



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, April 7, 2022

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Call, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:39 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the April 7, 2022 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. She stated that the meeting also could be accessed at the City's website. Public comments on the cases were welcome, both from meeting attendees and from those viewing at the City's website. Remote viewers should submit questions or comments during the meeting by using the form under the streaming video at the website. Their comments would be relayed to the Commission by the meeting moderator. The City is interested in accommodating public participation to the greatest extent possible.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Call led the Pledge of Allegiance.

OATH OF OFFICE

Mayor Fox administered the Oath of Office to newly appointed Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) members, Kathy Harter and Jamey Chinnock.

ROLL CALL

Commission members present: Rebecca Call, Kim Way, Lance Schneier, Mark Supelak, Warren Fishman, Jamey Chinnock, Kathy Harter
Staff members present: Nichole Martin, Thaddeus Boggs, Sarah Holt, Zachary Hounshell

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Mr. Fishman moved, Mr. Way seconded to elect Planning and Zoning Commission members Rebecca Call as the Chair and Mark Supelak as the Vice Chair.

Vote: Mr. Chinnock, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Ms. Call, yes.
(Motion approved 7-0)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES AND ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Way seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the March 3 and March 17, 2022 meeting minutes.

Vote: Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Chinnock, yes; Ms. Harter, yes.
[Motion approved 7-0.]

Ms. Call stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission is an advisory board to City Council when rezoning and platting of property are under consideration. In such cases, City Council will receive recommendations from the Commission. In other cases, the Commission has the final decision-making responsibility. Anyone who intends to address the Commission on administrative cases must be sworn in. She stated that there is one case was eligible for the Consent Agenda, Case 1, 6777 Crosby Court, 22-013WID-DP/SP, Site Plan. She inquired if any Commission member wished to move the case to the regular agenda for discussion. No member requested that the case be moved to the regular agenda.

CONSENT AGENDA

1. 6777 Crosby Court, 22-013WID-DP/SP, Site Plan

A request for construction of ±140,000-square-foot, flex/industrial building located within the West Innovation District on a 9.34-acre site, zoned ID-3, Research Assembly District, located southwest of the intersection of Crosby Court with Dublin Plain City Road.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

No public comments were received on the case.

Mr. Way moved, Mr. Schneier seconded approval of the Site Plan with two deviations:

- 1) Parking Location: To permit employee parking forward of the building on Houchard Road, Dublin-Plain City Road, and Crosby Court.
- 2) Parking Count: To permit 171 parking spaces where 63 are required.

Vote: Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Chinnock, yes; Ms. Harter, yes.
[Motion approved 7-0.]

TABLED CASE

2. Penalty Code Update, 21-113ADMC, Administrative Request – Code Amendment

A request to revise Zoning Code Section 153.999: Administration and Enforcement - Penalty in regards to unauthorized demolition of and alteration to properties within the Historic District and properties identified on Appendix G.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Holt stated that in 2021, the Architectural Review Board identified a need to address outdated penalties associated with Chapter 151 violations, specifically related to unauthorized demolition and/or modifications of historic structures. The current Code identifies these violations as Minor Misdemeanors with a fine of \$100, which is not a deterrent to violations, although each day may constitute a separate offense. In response, last year staff proposed an increase in the penalties to a Fourth Degree Misdemeanor, with the ability to accrue separate offenses daily. The proposal was to allow a first offense to be subject to a Fourth Degree Misdemeanor and a fine of \$250; a second offense within five years would be subject to a Second Degree Misdemeanor charge and a fine of \$500 to \$750. The proposed Code amendment was reviewed by the ARB in August 2021 and recommended for approval. At their October 14, 2021 meeting, the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting reviewed the proposed amendment to Code Section §153.999 – Penalty. The Commission discussed and identified the following concerns:

- need to not overburden Historic Properties but encourage compliance;

- need to provide a distinction between minor offenses and a demolition;
- need to determine a cap on the number of days for which the penalty could be applicable.

Staff was directed to identify a more tailored approach for the penalty. Subsequently, staff and the Law Director's office have revised the proposed Code amendment, which the Assistant Law Director will review for the Commission.

Thaddeus Boggs, Assistant Law Director, stated that he provided a memo in the meeting packet that reviewed the background for use of these particular criminal penalties for Code Enforcement purposes, as well as the limitations under which the City operates in regard to setting forth penalties as a means of deterrence and punishment for Zoning Code violations. There is a need for the City to have the ability, as a matter of last resort, to issue a citation to Mayor's Court and have a court order imposed as a community-controlled sanction to repair, replace or otherwise remedy a violation in the Historic District. This ability provides the ultimate leverage upon which all prior efforts to obtain compliance rest. It is, therefore, staff's recommendation that the level of some offenses be elevated to a Fourth Degree Misdemeanor; however, to address the concerns raised by the Commission at their previous meeting, it is proposed that some of the less intensive and obtrusive violations in the Historic District be parsed out, such as an unapproved color or replacement of historical hardware with non-historical hardware in the Historic District.

Staff requests the Commission to review and make a recommendation of approval to City Council for an amendment to Code Section §153.999 – Penalty (21-113ADMC) with one of the following two options:

1. Retain demolition as a fourth degree misdemeanor on a first offense and leave a first-offense unauthorized modifications as a minor misdemeanor. The Minor Misdemeanor fine would be increased from \$100 to \$150.
2. Make both modifications and demolitions subject to fourth degree misdemeanor penalties, with the exception of nonstructural modifications, such as painting or staining.

Mr. Boggs stated that, hopefully, the Commission will consider one of the two options workable, although, if needed, they can be refined further. If the Commission can reach consensus on one of the options, the recommendation would proceed to City Council.

Commission Questions and Discussion

Mr. Schneier stated that draft language regarding the demolition offense has been provided, but it has not been provided for alternative offenses.

Mr. Boggs responded that is correct. The intent was that the Commission would make a recommendation incorporating one of the two options, and subsequently, staff would provide that language for Council consideration.

Mr. Fishman stated that the proposed fines are not a deterrent. The fine for demolition of a building would seem minimal to an individual wishing to demolish the structure. Is it possible to place a lien on a building until the required remedy has occurred?

Ms. Call clarified that the proposal is to make a distinction between an unauthorized modification and a demolition – a Minor Misdemeanor versus a Fourth Degree Misdemeanor. She inquired what a violator's experience would be in Mayor's Court with either citation.

Mr. Boggs responded that in either case, the Mayor's Court experience would begin with the filing of a citation. In the case of a Minor Misdemeanor, the maximum penalty available to the Court is \$150 and court costs, or a total of \$225. If disputed, the case could be taken to trial in Mayor's Court. In that case, the Mayor's Court Prosecutor would present evidence to the Magistrate, who would make a

decision based on that evidence. In the case of a Fourth Degree Misdemeanor, the person potentially would face both a maximum fine of \$250 and up to 30 days incarceration. Additionally, the person could be subjected to community-control sanctions in lieu of incarceration, such as a requirement to return a property to its original state. They would have a right to a trial in the Mayor's Court. Because of the threat of incarceration with a Fourth Degree Misdemeanor, they would have the right to request a jury trial, which would be transferred to the Franklin County Municipal Court. If they could not afford legal representation, they would be appointed a public defender. They would have more robust procedural protections for a Fourth Misdemeanor than for a Minor Misdemeanor.

Ms. Call pointed out that, as proposed, the Court has discretion in determining the remedy or punishment.

Mr. Boggs pointed out that before the case would proceed to the point of Mayor's Court, the property owner would have had several informal contacts with the Code Enforcement staff.

Mr. Fishman inquired if staff had considered what other municipalities have in place for similar cases. The intent is not to place anyone in jail but prevent unauthorized demolitions and Code violations. He believes the City of Columbus has these types of regulations in place.

Mr. Boggs responded that most of the Zoning Codes with which he has worked have a Fourth Degree Misdemeanor Offense as a Code Enforcement offense for the purpose of having non-monetary penalties options available.

Mr. Supelak stated that there are two levels of violations with the Fourth Degree Misdemeanor. Does the City experience many of these types of offenses?

Ms. Martin responded that the Penalty Code is enacted infrequently for either historic or non-historic properties. However, with the recent demolition of two historic structures, which, unfortunately, cannot be re-erected, the ARB raised the need for the Penalty section of the Code to be modified to address violations that cannot be addressed in any other way.

Mr. Supelak responded that there was a legitimate triggering event. He inquired what would occur in the instance in which the property owner is an LLC.

Mr. Boggs responded that there are organizational criminal liability provisions. They are monetary penalties imposed on an organization, which are higher than \$250.

Mr. Supelak inquired if they would be sufficiently substantial so as to dissuade redevelopment, regardless of the Fourth Degree Misdemeanor.

Mr. Boggs responded that the penalties exceed \$1,000.

Mr. Supelak stated that from a developer's perspective, if the property value makes it worthwhile, he would not be dissuaded by a few thousand dollars, as the redevelopment would bring in a far greater amount of money. Does the City need to have something in place to address that type of scenario?

Mr. Boggs responded that in that case, it would be worth the City taking a civil enforcement action. If such an offense appears to be proceeding, the City can obtain immediately a Temporary Restraining Order (TRO) from the Court. If said violation were to proceed, the property owner is in contempt of Court, and the Court could impose hefty daily fines and penalties.

Mr. Supelak inquired if that would be true even if the organization were a corporation.

Mr. Boggs responded affirmatively. Ultimately, the corporation can be held in contempt and fined substantially, and the individual officers making the decisions also can be held accountable. Civil enforcement through an Environmental Court is an effective mechanism wherein rapid action is available. With the criminal penalty that has been proposed, the intent is to address the small to medium offenses. As regrettable as the recent demolition of the accessory structures on the previously mentioned property is, it is probably a small to medium offense.

Mr. Way inquired if a structure is demolished, does the Code require that it be replaced. Assuming that every building in the Historic District contributes to the character and quality of the District, does the Code not require the property owner to rebuild it? If they did not comply, this penalty would be imposed for every day it is not replaced; for every day the structure is not replaced, there would be a financial burden.

Mr. Boggs stated that the current Code does not require a property owner to replace a demolished historic structure. If the proposed Code amendment is enacted making demolition a Fourth Degree Misdemeanor, that option would be available to the Mayor's Court.

Ms. Call noted that, currently, the Court does not have that option, as the offense is only a Minor Misdemeanor.

Mr. Boggs responded affirmatively.

Mr. Way stated that in his opinion, there should be a requirement that the structure be replaced as close as possible to its original appearance. Because of the loss of the aged characteristic, it might be impossible to replace its history and character, but as a contributing building within the Historic District, it still would have value.

Mr. Boggs responded that he would defer to staff on that issue. In their initial discussion, there was a sense that some replacements might be worth doing; others may not be, perhaps because the historical integrity cannot be replaced or replicated.

Ms. Martin stated that the advantage of the Fourth Degree Misdemeanor is that Mayor's Court is able to look at these on a case-by-case basis, realizing that every historical property is unique, whether it is a primary structure, an accessory structure, or even a farmstead on which there are a series of accessory structures. Instead of incarceration, other conditions could be imposed, one of which might be replacement.

Mr. Way responded that action could only happen within the Court system. There is nothing in the City Code that requires that.

Ms. Martin responded that is correct, and it is the reason that the Fourth Degree Misdemeanor is proposed.

Mr. Way inquired the reason that the proposed Code language does not require if a historical structure is demolished, whether accidentally or with intent, that it be replaced; if not replaced, there would be penalties.

Mr. Schneier stated that perhaps we do not want to limit it to replacement. If a property owner tears down a shed, perhaps we do not want to require that it be replaced. The proposed penalty provides more latitude. The best outcome could be that the shed be replaced, but perhaps incarceration or a fine should be other options.

Ms. Call clarified that the Commission is challenged tonight to identify an equitable, graduated application for a Code amendment that protects the historic nature and distinguishes from a minor offense, such as wrong paint color, versus demolition of a historic structure. Currently, a demolition could range from removal of a historic fence to intentional demolition of a historic structure. Although two penalty levels are proposed, the wide range within the demolition offense is a struggle. Staff's suggestion is that due to that range, the penalty could be addressed in Mayor's Court. The Commission is requested to consider penalty language that would separate the modification and demolition offenses, thereby giving the Mayor's Court the ability and latitude to determine the penalty imposed.

Mr. Boggs clarified that he had stated that the Court could require reconstruction, but in reality, that Court order might read that (for example), in 30 days, the property owner must have an application submitted to Planning staff to replace the structure or repair the modification to a historic point; that they must pursue it diligently; and that any conditions imposed by the Architectural Review Board (ARB) be followed. When he states "reconstruction," it is an abbreviated reference for all the procedural steps

the property owner must follow, as they would continue to be subject to all the requirements before replacing any structure in the Historic District.

Mr. Supelak stated that the intent is to set a separate threshold for unauthorized modifications. Even though the property owner must pay the Minor Misdemeanor fine and court costs, what is the motivation to remedy the violation? In the example cited earlier of painting an incorrect paint color in the Historic District, the fine and court costs are less than the cost of hiring the job to be repainted. At what threshold is there motivation for the property owner to correct the violation? Are window replacements considered minor modifications? Window replacements are quite costly. He believes the property owners would prefer to pay the fines and courts costs than correct the modification. Is there a need to provide more specificity to the thresholds? That also could better address offenses such as a fence removal versus removal of one wing of a house.

Ms. Call agreed. Is there a way in which to have a Minor Misdemeanor in force until the modification is remedied? Perhaps there should be the option of a fine of \$250 per day until the violation is remedied. There is value in the City's Historic District, and we want to encourage residents who want to live there, want to contribute to it, and want their houses to be as valuable in 100 years as they are today. What language is needed that would retain the historic character, enforces the Code that many have worked diligently to enact, but at the same time provides more deterrent than a minor fee easily paid?

Mr. Boggs responded that the proposed amendment maintains the provision that each day constitutes a separate offense. The property owner could plead guilty and pay the fine for the first offense. If a grace period is permitted to correct the offense, but it is not corrected within that timeframe, a second, separate offense would occur the following day. That offense would then be a Fourth Degree Misdemeanor.

Mr. Supelak inquired if this would be true for the Minor Misdemeanor, i.e. the repeatability of the violation, if not remedied.

Ms. Call stated that time would be permitted for the remedy of the first offense to occur, before the second violation would be cited. If a violation should proceed to a third offense, of course, less leniency would be permitted.

Mr. Boggs reiterated that the City also has the Environmental Court option. When there are repeat players at Code violations, it becomes more tenable to cite them to the Franklin County Environmental Court.

Ms. Martin pointed out that when a property owner unknowingly commits a violation -- for instance, painting their window shutters the wrong color -- staff would contact the property owner and work with them to address the issue. The Penalty Code is rarely employed. If a violation is not corrected, however, a written Notice of Violation is sent. If that also is not heeded, the issue is escalated within the process. It would take approximately a year before a violation is fined.

Mr. Schneier stated that there is a significant difference between a minor modification and a demolition. In regard to the latter, most property owners are aware that removal of structures is not permitted in the Historic District. Even if it is not a person but an entity, there are sufficient regulations in place. However, in the middle area, there are more significant modifications, such as the replacement of historical windows with non-historic windows. How are major modifications handled? He had expected to see some draft language with more definition of minor modifications versus major modifications, which would warrant different procedures. He is uncomfortable with lumping all of the modifications together. If the language makes no distinction, then it becomes staff's discretion to identify the inadvertent versus the deliberate violations. The reason we are here is that the Commission did not want there to be situations in which the full force of the law came down on someone who was unaware of what was required with a modification or alteration. He does not believe the draft language covers that to his satisfaction. It refers to modifications but does not define modifications. If the intent is that

the determination would be deferred to staff, he has no objection, but he requests that it be made clear.

Ms. Call requested Ms. Martin to share an example of such a violation and the process followed by staff. Ms. Martin responded that in the instance that there would be a violation of any section of the Zoning Code, the first step would be to notify the property owner of the violation. Often, the City has had previous interactions with the property owner. If the property owner were unresponsive, staff would send them a written Notice of Violation with a 30-day timeframe for remedy. That is a zoning enforcement act, not a Code Enforcement action. If the first Notice of Violation is ignored, it would be followed with a second Notice of Violation. If both Notices of Violation are unheeded, staff would review the case with Code Enforcement, who would send the property owner a Notice of Code Violation. If Code Enforcement's Notice of Code Violation also is unheeded, staff would engage the Law Director's office and begin to pursue the Penalty Code and citation to Mayor's Court. The Penalty Code is needed for the exceptions; it is not the rule. When such an exception occurs, the penalty process needs to function in a manner aligned with the community's values but is also an effective tool for Code Enforcement and the Law Director's Office. In the particular instance that triggered this proposed Code amendment, that was not the case so there was no available recourse.

Mr. Schneier stated that he would like to see more specificity and clarity so people are aware of the process. It would then be incumbent on them to know what they can/cannot do. Because he recognizes that it may be difficult to include that specificity, he would not object to what has been proposed.

Mr. Fishman stated that key need is that the penalty be a deterrent. Intents to demolish a historic building are required to be submitted to the ARB for consideration, so this penalty would be needed only for those cases deliberately not submitted to ARB for approval. Did such a demolition occur? Mr. Boggs responded affirmatively. That was the experience with the demolition of the accessory structures, which triggered the proposed Penalty Code amendment.

Ms. Martin noted that it was an outlying historic property. One of the greatest values of our outlying historic properties are their accessory structures. The companionship of the accessory structures with the primary structure provides the rural character in which Dublin was established. With the case in question, a historic chicken coop and a well house were demolished without authorization. Staff worked with Code Enforcement and the Law Director's office, but no recourse was available.

Mr. Fishman stated that the first of the two proposed options could address that type of violation with 30 days in jail.

Mr. Boggs responded that, potentially, incarceration could occur. The second option would handle that type of violation, as well, although it would also cover more major modifications, such as window replacements.

Mr. Fishman requested verification that the Court could order the property owner to rebuild the historic structure.

Mr. Boggs responded that the Court would have that option available.

Ms. Harter stated that education is important. It is important that homeowners in the Historic District understand the importance of where they live. When buyers purchase a home in that District, they should be provided information regarding how to make changes or removals. Provision of that information also would provide a tool for the Court. They can indicate that said information was provided to the homeowner at the time they purchased the home, as well as subsequently. At the time of selling their home, an assessment on the seller also could be made.

Ms. Holt responded that is a valuable point, which staff also recognized. Planning has instituted two different ways to reach out to historic property owners:

1. Upon their purchase of the home, staff sends them a flyer with the City Welcome Packet, which defines the responsibilities and the stewardship expected with ownership of a historic property. It also provides staff contact information whereby the homeowner can obtain more information regarding what can/cannot be done with a historic property.
2. Additionally, information is mailed annually to all property owners in the Historic District and Appendix G, which reiterates the Historic District home ownership requirements. There should be no opportunity for property owners not to be aware of the requirements.

Ms. Call inquired if Commission members had further comments.

Mr. Schneier suggested that in the seventh line of Section (A), "... whoever constructs, reconstructs, alters, modifies or demolishes any exterior architectural feature, site, sign now or hereafter in the Historic District...." that a comma be added after the word "sign," and a conjunction between site and sign.

Staff indicated the revision would be made.

Ms. Call stated that the Commission recognizes the work that went into this proposed amendment, and the efforts made to protect the interests of Dublin.

Public Comments

No public comments were received by staff.

Ms. Call invited Mayor Fox to comment, as a member of the public present.

Mayor Fox stated that as a resident of the Historic District, she would question the lack of definition for a minor modification. With all homes, items will be replaced and repaired continually, and that is not always something that the homeowner can submit to the ARB for review. Consequently, sometimes a door knob may look different, or a paint color is not on the approved Historic District paint palette, but the shade is essentially the same. As a resident of the Historic District, she wants her home to always be well maintained, but she does not want to go before the ARB for every minor modification. From a resident's point of view, there should be flexibility to maintain your home without fear that a minor modification would result in a citation to Mayor's Court.

Ms. Call inquired if resources are available to the residents to identify types of hardware that could be used in the Historic District. Is there a repository or database of which residents are aware and have access to that would offer the needed information?

Ms. Holt clarified that if homeowners are replacing like with like, they are permitted to do so with no approval from City staff or the ARB. However, staff has many resources and information that they can provide to residents and do so on a regular basis. Phone numbers and emails are provided in the flyers distributed to encourage that communication.

Mr. Fishman pointed out that some historic districts permit some historically consistent modifications to be made from an approved color palette. Additionally, some historic hardware and windows are no longer available, so replacements are permitted, but only from a list of items with historically consistent characteristics. Therefore, a homeowner in a historic district would have some flexibility with modifications.

Ms. Holt clarified that the ARB recently approved a color palette for the Historic District, which provides a range of colors to be used that are appropriate not only for the time period of the home but also the style of the home. Any of those approved paint colors may be used without a visit to staff or the ARB. Ms. Call inquired if that resource is available at the City's website.

Ms. Martin responded that it would be posted as soon as the document formatting had been completed.

Ms. Call stated the City will see these types of occurrences in a far greater number than an individual homeowner. As we catalog these instances, the City will be able to aggregate those and expand its database to include hardware, windows and other home elements. This could be a significant service for not only our Historic District, but other municipalities to consider, as well.

Mr. Chinnock stated that there are many resources that are provided and available to the residents of the Historic District, and nearly all residents in that District are aware that they are living in a historic home. If violations still occur, he would encourage that care be taken that the City is not overly compassionate to homeowners who know better. He is not an incompassionate person, but is convinced that most homeowners are aware. There is a need to be very strict when the issue escalates to the point of a deliberate violation.

Ms. Call agreed, noting that is the reason for the proposed Penalty Code amendment. There is a need for a Fourth Misdemeanor penalty, whereas all previous violations were considered minor modifications. In that case, homeowners could prefer not to ask permission. There is a need to ensure staff and the Mayor's Court have the necessary recourse to protect the Historic District.

Mr. Boggs stated that as proposed, the penalty process is reasonable. If it should advance to Mayor's Court, there is no need for compassion at that point. The intent of including the Fourth Misdemeanor penalty in the Code is to incentivize property owners to reconsider their actions before proceeding with a violation.

Ms. Call stated that staff has requested the Commission to make a recommendation for an amendment to Code Section §153.999 – Penalty (21-113ADMC) with one of the following two options:

1. Retain demolition as a fourth degree misdemeanor on a first offense and leave a first-offense modification as a minor misdemeanor.
2. Define a modification subject to fourth degree misdemeanor penalties to not include nonstructural modifications, such as painting or staining.

Commission consensus was preference of Option #1.

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Fishman seconded a recommendation for approval to City Council of an amendment to Code Section §153.999 – Penalty (21-113ADMC) to: Retain a demolition as a fourth degree misdemeanor on a first offense and a first offense modification as a minor misdemeanor.

Vote: Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Chinnock, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes.

[Motion approved 7-0.]

COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Martin reported that:

- A Board and Commission recognition will be held at 6:00 pm, Monday, April 11, 2022 in the Council Chamber, preceding the regular Council meeting. Excluding PZC members, who were sworn in tonight, new Board and Commission members will be sworn in at that reception.

- A joint PZC-ARB-BZA work session is scheduled for 6:00 p.m., Wednesday, April 20, 2022, in the old Council Chamber at the Department of Development, 5200 Emerald Parkway. Following a light dinner, a training will be facilitated by the City's planning consultant, Greg Dale. The training is intended to be interactive. Members of the participating bodies are asked to identify two discussion questions for the meeting agenda.

PZC members identified the following three discussion topics:

1. Should economics be a factor considered by the bodies of review?
 2. How to achieve variety and variability with "cookie cutter" types of developments on small lots.
 3. PUDs - obtaining architectural variety and interest without being the designers of the project.
- The next regular meeting of PZC is scheduled for 6:30 p.m., Thursday, April 21, 2022.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.



Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission



Assistant Clerk of Council