuss Rezoning Application #ZON-21-03, Plan 4 Land.

51

52 Ms. Boni presented the Staff Report and presentation. They are proposing to rezone 2.27 acres from Farm  
53 Residential District and splitting it into 3 separate lots, to be a Single Family Planning Residential  
54 District. The site is located on S. Old State. There is currently 1 family residence and then they would  
55 make it 3 single family homes total. A divergence is requested as to the platting requirements; the  
56 applicant has requested to not have to plat this property. However, Regional Planning did make it a  
57 condition to their approval that it should be platted, so I'd like to discuss that with the Commission this  
58 evening. As far as Staff comments, I did have a couple of questions but we can get into that further. We  
59 received one written public comment from a nearby resident with some concerns, but I think he may be  
60 on this call, so when we open it up for public comment, feel free to share any concerns then. It's a fairly  
61 simple application; we don't get these too often, so I don't have any big concerns for this proposal.

62

### APPLICANT PRESENTATION/COMMISSION QUESTIONS & COMMENTS

63

64  
65 Joe Clase with Plan 4 Land, 1. S. Harrison Street, Ashley, Ohio 43003 we did an informal with the  
66 Zoning Commission 3 years ago or so, and we talked with your legal counsel at the time about the  
67 Straight Zoning District that Regional Planning initially recommended and found that this probably  
68 wasn't going to be appropriate, so we were directed toward the Planning Residential application. We're  
69 working with the 4 owners of the property to identify what that property might look like; we talked with  
70 Regional Planning, Delaware County Engineer, Soil & Water District and Sanitary Engineer to try and  
71 find the best plan that would work for the site. The existing house has a garage on the north side of the  
72 property and we originally looked at doing a common access drive to come into existing house and then  
73 branch south to these 2 new homes, but between the setbacks and hurdles that we had in the existing  
74 house location, the recommendation was to proceed with the shared access points the way the Delaware  
75 County Subdivision Regulations call it out. We worked the location through with Delaware County, and it  
76 looks like it's on the taper for the drive but they seemed supportive of it because of the ability to limit the  
77 number of trips in and out of the drive. We looked through the Single Family Residential District and we  
78 talked about in the informal was our concern about open space. It looked like the best way to address that  
79 was through a preservation, and the most benefit would be to try and preserve some of the trees at the rear  
80 of the site. There are some on the south side but the most critical for preservation seems as those across  
81 the rear of the property. Those on the south will mostly be retained as part of Lot 3 but not knowing  
82 where someone might build their house, I didn't want to put an easement across those at the same time.  
83 The request for platting was brought up during the informal as well as far as a concern of ours. The cost to  
84 plat a property is pretty extensive, typically involves the dedication of roadway, and I understand  
85 Regional Planning had mentioned that might be a more appropriate way to do the tree preservation  
86 easement but we felt that could be accomplished through the dedication either in advance, if you want to  
87 make it a restriction before the Township signs the lot split that it be presented and recorded, or we could  
88 tie it to the deed that Regional Planning will see, either of which is definitely enforceable and involve a  
89 much less rigorous process than as creating a subdivision plat which would also create winding lot lines  
90 down the road so if anybody did want to adjust the property line, it would be a lot easier to do as part of  
91 the no plat approval lot split which is pretty typical for projects that look like this. I think the only reason  
92 we're talking about a plat is because of the standards and what's in the SFPRD. This is the smallest  
93 planned district I've ever done, however, I think as far as the way they're laid out they typically involve  
94 roads, dedicated open space, other things beyond the tree preservation itself. We'd definitely like to get  
95 that divergence; it's a pretty critical part of the lot split to allow for this split to occur without having to go  
96 through a full subdivision plat because I think the conversation would go back to a common access drive  
97 with a subdivision plat. We explored it pretty heavily but didn't feel it was going to be a good scenario for  
98 this property.

99

## Zoning Commission

100 Ms. Boni: When we met with Joe a couple years ago, we originally thought to do the zoning as an R-3.  
101 That R-3 type of zoning doesn't exist in the Township any more. Probably in the past 20+ years with our  
102 previous counsel it was recommended to move all our residential into a Single Family Planned  
103 Residential District, so that is what we told Joe at the time. If Joe were to zone it to R-3, if that was an  
104 existing zoning, that would not require to be platted. I think when we look at changing our Code, we  
105 might want to reconsider that especially for these smaller parcels. In a typical lot split process, not every  
106 lot split has to get platted. This is just an unusual circumstance because he is applying for that Single  
107 Family District.

108  
109 Mr. McNulty: Educate me about platting. What is it that people would worry about if it wasn't platted as  
110 a standard broken up property? What is it they're concerned about?

111  
112 Mr. Clase: The subdivision plat itself gets signed off by multiple governmental entities and to amend it  
113 has to go in front of a public meeting of the Delaware County Regional Planning Commission, so I think  
114 they typically use the platting process to help guarantee and add another level of protection that  
115 something is not going to be removed in the future. Our thought process was that the tree preservation  
116 easement is going to be dedicated to the benefit of those who own the property and those that own the  
117 property are selling it, so they are going to remain in that chain along with the other 3 owners within this  
118 project. The other item is that it would be a part of the development plan which is kept on file at Regional  
119 Planning so that 50' easement would continue to remain, whether it was altered in some way, but there's  
120 really no way to alter an easement once it's recorded without going through the same process which  
121 would involve the Township, Soil & Water, County Engineer, Health Department, Sanitary and Regional  
122 Planning all signing off on it.

123  
124 Mr. McNulty: I agree for this small piece of property platting seems unnecessary. I potentially see why  
125 they got rid of the R-3 20 years ago, plenty of land in Orange Township, there were a lot of big  
126 developers coming in, and I don't think anyone anticipated the situation we're in now which Michele and  
127 I were just mentioning before it started. There's not a lot of land left in Orange Township. There are a lot  
128 of small chunks like this, and we would like them to be developed and people come in and utilize what's  
129 there, so I'm in agreement with you. I can't see platting being necessary and I think its great use for the  
130 property. Is the existing house going to be torn down and build another house?

131  
132 Mr. Clase: I believe it will remain today. It's probably in for improvement for the area, so there's the  
133 potential that a future owner may tear it down but it would not be part of the lot split.

134  
135 Mr. McNulty: What is the intention for the houses on these properties? Someone must have a vision for  
136 its future.

137  
138 Mr. Clase: What we laid out in the development text was conducive, and we modeled the architectural  
139 standards off of, was it the neighborhood behind this, Michele?

140  
141 Ms. Boni: I sent Joe the typical language we've been using for architectural materials, building materials,  
142 so he pretty much replicated that.

143  
144 Mr. McNulty: What is the typical size of the 3 houses you expect to build on this?

145  
146 Mr. Clase: I think they'll probably exceed the minimum standards, but we did lay out some minimum  
147 standards. We did not spell out a minimum square footage, but I think the expectation is 4 or 5 bedroom  
148 homes with the idea that they're going to meet these standards and obviously the land value market, and  
149 typically the land purchase price is 20% of the improved value so, I think we're looking at something that  
150 would be 5 times what the end sale price is for the marketable lots and from what I understand, these lots

## Zoning Commission

151 will probably be marketed in the \$150-180 range, so that puts our home value up and also increases our  
152 minimum square footage accordingly. We're looking at our dimensional shingles, trying to eliminate  
153 vinyl siding and trying to come up with standards that would be conducive to the neighborhood.

154

155 Mr. Pierce: These homes are going to be purchased by whoever is willing to buy them, right? Going back  
156 to that platting idea, is there any specific protection that that provides the potential new owners so that  
157 they don't potentially have to get into it with the neighbors as to what's what and what's where?

158

159 Mr. Clase: If there was common ownership, it's my idea that it would, but I'm not aware of anything in  
160 this scenario that it would provide protection that you normally wouldn't get.

161

162 Ms. Boni: Because this is a bit unique, when you file the lot split application with us internally, it would  
163 show the tree preservation area?

164

165 Mr. Clase: Yes, and it would be on all the survey work as well.

166

167 Ms. Boni: Do the owners ever have any intention of splitting the lots smaller in the future?

168

169 Mr. Clase: I don't think they do and with them being sold at the .6 range, the actual acreages that are on  
170 there, I don't think the future owners would be interested in splitting either because the acreages lend  
171 themselves pretty well, .69, .83, to single family build sites.

172

173 Ms. Boni: I only ask because the way the text is written does restrict it to no more than 3 lots.

174

175 Mr. Clase: I don't think they'd have that plan, and I think that would be part of a guarantee to the ones  
176 that buy these lots that their neighbors are not going to try and split their lots either.

177

178 Ms. Boni: Did the County Engineer approve the 2 access points off of S. Old State?

179

180 Mr. Clase: They will as part of the lot split process but they can't technically approve it until its split.  
181 They'll approve the development plans it is my understanding, they've been a part of the discussion. I  
182 talked to Will at their office today just to reaffirm that there weren't any bans on access at that location.

183

184 Ms. Boni: Because typically we get a letter from the County Engineer even if it's something preliminary  
185 saying they believe they're not going to foresee any issues but I just wanted to clarify that because I know  
186 the resident's concern that we did get was referring to access.

187

188 Mr. Clase: They will provide that as part of the lot split so we'll be back here trying to amend the plan if  
189 we can't get that approved. It would come subsequent to the split itself.

190

191 Ms. Trebellas: That was one of my concerns as well. Generally additional curb cuts are not encouraged on  
192 S. Old State and that was a resident's concern. What are the plans for Old State because I thought at one  
193 time that was going to be 3 lanes in front of those houses, and I was wondering if you had discussed that  
194 with the County Engineer because that's also an issue if that road is going to be developed. That road at  
195 Lewis Center can be a busy intersection.

196

197 Mr. Clase: I believe that's it's going to be a widened roadway and it's my understanding that that's why  
198 they've asked for 50' of dedicated road right-of-way here was to facilitate additional lanes.

199

200 Mr. Pychewicz: The way I see it with that additional right-of-way dedication it wouldn't have a  
201 significant impact on what's being proposed as long as it's laid out the way you're showing it here. I

## Zoning Commission

202 don't see that necessarily being an issue. I think by adding 2 houses and condensing it down to 1  
203 driveway, because 1 of these driveways is already existing for the house, so adding 1 driveway that is  
204 split, although not ideal, is better than 2 more driveways right next to each other on S. Old State. The only  
205 question I have, if you were doing the plat process, that requires bonds and everything in case say this  
206 was a much larger development which for larger developments it makes sense that if something was to go  
207 belly up or someone was to back out, they have the funds to finish out that project, and I don't see that  
208 being an issue here. I don't have any opposition on not doing the plat for these parcels; I don't think  
209 there's really much risk there for not doing that. I think what you're proposing here looks great.

210  
211 Ms. Trebellas: I understand because it's only 3 lots it's not a whole subdivision of 100 houses that the  
212 platting process that's designed for subdivision isn't maybe applicable. If you could explain a little better  
213 how we can insure that tree easement is going to be preserved. You said it was going into restrictions or  
214 go before Michele when she approves the lot split; how exactly does that work?

215  
216 Mr. Clase: I've done them a number of different ways. My preference if it's okay with Michele would be  
217 to present her the easement. We could even name Orange Township in the dedication so there's  
218 enforceability on Orange Township's part that if it would try to go away the ownership would fall to  
219 Orange Township but there are also jurisdictions who say they don't want any part of that. We didn't  
220 come in with a preconceived idea of how we were going to achieve it but we were committed to however  
221 the Board would see appropriate that we would make sure that that was recorded as part of the lot split  
222 and obviously there are protections in there. We did stipulate on the development plan that it would be to  
223 protect trees of a certain caliber and that they should be reviewed to make sure if they are dead or dying,  
224 they are to be removed. Like when we had the ash bore come through, there might be situations where it  
225 would need to be reviewed. We can either attach that to the deed or do it as a separate easement and  
226 present it to the Township as part of the lot split for approval. We're open to either scenario and if  
227 approved, you still have to sign off on the lot split, so there's protection there to make sure it goes through  
228 at that time.

229  
230 Ms. Trebellas: I would like to see some sort of language for that easement. I will rely on Michele with  
231 what works best for her office, but I would like to see that easement because that is one of the protections  
232 of the plat is my understanding, to insure that, but if we can find another way to do that I can forego the  
233 platting process.

234  
235 Ms. Boni: I just drafted something if we are making a recommendation as a modification to include  
236 language in the development text to insure the tree easement is recorded prior to issuance of the lot split  
237 application approved by the Zoning Inspector.

238  
239 Mr. Pierce: Michele, what did you say was the requirement of the plat for the Township's specific  
240 requirement that had to be done under certain circumstances?

241  
242 Ms. Boni: Properties that are zoned to Single Family Planned Residential District, which is what Joe is  
243 applying for, is required in the zoning to be platted. However, this zoning really is for subdivisions, this is  
244 just 3 single family homes, so he is requesting a divergence to not have to plat.

245  
246 Mr. Pierce: If it's a request under a single family farm or something like that, should he stick with the  
247 plat. If individuals come along who may buy the property at a later date and even though it's been  
248 recorded, just enforcing going through all those other layers that Joe shared I think is pretty important  
249 when you're talking home ownership, so I wouldn't want to see that weakened.

250  
251 Ms. Harris: That was my comment as well. Hypothetically could there be a scenario where one of these  
252 homeowners would need a plat in order to move forward with any type of changes to the land?

## Zoning Commission

253  
254 Mr. Clase: Not that I'm aware of. Typically a plat would be for the dedication of a road or a common  
255 access easement. The shared access easement is an exception to that in the Delaware County Subdivision  
256 Regulations and they allow it under the no plat lot split, so I think the only thing they would be platting  
257 would be additional lots. If they did that, they'd have to come back in front of you to modify their zoning  
258 and I'm sure the other new owners wouldn't be happy and would probably be attending saying this is  
259 what we bought into it with the idea of this is what's going to be here, so I don't think a plat would be  
260 desirable for any of them.  
261  
262 Mr. Pychewicz: And the boundaries of each property would be recorded with the lot split as laid out here  
263 so those areas are defined.  
264  
265 Mr. Pierce: Just going back to the plat on the survey of the property; I assume that's recorded somewhere  
266 and not just this is what we think it is.  
267  
268 Mr. Clase: Are you saying the survey for the preservation easement?  
269  
270 Mr. Pierce: Yes, and just the property in general.  
271  
272 Mr. Clase: We would include that in the survey for the individual lots as well as the legal description that  
273 we can present to Michele, so we'll have both of those included.  
274  
275 Mr. Pierce: From the tree line back, what was that?  
276  
277 Mr. Clase: 50'. There's a 35' easement setback but it would be in addition to that, so it would be 50',  
278 going 15' into the building pads.  
279  
280 Ms. Boni: With that easement, that would really make it a larger rear yard setback.  
281  
282 Mr. Clase: I think the only way they'd be able to build in there is if they were not impacting a tree at all.  
283 For the most part it's pretty heavily wooded right now.  
284  
285 Mr. Pierce: And that's recorded with each deed I presume so if the property sold from person to person,  
286 everyone would be aware of that.  
287  
288 Mr. Clase: Correct. We would call that out as well as the architectural standards in each deed as they get  
289 recorded so each lot is aware of the restrictions that are placed upon them.  
290  
291 Mr. Pychewicz: Going to public comment, there are a couple of ground rules for public comment. Any  
292 statements made or written in any chat rooms shall not serve as public comment. If you wish to speak,  
293 please unmute yourself, state your name and address, and limit your comments to 3 minutes.  
294  
295 Ms. Boni: Maybe we don't have any public comment but if the Board could confirm that they did receive  
296 the concern I sent.  
297  
298 Confirmed by Board all received.  
299  
300 Mr. Pychewicz: At this time then I will close public comment.  
301

## Zoning Commission

302 Ms. Boni: As far as public comment, for those that did not speak but wish to speak at a later date, we will  
303 be moving to the Trustee hearing after this evening and that will reopen public comments. Otherwise, you  
304 can email me any comments you may have and I will pass them on to the Board members.

305  
306 **RESOLUTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF ZONING APPLICATION #ZON-21-03 OF**  
307 **PLAN FOR LAND LLC WITH MODIFICATIONS.**  
308

309 Motion by Mr. McNulty to recommend to the Board of Township Trustees (the “Board”)  
310 the approval of Zoning Application #ZON-21-03 of Plan for Land LLC, the property owner, requesting the  
311 rezoning of 2.27 +/- acres from Farm Residential District (FR-1) to a Single Family Planned Residential  
312 District (SFPRD) with modifications, upon finding that it is in the interest of the public convenience,  
313 comfort, prosperity, or general welfare, and is sufficiently in accordance with the comprehensive plan. The  
314 version of the application recommended to be approved consists of those materials submitted by the  
315 applicant in a hard copy binder titled *MacCready NPA* the pages of which are each stamped RECEIVED  
316 with ORANGE TWP. ZONING above and APRIL 9 2021 superimposed by Orange Township Zoning  
317 (collectively, the “Development Plan”) and including modifications listed below:

- 318 1. Include language in the development text to ensure the Tree Easement shall be recorded prior to  
319 the issuance of the lot split application approved by the Zoning Inspector.

320 Further moved that the Zoning Secretary shall certify a copy of this resolution to the Board.

321 Seconded by Mr. Pierce

322  
323 Vote on Motion: Mr. Pychewicz-yes, Mr. McNulty-yes, Ms. Trebellas-yes, Mr. Pierce-yes, Ms. Harris-yes  
324 Motion carried

### **Approval of Minutes**

325  
326  
327 Mr. Piece made a motion to approve the March 9, 2021 meeting minutes of the Orange Township Zoning  
328 Commission for Zoning Application #21-01, North Farms Condominiums, LLC, with the following  
329 corrections:

- 330  
331 • Change the application number to #ZON-21-01 throughout the application  
332 • Revise the footer designation to reflect the current application

333 Seconded by Ms. Harris

334  
335 Vote on Motion: Mr. Pychewicz-yes, Mr. McNulty-yes, Ms. Trebellas-yes, Mr. Piece-yes, Ms. Harris-yes  
336 Motion carried

337  
338 Ms. Trebellas made a motion to approve the March 16, 2021 meeting minutes of the Orange Township  
339 Zoning Commission for Rezoning Application #ZON-21-02, Real Property Design & Development,  
340 LLC, with the following corrections:

- 341  
342 • Line 44: “and” should read “in”  
343 • Line 57 “District” should read “Districts”  
344 • Line 82 should read: “...I think the applicant has heard from the County Engineer that the access  
345 needs to be reconfigured....”

## Zoning Commission

- 346 • Line 292: “property” should read “proposed”
- 347 • Line 552: “Mt.” should read “Mr.”
- 348 • Line 569: “ate” should read “are”

349  
350 Seconded by Mr. Pierce

351  
352 Vote on Motion: Mr. Pychewicz-yes, Mr. McNulty-yes, Ms. Trebellas-yes, Mr. Pierce-yes, Ms. Harris-  
353 yes  
354 Motion carried

355  
356 Mr. McNulty made a motion to approve the meeting minutes of the Orange Township Zoning  
357 Commission dated April 6, 2021 for Route 23 Corridor Overlay District Application #RCOD-21-01,  
358 Sheetz Development, with the following correction:

- 359  
360 • Line 50: “3o” should read “30”

361  
362 Seconded by Ms. Trebellas

363  
364 Vote on Motion: Mr. Pychewicz-abstain, Mr. McNulty-yes, Ms. Trebellas-yes, Mr. Pierce-yes, Ms.  
365 Harris-yes  
366 Motion carried

### Other Business

367  
368  
369 Ms. Boni: We got 3 proposals for the zoning resolution rewrite and we have asked the Chair and Vice  
370 Chair to be a part of it, so Adam and Dennis will be involved in the ranking of the proposals. So after we  
371 do that there will be 5 of us ranking, including 3 staff. We will determine the top candidate and that will  
372 be presented to the Zoning Commission. That will be in June. We don’t have anything going on for the  
373 June 15<sup>th</sup> hearing so I don’t know if that seems like an available date but I’ll probably be aiming toward  
374 that to get everything set up.

375  
376  
377 Mr. Pychewicz: Has the deadline already passed for that submittal?

378  
379 Ms. Boni: Yes. The deadline was last Friday. I’ll be working with our legal counsel on this. It’s going to  
380 take some time to finalize the contract for our top candidate and we’ll need to pass a motion to select the  
381 candidate, approve the cost and make a plan. But June 15 is what I’m aiming for; is that something you all  
382 would be available to discuss? I’ll probably send that out in the next week or so.

383  
384 Mr. Pychewicz: Christine, I know you said you were going to be busy for the foreseeable future but is  
385 there any way you think you can make that meeting or is it play by ear right now?

386  
387 Ms. Trebellas: Right now I’m going to play it by ear. Someone in my office left so I’ve gotten to manage  
388 all their projects in the meanwhile, so until we can get more staff on board, I’m a little swamped right  
389 now.

390  
391 Ms. Boni: Obviously I’d love all of the Board’s input on making sure we’re selecting the right candidate,  
392 but Christine I would definitely want your input once we start having these meetings in reviewing the  
393 Code.

394



## Zoning Commission

395 Mr. Pychewicz: June 15 is the meeting to pick the candidate; I meant when we start reviewing the Code I  
396 was hoping Christine could be there as well.

397

398 Ms. Trebellas: I'm hoping our staffing problems will be resolved by then as well. I'd like to be there  
399 because I've gone through these a couple times before and I think Dennis has as well.

400

401 Mr. McNulty: Yes, and the last time was a nightmare.

402

403 Ms. Boni: I think this will be a little more structured and hopefully I have some notes together for the  
404 June 15<sup>th</sup> meeting to even talk some structure and a game plan on how these meetings should be held.

405 That I think should just be an open dialogue and we can give each other direction on how we want to  
406 move forward. Typically these kind of projects can take up to a year, so we did budget for that

407 appropriately, so we'll see how it goes.

408

409

410

411

412 Meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

413 Minutes prepared by Cindy Davis, Zoning Secretary