

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

June 29, 2023

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Andy Lorenz. Commission members present were Greg Bade, Andy Lorenz, Mayor Mackin, Rob Vela, Becky Williams, and Megan Wolfinger (6). John Wellstein was absent (1). Also present was Brody Walters, Planning & Zoning Administrator.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Williams moved to approve the minutes of the May 25, 2023 meeting as written. Seconded by Mr. Lorenz. Ayes: Bade, Lorenz, Vela, Williams, and Wolfinger (5). Nays: (0). Abstain: Mackin (1).

ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

None.

Preliminary Plat Extension Sanctuary in the Woods Phase 3

APPLICANT/OWNER/DEVELOPER

Greg Feller, P.E.
Feller, Finch & Associates, Inc.
1683 Woodlands Drive
Maumee, Ohio 43537

OWNER/DEVELOPER

Ed Bryant / Dick Wehrle
Retreat Associates, Inc.
4331 Keystone Drive
Maumee, OH 43537

Chapter 1295.06(i) – Preliminary Plats: Tentative Approval Time Limit;
Plat Resubmission

PROPERTY LOCATION & DESCRIPTION

Sanctuary in the Woods Phase 3 is an R-1 residential subdivision consisting of 109 lots on approximately 90.3 acres and is a continuation of the existing Sanctuary residential

development. It is located north of Roachton Road, west of Hull Prairie Road, south of SR65.

BACKGROUND

The Preliminary Plat was first approved December 4, 2003, and has been extended each year with the most recent request extending approval until May 27, 2023. The applicant did request the extension prior to the expiration date and therefore is allowed to proceed with the extension. If approved, this requested extension would be for two (2) years until June 29, 2025.

Plat 1, consisting of 16 lots was finalized and recorded on January 6, 2004.

Plat 3, consisting of 21 lots was finalized and recorded on December 24, 2014.

Plat 4, consisting of 13 lots was finalized and recorded on January 19, 2018.

Plat 2, consisting of 25 lots was finalized and recorded on January 25, 2018.

Plat 5, consisting of 15 lots was finalized and recorded on October 25, 2022

ANALYSIS

There are 35 un-platted lots proposed in the remaining portion of Sanctuary in the Woods Phase 3. Of those 50 lots, 18 of the lots do not meet the minimum lot size of 22,000 square feet.

(The lot numbers that do not meet the minimum lot size requirement are as follows: 88, 89, 92, 96, 97, 98, 100, 105, 106, 114, 115, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, and 125).

Preliminary Plat approval shall be effective for a maximum period of twenty-four (24) months unless, upon application of the developer, the Planning Commission grants an extension. If the Final Plat has not been recorded within this time limit, the Preliminary Plat must again be submitted to the Planning Commission for approval.

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning and Zoning Deputy Administrator recommends that the Planning Commission extend the Preliminary Plat approval until June 29, 2025. The developers have demonstrated a good faith effort to continue progress within the subdivision and will be finalizing additional plats in the near future. If development stalls and does not progress on a reasonable timeline between now and the recommended expiration date, the Planning Commission should consider (during the next extension review) requiring the submission of a new Preliminary Plat that shows remaining lots at a size that meets or exceeds the minimum lot size requirement of 22,000 SF.

Mr. Walters reviewed the above Staff Report regarding the Preliminary Plat Extension for Sanctuary in the Woods Phase 3. Developer Dick Wehrle was present, and added that the majority of the lots meet the minimum lot size (22,000 square feet) for R-1 (Single Family Residential) zoning, and noted that some lots do not.

Mr. Williams made a motion to approve the Preliminary Plat Extension for Sanctuary in the Woods Phase 3 until June 29, 2025. Seconded by Mr. Lorenz. Ayes: (6). Nays: (0).

Final Plat Fountain Point Villas Plat 2

APPLICANT/OWNER/DEVELOPER

DS Developers LLC
5135 S. Main Street
Sylvania, OH 43560
Schmit7605@aol.com

5 Points Partners LLC
3618 King Road
Toledo, OH 43617

Feller Finch and Associates, Inc.
1683 Woodlands Drive, P.O. Box 68
Maumee, Ohio 43537

REQUEST

Chapter 1295.07 – Final Plat

PROPERTY LOCATION & DESCRIPTION

Five Point Villas is a proposed subdivision now consisting of 69 lots (a former version contained 71 lots) that are each intended to provide a two-family living unit (total of 138 units). The subject parcel is located west of Southview Estates mobile home park and east of Shepherd of the Valley Church. The property (31.668 acres) is currently zoned R-5 (Two Family Residential).

Plat 2 is proposed to consist of 53 (two family) residential lots on approximately 22.336 acres of the total 30-acre site.

BACKGROUND

July 7, 2011, the Annexation into the City of Perrysburg was completed.

September 29, 2011, at the request of the property owner the Planning Commission recommended R-3 (Single Family Residential) zoning.

January 26, 2011, the property owner decided to change his preferred zoning request to R-5 (Two Family Residential).

March 28, 2012, the Planning & Zoning Committee of Council voted 2-1 (in favor of) for zoning the property as R-5 (Two Family Residential).

April 3, 2012, City Council passed Ordinance 83-2012 effectively rezoning this property to R-5 (Two Family Residential).

December 14, 2017, an application for Rezoning from R-5 (Two Family Residential) to RM (Multiple Family Residential) was submitted and withdrawn prior to the meeting.

May 27, 2021, an application for a Preliminary Plat was submitted to the Planning Commission for approval. The plat drawing depicted 77 lots, most of which did not meet the minimum depth requirement. The plat request was denied unanimously.

June 24, 2021, the current approved version of the Preliminary Plat of Fountain Point Villas was approved during the Planning Commission meeting after it was agreed that former lots 52 and 71 would be eliminated to allow for additional open space and more flexibility with nearby lot sizes. This approval remains active until June 24, 2023 (a copy of this overall approved plan is included in this packet).

December 8, 2022, the Planning Commission approved the Final Plat for Plat 1 consisting of 16 lots on approximately 9.332 acres.

ANALYSIS

The plat layout for Plat 2 is compliant with the Preliminary Plat that is currently active for this area. The number of lots, street layout and arrangement of lots is generally the same as originally proposed within the subdivision Preliminary Plat.

- Minimum lot width is 90’.
- Ch. 1295.05(a)(6)(G) - Lots shall not have a depth of less than 120’.
- Sidewalks shall be 5’ wide.
- Crosswalks to be provided where blocks exceed 900’ in length.
- All streetlights are now required to be LED rather than HPS (5 total).
- Ch. 1295.05(a)(6)(D) - All lots shall be designed to provide desirable building sites. A larger lot size may be required in particular cases in order to meet the desirable requirements for a subdivided area. **The applicant’s own design and layout of lots in this Preliminary Plat shall not be justification for future variance requests due to being unable to meet setback requirements for the proposed residential unit.**

- The developer will be required to provide payment for the “before developed” appraised fair market value of seven and one-half percent (7.5%) of the land in the subdivision immediately prior to its development, plus one hundred dollars (\$100.00) per recorded lot in the final plat. Such deposit shall be allocated for acquisition and improvement of open space and recreational lands and may be expended only for such purposes at the discretion of the City.

Open space requirement = There are three ways to satisfy the open space requirement for subdivision development. The first option is to provide 5% of the area of the subdivision as open space (cannot include detention/retention areas). The second option is to provide a cash in-lieu payment in an amount equal to 7.5% of the value of the undeveloped land and the third option is to dedicate an equivalent amount of land (5%) elsewhere in the city. Per the layout of this plat the developers will be required to provide a payment for 7.5% of the value of the undeveloped land. A recent appraisal (within the last 2 years) will be required to determine the value of this property.

Per Chapter 1295.07(d), the following escrows and fees attached to this report shall be provided to the satisfaction of the city prior to releasing the signed copy of the final plat:

ESCROWS

Roadway & Pavement
Drainage
Erosion Control
Waterline
Sanitary Sewer
Sidewalks
Curb Ramps

PAYMENT ITEMS

Street Signs
Street Lights
Open Space Fee

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning & Zoning Deputy Administrator recommends that the Planning Commission approve the Final Plat for Fountain Point Villas Plat 2 subject to the comments and recommendations in this report including the deposit of escrows, and payment of other fees as required.

Mr. Walters reviewed the above Staff Report regarding the Final Plat for Fountain Point Villas Plat 2. Developer Brian Gruber was present.

Mr. Vela made a motion to approve the Final Plat for Fountain Point Villas Plat 2 subject to the comments and recommendations in the Staff Report including the deposit of escrows, and payment of other fees as required. Seconded by Ms. Williams. Ayes: (6). Nays: (0).

***Preliminary Determination of PUD (Planned Unit Development)
Chapter 1240.06 – Request for Qualification
Coventry Pointe North – 25270 Fort Meigs Road***

APPLICANT/OWNER/DEVELOPER

Steve Mitchell
Five Point Investments LLC
3150 Republic Blvd., Suite 3
Toledo, OH 43615

Feller Finch and Associates, Inc.
1683 Woodlands Drive
P.O. Box 68
Maumee, OH

REQUEST

Chapter 1240.01 – Planned Unit Development
Chapter 1240.06 – Submittal and Request for Qualification
Chapter 1255.01 – Impact Assessment

PROPERTY LOCATION & DESCRIPTION

The subject property is comprised of two separate parcels; Q61-100-240000008000, and J37-100-240000020000 (recently annexed). These parcels are located on the west side of Fort Meigs Road, south of Roachton Road and north of Five Point Road. For additional reference purposes this property is immediately north of Coventry Pointe subdivision. Collectively this site is approximately 74.71 acres in size and all properties are zoned R-3 (Single Family Residential).

ANALYSIS

The applicant is requesting preliminary determination as to whether the provided plan for these parcels meets the qualification standards for the eventual approval of a Planned Unit Development (PUD). The applicant desires to develop this property for residential purposes in a way that will provide a mixture of residential uses (single family, two family, and multiple family units. The overall plan for this property includes both single story villas and apartments mixed with traditional single-family homes.

Proposed Statistics:

143 Single Family Lots = **143 units**
10 Four Unit Villas = **48 units**
22 Multi Unit Buildings = **123 units**
Total Possible Units = 314

Per Ch 1240.03, in order to qualify for the Planned Unit Development option all of the following must be met:

- a) The PUD option may be effectuated only in the R, RM, C, OS and I Districts.
- b) The use of this option shall not be for the sole purpose of avoiding the applicable zoning requirements. Any permission given for any activity or building or use not normally permitted shall result in an improvement to the public health, safety and welfare in the area affected.
- c) The PUD shall not be utilized in situations where the same land use objectives can be accomplished by the application of conventional zoning provisions or standards. Problems or constraints presented by applicable zoning provisions shall be identified in the PUD application.
- d) The Planned Unit Development option may be effectuated only when the proposed land use will not materially add service and facility loads beyond those contemplated in the Comprehensive Plan unless the proponent can demonstrate to the sole satisfaction of the City that such added loads will be accommodated or mitigated by the proponent as part of the Planned Unit Development.
- e) The PUD shall not be allowed solely as a means of increasing density or as a substitute for a variance request; such objectives should be pursued through the normal zoning process by requesting a zoning change or variance.

Additionally, at least two of the following must be met:

The proposed Plan Unit Development appears to meets four (4) of the eight (8) objectives per Chapter 1240.03(f) and are indicated below with a numbered circle:

- 1) ❶ To permanently preserve open space or natural features because of their exceptional characteristics or because it can provide a permanent transition or buffer between land uses.
- 2) ❷ To permanently establish land use patterns which are compatible or which will protect existing or planned uses.
- 3) To accept dedication or set aside open space areas in perpetuity.
- 4) ❸ To provide alternative uses for parcels which can provide transition buffers to residential areas.
- 5) To guarantee the provision of a public improvement which could not otherwise be required that would further the public health, safety, or welfare, protect existing or future uses from the impact of a proposed use, or alleviate an existing or potential problem relating to public facilities.

- 6) To promote the goals and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan.
- 7) ④To foster the aesthetic appearance of the City through quality building design and site development; the provision of trees and landscaping beyond minimum requirements; the preservation of unique and/or historic sites or structures; and the provision of open space or other desirable features of a site beyond minimum requirements.
- 8) To bring about redevelopment of sites where an orderly change of use or requirements is determined to be desirable.

In conclusion, it has been determined that the submission materials provided by the applicant are sufficient for making a preliminary determination as to the qualification of the proposed plan.

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning and Zoning Deputy Administrator recommends that the Planning Commission approve the Preliminary Determination and allow the applicant to proceed in the preparation and submission of a Planned Unit Development per Chapter 1240.07 for the proposed Coventry Point North project.

As an additional note the intersection of two roads cannot occur at a curve due to required minimum straight-line distances for intersections. This is just a note as the plan enters the next phase of design.

Mr. Walters reviewed the above Staff Report regarding the Preliminary Determination of PUD (Planned Unit Development) with regards to Chapter 1240.06 (Request for Qualification) for Coventry Point North located at 25270 Fort Meigs Road. Developer Steve Mitchell, and Tim Bockbrader, The EDGE Group, were present. Mr. Vela referenced Chapter 1240.03(d) and asked how the Planning Commission justifies meeting that portion, and Mr. Walters noted that in terms of infrastructure, this request is less impactful to a typical neighborhood, and added that it's proposed to have 314 units as a PUD. Mr. Mitchell noted that there are 1.5 miles of nearby bike path that are existing and that he would like to continue onward with that plan with the intent to create more greenspace. There was a brief discussion about the zoning for these two (2) parcels, and the previous requests. Ms. Williams said that she appreciates the greenspace and bike path, and Mr. Bockbrader said that they have preserved over 22 acres of open space, which is twenty-eight (28) percent of the site. Mr. Bade said that he is concerned with the density as proposed, and surprised with the PUD density. There was a brief discussion about the next steps in the PUD process, and Mr. Walters clarified that this request is step one and if approved by the Planning Commission, then the applicants will move on to step two by preparing the actual PUD for review by the Planning Commission. Mr. Mitchell noted that this is a cooperative process with the city, and added that he believes that there is a need for this type of living space (empty nester housing). He said that the park area is intended to be a grassy green area, with a nearby shelter area, a circular pattern for bike paths, and including patio homes that are detached as opposed to the traditional 1800-

2800 SF homes. Mr. Bade said that he prefers more pods, less boxes, and that this design is progress.

Jen Feehan, 402 E. Seventh Street, said that she owns two homes nearby on Fort Meigs Road, and asked if they would have the opportunity to tap into the city sewers as they are so close to this development. She noted that they currently have city water and septic. Mr. Walters said that he would be happy to check into the feasibility of Ms. Feehan's request, as he is surprised that they are not already connected to the sanitary sewer. Mr. Mitchell said that he is happy to provide sewer/water to neighboring properties.

Mr. Lorenz made a motion to approve the Preliminary Determination of PUD (Planned Unit Development) with regards to Chapter 1240.06 (Request for Qualification) for Coventry Pointe North located at 25270 Fort Meigs Road, and allow the applicant to proceed in the preparation and submission of a Planned Unit Development per Chapter 1240.07. Seconded by Ms. Williams. Ayes: (6). Nays: (0).

***Preliminary & Final Site Plan
Kay & Paulus Orthodontics
195 E. Boundary Street***

Project Name: Kay & Paulus Orthodontics - Final Site Plan

Location: 195 E. Boundary Street

Zoning: OS Office and Service

Applicant(s): Nancy Kime

Kime Design (Toledo, OH)

Land Use: Medical Office Building

Parcel(s): Q61-400-680401004001

Request: Preliminary and Final Site Plan Review

Land Use		Permitted	Special Approval	Not Permitted
1225.08	Land Use Type	x		
Dimensional		Compliant	Non-Compliant	Not Applicable
1230	Front Setback	x		
1230	Side Setback	x		
1230	Rear Setback	x		
1230	Lot Coverage	x		
1230	Height	x		
1230.03(a)	Height Variance from BZA			x
1230.03(b)	Features above max height (exemptions)			x
Parking		Compliant	Non-Compliant	Not Applicable
1250.02(t)	Parking Lot Location	x		
1250.02(r)	Parking Relief			x
1250.03	Parking Quantity	x		
1250.05(b)	Parking lot design/layout	x		
1250.05(c)	Wheel Stops	x		
1250.05(f)	Location of Driveways	x		
1250.06(a)(5)	Parking Lot Screening (near residential)	x		

1250.06(a)(7)	Parking Lot Surface Material	x		
1250.06(b)	Parking Space Sizes	x		
Landscape		Compliant	Non-Compliant	Not Applicable
1250.11	Planting Plan	x		
1250.11(a)(1)	Landscape Architect (stamp/sign)	x		
1250.11(a)(3)	Planting Schedule	x		
1250.13(g)	Tree size (8' height, 2 ½" caliper min)		x	
1230	Minimum Landscape Percentage of parcel	x		
1250.18(a)	Min. Landscape Percentage of Parking Lot (6%)	x		
1250.17(b)	Parking Lot landscape primarily shade trees	x		
1250.17(c)	Planting areas dispersed through parking lot	x		
1250.19(b)	5' landscape strip between parking lot and P/L		x	
1250.19(d)	Landscape island = 1 per ea. 10 parking spaces		x	
1250.19(d)	Shade trees located in islands	x		
1250.20	10' landscape strip between R/W and parking		x	
1250.20(d)	Hedge within 10' landscape (min 1.5' height)	x		
1250.27	Berms/Earth Mounds (if required)			x
1250.42	Fence/Screen Requirement (height & location)			x
1250.43	Lighting (height & direction)			x
Building Design		Compliant	Non-Compliant	Not Applicable
1250.44	Screening of Rooftop Mechanicals			x
1250.48	Building Material (allowable percentages)	x		
1250.481(a)	Customer entrance facing each street frontage	x		
1250.481(b)	Recesses/projections if > 100' in length			x
1250.481(d)	Façade to have color/texture/material change	x		
1250.481(e)	Rooflines to change at least every 100'			x

1250.481(f)	Façade colors – low reflectance and neutral	x		
1250.481(g)	Building trim to be non-illuminated	x		
Drives & Access		Compliant	Non-Compliant	Not Applicable
1250.51(a)	Driveway access onto public or private street		x	
1250.51(a)(2)	Drives enter perpendicular			x
1250.51(a)(3)	Driveway grade less than 10%			x
1250.51(a)(6)	Driveway – at least 100' from an intersection	x		
1250.51(a)(6)	Driveway – at least 80' from other driveways	x		
1250.51(c)	Driveway – alignment with existing drives			x
1250.53	Deceleration Lanes if use > 1,000 trips per day			x
Sidewalks		Compliant	Non-Compliant	Not Applicable
1250.56(a)	Sidewalks across all frontages	x		
1250.56(a)	Sidewalks from R/W to entrance		x	
1250.56(a)	Sidewalk material through drive aisles	x		
Dumpster		Compliant	Non-Compliant	Not Applicable
1250.57	Waste Receptacle - Location	x		
1250.57	Waste Receptacles to be consolidated	x		
1250.57	Waste Receptacle – design/materials			x
Acc. Buildings		Compliant	Non-Compliant	Not Applicable
1250.61(a)	Accessory Building – Location (rear yard)			x
1250.61(b)	Accessory Building – ≥ 5' from side or rear P/L			x
1250.61(b)	Accessory Building – ≥ 10' from main structure			x
1250.61(d)	Acc. Building – Height (20' or main structure)			x
1250.61(f)	Accessory Building – Size Limit (5% of lot size)			x
Traffic Study		Compliant	Non-Compliant	Not Applicable
1255.04	Traffic Study – if more than 100 trips/peak Hr.			x

1255.04	Traffic Study – if more than 750 trips per day			x
Miscellaneous		Compliant	Non-Compliant	Not Applicable
1260.15(a)(1)	Plan doesn't impede normal development	x		
1260.15(a)(2)	Existing landscape preserved (as possible)	x		
1260.15(a)(5)	Emergency vehicle access to structures	x		
1250.26	Wall Location (if required)			x

Notes:

1. New slender silhouette sweetgum tree is listed as 2' CAL which is likely a typo for 2". The minimum caliper size for new trees is 2.5".
2. Along the southern property line the parking/pavement goes completely up to the property line rather than providing a minimum 5' landscape setback.
3. There are two parking lot landscape islands shown but due to the large size of the one located in the southwest corner of the site it can be counted as 2 resulting in a total of 3 islands for the site. 34 parking spaces would then require a 4th island to comply with the 1 for each 10 spaces requirement.
4. The landscape setback along the street is shown at 5' rather than the required 10' setback. This was previously discussed during the last submission.
5. No evidence has been provided that the access to the site has been verified. The code requires that access be taken to and from a public or private street or from an adjoining property with a proper access easement in place.
6. The pedestrian access from the public sidewalk to the front entrance of the building is shown as painted stripes through the parking lot as opposed to a material change of the surface. Paint has not been an approved method of making this distinction. Additionally, it would be recommended to center the pedestrian walkway between parking spaces 11 and 12 (rather than favoring 12) so that landscape could help separate the walkway from the parking spaces.

Recommendation:

The Planning & Zoning Administrator recommends conditional approval of the Preliminary and Final site plan subject to properly addressing items 1-6 above with the Planning Commission.

Mr. Walters reviewed the above staff report for the Preliminary & Final Site Plan for Kay & Paulus Orthodontics at 195 E. Boundary Street. Nancy Kime, Kime Design, was present on behalf of this submission. The Planning Commission briefly discussed items 1-6 from the above Staff Report with Ms. Kime:

Item #1 – Ms. Kime noted was a typo, and it should read two (2) inches. She added that the Kay & Paulus Orthodontics are in agreement with this item.

Item #2 – Ms. Kime added that this is a tight site especially along the southern property line and stated that their biggest problem is with parking for their clients. She said that

they have a staff of 12-14 people, and that they have 8 patients at a time with another 8 patients in the waiting area. Ms. Kime distributed an additional site plan to the Commission, and noted that Kay & Paulus Orthodontics has maintained the landscaping noted in purple for over thirty years. She added that they are well over on green space areas to compensate for the plantings that are being removed to accommodate this addition. Mr. Bade said that he understands the need for the amount of parking spaces that they are proposing, but that the site needs more landscaping towards East Boundary Street. There was a brief discussion about the proposed addition, and Ms. Kime stated that the existing waiting room will become a consultation room, the addition is for a new waiting area, the old consultation room will become a new break room, and the current entry will be brought in to ADA compliance with a stoop, rails, and a new ramp for accessibility.

Item #3 – Ms. Kime said that they have considered providing green space at the entry which is also included in the parking lot landscaping. She added that they do not have ten (10) stalls together in the parking lot.

Item #4 – Ms. Kime stated that she prefers a five (5) foot landscape setback, as she would rather have space in front of the building, rather than the lot. There was a brief discussion about irrigation, and Ms. Kime added that it's possibly already existing on the site. Mr. Walters said that he assumes this site is planned for 2-way traffic, but noted that 1-way traffic could be more feasible and safer, and Ms. Kime said that they prefer to maintain 2-way traffic on site.

Item #5 – Ms. Williams asked about the access easement with the adjoining property, and Ms. Kime said that they have been in contact with Mercy Health, and that they are in favor of the easement. She added that the Kay & Paulus Orthodontics are in agreement with this item.

Item #6 – Mr. Bade said that he would prefer a concrete pedestrian access from the public sidewalk to the front entrance of the building instead of painted stripes, and Ms. Kime noted that the concrete would include dissecting the middle of the parking lot. She added that they could use anti-slip paint that's ADA compliant if he is concerned with safety. Ms. Kime said that this preference provides more access to the ADA ramp.

Ms. Wolfinger made a motion to grant conditional approval of the Preliminary & Final Site Plan for Kay & Paulus Orthodontics at 195 E. Boundary Street, with the following conditions:

1. Typo resolved, and should read: new slender silhouette sweetgum tree is listed as 2" CAL.
2. Along the southern property line the minimum landscape setback shall be five (5) feet.
3. The parking lot landscape islands shall be left as shown on the site plan.
4. The landscape setback along the street shall be left as show at five (5) feet.

5. Access Easement Agreement letter from Mercy Health to be reviewed and approved administratively.
6. The pedestrian access from the public sidewalk to the front entrance of the building shall be concrete, instead of painted stripes as proposed.

Seconded by Mr. Lorenz. Ayes: (6). Nays: (0).

OTHER BUSINESS

There was a brief discussion about Agenda item #10 and #11 being removed from tonight's meeting. Mr. Walters noted that the July 27, 2023 meeting may be cancelled due to a lack of Agenda items.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Heather Alfaro
Zoning Clerk

