

**PERRYSBURG TOWNSHIP ZONING COMMISSION**  
**26609 Lime City Road**  
**Perrysburg, OH 43551**

ZONING COMMISSION MEETING  
APRIL 11, 2005

Robert S. Black, Chairman, called the Perrysburg Township Zoning Commission meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and welcomed everybody. A roll call was taken.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Robert S. Black, Jeff Schaller, Carol Warnimont, John J. Benavides, and Stephen J. Stanford.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Arthur Rometo and Jeffrey Normand.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA: Ms. Warnimont moved with a second by Mr. Benavides to approve the agenda. A roll call vote was taken. Yes votes by Ms. Warnimont, Mr. Benavides, Mr. Stanford, Mr. Schaller, and Mr. Black. Motion carried 5-0-0.

APPROVAL OF 3/14/05 MEETING MINUTES: Mr. Schaller moved with a second by Ms. Warnimont to approve the minutes. There was no further discussion. A roll call vote was taken. Yes votes by Mr. Schaller, Ms. Warnimont, Mr. Benavides, and Mr. Black. Mr. Stanford abstained. Motion carried 4-0-1.

Mr. Black asked if anyone present in the audience had any non-agenda items of interest to the zoning commission to discuss, and no one responded.

**ZONING CHANGE APPLICATION NUMBER ZC-2005-02.** Mr. Kurt Miller of Miller Diversified, Inc., brought in an application from a William J. Wolf and Antoinette Wolf who wish to have their property rezoned. This property is located at the northwest corner of Neiderhouse and Thompson Roads and is approximately 41 acres in size. The property is presently zoned A-1 (Agricultural District). They are requesting that the zoning be changed to R-3 Suburban Residential District (Medium Density). The developer has stated that they would like to develop a single-family residential subdivision with approximately 90 lots. It is recommended that the zoning commission direct its zoning inspector to forward this application to the Wood County Planning Commission for its consideration and recommendation. Please note the letter attached concerning the postponement of the hearing process.

Mr. Black asked Mr. Garn if he had anything to share with the commission. Mr. Garn responded saying up to this point Mr. Miller of Miller Diversified pulled their application before it went before the planning commission, and they have mailed the application to the zoning commission for resubmittal. It was indicated that they would be submitting

a subdivision plot plan concurrently with their application for a zoning change to be held at the Wood County Planning Commission basically a little less than a month from now.

Mr. Black asked if there was anyone present for that application, and he informed them that what will happen is there will be a public hearing next month. They are going to resubmit an application that will be just like the last one with the addition of the actual plot plan. Mr. Black asked Mr. Garn if he would re-notify the interested parties, and Mr. Garn said yes, he would re-notify the adjoining property owners. The hearing date at the planning commission will be May 3, 2005, at 7:00 p.m., and it will be back at the zoning commission on May 9<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Black asked if anyone who is present and concerned about this issue had any questions at this point. There were no questions.

Mr. Black asked if there was a motion to send this application to the planning commission. Ms. Warnimont moved with a second by Mr. Schaller. There was no other discussion on the motion. A roll call vote was taken. Yes votes by Ms. Warnimont, Mr. Schaller, Mr. Benavides, Mr. Stanford, and Mr. Black. Motion carried 5-0-0.

**ZONING CHANGE APPLICATION NUMBER ZC-2005-03.** On April 4, 2005, an application for rezoning from Reitzel Realty was brought into their office. This property is located on the west side of Oregon Road, north of the Walgreen's entrance, which is north of SR 795 and is approximately 12.8 acres in size. The property is presently zoned C-2 (Community Business District). They are requesting that the zoning be changed to R-5 (Multiple Family Residential District, High Density). It is recommended that the zoning commission direct its zoning inspector to forward this application to the Wood County Planning Commission for its consideration and recommendation.

Sean McMahon addressed the commission regarding this application. He informed the commission that on Mr. Garn's suggestion, they came in preliminarily to meet with the commission and show them what they have in mind. He introduced Keith Reitz who was present with him, and he can share a little bit about the types of plants for landscaping. Essentially they are applying for a change from C-2 to R-5, 12.8 acres near the corner of Oregon and 795. They plan on constructing some medium density multi-family apartments on the property with attached garages, all possibly single story.

Mr. Black asked Mr. Garn if he had any questions. Mr. Garn said he did not have any questions. The only thing, which is unique that may or may happen, is what just took place with the previous one where they actually were doing a subdivision plan along with that so that it locked in exactly what was going to take place on that property. He informed the commission and the applicant that he was not making any suggestions, he is just saying that was a first for them. They have done that in some other townships in Wood County. Mr. McMahon said that was submitted along with the initial rezoning, and Mr. Garn said no, that was not, it's a separate thing. So they actually do not have that plan here at all. He has no copies of that. It was a concurrent review. They could always talk to Wood County Planning Commission if they wanted to about something

like that. There is a lot of work involved getting it ready for that type of review. He is not saying that it would need to be done, but it did lock in because they said they are going to a medium density versus a higher density. Mr. McMahon said so they could submit that simultaneously, and Mr. Garn said yes. Mr. McMahon thanked Mr. Garn for that information.

Mr. Black asked if any commission members had any questions. Ms. Warnimont asked what happened with the question that they had about supposed to have the tropic lights, and she indicated where, at some point when that was supposed to be developed. Mr. McMahon said at the entrance to Starbright. Ms. Warnimont said right, and this is where they wanted to develop and put a gas station in and the commission would not let them. They haven't brought it back through because of the traffic patterns. And they wanted to put it, the entrance and everything down closer to the 795 and the intersection right there. What's going to happen with all that. They are changing it. They have an entry up here. They are not going to put it perpendicular like the other one. Mr. McMahon said they will still have an entrance. Right now the property is deed restricted, both this piece and the piece to the south. If she remembers with the gas station they had the issue where things were looking positive for it, but they couldn't get the right-in, right-out off of 795 on the corner. And so essentially one of the reasons they feel it would benefit the property to rezone it from C-2 to R-5 is that they are restricted on the entrance across from Starbright. So with 12.8 acres of commercial property in kind of a square piece, it's probably more suited to a residential development since it really only has one access. Ms. Warnimont said that's going to prevent and they won't have any kind of right-of-way going along side of that to get into this property here; right. Mr. McMahon said that's correct, but they wouldn't be able to do that to get across Walgreen's drive without an easement. He asked if she was saying would there be a frontage drive that connects the two, and he said they couldn't do that without an easement. But the property to the south they would still plan on restricting as per the deed restrictions so they have two entrances left on the south piece. So they would have one entrance up here across from Starbright. With the 12.8 acre piece being square like it is, it really is better suited towards the residential because it's not quite big enough for a single commercial user like a large retailer. The smaller ones would only have one access off of Oregon Road.

Mr. Black asked how many living units they are calling for on this site. Keith Reitz addressed the commission regarding this application. He informed the commission that they get at most 9 units, 9 suites per acre, and that's it. They couldn't put more on there even if they wanted to. He does not think they will end up getting that type of density. These are two bedroom, two bathroom, one and two car garages. They look like condos. People confuse them for condos all the time. It's pretty upscale. It's not sub sized housing or any government money, it's just a real nice, quiet product. He asked if there were any other questions.

Mr. Black asked if there was a motion to send this to the planning commission. Mr. Benavides moved with a second by Mr. Stanford. There was no other discussion. A roll call vote was taken. Yes votes by Mr. Benavides, Mr. Stanford, Mr. Schaller, Ms. Warnimont, and Mr. Black. Motion carried 5-0-0.

**SITE PLAN REVIEW FOR ABC TOLEDO, NUMBER SPR 2005-01.** ABC Toledo of 9797 Fremont Pike would like to build a new addition on to their auction building. A copy of their plans is attached. An independent engineering firm is reviewing their plans and checklist for compliance. A copy of their findings is attached. They are still working on the deficiencies.

John DiSalle addressed the commission regarding this site plan. Mr. DiSalle informed the commission that Mark Shambarger is also present with him this evening, and he is the architect for this project. He introduced the other people present with him this evening. Mr. Black informed Mr. DiSalle that they had received some additional information and wondered if Mr. DiSalle had that. Mr. DiSalle responded he did not know about an April 8<sup>th</sup> letter, but he saw an April 6<sup>th</sup> letter.

Mark Shambarger addressed the commission regarding the site plan. He informed the commission that this is a letter that was drafted by Dave Kuhn, plan reviewer. Since then there has been information forwarded by their civil engineer to Dave Kuhn, and Mr. Kuhn has responded to Mr. Garn this day with that information. They had a surveyor out this morning checking the surface water elevation which confirms that it's very, very close to what the original design was. So the projected storage volume should be as designed. The information that they have to go with on the original plans shows so many cubic feet of storage available. It seems to be functioning as designed. They had a problem with the meter line originally. That's why the water raised out on to the parking lot and basically came to bank full on the pond. It was a maintenance problem. Since then it's been alleviated. They dug up the pipe, they cleared up the problem, and it seems to be functioning as designed.

Mr. Black thought the impression was how to widen the pond and wanted to know if that was right, and Mr. Shambarger said correct. Mr. Garn said that is still up in the air. He did talk to Mr. Shambarger beforehand where he feels that it was probably resurveyed by Debo's, but he has no idea. Mr. Black asked if that was Mr. Kuhn's survey that he was talking about, and Mr. Shambarger said no, they had surveyors out there today just confirming the water surface elevation, and found some invert elevations on some of the storm drainage. The surveyor came back with that information. It was sent to Jim Colony. He reviewed it, got to Mr. Kuhn, and evidently everybody is happy with the design calculations and the functioning of the existing system. Now, he has been out there with the plans, have looked at the pond and the swale that continues to the back of the property. It appears to be as planned, as designed. Now, he has not measured it. It's just sort of a visual stand, but it looks correct. And the electronic information that they received from the original survey

when there was a problem with the pond before, the invert pipe out of the pond was floating, had to be reinstalled. At that time they believe there was more engineering surveying done on the pond at that time to recalculate volumes, storage. The electronic data that they have, the contours of the pond seem to him to be a little irregular, so it leads him to believe that that was an as-built or as-surveyed extent of the contours. If they were to design something, it would be more regular, more refined, more squared off. It just looks to be or appear that it has been surveyed, and that is an as-built, but he can't confirm that.

Mr. Black asked Mr. Garn if he was satisfied with that. Mr. Black said he was a little confused. Mr. Garn said right, that's the same thing that they are all presuming that it was all resurveyed and re-engineered. He knows that Mr. Kuhn won't certify anything, and he can't either. No one knows for sure that it was all surveyed as built. Now maybe they could provide a letter from Debo's saying that it was resurveyed as built, or they could get a boat and go out and do some investigation.

Mr. Black thought the question was was it built as designed, and then was it designed appropriate. Mr. Shambarger said the original calculations that they were dealing with that Mr. Colony has confirmed is adequate, and the hydraulic calculations work. Now, if you go to the drawing as it is and you find out how much volume is available for storage, it works. The amount of head works with the size of the meter line out at the street. So he guesses the only question is what is the physical extent and the physical shape and size of the pond. He guesses if they got conditional approval, they could provide that information and confirm it. They didn't have the time to make this happen to meet tonight's meeting, but they've really been trying. They would be more than willing to have their surveyor back to confirm that and provide that.

Mr. Black asked what would happen if it didn't come back that way. Then what is their plan. Mr. Shambarger said at that point he would have to defer this to others, but he is thinking they would plan some kind of remediation at that point. Mr. Black asked Mr. Garn if that was acceptable. Mr. Garn said that would be acceptable, as long as they would do the remediation that was required. He assumed by remediation they are talking about redigging, and Mr. Shambarger said if they had to make adjustments to the size or to get that water volume. Mr. Black asked when they would propose to do that work, and in conjunction with what. Mr. Shambarger said he assumed it would happen in concert with the addition. Ms. Warnimont said she thought they would want it before that addition started. Mr. Shambarger said that equipment is going to be out there, so if there is anything that needs to be adjusted, that would be the time to do it.

Mr. Black asked Mr. Garn if that was the only issue. Mr. Garn said the other issue which Mr. Shambarger would maybe talk about was he brought in some additional drawings about landscaping. Mr. Shambarger said there is some question about the number of trees per square footage of paved area where they are dealing with that they had 30 some trees shown. They have increased that number to reflect what Mr.

Kuhn has calculated. So they have added the additional trees to the site. There are a couple pieces of plant material in the right-of-way. They have adjusted that, pulled them out, and evidently there was some other shrubbery that was considered too close to the pavement which they have relocated. Mr. Black said that Mr. Garn made some comment earlier about the landscaping he did not have a chance to review. Mr. Garn said he has not had that. Mr. Shambarger said they got it fresh and hot off the press today at 3:00. He checked it over himself and it seems to have addressed all of Mr. Kuhn's issues. Mr. Kuhn has not seen it, but he believes it has corrected those issues.

Mr. Black said to Mr. Garn given that issue and the storm water issues, are those the only two, and Mr. Garn said those are the only two that need to be resubmitted to Mr. Kuhn just to make sure they comply. Mr. Shambarger said they were going to do that. Mr. Garn said he would not issue them any zoning permits until they complied.

Mr. Black asked if there were any comments from the commission members and asked if there was a motion to approve the site plan subject to Mr. Kuhn reviewing the storm water issue and the resubmitted landscape issue. Ms. Warnimont moved with a second by Mr. Schaller to approve the site plan subject to those conditions. Mr. Black asked if there were any other comments from the commission members, and there were none. A roll call vote was taken. Yes votes by Ms. Warnimont, Mr. Schaller, Mr. Benavides, Mr. Stanford, and Mr. Black. Motion carried 5-0-0.

**SITE PLAN REVIEW FOR ECKEL TRACE, NUMBER SPR 2005-02.** West Valley Development would like to build a subdivision at the corner of SR 199 and Eckel Junction Road. A copy of their plans is attached. An independent engineering firm is reviewing their plans and checklist for compliance. A copy of their findings is attached. They are applying to the BZA for conditional use approval of their proposed ponds. The BZA would appreciate your guidance and recommendation.

Mr. Garn informed Mr. DiSalle that later on when things are approved, he will have some drawings available for signage by the commission and a representative of their group. They will be the original site plan review drawings.

Dave Saneholtz addressed the commission regarding this site plan. He started off by saying that the items that they are talking about are the two retention ponds that have been designed into the subdivision plan. He thinks that most of the members of the commission present this evening were present when they asked for rezoning of this parcel. The location and size of the retention ponds that were shown on this plan are essentially the same as what were shown on the concept plan that they brought before this commission at that time. They have now been engineered with more detail to them, the final sizing and all that good stuff. They have filed with the board of zoning appeals already for the ponds. The one pond is located up in the northwest corner near the corner of Eckel Junction Road and SR 199. That pond is the smaller of the two ponds that they have designed on the site. That pond provides some storm water

management facilities. It is also a requirement of the Ohio EPA now for a development of this size to have ways of providing closed construction storm water quality improvements, and that is the logical location for that to be very near the discharge point. Their discharge point for this storm system is to the west side of 199 going through that small pond at that location. The other pond is located more centrally within the development, the overall development. It's a little bit to the north maybe. It's more of a long, rectangular pond. It stretches from the west to the east and abuts several lots on the rear of those lots. The reason they put this in is to lock in to their storm water management for the subdivision, and in their opinion this provides them an opportunity to attract a different type of market to this area, or to their development, a market that would like some water out the rear that they would front or abut up against. They have maybe a half dozen lots there, maybe a dozen lots there that would have that opportunity at sometime within the development to have that water frontage or rearage if that's such a word.

As far as street trees, he has a copy of the letter from Feller Finch. Item number 2 talks about having street trees meeting the Wood County and Perrysburg Township requirements. They will definitely have that. All the other items they can address. Mr. Kuhn in his letter talks about providing a copy of the EPA/NOI application. They can either provide that, or they can provide the NPDS permit that was issued by OEPA for this development. They do have a copy of that or can provide a copy of that, so they have one of those two items. The NPDS permit is a 36 page item. The NOI is a one page application form.

Mr. Black asked Mr. Garn if he had any comments. Mr. Garn said just talking about some items as to item 4, A through D, about size of the pond, if there is any aeration of the ponds, the depth of the ponds. Just some issues to go over there. He knows that Mr. Sanholtz will be going over those with the BZA.

Mr. Sanholtz responded that as far as the comments that are in item 4, talking about the ponds, his first comment is that he thinks the pond regulations, and he may be incorrect in saying this, but he thinks they apply more to those individual lot owners that would like or desire a pond as opposed to what they are providing. What they are providing here is a storm management system along with the abilities of having something a little bit aesthetic with a body of water.

As far as the ponds being on lots 2 acres in size or larger, they do not meet that requirement. The small pond for post quality storm water is definitely on a couple lots, and it is not on 2 acres. The larger pond he is guessing is not on 2 acres either. But he assumes that requirement was primarily to again talk about ponds as they relate to an individual homeowner.

The ponds do not have a minimum distance from the top of bank of 25 feet from any existing or proposed adjacent property owners. They anticipate that the lots that they

are proposing that about this storm management pond/lake, whatever you want to call it, actually would like to have the pond somewhat close to their property line so that they have the advantage of having that water considered in their back yard. It also provides some distance between them and their normal adjacent property owner in the rear.

The ponds do not meet a minimum water depth of 17 feet. He actually thinks that has been corrected in the zoning code to 12 feet. Mr. Garn agreed. Mr. Saneholtz continued saying their larger pond does have 12 feet of depth.

The ponds are not located at least 70 feet from any existing or proposed right-of-way. The major pond is closer than 70 feet to their one roadway that runs north and south on the west side of that pond, and the other pond which is tucked up in the corner of Eckel Junction and 199 definitely does not meet that setback from that right-of-way, and that's why they are going to BZA.

Mr. Black asked if the ponds are going to not be owned by the home owners' association, and Mr. Saneholtz said yes, and then said the one up in the northeast corner is actually on a couple lots, but there will be an easement for maintenance of that pond given to the home owners' association. The second pond that has frontage on one of the roadways will be maintained by the home owners' association. Mr. Saneholtz pointed out the ponds on the plan.

A question was asked if these ponds will have water in them all the time, and Mr. Saneholtz said that is correct. They are not dry ponds. A question was asked about the water elevations varying. Mr. Saneholtz responded that the water elevation will vary about 3 feet. A question was asked about what the minimum water depth was expected to be maintained. Mr. Saneholtz said in the one pond will be a minimum of 12 feet maintained at least in part of the bottom of the pond. These are not flat ponds, and there are some low areas. There will 12 feet in the one. The smaller one they are anticipating there will be 8 to 10 feet of water depth in that. They didn't want to put it in, but it is an EPA requirement to have that type of facility up in the area where they have it.

Mr. Black asked Mr. Garn if he had any other questions. Mr. Garn said he thinks Mr. Saneholtz used some of the old zoning resolution and didn't pick up some of the changes in the ponds, and one of them is aeration. He didn't know if it was going to be possible to aerate those ponds to cut out stagnation. Mr. Saneholtz responded saying they are not proposing to put aeration in these ponds at this time. If they become stagnated, he assumes that the home owners' association which is going to be in charge of maintaining these ponds will have to address that issue. As far as whether or not aeration is needed in a pond that's 12 feet, that's always questionable. He knows there are some people that believe that if you get over 8 feet deep you can get enough of a water turnover that the pond can take care of itself. There are other people that

believe that you need 17 feet. He thinks there are a lot of differences on that. He believes if you have anywhere from 8 and above, and if you have ever been by their office, they have a small aeration fountain in front just for looks. It doesn't really aerate, but that pond, it's depth is 8 feet, and it goes up to 6 feet at points. He won't disagree that during very dry periods of time you may get some evaporation so the water level will go down, and you may get some algae to build up on the ends of the pond, but it's so questionable as to exactly the quality of the water in there as far as seasons and rainfall and all that. So they feel confident that the ponds will function properly. Mr. Black asked Mr. Garn if the regulations do require aeration as he understands it, and Mr. Garn said yes it does, aeration and the bubbling type instead of the fountain type.

Mr. Black then asked if the BZA is then asking for a recommendation from the ZC, and Mr. Garn said yes, they were looking for a recommendation because they have other issues such as the fencing and so on because it is a residential area. Aeration would be one of the bigger issues along with the size. Mr. Black said he would make a recommendation that they approve it subject to it having aeration.

Mr. Black asked if there were any other comments. Ms. Warnimont had one on the smaller pond, seeing that it is so close to the roadway, and the slope of the roadway, do they anticipate any drainage from the roadway into that causing it to overflow or build it up higher. Mr. Saneholtz said no, they took that into account, the area that normally drains that way anyway. The slope coming down on them, whenever you design something, you have to take a look at the contours and what normally would run off, so they took half the roadway and assumed that it was coming down towards their detention pond.

Ms. Warnimont said and that back part is not going to be fenced at all closer to 199 and Eckel Junction, and Mr. Saneholtz said no, they are not planning on putting any fence back in there primarily because this actually goes way up in the air there. He would guess that Eckel Junction goes up probably 15 feet at that location, and 199 goes up 15 feet at that intersection. So they don't anticipate having any type of fencing or anything around this, and they don't see a problem there. He does not have any knowledge of anybody coming off of that intersection and coming down or having a problem with that. Ms. Warnimont asked about how many feet was that. She thought that was a turn lane there, isn't it. Mr. Saneholtz said no. Ms. Warnimont thought that was a turn lane showing going in to Eckel Junction. Mr. Saneholtz said that was the public right-of-way, the embankment.

Mr. Black asked if the home owners' association was going to be just these plats right here, or is it larger. Mr. Saneholtz said it would just be these plats. Mr. Black said what they see there is one home owners' association, and Mr. Saneholtz said correct, about 115 lots total he thinks it is.

Mr. Black asked if there were any other comments. The comment was made that their regulations require aeration in both ponds then and that's what the motion is. Mr. Black asked if there was a second to that motion. Mr. Stanford was the second on the motion. So to reiterate, Mr. Black moved with a second by Mr. Stanford to approve the site plan with the condition that both ponds be aerated. Mr. Black asked if there was any other discussion, and there was none. A roll call vote was taken. Yes votes by Mr. Black, Mr. Stanford, Ms. Warnimont, Mr. Benavides, and Mr. Schaller. Motion carried 5-0-0. Mr. Garn asked if that was for a recommendation, and Mr. Black said that was just a recommendation. It is the BZA's responsibility.

Mr. Black commented to Mr. Garn that there is a letter from the WCPC concerning the PUD amendment for Fox Cove Villas. Mr. Garn said yes. Mr. Black said he does not remember having to deal with an issue like this before. Mr. Garn said this is the first time they have. What's happened is the different projects like Wexford, all the different condo projects have sold off individual lots in there, and they are similar to condo projects. And Wood County and Dave Steiner decided to do these as a subdivision plan sort of in order to designate these different lots that can be sold off to the individual home owners. So the footprint is surrounded by land owned by the association that they have to maintain. This was their ability to sell off these lots. So they were notifying the commission because they passed this on Fox Cove. They have passed this same thing before on other subdivisions. Mr. Black said so the footprint itself is the same, it's an ownership issue, and Mr. Garn said right, it's an ownership issue. It really has nothing to do with anything that they would approve as a major or a minor amendment. Mr. Black asked if they need to approve it as a non major amendment, or for that reason a minor, and Mr. Garn said he was not sure. Mr. Black said he was not sure either, because he is not sure how the ownership issue really impacts zoning. Mr. Garn said he could not see where it does effect the zoning at all. Mr. Black said but apparently the WCPC is expecting them to act, but he does not know if they should act on it as a non major, or a minor amendment. Mr. Garn said he could ask legal counsel to see what they think. There is no definite date when they have to vote on this. A question was asked that the PUD had not changed, had it. Mr. Garn said the PUD has not changed at all. The comment was made that nothing has changed. The comment was made with the exception of the ownership. That has been done before. Mr. Black said he does not understand why they would have to do anything because the physical layout is identical, it's an ownership issue. Mr. Garn said he does not think that they are really sure how to handle this either. He does not know how to say it. It's an area that no one is sure of what they are doing. Mr. Black said he is confused as to why they would have to do anything, and he suggests they should talk to legal counsel and ask them why they would have to take any action at all, and wondered if anybody disagreed with that. Mr. Schaller said the McCarty subdivisions are the same thing, they are PUD's and they are sold. Mr. Black told Mr. Garn he does not think they need to take any action. He does not know why they would need to, or what authority they would have. Ms. Warnimont asked if this had gone to the prosecutor's office, and said that would take awhile. Mr. Garn said they have exempted zoning, and he could go ask

Mr. Skaff in order to get a quicker response. Mr. Black said have the commission confer with Mr. Skaff that no action should be taken regarding this specific issue on this property. Mr. Garn said they have gone to Mr. Skaff maybe a half a dozen times a year with different issues, and the administrator seemed okay with that. Mr. Black asked if the WCPC was asking the ZC to do something. Why ask Mr. Skaff anything. Why not just do nothing. Mr. Garn said they could do nothing. Mr. Black asked if there was any problem with that. The comment was made that they were just CYA. Mr. Black said to just leave it go, because he does not see anything that they need to do. Mr. Garn said he thinks they wanted everybody to know on this end what was taking place, and that's the only thing he can think.

Mr. Black asked if Mr. Garn had any other comments, and Mr. Garn said no, not at this time. Mr. Black asked if anyone else had any comments, and there was none. Ms. Warnimont moved with a second by Mr. Benavides to adjourn. All members were in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 6:43 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Grant W. Garn,  
Recording Secretary