I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Darby.

II. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Meghan Sullivan-Wisecup, Tom Hall, Rich Bauer, Don Darby, Dave Okum, Lawrence Hawkins III, Joe Ramirez

Staff Present: Anne McBride, City Planner, Shawn Riggs, City Engineer representative, Gregg Taylor, Building Official

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

IV. MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 10, 2019

Chairman Darby: Our sound system is down and we don't have a 13-year old available to fix it for us so we are going to go. Our requirement is not that the sessions be recorded but it is required that we take notes so we will just go that way. I would ask that all presenters please speak so that you can be heard and so that we can take notes of what you say.

Chairman Darby: At this time the chair will accept the motion to adopt the minutes of our previous meeting October 8th.

Mr. Okum: So moved.

Mr. Hall: Second.

Chairman Darby: Moved and second that the minutes of October 8th be adopted. Voice vote.

(Voice vote taken and the minutes were adopted with a vote of 7 to 0)

Chairman Darby: The minutes are hereby adopted. We will go with our report on Council.

V. REPORT ON COUNCIL

Mr. Hawkins: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Council met on October 16. All seven members were present. Before us we had Ordinance No. 41-2019, an ordinance authorizing the Mayor and Clerk of Council/Finance Director to enter into a contract with Clark Schaffer Hackett and company for professional accounting services for the audit of the City of Springdale for the years ending 2019 through 2023. That was a first reading of that matter. We also had Ordinance No. 42-2019, an ordinance authorizing the Mayor and Clerk of Council/Finance Director to enter into a contract with TEC Engineering Inc. for design engineering services necessary for the St. Rt. 747 and Kemper Road intersection project and declaring an emergency. That passed with a 7 to 0 vote. Council also met on November 6, 2019. All 7 members were present. We had before us Ordinance No. 41-2019 for a second reading. An ordinance authorizing the Mayor and Clerk of Council/Finance Director to enter into a contract with Clark Schaffer Hackett and Company for professional accounting services for the audit of the City of Springdale for the years ending 2019 through 2023. That passed with a 7 to 0 vote. That was a total increase of $10,000 from the last contract that lasted from 2014 to 2018. We had Ordinance No. 43-2019, an ordinance providing the issuance of not to exceed $1,320,000 in real estate acquisition bond and
anticipation notes, 2019 renewal of the City of Springdale, Ohio in anticipation an issuance of bonds providing for the Pledge of Revenues for the payment of such notes and declaring an emergency. That passed with a 7 to 0 vote. That was for the Sheraton property bonds their five years to thirty years the annual interest is 3.55%. We had Ordinance No. 44-2019. An ordinance authorizing the Mayor and Clerk of Council/Finance Director to enter into an amended agreement with MediSync Midwest LLC, related to a job retention and creation of incentive agreement and declaring an emergency. That passed with a 7 to 0 vote. We had a Public Hearing and Resolution R18-2019, a resolution finding that the creation of the Springrose Meadows Community Authority will be conducive to the public health, safety, convenience and welfare and is intended to result in the development of a new community; declaring the authority to be organized and a body politic and corporate; defining the boundary of the authority’s new community district; providing the method of selecting that authority’s board of trustees; appointing four members to that board; fixing the surety for those trustees’ bonds; prohibiting the dissolution of the authority without consent; prohibiting the authority from imposing certain community development charges; and prohibiting amendment of the authority’s organizational documents without consent. That passed with a 7 to 0 vote. With regard to that matter we had the four Council appointees which involved Mrs. Zimmerlin, Mr. Anderson, Mrs. McNear and myself. Three members, there were three members appointed by the developers which were Mr. Ackermann and two other, I want to say Meierjohan, two other individuals who are developers with Mr. Ackermann. Each house individually pays $4950 per year for the assessment. The money/payment is to go through the County Auditor. So, from the home owners through the County Auditor. The Port Authority is going to end up paying off the loan. That concludes my report on Council unless there are any questions or anything that Mrs. Megan Sullivan-Wisecup wants to add?

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: We’re good.

Chairman Darby: Thank you very much.

VI. CORRESPONDENCE

None.

VII. OLD BUSINESS

None.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Tri State Umiya Dahm of Cincinnati (TUDC), 1141 East Kemper Road, Springdale, Ohio, Development Plan. (Application 35488)

Chairman Darby: Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Taylor: Thank you Mr. Chairman. This is an aerial from CAGIS of the site. What we are talking about here is, this is the site. You can see where, even on the aerial the pad from what was expected to be here still remains. There is a detention basin off site and this is Kemper to the north and this is where the proposed access is going to be in between these buildings. This is the site plan. This is oriented where north is to the right. I actually had it the other way because it lined up with CAGIS at one point but it was so difficult to really get the sense of the site so went ahead and turned it back this way. I hope everybody gets it. Kemper Road is to the right on the slide and then to the top is the access between the buildings that I showed you earlier. That heavy line at the top of the property is the proposed retaining wall. The two areas that you see in the lower right-hand areas of the property are storm water detention facilities. This is the landscaping plan. Mrs. McBride will certainly have several
Mrs. McBride: You are lucky because I tend to talk loud anyway so it should be in good shape here. The property itself is at 1141 East Kemper Road and as Mr. Taylor indicated it is in the OB (Office Building) district. The applicant is proposing a 46,889 square foot facility that would include the temple, assembly hall, including a stage area, changing rooms, offices, dining and kitchen areas, some storage space and then the two bedroom living unit. All of those uses are permitted in the building and I should say, backup for just a second and say that the site which you saw is currently vacant and contains about 7.6 acres. So all of those uses are permitted in our OB district with the exception of the residential living unit. That is actually permitted as a conditional use so the applicant will need to come back to make an application for a conditional use and come back to Planning Commission for that approval. The proposed building location meets all of the building setback requirements. It meets the height requirement of the OB district. The parking setbacks were all consistent with the zoning code as well as the design and layout of the parking area. The OB districts requires a 30% open space requirement and I am very comfortable that they have that 30% but they do need to provide us with that number just for the record. They have also provided us with a parking analysis for the proposed uses and we agree with the majority of their calculations but there are two areas, the assembly hall and the dining area where our code says that either one space per 500 square feet or one space per eight seats whichever is greater and they took that off of the square footage. We need to have the number of seats to make sure that we actually do have the correct parking requirements. They are proposing a total of 252 spaces on site but they also have a shared parking agreement with the office building to the west, so there is an overflow parking available to them and they have provided a pedestrian sidewalk connection between that lot and their proposed lot. So staff feels very comfortable that they are going to meet those parking requirements but again for the record we need to have those numbers. They have been working with our landscape architect on their landscape plan and they are just a very few minor items that need to be cleaned up that staff can work with them to get done. The proposed use could either be considered a low activity use for lighting purposes which would be a place of worship or a medium activity use as a community center because this facility is going to really serve as both. So, the lighting plan that they submitted actually falls between our low activity use and our medium activity use which is perfect. So, staff really has no comments on their lighting plan in terms of the height of the lighting, the foot candles of the property line are all fine, the maximum and the minimums and so forth, everything is fine with their photometric lighting plan. They did provide us, by the way, with cut sheets for the LED fixtures on the poles. So we’re good to go on the lighting. They are indicating a Dumpster location which would be at the southeast corner of the building, off of the building and they are indicating an enclosure for that waste facility but we will need to get details of that again to make sure that it meets the zoning code. They are showing mechanical equipment a lot of which is on the ground which is screened but we need to have a little bit more detail on that. So we are requesting that. Then the final item is signage. We didn’t receive anything for on the building but as long as it is consistent with our zoning code, staff can review it and approved that. They are proposing one ground mount sign and it would be consistent with the code, the maximum of 8 feet tall 100 square feet per side, 10 feet off of the right-of-way, however; their actual frontage is on Kemper Road. They are going to have their access because of the topography and the proximity to the Century
signalized intersection, they’re going to have their access off of Century Boulevard and they have provided us with a copy of that cross-access agreement. So, they would like to have their ground sign where their access is. It makes sense right? Well, the code does not allow for that property, that the sign would go on, to have two signs, two ground mounted signs on that property so they have made an application to the Board of Zoning Appeals which will be heard this month by them to allow for that ground mount sign, which would be at their access point which seems very appropriate honestly. So, staff is going to need to work with them to resolve the parking and the landscaping, the Dumpster details and the mechanical screening, all of which we feel very comfortable working with them on. Then they’re going to need to come back to this body to get a Conditional Use Permit to allow for the residential use within the facility and they are also going to then need to go to the Board of Zoning Appeals which will happen this month to get approval for that ground mount sign off site. So, that’s my report. If you guys have any questions I’d be happy to answer those.

Chairman Darby: I just want for the record want to note that all of the issues that will be reviewed by staff for the OK is consistent with what we have done in the past.

Mrs. McBride: That’s correct. You have left things to staff’s review and approval as long as they are consistent with the code and there’s no reason to think that any of these things are not going to be consistent with the code. Obviously, if they are they have to come back to you all and to the Board of Zoning Appeals depending on what they are. We have been working with the applicant and these are pretty minor details are what we are down to at this point in time.

Chairman Darby: Thank you very much.

Mr. Ramirez: Can I ask a question?

Chairman Darby: Sure.

Mr. Ramirez: On the 252 spaces and they have an agreement with the adjoining property, how are we going to be assured that agreement doesn’t go away, those people sell the property 11590 Century Boulevard?

Mrs. McBride: Yes, there is and they have provided us with a copy of that.

Mr. Ramirez: Okay. Thank you.

Mrs. McBride: Again, they have also made that physical pedestrian connection so that it is easy and it works in reverse that if the office building were to have some kind of event for trade show or whatever in one of the offices then they can use their parking and again there is a physical connection to actually allow for that.

Mr. Ramirez: Thank you.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. Hawkins: Thank you Mr. Chairman. The 7-foot retaining wall, is this the wall that is along the entryway of the drive?

Mrs. McBride: Yes, and that is going to be an Allen block wall.

Mr. Hawkins: They still have some things to take care of in terms of the lighting?

Mrs. McBride: No, the lighting is fine.

Mr. Hawkins: Okay. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Darby: Okay. I have been remiss, I want to welcome Mr. Riggs sitting in
with us this evening.

Mr. Riggs: Thank you. Generally speaking the site plan is acceptable. There are few minor details that we will have to continue to work out but with regards to the retaining wall, one of the concerns is that it would actually, it is off site, so they will need an agreement from the owner with permission to do that work. We need some other details too because of the height of 7 foot. There is also a sidewalk connection, connecting to the adjacent site that we would also need evidence of an agreement to perform that work as well. We will need some more details as far as curb installation, retaining wall, handicapped ramps and other items but nothing out of the ordinary. The applicant will also have to get a street opening permits on East Kemper Road, not for a driveway but for actually the water and sewer taps. In terms of traffic, they submitted a traffic count for a similar site in Sharonville that shows the peak hours occurred between 7:30 and 8:30 PM and it was 78 trips. So, with the understanding that peak generation will occur not during Sunday morning peak traffic which would be an issue. In terms of storm water management, everything seems to be acceptable. Again, there’s just some more details that have to be worked out in some more submittals. Nothing out of the ordinary. I believe that’s all for an overview.

Chairman Darby: Thank you. Does the applicant want to come to the dais please? Good evening.

Mr. Lynch: Good evening. My name is Tim Lynch. I am from the law offices of Cornetet, Meyer, Rush & Stapleton. I am presenting on behalf of the applicant Tri State Umiya Dahm of Cincinnati. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for giving us the opportunity to be here tonight. Thank you staff for that report. We’re here to tell you that we’re excited about this opportunity to take a vacant land and turn it into a Hindu temple and community center here in Springdale and anticipate along with our congregants, we will bring a lot of business to Springdale and we’re very excited to give a new option for people of this area to practice public worship, to attend this community center. It gives our members a chance at putting their children to engage in cultural and spiritual educational classes doing things like SAT and ACT prep. We’re happy to answer any questions that the commission may have. We have our full team of architects here along with Gail Frazier, our landscaping architect from Frazier and Associates. Steve Stewart of Genesis Designs, LLC. Our building architect Dennis Beaty and our lighting architect Joel Tibberdine of King Lighting Incorporated. The owner of the property is Design Build Solutions as well as the neighboring property at 11590 Century Boulevard is also here to answer any questions if necessary. But, I would like to address some of the items that were mentioned by staff and. On November 4 we did submit a supplemental application to the best of our ability answering the comments that were provided on the plan review. We would like to state that we do have the green space calculation, that was provided on our supplemental civil plans. We have 60.2% of green space on the property well exceeding that 30% requirement. We have re-calculated our parking calculations based on seating capacity for the two main rooms that were an area of concern. The dining hall as well as the assembly area. In total we’re looking at a need for 353 spots which puts us above the two that and 52 available parking spots that are on TUDC’s property but in total Century Plus Partners has 183 available spots in their parking lot. With TUDC and Century’s parking lots combined we’re looking at 435 spots which gives us an additional 83 spots, excuse me 82 spots than we are required in the code. Our Dumpster enclosure has been screened, we have screening in place for it and we’re happy to provide staff with further details of that enclosure. As was mentioned the sign that is being proposed at what will be the front entrance going up to Century Boulevard on the access easement that has already been recorded for the property. We have submitted a signed variance request on behalf of the owner for the property, Century Plus Partners LLC. We are also looking to put a sign on the front entrance so when you come into the building you’ll see the Tri State Umiya Dahm as you saw on the rendering that was initially put up on the screen. Thank you, Mr. Taylor. It may be my need to get an eye exam, it does say Tri State Umiya Dahm of Cincinnati, and we are intending on keeping at the same. So, that will be the sign that is in addition to the second requested ground mounted monument sign abutting Century Boulevard. Staff has been great as far as working with us for the requirements of the retaining
We anticipate that as well as a shared parking agreement may other agreements that were provided to the city and ask them for comment from the staff in order to best prepare us to have this use on the property. In addition, we have requested water availability from Greater Cincinnati Water Works so we can have that water and sewer taps and the street opening permit. The conditional use for the residence, we have provided for you today what we are going to have a residence located on the mezzanine inside the property for the Pujaris which is similar to a Catholic Priest. Like in the Roman Catholic Church we’re going to have a rectory in that mezzanine where the Pujaris will reside and similar to any other church someone who is looking to attend the Hindu temple and seek spiritual counseling will know that there is a custodian for lack of better term, who is always going to be on the premises. So those are just my comments. I’m happy to answer any other questions that members of the commission may have. Again thank you for this opportunity.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Okum.

Mr. Okum: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Just a couple of questions. Is there going to be a high element on the site, a tower?

Mr. Lynch: So, there are minarets and you can see on the rendering as well as on our building design plans. There’s going to be three minarets that are located on top of the roof. They are going to be below the height requirement of 48 feet, but yes Mr. Okum they will be there.

Mr. Okum: Are they similar to one in Sharonville?

Mr. Lynch: They are comparable. Yes.

Mr. Okum: They will be under the 45 feet?

Mr. Lynch: Correct.

Mr. Okum: Okay. Will there be lighting on those?

Mr. Lynch: There will not be.

Mr. Okum: Okay. So, they will not have any illumination except natural?

Mr. Lynch: That is not in our plans as we presented them.

Mr. Okum: I understand, just covering all of the bases.

Mr. Lynch: Certainly.

Mr. Okum: I guess she knew that before you got here right? Okay so, in regards to the building itself. It is sort of hidden. Is the building going to be visible from Kemper Road?

Mr. Lynch: From Kemper Road?

Mr. Okum: Yes.

Mr. Lynch: No. During construction obviously, we’re doing our best to preserve the existing vegetation and as Gail Frazier has put together, that is our intent. Putting together the parking lot and obviously when construction is going on you will see activity happening at 1141 East Kemper Road but once the building is actually erected an established, the way that we have our landscaping plan and design and the way that the building is tucked in between all of these other properties, given the street frontage it is still a landlocked parcel for lack of better term. You won’t be able to see it coming up Kemper Road. So, you turn onto Century Boulevard and when you see, hopefully the sign that we are asking to get approved on
Mr. Okum: I understand.

Mr. Lynch: You will see the driveway welcoming you to TUDC’s property.

Mr. Okum: Is there any improvements of the grassy area that goes up to their off of Kemper Road that are going to be made? Will there be a wall there on the side of the, when used to be the art academy or anything there that you need to do construction wise?

Mr. Lynch: No. The only thing that we’re proposing to do on what is the northern part of the property is to put a parking lot at. In our initial application we had proposed doing a drive and realized now that it is not possible. We are going to keep the existing vegetation that is there and add nothing else.

Mr. Okum: So, you do have owner’s rights on the property off of Century or is that an access easement?

Mr. Lynch: It is an access. Are you referring to the Century Boulevard entrance back?

Mr. Okum: The Century Boulevard entrance, right.

Mr. Lynch: There is currently a recorded access easement agreement.

Mr. Okum: Okay.

Mr. Lynch: And that was provided in our application and I believe the date that when it was recorded was the 28th day of September, 2012 between the company that was initially looking to develop the property and it was entered into between Century Plus Partners, current owner of 11590 Century and Welsh Kiesland III LLC.

Mr. Okum: So you are just utilizing the existing that is a recorded document that is recorded at the recorder’s office and still there.

Mr. Lynch: Correct. That’s still alive and well.

Mr. Okum: That’s fine. That’s all I had. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Darby: Thank you. Mr. Bauer.

Mr. Bauer: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Just one question, more for staff. The existing detention pond that is up there for the adjoining property.

Mr. Riggs: Yes, there was one previously excavated and they intend to use that. At least for the most part they are going to have to make modifications to verify the capacity of that and they’re putting in another separate water quality pond in addition to the detention pond.

Mr. Bauer: So, that detention couldn’t be utilized?

Mr. Riggs: Yes, generally speaking you can but the site differences may require more detention than was previously excavated to make up that difference.

Mr. Bauer: Okay. Thank you.

Chairman Darby: Thank you.

Mr. Hawkins: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A question has been answered that I do have a second question though. That is the outer building material project to be?

Mr. Lynch: The exterior of the building?

Mr. Hawkins: Yes.
Mr. Lynch: It is going to be brick and EIFS that is going to be of earth tone colors. So, there’s not going to be any blues and purples or anything that is when standout. That would upset Mr. Okum as he drives up East Kemper Road.

(Laughter)

Mr. Okum: I was hoping to see it personally.

Chairman Darby: We have had applicants who have argued purple was an earth tone.

Mr. Lynch: We are open to suggestions, but as of now that is not where we were getting to.

Mr. Hawkins: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Okum: Just a comment to staff. Mrs. McBride, part of your considerations calls for the Board of Zoning Appeals approving the additional signage and I’d like to include that staff review and approved that submission so that it has, it ties to the whole project.

Mrs. McBride: You can certainly do that if you want but I am actually preparing the staff report for the Board of Zoning Appeals so I am most certainly including that.

Mr. Okum: So, I don’t have to address that?

Mrs. McBride: You do not have to do that. I will be preparing their staff report.

Mr. Okum: I was just covering all bases. Based on that, Mr. Chairman, I’d like to move to approve the following project, which are the name I apologize. Tri State Umiya Dahm of Cincinnati, 1141 East Kemper Road, 7.6 acre site case number 35488. This motion includes the following conditions, staff, are City Engineer and City Planner’s recommendations and considerations contained in their report. This approval is also conditional on the approval of the Springdale Board of Zoning Appeals request as identified the variance and stipulated as required.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: Second.

Chairman Darby: It has been moved and second that the application be approved as identified in the motion. Secretary please call roll

(Secretary called the roll and the motion was approved with a vote of 7 to 0.)

Chairman Darby: Before you leave, I want to sincerely welcome you to Springdale. Your presence, what has been described to us will really enhance the mosaic that is Springdale as related to its diversity. We look for to you being here. Thank you.

Mr. Lynch: On behalf of Tri State Umiya Dahm, thank you.

B. Tri-State Signs on behalf of Jake Sweeney Alfa Romeo, 85 West Kemper Road, Springdale, Ohio, Development Plan (Application 35752)

Chairman Darby: Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Taylor: Thank you Mr. Chairman. This slide indicates the site. It is in this slide, north is again to the right. Kemper Road is at the right edge of the slide. Jake Sweeney Place is on the slide here. (Not audible too much background noise drowning out Mr. Taylor.) This is in the process of being turned into an Alfa Romeo dealership. The item before you is one that you have seen sadly many, many, many times. We have a cabinet sign here that is basically Alfa Romeo’s logo. So, that cabinet sign needs to be approved by you. This is an elevation view and the subject
sign is a round Alfa Romeo logo. The Alfa Romeo and Cincinnati North that is all channel letters and part of the code. Everything about that is compliant with code. The only thing for you here is the cabinet sign. This is a detail look at it. It’s actually a pretty small sign. It is only 7.22 square feet. It is my understanding is that it’s Alfa’s only available sign. That’s what they want, that’s what they need to do. So, that’s really the item before you is allowing this cabinet sign. That is all that I have.

Chairman Darby: Mrs. McBride.

Mrs. McBride: Well Mr. Taylor gave my whole report.

Chairman Darby: He does that.

Mrs. McBride: So, I will just try to supplement that by saying that the dealership, based on their 68 linear feet of frontage is actually entitled to 122 square feet of sign area and they are proposing only 55.65 square feet that, as you heard it says Cincinnati North and Alfa Romeo in the two channel cut letter signs and then the Alfa logo which is the 7.22 square feet which would require Planning Commission approval.

Chairman Darby: Thank you. Is that it from your side?

Mr. Okum: That’s it. That’s all you are going to get.


Mr. Bauer: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Just one for, is there an applicant here? Are you comfortable with the size of the sign? Is it big enough?

Mr. Weeks: Yes.

Mr. Bauer: That’s it. Thank you.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. Hawkins: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. For clarity sake, Alfa Romeo is mandating dealerships to have these types of signage?

Mr. Weeks: Yes.

Mr. Hawkins: So, that for the record it is a requirement for the dealers to have these types of signs.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Okum.

Mr. Okum: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don’t have any problem with the logo medallion. I feel that it sort of makes it work for visibility for the business and it is an identity feature. So, I have no problem at all. So, based upon that and no other lights, Mr. Chairman I move to approve Jake Sweeney Alfa Romeo request 35752 per specifications and designs provided in our meeting packet as exhibits which were submitted by the applicant and reviewed by staff prior to the meeting. This motion includes the following conditions staff and City Planner’s recommendations and considerations contained in their report.

Mr. Ramirez: Second.

Chairman Darby: It has been moved and second that this application be approved as identified in the motion. Secretary please call roll.

(Secretary called the roll and the motion was approved with a vote of 7 to 0.)

Chairman Darby: Motion is approved. Thanks for coming.
C. Crafty Crab, 11790 Springfield Pike, Springdale, Ohio, Minor Improvement requiring Planning Commission Approval (Application 35753)

Chairman Darby: Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Taylor: Thank you Mr. Chairman. This is an aerial shot from CAGIS. It’s Glensprings Plaza, formerly known as Wimbledon’s, formerly in this case the Outback Steakhouse. These folks are going to take this space and turn it in the Crafty Crab and once again the request before you is for a cabinet sign. This is the actual request. What we are talking about here is the crab claw. (Not audible) The claw is the logo that’s the request. There was kind of an alternate provided in the packet from the applicant and the idea here is if you look at this particular slide where it says Seafood and Bar, that’s also channel letters. It is underneath the Crafty Crab letters. If you are inclined to allow a cabinet, they also provided this one which is Seafood and Bar in a cabinet sign rather than channel cut letters. Crafty Crab is all cases is channel letters and the claw in all cases is a cabinet. It is kind of a two-fold request. It is a function of how far Planning Commission feels like. That is all that I have.

Chairman Darby: Mrs. McBride.

Mrs. McBride: Again, my staff report. So, this property gets the award for having the most letters attached to it from a zoning standpoint so it’s zoned OB, it is in our CRD District, Sub area B and it is also in our T, transitional district. So, there you go. So, at any rate they are going in as Mr. Taylor indicated, into the former Outback location. The crab logo is 34 square feet and they’re, as he indicated, there isn’t any way to make that a channel cut letter. The Crafty Crab is 47 square feet and that is channel cut letters. Then the seafood bar is 8 square feet if you build it with channel cut letters which is my understanding that that was what the applicant submitted. That is what we will review was the seafood bar was actually going to be channel cut letters. So, based on they have 80 lineal feet of tenant frontage so they are entitled to 140 square feet of sign area. They are proposing as part of that the 34 square foot cabinet sign which is actually 38.2% of the propose sign area. They are under the 50% for the non-earth tone colors which is a requirement right now of the corridor review district. They are allotted 140 square feet and they’re proposing 89 square feet so they are significantly under. That’s all I have.


Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: I have the same question that we had for Alfa Romeo, is this claw a logo that has to be on this? Is this like a required branding?

Chairman Darby: Oh, representatives please come forward. I’m sorry.

Mr. Chen: Do I have to go up front?

Chairman Darby: Yes, please.

Mr. Chen: The Crafty Crab is a chain restaurant. They all have the sign like this.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: So, it is for branding?

Mrs. McBride: Could we get your name for the record.

Mr. Chen: My name Anson Chen.

Mrs. McBride: Thank you.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Ramirez.

Mr. Ramirez: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I drive by that location, I saw the sign that
you have of there now. Any thought about, I thought it was a craft shop when I saw that. Any thought about making the seafood and bar larger so from the street you can tell what the business is all about?

Mr. Chen: This business is from Miami, Florida. They are the first restaurant there and they are doing like lobster tail, crabs, snow crab legs, oysters, all kind of seafood. They like the Crafty Crab name. They are a chain store and they want them in Ohio so, everything follows the restaurant whatever they are doing now.

Mr. Ramirez: You are going to be on the panel board out front as well?

Mr. Chen: What’s that?

Mr. Ramirez: The panel board where all of the other tenants are?

Mr. Chen: I don’t know?

Mr. Ramirez: They have white sections where every business has their name on that. You are on that as well?

Mr. Hall: The sign by the street.

Mr. Chen: Yes. Yes.

Mr. Ramirez: Do we know what that is going to look like?

Mr. Chen: I don’t know.

Mr. Okum: It would be just a face change.

Mr. Hall: Those are block letters aren’t they?

Mr. Okum: I believe those, if I may Mr. Chairman, I believe the requirement is that those are all symmetric, same color. It would just be a sign face change.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Taylor: That is all that I was going to say.

Chairman Darby: Okay.

Mr. Taylor: It was a requirement for the Glensprings sign that they all have the same color and that they all have the same font. The only thing that changes is the size of the font based on the number of letters. The little squares are all the same size.

Mr. Ramirez: That’s all I have. Thank you.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Bauer.

Mr. Bauer: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a question on the claw. Was there any thought about, their temporary sign that is up there has it all to the left of the Crafty Crab. Was there any thought about putting it on that metal stainless mesh? The owner, or when that was brought to us, that renovation, that’s where I guess I envisioned all of the signage to go was on that stainless mesh, not on the building itself.

Mr. Chen: We like the sign the way that it looks like. They try to have the chain restaurants so they want all to have the same sign on the restaurants.

Mr. Bauer: So that, so you are saying the way that’s oriented that is now their signage is typically everywhere on the chains? The crab up top.
Mr. Chen: Yeah, at the top. That is the way they want the claw on top.

Mr. Bauer: As far as, my opinion, I prefer all of the stuff below the crab to be channel letters myself. That’s just me. That’s it.

Mr. Chen: The claw is 34 square feet but if think it is too big we can make it a little smaller.

Mr. Bauer: No, I was more concerned about it hanging on the building. Somewhere down the line and that comes off and you still have the crab look up there for some time until they paint the building. But you are going to be successful so I won’t have to worry about that for a long time.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Okum.

Mr. Okum: I just have, I don’t know why bothering with this thing I’m so used to it. I get in trouble if I don’t have the MIC on button from hitting in any way. In regards to it, I think that did a quick browse and if you go to their Crafty Crab web site that is pretty much the way it is laid out. The only difficulty I have with it is the claw being above the sign band is an issue because of other businesses in that mall and sign band issues we have had on other developments where applicants have requested that we bring signage up above the sign band. So, I am just bringing that up for discussion so that we all are aware. I mean this is, like Mrs. McBride said, it’s got more letters to it and sections because it is part of the overlay district which is sort of like a PUD district for a district and it does give us some latitude on that. So, in this particular case I think evidence would be that obviously that would be important. I do think, and maybe it is me looking at it but I think it is off center with the center of the peak on the roof and I think the signage needs to be dead center. If it means you’re off by 6 inches from being that setback requirement that we have I would be okay with that. I think it all should align center wise directly under a gable and that is my only comment. I’m seeing heads shake.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Taylor: They have plenty of room to adjust it. I mean they have 80 feet of frontage.

Mr. Okum: So, they can center it up?

Mr. Taylor: Yes.

Chairman Darby: Okay. Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. Hawkins: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I agree with you about what Mr. Okum was saying in terms of centering in terms of the point of having the crab claw above the normal range of where the sign is. I agree that we want to be consistent but in this instance I would say based on the fact that this is to be consistent with the signs for this entity, I’d be okay with that in this instance for it to be maybe some variation.

Chairman Darby: It is to be noted that in response to those comments, although it preceded the sign band, the Outback sign was up there in that triangle. And it was very large.

Mr. Okum: That’s helpful.

Chairman Darby: For your information.

Mr. Okum: It’s very helpful.

Chairman Darby: My technological skills, I reacted, even pulled it up really quickly.

Mr. Okum: You did. If I may Mr. Chairman. I don’t see any more lights Mr. Chairman.
I hereby move to approve the following project, Crafty Crab at 11790 Springfield pike case number 35753 to include in the motion staff’s and our City Planner’s recommendations and considerations and also in this motion as to not allow the seafood and bar box cabinet sign but rather channel letters as required by code.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: Second.

Mr. Okum: And the unit shall be centered on the gable.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: Okay, now I second.

Mr. Okum: Did you follow that?

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: We’re good.

Mr. Okum: Sir?

Mr. Chen: It has to be in the center?

Mr. Okum: Center, yes.

Chairman Darby: Center.

Mr. Okum: That means moving it to the left a little bit.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: Just a little bit so it centers up with a gable.

Mr. Okum: Center of a gable.

Mr. Chen: Okay, okay.

Mr. Okum: Symmetric.

Mr. Chen: Okay.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: I seconded it.

Chairman Darby: Moved and second that did

Mr. Chen: So, you want the drawing and submit again?

Chairman Darby: Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Taylor: You don’t have to come to this board again.

Mr. Chen: Okay.

Mr. Taylor: But you have to submit for a building permit in the Building Department.

Mr. Chen: Okay.

Chairman Darby: It has been moved and second that this submittal be approved as identified in the motion. Secretary please call roll.

(Secretary called the roll and the motion was approved with a vote of 7 to 0.)

Chairman Darby: When do you plan to open?

Mr. Chen: As soon as possible.

Chairman Darby: Hurry up.
Mr. Chen: Maybe like in one month.

Chairman Darby: I drive by that sign several times a day

Mr. Chen: Before Christmas.

Mr. Okum: Your mouth waters.

Chairman Darby: That’s right. Thank you. Everyone okay?

D. Springdale Commerce Park, Buildings 2 & 3, 12110 Princeton Pike, Springdale, Ohio, Revised Development Plan (Application 35755)

Chairman Darby: Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Taylor: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Everybody is imminently familiar with this project. Obviously, this is the old GE Park. This aerial was actually taken early this year when the work was just beginning. This is I think the most descriptive drawing which is why I included it in the slides. The issue is, essentially the issue is the height, let me back that up. Primarily, at this point the height of the lighting fixtures and as part of the recommendation to Council that you folks made, the lighting was all supposed to be at 15 feet and Council affirmed that and it is actually in the recorded Covenants that the developer prepared that the lighting fixtures were supposed to be 15 feet. The proposal before you is the wall packs on the, at this point we are looking at buildings 2 and 3 which are the two that are along Crescentville Road which is at the top of the slide here. There are a number of wall mounted fixtures that are all at 30 feet on the building and then there are on the south side of building 3 there’s two poles that pole mounted locations that are 30-foot poles on a 3-foot base. Then the two dark circles you see there, kind of in the south east corner of building 3 are two 15-foot poles with a 3-foot base. So, this is a detail showing the wall mounted fixtures on building 2 and they are basically at 30-feet. This is the wall mounted fixtures. This is actually all the extra lighting on building 3 that shows the wall mounted fixtures and then the pole mounted fixtures to the south and in the southeast corner. This is a, I guess I call it a site plan key because these sight lines are numbered 1-6. This is sight lines 1, 2 and 3. Here is sight line 1 at the top, is site line drawn from the public road way right-of-way and obviously the 30-foot fixture will be clearly visible from the right-of-way. Same way on slide number two which again the road is in the middle of the two buildings and the little squares on the building that represents where the wall mounted lighting fixtures are. On the bottom there is a sight line shown, but basically that section is on the south side of building 3 and you can see the trucks back around and the dock on the left-hand side and the roadway if you will on the right and then the slope on down to the west. These are site lines 4, 5 and 6. Sight line 4, I believe, is from the Heritage Hill neighborhood. You can kind of see the small square here that represents the wall mounted light fixtures. Then this is actually number 5 is actually Crescentville Road and then number 6, I am going to ask Mr. Wright, when they come up here, to try to explain this a little bit because I don’t quite understand the match line shown on the sight line site visual. Then finally this is the sight line from the condo building at The Crossings. Looking out to building 2 and again, the little thing on the building here represents the lights. These sight lines, I think Mrs. McBride is probably going to have more to say about this but I think if you look closely at the sight lines, I think in a number of cases, I believe they don’t really indicate that these are going to be sufficiently screened. We did not receive a photometric plan as part of this submission, however; the applicant indicated that they submitted it some months ago. Actually, back in March. I can’t tell you whether it complies or it doesn’t because frankly I don’t recall. I think the issue at this point has more to do with the height of the lighting than anything else, however; we are not in a position to really addresses lighting from the buildings outward. The other thing that I will note is that the roadway light poles were intended to be at this point 25 feet height. That was never stipulated in the Planning Commission because we don’t regulate street lights. One thing that was part of the recommendation to Council and Council’s ultimate adoption is that those poles be bronze in color as I recall. I think that is about all that I have
with this. I know that there is more coming.

Chairman Darby: Mrs. McBride.

Mrs. McBride: Thank you. So, I’m not going to go back through, I tried for by the commission with some of the history because what was submitted to us was a multitude of things. It was some lighting stuff, some mechanical stuff, a kind of a mish mash of things. So, that’s why there are different items that are mentioned in your staff report. But, to focus on the lighting because that is all that the applicant is asking us to look at tonight, not the mechanical units and so forth. We, at three separate public meetings asked the applicant, who was the developer, are you in agreement that your lighting is not going to exceed the low activity level, which is 15-feet maximum mounting height and at each of those three steps the applicant/developer indicated that yes, he was. So much so to the point that that is what was put into the recorded Covenants and which the City has and was a party to. So, here we are tonight and we are looking at wall packs that are to be mounted at 30-feet on the east side of the building that is adjacent to a single-family residential development and along with two pole lights that are to be also 33 feet in height. We don’t have a photometric lighting plan. I can’t tell you what the light level is going to be at the property line. I don’t have any cut sheets for the lights or the poles. I really don’t know what to tell you. They agreed in the Covenants, they agreed in meetings that they would comply with all of the requirements of our zoning code relative to lighting and that is all out the window at this point in time. So, I don’t know what else to tell you. That’s all I’ve got.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Okum.

Mr. Okum: Just for the record, since your report is abbreviated, we have a staff report from you from October 16, 2019 which is a letter to the applicant stating the issues on the development and then we have our current November 12th, is that correct, staff report. I’d like for both of those reports to be part of the minutes of the meeting so that it is clear that the applicant knows that these items were requested of them back on October 16th and then later tonight. Everyone knew how sensitive this project was to these residents. Everyone knew how sensitive this project was to the community were all precedent and very key parts of this development. I am extremely disappointed. I’ve driven Crescentville Road now, I drive it probably once a week, twice a week and I’ve got dock doors and docking areas that are facing and are in clear view of the public right-of-way. There was discussion of that at our review and my motion stated that there should be screening of that. Obviously, there has been very little attention put to addressing staff’s comments in regards to the development and to the fact that we’ve got what we’ve got in front of us. I’m not in a position right now to vote on this or to give them approval. At this point they can wait until they get it straight and get it right and you can tell the developer and the builder and the owners that that’s my position. Now this commission can do what they decide to do but I will not be voting in favor of any changes to this development until they comply with the standards that were approved.

Mr. Wagner: Do you mind if I speak?

Mr. Okum: I’ll yield to your comments.

Mr. Wagner: Thank you for your time this evening.

Chairman Darby: Your name please?

Mr. Wagner: My name is Zach Wagner with Strategic Capital Partners. I work closely with John Cumming who I am sure you are all familiar with. He unfortunately was not able to make it tonight. As far as the response to the comments, I apologize that didn’t make it, I was under the impression that your comments had been addressed. So, we are happy to answer any additional questions. I think the reason that we are before you tonight, that this is truly a safety issue. That the average truck height is 13
½ feet tall and as the kind of look that the photometric plan, which again I thought you guys have copies, so if you don’t I will make sure you get them. The line of sight that we think would be buffering and existing landscaping that it should be sufficient based on the line of sites provided. I have got Christian Mains and Zach Wilson from Hemmer and Dave Wright with Kleingers to help with any technical questions you may have.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. Hawkins: I concur fully with the concerns the Mr. Okum has. It has to be appreciated that this property, this development is very sensitive to two different sets of residents. There was a property that through the course of development, the first developer who could no longer develop it through issues they went through with regard to the property changing hands. Development changed repeatedly. Development did not listen to what Planning Commission had said and what Council had said and we got to this point and the current developers too that over, that project, still something that is very sensitive. So, whenever things change, I think even this development when it came before Council there was some weird situation where they had some other plans that were different than what had come through Planning Commission and were approved. Everybody is very sensitive to that. So, when there is a change to these plans, and this isn’t about rigidity or a lack of flexibility, this is about great consideration going towards the residents that are in those condos and the residents that are in Heritage Hill and the impact on them and trying to minimize that as much as possible. All of the time and consideration that staff, this Planning Commission and City Council has given to reach a place of compromise, which there are residents that still aren’t happy with that situation. So, even though this has gone forward and this has been approved there are residents that are still not happy with the situation. So, the idea that there is something that deviates from what that agreement in planning was is very troubling. Because again that is not something that everybody said we are happy with it, it is what everybody needs to come to understanding and appreciating the circumstances that we are in. So, when you have this kind of change when we are dealing with things that involve lighting that can impact residents. We are involving things that may impact residents in terms of height and the sight lines, that is a very big deal. These are things that were major concerns along with noise and other things that are going to be distractions that impact resident’s quality of life. So, this is not a small thing. I am hearing you say that the request or the decision to increase the height of the lighting is based off the trucks being 13 feet tall?

Mr. Wagner: Yes, the photometric, the candles do not reach the pavement. Christian can provide little more than technical detail.

Mr. Mains: My name is Christian Mains with Paul Hemmer Company. I believe that you all received the packet papers that was delivered to everybody. So, within those papers as Gregg had mentioned, one clearly shows the big picture with the project then building 2 and building 3. On that sheet, if you don’t mind to go back to it? So, it is hard to see this but what we are requesting here is these 30-foot pole lights on 3-foot bases on the south side of building 3 and then the 25-foot pole lights all throughout the roadway. I put circles around all of the different wall pack lights of building 2 and building 3. I just wanted to let you know that we have tried to do as much as possible to help with the owners. We have been very, I’m sorry the residents as well. We have gone to them and we’ve, we’ve

Chairman Darby: Excuse me. Excuse me. Excuse me. Wouldn’t you think it would have been more appropriate to come to us first to come to staff first because there was a plan?

Mr. Mains: There was a plan, yes.

Chairman Darby: Agreed upon. Voted on.

Mr. Mains: From our stand point, I thought that once we received the building permit
for these, I thought that this was closed. I didn’t realize that this was not

Chairman Darby: Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Taylor: If you read that plan approval it specifically did not approve the lights because even when you guys submitted those original plans there were knock outs on the plans at 30-feet for this lighting and we said at the time that it was specifically excluded as was the mechanical screening and basically anything to do with the site because you guys were in such a hurry to get the building plans. You folks may have stuff in our packet that you probably really shouldn’t because there was stuff brought in here on Friday that was supposed to just be copies of what was sent to us on, I think September 30th because we never did get a response from our October 16th comments. They were due on October 28th and we never got them. So, if the information that is in your packet was supplemental to what we received on October, excuse me on September 30th, I should not have supplied it and we put it out in error to be honest with you because I assumed it was the same stuff that we had gotten previously. Clearly it was not. Let me just get back to the issue at hand here if I might. There has been, I think a tremendous effort on the part of Planning Commission and Council to try to do whatever could be done in order to be sensitive to the schedule and to the undertaking of this project and quite frankly, to my opinion and the city’s detriment we have done many things in an order that we wouldn’t have done under normal circumstances. We went through and approved the development plan in a series of phases in order to try to accommodate the construction schedule. I think that was undertaken in good faith on the part of the city because we thought we had a good understanding of where we were trying to get to in the end with this thing. As Mrs. McBride mentioned this lighting thing was mentioned numerous times and the trucks were 13 ½ feet tall two years ago when this thing got approved. They didn’t miraculously grow to a height that would have been unforeseeable at the time that this was approved. So, in recognition of the fact that this is an extremely sensitive project, there was a whole lot of back and forth and give and take in trying to get this thing resolved. Coming in, kind of at the 11th hour with this, it’s not, and I don’t want to say disingenuous, but it’s not in keeping with the way that this project has been handled. I think that there are some folks in the audience that would attest to that. That this has been, you have been extremely responsive to try to deal with the residents and this is kind of troubling for lack of a better term. I guess that is about all that I have to say about it.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Hall.

Mr. Mains: Mr. Chairman and staff it sounds like that you guys need additional information. So, if you wouldn’t mind, if we could table it and then apply next month? We can provide all the information needed. We are committed to the developer and partner with the community as well. We want to make sure that everybody has the sufficient amount of information.

Chairman Darby: Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup. I’ve got a couple more before we get back to that.

Mrs. McBride: I just would like to ask the applicant then if they can make sure that they provide us with what exactly about the trucks has changed from our original approval to what we were being asked to look at tonight because I think that the trucks have stayed at the same heights as Mr. Taylor does. So, you are really going to need to provide that documentation to staff.

Mr. Mains: Okay.

Chairman Darby: Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup. I’ve got a couple more before we get back to that.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: I can’t agree more with this site and also with what Mr. Hawkins said because I felt like we spent a lot of time. We had quite a few public hearings. We had quite a few meetings, then they went to Council. Council was very specific as well. I am looking at the pictures here with are talking about that you can
see the light from where the condos are as well as from the neighborhood and that was not in anything that we have ever seen before. In fact, that was very questioned and very covered in the first place that that was something that we did not want to happen. We do not want inconvenience anybody in either one of the sides of the neighborhood, the condos or the homes more than they need to be. They don’t need lights flashing into their second-floor condos or into their properties. I don’t know what you could bring us that could show us that this would be any different than what this is. If you have this type of lights and you’re showing me that this is the way that it is to the property lines even with the buffers in here that are shown in the pictures, I don’t know what else you could provide the changes that other than if you change back to what we originally agreed upon which was the 15-foot and I don’t understand why, after the votes here and the votes on council and everything else why this changed. I know you said for safety. It was just as unsafe when we first started this, I guess then it is right now if that was the case. This should have been looked at in the very beginning and that would have been addressed in the very beginning in my opinion.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Hall.

Mr. Hall: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I wholeheartedly concur with Mr. Okum and Mr. Hawkins but you indicated earlier, I mean the engineering has gone on, on this thing for months. The lighting has been developed and approved for months. Now you come in here and you tell us that we need to approve this because of a safety issue. What’s the safety issue? That’s your comment.

Mr. Mains: I think that I can

Mr. Hall: He indicated that it was a safety and I’d like to hear it from him.

Mr. Wagner: Where the existing lights are, the 15-foot plan across the top of the buildings, building 3 would be this building, that if the trucks were to park up against the building it would wash out the light and the light would not reach the ground, providing no light for trucks coming in.

Mr. Mains: I think it was better illustrated if you were to look at the sight line. The building backed up against the truck court. If you were

Chairman Darby: Let me interrupt here. I’m sure that’s good information but at this point I don’t think this panel is in a position to receive it. We are going to get back to your suggested motion but I do have a couple other people that want to make comment because this is going to have to be a very comprehensive response. Mr. Ramirez.

Mr. Ramirez: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You know, I just recently had the pleasure of walking that neighborhood for a week as I was running for election, I got to meet a lot of neighbors abutting that construction site. Just for the record I am going to have to say that there is no way that I would approve something like this. I think that they have been through enough over there. I don’t want to put them in any more jeopardy. Thank you.

Chairman Darby: Based on your request, the chair will accept the motion to continue this item until our next meeting.

Mr. Hawkins: Move to table.

Mr. Okum: Continue.

Mr. Hawkins: Or continue.

Mr. Ramirez: Second.

Chairman Darby: It has been moved and second that this item be continued to our
next meeting. Secretary please call roll.

(Secretary called roll and the motion to continue was approved with a vote of 7 to 0.)

Chairman Darby: I assume that you folks will be in touch with staff. We have work to do. Thank you for coming.

Mr. Mains: Thank you.

E. Zoning Code Text Amendments

Chairman Darby: Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Taylor: The next item of business. We had intended to bring text amendments to you all. We advertised for that and thought they would be ready. Unfortunately, we did not get the review comments back from our Law Director, so I’m going to ask you to open the public hearing and continue it.

Chairman Darby: We’ll do that.

Mr. Okum: Okay. Are you going to open it?

Chairman Darby: No, that’s your job, I don’t do that.

Mr. Okum: We’re going to open a public hearing in regards to the zoning text amendments. For everyone’s benefit in case they didn’t hear it they were not ready and not completed by the law director’s office so based upon that I move to continue the public hearing until the next meeting.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: Second.

Chairman Darby: It has been moved and second that public hearing be opened a continued.

(Voice vote taken and it was approved with a vote of 7 to 0.)

IX. DISCUSSION

Chairman Darby: Items for discussion.

Mr. Okum: We may see some new spaces here next month.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: Oh yeah, you are all fired except for me.

Mr. Hawkins: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was is going to say, obviously the only person that is definitely going to be back here is going to be Mrs. Megan Marie Sullivan-Wisecup.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: I got a middle name with it.

Mr. Hawkins: I just wanted to say I appreciate working with everybody, it’s a great commission and all of you I hope you are willing to work except for one I guess is not willing to. It’s been a pleasure.

Mr. Okum: What’s that, what are we doing down there?

Mr. Hall: You’re not going to be on a commission.

Mrs. McBride: But we don’t know that you are not going to be on Mr. Hawkins, correct?
Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: We don’t know.

Mr. Hawkins: Well we don’t know.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: Either he or Mr. Ramirez will not be here.

Mr. Ramirez: I’d like to say something similar. I appreciate you folks teaching me. I didn’t know anything about Planning and now I know a little bit.

Chairman Darby: You learned that the lot easier than BZA.

Mr. Ramirez: I appreciate you having me on.

Mr. Bauer: I’d like to say the same because I have decided not to return.

Chairman Darby: Where are you going?

Mr. Bauer: I have enjoyed my time. It is time for me to move on.

Mrs. McBride: I don’t deal well with change. I would have thought you guys might have noticed that over the past few years. This is too much. This is too much. Megan even with you staying.

Mr. Hall: Rich isn’t coming back?

Mr. Okum: No.

Chairman Darby: Mrs. McBride, I want to see you cry one more time. Would you inform the folks who may not know about our loss?

Mrs. McBride: So, Mr. Taylor is going to be leaving us.

Mr. Taylor: That’s not who he was talking about.

Mrs. McBride: Christine has already the left us. Then there was one. I mean gosh guys. Yes, so we are not actually sure of Mr. Taylor’s final day just yet. We are working on that.

Mr. Okum: Hey Gregg hang in there for a while would you please.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: At least until we get a new Christine.

Chairman Darby: Gregg, you have to come back and deal with these guys.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: That’s enough to make you want to quit tomorrow.

Mr. Okum: Okay, well.
XI. **ADJOURNMENT**

Chairman Darby: We are disintegrating.

Mr. Okum: Based upon that, Mr. Chairman I’d like to move to adjourn.

Mr. Hall: I’ll second that.

Chairman Darby: Moved and second that we adjourn. We are out of here.

Respectfully submitted,

___________________________________
Don Darby, Chairman

___________________________________
Richard Bauer, Secretary