PROCEEDINGS OF THE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

December 6, 2019

Regular Meeting

A regular meeting of the City Planning Commission was held this day in the J. Martin Griesel Room of Two Centennial Plaza with the following members present: Vice Chair Byron Stallworth, Mr. John Eby, Assistant City Manager John Juech, Mr. Jacob Samad, Ms. Anne Sesler, and Vice Mayor Christopher Smitherman.

Also in attendance were Mr. Marion Haynes, legal counsel, and Department of City Planning staff: Director Katherine Keough-Jurs, Mr. Alex Peppers, Mr. Michael Allen, Mr. Felix Bere, Mr. Jared Ellis, Mr. Andy Juengling, Ms. Caroline Kellam, Ms. Samantha McLean, Ms. Kira Palmer, and Mr. James Weaver.

Mr. Stallworth called the meeting to order and asked that everyone join in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The Commission approved the minutes from September 14, 2019, September 20, 2019, and October 4, 2019.
Mr. Juech made the motion, which Mr. Smitherman seconded.
Ayes: Mr. Eby, Mr. Juech, Mr. Samad, Ms. Sesler, Mr. Smitherman, and Mr. Stallworth.

Item 2, a report and recommendation on a proposed lease of Area 15 located at 262 Wilmer Avenue within Lunken Airport in the East End, was removed from the agenda on 12/04/2019 by request of the Department of Transportation and Engineering.

Item 7, a report and recommendation on a proposed Notwithstanding Ordinance permitting the construction of 16 residential dwelling units at 1518 Race Street in the Over-the-Rhine, was removed from the agenda on 12/04/2019 by request of the applicant.

Consent Items – Legislative

Item 3 was heard first. Mr. Samad was recused for Item 3 and left the room.

Item 3 was a report and recommendation on the proposed sale of City-owned property and the release of easements for the benefit of the City and the general public in the skywalks for property located at 505 Vine Street in the Central Business District. The Department of City Planning staff recommended approval.

The Commission adopted staff’s recommendation for Item 3 on the Legislative Consent Agenda.
Ms. Sesler made the motion, which Mr. Juech seconded.
Ayes: Mr. Eby, Mr. Juech, Ms. Sesler, Mr. Smitherman, and Mr. Stallworth.
Mr. Samad returned to the room.

**Item 4** was a report and recommendation on a proposed conveyance of the property located at 3241-3261 Spring Grove Avenue in Camp Washington and the re-conveyance of the property back to Hamilton County Land Reutilization Corporation. The Department of City Planning staff recommended approval.

Mr. James Heller-Jackson, on behalf of the Camp Washington Community Board, Camp Washington Business Association, and Camp Washington Community Council, spoke in support of the proposed conveyance and re-conveyance of the property.

The Commission adopted staff's recommendation for Item 4 on the Legislative Consent Agenda.
Ms. Sesler made the motion, which Mr. Juech seconded.
Ayes: Mr. Eby, Mr. Juech, Mr. Samad, Ms. Sesler, Mr. Smitherman, and Mr. Stallworth.

Ms. Sesler was recused for Item 1 and left the room.

Mr. Ellis presented **Item 1**, a report and recommendation on a proposed amended and restated lease to allow for the extension of the lease of City-owned property south of Mehring Way between Gest Street and the Mill Creek in Queensgate. The Department of City Planning staff recommended approval.

Mr. Jack Weiss, President of Cincinnati Bulk Terminals, and Edward Hatfield, President of River Trading, the parent company of Cincinnati Bulk terminals, spoke in support of the proposed lease extension. They presented a short PowerPoint presentation on the 100-year history of the family-owned business, their investment in Cincinnati, and their future plans. They explained that the proximity to interstates, the railroad, and the river make the location ideal for their diversified terminal and logistics company. They aimed to invest $8 million of private capital, preserving 65 jobs, creating 10 new full-time jobs, making physical improvements, and promoting cleaner and greener operations. Additionally, they stated that the lease extension was consistent with the Queensgate South Urban Renewal Plan and Plan Cincinnati.

Mr. Chris Carr, a professor of geography at the University of Cincinnati and avid kayaker, asked the City Planning Commission to remove 1.3 acres of land on the western side of the subject property. He explained that the area included the confluence of the Mill Creek and Ohio River, an area that Plan Cincinnati referred to as a unique area. By removing that portion of land from the lease, he believed it could act as a natural gateway area providing enhanced recreational opportunities.

Mr. Stallworth asked Mr. Carr what he was requesting from the applicant in terms of land and/or financial contribution. Mr. Carr stated that he was asking the City Planning Commission to remove 1.3 acres of land from the lease extension on the western side of the subject property.
Mr. Philip Denning, Director of the Department of Community and Economic Development, spoke in support of the lease extension. He explained that City Administration had been renegotiating the lease extension with Cincinnati Bulk Terminals for a year and that the lease extension would allow for investment and create jobs. Mr. Stallworth asked Mr. Denning if the portion of land on the western side of the property could be removed from the lease extension per Mr. Carr’s request. Mr. Denning stated that since this was the first time he had heard the request he would need more time to discuss it with the applicant.

Mr. Stallworth asked Mr. Haynes, legal counsel, if Mr. Carr’s request was legal. Mr. Haynes explained that the City owned the land and must decide how best to make use of that land. Legally, the request was possible.

Mr. Stallworth asked Mr. Weiss and Mr. Hatfield about whether Mr. Carr’s request was feasible. They explained that removing that portion of land from the lease extension would impact Cincinnati Bulk Terminal’s operations due to its proximity to the rail line. Additionally, they stated that heavy materials were stored on that portion of the property.

Mr. Stallworth inquired whether kayakers who wanted to use the Mill Creek near that portion of property would be at risk. Mr. Hatfield responded that kayakers using the Mill Creek were not at risk. He further elaborated that under the current lease Cincinnati Bulk Terminal had access to the western portion of land referenced by Mr. Carr and the land was used for operations, as previously stated.

Mr. Juech shared that he had been involved in discussions with Cincinnati Bulk Terminal throughout the past few years and that they have been excellent and transparent partners. He explained that the City Administration had an interest in retaining Cincinnati Bulk Terminals within the City of Cincinnati.

Mr. Carr reiterated his request that 1.3 acres of land be removed from the lease extension.

Mr. Gregory Lang, an advocate for multiple Lower Price Hill advocacy organizations, spoke about Interim Development Control (IDC) Overlay District #85 which was enacted in 2019 and was set to expire in April 2020. The IDC was established so that the City and the community could conduct a zoning study of the impacts of industrial uses along the Ohio River in Lower Price Hill. This study was in progress. He explained that there was a desire to develop recreational opportunities along the banks of the Mill Creek as a blue and green buffer between residential areas of Lower Price Hill and industrial uses of Queensgate. He asked that the area east of the Mill Creek and west of the Cincinnati Southern Bridge be considered for a Mill Creek recreation zone.

Mr. Tom Croft, on behalf of River West, spoke against the proposed lease extension as written. He requested that the lease extension be contingent upon establishing the provision of right-of-way for Ohio River Trail West – Queensgate Connection bike trail on the south side of Mehring Way between the Mill Creek and Gest Street. He explained that various partners, including the Department of Transportation and Engineering, had been involved with the Cincinnati Connects
trail study and planned to build the “Queensgate Connection” trail which would extend from the Mill Creek to Smale Riverfront Park. The proposed trail, which was cited in OKI’s Long-Term Regional Plan and the Cincinnati 2010 Bike Plan, may require easements on the leased City-owned land.

Mr. Stallworth asked Mr. Croft if he had conversations with the applicant. Mr. Croft responded that he had not had the opportunity to discuss this request with Cincinnati Bulk Terminals, however, they had conversations with the company in the past and have spoken with the City Administration.

Mr. Stallworth inquired about the previous conversations with Cincinnati Bulk Terminals. Mr. Croft explained that he had spoken to Cincinnati Bulk Terminals on an issue related to barge terminal construction.

Mr. Eby asked Mr. Weiss and Mr. Hatfield, of Cincinnati Bulk Terminals and River Trading, about how they had engaged with the community and if they were open to the proposed trail going through their site. They explained that they supported various community organizations, including Paddle Fest. They further explained that it would not be possible for their operations to continue if a trail went through their property, however, they were supportive of a bike trail in general.

Mr. Eby asked why the proposed extension was a 40-year lease. Mr. Weiss explained that this lease extension consolidated four separate leases and that due to the nature of the high capital investment projects they wished to pursue, a longer time frame was necessary in order to make a return on the investment.

Mr. Eby referenced Mr. Weiss and Mr. Hatfield’s presentation that stated there was an expected 40% increase in materials by 2025. Mr. Hatfield clarified that it was a regional projection, not just for their facility.

Mr. Eby encouraged Cincinnati Bulk Terminals to continue engaging with the community. Mr. Stallworth asked if there had been any accidents with people using trails near the property. Mr. Hatfield said that there were no trails on the property, so there had not been any accidents.

Mr. Juech shared that the City Administration supported the lease extension, as well as the proposed trail, adding that all involved parties should continue discussions. Mr. Smitherman echoed Mr. Juech’s sentiments, explaining that the Ohio River was important to our economy and that he was appreciative of Cincinnati Bulk Terminals.

Mr. Croft clarified that he was not requesting an easement through the property to establish a trail, but an easement of a few feet onto the property to provide the area needed to meet standards for a trail along the existing road. He asked that the departments of City Planning, Community and Economic Development, and Transportation and Engineering work together to determine if an easement was needed and incorporate that into the lease.
Mr. Bryan Williams, with the Department of Transportation and Engineering, said that the department had reviewed the lease extension and did not believe that it would affect the realization of the trail, which was a conceptual plan at the moment and would run along the roadway not across the subject property.

Mr. Juech reiterated that the bike trail and the lease extension were not in conflict with each other. Mr. Stallworth echoed Mr. Juech and asked that conversations continue between Cincinnati Bulk Terminals, trail advocates, kayakers, and the City Administration.

The Commission adopted staff’s recommendation for Item 1 on the Legislative Consent Agenda.
Mr. Juech made the motion, which Mr. Smitherman seconded.
Ayes: Mr. Eby, Mr. Juech, Mr. Samad, Mr. Smitherman, and Mr. Stallworth.

Ms. Sesler returned to the room.

Discussion Items – Quasi-Judicial

Ms. Kellam presented Item 6, a report and recommendation on a proposed Final Development Plan for Planned Development #73 (PD-73) Madison Square, Medpace Food Hall, in Madisonville. The staff of the Department of City Planning recommended the following:

1. APPROVE the Final Development Plan for Planned Development #73 (PD-73),
   Madison Square, Medpace Food Hall, in Madisonville as specified on pages 3-4 of this report and;

2. ADOPT the Department of City Planning Findings as detailed on page 5 of the report.

Mr. Stallworth inquired about how many people attended the Staff Conference. Ms. Kellam said that a few community members were in attendance in addition to the applicant.

Mr. Haynes swore in all those who were in attendance to provide testimony in connection with Item 6.

Mr. Joe Dillon and Mr. Seth Barnhard, representing the applicants, spoke in support of the proposed Final Development Plan. Mr. Dillon was with Brandstetter Carroll, the zoning and engineering consultants on the project, and Mr. Barnhard represented the owner, Mr. August Troendle, the founder of Medpace and the owner of the Medpace Food Hall. They presented an overview of the project and mentioned that the Food Hall would take advantage of the 2,000-space parking lot that was underutilized after 5:00 p.m. during the week and throughout the weekend.

Mr. Stallworth inquired about how the general contractor was aiming to meet inclusion goals. Jeff Smoker, the general contractor with Sanska, explained that they have a 20% diversity goal for every project. He further elaborated that Sanska recently hired a diversity and inclusion manager who had a plan to meet those goals. Additionally, Sanska hosted community outreach
events for contractors to engage the community during the bidding process. Mr. Stallworth encouraged the applicants to engage the Madisonville Community Council and the Madisonville community at-large. Mr. Barnhard reiterated statements about Sanska’s community outreach in Madisonville and creating a job plan with the local community.

Mr. Smitherman expressed his appreciation of Medpace as an anchor in the community and commented on the remarkable changes and increased property values that had occurred along the corridor in Madisonville.

**The Commission adopted the staff’s recommendations for Item 6 on the Discussion Quasi-Judicial Agenda.**

Ms. Sesler made the motion, which Mr. Smitherman seconded.

Ayes: Mr. Eby, Mr. Juech, Mr. Samad, Mr. Smitherman, Mr. Stallworth, and Ms. Sesler.

A recess was taken at 10:10 a.m.

The session was resumed at 10:24 a.m.

**Consent Item – Quasi-Judicial**

Mr. Juengling presented Item 5, report and recommendation on a proposed subdivision of land, including variance requests from the Cincinnati Zoning Code, for the purpose of constructing four single-family homes on the property located at 3001 Wasson Road in Hyde Park. The staff of the Department of City Planning recommended the following:

A. **APPROVE** the zoning relief as detailed in the Zoning Relief Staff Report.

B. **APPROVE** the proposed division of land at 3001 Wasson Road in Hyde Park, as the proposed subdivision was generally consistent with General Provision Purposes outlined in Section 100-03 of the Subdivision Regulations.

C. **ADOPT** the conditions to all approvals, as outlined below, pursuant to Cincinnati Subdivision Regulations Section 300-11(b) and 500-11, and Cincinnati Municipal Code Section 1433-21(c), finding that the conditions are necessary to secure substantially the objectives of the City’s Subdivision Regulations in promoting the public safety, health, and general welfare, with the following conditions:

1. The proposed project shall be reviewed at a Technical Design Review level of Coordinated Site Review prior to submittal of application for permits to ensure all City Department comments have been satisfied.
2. All easements, including but not limited to, the Sewer Easement, Sloping Cut Easement, any Shared Access Easements, shall be clearly indicated on the plat.
3. The Subdivision Plat shall show the maximum building envelopes for each lot with the minimum setback as required by the Cincinnati Zoning Code and any front and/or rear yard setback approved by City Planning Commission.
Mr. Haynes swore in Ken French and Angelo Pusateri, witnesses for Sean Suder, attorney on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Suder presented preliminary comments thanking City Planning staff and asked for a copy of any email correspondence that was received after the last packet of correspondence was distributed on Thursday, December 5th. He continued with his preliminary comments by addressing a complaint received by the Ohio Architects Board starting that Mr. French impersonated an architect. This complaint had been referred to the Hamilton County prosecutor. This referred to Mr. French, the individual, and not his entity, Habitation, LLC. Mr. Suder was made aware that Mr. French had an arrest warrant and that there was an intention to execute the warrant during the City Planning Commission meeting. Mr. Suder and Mr. Burke exchanged email correspondence on this matter and Mr. Burke declined any involvement in executing the arrest warrant. Realizing the misunderstanding, Mr. Suder asked that his communications on that matter be retracted, withdrawn, and stricken from the record. Furthermore, Mr. Suder stated that the complaint submitted to the Ohio Architects Board was irrelevant to the case and that its continued use during the City Planning Commission meeting would be inappropriate as it was prejudicial rather than probative.

Mr. Tim Burke, attorney on behalf of some Hyde Park residents, responded that he believed the complaint to the Ohio Architects Board was relevant since it spoke to the credibility of the applicant and that he planned to speak about that complaint. Mr. Stallworth explained that he wanted everyone to read the staff recommendation, remain focused on the issue at hand, and discuss facts. Mr. Burke agreed to present facts. He also noted an objection to the City Planning Commission rules that do not require City staff to be sworn in and available for cross-examination during the proceedings. Mr. Stallworth asked Mr. Haynes to respond. Mr. Haynes stated that he disagreed with Mr. Burke’s opinion.

Mr. Burke asked if Mr. Gary Wollenweber could be heard first since he had to leave for a work commitment. Mr. Haynes swore in Mr. Wollenweber.

Mr. Wollenweber, a resident of Hyde Park at 1330 Edwards Road and head of the Hyde Park Neighborhood Council (HPNC) Zoning Committee, said that no one present at their meeting on November 25th supported this project. As such, the HPNC Zoning Committee voted unanimously to recommend that HPNC Trustees deny the project due to the lack of support from property owners between 3012-3364 Portsmouth Avenue, the excessiveness of the variances, and the fact that the applicant created the variances as stated by Mr. Munzel, Zoning Plans Examiner, in his analysis of the variances requested during the original zone change application.

Mr. Suder cross-examined Mr. Wollenweber. He asked if any properties on Portsmouth Avenue abut the subject property, who owned the abutting property, and if that property owner was in support of this project. Mr. Wollenweber responded that no properties on Portsmouth Avenue abut the property and that the City of Cincinnati was the owner of the abutting property. He did not know if the City was in support. Mr. Suder asked him if he knew how the subject property was created and if it was created by Mr. French. Mr. Wollenweber explained that it was created when Norfolk Southern Railroad sold the 50-foot strip of land to the City of Cincinnati to create
the Wasson Way trail. If the land remained intact, the property would be 90-feet deep. Mr. French did not create this situation, however, it was the railroad’s decision and they were an owner in title. Mr. Suder asked him if he was aware that the site was unbuildable and if the HPNC was opposed to any residential or commercial development on the site. Mr. Wollenweber said that he believed that the lot was probably unbuildable. He elaborated that the HPNC did not consider all residential development, but that they were opposed to commercial development. The opposition to commercial development was a decision made in 2006 following a proposal to build a car wash on the site. The HPNC supported a zone change from a commercial zone to Single-family (SF-6). Mr. Suder inquired if Mr. Wollenweber thought single-family homes would be built on the property at the time it was rezoned to SF-6. He responded that he was not sure, but that the property was 90-feet deep at the time and would have been a suitable building lot. Mr. Suder asked if they knew at that time when the railroad would abandon the line and if a bike and pedestrian trail was planned. Mr. Wollenwebber said that they did not know when the railroad would cease operation, but it ceased sometime between 2005 and three to four years ago. As for the trail, there was no active plan.

Mr. Suder returned to his opening statement on the merits, stating that the case was about a subdivision and three variances. He explained that Mr. French had been working on this project for seven months, meeting with neighbors, the community, and City staff. Furthermore, he stated that Mr. French made compromises. Originally, the project was for six houses on 3,000-square-foot lots and now the project consisted of four houses on 6,000-square-foot lots with the need for two front yard setback variances and one rear yard setback variance. Mr. Suder described the subject property’s location as abutting a commercial area in the front and a 50-foot trail in the back. A backyard, a 50-foot trail, and an 11-foot setback separate the proposed houses from the houses on Portsmouth Avenue. Mr. Suder then spoke to the requested variances explaining that the 40-foot deep lots would not be buildable or have any economically viable use without them. He concluded his opening statement by stating that Mr. French had been met with opposition from the neighborhood despite the compromises he had made, including eliminated two $600,000 single-family homes.

Mr. Ken French, the applicant, introduced himself as an investor who used architectural thinking to solve complex problems. He proceeded to give a presentation on his proposed project, mentioning its consistency with Plan Cincinnati. He outlined the 16 community engagement meetings that were held about the project and the notices he sent to community members regarding public hearings and staff conferences. He explained how he met the concerns of community members. There was concern about traffic and he funded a traffic study, overseen by the Department of Transportation and Engineering, which found that there would be no traffic impact. The communities asked for the zoning to remain SF-6, to eliminate the proposed street parking, increase the rear yard setback to 15-feet, and to provide greenspace and landscaping. Mr. French said that he tried to meet all the requests except the rear yard setback. He had originally proposed a seven-foot setback but was able meet the community in the middle. To illustrate that the five-foot front yard setback was appropriate for the surrounding environment, he showed examples of other setbacks within the vicinity of the subject property. He also showed illustrative examples of setbacks less than 41-feet to the centerline of the trail, the same distance between his proposed houses and the trail centerline. He concluded by stating that a vote for this
item was a vote for economic development, private property rights, and a strategic Wasson Way investment.

Mr. Suder questioned Mr. French. Mr. Suder asked Mr. French if residences and his proposed lot size were permitted in the SF-6 zone. Mr. French said yes. Mr. Suder inquired how Mr. French decided to situate the buildings on the property. Mr. French explained that since the frontage was wider than a typical lot, he treated the front and back of the lots as side yards. Mr. Suder asked what Mr. French would be able to build if he met the setback requirements. Mr. French said he could build a house that was five-feet wide which was not practical. Mr. Suder stated that this hearing was about balancing private and public interest and asked Mr. French if he saw any public harm in building the proposed homes. Mr. French responded that he did not see any public harm and that the project would add value, clean up neglected land, provide a buffer to commercial space, and install a sidewalk. Mr. Suder asked Mr. French if his property abutted any properties on Portsmouth Avenue. Mr. French said no and that his property abutted the Wasson Way trail.

Mr. Stallworth asked Mr. French if he had purchased the land. Mr. French explained that he was under contract with Norfolk Southern and had paid option fees to extend the contract multiple times. Mr. Stallworth asked how much he had spent. Mr. French said that he had spent over $50,000 on legal fees, traffic studies, and more.

Mr. Burke cross-examined Mr. French. Mr. Burke asked if any of the photographs of setbacks shown in Mr. French’s presentation were in a SF-6 zone. Mr. French responded no. Mr. Burke asked him if his contract would allow him to recover payments if he did not get an approval for the subdivision. Mr. French said he could not answer that. Mr. Burke explained that the railroad owned the property and would be the predecessor in title if Mr. French closed on the property. He then asked Mr. French if the railroad created the current situation. Mr. French said that the City hired a surveyor to survey the land for subdivision in 2016. Mr. Burke said that the City was party to a contract, but that it was the railroad that decided they were going to sell the land to the City for $12 million ($7 a foot). He then asked Mr. French what the property was valued at currently. Mr. French said the railroad valued it at $19 a foot based on a valuation map produced by the railroad. Mr. Burke asked Mr. French if the railroad created the parcel. Mr. French said no. Mr. Burke asked Mr. French if he knew who Mr. Burke was representing. Mr. Burke said that Mr. Suder challenged Mr. Burke’s claim that he was representing 12 property owners within 100-feet of the subject property. Mr. Burke explained that he was representing 12 total property owners, not 12 separate properties. Mr. Burke noted that Mr. French had site documents that labeled the parcels inconsistently. Mr. French explained that the documents were prepared by different entities, but that the final plat was corrected for consistency.

Mr. Burke asked Mr. French if he stated that he was an architect in the letter sent out to surrounding property owners in May. Mr. French explained that Laure Quinlivan wrote the letter on his behalf and that he made a mistake in saying that he was an architect in the letter and fliers. Mr. Burke asked Mr. French about the issue he had with the Ohio Architects Board. Mr. French explained that he had an LLC called “Architectural Interventions” because he uses architectural thinking to solve problems. The board said that he could not use the word “architectural,” so he
changed the name to “Habitation Development Group LLC.” Mr. Burke asked Mr. French why he used the word “architect” on his business card after the name of the LLC was changed. Mr. French said that he had gotten rid of the business cards. Mr. Burke said that this raised a credibility issue. Mr. French said that he was not asking the neighborhood to trust him, but that they should trust the City Administration who reviewed every planning document. Mr. Burke presented certified copies of a complaint, affidavit, and warrant that had been on the public record since October 31st. Mr. French said that he had not been notified of this complaint.

Mr. Burke asked Mr. French about his assertion that the variances were to promote superior urban design. Mr. Juengling clarified that the variances being requested were for variances to the Cincinnati Zoning Code, not the Subdivision Regulations. The variances for superior urban design could only be sought for variances to the Subdivision Regulations. Mr. Burke asked Mr. French about the architectural plans he submitted in his application. Mr. French explained that the plans were illustrative and display what might be built. He said that he planned to use brick as the predominant material in the construction as it helped with sound. Mr. Burke asked Mr. French if he had an obligation to build what his plans proposed if the variances were approved. Mr. French said that he had no obligation. Mr. Burke said that Mr. French indicated that small setbacks were typical in commercials zones, however, the subject property was within a single-family zone. Mr. French said that the zone abutted a commercial zone to the north.

Mr. Burke asked Mr. French about his promotion of the houses as live, work, and play properties, and if he knew that home occupations could not have any employees. Mr. French understood this and said that the properties could be used for self-employment/home occupation. Mr. Burke referred to page 63 of the packet where Mr. French talked about enhanced landscaping and streetscaping. Mr. Burke asked Mr. French if he was required to provide this landscaping since he had not submitted a landscaping plan. Mr. French said that he was required to submit a landscaping plan prior to construction. Mr. Juengling clarified that landscape plans, in this case, must be supplied to the Department of Buildings and Inspections for review when Mr. French applied for permits. The Subdivision Regulations only required a preliminary landscape plan. Mr. Burke said that when variances were sought from the Zoning Hearing Examiner, the applicant committed to what would be built and what landscaping would be implemented.

Mr. Burke asked Mr. French when he was last on the property and if he saw an expansion of the parking lot onto the property. Mr. French said that he saw the expansion of the parking lot, but that he did not authorize it. Mr. Burke showed photographs of the pediatrician’s office parking lot being expanded onto the subject property and explained that no one knew who authorized this expansion. Mr. French reiterated that he did not own the property.

Mr. Burke asked Mr. French to explain the sloping cut easement. Mr. French explained that when Wasson Way was improved in 1996, the City and contractors had to move the land and grade it into its current configuration. Mr. Burke asked if the sloping cut easement was shown on the plans. Mr. French said that it was not on plans he had with him, but that the sloping cut easement was shown as a dotted line on the survey. He had discussed removing this easement with the Department of Transportation and Engineering. Mr. Burke asked about a sewer
easement that required Mr. French to move one of the houses back further on the lot. Mr. French explained that he learned of this easement during the Coordinated Site Review. Mr. Burke noted that as part of the subdivision application, Mr. French included the original contract to purchase the property which included the ability to recover his deposit money if the zoning on the property was not satisfactory. Mr. Burke asked Mr. French to identify any houses that were built within 5-feet to the front of the property line in a single-family zone. Mr. French said that he could not identify another single-family zone that looked like the zone in which his subject property sits, so it was hard to compare this to any other single-family property in Hyde Park. He explained that it was a unique parcel and that variances were used to provide relief for extraordinary properties. Mr. Burke said that the City Planning Commission must first find that the need for a variance was not created by the applicant or any other owner in the title; secondly, they must find that the variance was not contrary to the purpose of the zoning district. Mr. French said that the variances were compatible with the SF-6 zone. Mr. Burke said that the requested variances for the SF-6 setbacks were significant.

Mr. Stallworth asked Mr. Burke about the relevancy of the exhibit he submitted showing the parking lot expansion. Mr. Burke explained that it illustrated credibility issues since the parking lot was being expanded by someone on property that Mr. French may own the following week.

Mr. Suder continued to question Mr. French since his other witness, Mr. Angelo Pusateri, had to leave. Mr. Suder asked Mr. French if he would be able to recover his option fees and other fees associated with this project. Mr. French said no. Mr. Suder asked if the City would have needed to approve the subdivision when the land was split for the creation of the Wasson Way trail and if the railroad could have divided the land without City approval. Mr. French said that the City would have had to approve the subdivision. Mr. Suder inquired about further reviews needed for the project. Mr. French stated that he would need to submit his plans to Coordinated Site Review for a Technical Design Review which includes reviews for sewer, grading, and stormwater management. Mr. Suder addressed the parking lot expansion and asked Mr. French if he had the right of possession. Mr. French said that Norfolk Southern had the right, that the pediatrician's office had control of the parking lot area under a lease, and that he did not expand the parking lot.

A recess was taken at 12:04 p.m.

The session was resumed at 12:13 p.m.

Mr. Haynes swore in Youngwon French.

Youngwon French, a resident at 3405 Observatory Avenue, spoke in support of the project. She said that she believed the project would benefit Cincinnati and hoped to live in one of the houses. She explained that Mr. French had made compromises, but that the Hyde Park community was not willing to make any compromises. She ended in saying that there had been orchestrated attacks on her husband, Mr. French, from the community.

My Haynes swore in all remaining speakers for Item 5.
Mr. Paul Yankie, representing U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC) and Green Building Consulting, spoke in support of the item. He explained that he had worked with Mr. French for over 20 years on sustainable design projects. He said that as a planning commissioner for another municipality, he understood that variances were not desirable unless they were absolutely necessary. When reviewing this project, he took into consideration fiscal and green sustainability considerations. Mr. Yankie went on to say that the property was currently a cost to maintain and had invasive species, so this project would have an absolute positive impact. Additionally, he said that a LEED Platinum project at the proposed price point was significant. A LEED Platinum project would require low impact landscaping, removal of invasive species, and water detention. He concluded that the project was a cost-effective way to use the space.

Mr. Eby asked Mr. Yankie if he was speaking on behalf of the USGBC in Cincinnati. Mr. Yankie said that he was on the USGBC's state board's residential and advocacy committees. He reviewed all residential projects and considered the project's unintended consequences and if it promotes equity, connectivity, accessibility, and food access. He said that this project was a "big deal" for the USGBC.

Mr. Burke cross-examined Mr. Yankie. Mr. Burke asked Mr. Yankie how he could evaluate the quality of the buildings since Mr. French said he did not know what would be built on the property. Mr. Yankie said he could make the evaluation based on 20 years of experience with Mr. French and his intent to build LEED Platinum. Mr. Burke asked Mr. Yankie if Mr. French was legally obligated to build LEED Platinum. Mr. Yankie said no.

Mr. Couper Gardiner, a 30-year resident at 3547 Mooney Avenue, LEED-accredited professional, registered architect, and member of the Hyde Park Neighborhood Council’s Zoning Committee, spoke against this item. He said that illustrative materials were included in the report and not disclosed as only illustrative. One of the illustrations showed a projection into the 5-foot setback. Another illustration showed a dotted line where excavation would be needed. The topographic map that was received in previous packets was not included in the current material. All these issues impacted the City. Mr. Gardiner also brought up concerns about how access and retaining walls were illustrated on the materials. He appreciated how the applicant adjusted the design of the project but felt like there was more to be done. He concluded by saying that if a marginal piece of land was left behind, the best use of the land was not to build four residences on it. It could be used for parks and recreation.

Mr. Suder cross-examined Mr. Gardiner. Mr. Suder asked if Mr. Gardiner was familiar with real estate development in the City. Mr. Gardiner said that he was somewhat familiar since he was an architect. Mr. Suder asked if Mr. Gardiner knew that what the applicant submitted was only illustrative. Mr. Gardiner said yes, but that he wished it was noted as illustrative. Mr. Suder asked if Mr. Gardiner was familiar with a cantilevered zero property line retaining wall concept. Mr. Gardiner said no.
Ms. Sesler asked Ms. Keough-Jurs if material was required to be marked as illustrative. Ms. Keough-Jurs explained that it was not required and reminded the City Planning Commission that they were not voting on the design.

Mr. Gardiner added that he thought an applicant would try their best to make the variances as small as possible and propose a 16- or 20-foot-wide residence.

Mr. Burke gave his opening statement. He started by saying that this case would be better served in a different forum and that until this year it would have been heard by the Zoning Hearing Examiner (ZHE). He said that when he had been in front of the ZHE, he was required to produce detailed plans about what would be built so that the ZHE could make a decision about the quality of what was being proposed in exchange for the requested relief. Mr. Burke said that the applicant was requesting variances without knowing what he would ultimately build and that the neighbors and the City were entitled to know what would be built. He stated that no variances like these have been granted in single-family zones. Furthermore, Mr. Burke said that if this property was to be developed, it should be as a Planned Development so that detailed plans would be required. He concluded that the property could be developed in a way that would be beneficial for the trail and the neighborhood and then Mr. French could recuperate his money.

Ms. Sesler asked if the City Planning Commission should be hearing this case rather than the Zoning Board of Appeals. Mr. Haynes explained that the Subdivision Regulations stated that variances related to subdivisions were to be heard by the City Planning Commission.

Mr. Stallworth asked Mr. Burke how long he had been practicing law. Mr. Burke said that he had been practicing since 1971.

Mr. Burke called his first witness, Mr. Kelley Cowdrey, a resident at 3036 Portsmouth Avenue. Mr. Cowdrey spoke against this item. He explained that the community had been mischaracterized as being desperate to stop any development, but that they were for responsible and thoughtful development under the SF-6 zoning. For example, he welcomed the Wasson Way trail behind his house, but was against the proposed development for a car wash on the subject property. He expressed concerns about the impact of the proposed development on his property and the Wasson Way trail, especially since Mr. French could not state with any specificity what would be built. While plans were provided to allow City Planning to determine a building envelope, Mr. Cowdrey wished there were more details provided.

Mr. Suder cross-examined Mr. Cowdrey. Mr. Suder asked Mr. Cowdrey where his house was located and the current view from his property. Mr. Cowdrey explained that his property was on the north side of Portsmouth Avenue and six houses down from the subject property. He had no view of the gas station. Mr. Suder asked if Mr. Cowdrey’s backyard would change if development was permitted. Mr. Cowdrey said no. Mr. Suder asked how far his house was from the proposed houses. Mr. Cowdrey responded that he would not be able to determine the distance. Mr. Suder asked if Mr. Cowdrey was familiar with how real estate was developed. Mr. Cowdrey said no.
Mr. Joe Schnirring, a resident at 3040 Portsmouth Avenue, spoke against this item. He said that he was opposed for three reasons: it was not in the public interest of residents in Hyde Park, the variances were extreme, and it could reduce the future benefits of the trail. He explained that residents on Portsmouth Avenue had experienced flooding in their basements and that run off could be increased if the trail moves closer to their properties. He asked if the same variances would be given to other property owners if they were granted to the applicant. He explained that Norfolk Southern still owned the land and that their decision to sell the land was relevant to consider in this case. Additionally, he said that other plans should be considered, such as plans to widen the right-of-way. He concluded that this would land-lock the Hyde Park Plaza and asked the City Planning Commission whether they supported the Hyde Park Plaza or the Rookwood Plaza.

Mr. Suder cross-examined Mr. Schnirring. Mr. Suder asked Mr. Schnirring if he could see the gas station from his house and if he would be able to see it once the proposed houses were built. Mr. Schnirring said that he could see the gas station and that he may be able to see it if the houses were built. Mr. Suder asked Mr. Schnirring if his backyard would be impacted by the proposed development. Mr. Schnirring said he was not sure but was concerned about run off and placement of the trail. Mr. Suder asked Mr. Schnirring if he had any evidence that the trail would be moved closer to his house as he stated in his testimony. Mr. Schnirring said no. Mr. Suder asked Mr. Schnirring if the front yard setbacks would impact his property. Mr. Schnirring said that he thought the front yard setbacks would make travel down Wasson Road more dangerous for pedestrians and explained that the road should be widened. Mr. Suder asked Mr. Schnirring about his statement that the Hyde Park Plaza may have expansion needs and if he would support an expansion onto the subject property. Mr. Schnirring responded that he would not support commercial expansion, but he would support the widening of the road. Mr. Suder asked if the proposed development would prevent the City from making roadway improvements. Mr. Schnirring responded that he could not see how the road could be widened with this development. Mr. Suder asked Mr. Schnirring how wide Wasson Road was and if the City had any plans to widen it. Mr. Schnirring said that it was three and three quarters to four lanes wide and that he did not know of any plans. Mr. Suder ended in asking Mr. Schnirring if he was a traffic engineer. Mr. Schnirring responded no.

Ms. Amanda Schwendemen, a resident at 3046 Portsmouth Avenue located behind the subject property, spoke against the item. She explained that she attended the September 6th City Planning Commission meeting and spoke against the zone change. Ms. Schwendemen said that her neighbors and her had concerns about water runoff and the aesthetic impact that the proposed development would have on the trail. She said that as a taxpayer, she believed she had a right to speak about the trail since she financially contributed to it. Ms. Schwendemen handed out a map of the site with topography and the trail line. She explained that Mr. French showed that the trail would run down the centerline of the 50-foot trail property; however, due to the ravine, the trail could not be situated at that centerline. She said that the trail would be 13 feet away from his property line and 20 feet away from her property line, so his proposed houses and fences would be close to the trail. Ms. Schwendemen said she was concerned about losing the trees and the shade they provided. She also spoke about runoff and how her backyard currently had standing water in it. She was concerned about the increase in runoff once the trail was laid with asphalt.
She concluded by saying she thought her property value would decrease if the proposed development was built.

Mr. Stallworth asked Ms. Schwendemen if there was standing water in her backyard when she bought the house. She responded yes. Ms. Sesler inquired about how water runoff was considered during the Coordinated Site Review process. Ms. Keough-Jurs explained that the proposed project would be required to go through the Coordinated Site Review’s Technical Design Review at which point Water Works, Metropolitan Sewer District, and Stormwater Management Utility would provide comments and ensure that the project met their requirements.

Mr. Suder cross-examined Ms. Schwendemen. Mr. Suder asked her if she could see the gas station, the pediatrician’s office, the Kroger, or Wasson Road from her backyard. Ms. Schwendemen said that she could see the lights from the gas station, but not the other locations. Mr. Suder asked Ms. Schwendemen to explain how she came up with the centerline on her map. She explained that she used CAGIS 2011 aerial photography and drew a line over the railroad. Mr. Suder asked if she was a real estate developer or engineer or if she had any background in architecture or design. She said that she was not, but she was a concerned homeowner. Mr. Suder asked her if she had done a shade study. She said no. He followed-up by asking if she was aware that the City was under a consent decree with the federal government that required Mr. French to capture all rainwater runoff. She said that she was not aware. Mr. Suder asked Ms. Schwendemen about the value of her home. She said it was bought for $345,000. Mr. Suder concluded in asking her if she was aware that Mr. French was proposing to build $600,000 homes. Ms. Schwendemen responded yes.

Mr. Burke cross-examined Ms. Schwendemen. Mr. Burke asked her how she knew that the proposed homes would be $600,000. She responded that she did not know what he would build and that she believed her home was more valuable without houses behind it.

A recess was taken at 1:04 p.m.

The session was resumed at 1:07 p.m.

Mr. Joe Schwendemen, a resident at 3046 Portsmouth Avenue, spoke against the item. He started by saying that setbacks were in place to protect the neighborhood. He lived directly behind the property with his wife and two sons. He said that he believed the subject property parcel was too narrow and that the requested variance was excessive and amplified once topography was considered. Furthermore, he said that variances like these were nowhere else in Hyde Park. He said that the greenspace and trees protected his property from pollution, light, and runoff. Mr. Schwendemen explained that he believed the proposed development would affect his quality of life and financial investment and strip his family’s privacy. He concluded by asking the City Planning Commission to listen to the people in the neighborhood and to protect them.

Mr. Suder cross-examined Mr. Schwendemen. Mr. Suder asked Mr. Schwendemen if he had confirmed that there were no variances in Hyde Park like the ones proposed. He said that he spoke with Matt Shad, Zoning Administrator in the Department of Buildings and Inspections,
who said that he could not think of any. Mr. Suder asked if Mr. Schwendemen’s neighbors could look into his backyard. He said yes. Mr. Suder asked if Mr. Schwendemen’s trees or trees on the Wasson Way would be cut down. He said none of his trees would be cut down, but he believed some trees may be cut down when the trail was built. Mr. Suder asked if that potential tree loss would be due to his client’s proposed development. Mr. Schwendemen said that he believed trees on Wasson Way would be at risk. Mr. Suder asked Mr. Schwendemen if he was aware that all runoff from the trail would be considered by the Department of Transportation and Engineering. Mr. Schwendemen said that there was runoff on Grovedale when a portion of the Wasson Way trail was being built. He also said that without an ample foundation, the trail may be at risk. Mr. Suder asked him if Mr. French had control over the trail development. Mr. Schwendemen responded no, but said he believed the proposed development may have a negative impact on the trail. Mr. Suder asked him if he was aware that Mr. French was proposing to build $600,000 homes on the subject property. Mr. Schwendemen said that he was aware. He explained that his true property value was the privacy he had in his backyard, the love he had put into his house, and the school district. Mr. Suder asked him if he owned the Wasson Way trail. Mr. Schwendemen said that as a taxpaying citizen, he felt that he owned the trail. Mr. Suder ended by asking him if he was aware that there were other properties closer than 11-feet to the trail. Mr. Schwendemen said that those properties were all commercial.

Ms. Ann Gimbert, a resident at 3636 Victoria Lane, spoke against the item. She said that the proposal would negatively impact the Wasson Way trail. She explained that there had been a lot of community engagement on the subject property and that an opportunity emerged from these conversations. Ms. Gimbert presented a proposal for a pocket park, explaining that it would be a public space for everyone to enjoy and a perfect fit for the trail considering that many people would access the trail from Paxton. She said that the pocket park proposal was shared with the Hyde Park Neighborhood Council, Wasson Way, the Cardinal Land Conservancy, and Oakley Community Council. She ended in saying that the subject property could be an important piece of a premier trail system that Cincinnati hopes to showcase.

Mr. Suder cross-examined Ms. Gimbert. Mr. Suder started by asking that the pocket park be stricken from the record due to its irrelevance to the item at hand. He asked Ms. Gimbert if she was aware that one of the reasons Wasson Way was proposed was to spur economic development. Ms. Gimbert said that she had not seen the exact wording. Mr. Suder then asked if Ms. Gimbert thought the sole benefit of this trail was recreational. She said that the area was an important access point for the trail.

Ms. Patty Stefanik, a resident at 3031 Portsmouth Avenue, spoke against the item. She echoed the previous concerns made about safety, setbacks, shade, and runoff. Ms. Stefanik said that she wanted Cincinnati to grow, thrive, and be a good example to other cities. She explained that the proposed development was not an appropriate use of the land and that she was concerned about its impact on Portsmouth homeowners and the Wasson Way trail. She concluded by saying she believed that the greenspace should be preserved.

Ms. Lynn Schnirring, a resident at 3040 Portsmouth Avenue, spoke against the item. Ms. Schnirring said that the proposed project was not consistent with the single-family zoning that
the residents fought hard to put in place. The Portsmouth homeowners felt the effects of nearby developments and the trail development already and wanted the neighborhood to stay a SF-6 neighborhood. She ended in saying that these variances would impact the homeowners on Portsmouth Avenue and the Wasson Way.

Mr. Ed Romero, a resident at 3036 Portsmouth Avenue, spoke against the item. He asked Mr. Juengling to explain the notification process. Mr. Juengling explained the notification process and said that there was a clerical error made in the initial notification for when the applicant applied for a zone change. Mr. Romero said that this case was a blueprint for how not to engage a community. He said that his neighbors and he have been called anti-growth by Mr. Suder, but that it was an incorrect characterization.

Ms. Danielle Discepoli, President of the Hyde Park Neighborhood Council and board member of the Wasson Way, spoke on behalf of and in support of the neighbors. She explained that a lot of people had been engaged on this issue throughout the last few months and that the overwhelming majority of the neighbors were against the project.

Mr. Stallworth asked Ms. Discepoli how many people attended the neighborhood meetings. Ms. Discepoli responded that on average 10 people attend, but when meetings were held on this issue, 50-60 people attended. Ms. Sesler asked Ms. Discepoli if she had seen an example of when four new homes have been built in the neighborhood and property taxes decreased or the City did not handle the runoff properly. Ms. Discepoli responded that she was not sure she could answer those questions.

Mr. Bill Hopple, the president of the Cardinal Land Conservancy Board, spoke about the proposed pocket park. He said that the Cardinal Land Conservancy was willing to be involved with the park’s development. Ms. Sesler asked Mr. Hopple if the Conservancy had money to purchase the land. Mr. Hopple said that they did not have the money, but that he believed the project would qualify for a Clean Ohio Grant.

Ms. Janet Buening, a 40-year resident of Hyde Park residing at 3520 Mooney Avenue, spoke against this item. She explained that the neighbors wanted to preserve their residential neighborhood, the developer wanted to create a commercial neighborhood, and HPNC wanted the subject property to not be developed due to concerns about grading, sewer issues, topography, potential landslide issues, and more. Ms. Buening said that there was a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) stating that the Wasson Way needed to be preserved in a way that would allow it to be turned back into a light rail line in the future. She spoke about the community engagement meetings and that she was not aware of all of the 16 meetings Mr. French referenced. She said that Mr. French was invited to come to the November board meeting, but he told her that he had nothing new to share even though he had submitted the subdivision application. Ms. Buening concluded by saying that the Hyde Park community was opposed to the development and had expressed this through emails, meetings with City Council members, public hearings, attending meetings, and more, and at the end of the day, the subject property was only 40-feet wide.
Ms. Karen Robertson, a resident at 2013 Observatory Avenue, spoke against the item. She said that the proposal did not conform to residential setbacks and was not consistent with other single-family homes in Hyde Park. She explained that the original proposal was for a zone change in order to avoid the need for setback variances and that now, since the zoning was remaining the same, the variances had needed to increase. Ms. Robertson said that Hyde Park residents were worried about the dangerous precedent this may set. She also said that these homes would be 100% tax abated and that the City would have to wait 10-15 years to receive tax revenue. Ms. Robertson concluded by saying that the proposed homes could be built on another site and asked the City Planning Commission to turn the land into a park.

Mr. French presented his closing statement. He started by addressing some technical concerns that were raised. He said that he met with MSD and was told that there would be no impact on the Portsmouth sewer system. He met with DOTE and was told that the project would have no impact on traffic. He met with the Stormwater Management Utility and was told this would have no impact on stormwater runoff to Portsmouth Avenue. All drainage went to Wasson Road. He explained that the circulated petition included false and inflammatory claims. He emphasized that the City Planning Commissioners should listen to the experts in the City who reviewed the application. He concluded by asking for the City Planning Commissioners’ support and approval because City professionals approved the project as well.

Mr. Burke presented his closing statement. He stated that the subject property was in a traditional SF-6 zone. He said the question before the City Planning Commission was whether the zoning on the property made a difference. Mr. Burke explained that Chapter 1445-15 of the Zoning Code outlined standards for variances, including that a variance may be granted provided that the owner or the predecessor in title did not create the situation. Mr. Burke said that there was clear evidence that the railroad created the situation. Additionally, he said that a variance could be granted if it was not contrary to the current zoning district. He elaborated that the SF-6 zoning district was intended to provide decent setbacks and that variances to reduce these setbacks were being requested without concrete plans being presented. Mr. Burke explained that when the ZHE heard a variance request, applicants were required to submit detailed plans. Mr. Burke then presented another variance standard that asked whether a variance was necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right that was possessed by owners of other properties in the same zoning district. Mr. Burke said that the applicant was asking for far more than surrounding property owners currently had, including the ability to build to five feet to the front yard property line and to 11 feet to the rear yard property line. He concluded his statement by asking the Commissioners if the applicant met all the requirements for a variance. Mr. Burke said that the applicant did not meet the requirements.

Mr. Suder presented his closing statement. He stated that without the variances, the property owner would be deprived of their property rights. He explained that Mr. French could not provide further designs or plans until he knew his building envelope. He explained that a practical difficulty was created when the Wasson Way was planned, leaving a lot that was not buildable. The trail was meant to spur economic development and this project was proposed to be LEED Platinum, accessible, and walkable. Mr. Suder concluded in saying that the purchaser needed property rights and that practical difficulties would be suffered but for these variances.
Mr. Juech proposed a discussion from the Commissioners and then a vote. Mr. Eby said that he recalls this was not the first time the City Planning Commission had seen a case where an applicant wanted to know the building envelope before submitting other plans. Ms. Sesler asked why the City Planning staff recommended approval. Ms. Keough-Jurs explained that City Planning staff were not the only City staff who reviewed projects. In the case of a joint subdivision and variance review process, a Zoning Plans Examiner (ZPE) reviewed the variances, just as they would for a ZHE hearing. The ZPE in this case recommended approval and the City Planning staff agreed with the recommendation.

Ms. Sesler asked Mr. Juech what the City would do with the subject property if this development did not occur. Mr. Juech said that that situation was too speculative to address.

Vice Mayor Smitherman asked if City staff was involved in the community outreach. Mr. Juengling explained that he attended several of the community meetings, one prior to the zone change application, one after the Economic Growth and Zoning Committee hearing on the zone change in September, and one the prior week. During the meeting in September, the discussion centered around whether to proceed with the zone change or pursue an alternative. Mr. Juengling said that it was his understanding that the proposed subdivision with variances was a result of that meeting. He said that throughout the process there had been a good amount of opposition but that several concessions were made by the applicant to address concerns that were raised. Mr. Smitherman asked about the attendance at those meetings. Mr. Juengling said that about 20-30 people attended the Hyde Park Neighborhood Council meetings and about 12 people attended the meeting with various stakeholders. He explained that the community members expressed the same concerns that were presented that day. Mr. Smitherman asked if City Planning staff did direct engagement. Mr. Juengling said that notice was sent to community members based on Zoning Code and Subdivision Regulations. Additionally, City staff made themselves available for meetings, phone calls, and email. Mr. Smitherman said that he was told by the applicant that a lot of outreach was done, so he was surprised to see the level of opposition when he went on a site visit with Hyde Park leadership. He said this illustrated two perspectives on engagement.

Mr. Juech thanked the staff for their work on this item and stated that he had great respect for all the stakeholders in this conversation. He said that he was supporting the project based on the staff’s recommendation and because the investment in the Wasson Way was meant to spur walkable development.

**The Commission adopted** the staff’s recommendations for Item 5 on the Consent Quasi-Judicial Agenda.

Mr. Juech made the motion, which Ms. Sesler seconded.

Ayes: Mr. Eby, Mr. Juech, Mr. Samad, and Ms. Sesler.
Nays: Mr. Smitherman and Mr. Stallworth.

**Director’s Report**

Ms. Keough-Jurs presented the 2020 City Planning Commission Calendar.
The Commission approved the 2020 City Planning Commission Calendar. Ms. Sesler made the motion, which Mr. Samad seconded. Ayes: Mr. Eby, Mr. Juech, Mr. Samad, Ms. Sesler, Mr. Smitherman, and Mr. Stallworth.

Ms. Keough-Jurs said that the 2020 Zoning Board of Appeals Calendar would be presented at the next meeting on December 20, 2019.

The meeting adjourned at 2:25 p.m.
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