

**Brunswick Hills Township  
Zoning Commission  
Continued Public Hearing– November 7, 2019**

**CALL MEETING TO ORDER**

Chair Jenkins called the Brunswick Hills Township Zoning Commission public hearing to order at 7:03 p.m.

- **Board Members in Attendance:** Sandra Jenkins (Chair), Barb Porter, Trica Murphy, Linda Kijek
- **Board Members not in Attendance:** Sy Mougrabi
- **Alternate Board Members in Attendance:** Patti Wetterman
- **Others in Attendance:** Trustee John Witthuhn (Zoning Liaison), Trustee Mike Esber, Mary Jean Milanko (Secretary), Anthony Strazzo (Fire Chief), Officer P (Brunswick Hills Police)

Alternate member Patty Wetterman was seated to represent a full board.

**CONTINUED BUSINESS: PUBLIC HEARING ON REZONING**

**(1) Zoning Map Amendment by David Terry, Terry Properties, LLC, 1285 Marks Rd, Valley City, 44280** (in association with Ryan Homes), proposing to expand the existing 97-acre Marks Rd/Center Rd Planned Mixed Use Overlay District (PMUO) to include 214 acres (17 parcels present zoning C-2, R-1 and R-R) to the east (with frontage on Center Road and Substation Road) per Sec. 406-7E Addition of a Mixed Use Overlay of the Brunswick Hills Township Zoning Resolution.

Chair Jenkins stated this is a continued public hearing on the Zoning Map Amendment PMUO request by Terry Properties and explained that the Zoning Commission is a recommendation board and any action taken tonight would be passed on to the Trustees. She said we met last month and a lot of questions and concerns were raised so Terry Properties asked for a continuance to do some additional research to answer those questions. She said they have submitted a letter requesting another continuance to do additional research and I will open it up to the board for discussion.

**Discussion by the Board on the Continuance of the Hearing on the Zoning Map Amendment to a PMUO**

Mrs. Murphy said they requested that we post-pone the hearing until tonight and now they are asking for another continuance for next month. Mrs. Murphy said we have a lot going on next month with some new developments coming in and January is our Organizational Meeting, so if we do allow for a continuance do we do it for next month or do it for when it fits in our schedule. Mrs. Kijek stated she feels the same way and said they've had 30 days to answer the questions. Mrs. Wetterman stated she felt the same way; they've had time and this is not the first postponement that they've asked for. Mrs. Murphy said I think last month's postponement was because of the audience participation and they wanted to address the concerns of the audience as well as the board. Mrs. Murphy said I think we should allow them to continue it. Mrs. Wetterman asked if we can ask them to present any information that they currently have or that's new from the last meeting. Mrs. Wetterman asked if they have any new information? Chair Jenkins called Kristin Hopkins, CT Consultants/Terry Properties to the podium.

**Kristen Hopkins, CT Consultants representing Terry Properties, 1001 Lakeside Ave, Cleveland, OH 44114**

Ms. Hopkins stated there were questions and concerns related to the traffic; there were concerns related to the utilities, schools and additional things. She said the developer is consulting with traffic experts and utility experts and is dealing with experts for the recreational trails. She said unfortunately these types of professional services takes a while to get under contract and get the project going to get the results. Ms. Hopkins said we are flexible and I would say that if you weren't able to take this up in December and wait to January, or if you wanted to delay until February that would be fine with us. She said that would give us time to get the results back so you

would have the information that would help you make the best decision in light of what we present. Ms. Hopkins stated we ask you for that consideration.

**Additional Discussion by the Board**

Mrs. Porter stated she has read a great deal of testimony and many letters from many of the residents and I find their concerns very compelling and very real. Mrs. Porter said quite frankly this rezoning application is completely inconsistent with our Comprehensive Land Use Plan as the rezoning request is presented now. She said the Land Use Plan was put into effect in 2005 and this plan does not reflect the wishes and the will of the residents at that time, nor from what I can see here tonight it doesn't reflect the wishes of the residents today. She said the majority of the land in this rezoning request is R-R Rural Residential, which means one (1) house per every two (2) acres and the preferred land use, page 33, Figure 7, in our Comprehensive Land Use Plan that was put into effect in 2005, retains this R-R zoning for this particular area. Mrs. Porter said it doesn't show that we should have higher density zoning or that we should have PMUOD's (Planned Mixed Use Overlay District) or anything like that; it calls for the large lot residential or Rural Residential which is the same thing. Mrs. Porter said there are provisions in our zoning code, namely the Conservation Development Overlay, Section 411 that makes it economic feasible for a developer to develop R-R land under the R-R zoning and still retain the open space and rural character. Mrs. Porter said it is my hope that this developer could come back to us and bring us a plan for this area that would adhere to our Comprehensive Land Use Plan and would also reflect the visions and the wishes of the residents of our community.

Mrs. Wetterman stated I agree with Barb that it does not match what we put out in the Comprehensive Plan and what they are checking on with the traffic and everything does not have anything to do with the PMUO. She said that is what goes with the development plan, which does not meet the Comprehensive Land Use Plan. Mrs. Kijek also agreed.

**Motion to Continue the Public Hearing for the Tax Map Amendment Rezoning for a PMUO**

**Motion:** Mrs. Murphy made a motion to honor the request to continue the public hearing until our February 6, 2020 @ 7:00 p.m. **Discussion on the motion:** Mrs. Kijek seconds the motion and said I would like to make a comment that they come back with a plan that will go according to our Comprehensive Land Use Plan. Mrs. Murphy asked if she is amending the motion. Mrs. Kijek stated she was amending the motion. Secretary Milanko stated they have already submitted a plan and we can only consider what is in their application request now which is the PMUO Rezoning Request. Secretary Milanko stated the general development plan itself and what they are planning can't be discussed unless the rezoning is approved or changed. Chair Jenkins asked if Mrs. Kijek wished to second the motion without the comment. Mrs. Kijek withdrew her comment and seconds the motion.

**Motion Restated:** Mrs. Murphy made a **motion to honor the request to continue the public hearing until February 6, 2020 @ 7:00 p.m.** Mrs. Kijek seconds. **Roll Call:** Mrs. Porter-no; Mrs. Murphy-yes; Mrs. Wetterman-no; Mrs. Kijek-no; Mrs. Jenkins-no. **Request to continue the public hearing denied by vote of 4 to 1.**

Chair Jenkins asked Ms. Hopkins (CT Consultants/Terry Properties) if she wanted to submit anything tonight and have a recommendation to the Trustees tonight on the rezoning since the continuance was denied. Kristin Hopkins stated she was not sure what she was asking. Chair Jenkins said the continuance is denied so tonight we can just move forward with what you've submitted already or it would have to come back with a different plan. Ms. Hopkins asked for a few minutes to confer with the developer David Terry. Ms. Hopkins stated the developer would like to make a comment if he may.

**Comments by the Developer, David Terry**

**David Terry, Terry Properties, 1285 Marks Road, Valley City, Ohio** approached the podium and stated we have spent the last 30 days consulting with experts on the traffic issues, the utilities and we have some solutions in

the works right now. Mr. Terry said we did find out that ODOT is considering looking at this traffic problem and they have until this spring to determine if it is viable for them to consider designing something. Mr. Terry stated as in the past it will be most likely 5-10 years before they get the project on the books because ODOT is that busy. Mr. Terry said what happens in these situations is that the priority spots that they deal with have to have traffic deaths at them and those go to the top of the list to be fixed and this one doesn't qualify for that. Mr. Terry referenced Bennett Road and Boston Road and said it's been 20 years now and they still haven't widened Boston Road.

Mr. Terry said what we are looking at here is a project that will definitely impact the traffic situation and it is probably a 10-year absorption process. He said it could take up to 10 years to complete this project and we base that on approximately 50 units a year. Typically, a project like this would not go into construction until probably 2022 and that would take it out to 2032 before it was completed. He said my past experience on these is that we will most likely as developers will be fixing the road ourselves but we will have to go through ODOT because it is their roadway and we will deal directly with them. Mr. Terry said we will probably have to fix the traffic lights and probably add a traffic light to the main intersection that we will be creating.

Mr. Terry said I was the developer for the original PMUO at Marks and Center Road where Drug Mart is right now and I built in the gas station, the car wash and the storage units on the north side. Mr. Terry said that land was RR (Rural Residential) as well and the property owner wanted to sell it and he came to me and asked me to buy it. Mr. Terry said well we've got some problems with it but we were able to overcome getting the sewers in and took it to the Planning Commission to see what they could do with it to get some assistance down at that corner. He said the Planning Commission recommendation was a PMUO so we drafted a PMUO that would fit with the guidance of the township and the county and it was adopted. Mr. Terry said it does allow for expansion of this and it also identified certain areas where these PMUO's would be permitted. Mr. Terry said we have met that with this application and we are well under the allowable density which is less than three to an acre and I believe the density in a PMUO can be as high as six to an acre. Mr. Terry said so we kept uniform to the other existing developments that are there now on the north side that Parkview, Pulte and Ryan Homes built. Bramblewood is what this project would look like when it's done.

Mr. Terry said the other thing Medina County recommended for this project to go forward was that the Economic Development Department in the county is pro-growth on industrial and they have determined that there isn't enough affordable housing in Medina County to entertain recruiting of industry to move in the area. Mr. Terry said we are not doing anything different than what has already be done on the north side and west of it. Mr. Terry said we don't have a problem going into February with this and that's why we asked for the continuance because we need to hire professionals that can give us the answers to those questions. Mr. Terry said many of the questions at the last meeting had to do with the traffic issues and I can understand that because I deal with it going in and out of my office as well. He said the traffic is bad and this is the quickest way to get that fixed rather than trying to wait on ODOT because there is no guarantee that ODOT will do this job in five years or 10 years. Mr. Terry said ODOT does not have the funds to do it and will have to go to the government for assistance so it will take a long time.

Mr. Terry said there are other issues there with utilities and we may have to assist the county with and pick up the expenses for that. Mr. Terry said the way we planned this is not to have 500 houses there overnight, but to mingle with the existing community there. Mr. Terry said we are developers and our occupation is supplying a need. He said in Brunswick and throughout the county there is a huge shortage of available lots and we have a growing population expansion going on. He said every community has had to accept expansion to make room for future families. Mr. Terry said he understands when someone moves in that they don't want anyone else moving in next to them, but that is the same thing he went through on the corner of Marks and Rt. 303. He said change is fearful, it's unknown, but there are people out there who just want to find a place out here in the suburb with a great school system and it's safe and convenient. Mr. Terry said the reason why we wanted that

continued is so that we can give you a much more thorough report and give you a better timeline. Mr. Terry said it is impossible to do this in 30 days and said I could ask you to withdraw your vote and reconsider time to put this out so we can be more thorough with this and we have a fair shot at this or you can do what you have to do. Mr. Terry stated that this application and drawing meets all of the requirements.

**Kristin Hopkins (CT Consultants/Terry Properties)** approached the podium and said there was a comment made earlier about a Conservation Development as an economically feasible alternative. Ms. Hopkins said that would require some analysis that we would like to do so we can all see the analysis and confirm whether that is accurate or not. She said that is one of the constitutional tests on whether your current zoning is constitutional if whether or not it is economically feasible. Ms. Hopkins said I think it behooves the township to have a good understanding of that and I would also remind you that the Comprehensive Plan, while it was agreed upon and represents the will of the people as it should, I commend you for doing the plan. Ms. Hopkins said there has been development along Rt. 303, so the conditions along Rt. 303 are different now than when the Comprehensive Plan was done so that also needs to be revisited. Ms. Hopkins said the Comprehensive Plan does not take into consideration the industrial zoning that is on the east side of Substation Road and that is one of the existing conditions that the Medina County Planning Director did point out that on three sides of this proposed development is higher density zoning so again, I would caution you in terms of relying on the existing Comprehensive Plan as an accurate portrayal of what's reasonable for this parcel.

#### **Discussion by the Board**

Mrs. Wetterman said in the Comprehensive Plan that is approved every year at our meeting also mentions to be well aware of putting adjoining houses next to anything that would allow annexation or cause parcels to be annexed to the city. She said going east of your plan puts us in proximity of Brunswick City. She said that was taken into consideration clear back in 2005 and Medina County needs homes, yes, the public needs homes, but we also have to take into consideration the public people that are in the township and there has been a lot of input that it's not a good idea right now. Mrs. Wetterman said and to have promises that you will work with ODOT on the transportation/traffic, that area has been trying to be fixed for a very long time and I feel we would need and the township would need a guarantee of it being fixed before this be approved.

Mrs. Hopkins said at the last meeting the request was to see the results of a traffic study before making a decision. Mrs. Wetterman said and that traffic study has not been done. Ms. Hopkins said it can't be done in 30 days so we had respectfully requested a continuance so that we could present you with the information that you requested. Ms. Hopkins said you brought up the issue of annexation and I would say that the allowance of the requested project precludes the need for annexation because there is no reason to be annexed into the city. She said typically developers ask for annexation into the city either for utilities or for the density. She said there are instances in Cuyahoga County, Olmsted Township, where the Olmsted Falls and Olmsted City share the same school district and a developer requested a rezoning to a parcel in Olmsted Township and the township said no so the developer went to Olmsted Falls and got the requested rezoning. Ms. Hopkins said so the school district was impacted regardless. Mrs. Wetterman said we are not Cuyahoga County. Ms. Hopkins said I understand that but what I'm saying is that there is no need to seek annexation from the township with the PMUO.

#### **Public Comment**

**1. Terry Sturgill, 1855 Substation Road, Brunswick Hills.** Mr. Sturgill said the way I understand it is that you have not decided whether you will continue this or not to the next meeting or February. Chair Jenkins stated it is not going to be continued. Mr. Sturgill said all of the concerns that were raised about the development can't happen unless the rezoning is done. He said if the rezoning of the proposed PMUO is not consistent with the Comprehensive Land Use Plan, then it should probably be denied on that basis. He said there are a number of issues that can arise if the development is built, but the issue right now is whether to give the rezoning to make that even possible. Chair Jenkins stated correct. Mr. Sturgill asked the board to please reject it on the basis that it is not consistent with your current plan.

**2. James Holby, 3142 Sleepy Hollow Road, Brunswick Hills.** Mr. Holby said when they did the development across the street from me and they promised all of these things as far as the lake that was going to always be maintained, that didn't happen and that thing was drained. Mr. Holby said you're talking 500 homes? Chair Jenkins stated tonight we are talking about rezoning an area. Mr. Holby said if you put in 500 homes you are talking about traffic, two cars per household and that's 1,000 cars. You're talking schools and taxes and I don't agree with it. He said what happened on Laurel Road when they are 20 feet apart, I did agree with it and said ok if it is 2 acres, not 20 feet apart. Mr. Holby said you can't believe everything the developer says because they are going to make their money. He said then the development comes through and I've seen it in Brunswick City and Brunswick Hills, the concrete is bumpy as you drive because they didn't do quality work. He said I know you are all volunteers, but where are the inspectors to make sure that is done right?

**3. Robert Murphy, 4041 Foskett Road, Brunswick Hills.** Mr. Murphy said he is trying to understand that Mr. Terry said that ODOT is going to let him put up a street light on Rt. 303? He said he was going to make improvements to the roads but I don't think the State of Ohio is going to let him touch either of these roads. Mr. Murphy said what I think he needs to do is get his traffic plan in order; submit a new plan and then look at that before we start with this.

**4. Adam Gajewski, 795 Substation Road, Brunswick Hills.** Mr. Gajewski stated I was a member of this board for a long time and I would like to say that you have to keep in mind to not let the benefits of a few be the demise of many as far as the traffic concerns and the school concerns. He said just remember what former First Lady, Nancy Reagan, said about the drug war – just say no.

**5. Kurt Costantino, 4655 Ruby Lane.** Mr. Costantino said we were talking about the traffic at Substation and adding another 1,000 cars. He said like clock-work every other year, Rt. 303 gets a watermain break and traffic goes down Substation and then goes up Grafton Road. He said Grafton Road doesn't have a turning light and traffic was terrible when they closed Boston Road. He said now you are adding that and if they go up Laurel Road, they have a turning lane, but Substation Road does not have a turning lane and Marks Road doesn't so now you have three choke points. He said that it a lot of traffic and it's got to go somewhere.

**6. Rodney Hurkman, 5052 Center Road, Brunswick Hills.** Mr. Hurkman said he would first like to thank the board for voting no on the continuance because the entire plan is a waste of time because he didn't bring it to the standards that the Zoning Commission set forth for our community and for the will of the people and what we want. Mr. Hurkman stated I don't believe he's done his homework and I don't believe he has what's in the best interest of our community. He hasn't designed a plan that would make anyone here happy and that is why this group has gathered here last month and this month, which is probably record setting here for the last few meetings. Mr. Hurkman said based on that information and his lack of planning to bring forth a plan that would meet our requirements, that should just end the conversation now, but I hope you vote no.

**7. Robert Norton, 1593 Marks Road, Valley City OH.** Mr. Norton asked if this plan gets approved, what stops him from turning the golf course into a commercial property instead of a residential property once it's rezoned? Chair Jenkins said if it were to be rezoned, the commercial is only on the Center and Marks Road. Mr. Norton said if that driveway to that commercial dumps out on Rt. 303, would that still be considered on Rt. 303? Ms. Jenkins said if it were rezoned it would be just the frontage. **End of public comment.**

#### **Discussions/Questions by the Board**

Mrs. Wetterman said from what I understand, Map 5 that was submitted extended the PMUO down to Substation Road and asked if that is going to be included in the industrial or what do they have that designated as? Mrs. Wetterman said there is commercial right there on Substation Road and he has a road coming out onto Substation and there is one behind on Substation Road also, that is not under our PMUO as one of the roads allowed for commercial. Ms. Hopkins, CTT Consultants asked to respond.

Kristin Hopkins, CTT Consultants/Terry Properties said at the October meeting we had separated our application for the requested PMUO zoning amendment from the concept plan that's being referred to right now. Ms. Hopkins said there have been comments made by the County Planning Director regarding the layout of this concept plan, so it was agreed upon at the last meeting at our request and the Zoning Commission agreed that we are requesting the rezoning only. She said the concept plan was only to give you an idea of what we were considering, but it was not the concept plan that we were going to ask you to actually vote on. Ms. Hopkins said so we would respectfully request that we would, when it comes time, submit a revised concept plan that we will take into consideration your concerns as well as the concerns of the County Planning Director in terms of where the commercial should be and where the townhouses/multi-family should be. Ms. Hopkins said so I would just refer back to those comments and whatever is showed on this concept plan is more for an idea of what is being considered if the rezoning goes through. Ms. Hopkins said we would be resubmitting a redesigned concept plan. Chair Jenkins confirmed to the audience that we are just considering the rezoning tonight.

Mrs. Murphy said I have a comment about the PMUO District about the roads that it should be on. Mrs. Murphy said I brought this up at the last meeting, but one of the roads is Center Road and this plan has quite a bit of frontage on Substation Road, which is not a main road per the code. Mrs. Murphy said so it looks like it is mostly on Substation Road and then a little bit on Center Road and I have an issue with it being on Substation Road because there will be ingress and egress on Substation Road, which is not one of the main roads or major roads per our Zoning Resolution. End of discussion.

**Motion to Send Recommendation to the Trustees on the Request by Terry Properties to Expand the PMUO**

**Motion:** Mrs. Wetterman made a motion to send a recommendation to the Brunswick Hills Trustees that the request for the PMUO not advance; that it be denied. Mrs. Kijek seconds. **Discussion on the motion:** Mrs. Murphy said so for this application it was under Sec. 406-7 Application for a PMUO Submission Requirement and in #7. It says that they have to include the proposed pedestrian and vehicular circulation system for the project, is that correct? The board referred to Sec. 406-7(A)(7) of the zoning code. After review, Chair Jenkins stated that would be for the site plan or the General Development plan and they have to come back with that.

The motion was restated: **Motion to Send Recommendation to the Trustees on the Request by Terry Properties to Expand the PMUO**

**Motion:** Mrs. Wetterman made a motion to send a recommendation to the Brunswick Hills Trustees that the request for the PMUO not advance; that it be denied. Mrs. Kijek seconds. **Roll Call:** Mrs. Murphy-yes; Mrs. Kijek-yes; Mrs. Wetterman-yes; Mrs. Porter-yes; Mrs. Jenkins-yes. **ZC Recommendation for the Zoning Map Amendment Request by Terry Properties for Expanding the PMUO: DISSAPROVE/DENY.**

Chair Jenkins announced to the audience that the Trustees will also have a public hearing on this once the recommendation from the Zoning Commission goes to them, so it now goes to the Trustees for their action. Trustee Witthuhn said the Trustee meetings are the second and fourth Tuesday of each month and stated that the Trustees will need to announce a public hearing on the matter.

**CONTINUED BUSINESS: PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENTS TO THE BRUNSWICK HILLS TOWNSHIP ZONING RESOLUTION**

**1. Agritourism** – Add new Sec. 303-14 Agritourism Purpose and General Regulations.

**2. Proposed Text Amendments to Existing Zoning Resolution:** Sec. 303-10 (E), Sec. 406-7(A)(1), Sec. 411-5 (B), Sec. 411-5(F), Sec. 703, Sec. 704, Sec. 705, Sec. 902-2 (E), add new Sec. 904-3, 904-4, 904-5, 904-6, 904-7, Sec. 1103. Remove “equestrian activities” from Conditionally Permitted Uses in all Zoning Districts. Gender Neutral Changes in: Sec. 411-6, Article II Definitions Personal Care Services, Plainly Audible, Sec. 303-9

Driveways, Sec. 303-10 (C), Sec. 402-5(E), Sec. 406-1, Sec. 411-5 (A), Sec. 507 (D), Sec. 802-1, Sec. 804-2 (2) Sec. 903-2, Sec. 1001-1, Sec. 1003-4, Sec. 1004, Sec. 1103, Sec. 411-5 (D).

Chair Jenkins stated we have been working on this since the new Senate Bill 75 came out on Agritourism. She said so for the Agritourism and the Proposed Text Amendments on the agenda, I propose that we consider having a special meeting or workshop to review and get it off our plate and make sure we are making the recommendations from the Prosecutor and that Planning Commission. We've just had a lot on our agenda so we may want to continue items one and two. She said in January we will have two meetings, our Organizational Meeting and our regular zoning meeting. Mrs. Jenkins stated there is some language in the proposed text amendments that will take time to review.

### **Public Comment**

1. **Terry Sturgill, 1855 Substation Road, Brunswick** from the audience asked if the board is moving item #2 Proposed Text Amendments to the next meeting. Chair Jenkins stated we are actually talking about having a workshop on it and the public is allowed to attend there is just no public comment. She asked if he had public comment on one of the items. Mr. Sturgill asked what does it mean by removing "equestrian activities" from Conditionally Permitted Uses in all Zoning Districts? Mrs. Porter stated we cannot regulate equestrian activities so that is why we are removing it. Chair Jenkins confirmed that our Zoning Inspector informed us that equestrian activities fall under Agriculture and Agritourism Senate Bill #75 therefore we cannot regulate it. Mr. Sturgill said so item #1 is Agritourism and item #2 is proposed amendments to the existing zoning resolution and asked if some of those are linked. Ms. Jenkins said some of them are and some of them aren't. He said so legislative action at a state level, does that mean that the current codes can't regulate those under the existing code so you are changing them so you can? Chair Jenkins said we are changing language to be in compliance with the new Agritourism and she said the other proposed text amendments do not apply to Agritourism, it's just language we need to change. She said some of it was as simple as adding the word Township and some were a little more in-depth than that, but if you have a specific one, we can talk about it right now. Mr. Sturgill said a lot of my neighbors keep horses and I believe that is an equestrian activity all in itself so what would you change? He said you are talking about removing equestrian activities from Conditionally Permitted Uses in all Zoning Districts and said I don't even know what that means but it sounds like people would not be able to have horses anymore. Chair Jenkins and the entire board said no. Chair Jenkins said it is just the opposite. Mrs. Porter and several board members said they can have horses; we just have no authority to control that under the Agriculture regulations. Chair Jenkins stated our zoning inspector is not here but she has a lot more information on that. Mr. Sturgill said he will send her an email.
2. **Rob Romph, Mapleside Farms, 294 Pearl Road, Brunswick Hills, OH 44212** said Bill Thorne has been representing us (Mapleside Farms) and he could not be here today. Mr. Romph said he did however leave me notes and distributed a copy to the ZC Board members. Mrs. Jenkins asked what he is passing out. Mr. Romph said these are Bill's notes on verbiage and stuff. Mr. Romph said he thought Mr. Thorne had gotten something from the county and talked to them. Chair Jenkins said he's got two pages of notes and that is why we are proposing a special workshop where we can dig into this. Mr. Romph said this is just for your information and these are obviously what we looked over as far as what things came across and we want to make sure we really sharpen our pencils on and look at a little closer. Chair Jenkins said the workshop will be public but it is a workshop and it is not interactive. He said if you do have a workshop, we are able to watch, then do we go again to another open public forum before it goes to the trustees, or will it go from the workshop to the trustees? Chair Jenkins stated we would have to have a public hearing on it. Secretary Milanko stated if you continue the public hearing to the next meeting you don't have to re-advertise it.

**Motion to Hold a Special Workshop on Text Amendments:** Mrs. Kijek made a motion to hold a workshop on Agritourism and the Proposed Text Amendments on Thursday, November 21, 2019 at 7:00 p.m. Mrs. Murphy seconds. **Roll Call:** Mrs. Kijek-yes; Mrs. Wetterman-yes; Mrs. Porter-yes; Mrs. Murphy-yes; Mrs. Jenkins-yes. **Motion carries to hold workshop on November 21, 2019 at 7:00 p.m.**

**Motion to Continue Public Hearing:** Mrs. Porter made a motion to continue the public hearing on Agritourism and Proposed Text Amendments to our next regular meeting on December 5, 2019 at 7:00 p.m. Mrs. Murphy seconds the motion. **Roll Call:** Mrs. Porter-yes; Mrs. Wetterman-yes; Mrs. Kijek-yes; Mrs. Murphy-yes; Mrs. Jenkins-yes. **Motion carries to continue the public hearing to December 5, 2019 at 7:00 p.m.**

**Motion to Adjourn the Public Hearing:** Mrs. Murphy made a motion to adjourn the public hearing. Mrs. Wetterman seconds. **Roll Call:** All in favor. Public hearing officially adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Mary Jean Milanko, Zoning Secretary

---

Sandra Jenkins, Chair

Date