

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

JUNE 24, 2021

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman John Wellstein. Commission members present were Greg Bade (via AT Teleconference System), Andy Lorenz, Mayor Mackin, Craig Pickerel, Rob Vela Jr., John Wellstein, and Becky Williams (7). Also present was Brody Walters, Planning and Zoning Administrator.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Williams moved to approve the minutes of the May 27, 2021 meeting as written. Seconded by Mr. Wellstein. Ayes: Bade, Mackin, Wellstein, and Williams (4). Nays: (0). Abstain: Lorenz, Pickerel, and Vela (3).

ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

Mr. Walters noted that Item #6 on the Agenda will be bumped to the July meeting due to an updated address for the business. He added that due to the summer City Council meeting schedule, the Public Hearings will now be scheduled for Tuesday, August 17, 2021 instead of the dates previously listed in the Staff Reports.

Rezoning Request

***C-4 (Highway Commercial) to I-1 (Light Industrial)
12425 Williams Road***

APPLICANT/OWNER/DEVELOPER

Kurt Barney
Vandalia Rental
3901 Elida Rd
Lima, OH 45807
Kurt.Barney@VandaliaRental.com
O: (937) 454-7422

REQUEST

Chapter 1285- Changes and Amendments

PROPERTY LOCATION & DESCRIPTION

The subject property is located on the south side of Williams Road immediately east of SR25. The parcel ending in "46001" is currently zoned C4 (Highway Commercial) and the applicant is hereby requesting a rezoning of the property to I1 (Light Industrial).

Adjacent zoning:

1. North: "C4" - Speedway and "I1" - Murphy Tractor
2. East: "I1" - Corrigan Moving Systems
3. South: "I1" - former Ohio CAT site
4. West: "C4" - Tireman Auto Service

The area of this property is approximately 2.72 acres and currently features a 4,500 SF building.

BACKGROUND

This property was annexed from Perrysburg Township and was assigned C-4 (Highway Commercial) upon its arrival into the City. The most recent occupant of the property (the current owner) was RECO Equipment. RECO Equipment, Inc. is a full line distributor supplying all types of construction and mining equipment - new, used and rental, a use which is not dissimilar to Vandalia Rental. RECO had been operating at this location as a legal non-conforming use and as a result Vandalia Rental would inherit that same status. Vandalia Rental has expressed an interest in enlarging a portion of the building and expanding the use throughout more of the property if the property is acquired. The current zoning classification would not permit the current use to be expanded upon the property.

ANALYSIS

The City recently began the process of updating its Land Use Plan and while the final plan has not yet been adopted by the City, the initial draft has indicated a proposed use classification of "Village Mixed Use." This classification is not anticipated to change as part of any upcoming revisions or amendments.

Per Ch. 1220.03, I-1 zoning is defined as areas which are adaptable for industries of a restricted nature and generally limited to operations conducted wholly within a building and having no detrimental effects on neighboring land uses.

The following uses are permitted uses or allowed with a Special Approval Use (SAU) within **I-1**.

Kennels

Automotive Sales or Lease for New and Used Vehicles – Outdoors **(SAU)**

Commercial Recreational Facilities **(SAU)**

Recreational vehicles/equipment outdoor sales **(SAU)**

Restaurant – Full Service **(SAU)**

Sexually Oriented Business **(SAU)**

Child Day Care Centers **(SAU)**

Institutional Use **(SAU)**

Non-Commercial Recreational Facilities (SAU)
Part-Time Child Day Care Centers (SAU)
Wireless Telecommunication Facility (SAU)
Oil and Gas Wells (SAU)
Outside Storage (SAU)
Transport and Trucking (SAU)
Wind Generator (Turbine) (SAU)
Agriculture, Construction, Semi-Truck Sales/Service
Automotive Repair – General
Commercial Semi-Truck Sales/Service
Printing
Sales and Storage of Building Materials
Self-Service Storage
Nursery/Green House
Medical Urgent Care Facility
Accessory
Essential Services
Public Service Facility
Public/Private Utility
Food Processing
Laboratories
Manufacturing, Sale/Storage of Building Materials
Manufacturing: Light
Publishing
Research & Testing
Warehousing
Wholesale Business

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning and Zoning Administrator recommends that the Planning Commission recommend to City Council approval of the zoning amendment from C-4 (Highway Commercial) to I-1 (Light Industrial) for the subject parcel. This zoning district would allow the continued use of the property as a light industrial use consistent with the neighboring uses to the east. Additionally, the property does not have direct access to SR25 which has primarily been our C-4 corridor.

Further, it is recommended that a Public Hearing be set before City Council for August 17, 2021 at 6:05 p.m.

Mr. Walters reviewed the above Staff Report regarding the Rezoning Request from C-4 (Highway Commercial) to I-1 (Light Industrial) for 12425 Williams Road. Megan Malczewski, Signature Associates, was present on behalf of the applicant, and added that she is the listing agent for this property. She added that this property has always been utilized as heavy equipment sales and service since it was built within Perrysburg Township. Ms. Malczewski read a prepared letter from Vandalia Rentals based upon

their rezoning request for this property (a copy of which is attached hereto and made a part of these minutes). Mr. Pickerel asked how this request is affected by the current land use plan assessment, and Mr. Walters confirmed that this rezoning request is currently not in conflict with the draft plan. Mr. Walters clarified that Vandalia Rental is the applicant for this rezoning request, and that it is appropriate for this application. There were no further comments or questions from the Commission, nor the public.

Mr. Lorenz made a motion to approve the proposed Rezoning Request for 12425 Williams Road from C-4 (Highway Commercial) to I-1 (Light Industrial) per the recommendations in the Staff Report, and that a Public Hearing be set for August 17, 2021 for 6:05pm. Seconded by Ms. Williams. Ayes: (7). Nays: (0).

Final Plat Summerfield Plat 4

APPLICANT/OWNER/DEVELOPER

Mr. Steve Mitchell
MB Investments, Inc.
3150 Republic Blvd. Suite 3
Toledo, OH 43615

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

REQUEST

Chapter 1295.07 – Final Plat

PROPERTY LOCATION & DESCRIPTION

Summerfield is an R-4 residential subdivision proposed to consist of 145 lots total. This subdivision is located on the north side of Five Point Road between SR25 and Fort Meigs Road. The entire subdivision is approximately 54.3 acres.

Plat 4 is proposed to consist of 35 residential lots on approximately 10.939 acres.

BACKGROUND

The current version of the Preliminary Plat of Summerfield was approved by the Planning Commission on September 26, 2019 and is still active until September 26, 2021.

Plat 1 consists of 21 residential lots on approximately 11.6 acres and was approved in October 2018.

Plat 2 consists of 21 residential lots on approximately 6.645 acres and was approved in September 2019.

Plat 3 consists of 33 residential lots and one “common lot” on approximately 13.351 acres and was approved in September 2020.

ANALYSIS

The plat layout for Plat 4 is compliant with the Preliminary Plat that is currently active for this area. The number of lots, street layout and arrangement of lots is the same as originally proposed within the subdivision Preliminary Plat.

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 5 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 Summerfield Plat 4 subject to the comments and recommendations in this report including the deposit of escrows, and payment of other fees as required.

Mr. Easterling reviewed the above Staff Report regarding the Final Plat for Summerfield Plat 4. Greg Feller, Feller Finch, was present on behalf of the application. There were no comments or questions from the Commission, nor the public.

Mr. Lorenz moved to approve the Final Plat for Summerfield Plat 4 per the recommendation in the Staff Report. Seconded by Ms. Williams. Ayes: (7). Nays: (0).

Kevin Rantanen, 925 Locust Street, confirmed that the plat has already been created and asked about street addresses.

Historic District Boundary Update

The current City of Perrysburg Historic District is delineated by a legal description contained within Ch. 1245.49 that is dated May 15, 1984 (ordinance 46-84). Detailed examination of existing maps revealed what appeared to be several oddities to the boundary of the district in relation to residences, structures and streets. On March 11, 2020 the Planning and Zoning Division contracted with Garcia Surveyors, Inc. to review the legal description and to provide a survey drawing that illustrates the boundary of the district as defined by the legal description. On April 10, 2020 we received the survey drawing showing the existing boundary of the district which was then used to identify boundary issues such as excluded parcels and parcels that contained structures that were only partially within the district. An example of this would be the home on the northwest corner of Pine and Second Street where the eastern half of the home is in the district but the western half is not. Other similar issues were also found in other areas of the district. The Planning and Zoning Division provided a marked-up copy of the survey to the Historic Landmarks Commission at their December 14, 2020 meeting to explain the issues that were uncovered by more closely examining the legal description. This issue appeared before the HLC approximately half a dozen times, ultimately resulting in the commission providing targeted notices to property owners and soliciting input as to whether or not these owners would be supportive of joining the district (or bringing the remainder of their properties in). As would be expected some property owners welcomed the inclusion of their properties while others expressed their opposition. The map that is attached to this memo is the boundary description that the Historic Landmarks Commission ultimately voted to recommend approval for. The orange/golden line identifies the existing historic district boundary line (as described in the legal description from 1984). The areas in green are those areas that the commission felt should be added to the district and the area in red is the area they recommended to remove from the district. The contract with Garcia Surveyors Inc. is a two part contract with part one being the identification of the existing boundary line (as shown on the map) and part two is the creation of a new survey and legal description to reflect and all changes that are ultimately made to the district boundary. It is the intention of my office to take this boundary modification recommendation through the process including the Planning Commission and ultimately City Council for review and consideration. Upon the approval of a boundary modification we will execute part two of the contract which will provide the city with a new survey and legal description which will reflect the agreed upon modifications to the boundary.

Additionally, it is recommended that a Public Hearing be set before City Council on August 17, 2021 at 6:10 p.m.

Mr. Walters reviewed the above Staff Report regarding the Historic District Boundary Update and noted that the boundaries are defined by legal description and that there were some irregularities from the professional survey completed by Garcia Surveyors and the current boundary map. He noted that the Historic Landmarks Commission has done their due diligence in providing this recommendation to the Planning Commission, and appreciates their efforts thus far. The Historic Landmarks Commission recommends by a 6-0 vote that 114 Pine Street, 116 Pine Street, and 409 W. Second Street be completely included in the Historic District, as these parcels are currently partially-in and partially-out of the District. The Historic Landmarks Commission recommends by a 5-0-1 vote that the entirety of the Carranor Club property at 502 E. Second Street be included in the Historic District. The Historic Landmarks Commission also recommends by a 5-1 vote that all parcels that encompass Elm House at 230 Elm Street be removed from the Historic District. Mr. Walters noted that since the legal descriptions are codified that is why this update is before the Planning Commission as it's treated like a Code Amendment. He added that if the Planning Commission supports the changes that a Public Hearing will be set for August 17, 2021 at 6:10pm. Ms. Williams confirmed that Planning Commission will need to make a motion. Mr. Vela asked about the twelve (12) properties that were not included in the update to be accepted into the Historic District, and Mr. Walters said that the HLC did not want to force those properties into the District. Mayor Mackin confirmed that the Elm House parcels want to be removed from the District, and Mr. Walters said that it's likely a mapping error. Mr. Wellstein noted that the HLC did thorough work with their recommendation, and Mayor Mackin confirmed that the Carranor Club is agreeable to the recommendation. There were no further comments or questions from the Commission, nor the public.

Ms. Williams made a motion to recommend the Historic District Boundary Update from Historic Landmarks Commission to City Council, and that a Public Hearing be set for August 17, 2021 for 6:10pm. Seconded by Mr. Wellstein. Ayes: (7). Nays: (0).

Code Amendment – Chapter 1250.42(a) Fences, Walls, Structural Screens, Hedges and Screen Plantings

In June 2020, the Planning and Zoning Committee of Council fielded a complaint from a citizen regarding the enforcement of the fencing portion of the Zoning Code as it pertains to Plant Screenings. It was explained that screen plantings such as rows of arborvitaes are currently regulated similarly to privacy fences since the regulation was focused on the effect of the screening rather than the feature that was used to create it. Council members then tasked the planning and zoning division with researching neighboring municipalities and how planting screens are enforced, as well as having the Planning Commission review the existing Code to see if there are any changes they would like to see made to the existing

Code language. I have listed the code sections below and have highlighted the sections that refer to plant screens.

1250.42 FENCES, WALLS, STRUCTURAL SCREENS, HEDGES AND SCREEN PLANTINGS.

(a) The following regulations shall apply to fences, walls, hedges and screen plantings.

- (1) A permit is required for the installation of any fence.
- (2) The posts and all other supporting portions of fences shall be placed on the side of the fence facing the interior of the property owner installing the fence.
- (3) The height and location of a fence, wall, structural screen, hedge or screen planting shall conform to the style/dimensional chart.
- (4) Fences, walls, structural screens, hedges and screen plantings shall include all structures, shrubs, plantings or trees used to separate, enclose, screen or demarcate a boundary.
- (5) For fencing purposes the side yard shall consist of the area between the front of the house to the midpoint of the side yard. Any portion of yard between the midpoint of the house and the rear facade of the home shall constitute a rear yard for fencing purposes only.
- (6) Fence posts shall not exceed the maximum permitted height of the fence by more than four (4) inches.
- (7) The measurement of the height of a fence shall be made from the ground surface at the bottom of the fence.
- (8) All fences or screens within the Historic District shall require review and approval by the Historic Landmarks Commission.
- (9) Fences or screens six (6) feet or less in height must be installed or maintained at least four (4) inches from property lines. If taller than six (6) feet, a twelve (12) inch setback from property lines shall apply.
- (10) Chain-link fencing is prohibited in any front yard.
- (11) Barbed wire is prohibited.
- (12) Above ground electric fencing is permitted in A-1 districts only.

Location & Maximum Height									
Zoning District	Front Yard			Side Yard			Rear Yard		
	4'	6'	8'	4'	6'	8'	4'	6'	8'
R-1-R-5	P	Z	*	P	Z	*	P	P	*
RM	P	*	*	P	P	*	P	P	Z
A1	P	Z	*	P	Z	*	P	P	*
C1	*	*	*	P	Z	*	P	P	*
C2	P	*	*	P	Z	*	P	P	*
C3	P	Z	*	P	Z	*	P	P	*
C4	P	Z	*	P	Z	*	P	P	*
I1	P	Z	*	P	Z	*	P	P	Z
I2	P	Z	*	P	P	Z	P	P	Z
INS	P	Z	*	P	Z	*	P	P	Z
OS	P	*	*	P	*	*	P	P	*
P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
PBP	P	Z	*	P	Z	*	P	P	Z
S1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

The following excerpt is from the minutes of the October 29, 2020 Planning Commission meeting:

Mark Easterling (Deputy Planning and Zoning Administrator) reviewed the staff report for the Zoning Ordinance Review for Chapter 1250.42 Fences, Walls, Structural Screens, Hedges and Screen Plantings, and added that this review is for the Planning Commission to discuss and entertain the possibility of changes to the Code related to the highlighted portions. Mr. Pickerel asked about a review of other jurisdictions and those findings, and Mr. Easterling added that there was a mixture amongst other municipalities, and that the City of Maumee enforces the Code the same as we do. He added that there was nothing consistent across the board, and clarified that this review is related to growth of screenings beyond six (6) feet.

There was a brief discussion about the requirements of highlighted portion #9, and Mr. Pickerel added that it needs to be clarified. Mr. Bade added that the City cannot continue to change the Code to accommodate residents. Mr. Lorenz asked if there have been a lot of complaints over the years, and Mr. Walters said that it's a unique complaint from an installer that has four or five customers that have been affected. There was a brief discussion about the intention of the screenings in terms of a "fence" and enforcement of the Code. Mr. Wellstein stated that there are a small number of complaints, and that the Code addresses this issue appropriately. Mr. Walters noted that this proposal is an examination of the current Code. There was a brief discussion about permitted fencing heights. Mr. Wellstein made a recommendation to deny the proposed Zoning Ordinance Review for Chapter 1250.42 Fences, Walls, Structural Screens, Hedges and Screen Plantings. Seconded by Mr. Bade. Ayes: (6). Nays: (0).

After the Planning Commission meeting in October the Planning and Zoning Committee of Council discussed this topic at several subsequent meetings and ultimately created the attached proposal for reconsideration by the Planning Commission. The changes to the existing code are highlighted on the attached proposal.

Mr. Walters reviewed the above Staff Report for the proposed Code Amendment to Chapter 1250.42(a) – Fences, Walls, Structural Screens, Hedges and Screen Plantings, and noted that the highlighted areas in the Staff Report indicates what the Planning and Zoning Committee of Council would like to change. Ms. Williams said that she's concerned with arborvitae growth and expansion (height and width) related to encroachment, and Mayor Mackin agreed that it's a fair concern. There was a brief discussion about properties with two (2) front yards, and Mr. Wellstein said that he's not in favor of changing the Code for a select few properties. Mr. Bade stated that he believes that there needs to be a height limit and that he supports the encroachment concern. Kevin Rantanen, 925 Locust Street, said that he appreciates the compromise from the City, and doesn't believe that there should be restrictions related to the height. There was a brief discussion about plantings in specific zoning districts, like I-1 and I-2, and Mr. Walters clarified that the proposed changes are only where it's necessary. Mr. Rantanen referenced the arborvitae that line the outdoor patio at Basil Pizza & Wine Bar at Levis Commons and added that the plantings create a beautiful space. Mr. Wellstein said that he likes the idea of a height limit, and prefers the look of arborvitae compared to a fence. There was a brief discussion about commercial properties and the need for more plantings, and Ms. Williams noted the commercial property on Eckel Road that abuts a neighborhood. Mr. Walters added that this is a narrow focus on just one type of planting, and Mr. Pickerel said that he is not in favor of changing the language. There was a brief discussion about enforcement related to the current and proposed language, and Mr. Walters clarified zoning violations can be incurred if the code regulations are not met. Ms. Williams said that there should be continuity amongst the zoning districts and added that she is inclined to agree with the Planning and Zoning Committee's basic chart. Mr. Lorenz confirmed that this proposed language encompasses all plantings, and Mr. Pickerel said that he is in favor of a hedge creating a barricade with regulations. There was a brief discussion about breaking the charts into 2 separate charts so that there isn't any confusion going forward. There were no comments or questions from the Commission, nor the public.

Ms. Williams moved to not approve the proposed Code Amendment to Chapter 1250.42(a) – Fences, Walls, Structural Screens, Hedges and Screen Plantings, and asked that the Planning and Zoning Committee of Council review the charts and consider a separation of setbacks from the property lines, and that a Public Hearing be set for August 17, 2021 for 6:20pm. Seconded by Mayor Mackin. Ayes: (7). Nays: (0).

Preliminary Plat Five Point Villas

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 1295.01 – Preliminary Plat

PROPERTY LOCATION & DESCRIPTION

Five Point Villas is a proposed subdivision now consisting of 71 lots (former version contained 77 lots) that are each intended to provide a two-family living unit (total of 142 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).

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.

ANALYSIS

The Code requires a minimum lot area of 10,000 S.F. for R-5 Zoning. All proposed lots currently meet or exceed the minimum lot size.

The subject property shall be subject to Chapter 1295 – Subdivision Regulations.

Planning & Zoning:

- Minimum lot width is 90'. Lot 24 and lot 69 do not appear to meet this requirement.
- Ch. 1295.05(a)(6)(G) - Lots shall not have a depth of less than 120'. The pond width was reduced to accommodate a lot depth of at least 120'.
- Rear yards of "pond lots" to have an access easement of 16' for maintenance purposes.
- 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. An area of concern with the preliminary drawing is the driveway access to these units specifically on curved portions of the street. The driveway detail shows an awkward driveway angle into the middle of a road curve on lot 52 as an example. Other lots such as lots 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 13, 14 and 15 may also have an awkward driveway angle that could be considered as undesirable. **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.**
- A land appraisal will need to be provided for any future final plat request for calculation of the Open Space Fee. 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.

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 Administrator recommends that the Planning Commission deny the overall Preliminary Plat drawing for the Five Point Villas as submitted due to the requirement of Ch. 1295.05(a)(6)(D) for the creation of desirable building lots. A further reduction of the number of lots would allow the placement of driveways on the remaining lots to be more navigable.

Mr. Walters reviewed the above Staff Report regarding the Preliminary Plat for Five Point Villas. Greg Feller, Feller Finch, and Dave Schmidt, DS Developers, were present. Mr. Feller said that they have made quite a few changes from their last proposal to comply with City regulations with regards to lot depths, storm water, driveways, garages, and green spaces. He said that they can eliminate lots 52 and 71 to create more green spaces for the residents. Mr. Vela asked if there were any comments regarding the seven (7) foot tall mounds, and Mr. Walters added that he spoke with neighboring resident Bob Friedly, 12983 Five Point Road, who said that he welcomes the mounds. Mr. Walters stated that there is a concern with lots 52, 61, and 62, and Mr. Feller presented an updated driveway drawing to the Planning Commission. Ms. Williams asked Mr. Walters if these new changes presented tonight change his recommendation, and Mr. Walters agreed that they do. Kevin Rantanen, 925 Locust Street, asked if these villas will be rentals, and Mr. Feller confirmed that they will be. Mr. Wellstein said that he appreciates the changes made to this application. Mr. Walters asked if there will be a storm water pump, and Mr. Feller said that it is not a part of the plan. There were no comments or questions from the Commission, nor the public.

Mr. Lorenz moved to approve the Preliminary Plat for Five Point Villas per the recommendations and as discussed, by also removing lots 52 and 71 and respace lot 24. Seconded by Mr. Wellstein. Ayes: Lorenz, Mackin, Pickerel, Vela, Wellstein, and Williams (6). Nays: (0).

OTHER BUSINESS

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:34 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Heather Alfaro