

PLANNING COMMISSION

NOVEMBER 19, 2015

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Chris Carry. Commission members present were Chris Carry, Byron Choka, Tom Forquer, Seth Hudson, Eric Nicely and Therese Witt (6). Mayor Olmstead arrived at 7:59 p.m. Also present was Brody Walters, Planning and Zoning Administrator.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Forquer moved to approve the minutes of the October 22, 2015 meeting as submitted. Mr. Hudson seconded. Ayes: Carry, Forquer, Hudson, Nicely, Witt (5). Abstain: Choka (1).

ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

Mr. Walters said that there will be a full agenda for the December 17th meeting and he called attention to a letter received from Jeremy Ballert, 202 W. Front Street, regarding Riverside Park that was distributed to Commission members.

Preliminary Site Plan Schuetz Container

Mr. Carry made a motion to untangle discussion regarding the Preliminary Site Plan for Schuetz Container. Mr. Hudson seconded and it was unanimously approved.

Mr. Walters stated that a new preliminary site plan was received from the applicant and was provided to Commission members. He distributed to the Commission members a copy of the twelve outstanding items that were included in the original Staff Report:

1. Transformer Pad (8' x 8') shown along Spafford Drive should be relocated or properly screened to the satisfaction of the PZ Administrator or the Planning Commission.
2. Two air handling units (15' x 30' in size) along the west side of the building to be screened and located at least 5' from the property line and to be relocated within a rear yard or receive a variance from the BZA.
3. Front yard setback (along Spafford Drive) is not being met.
4. Aerial easement is necessary from the City.
5. Side yard setback (along railroad line) is not being met.
6. Access drives to site are not in compliance with code requirements.
7. Parking space quantity is insufficient (no justification for fewer spots has been provided).
8. Parking in the required front yard is not permitted due to SAU.
9. Landscape percentages have not been provided for parking area or site.
10. Lighting details have not been provided.
11. Sidewalks are shown to be removed through driveways (walks must continue through all driveways).
12. Building elevations are inconsistent with Ch. 1250.481(a)-(f)

Mr. Walters said that since the last review, the applicant appeared at the Board of Zoning Appeals to remedy their setback issues and they were granted relief on those issues. Mr. Bailey said that on the revised preliminary site plan the trailer parking on N. Wilkinson Way has been removed and they shaded in along the North Wilkinson right of way to show where parking could go if the building were sold, as well as the potential for thirteen parking spaces on the north side of the truck dock. He said that they have no intention of striping those, it's just to show that additional parking can be added. Mr. Walters stated that item #4 regarding the aerial easement has not been completed, but the City Administrator indicated the conversation is going well. He said that in the previous review he called out that 39 parking spaces would be required for this size warehouse. He said that with the parking spaces that were shown on the revised site plan he has some concern regarding the navigation of trucks because the row of parking between the two drives on N. Wilkinson Way and the dock doors could not be used simultaneously. Landscape islands would also need to be added.

Mr. Forquer asked what options remain for the Planning Commission now that the Board of Zoning Appeals granted variances for reduced setbacks. Mr. Walters explained that the Commission still has the same authority, those items are just no longer considered deficiencies. He said that his recommendation would be to clean up the last two conditions which are the aerial easement and the additional parking spaces, along with the requirement of landscape islands. There was discussion regarding the alignment of the driveways. Mr. Bailey indicated that one will be designated as an entrance and the other as an exit. Ms. Witt asked if there is any landscape requirement with the seven parking spaces. Mr. Walters said there is, but that will be determined with the final site plan. Mr. Bailey clarified that the final site plan will remain tabled and Mr. Carry said it would be.

Mr. Carry moved to approve the Preliminary Site Plan for Schuetz Container with the conditions indicated by the Planning and Zoning Administrator in accordance with the Board of Zoning Appeals approvals. Mr. Hudson seconded and it was unanimously approved.

Final Plat

Hawthorne Plat 3

APPLICANT/OWNER/DEVELOPER

Hawthorne DEV, Inc.

Mr. Mark Rich, President

23285 West State Route 51

Genoa, Ohio 43430

Feller Finch and Associates, Inc.

1683 Woodlands Drive

P.O. Box 68

Maumee, OH

REQUEST

Chapter 1295.07 – Final Plat

PROPERTY LOCATION & DESCRIPTION

Hawthorne is an R-3 residential subdivision originally proposed to consist of 242 lots. This subdivision is located south of Coe Ct., north of Roachton Rd., and is immediately west of the CSX railroad tracks. The entire subdivision is comprised of approximately 107.8 acres.

Plat 1 consists of 30 lots on approximately 12.456 acres and was finalized on December 19th, 2013.

Plat 2 consists of 28 lots on approximately 17.647 acres and was finalized on March 26th, 2015.

Plat 3 is proposed to consist of 25 lots on approximately 10.263 acres rather than the original 27 lots indicated on the original preliminary plat. The loss of 2 lots comes from slightly increasing the lot sizes along Taylors Mill Circle.

BACKGROUND

The Preliminary Plat of Hawthorne was approved by the Planning Commission on July 25, 2013 by a vote of 7 to 0. Since the preliminary plat was approved the developer and the City of Perrysburg have worked together to complete the “land swap” and rezoning that was necessary to construct the northern portion of the subdivision as proposed. The “land swap” involved the developer extending/connecting Ringle Road to the south in exchange for a small portion of city owned land south of the “wooded area” and a portion of city owned land south of the current Dwyer Drive.

ANALYSIS

The staff has reviewed the final plat for plat 3 and approved with the following comments:

- Provide Open Space Fee payment (in accordance with equation below)

Public Service: A street tree plan is to be provided prior to the signing of the final plat.

Per Chapter 1295.05 (a)(7)(c)(1), Planning Commission, on July 25, 2013, approved 2.91 acres (originally shown as 2.83 acres) of open space in lieu of an Open Space Fee for a portion of the subdivision in accordance with the following formula.

Open space requirement = 2.91 acres of donated land + 7.5% value of 51.12 acres + \$100 per lot.

Total Open Space Fee for Plat 1(30 lots) = 12.456 acres x (\$10,807.05 x 7.5%) = \$10,095.95 + \$3,000 (\$100 x 30 lots) for a total of \$13,095.95.

Total Open Space Fee for Plat 2 (28 lots) = 17.647 acres x (\$10,807.05 x 7.5%)
= \$14,303.40 + \$2,800 (\$100 x 28 lots) for a total of **\$17,103.40.**

Total Open Space Fee for Plat 3 (25 lots) = 10.263 acres x (\$10,807.05 x 7.5%)
= \$8,318.42 + \$2,500 (\$100 x 25 lots) for a total of **\$10,818.42.**

Notes: Value per acre = \$10,807.05 (certified appraisal)

Value of 51.12 acres = \$552,456.39

7.5% of 51.12 acres = \$41,434.23

Remaining Open Space Contribution after Plat 3 payment = \$8,716.46

Per Chapter 1295.07(d), the following escrows shall be provided to the satisfaction of the city prior to signing the final plat of Plat 2:

Estimate of Construction Costs:

• Roadway and Pavement	\$TBD
• Drainage	\$TBD
• Erosion Control	\$TBD
• Waterline	\$TBD
• Sanitary Sewer	\$TBD
• Sidewalks (5'): (13,262.25 sq.ft. @ \$6.00/sq.ft.)	\$79,573.50
• Curb Ramps: (9 @ \$1,000 each)	\$9,000.00
• Street Lights: (2 @ \$1,796.64 each)	\$3,593.28
• Street Signs: (# of signs x \$150)	<u>\$TBD</u>

Total Escrows	\$TBD
----------------------	--------------

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning & Zoning Administrator recommends that the Planning Commission approve the Final Plat for Hawthorne subdivision Plat 3 subject to the comments and recommendations in this report including the deposit of escrows and open space fees.

Mr. Walters reviewed the above Staff Report. Mark Rich was present to answer any questions the Commission may have. Ms. Witt said that she is struggling with this request because of the land swap and this plat is inching it towards those roads.

Mr. Carry moved to approve the Final Plat of Hawthorne Plat 3 subject to the comments and recommendations in the Planning and Zoning Administrator's report. Mr. Hudson seconded and it was approved 5-1. Ayes: Carry, Choka, Forquer, Hudson, and Nicely. Nays: Witt (1).

Special Approval Use
Primrose
Levis Commons

APPLICANT/OWNER/DEVELOPER

Primrose School

ALT Architecture
2440 Dayton-Xenia Road, Suite B
Beavercreek, OH 45434

REQUEST

Chapter 1235.04(k) – Child Day Care Center

PROPERTY LOCATION & DESCRIPTION

Location: The proposed project is seeking a Special Approval Use (SAU) for the operation of a child day care center on a property located at the southeast corner of Doug Guest Dr. and S. Wilkinson Way. This property is immediately north of the Holiday Inn Express that is currently under construction.

Property Size: N/A

Parcel: Q61-400-180007018001

BACKGROUND

Levis Commons is a Planned Business Park (PBP) that also features an “Urban Village” overlay. Due to zoning of this property and the associated overlay development plans are typically reviewed and approved by the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) and are not required to be presented to the municipal planning commission. This application is unique in that the proposed use is listed as a SAU for this zoning district and therefore requires the review and approval of the planning commission. Currently, the Levis Commons ARC has only provided preliminary site plan approval and will not proceed to a final site plan review unless the SAU is granted.

ANALYSIS

Special Approval Uses generally require that two sets of criteria be met in order to grant approval. The first set of requirements is what is referred to as the “general conditions” and the second set is referred to as the “specific conditions”.

SPECIAL APPROVAL USE

General Requirements

Ch.1235.02(d)

1. The establishment, maintenance or operation of the special approval use will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, or general welfare or the natural environment.
2. The special approval use will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted nor shall it substantially diminish and impair property values within its neighborhood.
3. The establishment of the special approval use will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of the surrounding property for uses permitted in the district.
4. Adequate utilities, access roads, drainage and necessary facilities have been or will be provided.
5. Adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide ingress or egress so designed as to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets.
6. The special approval use shall, in all other respects, conform to the applicable regulations of the district in which it is located and to any additional conditions or procedures as specified in this Chapter.

Specific Requirements

Ch.1235.04(k) Child Day Care Center

1. Assurance shall be provided that all requirements of Ohio Revised Code 5104 Child Day Care are complied with.
2. Where childcare centers are located in residential districts adequate fencing and screening of outdoor play areas shall be provided. (Ord. 186-2006. Passed 8-1-06.)

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning and Zoning Administrator has reviewed the proposed Primrose project and recommends disapproving the request for a Special Approval Use. The primary objection to the request is the placement of a child day care center within a Planned Business Park and specifically adjacent to a hotel and other future busy commercial uses.

Mr. Walters reviewed the above Staff Report. Jerry Parker, attorney for the applicant, Mr. and Mrs. Churchill, the franchisees, Jim Alt, architect, and Jon Roumaya, the owner of the property were present. Mr. Parker stated that the Planning and Zoning Administrator's recommendation is very subjective. He addressed the specific and general criteria for the special approval use. He said that the daycare won't endanger the natural environment or public health. He said there are 372 Primrose schools in the U.S. They started thirty years ago and are the finest you'll find in the U.S. Mr. Parker said Levis is a lifestyle center although it's called a business park and with so many people living there, it is a natural fit. He said that there is a Kidz Watch in Levis and it is not causing any detriment. He said the applicant will be spending over \$350,000 to do upgrades with the overall project costing \$4.5 million dollars. Mr. Parker said that Primrose would be an excellent complement to Levis.

Mr. Parker said that he disagrees that it would be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the vicinity. He said that the owner of the hotel adjacent to the proposed site supports it and there is not much left to develop at Levis. He said that the Code is arbitrary because a part-time day care is a permitted use. He said that there has been an outpouring of support for this daycare at this location including from O-I. Mr. Parker said that he can request a deferral if the Planning Commission would like to hear from other tenants of Levis who support it.

Mr. Carry asked the operating hours. Mr. Parker said they will be open from 7 a.m. to 6 p.m. Mr. Walters stated that Kidz Watch was opened prior to the requirement of the Special Approval Use. He said that his recommendation is purely an issue of placement and if it were proposed for several hundred feet away, his recommendation could be different. He said that this proposed site is at a prominent corner and a more appropriate use would help create energy or a synergy, but this business is closed after 6 p.m. and will not be part of that energy. Mr. Parker said that is arbitrary and this daycare center will not create a detriment to Levis.

Mr. Choka asked about the safety of 200 kids at the intersection of two busy streets with parking for the Holiday Inn adjacent to the site. Mr. Alt said they have aggressively addressed that with a six foot wrought iron fence all the way around the building. He said that all exits go out into the fenced area and he added that Chappel comes into a cul-de-sac, it is not a through street.

Mr. Hudson said that he would like to hear from other businesses in the area around the proposed site of Primrose. Mr. Nicely agreed adding that he would also like to see the safety records for Primrose's other locations.

Mr. Hudson moved to table the request for a Special Approval Use for Primrose. Mr. Carry seconded and it was unanimously approved, 7-0.

Preliminary and Final Site Plan and Special Approval Use Riverside Park

APPLICANT/OWNER/DEVELOPER

City of Perrysburg
201 W. Indiana Ave.
Perrysburg, OH 43551

Tim Bockbrader
The Edge Group
33 S. Michigan St., Suite 304
Toledo, Ohio 43604

REQUEST

Chapter 1260.05 – Preliminary Site Plan Review

Chapter 1260.08 – Final Site Plan Review

Chapter 1250 – Site Design Standards

Chapter 1235.04(cc) – Parks, Parkways and Non-Commercial Recreational Facilities

PROPERTY LOCATION & DESCRIPTION

Location: The subject property is known as Riverside Park and the Water Street right-of-way. This land is located north of Front Street and is in general terms located between Walnut Street and Pine Street. Riverside Park consists of 3 areas; 1) the upper street level (where the benches and various monuments and memorials are located, 2) The sloped hillside that descends approximately 40' from top to bottom, and 3) The lower path level area that is flat and extends to the river's edge. This waterfront park is bordered on the east by AHFEY, LLC (residence) and to the west by the Therrien residence.

Property Size: approximately 3.3 acres

Parcels: Q61-000-901301001000

Q61-000-901206015000

Q61-000-901205012000

Q61-000-901205011000

BACKGROUND

The City of Perrysburg has undertaken many studies over the years (some as old as 1962 and some as new as 2015) to determine the role that the river and adjacent park could/should play in terms of community recreation, access, and overall quality of life for the residents of the city. In summary, these studies have requested or recommended enhancing public space in these area so as to provide better access and overall improved amenities. Recently, the city of Perrysburg with assistance from the Edge Group refined plans that were originally done in 2012 by the planning firm Harley Ellis Devereaux (Southfield, MI). This most recent planning effort has resulted in the attached plan for Riverside Park.

ANALYSIS

Due to the nature of the improvements that are proposed as part of this project a typical review as part of Ch. 1250 is not warranted or beneficial. The majority of the review items were handled through the review provided by the Historic Landmarks Commission, with the exception of the review and approval of the Special Approval Use which will be heard by the planning commission and ultimately city council. On November 9th the Historic Landmarks Commission approved all aspects of the provided plan (with the exception of the red sunshades) by a vote of 3 – 1 with one person abstaining.

Preliminary Site Plan

- **Zoning:** Park (P) with Historic Overlay (the majority of land is within the public right-of-way with only a portion existing on parcels with “park” zoning)
- **Setbacks:** Front: 50 ft.
Side: 20 ft. (min. one side) or 50 ft. total
Rear: 75 ft.

Traditional setbacks will not apply to this request as there are no structures that are subject to zoning setbacks.

- **Adjacent Zoning/Uses:**
North – Maumee River
East – Residential
South – Front St. / Residential
West – Residential
- **Land Use(s):** Parks, Parkways and Non-Commercial Recreational Facilities (SAU)
- **Site Layout:** The proposed improvements to Riverside Park consist of three primary features: 1) the upper terrace/plaza area, 2) the accessible pathways (staircase and sloped ramps) and 3) the lower plaza area. The project will be intersected with a 10' wide multi-use path within the right-of-way of Water Street.
- **Roads and Access:** No additional roadways are proposed as part of this project. It is intended and anticipated that this neighborhood park will contain largely pedestrian and bicycle traffic with no need for additional roads or parking facilities. If vehicular parking is necessary for users, parking is available in the upper and lower portions of Hood Park, and at Orleans Park as well.

Final Site Plan

- **Parking:** No onsite parking is proposed. The existing parking along the lower plaza area is proposed to be removed.
- **Site Landscaping:** The existing park is largely grass with a few trees within the site. Landscape enhancements are shown along the upper plaza/terrace area and also near the area east of the staircase along the ramped walkway.
- **Signage:** Signage shown on the provided submission is preliminary and will be reviewed by the Historic Landmarks Commission if any non-traditional park signage is proposed. Per Chapter 1250.32 the zoning district of “park” does not have any required dimensional standards.

- **Lighting:** Per Chapter 1250.43 lighting is permitted to exist within “park” zoning at a height not to exceed 30 feet. No lighting is being proposed at this time but the possibility of providing under-lit railings or bollard safety lighting is being explored. Any proposed lighting would be of low intensity, down-lit and very sensitive to adjacent properties. It is recommended to allow for administrative approval of any proposed lighting providing it is found to meet the requirements of Ch. 1250.43.
- **Building Materials:** There are no buildings being proposed as part of this plan. However, approval from the Historic Landmarks Commission will be necessary for materials used in certain areas of the park such as the retaining wall. The retaining wall, which is the largest feature of the park is proposed to be constructed of *Redi-Rock*, a proprietary concrete product that is stackable and imitates the look of stacked limestone. This product was selected due to the pressures of an undulating hillside, constructability, durability and overall cost.
- **Sidewalks:** Public sidewalks are required across all frontages and are shown on the site plan.
- **General Engineering:** The applicant shall submit and obtain City of Perrysburg engineering approvals for site civil construction plans, including pavement and drainage, water, storm and sanitary sewer prior to a zoning permit being issued. A zoning permit is required prior to Wood County issuing a building permit. Additionally, a pre-construction meeting is required prior to permitting by the City of Perrysburg.

SPECIAL APPROVAL USE

General Requirements

Ch.1235.02(d)

3. The establishment, maintenance or operation of the special approval use will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, or general welfare or the natural environment.
4. The special approval use will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted nor shall it substantially diminish and impair property values within its neighborhood.
7. The establishment of the special approval use will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of the surrounding property for uses permitted in the district.
8. Adequate utilities, access roads, drainage and necessary facilities have been or will be provided.
9. Adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide ingress or egress so designed as to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets.
10. The special approval use shall, in all other respects, conform to the applicable regulations of the district in which it is located and to any additional conditions or procedures as specified in this Chapter.

Specific Requirements

Ch.1235.04(cc) Parks , Parkways and Non-Commercial Recreational Facilities

3. Parks, parkways and recreational facilities shall be subject to site plan review to assure compatibility with residential areas.
4. Any such use shall be so located and developed so as not to create a nuisance to abutting property, and so as to be neither injurious to the surrounding neighborhood nor contrary to the spirit and purpose of this Zoning Code.
5. The development of parks, parkways or recreational facilities on waterfront sites shall be so developed as not to create visual barriers to other residential waterfront property or in any way restrict the use of residential waterfront property.
6. Any use of land created by filling of water areas for parks and/or recreational use shall only be allowed upon the issuance of a permit by the City. Such permit shall be issued only if it can be shown that such filling of water areas will not in any way obstruct the view or hinder access to open water or which could in any way create any hazard to health or in any other way diminish the amenity enjoyed by land abutting the water area.
7. No building or outdoor storage area should be closer than fifty (50) feet to any property or street right-of-way line.
8. Facilities shall provide off-street parking and passenger loading areas at least twenty-five (25) feet from residential lot lines.
9. All sports fields shall be a minimum of one hundred (100) feet from any lot line and two hundred (200) feet from any dwelling.
10. All buildings shall be harmonious in appearance with the surrounding area and shall be similar in design and appearance to other buildings on the same development site.
11. Lighting of outdoor activities shall be shielded from adjacent residential areas.
12. After review, the Planning Commission shall make a recommendation to the City Council. City Council shall hold a public hearing with respect to the proposed use, in accordance with the same procedures as provided for in Chapter 1285, shall review and decide whether or not the use will be permitted in accordance with the criteria of this Zoning Code and the procedures of Chapter 1285.

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning and Zoning Administrator has reviewed the proposed improvement plan against the requirements of the planning and zoning code and has found all aspects of the plan to be consistent with the relevant code requirements.

It is recommended to approve the preliminary and final site plan as proposed with the allowance that the PZ Administrator may administratively approve any proposed lighting providing it is found to be consistent with Ch. 1250.43. It is also recommended to recommend approval of the special approval use (SAU) to city council.

Further, it is recommended that a public hearing be set before City Council for January 5, 2016 at 6:15 p.m.

Mr. Walters reviewed the above Staff Report. Tim Bockbrader of the Edge Group was present to assist in answering any questions that the Commission or public may have. Mr. Walters once again called attention to a letter received from Jeremy Ballert, 202 W. Front Street, that stated he is in favor of the project but has concerns about the view of the river being blocked and the placement of trees.

Mr. Bockbrader stated that first and foremost, their charge was to provide ADA access to the river from Front Street. He said that the upper plaza provides an area off of the sidewalk to allow a view of the river. Mr. Forquer expressed concern that skateboarders will use the ramps and he thinks the sidewalks and ramps could be adjusted to prevent that. Mr. Bockbrader said that the ramps were done in a single line to minimize construction costs. Ms. Witt said that it has to be ADA accessible and if we try to block skateboarders, we will violate ADA requirements. She added that she thinks it is beautiful.

Katina Holland, 335 W. Front Street, said that the area between the multi-use path and river is a cliff; it drops off beyond imagination and is very dangerous.

Chip Phfleghaar, 401 W. Front Street, said that the plans look pretty, but there are sewer issues that need to be addressed.

Judy Nazorowski, 117 Cherry Street, asked about the trees on the upper plaza. Mr. Bockbrader showed where the four trees will be in the upper plaza.

Juan Artiaga talked about a cannon that was found at this site during past excavation. Mr. Bockbrader said that they have historical reports from the Ohio Historical Society and they don't expect to find any significant artifacts here. He said that as a precaution they will have experts on site during construction and there are procedures in place for dealing with projects like this. Another member of the audience talked about the cannon and suggested that the City will hide stuff. Mayor Olmstead stated that there are processes in place and if something happens, the City will act as required and will follow all procedures in accordance with the law.

Susan Berry, 341 W. Front Street, said that the ADA does not like big long ramps and she is concerned about handicapped people crashing down the hill. Mr. Walters clarified that the ramp will only drop one foot over a twenty foot section of the ramp.

John Bothe, 413 W. Front Street, asked if an amphitheater is included in this plan. Mr. Walters stated that there is no amphitheater; it was incorrectly referred to in a previous plan.

Responding to a question about the multi-use path, Mr. Walters explained the phasing of the path.

Mary Kazmaier, 244 W. Front Street, expressed concern about parking and people crossing Front Street. There was discussion regarding access to the park and a couple of audience members suggested that the ramp be flipped and start at the east end of the park instead of the west end. Mr. Bockbrader explained that there are existing cannons and memorials that they wanted to preserve in their current location, and if they started at the east end they would run into the sewer overflow.

Dan Judson, 139 W. Front Street, said that it is a good design for the retaining wall, but he suggested the width of the ramp be narrowed to limit skateboarders. Mr. Carry said that the eight foot width allows two wheelchairs to pass each other. Mr. Bockbrader said it also allows two families to pass each other.

Jon Orser, 125 E. Front Street, said that this whole plan should be thrown out. He said it is a violation of the Historic District and is completely unnecessary. Deborah Born, 125 E. Front Street, agreed. Mr. Bothe asked what is going to be done about the sewer issues. Mr. Walters said that the City has taken several steps to minimize these issues including the Wastewater Treatment Plant expansion and the completion of a significant amount of the sewer separation projects. Mr. Walters said the City has made an ongoing commitment to minimize overflows. He added that the City has no intention to spend \$1.5 million dollars on an area that won't be desirable. There was some discussion regarding parking.

Mr. Carry made a motion to approve the Preliminary and Final Site Plan of Riverside Park subject to the comments and recommendations in the Planning and Zoning Administrator's report and to recommend approval of the Special Approval Use to City Council and that a public hearing be set before City Council on Tuesday, January 5, 2016 at 6:15 p.m. Seconded by Ms. Witt. Ayes: Hudson, Olmstead, Witt (3). Nays: Carry, Forquer, Nicely (3). Abstain: Choka (1). Mr. Choka said that his firm does work for the City so he is prohibited from voting.

Mr. Carry asked what the anticipated start date is. Mr. Bockbrader said that construction is proposed to start in March. Mr. Walters said that timing is important because the goal is to have construction completed before Bicentennial events to be held the end of June and early July.

Mayor Olmstead made a motion to approve the Preliminary and Final Site Plan of Riverside Park subject to the comments and recommendations in the Planning and Zoning Administrator's report and to recommend approval of the Special Approval Use to City Council and that a public hearing be set before City Council on Tuesday, January 5,

2016 at 6:15 p.m. Seconded by Ms. Witt. Ayes: Hudson, Olmstead, Witt (3). Nays: Forquer and Nicely (2). Abstain: Carry and Choka (2).

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:23 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Jo Sutton