

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
SUMMARY MINUTES
August 10, 2021
7:00 P.M.

PLEASE TURN OFF CELL PHONES

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Mr. Okum, Chairman

II. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Dave Okum, Steve Galster, Bob Diehl, Don Darby, Tom Hall,
Joe Ramirez, Meghan Sullivan-Wisecup

Staff Present: Carl Lamping, Building Official; Shawn Riggs, City Engineer;
Liz Fields (sitting in for Anne McBride, City Planner)

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

IV. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING ON June 8, 2021

Motion to adopt minutes made by Mr. Galster. Mr. Hall seconded the motion.

Voice vote taken and the minutes were approved with a vote of 7 to 0.

V. REPORT ON COUNCIL - NONE

VI. CORRESPONDENCE - NONE

VII. OLD BUSINESS

A. Rt 4 Corridor Review District Plan, 12183 Springfield Pk – Mangos
(Application #20210983)

Jay Rodgers, proprietor for Mangos, stated they are proposing to brighten up the building. He stated they would like to add a few things as well. The building owner, Bill Harkleroad, was present for additional comments or questioning. He showed an exhibit of what they would like the exterior to look like in order to be compliant. Mr. Rodgers stated they would like to paint the building a taupe color similar to Hooters. They are proposing a black metal roof, and sliding doors to make it open air. Mr. Rodgers addressed the sign on the roof, and the notification he received that the sign is nonconforming. He asked the Planning Commission to consider some signage to promote his business. He stated it is a seafood based restaurant with a tropical feel.

Ms. Fields presented the staff report and comments.

Mr. Okum commented that the landscaping/tree replacement be consistent with the approved site plan, that was previously approved.

Mr. Lamping stated that Mr. Okum was correct, or it must meet the zoning code requirements.

Mr. Darby stated the commission should provide input in regards to the signage.

Mr. Okum stated the Hooters signs are on Mangos elevation because it is one building. The signage is based upon the building and not tenant. He stated they could place a monogram or marquee on the gable at the entryway. Mr. Okum stated as long as the location they choose is compliant with code he has nothing further to comment.

Ms. Sullivan-Wisecup asked in regards to the signage on the roof, how many past tenants were approved to use it.

Mr. Galster stated the last three tenants have used the roof sign, but it has also been a long time since it was used. It was grandfathered in, but once not used for six months, that clause goes away. A new sign for a new tenant needs to comply with existing codes. Mr. Galster stated over the gable in front of the doors or multiple signs on the elevations are good locations.

Mr. Harkleroad stated that the Hooters signage is on the front of the building and one side wall.

Mr. Okum stated that the previous tenant had a sign on the east facing elevation.

Mr. Harkleroad stated a sign for exposure to Mangos is important.

Mr. Galster stated over the entry door is one location. The south wall all the way to the east is another location that would reach the same people as the roof mounted sign. He feels with the south elevation there are better options than the roof mounted sign. Mr. Galster pointed out they also have the monument sign that can be shared.

Mr. Rodgers stated he feels only people in the parking lot see the roof mounted sign anyways. They just want to make sure they can have signage for their space. He feels like with the suggestion made the signage will be an easy fix.

Mr. Galster questioned if any roof work had been completed.

Mr. Rodgers stated they have been waiting.

Mr. Hall asked if Mr. Rodgers was part of the organization that had the Mangos at Rt 4 and Mulhauser Rd.

Mr. Rodgers stated that was their location for about two years, and then the restaurant was set on fire. That is the reason they are looking to relocate. He stated both Mr. Harkleroad and himself were looking into purchasing the building. He stated the realtor put them together, because Mr. Rodgers was looking more for operating room and Mr. Harkleroad was looking for a building.

Mr. Okum questioned the mechanical units, a unit on the roof that looks new.

Mr. Harkleroad stated the two new units on the roof are both Hooters and they were permitted.

Mr. Okum stated code requires the mechanical units to be screened, and needs to be addressed.

Mr. Harkleroad stated they were screened and it fell down.

Mr. Okum questioned if they planned any lighting on the building.

Mr. Rodgers stated he hasn't even gotten that far, he was just looking at getting the building painted. He stated there is a light above the gable and they will see how much lighting that will give.

Mr. Okum advised that any lighting change needs to be downlit and compliant with code. Mr. Okum stated that no accent lighting is being approved at this meeting. If accent lighting was added it would be a change and need to go in front of the Planning Commission. He mentioned that staff brought up the tree replacement. He stated there is a lot of landscaping issues where the trees have been removed.

Mr. Rodgers and Mr. Harkleroad both stated they have not removed any trees on the property.

Mr. Okum stated that they are not consistent with the approved plans for the site.

The chair will entertain a motion to approve the following project, Mangos - Rt 4 Corridor Review District Plan, 12183 Springfield Pk, Case #20210983; per specifications and designs provided in our meeting packet as exhibits which were submitted by the applicant prior to this meeting, and reviewed by Staff. This motion includes the following conditions: Staff, our City Engineer, and our City Planner's recommendations and considerations contained in their reports. Item 4 on the City Planners comments in regards to tree placement per the previously approved site plan. Any supplemental conditions would be any changes or modifications to mechanical units from view of adjoining properties and public right of ways, shall be required, and those mechanical units shall be in Staff and City Planning Commissions approved enclosures and screening. All lighting on the site of existing fixtures shall conform to the existing zoning code. Any accent lighting, led, neon, etc. that may be added is not approved at this time. All other zoning regulations and conditions not detailed in the motion shall remain in effect.

Mr. Hall made a motion to approve; Mr. Galster seconded.

Secretary called the roll and the motion was approved with a vote of 7-0.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Final Development Plan, 11911 Sheraton Ln – Milhaus Multi-Family Development, (Application #20211170).

Jake Dietrich, Milhaus Development, representative for the developer. He stated he was only going to recap what was presented at the preliminary plan. He stated he would walk through the plans at a high level of what was submitted and included updates to elevations based on feedback. Mr. Dietrich pointed out the second slide in his presentation, and stated it was the initial filing for the preliminary plan and a recap of where the project started. He stated they have tried to respond to Planning Commission and Staff comments along the way. He stated he would point out highlights of changes to buildings they made. Mr. Dietrich next referenced the site plan that was submitted with the preliminary plan that has slight modifications to accessory uses. He stated the basic footprint of buildings and the layout of the site remains relatively the same. He moved on to the next site plan that reflects the current plans. Mr. Dietrich noted the next exhibit showed the elevations submitted with the final development plan. The next exhibits show a change to the balcony design and elevations after comments were received from the

commission. Mr. Dietrich pointed out the roof lines being changed to a more contemporary look. He stated the amount of masonry on the buildings has almost been doubled from the initial presentation using two different shades of red brick.

Mr. Okum pointed out the applicant was displaying a color board that showed the materials to be used.

Mr. Dietrich compared the power point slides to the material board for more clarity on the colors. The next slide presented showed the elevation for the clubhouse. Mr. Dietrich presented slides showing the inside of the building just to give an idea of what the space will look like. He pointed out outdoor seating, a fire pit area, the swimming pool, and an aerial of the outdoor space. Mr. Dietrich recapped the submittal stating it will have a top of the line amenity package. He stated the total investment is \$40 million. He highlighted some things that were changed from the initial meetings.

Mr. Okum asked if the two representatives (Seth and Sari) on the zoom call had anything additional to add.

Mr. Dietrich did point out that the civil engineer and landscape architect were in the audience.

Mr. Okum asked Mr. Dietrich to present the building materials to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Dietrich stated there are two different building sizes, one longer than the other. The longer building will have one type of brick (darker) and the shorter building will have another type of brick (lighter).

Mr. Okum asked which brick was on the clubhouse.

Mr. Dietrich pointed to the darker brick. He stated that the fiber cement panels will only be at the building entryway.

Mr. Okum asked if the cement panels above the entryway would be the dark gray.

Mr. Dietrich confirmed they would.

Mr. Okum questioned the orange and where it would be located.

Mr. Dietrich approached the commission and his statement is inaudible.

Mr. Okum asked if the decks were going to be wood.

Mr. Dietrich stated that they will be a trex product with a cement panel trim board.

Ms. Fields presented the staff report and comments.

Mr. Riggs presented his staff report and comments.

Mr. Hall asked if the trunk line for the sanitary sewer would be able to handle the proposed amount of residents.

Mr. Riggs stated the sanitary sewer would be reviewed by MSD.

Mr. Dietrich added that the capacity letters were received and there is acceptable capacity in the storm sewer.

Mr. Okum questioned the traffic impact study in regards to the left turn lane off of Springfield Pk onto Ray Norrish. He feels there may need to be more turning time because approximately only 6 cars can stack in that lane.

Mr. Riggs commented and said that the city is aware of some issues and public works is working with the traffic engineer to address. He stated there may be some modifications that can help improve some of these issues.

Mayor Webster provided some history to that intersection and the stacking off of Crescentville.

Mr. Okum stated that during staff review on Thursday August 5, 2021 there was discussion regarding this being the entry point to the City of Springdale. He does not feel the clubhouse is an asset to the development. He has an issue with the cement panels. Mr. Okum stated he drove to Indianapolis to visit three of their properties and the weathering on the cement panels is an issue. He stated the cement won't be an issue but the finishes on them typically wear, and he is concerned over time how this will look. Mr. Okum stated what the community sees and the lasting impression off of 275 needs to stellar. He does not feel the clubhouse is a spotlight. He addressed the architect stating he has done a fairly good job on the building elevations. The clubhouse is not appealing in his view. Mr. Okum noted he is not in a place to vote in favor of the building elevations with what was presented. He thinks the color pallet is phenomenal for the market.

Mr. Dietrich addressed the clubhouse and fiber cement panel comments specifically. He stated what he is certain about is that installation is a big part of fiber cement panels. He stated if it isn't installed correctly, as with anything, there could be big issues. He stated all materials deteriorate, the materials they are presenting are solid but may need to be repainted. Mr. Dietrich stated there will be maintenance issues with the building materials that are unavoidable with any building. He stated that someone coming off of the interstate is not going to pick up the cracks that were picked up by someone standing five feet away. Mr. Dietrich believes the person coming off the interstate will see something that looks distinctive and is not like everything else that has been designed. He stated that he has developed \$4 million worth of projects, and they have used this material that is widely accepted as the better option for an accent material.

Seth, architect via zoom, stated that they try and locate this material in areas that are not prominent and set back. He stated they were very careful with the placement of the panels. He stated they have done close to 10,000 units in the last five years and have used a lot of fiber cement. He stated his firm provides full service construction administration to Milhaus and the project. Seth stated they will be on site, doing field observations, and are aware of the installation issues that have been seen. He stated they require the installers to be certified by the manufacturer, and they get reps from the manufacturer to do field inspections.

Mr. Okum asked if all of the flashing, trim, and everything are the cement panel manufactured product.

Seth stated this is specified as a system (the flashing, tape) and that is how they will get the warranty on this project. All the steps must be followed.

Mr. Okum asked about the warranty on the finish for this product.

Seth stated the prefinished material carries at least a 10 year warranty, and that can be upgraded to 15 years. Painted finish relies on the paint. He believes it to be at least a 15 if not 20 year type finish.

Mr. Dietrich stated that is the warranty not the expected lifespan.

Mr. Okum asked if the cement panels intended to be used are prefinished.

Mr. Dietrich stated they are field painted.

Mr. Okum asked what the aluminum trim flashing assemblies that are used would be.

Mr. Dietrich stated they will be field painted. He stated that some of the buildings that were visited in Indianapolis were hardy panel and an easy trim reveal system. We stated they have learned from those issues and have corrected that.

Mr. Okum stated he is comfortable with cement panel issues on a horizontal lap siding. The application of a square panel and the flashing systems jump out negatively. Mr. Okum stated it takes maintenance by the applicator and maintenance by the owners. He questioned whether Milhaus will own this property for the next 20 years, or is this developed and you do not know.

Mr. Dietrich responded stating they build them like they are going to own them forever. He also pointed out the distinction between panels and lap siding, stating the use of panels is isolated only to the main building entrances. He pointed out a very limited portion of the building will be panels. He said that if the area failed it's a very minuscule area.

Mr. Galster agreed that the hardy type siding does last longer than other products. He stated the brick and stone have a lot less maintenance than the other products. He feels that when a project stays closer to the 50% brick and stone in the corridor that's a plus for the community, or it ends up looking like too much siding. Mr. Galster thinks that increasing the brick and stone on the buildings that face the public right of way might be something to look at. He feels the elevations for the garages, and they will be viewed from the public right of way, need to be brick halfway or a third of the way up and not all siding. He suggested adding stone to the clubhouse. The garage south of the clubhouse is right at the intersection and the view will be a sided building. Mr. Galster stated if damage was to happen it most likely will be to the lower portion from vehicles and it won't show the marks. He stated that he likes the change to the entrance features and the depth that was added. He feels that the submittal has improved, but doesn't feel that enough was done with the addition of brick and stone that will be seen from the main thoroughfare. Mr. Galster stated the exhibit shows a downspout in the middle of the brick, and feels there should be one in between each window. He feels they need to be hidden by the trim.

Mr. Dietrich stated that everyone has preferences and ideas on what looks good and what does not look good. He stated the brick on the main buildings is what they want people to see. The brick on a multistory building will catch their attention more than a single-story garage.

Mr. Galster appreciates the detail to the three story building, but feels no attention has been paid to the garages.

Mr. Dietrich stated he appreciates Mr. Galster's opinion, but the design team went round and round on the elevations. They wanted the elevations to have the same form and character as the residential buildings.

Mr. Galster doesn't think that it was to be on every elevation of the garage or on every building, but the ones that front the main corridor need the attention. He stated his vote will go based on how the overall appearance and substance of the project is effected by the building materials.

Ms. Sullivan-Wisecup stated from the beginning she felt like the garages were shed-like. She agreed with Mr. Galster, and thought maybe it was just her personal thoughts being overcritical. She stated she understands a budget but feels something needs to be done in regards to the garages so they do not just look like sheds.

Mr. Hall addressed the material being used in the soffits and parts coming down. He indicated that if the installation was done correctly the warranty would be, and questioned the architect.

Mr. Dietrich addressed Seth with the question, who was having a difficult time hearing the meeting.

Seth asked if he was addressing the underside material or the fascia.

Mr. Hall stated were it is put together with the system.

Seth stated it has the same warranty as the other fiber cement material.

Mr. Hall questioned who would be in charge of verifying it was being installed correctly and that the warranty would be in effect.

Seth stated it is a combination. His firm provides a construction administration service that is not on site fulltime. Milhaus has a construction team has superintendents and a system in place. His firm is there to show the standards that have to be met. The manufacturer has the same obligation to the job. Seth stated his firm does spot inspections when they are on site and no one knows what they will be looking at. If there is an issue it gets marked on the field report and submitted to the owner as an issue that needs resolved.

Mr. Dietrich stated there will be contract terms that require the contractor to remedy anything that is not in compliance with the architects drawings.

Mr. Hall questioned who is responsible for signing off on this material in order to execute the warranty.

Mr. Dietrich stated the owner is responsible for accepting the building as it is constructed. The owner will not accept the building unless it is built in compliance with the plan specifications.

Mr. Diehl questioned if the sign would incorporate the logo.

Mr. Dietrich questioned if he was addressing the sign on the clubhouse or the sign on the ground.

Mr. Diehl stated the ground sign.

Mr. Dietrich confirmed it will have their logo on it that will be designed.

Mr. Diehl stated he likes the clubhouse.

Mr. Okum stated there are varying opinions. He agreed there is vinyl that warps and it was seen on newly constructed homes. He stated there is heavier vinyl that does not warp. He stated his point is that brick will last. Mr. Okum stated he likes the site plan and feels this project is a good use for the property. He has liked it from the beginning but the hurdles on the building elevations are difficult for him. His concern is what this development will look like in 25 to 30 years. Mr. Okum stated it is a keystone location in the City of Springdale. He voiced his concern in regards to the cement panels, and the maintenance issue this is going to cause for whoever owns the property down the road. Mr. Okum stated if they would have presented this project with cedar siding there would be the same questions. He stated the building designs have dimension and depth and all the things the planners have talked about. Mr. Okum believes there are two elements of this development that stick out the most. The two elements are the garages and, in his opinion, the clubhouse that is not a feature look. He stated he would be ready to make a motion to approve the development with the exclusion of the garages and the clubhouse.

Mr. Dietrich commented stating if they do not walk away with everything tonight and have to come back it doesn't change much for them. He is aware of what the commission is concerned about. Mr. Dietrich wanted to address two items brought up in discussion. The first item being the amount of brick on the primary facades of the buildings. He stated that every side of the building looks the same. Mr. Dietrich feels there are ways they can take brick off of one side of the building and put it all on the street facing side. He does not feel like that is the right solution, but if that is what the commission wants they will do it. Mr. Dietrich questioned if a building is parallel to Springfield Pk, the brick was taken off of the west elevation and added to the east elevation, if that would be acceptable to the commission.

Mr. Okum asked if he was addressing the four buildings that faced Mallard Lakes.

Mr. Dietrich responded saying Mallard Lakes would see no brick and Springfield Pk would see all of the brick.

Mr. Galster responded asking if he was looking at the east elevations of building 1, 2, & 8 and the south elevation 6 & 7, the sides visible from the main right of way. He stated that in the middle section just adding brick on the first floor breaks things up and adds another feature. He referenced drawing A4-21, the side view that shows all siding. Mr. Galster feels adding brick to the first and second level elevations on the main buildings will help. He also addressed adding brick to a certain height on the garages so they do not look like sheds. He stated possibly just three or four feet around the bottom of all garages visible from the public right of way. He would like to see brick on the garage south of the clubhouse, the garage attached to the maintenance building, the southwest garage. He feels developing things to last into the future is necessary so redevelopment in 20 years is not a concern.

Mr. Dietrich stated this is not a 20 year project. He stated there is no lender that will give a construction loan for that.

Mr. Galster stated he does not want the maintenance to become an issue. He feels adding the brick and the stone will add to less maintenance long term.

Mr. Dietrich stated they are willing to make adjustments, but they have a limited budget. He believes this would be a redistribution of masonry that would have negative effects on the architecture of the project as a whole. He stated if this is the desired look they would be willing to make some changes.

Mr. Galster responded stating the commission did not want to have any brick taken off of any side. He stated he is trying to address the ones that he feels are critical. He believes that the additional brick would not be a ton. Mr. Galster stated the trade will be on site and this is not a major change.

Mr. Dietrich questioned the concerns with the clubhouse. He does not feel like he had objective feedback on how to respond to the negative feedback.

Mr. Hall stated the garages have no curb appeal, no character, and it doesn't even look like it belongs in that development.

Mr. Darby commented in regards to the garages. He also feels they do not fit in with this development and they resemble sheds. He feels the development is very classy. Mr. Darby does not have a problem with the clubhouse. He feels it blends in with the buildings. He stated since these are rentals the owner better take care of the maintenance of the buildings because there will be turn over. Mr. Darby stated he supports what has been presented except for the garages.

Mr. Lamping addressed the code section comments that were put together by Ms. McBride and Ms. Fields. The city's code requires that at least 50% of

three facades visible from the public way have brick or stone. He stated there is not a complete evaluation of the percentage presented. Milhaus believes it to be around 30-40%. He stated they are asking for a reduction of masonry than what is required in the code. Mr. Lamping stated if they provide the 50% instead of 35% it would comply with the code, except for the garages. Mr. Lamping continued by saying because it is a PUD it becomes more of a discussion.

Mr. Okum recapped stating Mr. Galster made a suggestion that brick is added to the elevations. Staff has indicated that you are below the requirement. He continued stating the garages are part of the requirements. Mr. Okum does not believe the commission is asking too much by stating the garages need a skirt wall a few feet high. He stated he believes the commission is in favor of getting them thru the Final Development Plan, but feels it is difficult to even get a motion to the floor. Mr. Okum stated commission members are all over with their thoughts. He informed Mr. Dietrich that the commission wants to work with them to make this project happen. He advised he does not think the clubhouse is a welcome sign to the City of Springdale. He asked the commission their thoughts on the clubhouse.

Mr. Diehl asked Mr. Dietrich what his feelings are with the clubhouse.

The commission members have varying opinions on the clubhouse. None of them feel like the clubhouse is the biggest concern, and as presented is acceptable.

Mr. Dietrich wanted to address the question asked by Mr. Diehl. Mr. Dietrich stated he wanted to walk out of the meeting with an objective plan, and what will make the commission happy. He stated he has a design team that is very happy, and an ownership that is happy with the design. Mr. Dietrich pointed out he, as the developer, has a challenging job to make sure everyone is happy. He also stated with that the job has to be affordable. He stated the goal is to close and start this project before Christmas 2021. Mr. Dietrich stated it will be very challenging if they have to return to the Planning Commission meeting in September. He requested that there be some established parameters, and work with staff to accomplish the requests of masonry percentages on street facing facades. He would also like to work with staff on elevating the garages.

Mayor Webster addressed the commission in regards to all of the talk about brick. He stated that Mallard Lakes is what is currently seen and it is all brick. He did state that after years it still looks great, but does it have to be the same thing at this location. Mayor Webster stated beauty is in the eye of the beholder, and he likes what he sees. He stated he does not agree that the concern should be what this will look like in 40 years. He pointed out it will need to be maintained and if it isn't then they will not have tenants. The hotel was not maintained and went out of business on this site. He stated the city has been sitting on the site for years with proposals that never made it to the Planning Commission. Mayor Webster said the city did not feel the previous proposals would not have been proper use of the property. He stated that he would rather come off the interstate and see this development as opposed to what he has seen for the last 45 years.

Ms. Sullivan-Wisecup she thanked the Mayor for his comments and giving her a different vision. She stated they are below code and the decision is whether to hold them to code standard as a PUD or approve the submittal as is.

Mr. Galster stated the mixture of different building materials has evolved since the development of Mallard Lakes. He agrees with Mayor Webster and does not like the look of just one material. He feels it is important to address all finishes, as the redevelopment is not something that takes place very often.

Mr. Galster does think the applicant has done a wonderful job taking all the considerations and applying them.

Mr. Okum stated after reviewing staff comments that there are some final decisions that staff recommends. There are five items and four of them were not a concern with the commission members. The only item is in regards to the design, colors, and materials being consistent with the intent of the Rt 4 Corridor Review District. Mr. Okum stated he does not agree with taking brick away from other elevations and he would not support that.

Mr. Darby asked Ms. Fields to address code and the PUD.

Ms. Fields stated a PUD, when proposed, relies on the underlying zoning district. In the case of this project that would be the Residential Multi-housing Zoning District as a base standard for review. The intent of the PUD is to allow flexibility in design and to encourage a high level of quality of design. It does not have to meet the letter of the code.

Mr. Dietrich also asked that instead of saying it needs to be at 50%, they should look and see what architecturally makes sense on where to add brick. He requested that if brick needs to be added it is done in places that make sense, not just a percentage.

Mr. Okum stated he does not want to put the burden on staff, it should be at Planning Commission level for that approval. He stated if needed there could be a special meeting held.

Mr. Dietrich requested that on the elevations on the long elevations. He pointed to a building rendering on print. There are single story brick components in the middle of the building as compared to two story brick components. He proposed raising the one story brick to two story on the long elevations of buildings that face Springfield Pk. He stated their budget will need to be examined and determine if that will be pulled from opposing elevations. Mr. Dietrich recommended not changing the elevation on the short side of the building.

Mr. Dietrich went over to the monitor to highlight some details and everything that he said was inaudible.

Mr. Ramirez thanked Mr. Dietrich for working with the commission in order to not delay the project any further over a few rows of brick.

There was a lot of discussion on how to word the motion.

The chair will entertain a motion to approve the following project Final Development Plan, 11911 Sheraton Ln, Milhaus Multifamily Development, (Case #20211170). Per specifications and designs provided in our meeting packet as exhibits which were submitted by the applicant prior to the meeting, and reviewed by staff. This motion includes the following conditions: Staff, our City Engineer, and City Planner's recommendations and considerations contained in their report. We accept all of the recommendations except item 7 with our City Planners considerations, include under this condition regarding building elevations are:

- A. Building 2 east elevation, a water table at least 36" of brick or stone masonry, or masonry brick or stone shall be added one floor high.
- B. Building 1 east same conditions as building 2.
- C. Building 8 east same conditions as building 2.
- D. Building 7 south and east same conditions as building 2.

A water table or one level of brick will be added to the above elevations instead of siding to the ground.

Regarding the garage elevations:

- A. The garage south east of building 1 shall have a water table that is at least 36" high that is brick or stone on the north and east sides.
- B. The garage south of building 8 shall have a water table of brick or stone at least 36" high on the east and south of the complete structure.

This plan is also conditional upon staffs review of the PUD and the Law Directors approval of the covenants as necessary.

Mr. Galster made a motion to approve. Mr. Darby seconded the motion. Secretary called the roll and the motion was approved with a vote of 7-0.

- IX. DISCUSSION - NONE
- X. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT - NONE
- XI. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Galster moved to adjourn. Mr. Darby seconded.

Meeting was adjourned with a voice vote of 7-0.

Respectfully submitted,

_____, 2021 _____
Dave Okum, Chairman

_____, 2021 _____
Robert Diehl, Secretary