MINUTES OF THE
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
J. MARTIN GRIESEL CONFERENCE ROOM
June 17, 2005
9:00AM

CALL TO ORDER

Caleb Faux called the meeting to order at 9:05 am.

Commission Members:

Present: Mr. Faux, Ms. Hankner, Ms. Lemmie, Ms. McCray, Mr. Paddock and Mr Tarbell

Members Absent: Mr. Mooney

Community Development and Planning Staff:

Margaret Wuerstle, Renee Christon, Steve Briggs, and Katherine Keough-Jurs.

Law Department:

Dottie Carmen and Julia Carney

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Submission of the minutes from the June 03, 2005 Planning Commission meeting for approval.

Motion:	Mr. Tarbell motioned approval of minutes with the correction that the Developer offered to purchase Theresa Smith's property not the City.
Second:	Ms. Lemmie
Vote:	All ayes (6-0), motion carried

CONSENT ITEMS.

ITEM #1 A report and recommendation on a lease with the Community Arts Institute, Inc. for the Madisonville Senior Center in Madisonville.

ITEM #2 A report and recommendation on an ordinance to accept and confirm the dedication of a permanent easement within Hamilton County to public use for construction, maintenance, repair and replacement of water main and water main appurtenances.

ITEM #3 A report and recommendation on the sale of a portion of Dunloe Avenue, off of Coleridge Avenue in Kennedy Heights.

ITEM #4 A report and recommendation on the sale of Westfield Avenue in Oakley to Westfield Station, LLC.

Motion:	Ms. McCray moved approval of Consent Items
Second:	Ms. Hankner
Vote:	All ayes (6-0), motion carried

DISCUSSION ITEMS

ITEM #5 A report and recommendation on an application to install three signs at 3524 Edwards Road within Urban Design District #4 and Interim Development Control (IDC) District #62 in the community of Hyde Park.

Katherine Keough-Jurs, Senior City Planner, presented this item

BACKGROUND:

On January 14, 2004, Interim Development Control District #62 was established during the Zoning Code rewrite approval process to study the proposed change of zoning from R-4 (T) to CN-P. Unlike other IDCs, there are no guidelines for this IDC. The overall goal of this overlay district is to protect this area from adverse development during the process of the zoning study. The IDC requires that the City Planning Commission (CPC) review building permit applications. In addition, this property is located within Urban Design District #4 Hyde Park Square Business Area. In an effort to efficiently process this application, it was determined that it would be legal and appropriate for the CPC to conduct one hearing for all the issues associated with the application.

On December 17, 2004, the CPC reviewed and approved the necessary variance to facilitate the construction of a 2000 square foot addition. The CPC requested that staff work with the applicant to agree on an appropriate size for the signs and return to the CPC for final approval of the sign variances.

Since December 17, 2004, IDC 62 has been allowed to expire. Given that this particular application was continued until sign sizes were finalized, staff is bringing this application back to the CPC as requested for final approval.

DESCRIPTION:

The property is located on the east side of Edwards Road and north of Hyde Park Square. The current underlying zoning is CN-P with an Urban Design District and an IDC zoning overlay. The lot measures 102' deep by 52' wide. Although originally, built as a residence, this wood frame, 2- story structure has been used for various commercial uses. Currently, the building is vacant. The permit for the addition has been reviewed and approved, and construction is now underway. This building has had several alterations and the front elevation does not appear original. All of the proposed wall signs will be painted wood with external illumination. As proposed the three signs require the following variances in a CN-P Zoning District:

- Section 1427-23 (CZC) limits wall signs being located more than 20' above grade at the top of the sign. The 2nd story sign is 24' above grade.
- Section 1427-37 (CZC) limits wall signs to 1 per street frontage. Therefore, a variance will be required to allow the three wall signs on the street frontage.
- Section 1421-39 (CZC) limits the height of exterior lighting to no more than 20' above grade. The proposed exterior lighting is more than 24' above grade.

Urban Design Review

The Urban Design District guidelines do not address wall signs, the placement of wall signs or the number of wall signs permitted. This commercial property like many commercial properties in Hyde Park Square is being leased to several different businesses on different

floors. Each business needs a sign, which needs to be seen from the public right of way. Multiple signs on different levels of buildings are quite common in this Hyde Park Square Urban Design District. The design of signs and external illumination are compatible with the building and the surrounding district.

This property is located within IDC #62. There are no specific guidelines for this IDC. As per Section 1431-19 Exceptions for Underlying Zone District Regulations, the Cincinnati Planning Commission does have the authority to grant special exceptions/variances.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION:

Urban Design Review

As per Section 1445-15 Standards for Variances a variance can be granted if:

a) Owing to special circumstances or conditions pertaining to a specific piece of property, the strict application of the provisions or requirements of this code are unreasonable and would result in practical difficulties.

There are three different businesses in this building on two different floors and each business needs to have a sign that is visible from the right of way. If these signs were not approved as proposed, this would limit the property owner's ability to lease the property. There is already a pattern of this type of sign installations throughout the Hyde Park Square Business District. Staff recommends approval of the variances finding that the variances are not contrary to the intent or purpose of this code and they are not detrimental or injurious to the public health, safety and general welfare.

IDC Review

As per Section 1431-17 Standards For Review, staff recommends approval of the building permit application for 3524 Edwards Road within IDC 62 finding that:

a) The proposed sign installations are permitted by the current zoning.

b) The proposed sign installations are compatible with the prevailing land use, building and structure patterns in the surrounding neighborhood and community and with signs in the Hyde Park Square Urban Design District.

c) The proposed sign installations do not have a detrimental effect to the public peace, health, safety or general welfare.

d) The proposed sign installations will not have an adverse effect on the adjoining properties.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Community Development and Planning Department staff recommends that the City Planning Commission take the following action:

1. Approve the building permit application for 3524 Edwards Road within Urban Design District #4 finding that the signs meet the intent of the district and are compatible with other signs in the Hyde Park Square Urban Design District.

2. Approve the following variances to allow the three sign installations as proposed:

- Grant a variance from Section 1427-23 (CZC), which limits wall signs being located more than 20' above grade at the top of the sign, to allow the 2nd story sign to be 24' above grade.

- Grant a variance from Section 1427-37 (CZC), which limits wall signs to 1 sign per street frontage, to the allow the three wall signs on the street frontage.
- Grant a variance from Section 1421-39 (CZC), which limits the height of exterior lighting to no more than 20' above grade, to allow the proposed exterior lighting to be located more than 24' above grade finding that:
  a. The variances are not contrary to the intent or purpose of this code and they are not detrimental or injurious to the public health, safety and general welfare and
  b. Owing to special circumstances or conditions pertaining to a specific piece of property, the strict application of the provisions or requirements of this code are unreasonable and would result in practical difficulties.

3. Approve the building permit application for the three signs at 3524 Edwards Road in the community of Hyde Park within IDC #62 finding that:
   a. The proposed sign installations are permitted by the current zoning and the proposed sign installations are compatible with the prevailing land use, building and structure patterns in the surrounding neighborhood and community.
   b. The proposed sign installations do not have a detrimental effect to the public peace, health, safety or general welfare.
   c. The proposed sign installations do not have an adverse effect on the adjoining properties.
   d. The proposed sign installations do not conflict with the Urban Design District 4 guidelines.

DISCUSSION:

Ms. McCray commented that the pictures showing the proposed signage for the property at 3524 Edwards Road looked wonderful, but her concern was what would happen in the future.

She asked if a new tenant were added to the property, what would the procedure be for a new sign. Staff stated that the owner proposes only (3) businesses on the property. Staff stated that if in the future a new sign is needed the applicant would apply through Building and Inspections. Since the IDC has expired, any new signage would go to the Hearing Examiner for approval not the Planning Commission.

Gary Wollenweber, Mr. Norm Lewis and Carl Ulbelacker all spoke against the approval of the signage. They felt that the approval would set a precedent regarding the (3) signs. They also felt that approval of the variance for the second floor (Digs) sign is very inappropriate and that are other alternative signs such as window signs, signs on awnings, or signage on the retaining wall. Mr. Wollenweber was disappointed that he was not consulted in preparation of the Staff report.

Mr. Ubelacker felt that this was a self-created hardship and that the second floor sign would set a precedent for signs above 20 feet. Mr. Ulbelacker stated that the Neighborhood Council did not oppose the use of the signage, just the location and the square footage allowed on the building.

Mr. Norm Lewis, Chair of the Hyde Park Square Environmental review Committee, stated that the variances were not needed and that this would set a bad precedent.

Mr. Tarbell asked Mr. Norm Lewis if he had a business on the square. Mr. Lewis responded that he did not but two of the three members on the same Hyde Park Environmental Committee as he did and they agreed with him.

Mr. Tarbell had asked if the Hyde Park Business Association had been contacted concerning the proposal and Ms. Wuerstle stated that they were not notified.

Ms. Hankner felt that the signage was in character with the existing signage in the area. She asked Julia Carney if there were any actions that can be taken to prevent setting a precedent. Ms. Carney responded by saying that the purpose of a variance is so that each proposal is judged individually on its own merit.

The owner Lori Wellinghoff stated that she had shown a picture of the proposal to as many people in the neighborhood as possible as well as to the Environmental Review Committee. She had never received any negative responses. She stated that she wanted the signage to be compatible architecturally with the building. She is requesting an additional four feet. Most of the properties in Hyde Park are on flat ground but her property is not. Therefore, the topography impacts the need for the requested variance. She stated that the second floor sign that is four feet above requirement would be above French doors and for that reason window signs would not work in this situation.

Mr. Greg Tilsley, Tilsley Architects, stated that the proposal was carefully designed because this is not a commercially designed building. The proposed signs have been integrated into the design of the building which is located in a transitional zoning area.

Mr. Faux pointed out that the Signage Committee is in the process of revising the code requirements for signs.

Mr. Paddock stated that there must be a practical difficulty for a variance to be granted and wanted to know what the practical difficulty was in this situation.

Ms. Julia Carney responded to Mr. Paddock stating that testimony had been given that the topography creates a practical difficulty.

Mr. Tarbell asked how much the owner had invested into this property. The owner responded that she had purchased the building for $310,000 and has invested about $700,000 total into building with renovations.

Motion: Mr. Paddock moved approval stating that the topography of this site creates a special

circumstance which makes an unreasonable and practical difficulty for the owner to comply with the twenty (20) foot above grade zoning limitation.

Second: Ms. McCray

Vote: All ayes (6-0), motion carried

ITEM #6 A revised report for informational purposes on the sale of Gerard Street between Stetson Street and Rochelle Street to Corryville Community Development Corporation in the neighborhood of Corryville**.**

Steve C. Briggs, Senior City Planner, presented this item

BACKGROUND:

The City Planning Commission at its June 3, 2005 meeting heard testimony and discussed the conveyance of a portion of Gerard Street between Stetson Street and Rochelle Street. The Corryville Community Redevelopment Corporation is seeking to acquire the dedicated but unimproved Gerard Street. Gerard Street, if acquired, would be incorporated into a mixed-use residential development, being touted as a new University Village identified as Stetson Square.

Teresa A. Smith, property owner of 214 E. Rochelle Street, the only other abutting owner to Gerard Street, has not consented to the sale. Ms. Smith has lived at this address for approximately 10 years during that time constructed a patio and garden in the right-of-way area.

After hearing testimony on this issue the City Planning Commission voted to withhold action on the sale of Gerard Street pending further information relating to the adjoining Planned Development District No. 9 project Stetson Square.

The property located at 214 E. Rochelle Street is zoned Residential Mixed (RMX) District. The property to the west and north is zoned Planned Development (PD) District No. 9. The zone dividing line between the RMX district and PD district is the centerline of Gerard Street and the rear property line of 214 E. Rochelle Street. Gerard Street is a forty foot wide unimproved dedicated right-of-way that extends from E. Rochelle Street northward to Stetson Street.

THE VILLAGE AT STETSON SQUARE

The Village at Stetson Square project is located within PD No. 9 that extends from Highland Avenue on the east, Martin Luther King Drive on the north, properties along Eden Avenue on the west and Rochelle Avenue on the south. The centerline of Gerard Street is an east boundary line where adjacent to 214 E. Rochelle Street.

The Commercial portion of the project will include 68,000 square feet of class A office space, 15,000 square feet of street level retail and a 313-space underground parking garage near the intersection of Stetson Street and Highland Avenue.

The residential portion of the project will include approximately 205 rental units, 86 for-sale units, a 335-space underground parking facility on the west side of Eden Avenue north of Rochelle Street. Near the intersection of Stetson Avenue and Eden Avenue there will be a 40-space underground parking garage, multifamily residential structure with amenities for

residents such as a library, coffee bar, fitness and business center, a 12-20 seat home style theater, and terrace with swimming pool.

On December 17, 2003, City Council passed an ordinance (Ord.#448-2003) granting special exception to the existing zoning code districts requirements and any future changes or revisions to allow the construction of a new University Village. The boundary for the special exception ordinance is entirely within PD No. 9. This special exception to the zoning code will expire within three years. The ordinance was subsequently amended on February 11, 2004 (Ord.#54-2004) to correct the boundary description. After the ordinance was passed, building permits were issued notwithstanding the previous and current zoning codes in order allow construction of the Village at Stetson Square to begin without delay. No presentation has been made to the City Planning Commission concerning the project.

The driveway for the garage entrance for the multi-family uses would extend from Rochelle Street northward and be located in the Gerard Street area. The Gerard Street centerline is the zone dividing line between PD#9 District and the RMX District. The width of Gerard Street is forty feet. The proposed driveway access to the garage entrance may require 25 to 30 feet of width. Therefore, there would an encroachment of between five to ten feet into the RMX District by the project.

ZONING CODE REQUIREMENTS:

Section 1441-09 (b) of the Zoning Code states: "Access to a Use. A building permit or Certificate of Occupancy and Use may not be issued for any building or use that would require access across a district prohibiting the use. For the purposes of this Zoning Code, access to a use is deemed the use." The Residential Mixed (RMX) District permits multi-family uses, up to three dwelling units.

The encroachment of the PD #9 District multi-family use into the RMX District use should not affect the potential sale of land. The developer has the option of redesigning the access driveway width, change the direction of access from Rochelle Street to Stetson Street or apply for a change in zoning to adjust the PD #9 boundary accordingly.

RECOMMENDATION:

There is no action required at this time. This report is for informational purposes only.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Humes, who is with the Great Traditions Company, pointed out that the money has been paid to the City for the purchase of the street and the issues involving the owner of the adjacent property are holding back their construction.

Mr. Faux stated that he would like this item on the July 1, 2005 agenda of the Planning Commission.

Mr. Chad Munitz stated that he thought that the owner was suppose to be present at the meeting and she is currently out of town. Michele Fleming, the attorney for Ms. Smith, stated that the owner would be available for the July 1 meeting.

The President of the Corryville Community Council said that he would be out of town and wanted to make sure that his testimony would go on record. Ms. Hankner suggested he put his statement in writing and email or send it to staff for next Commission meeting.

Mr. Smith had stated that he was speaking for his daughter who was on vacation and that she did not want to sell or relocate. She just wanted to be treating fairly and all she is asking for is a fence and 10 ft. so she can park her car on her property.

Ms. Lemmie added that the statement of the owner's father, Mr. James R.T. Smith, be included in the Commission packet for the next meeting.

Dotty Carmen stated that a legal opinion regarding the rights of Ms. Smith was handed out to the Commission by Ms. Wuerstle.

Mr. Faux stated that since no action was required by the Commission on this item that they would now move onto Item #7.

ITEM #7: A report and recommendation on the sale of Stetson Street between Bellevue and Eden Avenues in Corryville to the Corryville Community Development Corporation (CCDC).

Steve Briggs Senior City Planner presented this item.

BACKGROUND:

This ordinance provides for the conveyance of a portion of Stetson Street between Bellevue and Eden Avenue for a residential mixed development called the Village of Stetson Square. The market value of the property as appraised is $61,000, however this portion of Stetson Street will be sold for $100.00 because of the benefits to the City of divesting itself of Stetson and of the mixed-use development. All of the restrictions required in the coordinated report have either been met or are included in the ordinance. There were no objections from any abutting property owners.

This property is zoned Planned Development (PD) District No. 9. On December 17, 2003, City Council passed an ordinance (Ord.#448-2003) granting special exception to the existing zoning code districts requirements and any future changes or revisions to allow the construction of this new Village at Stetson Square. The boundary for the special exception ordinance is entirely within PD No. 9. This special exception to the zoning code will expire within three years. The ordinance was subsequently amended on February 11, 2004, (Ord.#54-2004) to correct the boundary description. Due to the ordinance passage building permits were issued notwithstanding the previous and current zoning codes in order allow construction of the Village at Stetson Square to begin without delay.

RECOMMENDATION:
The staff of the Department of Community Development and Planning recommends the City Planning Commission take the following action:

Authorize the sale of a portion of Stetson Street between Bellevue and Eden Avenues in Corryville to the CCDC, which real property is no longer needed for any municipal purpose.

DISCUSSION:
Mr. Tom Humes and Greg Robinson of Great Traditions Company, presented a summary of the construction project for the Corryville Area. He stated that for three years his company has been working with the Corryville Council to develop a new Urban Village. There will be a 204 luxury apartment with underground garages served by elevators, an amenity center with pool, exercise room, new home theatres, and a café. There would also be 52 condominiums and new homes developed. He pointed out that a very important part of the project is the streetscape area, which include closing off part of Stetson Street to make room for a green space and create Stetson Square.

The Commission was very impressed with the presentation of the New Urban Village. Ms. Hankner commented that she felt history is repeating itself in reference to the fact that the Commission's involvement is to know avail at the end of the project when its time for approval. She stated that if the Commission was involved at the beginning, approval of the project would not be an issue.

Curt paddock stated that at one time he had a contractual relationship with 3CDC and asked Julia Carney if this presented any conflict of interest issues. Ms. Carney responded that there was no conflict of interest.

Motion: Ms. Lemmie moved approval of staff recommendation
Second: Ms. Hankner
Vote: All ayes (6-0), motion carried

OTHER BUSINESS

BY-LEAVE ITEM #8:

Ms. Wuerstle presented the Commission with §1409-07 Zoning Code Text Amendment that was discussed in a previous meeting. Since not all of the text amendments regarding outdoor eating and drinking establishments were approved by the Planning Commission, the reference to §1419-21 Additional Regulations, in this text amendment needs to be removed until the sections on outdoor eating and drinking establishments are completed and brought back to the Commission for approval.

Motion: Ms. McCray moved approval of the revision to §1409-07 Zoning Code Test Amendment

Second: Ms. Lemmie
Vote: All ayes (6–0), motion carried

Mr. Tarbell left at 10:05

THE BANKS PROJECT PRESENTATION

Mr. Faux acknowledged that he had requested information on the Banks project for the River Front. Mr. Steve Briggs, Senior City Planner stated that he had reviewed the Planning Commission actions concerning The Banks Project and had summarized his findings in the report that was distributed to the Commission.

Steve Briggs presented his report.

BACKGROUND:

In response to the announcement that Hamilton County Commissioners unanimously approved the selection of Corporex Companies and Vandercar Holdings Inc. as developers of The Banks project, questions were asked as to when was the Central Riverfront Plan, reviewed and approved by the City Planning Commission.

MASTER PLAN:

The Cincinnati Central Riverfront Urban Design Master Plan as the City's planning guide for the Cincinnati Central Riverfront was approved by City Council on October 4, 2000 (Ord.366-2000). Urban Design Associates prepared the plan from 1996 to its adoption in the 2000. Prior to City Council action the City Planning Commission approved amendments to the Cincinnati 2000 Plan and provided conceptual approval to the Central Riverfront Plan on March 17, 2000.

THE BANKS SUBDIVSION:

The City Planning Commission approved the Subdivision Improvement Plan for the Banks Subdivision on June 30, 2000. This improvement plan established the street grid and 13 blocks that included the Reds Stadium, Great American Ball Park.

The Plat of Subdivision for The Banks – Phase 1 was approved on December 15, 2000. This record plat dedicated Theodore M. Berry Way and created lots for the, then, proposed National Underground Railroad Freedom Center.

The Plat of Subdivision for The Banks – Phase 2 was approved on October 2, 2002. This record plat dedicated the remaining street right-of-ways of Main Street, Walnut Street and Race Street. In addition, the building lots were established corresponding to the 13 blocks identified in the improvement plan.

The Plat of Subdivision for The Banks – Phase 3 will be submitted for review and approval in the future. This record plat consists of Lot 12 that will contain the Riverfront Park and dedicate a relocated Mehring Way.

FREEDOM CENTER:

On April 20, 2001 the City Planning Commission reviewed and approved the lease agreements for the National Underground Railroad Freedom Center. This was the first development other than the two stadiums that effectively addresses garage parking and air rights.

INITIAL REVIEWS:

In January 23, 1998, September 17, 1999 and October 15, 1999 the City Planning Commission had the benefit of presentations on the Memorandum of Understanding between Hamilton County and City of Cincinnati as related to the future riverfront development for the new stadiums, The Banks and Riverfront Park.

RECOMMENDATION:

There is no action required at this time. This report is for informational purposes only.

Mr. Tarbell returns at 10:15 AM

Ms. Lemmie stated that she would have to leave but wanted to address the issues concerning the information in the newspaper articles about the Banks project. Ms. Lemmie informed the Commission that the City Administration was not aware of the details of the proposal of Hamilton County that was reported in the newspaper concerning The Banks project. The City is concerned about the affects the proposal would have on City, State and Federal funding commitments. She stated that City will meet next week to discuss these issues and after that meeting, correspondence would be sent to City Council, as well as the Commission, regarding the agreements that were made previously by the County.

Ms. Lemmie went on to say that the County is not in compliance with the current agreement and that the administration is sympathetic to the concerns of the Planning Commission. The City has the air rights on these properties but there are a variety of issues that need to be addressed. At the current time there are a lot of questions that the City just doesn't have the answers to.

Mr. Paddock questioned whether the RFP issued by the Port Authority contained financials.

Ms. Lemmie responded that it did not.

Mr. Paddock left at 10:20 a.m.

Mr. Faux wanted to know if the Planning commission had any say in the plans for this project and at what stage. He did not want a repeat of what happened with the Fountain Square project.

Ms. Lemmie responded that the Planning Commission can ask for a presentation at any time. If the Commission members see anything on the television or at a City Council meeting that they would like to know about, they can contact Ms. Wuerstle to arrange for a presentation.

Dotty Carmen apologized for the Fountain Square mishap. She stated that she and Chad Munitz had work on the Fountain Square project and they just didn't think to include the Planning Commission.

Ms. Lemmie left at 10:28 a.m.

Ms. Hankner stated that the Planning Commission should remind the County that they need to obtain approvals from the Commission and therefore, should include the Commission in the process.

Chad Munitz stated that the original $25,000,000 was to be used for the parking structure and not the above grade roadway system. The funds cannot be used to build streets.

Mr. Faux asked what the property was zoned and Mr. Briggs responded that it was zoned DD. The County owned the land and the City owned the air rights. The only action required by the Planning Commission would have to do with the sale or lease of the air rights.

Ms. McCray asked if we knew the timing on the project. She stated that she would not sit in a room at City Hall and vote on something that she hasn't had the time to read.

Chad Munitz stated that the City hasn't seen the County's agreement at this time but that they would be meeting with the County next week. The County agreement referred to Block 12 but the County's area is actually much smaller that what the City refers to as Block 12. There are many issues to be worked out. He went on to state that the current agreement between the City and County covers four items: (1) where things are now, (2) the transfer of ownership, (3) who has control over the land, and (4) who has control over the air rights.

Ms. Hankner suggested that the Planning Commission give the City Council the authority to add to any communication they might submit to the County, the fact that the Planning Commission has concerns over this project and the process.

Mr. Tarbell felt that the Planning Commission should take action on their own and pass a resolution because what the County did was fundamentally wrong. The Planning Commission should pass a resolution stating that the County actions were fundamentally flawed and need to be revisited because there is $25,000,000 appropriated to 3CDC and the Port Authority that stands to be lost.

Motion: Mr. Tarbell made a motion to send a communication to the County stating:

> The City of Cincinnati Planning Commission is very much in favor of The Banks project proceeding forward. There has been a competitive process in place within the County. The resolution passed by the Hamilton County Commission on Thursday June 9, 2005 is flawed and sends a negative message to developers that their proposals will not be given fair consideration. It also risks losing or delaying significant amounts of money pledged to The Banks project. The Planning Commission has serious concerns about the flawed process.

Second: Ms. Hankner

Vote: All Ayes (4-0), motion carried

ADJOURN:

Motion: Ms. McCray motioned to adjourn.

Second: Ms. Hankner

Vote: All ayes (4-0), motioned carried

_____	_____
Margaret A. Wuerstle, AICP	Caleb Faux, Chair
Chief Planner City Planning Commission	
Department of Community	
Development & Planning	
Date: _____	Date: _____