

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
CITY OF REHOBOTH BEACH**

April 11, 2014

The Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Rehoboth Beach was called to order at 6:35 p.m. by Chairman Preston Littleton on Friday, April 11, 2014 in the Commissioners Room in City Hall, 229 Rehoboth Avenue, Rehoboth Beach, DE.

ROLL CALL

Mr. Francis Markert called the roll:

Present: Mr. Paul Hubbard
 Mr. David Mellen
 Chairman Preston Littleton
 Mr. Francis Markert, Jr.
 Mrs. Jan Konesey

Absent: Mr. Brian Patterson
 Mr. Harvey Shulman
 Ms. Lynn Wilson
 Mr. Michael Strange

Also Present: Mr. Glenn Mandalas, City Solicitor (arrived at 6:42 P.M.)
 Ms. Terri Sullivan, Chief Building Inspector

A quorum was present.

VERIFICATION OF MEETING NOTICE

Ms. Ann Womack, City Secretary, verified that the Agenda was posted at City Hall, Building and Licensing Department and the City website on April 4, 2014. The Agenda was faxed to Cape Gazette, Coast Press and Delaware State News on April 4, 2014. An E-News blast was also sent out on April 4, 2014. Both notices for Public Hearings for 114 St. Lawrence Street and 50 Park Avenue were posted at City Hall, Building and Licensing Department and the City website on March 26, 2014. Both notices were advertised in the Cape Gazette on March 28, 2014 and April 1, 2014, in the Coast Press on April 2, 2014 and in the Delaware State News on March 27, 2014 and March 28, 2014. Mailings to property owners for both Public Hearings were sent out on March 27, 2014, and signage was posted on the properties on March 27, 2014.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes of the November 8, 2013, January 10, 2014 and March 14, 2014 Planning Commission Regular Meetings and March 15, 2014 Planning Commission Workshop Meeting were distributed prior to the meeting.

Mrs Jan Konesey made a motion, seconded by Mr. David Mellen, to approve the November 8, 2013 Planning Commission Regular Meeting minutes as written. Motion carried unanimously.

Mrs. Konesey made a motion, seconded by Mr. Mellen, to approve the January 10, 2014 and March 14, 2014 Planning Commission Regular Meeting minutes as written. Motion carried unanimously.

Mrs. Konesey made a motion, seconded by Mr. Mellen, to approve the March 15, 2014 Planning Commission Workshop Meeting minutes as written. Motion carried unanimously.

CORRESPONDENCE

Correspondence received will be read into the record when the Other Business portion of the meeting is held.

OLD BUSINESS

Chairman Littleton called for the Public Hearing of Minor Subdivision Application No. 1013-03 for the properties located at 114 and 118 St. Lawrence Street and 113 Lake Drive, Block 23, into three (3) lots with Lot Nos. 9, 10 and a portion of 11 facing St. Lawrence Street and Lake Drive becoming one (1) lot of 6,920.44 square feet; a portion of Lot Nos. 11,12 and 13 facing St. Lawrence Street becoming one (1) lot of 5,025 square feet ; and a portion of Lot Nos. 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16 facing Lake Drive becoming one (1) lot of 11,279.91 square feet. The

properties are owned by Charles R. Bailey, Jr. & Kathleen Ann O. Bailey and David I Rowland & Suzanne B. Rowland. The Minor Subdivision has been requested by Veronica O. Faust, Esq. of the law firm Morris James LLP on behalf of the owners of the property. Chairman Littleton provided the Public Hearing procedures. The Preliminary Review was entered into the record.

Building Inspector Terri Sullivan had nothing additional to add to her report for this hearing.

Ms. Veronica O. Faust, Esq. of the law firm Morris James LLP represented Mr. & Mrs. Bailey and Mr. & Mrs. Rowland, owners of the property. The owners of the property were in attendance at the meeting. Attorney Faust had nothing further to add for this hearing.

There was no correspondence and no public comment.

Chairman Littleton closed the public portion of the hearing.

Attorney Faust noted that probably a holly tree will be destroyed in the demolition on the proposed subdivision plan.

City Solicitor Glenn Mandalas acknowledged that the original sewer and water easement on the easterly was an easement agreement between the property owners and the City, and he would like to see the easement continue. If the Planning Commission gets to the point of considering an approval, one of the conditions he would like to see is that there is access to the sewer and water mains from the Lake Drive property. The City has a duty to provide sewer and water to every lot. Currently, there is no main that runs down Lake Drive. He would like to see the City have rights to that easement.

Chairman Littleton noted that the easement on the easterly side of the property is an historic easement between the City and the owners. The owners collectively are agreeing among themselves to put in another easement on the western boundary of the newly established lot.

Attorney Faust acknowledged that deed has been changed in Georgetown with regard to the shares which each of the particular participants own in the net land. The deed has been included in the amended application packet.

There was consensus of the Planning Commission members present to approve the Application.

City Solicitor Mandalas read the Resolution of the Planning Commission granting conditional approval pursuant to Chapter 236, Section 236-10 of the Municipal Code of the City of Rehoboth Beach of Minor Subdivision Application 1013-03 for the property located at 114 and 118 St. Lawrence Street and 113 Lake Drive. The Planning Commission finds and concludes that the proposed subdivision of the property is consistent with the Rehoboth Beach Comprehensive Development Plan and strikes a reasonable balance between the CDP's goals. The Planning Commission finds and concludes that subdividing the property as proposed promotes the health and general welfare of the community by creating well-coordinated development of land. The oral and written public comments made part of the public record have been given careful consideration in the final decision of the Planning Commission. Minor Subdivision Application 1013-03 shall be and is hereby conditionally granted with conditions of final approval. Adoption of this Resolution shall constitute conditional approval, not final approval. This conditional approval shall expire six months from the effective date of this Resolution, unless the Applicant has fulfilled all of the conditions enumerated as a contingency of final approval.

Attorney Faust said that the Resolution referenced the property with tax identification no. 3-34.30.05-297.01 which is the Bailey's property and is not involved in the subdivision. She requested that this property be removed from the Resolution.

The following are the conditions applied to this Resolution:

1. The Applicants shall remove the existing structures presently existing on tax parcel identification nos. 3-34-20.05-295, 3-34-20.05-296 and 3-34-20.05-306 including the existing dwelling, pool, pads and arbor as show on the existing conditions plan by Adams-Kemp Associates Inc. dated December 6, 2013 with revisions on December 23, 2013.
2. The Applicants shall prepare an easement agreement to be recorded with Office of Recorder of Deeds, Sussex County, through new Lot No. 1 as shown on the proposed resubdivision plan by Adams-Kemp Associates Inc. dated December 6, 2013 with revisions on December 23, 2013 and making the City a party with enforcement rights. Attorney Faust would draft the easement agreement for approval by the City Solicitor.

Attorney Faust said that as part of the subdivision, there will be a deed from the Baileys to the Rowlands for the portion of the lands which is being added to the Rowland's property. When the Planning Commission has approved the subdivision plat for recording, the deed will also be submitted, and those documents will have to be recorded simultaneously with the plat being recorded first followed by the deed.

Mrs. Konesey made a motion, seconded Mr. Mellen to adopt the Resolution as read with the two conditions as enumerated earlier, one of them being removal of structures on 3-34-20.05-295, 3-34-20.05-296 and 3-34-20.05-306, the second being the preparation and recordation of an easement to new Lot No. 1 as shown on the resubdivision plan giving the City enforcement rights, and deleting the reference to parcel no. 3-34-20.05-297.01 in two locations in the Resolution. Motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Littleton provided the process for final approval of the Planning Commission.

Chairman Littleton called for the Public Hearing of Partitioning Application No. 0114-01 for the property located at 50 Park Avenue, Lots Q & R, into two (2) lots with Lot Q becoming one (1) lot of 5,000 square feet and Lot R becoming one (1) lot of 5,000 square feet. The Partitioning has been requested by Timothy G. Willard, Esq. of the law firm Fuqua, Yori and Willard, P.A. on behalf of Michael Vardell of Vardell Realty Investments LLC, owner of the property. Chairman Littleton provided the Public Hearing procedures. The Preliminary Review was entered into the record.

Building Inspector Sullivan had nothing additional to add to her report for this hearing.

Mr. Timothy Willard, Esq. of the law firm Fuqua Yori & Willard P.A. represented Michael Vardell, owner of the property. The owner of the property was in attendance at the meeting. Attorney Willard noted that two of the supplemental surveys had minutes which were inconsistent with the main survey. Correspondence was submitted on March 21, 2014 by Mr. Doug Wingate of Wingate & Eschenbach explaining that the error on the surveys was typographical and was his mistake. The two surveys were corrected and were resubmitted. A demolition permit has been obtained to remove all the buildings.

There was no correspondence and no public comment.

Chairman Littleton closed the public portion of the hearing.

There was consensus of the Planning Commission members present to approve the Application.

City Solicitor Mandalas read the resolution of the Planning Commission granting conditional approval pursuant to Chapter 236, Section 236-9 of the Municipal Code of the City of Rehoboth Beach of Partitioning Application 0114-01 for the property located at 50 Park Avenue. The Planning Commission finds and concludes that the proposed partitioning of the property is consistent with the Rehoboth Beach Comprehensive Development Plan and strikes a reasonable balance between the CDP's goals. The Planning Commission finds and concludes that partitioning the property as proposed promotes the health and general welfare of the community by creating well-coordinated development of land. The oral and written public comments made part of the public record have been given careful consideration in the final decision of the Planning Commission. Partitioning Application No. 0114-01 shall be and is hereby conditionally granted with conditions of final approval. Adoption of this Resolution shall constitute conditional approval, not final approval. This conditional approval shall expire six months from the effective date of this Resolution, unless the Applicant has fulfilled all of the conditions enumerated as a contingency of final approval.

The following is the condition applied to this Resolution:

1. The Applicant shall remove all structures on the property.

Chairman Littleton noted that on page 3 of the Resolution, the survey dated January 7, 2014 should also include that it was revised March 18, 2014.

Mrs. Konesey made a motion, seconded by Mr. Mellen to adopt the Resolution as read by City Solicitor Mandalas to approve the partitioning of the property at 50 Park Avenue comprised of Lot Nos. Q & R as amended and with the condition. Motion carried unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

There was none.

OTHER BUSINESS

Chairman Littleton called for public comment from Mr. Jim Ellison regarding correspondence he had

previously sent to the Planning Commission. This public comment and correspondence was relative to the Resolution Regarding the City's Trees passed by the Mayor and City Commissioners asking the Planning Commission "...to research and propose amendments, as necessary, to the City's ordinances, regulations or procedures which are designed to protect and augment the City's urban forest in order to ensure the environmental healthy, beauty and enjoyment of Rehoboth Beach's trees.

Mr. & Mrs. Jim Ellison, 107 Henlopen Avenue, were in attendance at the meeting. Mr. Ellison summarized his letter dated August 3, 2013 that there are approximately 50 trees located on their lot. At the front of the house, the trees are fairly dense. Mr. Ellison had applied to have trees removed, and his request was rejected because none of the seven conditions were met. In his letter, Mr. Ellison requested to remove the holly trees due to their desire to have more sunlight penetrate the dense tree canopy and reach the brick walkway to the front stoop and surrounding planted areas. Removing the holly trees would enhance the ability of other trees and plants to grow. A few weeks ago Mr. Ellison was made aware of the proposed changes to the tree ordinance that would affect and supposedly respond to his need. Mr. Ellison found that the proposed language is still way too tight, and there is not any flexibility put into the Code. A tightly defined condition of the subject tree is that it must be interfering with the root or crown development of a larger healthy protected tree. This is a limiting condition. The Ellisons are looking for additional sunlight on a larger portion of the planted area in order for that area to thrive. Mr. Ellison hoped that there would be a way to provided adequate flexibility with the Code.

Chairman Littleton noted that the Planning Commission was trying to be responsive to Mr. Ellison's comments in Fall 2013 as well as other public comments in its interviews and research. A proposed provision which does not exist in the current Code would allow the City Arborist, when he sees conditions which are prohibited by the strict interpretation of the Code, to go to the Parks & Shade Tree Commission to possibly allow exceptions.

Mr. Mellen noted this problem has not only been raised by Mr. Ellison, but also other people. If the Planning Commission makes some Code changes, this would not be just in response to Mr. Ellison's concerns. Several weeks ago when the draft of the Code was available to the public, Mr. Ellison read the proposed changes and send an email to Mr. Mellen with his concerns. Mr. Mellen read the email dated March 31, 2014 from Mr. Ellison. In Mr. Ellison's email, the proposed modification, Section 253-30(A)(2)(a)(7) may be useful but has not a single thing to do with what is thought to be a problem with the density of trees on his lot and the resulting blockage of light which cannot reach his front walkway and other plantings that would grow more effectively and more beautifully if they had access to sunlight. The trees he wishes to remove are not weak understory trees. The proposed modifications to the Code are timid and extremely disappointing. In Mr. Ellison's view, it provides almost no additional flexibility for the City Arborist to provide relief to the property owners. This draft code continues to be written to save every tree without regard for other than the most obvious circumstances. Mr. Mellen said that the issue Mr. Ellison has talked about is that the City should be practicing good forestry management practices, which includes thinning of trees, clearing underbrush, etc. The Planning Commission has not yet adequately incorporated this into the new Code proposal. The issue from a code standpoint is that even with the City Arborist's mindset that something is right to do and correct from a forest management standpoint, there is little room in the Code to allow the City Arborist or Parks & Shade Tree Commission to allow those kinds of activities to take place. The Planning Commission needs to make available within the Code the wording which would allow experts to make good forest management decisions relative to maintaining the forest within the City itself.

Chairman Littleton called for the City Solicitor's Report. Also included in City Solicitor Mandalas' report was possible action concerning those activities or actions taken at Regular or Workshop Meetings of the Mayor and Commissioners that directly relate to the Planning Commission.

City Solicitor Mandalas reported that an invitation has been extended from the State Attorney General's office to set up a Roadshow with regard to the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Some interest has been expressed by the City Commissioners to host the Roadshow which would be limited to the City of Rehoboth Beach. Chairman Littleton noted that the Planning Commission would welcome and support the Roadshow.

City Solicitor Mandalas reported that Commissioner Stan Mills has been pursuing the merger agenda item. At the last City Commissioners Workshop Meeting, Commissioner Mills went through a series of diagrams in a powerpoint presentation and tried to illustrate what merger is. It was an educational piece to continuing that discussion. There was also discussion related to the Building & Licensing Department's recent change in policy based upon decisions by the Board of Adjustment. Based upon the decisions by the Board of

Adjustment, Ms. Sullivan's job is to interpret the Code. What has occurred with merger is that there have been creative attorneys and applicants who have figured out avenues to achieve an outcome, and they have challenged her decision on merger several times. Each time Ms. Sullivan's decision has been challenged, the Board of Adjustment has reversed her view of merger and her decision on a merger topic. Although the City Commissioners have been pursuing the merger topic for some time and the Planning Commission has made recommendations to the City Commissioners, it has gotten to the point where City Solicitor Mandalas and Ms. Sullivan were concerned that rather than the Board of Adjustment making a decision, it would go to a higher court somehow, and a judge would look at the Board of Adjustment decisions.

Mrs. Konesey was angry at the fact that no one called Chairman Littleton to let him know that the policy for the Building & Licensing Department changing regarding merger. Every partitioning merger/unmerger has come to the Planning Commission, and it has gone back to the City Commissioners and said that the Code needs to be adjusted or something needs to happen, and nothing happened. Ms. Sullivan noted that she had emailed a signed copy of her memo to the Planning Commission.

Chairman Littleton noted that in 2012, the Planning Commission was sympathetic to the City Solicitor and Building Inspector with regard to the Board of Adjustment. When all of this took place, Chairman Littleton wrote a letter, which he had asked to not be distributed publicly, that laid out his personal concern about it. Several City Commissioners have contacted Chairman Littleton who shared his concern about that they were in the process of discussing merger/unmerger one business day after the memorandum came out from the Building Inspector. Unmerger by subdivision or partitioning has been the practice of the City. A lot of people needed to be involved with this issue, and it has resulted in irritation which did not need to happen. The Planning Commission unanimously agrees that the past practices of the City should continue, but this is a decision for the Board of Commissioners to make.

City Solicitor Mandalas said that there has been confusion about the past practices. He shared memorandums from a past City Solicitor that made clear at one time the practice of merger only dealt with sub-standard lots. Two standard-sized lots of 5,000 square feet would not have come to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Mellen said that everyone, especially the City Commissioners, should focus on 2014 and the way the City should be and look at the issues relative to land planning and the impact of what is taking place in terms of building and land development. The problem he has is not with the decisions the Board of Adjustment makes, but it does not take the next step and do the things related to land planning that the Planning Commission believes should be done in the public interest. City Solicitor Mandalas noted that the Board of Adjustment does not have discretion to do that. Mr. Mellen said that this is all the more reason why land issues should be afforded a process where it comes before the public.

City Solicitor Mandalas noted that the Board of Commissioners has extended an invitation to the Planning Commission to come to a future meeting and make its case as to why merger issues should come before the Commission. Then the Board of Commissioners would have the opportunity to codify it in a way that would assure the Building Inspector's decision to send the case to the Planning Commission would be affirmed by the Board of Adjustment. Chairman Littleton said that the Planning Commission is looking to City Solicitor Mandalas to help support the logic of the Planning Commission before the Board of Commissioners. City Solicitor Mandalas acknowledged that the Building & Licensing policy change is an interim policy until the Board of Commissioners does something.

Commissioner Toni Sharp said that she is looking forward to the discussion with the Commissioners and the Planning Commission so she can be much more well-informed.

Mr. Mellen thought it would be helpful that City Solicitor Mandalas summarize what the existing case law is in Delaware regarding merger and whether there are ordinances in other municipalities..

Chairman Littleton called for the Building Inspector's Report.

Ms. Sullivan reported that Delmarva Power will be taking down trees on Bayard and Delaware Avenues and Munson Street.

Chairman Littleton called to review, discuss and possibly finalize the working draft of an amended City Tree Ordinance based on public input, interviews and recommendations received by the Planning Commission and research conducted by the Commission. This is in reference to the Resolution Regarding the City's Trees passed by the Mayor and City Commissioners asking the Planning Commission "...research and propose amendments, as necessary, to the City's ordinances, regulations or procedures which are designed to protect and augment the City's

urban forest in order to ensure the environmental health, beauty and enjoyment of Rehoboth Beach's trees." review, discuss and possibly finalize the working draft of an amended City Tree Ordinance based on public input, interviews and recommendations received by the Planning Commission and research conducted by the Commission.

Chairman Littleton suggested putting the working draft amended Tree Ordinance on the City website to seek additional public comment.

Comments in reference to the working draft amended Tree Ordinance:

1. Article I. There were no comments.
2. Article II: Shade Tree Ordinance. Line 174. Remove Shade Tree Ordinance. Article II should be set as a preamble as to why there is an ordinance and describes that Rehoboth is a treed city and has forests to maintain, etc.
3. Article II. Section 253-22 – Purpose. Add a new provision – Property Forest Management. Incorporate giving the flexibility to the City Arborist to make decisions or to recommend decisions that are based on supporting words in the Code relative to proper forest management that go above and beyond just removal of trees, planting of trees, etc. Leave some judgment for the City Arborist and perhaps the Parks & Shade Tree Commission to look at issues which Mr. Ellison had described.

Mr. Tom Zellers, 308 Stockley Street and President of Country Club Estates Homeowners' Association, discussed different ways to be more friendly to people with regard to the tree ordinance. Munson and Sandalwood Streets and Country Club Drive do not have any trees. The Association has hoped that when a building permit is issued, three trees would be required to be planted, but it has not happened. The Association is fully behind trees for its neighborhood.

Mayor Cooper thought that it would be bad form and possibly illegal to have a City employee making an appeal or a case on behalf of an applicant to another City board. It would be a conflict of interest. The person should have to apply, and the Building Official or the City Arborist may say they have no objection, but for them to make the case for an individual is out of the scope of their duties.

4. Article II. Section 253-23 – Applicability. (D) Emergency Waiver. Lines 230-231." Change "...this article may be suspended or waived by the City during a period officially declared by the City Manager..." to "...this article may be suspended or waived by the City during a period officially declared **an emergency** by the City Manager..."
5. Article II. Section 253-44 – Definitions and word usage. Add a definition of forest.
6. Article II. Section 253-44 – Definitions and word usage. Remove or Removal. Remove "or" after poison.
7. Article II. Section 253-26 – Minimum tree density requirements. Line 348. Change "[A]ll residential lots, whether or not they contain a structure, and all residentially used lots that are commercial lots or mixed-use lots or other lots that are not residential lots,..." to "[A]ll lots used for residential purposes whether zoned residential or not..."
8. Article II. Section 253-26 – Minimum tree density requirements. Line 354. Change "...one shade tree for each 1,666 square feet of land for lots smaller..." to "...two shade trees for lots smaller..."
9. Article II. Section 253-26 – Minimum tree density requirements. Line 367. Change "...shade trees exceeding four inches D.B.H...." to "...shade trees exceeding four inches D.B.H. and twelve feet in height..."
10. Article II. Section 253-26 – Minimum tree density requirements. Lines 377-378. Change "...lots fronting a street to the south of Pennsylvania Avenue..." to "...lots in the ocean block south of Pennsylvania Avenue..."
11. Article II. Section 253-26 – Minimum tree density requirements. Lines 389-390. Remove "...conveyance or transfer of the lot..."
12. Article II. Section 253-26 – Minimum tree density requirements. Line 400. Change "...three inches D.B.H. in size..." to "...three inches D.B.H. in size and twelve feet in height..."
13. Article II. Section 253-26 – Minimum tree density requirements. Lines 401-402. This pertains to a conveyance issue.
14. Article II. Section 253-27 – Maintenance of trees. (1). Remove "...in areas where falling limbs may be a hazard to people or property."
15. Article II. Section 253-27 – Maintenance of trees. (1). Reference back to Section 253-14(A).
16. Article II. Section 253-29. Change "[S]ubmission of plans with applications for building or demolition permit, for approval of subdivision, or tree-removal permit" to "[S]ubmission of plans with applications for building or demolition permit, for subdivision or site plan approval, or tree-removal

- permit”.
17. Article II. Section 253-29 - Submission of plans... (2). Change “...will proceed in the same manner by the same City officials and/or entity responsible for reviewing and approving the application for building permit, tree-removal permit, subdivision or site plan approval, or demolition permit” to “...will proceed in the same manner by the same City officials responsible for reviewing and approving the application for building permit, tree-removal permit, subdivision or site plan approval, or demolition permit approval.”
 18. Article II. Section 253-29 - Submission of plans... (B)(3). Remove freestanding signs.
 19. Article II. Section 253-30 – Tree-removal permits. (A)(2)(a)(7). Change “[T]he tree is an understory tree located...” to “[T]he tree is located...”
 20. Article II. Section 253-30 – Tree-removal permits. (C). Change “...on a sign prescribed by the Commission” to “...on a sign prescribed by the Parks & Shade Tree Commission”. Change “...applicant shall agree in writing to entry onto his lot...” to “...applicant shall agree in writing to entry onto their lot...”
 21. Article II. Section 253-30 – Tree-removal permits. (D)(1)(a). Change “[S]tatement as to the applicant’s ownership interest in the lot” to “[S]tatement as to the ownership interest in the lot”.
 22. Article II. Section 253-30 – Tree-removal permits. (D)(2). Remove “[E]xisting and proposed site elevations and major contours should be included in the case of a proposed subdivision”.
 23. Article II. Section 253-30 – Tree-removal permits. (E)(1). Change “...administrative fee of” will be...” to “...administrative fee will be...”
 24. Article II. Section 253-31 – Tree plan inspection. Remove “[T]he applicant or his designee shall be advised as to the date and time of the inspection and given an opportunity to participate”. Change “...advise the applicant in writing of any...” to “...advise the applicant of any...”
 25. Article II. Section 253-32 – Tree protection during construction. (D). Refer to 253-38.
 26. Article II. Section 253-35 – Mitigation of protected trees. (A). Change “...because it is an understory tree located...” to “...because it is a tree located...”

Chairman Littleton will redline the changes. The working draft amended tree ordinance will be placed on the City website. Mr. Markert volunteered to write a preamble to it, and Chairman Littleton will review it.

Chairman Littleton noted that in the transmittal document, Trees in the City of Rehoboth Beach – Goals, Realities and Opportunities, he has written suggested recommendations with regard to goals, realities and opportunities. He will develop a tree plan to be placed in the transmittal document. Chairman Littleton suggested that the Planning Commission members review this document.

The remaining agenda items were deferred to the next meeting.

No new subdivision applications have been submitted to date.

The next meeting of the Planning Commission is scheduled for May 9, 2014 at 6:30 p.m.

Mrs. Konesey made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hubbard, to adjourn the meeting at 9:16 p.m.

RECORDED BY

(Ann M. Womack, CMC, City Secretary)

**MINUTES APPROVED ON
MAY 9, 2014**

(Francis Markert, Secretary)