



**Oberlin Planning Commission
June 15, 2011, 4:30 p.m.
City Hall Conference Room #2
85 South Main Street, Oberlin, Ohio**

Members Present: Frank Carlson, Christina Nichols, David Gibson and Marilyn Fedelchak-Harley.

Members Absent: Eric Gaines.

Others Present: Gary Boyle; Wendie Fleming, Secretary to the Planning Commission; Sharon Soucy, Council Liaison; Tony Gaines; Ken Sloane; Allan Gibson; Jean Pease; Eric Norenberg; Elizabeth Rumics; Cindy Moroney and Tony Mealy.

Chair Carlson called the meeting to order at 4:31 p.m.

1. Approval of the Approval of the June 1, 2011 Meeting Minutes.

Gibson made a motion to approve the June 1, 2011 meeting minutes as submitted. Nichols seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

2. Application for Site Plan Approval, Outdoor Dining Facility/Café, Magpie Pizza, East College Street Project, 65 East College Street, Suite 2.

Boyle advised that this application seeks the approval of the operation of an outdoor dining facility by Magpie Pizza in front of Building B of the East College Street Project and adjacent to the Magpie Pizza restaurant. He indicated that this space is fenced from the East College Street right-of-way, and is partially covered by the building's overhang. Boyle stated that this space appears to be a natural adjunct to the existing restaurant use. Four (4) tables with four (4) chairs each are proposed.

Boyle noted that the Code requires that a permit must be issued for this outdoor dining facility. He further indicated that there are no staff review issues with respect to this application, only a suggestion that the area in front of the windows be kept open for pedestrian circulation to the stairs leading to South Pleasant Street. Any approval should be contingent on compliance with conditions to regulate the use as outlined in the Code. The Commission noted that the proposed layout was acceptable.

Gibson made a motion to approve the application subject to compliance with all of the applicable conditions outlined in the regulations. Nichols seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

3. Application for Conditional Use Permit, Proposed Bed and Breakfast Inn, Carl Zimring and Jennifer Potter, 171 Elm Street.

Boyle stated that an application for a "Conditional Use Permit" for a proposed "bed and breakfast inn" to be operated on property known as municipal number 171 Elm Street has been submitted. He advised that the applicants propose to have up to three (3) "bed and breakfast inn" rooms. He also noted that this application is currently under review by City departments.

Boyle indicated that this report was submitted to the Commission for its information and to advise that a "Public Hearing" to consider the "Conditional Use Permit" has been scheduled for the Commission's meeting on June 29, 2011. He noted that a detailed staff report this proposal will be provided at that time.

4. Review of Possible Sign Code Updates.

Boyle advised that the Commission has previously considered possible updates to the Sign Code over the course of a number of meetings. He stated that at the Commission's meeting on June 1, 2011, the Commission continued its review and discussion regarding possible amendments to the Sign Code. Boyle noted that at that meeting, all sections of the Sign Code, with the exception of regulations for "residential districts" (Section 1351.05) and for "commercial and industrial districts" (Section 1351.06) were reviewed, and the Commission suggested some additional changes with respect to calculation of sign surface area, abandoned signs, non-conforming signs, prohibited signs, etc.

Boyle stated he had discussed possible amendments to signage regulations for "residential districts" (Section 1351.05) and for "commercial and industrial districts" (Section 1351.06) with Mark Majewski, the City's Planning Consultant. A draft of those proposed amendments was provided to the Commission for its review in its packet. Boyle indicated that revisions to the Sign Code are being considered for a number of reasons including an effort to eliminate some redundancies and to clarify language thereby helping with enforcement issues.

Boyle provided an overview of the draft changes. He indicated that Section 1351.05(a), Signs in Residential Districts, has been reworked to state that one multi-purpose sign per dwelling would be allowed, not to exceed four (4) square feet. Currently Section 1351.05(a)(1) Property Identification Signs is separated into three (3) subsections. Boyle advised that the draft suggests that these subsections be simplified and combined into one section. The Commission agreed with this approach.

Boyle indicated that the new draft Section 1351.05(b)(2) "Uses Other than Dwellings," proposes amendments which include removing the wording "religious or educational institution" and adding "non-residential use" other than the uses listed in proposed subsections (3),(4) and (5) in

Oberlin Planning Commission

Meeting Minutes

June 15, 2011

3 | Page

the draft. He further advised that the wording "hospital, private club or lodge, tourist home" in Section 1351.05(a)(1)(C)(4) should be removed. Boyle also noted that the wording "with the approval of Planning Commission" in Section 1351.05 was implicit and suggested it be removed. In addition, he stated that he and Majewski discussed this section and suggested that a subsection be added to 1351.05(b) stating a hospital would be permitted to have one ground sign not to exceed 60 sq. ft. and one wall sign not to exceed 60 sq. ft. Boyle indicated that this size is close to what is currently installed at Mercy Allen Hospital and a variance can be requested if a larger sign is desired in the future.

Carlson suggested that this entire subsection could be further simplified by combining signs for religious uses, nursing homes, schools of commerce and professional offices in just one subsection as the same size sign would be permitted for all of those uses. Boyle agreed to look into that.

Boyle advised that the "Temporary Message Sign" subsection was changed to add that "one additional such sign shall be permitted for each candidate or issue." No changes were made to the regulations for "Temporary Construction" or "Temporary Subdivision" signs other than to remove the wording "at the discretion of the Code Administrator."

Boyle indicated that in Section 1351.05(b) "Special Residential District Regulations," no changes were suggested to permitted sign height or setbacks. However, a prohibition was added concerning electronic message signs in residential districts.

Carlson noted that it appears that there are basically two categories – "permitted" and signs not requiring a permit and asked if these categories are different for temporary signs. Boyle stated that they are different for temporary signs and advised that the "multi-purpose" signs discussed for residential uses can be a maximum of 4 sq. ft. in size to allow for name signs, Historic Landmark plaques, etc. Temporary signs could be up to 6 sq. ft. in area. Carlson again indicated that the subsection "Uses Other Than Dwellings" in residential districts needs to be clarified and he suggested that in proposed item number 2, where it states "non-residential use other than the uses listed in (3), (4) and (5) below. . .", item number 4 "nursing homes, schools of commerce, etc." should be removed as an exception. Boyle agreed with this clarification, and this approach would further simplify regulations for "Uses Other Than Dwellings."

Carlson stated that with respect to temporary signs, its conceivable that someone could have multiple signs with one each for an issue or candidate, which could add up to dozens of signs. Nichols agreed. Carlson suggested that the language regarding political signs be reworded to state that that one political sign per issue or candidate would be permitted. Boyle agreed with this suggestion. The Commission suggested that the Law Director be asked for a legal opinion on this matter.

Soucy asked about locational requirements for temporary signs. Boyle stated that location of the signage is covered in another section of the Code. Fedelchak-Harley asked whether a "standard" political sign like the ones noting objection to SB5 were 6 sq. ft. in size? Nichols indicated that

Oberlin Planning Commission

Meeting Minutes

June 15, 2011

4 | Page

they are generally smaller than 6 sq. ft. Carlson noted that historically Oberlin has not be inundated with political signs, but he is of the opinion that restricting the size of such signs is a good idea, especially in a residential district.

Carlson indicated that prohibiting electronic signs in residential areas is also a good idea and would eliminate potential nuisance complaints. The Commission agreed that such signs should not be permitted in a residential district. Soucy asked if the portable speed limit monitoring trailer used by the Police Department would be prohibited in a residential area? Boyle advised that because it is a "governmental sign," it would be allowed.

Boyle indicated that there have not been too many significant changes suggested for the commercial/industrial sections of the Sign Code. He advised that there were only a few obvious changes that needed to be made. He stated that one area of the commercial/industrial sign regulations that needed to be addressed was the provision for wall-mounted signs for buildings on corner lots. Boyle advised that currently, a building on a corner lot would only be allowed to have signage that is 25% of the total sign surface area for a building and it is suggested that the amount could be increased to 50%. He noted that this would also likely address situations like the First Merit Building downtown. The configuration of the Bush Building raises other issues related to the "Rear or Side Entrance Wall Sign" section, where there some of the commercial units in the "rear" of the building face the parking lot and it is not technically a corner building. Nichols stated that while she feels that 25% for an additional sign may not be enough, she considers 50% to be too much. She suggested that the size for an additional sign should probably be somewhere between 25% and 50%. Boyle asked whether the Commission was interested in adding a separate district for signage in the downtown area to better deal with these types of issues, and it would be possible to create one if the Commission wanted to. The Commission made no decision on the same.

Carlson advised that he views signage as a utility, where it seems that some of the newer Commission members are of the opinion that signage often times detracts from the appearance of a building or area and that signage is seen as a necessary evil. He noted that for most business owners, visitors, etc. signage is viewed as valuable and he tends to agree with that and is, therefore, often in favor of somewhat larger signs.

Boyle stated that he can ask Majewski to provide a graphic example of a building showing what the different sizes of signs might look like. Nichols liked this idea. Boyle advised that staff felt that buildings with rear entrances, or entrances on a side of a building other than the front needed larger signage. Fedelchak-Harley noted that historically in downtowns, there were often large "billboard" type signs painted on the sides of buildings.

Boyle advised that in the commercial/industrial sign sections of the Code, the size, height and setback of freestanding signage was unchanged. He further noted that some of the language in Subsection (E) Business Park Identification Sign was reworded slightly.

Oberlin Planning Commission

Meeting Minutes

June 15, 2011

5 | Page

Boyle indicated that the subject of temporary signage in the commercial/industrial section of the Code has been discussed at length on many occasions by the Commission. He noted that the types of temporary signage currently listed in the Sign Code are extremely difficult to enforce and he felt that having regulations for temporary signage such as for window signs that cannot be enforced was counter-productive.

Carlson asked if banner signs were still going to be prohibited? Boyle stated that based on the Commission's last discussion they would be. A question was raised about the large banner that hangs over the Main Street right-of-way, will it continue to be permitted? Boyle advised that OMLPS reviews requests and installs these banners. Boyle stated that with respect to the banners at Allen Art Museum, the Commission has discussed this matter at length in the past. Carlson advised that the Commission determined that the banners at Allen Art Museum are acceptable and proposed that displaying of these types of banners be restricted to only institutional uses. Boyle indicated that many communities allow temporary banner signs for openings of new businesses, etc. and suggested that the Commission may want to further consider this matter before making a final decision. Carlson asked how the Allen Art Museum banners would be handled? Boyle stated that the signs for the Art Museum would be covered by the regulations in the residential section of the Sign Code since the museum is in the "R-2" District. Based on the fact that the Commission and staff want to continue to permit them to be displayed we need to develop some rules. Fedelchak-Harley asked if there would be size restrictions for these banners? Boyle stated that because of the types of exhibits and events for the museum vary, it may not be a good idea to have a significant size restriction since the Commission recognizes that such banner signs are important, and are often used by museums everywhere.

Carlson stated that with the removal of provisions for temporary signs in the commercial/industrial districts, how are "sandwich board" signs going to be handled? Boyle advised that "sandwich board" signs have never been permitted on the public right-of-way and that this is an enforcement issue. Soucy asked if some type of temporary signage should be permitted in the commercial districts? Boyle stated that the Commission can reconsider whether it wants to remove temporary signs from the Code, but he cautioned that it could likely be problematic if some temporary signs are allowed while other ones are not. Soucy asked what the procedure would be if someone wanted to install a banner sign like the one that Sustainable Community Associates installed? Boyle stated that they would have to submit an application and the banner would have to be reviewed and if staff denied a permit, it could be appealed to the Commission. Carlson indicated that a temporary sign for a business opening or other special event would need to have a set time period that it would be allowed to be displayed. Boyle agreed. Carlson advised that there would need to be a "triggering event" identified, such as a store "Grand Opening," etc. Boyle noted that if the Commission is interested in permitting banner signs on a limited basis other than at the Art Museum, language could reflect that they are only for a business opening, a seasonal event, return of students, etc. He further stated that in the current Sign Code, a temporary freestanding sign is not permitted if there is already a permanent freestanding sign in place. He further advised that he could reword this section of the Code to state that a "triggering event" would need to be identified for a temporary banner sign.

Oberlin Planning Commission

Meeting Minutes

June 15, 2011

6 | Page

Carlson noted the "Appeals" section of the Sign Code has been changed so that appeals of the Planning Commission decisions of signage matters would have to be filed with Lorain County Common Pleas Court instead of with City Council. Boyle advised that this is correct and further stated that this appeals procedure matches the one that was changed for appeals of the Zoning Board of Appeals' decisions. The Commission concurred with this approach.

Boyle advised the Commission that it is being suggested that Section 1351.07 "Special Provisions for College Signs" be removed. The College should apply for permits like any other applicant. The Commission concurred.

Boyle indicated that the Commission has previously discussed possible changes to the maximum sign surface area that would be allowed in the downtown area. With respect to the downtown district, the size of signs could be limited to 2 sq. ft. per lineal foot of building frontage rather than 3 sq. ft. as not permitted. The present regulations could still apply to "C-2", "O:" and "M-1" Districts, and should also be considered for the "C-3" District. The Commission agreed with that approach.

Boyle also noted that the Commission has discussed the issue of electronic video signs and how they should be regulated. Fedelchak-Harley asked if the sign industry has a definition/description of the video signs that could be used? Boyle stated that there are existing definitions/descriptions for these types of signs that may need to be reworked. The Commission agreed that video or electronic signs should not be permitted. Nichols noted that the American Planning Association would also likely have a definition that could be used.

Boyle advised the Commission that Section 1351.99 "Penalty" needs to remain in place for enforcement purposes. The Commission concurred.

Boyle informed the Commission that there were a couple of other issues that the Commission should discuss such as whether a "severability clause" needs to be added to the Sign Code as well as "prior restraint and review procedures." He indicated that Majewski feels that a severability clause would be useful in case part of the Sign Code was struck down by the Courts. Carlson advised that likely only a Constitutional issue would cause that to happen and would likely only apply to the specific subsection and not the whole Code. He noted that it may be a good idea to have a severability clause and advised that the Law Director should be consulted about this. Boyle indicated that prior restraint and review has also become an issue as apparently Courts have been examining sign review procedures to make sure that there has not been any suppression of speech through unfettered discretion. He noted that if the Commission ends up shortening the time period that the Design Review Subcommittee has to make a recommendation to the Commission on a sign application, no one could claim that sign permit review is excessive. Currently, most commercial-type signs are reviewed within 3 weeks or so at the most. We want to avoid the perception that a delay in a recommendation is actually a ploy to deny an application. The Commission suggested discussing this matter with the Law Director too.

Oberlin Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes
June 15, 2011
7 | Page

Boyle advised the Commission that staff will make further changes to the draft Sign Code that were discussed at this meeting and submit a revised draft for the Commission to review at an upcoming meeting. Carlson asked if staff could provide both the revised draft and the strike-out version for the Commission's review. Boyle stated that staff would develop both for the Commission's consideration.

Mealy stated that he has noticed an increasing number of "sandwich board" type signs on sidewalks downtown and asked if they were now going to be permitted. He indicated that he recently witnessed an elderly lady tripping over one downtown. Boyle stated that they are currently not permitted and that there has not been any discussion by the Commission about allowing them in the future. Mealy advised that the Farmers' Market has been placing a sandwich board-type sign at the north end of Tappan Square. Boyle indicated that staff would contact the manager of the Farmers' Market to advise them that the sign is not permitted. Carlson agreed that this section of the Code should remain as it is and noted that better enforcement would be needed to get the signs removed. Boyle will follow-up with the Police Department regarding the enforcement of these signs.

Gibson recused himself from the Commission table.

5. Application for Site Plan Approval, Outdoor Business Activity, Gibson's Bakery, 23 West College Street.

Boyle stated that this application seeks approval of the use of a portion of the West College Street public sidewalk for outdoor business use associated with Gibson's Bakery and Food Market. He advised that the proposed business use would include the placement of two (2) tables with two (2) seats each that would be located adjacent to the building's storefront, and three (3) tables with six (6) seats each located along the brick paver/curb side of the sidewalk for the use of patrons of Gibson's Bakery and Food Market.

Boyle indicated that the proposed location of tables and chairs along the curb does not comply with Council's adopted regulations related to business use on downtown sidewalks as all of the tables and chairs are not located "immediately adjacent to and directly in front of the building housing the business." He stated that the applicants were notified of that non-compliance with the Code and subsequently filed an appeal seeking the Planning Commission's approval of an exception to the regulations. Boyle further noted that if the Commission grants an exception to the regulations, the City Manager must still approve the application.

Boyle advised that this proposal has been reviewed by City departments, and the only concerns expressed by staff were from the Fire Chief and the City Engineer. Their concerns were regarding the placement of the tables away from the building. Carlson indicated that he did not feel that the placement of the tables and chairs away from the building would cause an obstruction for firefighters. Fedechak-Harley asked what the City Engineer's concerns were. Boyle advised that the Engineer was of the opinion that if all of the tables were kept adjacent to the building, it would allow for a clearer path for pedestrians on this sidewalk. He has, however,

Oberlin Planning Commission

Meeting Minutes

June 15, 2011

8 | Page

noted that adequate capacity for pedestrian traffic would be available with a 7.5 ft. wide area shown on the applicants' plan.

Carlson advised that when the Commission developed the regulations for the sidewalk cafes and outdoor business activity, it did not require that tables/chairs be located immediately adjacent to the building. He noted that City Council changed that part of the regulations. Carlson further indicated that in granting an exception, the Commission must be able to demonstrate specific findings that are unique to this situation so that it does not set a precedent for other business owners on West College Street to do so.

Cindy Moroney read a statement in support of the seating in front of Gibson's. She advised that she has not noticed any issues with respect to pedestrians having trouble walking through that area and that it appears that a sufficiently wide path is being maintained. Moroney noted that there is a bike rack in front of Gibson's and that has caused problems for pedestrians in the past, however, with Gibson's tables being placed in line with the bike rack, this problem has been eliminated.

Jean Pease noted that she was present to support seating in front of Gibson's too. She indicated that she has lived in Oberlin for over 50 years and noted that Gibson's has always had seating in front of the store. Pease stated that she has observed that the seating in front of Gibson's is well used and that a clear pedestrian path is always maintained. She noted that if the tables were required to be placed up against the storefront, it would be hard for patrons to enter and exit the store as the doorway is situated in the middle of the storefront. She also observed that there is good pedestrian flow past Agave and Gibson's. She questioned why Gibson's is being asked to change and felt that one size regulations do not fit all.

Nichols noted that the simple desire to have seating in an area different from the Code is not a reason to grant an exception. She did, however, agree that the bike rack's location does present a unique situation because it is several feet in width and projects out into the sidewalk area.

Tony Gaines indicated that he is a lifelong resident of Oberlin and that Gibson's has outdoor seating on the sidewalk for many, many years and it was never considered a problem before. He advised that the bike rack in front of Gibson's does make this situation unique because there is no other business that has a bike rack located in front of it. Gaines also indicated that if the applicant were required to place the tables adjacent to the storefront, it would likely affect a person's ability to see into the store. Gaines advised that he has had much experience in retail management for a national chain, and noted that "visual merchandising" is important to Gibson's business and if patrons cannot see the window displays, it could mean a loss of business. Gaines further stated that the applicant experimented with placing the tables at the storefront and it was a disaster. He advised that the tables and chairs crowded the store entrance and the configuration of the tables and chairs basically created a "maze" that was virtually impossible for pedestrians to walk around. Gaines stated that he is not aware of any complaints about the tables and chairs.

Oberlin Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes
June 15, 2011
9 | Page

Nichols stated that the bike rack would block pedestrian traffic if tables and chairs were located adjacent to the storefront. She noted that this is not a restaurant and no liquor is served like Agave, so the tables and chairs could be located away from the building. Carlson indicated that while Gibson's is not a restaurant, he is of the opinion that this outdoor seating could be considered to be more than just an "outdoor business activity." Carlson asked how City Council came to the decision that the seating should be located adjacent to the storefront? Soucy advised that there were a couple of residents at a City Council meeting when the regulations were discussed and they complained to City Council about the seating in front of Gibson's and because it is close to the curb, they felt that people could not walk up onto the curb in that area. She also indicated that further complaints were expressed because the fenced in eating area at Agave constrained the pedestrian way in that area last year.

Gibson indicated that if the tables were moved adjacent to the storefront, this would cause more problems for pedestrians trying to walk in this area. Nichols reiterated that the bike rack presents a unique circumstance which would create real pedestrian traffic issues if the applicant were required to place the tables/chairs adjacent to the storefront. Fedelchak-Harley advised that she has concerns about granting a variance as this could set a precedent for any business owner to display merchandise or set tables in the vicinity of the curb.

Mealy noted that other restaurants have put tables out near the curb, such as the Feve did in the past. He further stated that it is his opinion that Agave should not have been granted permission to install the fenced-in eating area in front of that restaurant and that approval for the Agave sidewalk café should have been given by City Council or the Planning Commission. Boyle advised that the Planning Commission did consider an exception to the regulations for the Agave sidewalk café because the railing height was not in full compliance by a few inches. He noted that the Commission reviewed the request for a variance and ultimately moved to grant an exception to the railing height. Carlson asked Mealy if he was speaking in favor of the seating for Gibson's or not. Mealy advised that he is in favor of the table/chair layout as submitted and allowing it along the curb. That is the fair thing to do in his opinion. He further stated that he feels that because the Code does not allow sandwich board type signs, that this should be enforced too. He stated that Council seems to confer favor on its friends. Soucy stated that she had no idea what he was referring to.

Carlson noted that the exception, if granted, would only run for the permit period and agreed with Nichols that the bike rack in front of Gibson's does affect where seating can be placed and that no other business has a bike rack located in front of their store.

Norenberg advised that the biggest concern is that the 7.5 ft. wide pedestrian path be maintained at all times. He indicated that the tables and chairs in front of Gibson's are moveable and patrons are often reconfiguring the layout of the tables and chairs to accommodate their particular group, which often ends up decreasing the width of the pedestrian path on the sidewalk. He observed that first-hand recently. Norenberg further suggested that if the Commission were to grant the exception, a possible condition of that approval should be that the applicant's staff must maintain the 7.5 ft. wide pedestrian path at all times.

Oberlin Planning Commission

Meeting Minutes

June 15, 2011

10 | Page

Gibson agreed that this is a fair condition of approval and stated that he can have his staff frequently check the tables and chairs to make sure they are not blocking the pedestrian path and enforce this as best they can. He further noted that potentially tables and chairs could be permitted on South Main Street in front of the restaurants there, and the sidewalk on South Main Street is much narrower in width than the sidewalk on West College Street and the pedestrian circulation area that he has shown on his plan. Carlson noted that the three (3) tables on the curb side of the sidewalk are quite large and take up a lot of space. He suggested that using smaller tables would help create more space on the sidewalk. Gibson agreed that the tables are large and indicated that generally he has to replace the tables and chairs every year because they are damaged. He noted that he could look into the use of smaller tables.

Fedelchak-Harley stated that this situation is precisely why the Commission did not want to require the tables/chairs to be adjacent to the business's storefront. Gibson advised that each of the sidewalk business activity or sidewalk café applications should be handled on a case by case basis because all businesses are not alike or have the same circumstances. Carlson indicated that City Council may want to revisit these regulations in the future.

Carlson asked where the nearest landscape planter box was in relation to Gibson's. Boyle stated that it was moved last year to accommodate Agave's sidewalk café.

Gibson reiterated that he would have his staff keep the chairs and tables out of the brick paver area and would make sure that the 7.5 ft. wide pedestrian path is maintained at all times.

Nichols made a motion to grant an exception to the Sidewalk Business Activity regulations based on the facts noted earlier related to the bike rack and its impact on pedestrian flow if the seating is adjacent to the building, and to approve the application with the condition that a width of 7.5 feet for pedestrian traffic be maintained at all times. Fedelchak-Harley seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Gibson rejoined the Commission at the table.

6. Discussion of Design Review Subcommittee Procedures, Etc.

Boyle advised that the Commission has discussed this matter at a number of meetings in the past. He noted that staff had provided a draft outline of one possible approach to restructuring the Design Review Subcommittee in an effort to enhance this function for the Commission's consideration as requested at the Commission's last meeting. Boyle indicated that this draft proposes that the Design Review Subcommittee be reduced in size to three (3) members, with those members being appointed by the Planning Commission for staggered three (3) year terms. Suggested background experience for members is also noted. He further stated that the time period for a recommendation from the Subcommittee to the Planning Commission could also be reduced from forty-five (45) days to twenty-one (21) days. All of these suggestions are intended to improve the design review function, efficiency and consistency in decision-making as well as being user-friendly to applicants.

**Oberlin Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes
June 15, 2011
11 | Page**

The Commission considered the suggested changes in the staff report, and noted that they reflected its past discussions. Nichols made a motion to recommend approval of the restructuring of the Design Review Subcommittee as submitted to City Council. Gibson seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Boyle stated that staff would prepare a report to City Council for the Chair to sign regarding this matter.

7. Other Business.

a. June 29, 2011 Planning Commission Meeting.

Boyle advised the Commission that its next meeting is scheduled for June 29, 2011 at 4:30 p.m. and a Public Hearing for the Conditional Use Permit for a "Bed and Breakfast Inn" at 171 Elm Street is to be considered at that meeting. He asked if any of the Commission members would not be available to attend that meeting and noted that Gaines had already indicated that he would not be at the June 29th meeting. Gibson advised that he would not be able to attend that meeting either. The other members indicated that they would attend that meeting.

b. Strategic Plan Meeting.

Fedelchak-Harley noted that the City's Strategic Plan will be the subject of a meeting at the Zion Fellowship Hall on June 23 and June 30, 2011, and reminded interested persons to attend.

8. Adjournment.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:50 p.m.



Frank Carlson, Chair



Wendie Fleming, Secretary

