

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

ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
May 8, 2006

The Perrysburg Township Zoning Commission held a meeting on May 8, 2006, at 6:00 p.m. Robert S. Black, chairman, called the meeting to order at 6:06 p.m. A roll call was taken. The meeting was tape-recorded. Grant W. Garn, zoning inspector, was also present.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Robert S. Black, Carol Warnimont, John J. Benavides, and Arthur Rometo.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Jeff Schaller, Stephen J. Stanford, and Jeffrey Normand.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA: Ms. Warnimont moved with a second by Mr. Rometo to approve the agenda as written. A roll call vote was taken. Yes votes by Ms. Warnimont, Mr. Rometo, Mr. Benavides, and Mr. Black. Motion carried 4-0-0.

APPROVAL OF 3/13/06 MINUTES: Mr. Benavides moved with a second by Mr. Rometo to approve the meeting minutes. A roll call vote was taken. Yes votes by Mr. Benavides, Mr. Rometo, and Ms. Warnimont. Mr. Black abstained. Motion carried 3-0-1.

APPROVAL OF 4/10/06 MINUTES: Mr. Rometo moved with a second by Mr. Benavides to approve the meeting minutes. A roll call vote was taken. Yes votes by Mr. Rometo, Mr. Benavides, and Mr. Black. Ms. Warnimont abstained. Motion carried 3-0-1.

Mr. Black asked if there was anyone present that wished to address any comments of interest to the ZC on any non-agenda items, and there were none.

SITE PLAN REVIEW FOR PERRYSBURG HEIGHTS COMMUNITY CENTER, SPR-2006-02. The Perrysburg Heights Community Center of 12282 Jefferson Street would like to build an addition. Spring Valley Architects and ESA Engineering are working on this project. An independent engineering firm is reviewing the plans and checklist for compliance. Our fire inspector is currently reviewing the submission.

Adam Kral addressed the commission regarding this site plan. Mr. Black informed Mr. Kral that they do have a letter from their engineer at Feller Finch, David Kuhn, and he asked if he was aware of that letter that was sent out, and Mr. Kral said he was. Mr. Black told him to continue. Mr. Kral said they reviewed the letter and complied with all of its requirements, and he believes they have everything they need for approval. Mr.

Black said so any of the deficiencies listed on May 3rd they have complied with, and Mr. Kral said yes, sir.

Mr. Black asked Mr. Garn if he had any comments. Mr. Garn said the only thing that they have not taken care of is with their fire inspector. He had not seen the most current drawing knowing where the fire hydrants were, and the size of the road, and he thinks those were the main issues. Mr. Kral said he spoke to the fire chief Friday afternoon. He just became aware of it Friday that he had not seen the drawing. He had no quantity of concerns. It was just a couple additional dimensions, a sheet of standard notes, and he was able to deliver those to Mr. Garn this morning. He spoke to the fire chief this afternoon who was in classes. The fire chief was going to drive out to his office. He assured him that the drawings were over here at the township, and he would not need to do that.

Mr. Black asked Mr. Garn if the fire chief signs off on all these plans, and Mr. Garn said basically yes. It's the fire inspector. He looks at it just to make sure. Mr. Black said so he would have to sign it for it to be approved anyway, and Mr. Garn said he believed so, and that would be the final thing.

Mr. Black asked if there were any comments from the members, and there were none. He asked Mr. Kral if he had anything else to add, and Mr. Kral said no sir. Mr. Black asked if there was a motion to accept the site plan for the Perrysburg Heights Community Center. Ms. Warnimont moved with a second by Mr. Rometo to approve the site plan. There was no other discussion. A roll call vote was taken. Yes votes by Ms. Warnimont, Mr. Rometo, Mr. Benavides, and Mr. Black. Motion carried 4-0-0.

CONTINUED SITE PLAN REVIEW FOR EMERALD LAKES PLAT ONE, SPR-2005-

04. McCarthy Builders, Inc., would like to place their area identification sign in the Emerald Lakes Drive boulevard entry off of Eckel Junction Road.

Brian McCarthy addressed the commission regarding this site plan. He told the commission he is here before them this evening as part of the review process for Emerald Lakes for the subdivision sign that they wish to place in the boulevard at Emerald Lakes Drive and Eckel Junction. The best way to illustrate what they have in mind for the sign is it will be very similar to the sign that they did at Wexford right up the street. He has enclosed a photo of that sign, and then kind of what they had in mind for Emerald Lakes as far as the lettering, and also attached are basically approximate dimensions of that Wexford sign, which this sign would basically have the same dimensions as that sign. It's a granite sign, sand blasted. The Emerald Lakes letters will be a little bit different. They will be put in gold as opposed to a white lithograph, gold leafed, and a masonry structure which is very similar around that granite piece as on Wexford.

Mr. Black asked him if the sign was in the same location, physical location, as it relates to the right-of-way at both Wexford and Emerald Lakes, or is that a little different location. Mr. McCarthy said to be honest, he is not sure. Generally they like to place them approximately 10 feet inside the boulevard, which the boulevard is out of the right-of-way. He checked his site plan real quick on that.

Mr. Black asked Mr. Garn if he had any comments. He said no, other than this is something, because it's a PUD, where the ZC has complete authority over the signage where it is not taken care of in their regular sign resolution which applies to everything except PUD's. Mr. Black said okay. Mr. Garn said in that other section, a sign like this in the boulevard would go to the BZA for safety reasons and so on.

Mr. Black said he shows it 53 feet from centerline, and it's a 50 foot right-of-way, and wondered if that was correct. Was he reading that right or not. Mr. McCarthy said that would be correct. They could probably move that back. It's probably 10 feet from the edge of the boulevard. Mr. Black said he was concerned about some obstruction particularly as it relates to a sidewalk, and pulling out, and just making sure you could see to the other side. He asked if Mr. McCarthy knew where he was coming from, and Mr. McCarthy said absolutely. Mr. Black said that's all. So if they could just keep that in mind. Mr. McCarthy said yeah, he thinks if they moved it 10 feet back, and Mr. Black said so that would be 60 feet rather than 53 feet, and asked if that was all right with them. Mr. McCarthy said that's fine. He thinks aesthetically it looks better like that also. It's not pushed so far to one edge. He thinks that would be fine.

Mr. Black asked Mr. Garn if he had any comments. Mr. Garn said there are general rules that it needs to be normally 30 feet back from the right-of-way for sighting distances, but the road here is so much further out in front. Mr. Black said if he would look at the picture he has there, it's not 30 feet back in this other one he does not think. Mr. Garn said probably not. Mr. Black asked if there were any other comments, and there were none. He asked if there was a motion to approve the site plan subject to the change that would be a minimum of 60 feet from the centerline. Ms. Warnimont so moved with a second by Mr. Rometo.

Mr. Black asked if there was any further discussion. Mr. Garn asked how far back is the right-of-way. Is this a 30 foot right-of-way or a 50 foot right-of-way from the centerline. Mr. McCarthy said it should be a 50 foot a half at this point. So 100 feet total of right-of-way, 50 feet from the center. Mr. Garn said it just looks like they are going to have it a lot further back by this drawing. Mr. McCarthy apologized that this drawing does not look accurate to what it's actually going to be. The scale is not accurate to what's actually being shown. The right-of-way line should be 50 feet. Mr. Black said should be 50 feet. That's why he was confused as to where is the right-of-way line, and then he shows it 53 back, and that's why he wanted to make sure. Mr. McCarthy said that's correct. That can't be 53 feet to the front of the boulevard. Mr. Garn said he would think there would be a problem with that sidewalk if they are just

10 feet back from the normal. Mr. Black asked how far does he think that the radius of the boulevard is from the edge of the right-of-way. It's already in, right. Mr. McCarthy said yes. And actually technically from the sidewalk, the sidewalk technically is inside the new right-of-way. Mr. Black said okay. Mr. McCarthy said so when they allocated 50 feet off the centerline for the new right-of-way, the 4 foot sidewalk then is within the right-of-way. Mr. Garn said so the new right-of-way is really just touching the end of the boulevard. Mr. McCarthy said yeah, the existing right-of-way where it says right-of-way there, the first line as you move south there, that would have been the existing right-of-way. And then as they come back you can see the black line just south of the sidewalk, that is the new right-of-way. So that right-of-way there would be the 50 feet right there. Mr. Black said did it expand by 20 feet. It went from 30 to 50 feet. Mr. McCarthy said that would be probably accurate. Correct. It would have been a 30 foot half to add 20 on it. Correct. Mr. Garn said the problem will be in the future if it becomes a three-lane road, and the ditch is filled in, then the road will be fairly close to the old right-of-way line probably because the old right-of-way line would have been about the top of the ditch.

Mr. Black said so they have a motion on the floor. Ms. Warnimont said so they need to go a lot further back. Mr. Garn said he was thinking they may want to look at it going a little further back than the 10 feet, because just a regular car, you would be out putting the car way out there. Mr. McCarthy said they could see where they have actually placed the sidewalk right now. The new roadway would not get close to that sidewalk. Mr. Garn said that's why he said it would probably get out approximately where the old right-of-way lines were. Mr. Black said he thinks that sign sits 60 feet from the center of the right-of-way, it will be fine. The motion is on the table. Mr. Garn said yeah, because it's a 50 foot right-of-way. A roll call vote was taken. Mr. Garn asked who made the motion, and Ms. Warnimont said she made the motion. Mr. Garn said the second, and Ms. Warnimont said there is not a second to it. Mr. Rometo said he was the second. Mr. Black said he thought Mr. Rometo did. Yes votes by Ms. Warnimont, Mr. Rometo, Mr. Benavides, and Mr. Black. Motion carried 4-0-0.

PUD Amendment – Major/Minor, Shannon Hills. Brian McCarthy of McCarthy Builders, Inc., and Bill Hupp of the Shannon Hills Homeowners Association would like to amend the PUD for Shannon Hills to include a white PVC privacy fence along their northern border.

Bill Hupp addressed the commission regarding this amendment. He said as the package indicates, they would like approval to erect a solid panel privacy fence. They are the residents on the extreme north side of this development which borders on the Lakes at Woodmont apartment complex. Not 100 percent, but nearly all of the residents starting from the entrance boulevard going along North Shannon Hills Drive until you get to the western end curve have indicated interest in this privacy fence to facilitate the enjoyment of their properties, and not looking at the kinds of things that are illustrated in the picture that was provided to the commission. Secondly, to forestall

intrusion into their backyards of adults as well as children playing various sundry games. He asked if there were any questions from the commission.

Mr. Black asked Mr. Garn if he had any comments that he would like to make. Mr. Garn asked if this fence was going to be put on top of the mound, and Mr. Hupp said yes, that's what they indicated. In the north right end corner next to the block is a detail of that proposed location. It would be placed entirely on Shannon Hills' property owners' property at the top of the existing berm that runs east and west along there. Mr. Black said so it's a 6 foot high fence on top of how high of a berm, and Mr. Hupp said it's roughly 4 feet. Mr. Black said 4 feet, so effectively a 10 foot fence. Mr. Hupp said yes. The illustration is as accurate as they could get it in terms of the before and after what it would hide from the viewpoint of the property owners. Mr. Black asked if there was vegetation there now. Mr. Hupp said there are sporadic plantings of spruce trees. Mr. Black said because this is a rendition that is showed, and Mr. Hupp said yeah. Right now there is a spruce tree, about one per lot, and there are 18 lots that go from the entrance to the corner. But these four properties look out on a total grain field anyway, and they are not interested in participating. But there is approximately one spruce tree per lot. Mr. Black said they will be displaced as a result, and Mr. Hupp said no, they are, in fact, planted on the inside slope of the berm, so they will be contained on the property owner's side of the fence.

Mr. Black confirmed that Mr. McCarthy sent them a letter as President of the Homeowners' Association, and Mr. McCarthy responded affirmatively. Mr. Black asked if there were any comments from the members.

Ms. Warnimont asked if it interfered at all with the irrigation. Isn't there irrigation alongside of that? Mr. Hupp said indeed there is irrigation. Ms. Warnimont said it's still okay. It will be on their side of the fencing. Mr. Hupp said there are no heads on the other side of the fence for maybe 10, 12 feet that might not get any irrigation. So what the apartment complex has, whatever irrigation they might provide, but the back slope of the berm would probably be denied the water it gets now because it gets thrown across. Ms. Warnimont asked if they would continue to maintain it, though, as far as cutting the grass, and Mr. Hupp said mowing, absolutely. Mr. Black said so both sides of the berm from the peak is theirs, and Mr. Hupp said is still their property, yes, and their responsibility to continue to mow and maintain.

Mr. Black asked if they had talked to the neighbors. Mr. Hupp said they did send a letter to the apartment complex. In fact he was contacted by their organization in Columbus who said that they were aware that there had been some complaints about some of their residents. In terms of participating in the project financially, they said they would get back to them. They did not dismiss it out of hand. He is not terribly optimistic that they will participate, but they did say they would get back with them. Mr. Black said but as the property owner they don't have any objection, and Mr. Hupp said no, they did not voice any objection. He would think they would be delighted.

Mr. Black asked if there was a motion. Ms. Warnimont asked if 10 foot was too high. Mr. Garn said they do not have any resolution about the height on top of a mound. They have done things like that at Kohl's and Lowe's, 7 foot on top of higher mounds. Ms. Warnimont said okay. Mr. Garn said they have no prohibition against it. Mr. Black asked if there was a motion to approve it as a minor amendment. Ms. Warnimont moved with a second by Mr. Benavides. There was no further discussion. A roll call vote was taken. Yes votes by Ms. Warnimont, Mr. Benavides, Mr. Rometo, and Mr. Black. Motion carried 4-0-0. Mr. Garn said this will go to the trustees next Monday during the meeting. Mr. Black said so it would be good to be there.

PUD Amendment – Major/Minor, Simmons Road Adult Living Community.

Tim Burns of Grassy Creek Developers would like to eliminate the three unit structures along the entry road and make them all two unit structures leading up to where Grassy Creek passes under the road. That would make a total net loss of one unit.

Leonard Michaels addressed the commission regarding this amendment. He told the commission they had a meeting on Friday with the city, and after the meeting, in addition to one unit that they are asking to drop now, they decided to drop four more units. So he has new drawings here. And they are putting in sidewalks. Mr. Black confirmed that he has new drawings to share with them, and Mr. Michaels said right. Mr. Black said why doesn't he pass them out now and give one to each of the members and also to Mr. Garn. Mr. Michaels said after they have eliminated three unit buildings as they submitted to them originally, they decided to go down to two units and further eliminated after that. They looked more closely and found out that they are crammed up too much, so they decided to spread them out. Now the distance between units is greater than it was before. Also, like he said at the same time they talking to the city, they decided to put sidewalks in, 4 foot sidewalks, which would probably be in line with the density concern the commission and the trustees had before. So they are going down from a total of 163 down to 158 at this point. Mr. Black asked him to point out exactly where these units have changed. That would be very helpful. Mr. Michaels said it's between Simmons Road and Grassy Creek they showed, and the plan was submitted to them on Friday. There are more units there. A question was asked they have how many, and the response was five on the one side and then one less on the south side. Mr. Michaels said they have four on the north side, and they have one less building here. And thus it allowed them to spread them. And like he said when they discussed it, the developer decided to show sidewalks because eventually they will be required, and they just decided might as well do it. That's what they show, and he considers it a minor change, but they decided to bring it to their attention at this point because they are going into detailed engineering phase. They need to tie it all down.

Mr. Black asked Mr. Garn if he had any comments. Mr. Garn said no, other than it's lessening of the units. Mr. Black asked if there was a motion to approve it as a minor amendment. Mr. Benavides asked what are the definitions again. Mr. Garn read the definitions. He said really it's a decrease in everything. Not materially increasing

anything. Mr. Black asked if there was a motion. Mr. Rometo moved with a second by Ms. Warnimont to consider it a minor amendment. There was no other discussion. A roll call vote was taken. Yes votes by Mr. Rometo, Ms. Warnimont, Mr. Benavides, and Mr. Black. Motion carried 4-0-0.

Informal review of addition to Mr. Beefy's. Mr. Beefy's American Roadhouse of 27096 Oakmead Drive built some type of addition without obtaining any type of permits (zoning or building). They would like to discuss this addition, the 6/1305 ZC directive, and the patio fencing.

Chris Frick addressed the commission regarding this informal review. He started off by saying they submitted some plans to Mr. Garn. First he would like to apologize. When they were getting opened, due to the hasty confusion, he thinks they put the cart before the horse, so to speak, on some of these additions. Maybe they thought they had a plan for them, but he guesses they didn't after speaking with Mr. Garn. They submitted a request, plans to have reviewed. They would like to keep the addition up rather than tear it down.

Mr. Black said first of all he does not think there was any haste and/or confusion on their part. They unilaterally made a decision to do something that they were told not to by their representative that was at this meeting. Mr. Frick said for what, and Mr. Black said for the prior issue. Mr. Frick said he does not believe that to be true, but he apologizes if that was the case. Mr. Black said that person represented to the commission that that was, in fact, the truth, and that the owner apparently did not want to show up. He sent his minion. Mr. Black asked him if he was the owner. Mr. Frick said yes, sir. Mr. Black said so he is ultimately responsible for these decisions that have been made. Mr. Frick said absolutely. Mr. Black said he just wanted him to know that everyone on this commission thinks it's a serious defect that he would knowingly violate the ZC regulations. Having said that, that's the foundation from which he will work. Mr. Frick said okay. Mr. Black said he will comply fully with all zoning regulations, and Mr. Frick said that is their desire.

Mr. Black asked Mr. Garn if he had any comments. Mr. Garn said he knows that last year he had put in a patio area, and he does not know what the intentions are this year. Mr. Frick said they have no intentions of having any outdoor seating. And the little base poles that have been erected for the fence now are going to be taken down. Mr. Garn asked if he was aware at all of any of the complaints about their noise. Mr. Frick said a couple were made, and the township came by, and that's one of the reasons that when he mentioned that to Melissa that they abandoned any desire to have any outdoor dining. They want to be good neighbors, not bad neighbors. Mr. Garn said he remembered that was the last meeting they had was about that issue with his representative.

Mr. Black asked who was their representative, and Mr. Frick said he thinks it was Bob Herrig, but he no longer works for the company. Mr. Black asked if that was normally the way that he conducts business, and Mr. Frick said in what way, and Mr. Black said sending one of his employees out to do something. Mr. Frick said well, when you have a contractor, yeah. That's why he no longer works for them. But they want this cleared up. And every other time they have had anything in front of the township, like the signage, and when they had Jed's back there and they had a zoning variance, he had been at each meeting. Mr. Black said he missed an important meeting, and Mr. Frick said yes, he thinks he did.

Mr. Black asked Mr. Garn to itemize the issues they have with the Mr. Beefy's facility. Mr. Garn said the issues now is there is an addition that was added on. Now, the addition is not large enough to require site plan approval because of the square footage. It would not have effected anything that way. But it is in the setback area, this addition they put on. There was a previous addition that was put on a number of years ago which is probably within 10 feet or less of the rear property line. This addition is still within, he thinks there is a 40 foot setback, so it would have to go to the BZA even if any addition is put on. The other issues they would have beyond that is if there were any approval given on this end, they still have to comply with WC building inspection to prove that it was built according to specifications for commercial structures or any structure having footers and other things.

Mr. Black said they have two issues. They have this addition he was just talking about, and that's in the first portion of the agenda item. Mr. Garn said he thinks that is a blow-up. The second page is the blow-up of that addition. Mr. Black said he was just looking at the agenda here, item F. They are here, they have built some type of addition without obtaining any permits, zoning or building. Is that the issue that was just discussed, and Mr. Garn said yes. Mr. Black said then another issue is the discussion of the June 13th, '05 ZC directive and the patio fencing. Mr. Garn said that portion of the meeting said there was nothing to be added on to the building until the representatives came back and met with the ZC for site plan approval. Mr. Black said so he sent notice to Mr. Frick regarding this June 13th, '05 directive. Mr. Garn said that that addition was put on without any prior approval, and Mr. Black said right. And this is the first time that Mr. Frick has been here since he requested him back in June, and Mr. Garn said he thinks it was about late summer, early fall. Mr. Black asked about the patio fencing, what's that issue. Mr. Garn said the patio fencing now has been taken down. There is no patio area at this time. That's been removed completely.

Mr. Black asked if any of the members had any comments they would like to make at this point. Ms. Warnimont said well, they also have some parking. Does that need parking out there, too, that addition. Mr. Frick said that would only be effected if that patio area were going to be in use, and it is not going to be. Ms. Warnimont said so the five motorcycle parking and the four on the side are not parking at all, and Mr. Frick said right. Correct.

Mr. Black asked if there were any other comments from the members. He said let's go back and talk about the first part of that request, about the addition. He asked Mr. Garn to explain to him exactly what happened, the addition without obtaining any permits. Mr. Garn said he only noticed when he happened to be driving by the building once that there was a new addition that had been put on. He does not know exactly what time, but it was not painted out all, so it sticks out where you can tell that it was put on after the building had been painted. He believes it was not on there when the patio area was an issue. Mr. Frick said it was on when they opened. Mr. Garn said it was on when they opened. Mr. Black said to Mr. Garn that he is telling him that it was not enough square footage to require a permit. Mr. Garn said it would require a zoning permit, but not enough to require site plan review. Now he is getting the idea it was put on before so that possibly his construction manager knew it was already there, but the commission did not know it was there. Mr. Black said and it encroaches on the setback. Mr. Garn said it encroaches. It would definitely have to go to the board of appeals. Mr. Black asked what their zoning resolution states regarding doing additions without permits, and Mr. Garn said it would require it to be torn down. Mr. Black said okay.

Ms. Warnimont asked what that part was used for. Mr. Frick said it's just an access hallway. It's only 6 feet wide to get to the addition that Mr. Croy had put on the building originally. Ms. Warnimont asked what that was used for. Mr. Frick said nothing right now. He wants to eventually use it for additional seating and a banquet area. But right now it's pretty messy back there.

Mr. Black said so at the very least they would be required to go to the BZA. Mr. Garn said for that, and he is not sure on the expanding the area, because that addition, he believes it was originally a warehouse area, or where they made salad dressing. So he is not sure if it was ever included in the parking space requirements. That will be a separate issue if that were to become something else. Mr. Frick said that's what she was originally started working out, but he had to have her adjust this, eliminate that whole patio. Mr. Garn said to get the parking in case he turns the back into seating. When he does increase the parking at five spaces or more, then he has to come back to this ZC for site plan approval. Even though that addition is there, he is using it for something differently than it was intended to be used for.

So Mr. Black asked if that was a fair assessment, and Mr. Frick said that is fair. Mr. Black asked Mr. Frick to tell him exactly what he wants to do, and what is he trying to accomplish by coming to the meeting this evening. Mr. Frick said not tearing that addition down. Mr. Black said that's all he was trying to accomplish, and Mr. Frick said right, and to apologize to the commission for not having this be smooth and going in the right order, and he does apologize. He wishes he wouldn't have done what he did, and wishes they just went the way it was supposed to go and not in reverse order.

Mr. Black asked if there were any other comments. Ms. Warnimont said the only thing is if the hallway is his part, but the other part of it was from Croy, how can they penalize him for what Croy did now. Can they require him to go to BZA for something somebody else did. Mr. Garn said for that addition, and Ms. Warnimont said for the prior addition, not the newest one. Mr. Garn said oh, the big, the prior large addition, he believes that was approved. Ms. Warnimont said that was approved. Oh, okay. Mr. Garn said he believes that was all approved. Ms. Warnimont said so his addition is still encroaching, through, also. Mr. Garn said right. Ms. Warnimont said she thought he was talking about the bigger part. Mr. Garn said the bigger part he can't quite read, but it's about 8 feet from the property line. His is back a little further, but it's not 40 feet away. So there is he believes a 40 foot setback for that type of zoning.

Mr. Black said as he understands it then, there is really nothing for them to do. Mr. Garn said they have to go to the proper area, but they needed to know whether they need to come back here for the future. Mr. Black said the answer to that is yes, and Mr. Garn said definitely. Mr. Black said it appears to him that he needs to go to the BZA and get approval for the setback issue. As he understands it, there is nothing else that they need to do at this point. Mr. Garn agreed. Mr. Black said so what he needs to do is to go to the BZA and request a variance for a setback. Mr. Frick said thank you. Mr. Black said there is no other work he is doing, and Mr. Frick said no. Mr. Black said they appreciate his apology, and thanked him for coming in, and please don't let that happen again. Mr. Frick said you got it.

Mr. Black asked Mr. Garn if under the other if he wants to just touch on the trees in the right-of-way. Mr. Garn said okay. He brought up the tree issue to the trustees, and he brought it up, that was 2 weeks ago. Then today he brought it up again, and they are still somewhat up in the air. A couple of the trustees said they do not appreciate having trees in the right-of-way because they look at them as a safety issue when you pull out, and depending on how high the branches are. They bring up some issues in the city where there are certain locations where it's hard to see through trees that are out in the right-of-way. You get up to a stop sign, and he knows the one trustee brings up about the post office, especially if you are in a truck, that it was hard to see through some of those. So right now the trustees are sort of in between, but they also said that they were going to meet with the city today, and that issue was going to come up, and they were going to talk to them about trees in the right-of-way. Because on the other part the city definitely wants them. And the developers, which he has brought up to them, have included trees when they are selling lots to someone. They have some interesting problems because they always just presumed that the township wanted trees in the right-of-way. Mr. Black said so it's just with the trustees, and Mr. Garn said it's in their court right now, and see what they finally want to do one way or the other.

Mr. Black asked if there was anything else anyone wanted to bring up today, and there was nothing. He asked Mr. Garn if he had any other issues, and he did not. Mr. Black asked if there was a motion to adjourn. Mr. Benavides moved with a second by Mr.

Rometo. All members were in favor, and none were opposed. The meeting was adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Grant W. Garn,
Recording Secretary