

(DRAFT COPY – SUBJECT TO APPROVAL BY THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS)
MINUTES OF A PUBLIC HEARING AND THE DELIBERATIONS OF THE TAZEWELL COUNTY
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

A Public Hearing of the Tazewell County Zoning Board of Appeals was held at 6:00 P.M. on Tuesday, February 3, 2015, Tazewell County Justice Center, 101 South Capitol Street, Pekin, Illinois. Chairman Duane Lessen called the meeting to order.

PRESENT: Chairman Duane Lessen, Alternate Cheryl Linsley, Sandy May, Don Vaughn, Phil Webb and Ken Zimmerman

ABSENT: JoAn Baum, Loren Toevs

STAFF: Kristal Deininger, Community Development Administrator; Jaclynn Workman, Inspections Coordinator; David Smesrud, Land Use Planner; Matt Drake, Assistant States Attorney; and Land Use Members: Chairman Terry Hillegonds, K. Russell Crawford, Monica Connett, John Redlingshafer and Sue Sundell

OTHERS

PRESENT: Petitioners and Interested Parties

MINUTES: Moved by May, seconded by Webb, to approve the Minutes of the November 4, 2014 Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting. **Motion carried by voice vote.**

CASE NO. 15-01-S: The petition of Cynthia Wilmot for a Special Use to operate a Home Commercial Business for the purposes of canine training, with on-site boarding only for canines in the training program from an existing accessory structure in an A-1 Agriculture Preservation District.

The Tazewell County Land Use Planner submitted a report recommending approval of the proposed Special Use request.

Tazewell County Health Department submitted a report regarding the proposed Special Use request stating no issues following clarification on a few items.

Tazewell County Soil & Water Conservation District submitted a report having no comment regarding the proposed Special Use request.

Tazewell County Farm Bureau submitted a report recommending approval regarding the proposed Special Use request.

Ken Siegrist, Dillon Township Road Commissioner submitted a report having no objection regarding the proposed Special Use request.

Craig Fink, Tazewell County Highway Engineer submitted a report stating a minimal increase in traffic would be expected and to contact the Township Road District for further comment.

School District 703 made no comment regarding the proposed Special Use request.

Cynthia Wilmot appeared to testify on behalf of the proposed Special Use request. Ms. Wilmot stated she provides basic training to canines on a leash and would operate from an existing building on the recently purchased property. Ms. Wilmot said there would be no more than 4 or 5 dogs at any time for the purposes of attention. Ms. Wilmot added any waste would be picked up off of the concrete floor and then bagged for disposal. Ms. Wilmot stated the building did not have any water on the inside, however there was a pump on either end of the exterior of the building. Ms. Wilmot said she would like to place a sign in the front yard. Ms. Wilmot added there would be no breeding of animals and the dogs are placed in separate kennels for approximately 3 weeks of training. Ms. Wilmot stated the nearest neighbor was located approximately ¼ to ½ mile from the proposed building and there was 6" insulation in that building that would help reduce any noise generated from the training of canines. Ms. Wilmot said the dogs are outside for exercise for approximately an hour and they are never outside unsupervised. Ms. Wilmot added she was in the process of obtaining a State license and that if she had more than 4 dogs, the State would require her to carry a Kennel License. Ms. Wilmot stated she was comfortable with a maximum of 5 dogs and understands any kenneling or additional dogs would require an additional request be made.

Following all Public Hearings, moved by May, seconded by Vaughn, to approve **Case No. 15-01-S.**

Following discussion, moved by Vaughn, seconded by May to amend the Main Motion to include the following conditions:

1. There shall be no more than 5 canines on the site for training or boarding, at any given time.

Motion carried by voice vote for the amendment.

After considering all the evidence and testimony presented, the ZBA discussed the findings of fact and reviewed the Report of the Land Use Planner and arrived at the following findings of fact:

1. *The Special Use shall, in all other respects, conform to the applicable regulations of the Tazewell County Zoning Ordinance for the district in which it is located.*

POSITIVE. The Special Use shall conform to all applicable regulations of the Tazewell County Zoning Code to be enforced by the Community Development Administrator.

2. *The Special Use will be consistent with the purposes, goals, objectives, and standards of the officially adopted County Comprehensive Land Use Plan and these regulations, or of any officially adopted Comprehensive Plan of a municipality with a 1.5 mile planning jurisdiction.*

POSITIVE. The proposed Special Use will be consistent with the Tazewell County Comprehensive Land Use Plan implementation strategies.

3. *The petitioner has met the requirements of Article 25 of the Tazewell County Zoning Code.*

POSITIVE. Per the applicant's submitted site plan, all requirements of Article 25 of the Tazewell County Zoning Code will be satisfactorily met.

4. *The Site shall be so situated as to minimize adverse effects, including visual impacts on adjacent properties.*

POSITIVE. Anticipated adverse effects from the granting of the requested Special Use are minimal. Adjacent properties are primarily agricultural. The nearest residence is approximately 600 feet from the Morton building where the canines are to be housed. The applicant will only have a maximum of five dogs at any one time and they will spend the majority of their time indoors. Therefore, adverse effects of the Special Use will be minimized on adjacent properties.

5. *The establishment, maintenance or operation of the Special Use shall not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, morals, comfort or general welfare of the neighboring vicinity.*

POSITIVE. The kennel is not anticipated to be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, morals, comfort, or general welfare of the neighboring vicinity. The canines will be housed indoors and a chain-link fence is currently being constructed around the Morton building to prevent the dogs from escaping.

6. *The Special Use shall not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted.*

POSITIVE. The subject area is primarily agricultural; injury to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate area is not anticipated.

7. *The Special Use shall not substantially diminish and impair property values within the neighborhood.*

POSITIVE. Given its proposed location, a commercial kennel is not anticipated to substantially diminish and / or impair property value within the neighborhood. The kennel will operate out of existing buildings; no new structures are planned for construction.

8. *That adequate utilities, access roads, drainage and other necessary facilities have been or are being provided.*

POSITIVE. The Special Use already has sufficient access to utilities.

9. *Adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide ingress and egress so designed as to minimize traffic congestion and hazard on the public streets.*

POSITIVE. The Special Use does not require additional access off Delavan Road. Clients will not be visiting the property so there is no additional traffic generation from granting the special use.

10. *The evidence establishes that granting the use, which is located one-half mile or less from a livestock feeding operation, will not increase the population density around the livestock feeding operation to such levels as would hinder the operation or expansion of such operation.*

NOT APPLICABLE.

11. Evidence presented establishes that granting the use, which is located more than one-half mile from a livestock feeding operation, will not hinder the operation or expansion of such operation.

NOT APPLICABLE.

12. Seventy-five percent (75%) of the site contains soils having a productivity index of less than 125.

POSITIVE.

13. The Special Use is consistent with the existing uses of property within the general area of the property in question.

POSITIVE. The Special Use request for a commercial kennel is consistent with the other uses in the immediate vicinity. There is no negative impact on the surrounding agricultural uses.

14. The property is suitable for the Special Use as proposed.

POSITIVE. Given its size and topography, the subject property is suitable for the Special Use request as proposed.

Moved by May, seconded by Vaughn, to approve the findings of fact as written. **Motion declared carried.**

On roll call to approve **Case No. 15-01-S, as amended** the vote was:

Ayes: 6 –Alternate Linsley, May, Vaughn, Webb, Zimmerman and Chairman Lessen

Nays: 0

Absent: 2 - Baum, Toevs

Motion declared carried.

CASE NO. 15-02-S: The petition of Thomas Brewer, Trustee of St. Mary's Church for a Special Use to allow for the expansion of a Non-Conforming Cemetery in an A-1 Agriculture Preservation District.

The Tazewell County Land Use Planner submitted a report recommending approval of the proposed Special Use request.

Tazewell County Health Department made no comment regarding the proposed Special Use request.

Tazewell County Soil & Water Conservation District submitted a report recommending approval regarding the proposed Special Use request.

Tazewell County Farm Bureau submitted a report recommending approval regarding the proposed Special Use request.

Craig Fink, Tazewell County Highway Engineer submitted a report regarding the proposed Special Use request recommending a survey plat be prepared prior to consideration to show proper road right of way, which is essential to their consideration.

Penny Bright, City of Delavan submitted a report stating no opposition regarding the proposed Special Use request.

School District 703 made no comment regarding the proposed Special Use request.

THE FOLLOWING CONTAINS TESTIMONY FOR BOTH CASE 15-02-S AND CASE 15-03-V.

Attorney Thomas Brewer appeared to testify on behalf of the proposed Special Use request. Mr. Brewer stated the existing cemetery was used all the way to the Right of Way, which is 34.77' from the centerline of the road. Mr. Brewer said there was a potential to lose 400 burial sites if the 30' setback were to be met and the Special Use request was for the ability to use of the remainder of the land, which would only be opened as needed, however it would remain farm land until that time. Mr. Brewer added the road was expanded in 2002 and there were existing plots up to the right of way presently. Mr. Brewer stated there was a possibility of having the first 2 rows of stones flat for traffic safety, and in order to make up for the loss of additional plot space, the cemetery would need to acquire additional land to the West. Mr. Brewer said there would be a survey of the land pending the outcome of the hearing to find the most efficient layout for the burial plots. Mr. Brewer added the County had already placed a culvert for an additional entrance when Springfield Road was widened in 2002, and the cemetery conveyed 35' of land to the County for the right of way expansion. Mr. Brewer stated it was his understanding the cemetery wanted to use all available land before removing crop land from production. Mr. Brewer said he would be agreeable to using a lane around the perimeter of the cemetery in addition to the 1' setback. Mr. Brewer added the cemetery presently had 608 grave sites.

Following all Public Hearings, moved by May, seconded by Zimmerman, to approve **Case No. 15-02-S**.

After considering all the evidence and testimony presented, the ZBA discussed the findings of fact and reviewed the Report of the Land Use Planner and arrived at the following findings of fact:

1. *The Special Use shall, in all other respects, conform to the applicable regulations of the Tazewell County Zoning Ordinance for the district in which it is located.*

POSITIVE. The Special Use shall conform to all applicable regulations of the Tazewell County Zoning Code and provisions of the variance (15-03-V) to be enforced by the Community Development Administrator.

2. *The Special Use will be consistent with the purposes, goals, objectives, and standards of the officially adopted County Comprehensive Land Use Plan and these regulations, or of any officially adopted Comprehensive Plan of a municipality with a 1.5 mile planning jurisdiction.*

POSITIVE. The proposed Special Use will be consistent with the following Tazewell County Comprehensive Land Use Plan implementation strategies:

- Locate new development contiguous to existing development to aid police and fire protection.
- Avoid leapfrog development and isolated land development to preserve contiguous tracts of productive agricultural land.

3. *The petitioner has met the requirements of Article 25 of the Tazewell County Zoning Code.*

POSITIVE. All requirements of Article 25 of the Tazewell County Zoning Code have been satisfactorily met.

4. *The Site shall be so situated as to minimize adverse effects, including visual impacts on adjacent properties.*

POSITIVE. The subject area is not heavily populated and is surrounded by agricultural land. As such, anticipated adverse effects, including visual impacts on adjacent properties, from the granting of the requested Special Use are minimal.

5. *The establishment, maintenance or operation of the Special Use shall not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, morals, comfort or general welfare of the neighboring vicinity.*

POSITIVE. An expansion of an existing cemetery is not anticipated to be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, morals, comfort or general welfare of the neighboring vicinity.

6. *The Special Use shall not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted.*

POSITIVE. The subject area is primarily farmland, which shall remain in crop production for the foreseeable future, limiting injury to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate area. However, as the cemetery expands, cropland will be lost.

7. *The Special Use shall not substantially diminish and impair property values within the neighborhood.*

POSITIVE. An expansion of an existing cemetery is not anticipated to substantially diminish and / or impair property value within the neighborhood.

8. *That adequate utilities, access roads, drainage and other necessary facilities have been or are being provided.*

POSITIVE. Given its adjacency to an existing cemetery, the proposed expansion has access to utilities, if needed.

9. *Adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide ingress and egress so designed as to minimize traffic congestion and hazard on the public streets.*

POSITIVE. Vehicular access to the proposed expansion will be either through the existing loop road or through an additional loop to be constructed, as needed. A ditch culvert has been installed by the Tazewell County Highway Department to allow for an additional access off Springfield Road. Given the current traffic volumes on Springfield Rd. and adequate site distances, there are no foreseeable traffic congestion or safety issues from granting the Special Use request.

10. *The evidence establishes that granting the use, which is located one-half mile or less from a livestock feeding operation, will not increase the population density around the livestock feeding operation to such levels as would hinder the operation or expansion of such operation.*

NOT APPLICABLE. Per the applicant, there are no livestock feeding operations within one-half miles of the subject parcel.

11. *Evidence presented establishes that granting the use, which is located more than one-half mile from a livestock feeding operation, will not hinder the operation or expansion of such operation.*

NOT APPLICABLE. Per the applicant, there are no livestock feeding operations within one-half miles of the subject parcel.

12. *Seventy-five percent (75%) of the site contains soils having a productivity index of less than 125.*

POSITIVE.

13. *The Special Use is consistent with the existing uses of property within the general area of the property in question.*

POSITIVE. The Special Use request for an expansion of a cemetery is not necessarily consistent with the agricultural uses in the vicinity. However, the expansion is to occur entirely within the existing parcels already owned by the Church, next to an existing cemetery that has occupied the site for several decades. There appears to be little, if any, conflict with neighboring uses, as cemeteries are typically low-impact developments.

14. *The property is suitable for the Special Use as proposed.*

POSITIVE. Given its proximity to the existing cemetery, size, topography, and utility access, the subject property is suitable for the Special Use request as proposed.

Moved by May, seconded by Vaughn, to approve the findings of fact as modified. **Motion declared carried.**

On roll call to approve **Case No. 15-02-S** the vote was:

Ayes: 6 –Alternate Linsley, May, Vaughn, Webb, Zimmerman and Chairman Lessen

Nays: 0

Absent: 2 - Baum, Toevs

Motion declared carried.

CASE NO. 15-03-V: The petition of Thomas Brewer, Trustee of St. Mary's Church for a Variance to waive the requirements of 7TCC1-25(f)(6)(i) to allow the expansion of an existing Cemetery with burial plots to be within 1' of the Right of Way line of Springfield Road, which is 29' less than allowed and to be within 1' of the Rear Property Line and Southern Side Property Line, which is 24' less than allowed; all situated in on A-1 Agriculture Preservation District.

Tazewell County Health Department made no comment regarding the proposed Variance request.

Tazewell County Soil & Water Conservation District submitted a report recommending approval regarding the proposed Variance request.

Tazewell County Farm Bureau submitted a report recommending approval regarding the proposed Variance request.

Craig Fink, Tazewell County Highway Engineer submitted a report regarding the proposed Variance request recommending a survey plat be prepared prior to consideration to show proper road right of way, which is essential to their consideration.

Penny Bright, City of Delavan submitted a report stating no opposition regarding the proposed Variance request.

School District 703 made no comment regarding the proposed Variance request.

PLEASE REFER TO CASE NO. 15-02-S FOR THE TESTIMONY FOR CASE 15-03-V.

Following all Public Hearings, moved by May, seconded by Vaughn, to approve **Case No. 15-03-V.**

Following discussion, moved by May, seconded by Vaughn to amend the Main Motion to include the following

conditions:

1. The Setback for the burial plots shall be 10' from the Right of Way of Springfield Road.
2. The West Side Setback for burial plots shall be 10'.

Motion carried by voice vote for the amendment.

After considering all the evidence and testimony presented, the ZBA discussed and arrived at the following findings of fact:

1. *The particular surroundings, shape or topographical conditions of the specific property involved would result in a particular hardship upon the owner, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if the strict letter of the regulations were to be carried out;*

POSITIVE. Allowing the amended setback and due to the need for additional burial plots utilizing the property to its fullest extent is practical in this situation and will not have a negative impact on surrounding properties and preserves the potential for removal of farmland for future burial plots.

2. *The conditions upon which a petition for a variance are based are unique to the property for which the variance is sought and are not applicable, generally, to other property;*

POSITIVE. Allowing the amended setback and due to the need for additional burial plots utilizing the property to its fullest extent is practical in this situation and will not have a negative impact on surrounding properties and preserves the potential for removal of farmland for future burial plots.

3. *Granting the variance will not be detrimental to the public welfare, nor injurious to other property or improvements in the neighborhood in which the property is located or otherwise be inconsistent with any officially adopted County Plan or these regulations;*

POSITIVE. Allowing a Variance for the use as requested will not be a detriment to the area.

4. *The proposed variance will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property, nor substantially increase the congestion in public streets or increase the danger of fire, or endanger the public safety, or substantially diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood;*

POSITIVE.

5. *The purpose of the variance is not based exclusively upon a desire to increase the monetary gain realized from the property;*

POSITIVE. Due to the need for additional burial plots utilizing the property to its fullest extent is practical in this situation and will not have a negative impact on surrounding properties.

6. *The circumstances or conditions are such that the strict application of the provisions of this section would deprive the applicant of reasonable use of his or her property. Mere loss in value shall not justify a Variance;*

POSITIVE. Allowing the amended setback and due to the need for additional burial plots utilizing the property to its fullest extent is practical in this situation and will not have a negative impact on surrounding properties and preserves the potential for removal of farmland for future burial plots.

7. *Granting of the Variance is the minimum adjustment necessary that will make possible the reasonable use of the land or structure;*

POSITIVE. Allowing the amended setback and due to the need for additional burial plots utilizing the property to its fullest extent is practical in this situation and will not have a negative impact on surrounding properties and preserves the potential for removal of farmland for future burial plots.

8. *The plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances;*

POSITIVE. Allowing the amended setback and due to the need for additional burial plots utilizing the property to its fullest extent is practical in this situation and will not have a negative impact on surrounding properties and preserves the potential for removal of farmland for future burial plots.

Moved by Zimmerman, seconded by May, to approve the findings of fact as discussed. **Motion declared carried.**

On roll call to approve **Case No. 15-03-V, as amended** the vote was:

Ayes: 6 –Alternate Linsley, May, Vaughn, Webb, Zimmerman and Chairman Lessen

Nays: 0

Absent: 2 - Baum, Toevs

Motion declared carried.

CASE NO. 15-04-V: The petition of Akiko Henderson for a Variance to waive the requirements of 7TCC1-7(f) to allow the creation of a non-buildable zoning lot of record to have 60 feet of frontage along Furrow Road which is 140 feet less than allowed and to waive the requirements of 7TCC1-7(d) to allow the same lot to be 6.1 acres, which is 33.9 acres less than allowed in an A-1 Agriculture Preservation Zoning District.

Tazewell County Health Department submitted a report regarding the proposed Variance request stating a zoning inspection must be completed by a licensed septic contractor and the septic and well must remain on the property in which it serves.

Tazewell County Soil & Water Conservation District submitted a report having no comment regarding the proposed Variance request.

Tazewell County Farm Bureau submitted a report recommending approval regarding the proposed Variance request.

Craig Fink, Tazewell County Highway Engineer submitted a report regarding the proposed Variance stating additional traffic may be expected and to notify the Township for further comment.

Ron Hawkins, Cincinnati Township submitted a report having no objection to the proposed Variance request.

Village of South Pekin made no comment regarding the proposed Variance request.

School District 703 made no comment regarding the proposed Variance request.

Gary Allen, Realtor for the Petitioner appeared to testify on behalf of the proposed Variance request. Mr. Allen stated the property owner would like to sell the property to her grandson. Mr. Allen said the petitioner's daughter will acquire the 6+ acres until the grandson can refinance and retain ownership of both parcels. Mr. Allen added there were financing restrictions causing issues with the grandson being able to purchase the entire parcel as is. Mr. Allen stated both properties would remain as is, and that there are no new entrances being proposed.

Following all Public Hearings, moved by May, seconded by Webb, to approve **Case No. 15-04-V.**

After considering all the evidence and testimony presented, the ZBA discussed and arrived at the following findings of fact:

1. *The particular surroundings, shape or topographical conditions of the specific property involved would result in a particular hardship upon the owner, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if the strict letter of the regulations were to be carried out;*

POSTIVE. The applicant has no other alternative for division of the property. Although the circumstances of bank financing is not a true finding of uniqueness it is important to clarify that such a Variance would not be warranted if it weren't due to new rules and regulations imposed by the Financial Institutions. The Financial Institution will only allow the grandson of the applicant to finance for the home site area, therefore the applicants Daughter will be purchasing the property intended for the Variance and will at a later date deed the property to the Son.

2. *The conditions upon which a petition for a variance are based are unique to the property for which the variance is sought and are not applicable, generally, to other property;*

POSTIVE. The applicant has no other alternative for division of the property. Although the circumstances of bank financing is not a true finding of uniqueness it is important to clarify that such a Variance would not be warranted if it weren't due to new rules and regulations imposed by the Financial Institutions.

3. *Granting the variance will not be detrimental to the public welfare, nor injurious to other property or improvements in the neighborhood in which the property is located or otherwise be inconsistent with any officially adopted County Plan or these regulations;*

POSITIVE. Granting the Variance will have no adverse affect on the public or improvements in the area.

4. *The proposed variance will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property, nor substantially increase the congestion in public streets or increase the danger of fire, or endanger the public safety, or substantially diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood;*
5. *The purpose of the variance is not based exclusively upon a desire to increase the monetary gain realized from the property;*

POSTIVE. The applicant has no other alternative for division of the property. Although the circumstances of bank financing is not a true finding of uniqueness it is important to clarify that such a Variance would not be warranted if it weren't due to new rules and regulations imposed by the Financial Institutions. The Financial Institution will only allow the grandson of the applicant to finance for the home site area, therefore the applicants Daughter will be purchasing the property intended for the Variance and will at a later date deed the property to the Son.

6. *The circumstances or conditions are such that the strict application of the provisions of this section would deprive the applicant of reasonable use of his or her property. Mere loss in value shall not justify a Variance;*

POSTIVE. The applicant has no other alternative for division of the property. Although the circumstances of bank financing is not a true finding of uniqueness it is important to clarify that such a Variance would not be warranted if it weren't due to new rules and regulations imposed by the Financial Institutions. The Financial Institution will only allow the grandson of the applicant to finance for the home site area, therefore the applicants Daughter will be purchasing the property intended for the Variance and will at a later date deed the property to the Son.

7. *Granting of the Variance is the minimum adjustment necessary that will make possible the reasonable use of the land or structure;*

POSTIVE. The applicant has no other alternative for division of the property. Although the circumstances of bank financing is not a true finding of uniqueness it is important to clarify that such a Variance would not be warranted if it weren't due to new rules and regulations imposed by the Financial Institutions. The Financial Institution will only allow the grandson of the applicant to finance for the home site area, therefore the applicants Daughter will be purchasing the property intended for the Variance and will at a later date deed the property to the Son.

8. *The plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances;*

POSTIVE. The applicant has no other alternative for division of the property. Although the circumstances of bank financing is not a true finding of uniqueness it is important to clarify that such a Variance would not be warranted if it weren't due to new rules and regulations imposed by the Financial Institutions. The Financial Institution will only allow the grandson of the applicant to finance for the home site area, therefore the applicants Daughter will be purchasing the property intended for the Variance and will at a later date deed the property to the Son. It is also noted that if the plans change for this property such as utilizing for a home site, a Special Use for approval by the Zoning Board of Appeals would be required.

Moved by May, seconded by Zimmerman, to approve the findings of fact as discussed. **Motion declared carried.** Abstain: 1 - Vaughn

On roll call to approve **Case No. 15-03-V** the vote was:

Ayes: 5 –Alternate Linsley, May, Webb, Zimmerman and Chairman Lessen

Nays: 0

Abstain: 1 - Vaughn

Absent: 2 - Baum, Toevs

Motion declared carried.

NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals will be **Tuesday, March 3, 2015** at 6:00 p.m. in the Tazewell County Justice Center, 101 South Capitol Street, Pekin, Illinois.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, moved by May, seconded by Zimmerman, to adjourn the Zoning Board of Appeals Public Hearing at 7:35 p.m.

Kristal Deininger, Secretary

Secretary's Note: For further information regarding the discussion and testimony during the Public Hearing, please contact the Community Development Department for copies of the transcripts.