

**KENT PLANNING COMMISSION
BUSINESS MEETING
April 3, 2018**

MEMBERS PRESENT:

**Amanda Edwards
Jeff Clapper
John Gargan
Peter Paino
Michel Bruder**

STAFF PRESENT:

**Jennifer Barone, Development Engineer
Bridget Susel, Community Development Director
Eric Fink, Asst. Law Director
Sheila Uzl, Transcriptionist**

I. Call To Order

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

II. Roll Call:

Ms. Edwards, Mr. Gargan, Mr. Clapper, Mr. Paino and Mr. Bruder were present.

III. Reading of the Preamble

The Planning Commission operates in accordance with the provisions of the Kent City Charter, the Kent Zoning Code and Subdivision Regulations, all of which establish the powers and duties of the Commission. Members of the Planning Commission are appointed by Kent City Council and serve without compensation. Certain cases such as Conditional Zoning Certificates, Special Zoning Permits, Overlay District Projects and Zoning Amendment require Public Hearings before the Planning Commission. During the Public Hearing, any person wishing to address their concerns to the Commission will be provided the opportunity. Once the Public Hearing is closed, it shall be the discretion of the Chair whether to allow any additional public comment. Cases such as Site Plan Reviews and Subdivision Projects do not require a Public Hearing. However, the Chair will allow public comment on each case as it is taken on the agenda. In each instance where the Commission receives public comments or conducts a Public Hearing, those persons wishing to address their concerns to the Commission will be required to do so under oath or positive affirmation. The oath or affirmation shall be administered to all who wish to speak at the beginning of the Planning Commission Meeting. Once a decision has been made by the Planning Commission on a case, the Case is closed for the commission, as there is no provision to reopen a case. With the exception of cases falling under the Subdivision Code, any decision of the Planning Commission may be appealed to the City's Board of Zoning Appeals in accordance with the Chapter 1109 of the Zoning Code. Anyone interested in appealing a decision of the Planning Commission is advised to seek private legal counsel.

IV. Administration of Oath

Mr. Fink instructed those members of the audience wishing to be heard on any of the cases presented at this meeting to rise and raise their right hand. Mr. Fink administered the Oath, "Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony that you are about to give this evening is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God? Please say "I do." The participants responded, "I do."

V. Correspondence

An email dated April 2, 2018 has been received from Wendi Koontz regarding Case PC18-005, Home Occupation.

VI. Old Business

None

VII.. New Business

**A. PC18-001 MC Automotive (Montrose)
 1133 West MainStreet
 Conditional Zoning Certificate and Site Plan Review**

The applicants are seeking Conditional Zoning Certificate and Site Plan Review and Approval for a vehicle display lot. The subject lot is zoned IC-R: Intensive Commercial- Residential District.

Ms. Edwards asked staff to introduce the project and review the Staff Report.

Ms. Barone stated MC Automotive (Montrose) is asking for Conditional Zoning Certificate and Site Plan approval to use the parking in front of what is known as Dalton Furniture at 1133 West Main Street to use the area to display vehicles. Parking for clients and employees will be at the adjoining Montrose dealership. This is a permitted use in in the ICR District. The vehicles will be displayed in front of the building. The conditions have been met that are listed in the Staff Report. There are no utility changes, no signage changes, no landscaping changes or no dumpster changes. This project is not required to go before the Architectural Review Board.

Mr. Fink stated the applicants are not planning to use the building at this time. If they should decide to use it in the future, they would have to come back before the Planning Commission.

Ms. Edwards asked the applicants to present the project.

Joe Stefanini, 3960 Medina Road, Akron, Ohio, stated he was the Vice President of the company who owned this property as well as the adjacent property. He said they want to

Planning Commission Minutes

April 3, 2018

Page 3

upgrade the facility and their intention is to continue the front parking row which will be in front of the old Dalton place. He said they are not using the building but might build one in the future. At some point, it will be a front for the Mazda facility. It will be built between the two buildings. They will build that one first and then the Dalton Furniture store will be knocked down. For now, this application is for the display lot at 1133 West Main Street.

Mr. Paino asked if there would be a landscaping buffer up by the sidewalk.

Ms. Barone replied when the applicants return with the new building, the landscaping buffer would be considered. She said it is a parking lot now, so a landscaping buffer does not have to be considered.

Mr. Paino asked how West Main Street could look nicer if cars continued to be parked 3' over the sidewalk.

Mr. Stefanini replied that they should be able to meet the City's setback requirements when they put in the new building. He said they are waiting to build the new facility because Mazda has to "kick in" some money.

Mr. Paino asked if the site plan review would be for all three parcels.

Ms. Barone replied it would depend on the proposal that was submitted, but yes, it could be all three parcels.

Mr. Gargan asked what the time frame they were talking about.

Mr. Stefanini replied they would have to complete the new building then demolish the existing Mazda building and Dalton building. Both of these areas will become parking.

Mr. Bruder asked if they had a sense of how many years before this happened.

Mr. Stefanini replied two years. He said the existing building is outdated, old and dilapidated.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Mr. Gargan stated it is what it is.

Mr. Clapper stated he was concerned about the building occupation. It cannot be occupied.

Planning Commission Minutes

April 3, 2018

Page 4

Mr. Bruder had no comments.

Mr. Paino stated he would rather see the cars parked further back from the sidewalk but he will wait for the new plans.

Ms. Edwards was also concerned about what the City's intention in the future was and the thoroughfare plan and the character of the area. That is the main artery into downtown. She was concerned with the street appearance.

Mr. Paino asked if the setback was 20 feet from the property line.

Ms. Barone replied when the applicants return, they will have to combine the two parcels and the property line will be moved back to the right-of-way line. Stoddards did this.

There were no other questions or comments so Ms. Edwards asked for a motion.

MOTION: *Mr. Gargan moved in case PC18-001, MC Automotive (Montrose), property located at 1133 West Main Street Street, that the Planning Commission approves the Conditional Zoning Certificate and Site Plan to allow vehicles to be displayed for sale in front of the building at 1133 West Main Street.*

Subject to the following condition:

1. Submit for Technical Review.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Clapper

The motion passed 5 – 0.

**B. PC18-003 Alterations/Addition
 257 North Water Street
 Site Plan Review**

The applicants are seeking Site Plan Review & Approval in order to construct a building addition. The property is zoned C-D: Commercial Downtown District.

Ms. Edwards asked staff to introduce the project and review the Staff Report.

Mr. Gargan recused himself from this case.

Ms. Barone stated the applicant is seeking Site Plan Approval to demolish a portion of an existing building at 257 North Water Street and constructing an addition. It is a permitted use in the Commercial District. The applicants came in a few years ago for a three-story building and that was approved, but the approval expired. They are back with a different

Planning Commission Minutes

April 3, 2018

Page 5

design. Off street parking is not required in the C-D District. The applicants have to provide a parking plan. The plan is to utilize spaces on the street. There is an eight (8) space paved area within the street right-of-way off of Portage Street. This area would normally be curbed and grass, but it is paved. It is a parking area, but it is not dedicated to the applicants. Utilities are available. There are no signs proposed. Lighting will consist of low wattage building fixtures. No landscaping other than grass is proposed. The dumpster will be within the trash enclosure located in the back. The Architectural Review Board reviewed the project on March 6, 2018 and issued a Certificate of Appropriateness as submitted. No variances were required. There is a loading dock in the back. If the Planning Commission chooses to approve the application, staff recommends two conditions be added to the motion: Submit for Technical Plan Review and obtain a license to occupy the right-of-way from Kent City Council to allow the footers to be constructed and utilized.

Mr. Fink had no comments.

Ms. Edwards asked the applicants to present the project.

Randy Matejka with Design Wise, 4300 Brookpark Road, Suite 5 Cleveland, Ohio stated he was representing 257 North Water Street. He displayed the site plans and discussed them. He said it is two stories and the addition will also be two stories. He said a three-story mixed-use building was approved by the Planning Commission in July 2015. This approval expired so the applicant is back with a new site plan. He said first floor will be store front. The second floor has access from the rear due to the slope. He pointed out the grass area and loading area. He said they will be replacing the sidewalk. He showed the location of the utilities. Parking will remain the same. A 30" retaining wall be installed due to the grade.

Mr. Bruder asked if there was any parking intended in the rear of the building.

Mr. Matejka replied there might be one but the area is more for deliveries and short -term parking.

Mr. Bruder confirmed that the area was more for a service area for the dumpsters, delivery and short- term parking.

Mr. Matejka replied yes.

Ms. Susel stated a sign could put up stating loading area only or delivery area.

Mr. Paino asked if that area sloped.

Mr. Matejka replied no. It slopes east to west. He referred to the site plan and further discussed the slope.

Planning Commission Minutes

April 3, 2018

Page 6

Mr. Bruder asked if the City of Kent maintained the parking,

Ms. Susel replied yes. It is on street parking requiring a permit since it is designated as overnight spaces for eight (8) spaces. If the area was to be put back to tree lawn and off street parking like the rest of Portage Street, several steps would have to be taken. One is to go before the Parking Action Committee to eliminate the overnight permits for that area, and then that recommendation would have to be taken before the Kent City Council to agree to convert the area to tree lawn. The cost factor of changing the area is something that also has to be considered. She said it is a challenging area but is the only area designated for overnight parking downtown other than the deck. She said overnight parking downtown is prohibited from 3:00 a.m. to 6:00 a.m. A recommendation before Kent City Council, which Council approved, because there were residents in the area.

Mr. Paino asked how deep the parking is. He said the street, sidewalk and parking are not in good shape. He asked how long of wait will there be to improve this area.

Ms. Susel replied the recommendation would be taken to the Parking Action Committee by Staff.

Mr. Paino stated that the City of Kent has some responsibility to improve the conditions.

Ms. Barone replied some kind of upgrade could be done when Portage Street is improved.

Ms. Susel state this could be looked at during the Technical Plan Review.

There was continued discussion about the parking area. It was noted that there is angled parking across from St. Patrick's on Portage Street.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Mr. Clapper stated that people will assume there is parking with the building.

Ms. Susel stated that is not part of the site plan.

Mr. Bruder commended the redevelopment. He recommended that staff consider that the North Water Street improvements include this area.

Ms. Susel stated that staff agrees and this area has been under review. It has challenges on many levels. It is on the list.

Ms. Barone stated the applicant is seeking site plan approval. It is a permitted use in the Industrial District. The applicant wants to construct an addition to the northeast corner of the building and expand the parking spaces. The existing parking is 53 spaces with 34 of them being in the rear of the building. She said 13 spaces will be removed where the building addition is proposed and 28 spaces are proposed in the parking expansion. The net gain will be 15 for a total number of 68 spaces. Staff used the most stringent criteria to calculate how many spaces they needed and determined that 66 spaces were required. A storm water basin is proposed to serve the new parking area. A sign is proposed on the

Planning Commission Minutes

April 3, 2018

Page 8

front of the new addition. There will be parking lot lights in the new parking area. The landscaping plan includes utilizing existing vegetation and planting five (5) trees along the west side and shrubs on the east side of the proposed parking area plus fencing. There are no changes to where the dumpster is located. The Board of Zoning Appeals approved three variances requested by the applicant. They asked for a variance from the front yard setback, a variance from the landscaping in the front yard and a variance to allow three accessways. She recommended that if the Planning Commission makes a motion to approve, two conditions be added to it: 1) Submit for Technical Plan Review. 2) Review and approval of the proposed sign.

Ms. Susel added that the 12-foot variance from the 50-foot minimum front yard setback is a variance from the code, but the actual existing condition it was already 40 feet from the front. While the variance was based on the 50-foot minimum, the actual location was 40 from the front yard setback so it is actually a 2-foot variance.

Ms. Edwards asked the applicants to present the project.

Jonathan Morschl, 2850 South Arlington Road, Akron, Ohio, stated he is the architect for the project and would be presenting the project. He said the business owner was at the meeting who would answer any questions if needed. He referred to the plans and explained what is proposed. He said a large portion of the facility involves the factory area. There is a small area in the front that is their administrative offices and will be expanded to align with the existing warehouse and manufacturing area. It will extend a couple feet past the existing building. The building expansion will include a larger conference room as well as additional offices. The intention is to give everyone their own office. The front parking area is where the administrative staff and visitors park now. They are proposing 28 new spaces as well as an additional curb cut. Most of the daily traffic will come through two curb cuts. The curb cut on the southern portion of the site is used for deliveries. He said there will be a detention basin in the front and will utilize existing vegetation as well plant five (5) trees and some shrubs. He said the owner purchased a portion of the property in the back. There will be two new pole lights. There will be a wooded buffer to the north between the new lot and the residential apartment complex. The apartments will not have the lights shining on them.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Mr. Gargan asked how many trees will be removed.

Mr. Morschl replied there will be one large tree removed and a couple of shrubs.

Mr. Gargan asked if parking was permitted at night.

Mr. Morschl replied it would be available during normal working hours. The light poles are on a timer.

Mr. Bruder asked why the parking was not extended behind the building.

Mr. Morschl replied they wanted to leave that open for future potential, plus it is closer for the staff and guests to enter.

Bob Oborn, 1560 St. Clair Avenue, Kent, Ohio, stated he was president of Kent Elastomers. He said if people walked back there, they would have to walk past two loading docks. He said the hourly people park in the back while the salaried park in the front.

Mr. Bruder asked if the lights will spill over the property line and if it would be at an acceptable level.

Ms. Barone replied the lights are supposed to be zero at the property line and that will be tightened up at the Technical Plan Review.

There were no further comments or questions so Ms. Edwards asked for a motion.,

MOTION: *Mr. Clapper moved in case PC18-004, Kent Elastomer Office, property located at 1500 Saint Clair Avenue, that the the Planning Commission approves the Site Plan to construct an addition and expand the parking facilities for commercial use.*

Subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Submit for Technical Review.*
- 2. Review and approval of the proposed sign.*

The motion was seconded by Mr. Paino

The motion passed 5 – 0.

**D. PC18-005 Home Occupation
 811 South Water Street**

The applicants are seeking Conditional Zoning Certificate and Site Plan Review and Approval in order to operate a home occupation as a psychic reader. The subject property is zoned R-C: High Density-Multifamily Residential District.

Ms. Edwards asked staff to introduce the project and review the Staff Report.

Planning Commission Minutes

April 3, 2018

Page 10

Ms. Barone stated the applicant is seeking a home occupation which is a conditionally permitted use in the R-C District. They are asking for a conditional zoning certificate and site plan approval to run a business out of a home at 811 South Water Street, which is a duplex. She said the conditions for a home occupation have been listed in the Staff Report and staff believes these conditions have been met. Essentially, there are no changes to the property other than a sign going out in the front. The applicant intends to perform psychic readings in the foyer area. The readings are supposed to be done by appointment only. Existing parking is in the back of the building. There are no changes in the utilities, storm water or lighting. A 3'x 3' sign is proposed. The sign does not meet the zoning code. It will either have to be modified or get a variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals. She recommended that if the Planning Commission does make a motion to approve, two conditions be added to it: 1) Submit for Technical Plan Review. 2) Modify the signs size to meet the zoning code requirements or obtain a variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Ms. Edwards asked the applicants to present the project.

Bob Stevenson, 3732 Stockbridge Drive, Stow, Ohio, stated he was at the meeting to answer any questions and explain his proposal.

Don Mitchell, 3732 Fishcreek Road Suite 267, Stow, Ohio stated there will be no changes. Two exits already exist and parking will be in the back. He said he drove down South Water Street and noticed that two houses down from this location is a seamstress who has a sign out in the front of her house. There are a lot of businesses in this area. The sessions will be held in the foyer where there will be a small table and two chairs. The rest of the house will be blocked off. There are never more than one or two cars in the lot. He said the sessions will last from ten (10) minutes to one hour.

Mr. Stevenson stated he has been doing this for a number of years and has been in the area for many years.

Mr. Paino asked what his daily calendar looked like and how many daily sessions were there.

Mr. Stevenson replied he could have one to daily during the week and two to three on the weekends.

Mr. Paino asked what the hours would be.

Mr. Stevenson replied he would be done by 9:00 p.m. He would be open 9:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. He said a lot of his clientele work.

Mr. Clapper asked why he moved and wanted to do this from his residence.

Mr. Stevenson replied he found a place available and it is in a Residential - Commercial District.

Mr. Mitchell said he lost his lease on the other property and he wants to stay on State Route 43. He moved out of the office area and leased this property with the intention of doing business out of his home.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Zelma Elba 809 South Water Street, Kent, Ohio, stated they live right next door so they have major issues. Parking is an issue. They share a driveway. She referred to the parking plan. She said at times they get blocked.

Mr. Gargan stated this situation has been on-going.

Ms. Elba stated it was not even the parking issue but rather the hours of operation. She was talking about 2:00 a.m. and 3:00a.m. The neon sign in the front yard was on all night long and it is huge. They finally did take the sign down.

Mr. Fink asked Ms. Elba to clarify to what she was referencing by east, south, north or west.

Ms. Elba replied that north where the garages are in the back. They have a bigger portion of that back area so everyone is parking there and not much parking in the middle and that is the back of the property. If you are facing from South Water Street, you are on the left side.

Mr. Bruder asked if the property has always had the same landlord.

Ms. Elba replied they are owner occupied. All three of them 809, 811 and 815 have separate owners.

Mr. Bruder asked if there is a shared garage.

Ms. Elba replied yes, there is a two car garage on their side, but there is only is a little access door. No one really uses the garage. The parking she was talking about is just the parking outside.

Mr. Paino asked where she parked.

Ms. Elba said she parked in the rear yard.

Mr. Paino asked if there was a garage door.

Ms. Elba stated there was a barn door to the garage. She said they were supposed to install a wall.

Mr. Paino asked if the parking area was paved or gravel.

Planning Commission Minutes

April 3, 2018

Page 12

Ms. Elba replied it is gravel and the parking is angled. She said there should be a parking agreement.

Mr. Paino stated that technically Ms. Elba had to cross over the applicant's property to get out onto Oak Street. He discussed how people should be parking on the property.

Mr. Clapper asked if the residents were single family.

Ms. Elba replied her son who goes to Kent State lives there.

Emily Durr, 803 South Water, Kent, Ohio, stated there is a lot of traffic in the area. The next door has four or five cars and on the other side there are two to four cars. She had no real problems. The sign was terrible and more difficult with snow. She has not seen any traffic jams.

The Planning Commission received an email from Wendy Koontz. She had some concerns of hours of operation. She was also concerned about the sign.

Ms. Edwards asked that if the commissioners had any comments or questions pertaining to the public comments, or the applicant's and staff's comments present. After that, the applicant will return for final comments.

Mr. Bruder asked how the City of Kent handled disputes.

Ms. Barone replied the disputes are private and the City does not typically get involved.

Mr. Clapper asked if this building was presented as commercial property to you. Mr. Stevenson replied no. It might have been commercial at one time but it was presented as residential property. He confirmed that there would not be any 3:00 a.m. appointments. Ms. Edwards said the applicant can have chance to make final comments.

Mr. Mitchell showed how the cars parked. He said he has been at the property when there were no clients and there were cars in Mr. Stevenson's spaces. He said Mr. Stevenson does not practice after 9:00 p.m.

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Mr. Gargan stated he could not support what the applicant does. He just had ethical concerns.

Mr. Clapper was concerned about the usage; residence as a business. Section 1107.05 of the zoning code that states: "Shall be designed, constructed, operated and maintained so as to be harmonious and appropriate in appearance with the existing or intended character of the general vicinity and that such use shall not change the essential character of the same area". He felt there would be some serious issues with it.

Planning Commission Minutes

April 3, 2018

Page 13

Mr. Bruder asked what could be done if clients were not there between 9:00 a.m. - 9:00 p.m.

Mr. Fink replied the City of Kent would rescind the applicant's approval.

Mr. Bruder asked how the City would know.

Mr. Fink replied someone would have to let staff know and issue a complaint. He said if this project does get approved, as part of the Technical Plan Review, something would be obtained from the owner of the property that she is alright with this use.

Mr. Bruder asked how the lit sign issue was resolved.

There was a complaint issued with the City of Kent.

Mr. Paino asked if this was a duplex. He asked if it was a two- family unit.

Ms. Susel replied yes.

Mr. Stevenson stated there are two; one up and one down. He said he lives in the lower unit and he has two bedrooms. There is no one living upstairs, and it also has two bedrooms.

Mr. Paino asked at this location zoning wise, what can be done. He said any location within the City can have a home occupation within reason.

Ms. Susel agreed.

Mr. Paino said this had nothing to do with commercial or commercial - residential zoning.

Ms. Susel stated that this type of use is done on a case by case basis.

Ms. Edwards stated she did see the lease and it said there are six parking spaces. Parking spaces will be designated and the parking spaces for the upstairs unit will be designated.

Mr. Stevenson said there is parking for three cars along the garage. He said there is one space there for his own personal use.

Mr. Paino asked how many parking spaces were needed.

Ms. Barone replied four.

Mr. Paino said the four spaces have to be shown on the site plan. He said there is actually no way for the neighbors to get onto Oak Street.

Planning Commission Minutes

April 3, 2018

Page 14

Ms. Susel replied there actually is because there is an easement to Oak.

Ms. Fink stated the shared drive extends all the way out to Oak Street.

Ms. Barone stated the parking spaces fit on the lot.

Mr. Stevenson stated he had spoken with Ms. Phile for the sign. He said he wanted a temporary sign and got a 4' x 8' which is lit not flashing.

Mr. Clapper felt that the conditional commercial use was cleared.

Ms. Edwards stated that the Planning Commission cannot get involved in the parking dispute but what it can do is to verify there are adequate spaces for parking.

Mr. Fink said the lease states that the tenant can only have two vehicles on site.

Mr. Clapper asked if conditions could be added to the property.

Ms. Susel clarified that he wanted conditions put on the conditional use for that property. A home occupation would be approved, not commercial use for this property. A condition can be put on the motion for the home occupation that they have to be able to provide parking.

There was a continual discussion on parking.

Mr. Paino suggested putting up signs by the applicant for parking.

Ms. Barone stated that parking signs would be alright because they would not be a part of the number of permitted signs. There is a section in the code that addresses home occupation; Section 1119.05 which states: "Parking for the Home Occupation should be adequate and contained on the site of the proposed use. On-street parking generally should not be counted toward meeting the parking need... Where rental properties are involved, the parking to be utilized for the home occupation must be in addition to the on-site parking required by the zoning code for the use of the tenants, including the occupants of the dwelling unit being used by the home occupation. Four is the minimum for the two bedrooms.

There were no other questions or comments so Ms. Edwards asked for a motion.

Mr. Clapper moved to not approve the application. The motion died for lack of a second.

MOTION: *Mr. Bruder moved in case PC18-005, Home Occupation, property located at 811 South Water Street, that the Planning Commission approves the Conditional Zoning Certificate and Site Plan to operate a home occupation as a psychic reader.*

Subject to the following condition:

- 1. Submit for Technical Plan Review.*
- 2. Modify the signs size to meet the zoning code requirements or obtain a variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA).*
- 3. Only one parking space is to be used for business clients.*
- 4. Hours of operation shall be 9 am to 9 pm.*
- 5. Permission from the landowner for the home occupation and parking provision shall be provided.*

The motion was seconded by Mr. Paino

The motion passed 3 –1

*Mr. Clapper voted no based-
on Section 1107.05 of the
zoning code.*

*Mr. Gargan abstained based
on personal bias.*

VIII. Minutes *February 20, 2018*

MOTION: *Mr. Gargan moved to approve the February 20, 2018 minutes as submitted.*

The motion was seconded by Mr. Clapper.

The motion passed 5 – 0.

IX. Other Business

Ms. Barone stated there will be no second meeting in April. The next meeting is May1st.

Ms. Susel stated a consultant has been selected. The process will take 15 – 18 months. They are going through the entire code to check everything. The contract was executed. It was signed and she received it yesterday, and it is being routed for signatures. The consultant is going to take 6 – 8 weeks to do a diagnostic where they are going to read everything. They will identify all the areas that need to be addressed, basically a triage on the code. Based on that, meetings will then be held to discuss the diagnostics results and to understand the City's concerns. They probably will have the first meeting a couple weeks after submitting the diagnostic report. They will meet with the Planning Commission once staff gets that report with comments back from them. Work sessions will be scheduled throughout Phase I. Some of the main elements will be addressing conflicts and the redundancies. Phase II is where they will be doing more of the Comprehensive Plan update. There will be a lot of planning over for the next three years. A lot of work sessions will be held. She said the team seems very professional and prepared.

Mr. Fink gave an update on court cases and pending projects.

1. **Capstone** (CDC Kent) – The magistrate’s decision was taken to the Court of Appeals where the judge sided with the magistrate’s decision regarding the appeal. The residents are not allowed to be involved any further in the case.
2. **1005 East Main** – A dismissal of appeal was filed. The deadline is Friday, April 25th for verbal arguments.
3. **East Main Street Loft** - The City was ordered into mediation. The City will file a brief in mid-April. The City wants the new law director to have a say in what happens. There might be one extension. The City has seven days to respond. There will probably be oral arguments July – August.

There were no other questions Ms. Edwards asked for a motion to adjourn

X1. Adjournment

Motion: *Mr. Gargan moved to adjourn.*
 The motion was seconded by Mr. Clapper

Vote: *The motion carried 5 – 0.*

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.