

The North Royalton **Planning Commission** met in the **North Royalton Council Chambers on Wednesday, January 5, 2011**. Chairman Tony Sandora called the meeting to order at 7:03 PM.

Chairman Sandora: Good evening everybody. Welcome to the North Royalton Planning Commission meeting for Wednesday, January 5, 2011. Mrs. Broestl, please call the roll.

Present: Mayor Stefanik, Don Willey, Mike McCarthy, Victor Bull, Chairman Sandora, Law Director Tom Kelly, City Engineer Mark Schmitzer, Building Commission Rito Alvarez, Secretary Julie Broestl

Chairman Sandora: Please stand for the opening ceremony, the Pledge of Allegiance.

Everyone stood and cited the Pledge.

Julie Broestl: I need a motion and a second to excuse Mayor Stefanik from Voting on the minutes of December 15, 2010.

Moved by Don Willey, seconded by Victor Bull, to **excuse the Mayor from voting on the minutes.**

Chairman Sandora: It has been moved and seconded to excuse Mayor Stefanik from approving the minutes. Mrs. Broestl, please call the roll.

Victor Bull:	Yes
Mike McCarthy:	Yes
Don Willey:	Yes
Chairman Sandora:	Yes

**Yeas – 4 - Nays – 0
Motion carried. (4-0)**

Julie Broestl: I need a motion and a second to approve the minutes of December 15, 2010 if you so choose.

Moved by Victor Bull, seconded by Don Willey, **to approve the minutes of December 15, 2010.**

Chairman Sandora: It has been moved and seconded to approve the minutes for December 15, 2010. Mrs. Broestl, please call the roll.

Don Willey:	Yes
Mike McCarthy:	Yes
Victor Bull:	Yes
Chairman Sandora:	Yes

**Yeas – 4 - Nays – 0
Motion carried. (4-0) – Minutes of December 15, 2010 were approved.**

Old Business:

Woodcroft Glen, Royalton Road, GB and RMD Zoned. Woodcroft Glen Phase 2 Final Plat approval. **Tabled. No Action.**

North Royalton Animal Hospital – Dr. P. Adam Hchko/Paul Beegan Architect, 9027 Ridge Road, PPN: 489-04-006, Local business Zoned. Site Plan approval for Improvements and Building Addition. **Tabled. No Action.**

Ordinance No. 10-105 – An Ordinance accepting the dedication of 639 feet of Yorkshire Way and 175 feet of Butternut Lane in the Villas of Worthington Subdivision Phase 2B from Pride One York Royalton LLC, and declaring an emergency. **Tabled. No Action.**

Ordinance No. 10-131 – An Ordinance amending the Codified Ordinances of the City North Royalton Part Twelve Planning and Zoning Code, Chapter 1220 Planning Commission, Section 1220.06 Matters to be Considered, by deleting Paragraph (d) Location of Utilities, and Declaring an Emergency. **Tabled. No Action.**

Sunshine Diversified/Tom Unik, 8868-8888 Ridge Road, PPN: 482-12-017 and 482-12-018, Local Business Zoned. Site Plan Approval for Lot Split and Consolidation. **Tabled.**

Julie Broestl: We need a motion and a second to remove from the table.

Moved by Don Willey, seconded by Mayor Stefanik, to **remove Sunshine Diversified from the table.**

Chairman Sandora: It has been moved and seconded to remove Sunshine Diversified from the table. Mrs. Broestl, please call the roll.

Victor Bull:	Yes
Mike McCarthy:	Yes
Don Willey:	Yes
Mayor Stefanik:	Yes
Chairman Sandora:	Yes

Yeas – 5 - Nays – 0

Motion carried. (5-0) – Sunshine Diversified removed from the table.

Chairman Sandora: The applicant is here. Please step forward and present to us which you would like to do.

Tom Unik approached the microphone.

Mr. Unik: My name is Tom Unik and I'm a general partner of Sunshine Diversified Investments and I'm here to split and consolidate the lot and split the parcels so one building is on one and one building is on the other. Thank you.

Chairman Sandora: Mr. Unik, stay up here please. Everything that I'm about to say is my opinion and my opinion only, but I'm going to run through this before I ask anybody anything, okay. Mr. Unik, when you purchased the property you knew there were two buildings on one parcel?

Mr. Unik: Yes.

Chairman Sandora: You did. When did you purchase this?

Mr. Unik: Three or four years ago.

Chairman Sandora: Three or four years ago. Why did you think that you should or you could split into two?

Mr. Unik: Because the way the buildings lie and the way that the lease is currently done, from the fence back that is what the tenant leases and from the fence forward that is what is unleased right now. It made perfect sense that that is where the lot should be split.

Chairman Sandora: When you were here before us before I asked you to think about buying that property on Tilby Road and taking down a house and putting a road in and make a parallel road. I mean have you ever considered that?

Mr. Unik: Yes.

Chairman Sandora: You realize there is almost 500 feet beyond that second building and how many additional parcels could be made on that piece of property by doing it that way?

Mr. Unik: Yes. But the current tenant, AT & T has the lease and they have a four year left and a then a two five year options so, I wouldn't be able to do anything with that property for fifteen years or so.

Chairman Sandora: What are you planning to do with the property now?

Mr. Unik: I'm going to sell the rear lot, the rear property, to an investor, so the operation is still going to stay the same, and then lease or sell the front property.

Chairman Sandora: So, basically if there is one owner there or two owners for one parcel nothing is really going to change? There is no benefit; there is nothing for the City what so ever in any shape or form, because the square footage stays the same. There is not going to be anymore traffic or anymore anything there. So, the City really gains nothing out of this, only you do.

Mr. Unik: That would be for the rear property. For the front property it is currently vacant. So, to put 30, 40, or 50 people in there, I think that it would be a great benefit to the City.

Chairman Sandora: Okay. But what changes if there is one person or two people that own it?

Mr. Unik: Silence.

Chairman Sandora: Nothing!

Mr. Unik: I can't answer that.

Chairman Sandora: Right. Okay. You know, I have to say that this is the worst manipulation of a City Code that I've seen since I've been on this Board. I don't know who came up with this or why, but this is like something out of the play book from Cuyahoga County the situations that have been happening down there.

Mayor Stefanik: Mr. Chairman. That has no relevance to this.

Chairman Sandora: Mayor, Mayor.

Mayor Stefanik: You can have your say but we should stay on topic here.

Chairman Sandora: I am going to stay on topic. Okay. But this is just something that really has been on my mind since this whole thing started here and started taking place here. We are supposed to be a Planning Commission up here. We are supposed to be planning for the community. The best for the City and its residents. Is this keeping with the Master Plan by doing something like this? What other properties may decide to try and do the same sort of situation like this. There is no hardship here. We would be creating a Hatfield and McCoy situation over there. I don't know if anybody has really looked at this plan. Maybe somebody could explain this to me. I'm going to ask all the Board members what they feel about this. I look at this and the way this thing is going to be divided, okay. You have a main sanitary

line, you have a main gas line, and a main water line in there. Are those utilities split now with separate meters?

Mr. Unik: Yes.

Chairman Sandora: Is there a separate line going back?

Mr. Unik: I would imagine so because they have separate bills, everything is separate in the two spaces.

Chairman Sandora: In two spaces. But there is only one main line going back there on that. Do you know what that main line is going through right now?

Mr. Unik: No.

Chairman Sandora: Well, a few weeks I have spent over an hour and a half down at the Building Department and I looked through all the plans from that building. There was a stack about 9-inches thick down there. Where you want to do this property split is where the main sewer line comes in and the gas line comes in. It's right through that 100-foot section where you want to do this, okay. To me this is creating a huge problem over here. First of all, who maintains that 100-feet in front of the first building, the building owner in the back or the building owner in the front?

Mr. Unik: Building owner in the front.

Chairman Sandora: Okay. What happens if there is a problem with the gas, water or sewer line that goes in there? The back building has to ask the owner of the front building for permission to work on these various areas if it goes across there someplace on their property?

Mr. Unik: There is an easement, so that would allow them to use that at any time.

Chairman Sandora: Do we know where those lines are? We do not know where those lines are. They could be anyplace. If the back building lines come through on the other section of that front building and the front owner doesn't want to give that access to the back building then what happens? We are putting the City here in a really vicarious situation here, I feel. This is just me talking.

Mr. Unik: The rear building has the access now. That is there land now so they can always get back there.

Chairman Sandora: What I am talking about is your governmental services. What I'm talking about is the gas line, I'm talking about the water line, and I'm talking about the storm sewer line. How does the property drain. What happens if there is a problem someplace when we are dividing this property up? Everything was fine when it was one building with one owner because if there was a problem or a situation it could be handled by the one owner. Now we are going to have two owners and if they are bumping heads nothing is going to get done. The City is going to be called into it, for whatever reason. Somebody is probably going to question why this was even happening down the line. I don't know. I'm just looking at things in the future. That's what I'm looking at. I'm trying to avert any kind of a problem that could come across. I will ask the Law Director later on what he thinks, but there should be certain things in the covenants of these deeds if this is going to go through. It defiantly needs to be explained who is going to be taking care of what, when and how. To me it is just opening up an entire can of worms here.

Mr. Unik: That currently in the lease. Right now we maintain it but they pay 54.6% of that property, the AT &T, so within the large lease that I review before I purchase the property, all that was explained and taken care of to the best of my knowledge. There is also on the opposite side of the property there is access there too. We put a fence in and have a double opening so that in an event of something happening to the right side of the property you could still enter and exit through the left side. So, there is a secondary exit that could be used in the event of something happening with utility lines and so forth. On the opposite side of the property it is wide open, but they still could get back and forth.

Chairman Sandora: But again it's still go from one parcel to the other. You still have to get the permission from the one owner to the other to even go on it to work on it. Am I correct?

Mr. Unik: Correct.

Chairman Sandora: Like I said, I'm throwing all this stuff out there because I'm trying to, I'm just trying to justify in my mind how that this could possibly even happen and benefit either side so that no side is really gonna be in a harmful position. Are you aware that there are buried storage tanks on that property, all over the place? Underground gas tanks, underground oil storage tanks?

Mr. Unik: Yes.

Chairman Sandora: Now, where are they at? I don't know where they are at. Whose property are they going to be on? If they start leaking or need to be replaced, I mean who's going to dig up and who is going to pay from one side to the other? If this isn't all specifically spelled out. I mean this is a really hard situation here that I'm finding. Again, one owner, he controls everything. If there is a problem he would take care of it. But when you divide it up into two owners on parcel and probably, who knows when, you are probably going to sell the front building anyway and walk away from it. That would be my thinking. So, now we are left with two owners that are going to be bumping heads and fighting. That's my comments. Now I would like to hear from anyone on the Board.

Don Willey: Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Sandora: Mr. Willey.

Don Willey: First of all the public utilities have easements you don't have to get permission from another owner if there is an easement from the public utilities, gas, electric, sewer.

Chairman Sandora: Not on private property.

Don Willey: Sure you do. For instance the North Royalton sanitary system, this isn't he though I think, has an easement to access and service them and same with the gas company and water companies.

Chairman Sandora: Mr. Willey, I beg to differ but they can't come on my property and they can't come on your property without your permission. In the right-of-way they can do what they want.

Don Willey: Well if you get a water leak

Chairman Sandora: It's your responsibility.

Don Willey: Okay, alright. But, the point is your badgering this guy.

Chairman Sandora: I'm not badgering this guy. I'm just trying.

Don Willey: Yes you are. Mr. Chairman, you are badgering him. He is simply trying to create some economic advantage to this property. There is a front building that is empty; perhaps someone wouldn't be interested in it if there were one owner. It's the market ability if it is the possibility all this land behind here where those garages are the technology is changing and my guess is AT & T, from what I understand, that may be converted to other similar type of businesses. I don't see any disadvantage of splitting these properties and enhancing a possible marketability. After all, we do still in this country have private ownership and the Government tries to take away those rights of citizens. I don't know what the big deal is about this, Mr. Chairman, why should we concern ourselves with an event that may or may not happen in the future regarding the economics. We are not supposed to make decisions in the Planning Commission on the economic advantage or disadvantage to zoning and so forth.

Chairman Sandora: That's true Mr. Willey.

Don Willey: I just think that this is unnecessary concern.

Chairman Sandora: But is this good planning? Is this planning in the Master Plan?

Don Willey: I see nothing wrong with that. It is the highest and best use of the land, which is one of the principals of

Chairman Sandora: This is my personally, It's only me

Don Willey: I understand. And this is me personally.

Chairman Sandora: And again, I don't see any difference between one owner or two owners. Mr. Bull, do you have anything to say?

Victor Bull: No comment at this time.

Chairman Sandora: Mr. McCarthy?

Mike McCarthy: I would like to hear a little more. I think Mr. Jordan has something to say and I would like to hear some more about it before I comment.

Chairman Sandora: Go ahead Mr. Jordan.

Tom Jordan approached the microphone.

Tom Jordan: A little history on the parcel. You may have seen the earlier submission where the parcel was halved in two with a strictly rear parcel and a front parcel with no frontage on Ridge Road. While the County, who I spoke to the recorder's office as well as the engineer's office who approves the plats, did find that that first proposal was recorded, which I found surprising because that was the purpose of my phone call. As long as he had a publically recorded easement to the front without any frontage it was a recordable deed. However, it still had problems under the City Code. It lacked the proper amount of frontage and adjacent to the public right of way. The changes that were made basically made it acceptable under the City Code. So, now under the City Code, as well as the County Code, the lot splitting consolidation before you is technically correct. There is no reason to disapprove this lot split consolidation under its current form. Further under our Code I would question whether or not it should be before the Planning Commission. As a minor lot split consolidation the Engineer may have authority on his own to approve it. Only lot splits and consolidations involving five or more parcels, I believe are required. No that it is only two and has nothing to do with variances it may not

or should not be in front of the Planning Commission. As to the economic viability of the parcel, the rear parcel or history of the parcel, as many of you may know, was entirely used by AT & T for offices as well as they had dispatched service trucks out of there. In the rear of the parcel they had a training building. The training building is still in use today by AT & T, as well as the majority of the five acres that will be split. They have poles literally that they train their individuals on and they wish to continue that purpose indefinitely according to the AT & T representative. They just did not wish to own the facility any longer and sold it off some years ago. I think to an investor and then now to Mr. Unik. The front building I have taken a number of businesses through the front building it is three quarter warehouses where they used to put the big trucks for AT & T and about a quarter of it is office space. There are very few companies that will utilize that space. There is however, an existing Royaltan company that has looked at a couple of these buildings and is interested in it. They train mentally handicapped individuals in a bunch of different exercises and would convert most of the space to classroom and offices. They are currently on Progress Parkway and they have looked at the BilMar building and they are currently in negotiations with Mr. Unik to initially lease and then possibly purchase the building. They plan to invest a lot of money into the building and they are interested in making the investment as a lease tenant as long as Mr. Unik was open to purchasing. All those details have yet to be worked out with Mr. Unik. However, the basic issue here is the revised lot split and consolidation technically correct by the County review, and I believe our own City review, it is now technically correct, whether or not the Planning Commission has jurisdiction. In my estimation it is questionable, but I see no reason why the Planning Commission or the basis of the Planning Commission to turn it down. I do believe when it initially came through I had no idea what was going on. I also found it hard to believe, as I indicated early on, that it was recordable. It is now recordable, it is technically correct. I do believe that the continued use of rear by the AT & T entities is a good purpose as long as it gets going and also there is a prospected purchaser on the front. I request that the Board approve of this lot split and consolidation. There is one other issue which I did not mention and hasn't been mentioned so far, is that parcel 017 there is a problem. This lot split, or certainly the consolidation portion, of it has to go through. The building is built over the lot line. 017 and 018 have been jointly owned. 017, I believe, right through the building, you have to consolidate those buildings, those lots. It is technically out of compliance as it is today. Something has to happen here.

Mr. Kelly: Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Sandora: Mr. Kelly.

Mr. Kelly: Thank you sir. If I may, may I ask Mr. Alvarez a question? Rito, have you looked at this?

Rito Alvarez: Yes.

Mr. Kelly: Are you satisfied that it meets our Code?

Rito Alvarez: Yes. My two comments I had prior at the November 10th meeting, the lots that they were proposing were land locked with that back parcel. So, now both parcels are abutting a dedicated street, which is required.

Mr. Kelly: Mr. Chairman. From the Law Department's point of view a few comments. Number one, we recognize the concern that you have with regard to common utilities serving two parcels, if that's the case. Is that what I am hearing?

Chairman Sandora: Yes.

Mrs. Kelly: We know that in fact the sanitary line is one line and it serves both buildings?

Chairman Sandora: Yes. As far I saw on those prints down there. Yes. I don't know if there are two meters. I don't know if

Mr. Kelly: Mr. Unik said that all the utilities are separately metered I wouldn't have any reason to doubt him. You make a legitimate point, a legitimate legal point that the common utility lines serving the buildings that are not subject to easement language, at least not that we have seen. I see you have drawn an easement here and I see that there is an easement for ingress and egress. The common utility lines that would be properly subject to easement consideration is a concern. It is a concern for the community only in the event that there is a serious back up of one form or another or brake down, or malfunction, or something, in only to the extent that our service department then would be called to provide some aid or assistance. But the fact of the matter is and as to this Mr. Jordan is correct, if it is on private property it's their problem. Now, we are contributing, theoretically, maybe contributing to it to the extent that we give an approval for this split, but to the extent that it meets our Code whether you consider it an aberration or whether you consider it an imaginative use of the existing frontage in order to secure the compliance, the fact is it meets the Code and there would be no legal reason to object to it. The commonality of the utility lines and such problems as may occur is first and foremost the problem for owners of the two separate properties in the event that they fall under separate ownership. So, that's really their problem. Primarily first, and legally their problem or Mr. Unik's problem, not ours. You have not sold off one or the other?

Mr. Unik: Not as of right now.

Mr. Kelly: Okay. So, in the event you go to sell it, presumably, I don't care which one you keep or which one you sell, the fact of the matter is in either instance a purchaser would be interested in knowing that his utility lines were properly configured and that whatever easements were necessary to be in place would then be placed in the record and as part of the transaction. Mr. Chairman, I understand your concerns and I recognize that they bare a legitimate review but legally I don't see any objection to the program.

Chairman Sandora: Thank you Mr. Kelly. Let me ask you this Mr. Kelly, then what you are saying in the deed descriptions everything should be spelled out in that deed when they redo the new deed so that each party understands fully what

Mr. Kelly: No, and I don't claim to be an expert in real estate that some lawyers may be, I'm certainly not. While the parcels are under the same ownership there would be no concern raised as to the commonality of the utility lines, but when, if ever Mr. Unik or his company decides to sell off one or the other or both parcels the prospective purchasers are going to have to insist at that time upon cross easements being given. In order for the title companies to give approval for title insurance and so on they will insist upon it as well. So, it doesn't have to be done now but it very likely will have to be done at some date in the future.

Chairman Sandora: Thank you Mr. Kelly. Anybody else have anything?

Mayor Stefanik: Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Sandora: Mayor.

Mayor Stefanik: Mr. Chairman, I do agree with you, this isn't the ideal situation but it is what it is and if you look at what you suggested to take a house off Tilby Road for access that is zoned residential and we would be opening up a whole can of worms over there. Unfortunately, this looks like probably the cleanest way to do it, although it doesn't look like an ideal lot it serves his purpose and really falls under

all of our zoning codes according to the Building Commissioner. I think with that I would have to support this lot split and consolidation.

Chairman Sandora: Thank you Mayor. Anybody else?

Mike McCarthy: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Sandora: Mr. McCarthy.

Mike McCarthy: Going further and following up on what Mr. Kelly talked about regarding the easements would it behooves us to consider requesting of the applicant that he clean up the easements at this time if it's not an undo hardship to make sure that we are doing it if it is easier at this time to put those in place?

Mr. Kelly: Mr. Chairman, may I?

Chairman Sandora: Mr. Kelly.

Mr. Kelly: Here is the problem, he would be giving easements to himself. It really only comes into play and becomes an issue at such time as one or the other or both parcels are going to be sold to different ownership. When you have a common ownership it's really not a concern Mike.

Mike McCarthy: I hear what you are saying but I would hate to be a party to a future transaction whenever that may or may not occur where we could have done something to prevent it.

Mr. Kelly: Well, Mr. Chairman, we could ask the applicant if he would be willing to as a condition of a favorable vote from the commission, to see to it that the appropriate easements for common utility lines are placed on both parties, cross easements.

Chairman Sandora: Mr. Kelly, that is why I brought all this stuff up on the floor. Because of the fact that I am looking at the long range of things. I'm looking at this as to what could happen or what should happen. In my own mind, you are the attorney, in my own mind this gentleman is selling the back parcel right now. He has to go down and he has to do a property description on that deed, if I'm not mistaken. There should be a new deed description on there so when he goes down

Mr. Kelly: Yes. You absolutely correct Mr. Chairman. There has to be a new legal description drawn. Yes sir.

Chairman Sandora: So, when that new legal description

Mr. Kelly: Actually two.

Chairman Sandora: Actually two. So when that new legal description is drawn these things that that

Mr. Kelly: Mr. McCarthy.

Chairman Sandora: Mr. McCarthy has stated and what I am trying to state is if he is going to try and go through with this it should be done right. That is the only thing that I am trying to get across to this Board. Either turn it down or come back and do it right is what I am trying to say.

Mr. Kelly: Respectfully Mr. Chairman, this is right. The issue of the additional cross easements for common utility lines supporting both the properties is not timely, it's not right. It ripens at such time, if ever, as he has a purchaser for one or the other or

both. And that often times is a matter of the exchange process and the fact is that any perspective purchasers is going to insist upon it at that time. Doing it now, can it be done, I suppose it could be done. Is it necessary, it is not necessary. That is just my view of it sir.

Chairman Sandora: Anybody else on the Board have anything? Mr. Schmitzer do you have anything?

Mark Schmitzer: Based on my review, I believe you have seen that, it is still labeled as an ingress and egress easement. The backwards 'L' shaped. It's actually real estate correct? I just want to clarify it for the record.

Mr. Unik: Yes.

Mark Schmitzer: It's not an ingress and egress because you have created the 100-foot that we require by our Code and the 23 to 28.5 foot varying parcel going back to the parcel B.

Mr. Unik: Correct.

Mark Schmitzer: And that will be all parcel B?

Mr. Unik: Right.

Mark Schmitzer: Thank you.

Chairman Sandora: Mr. Schmitzer do you see any problems with any storm water problems? Because that storm water sewer line goes right through the center also on the one side from the back to the front.

Mark Schmitzer: Well, splitting a property I don't see an issue with the storm water. We wouldn't address as there is a storm issue here. We work with both owners and get that issue resolved.

Chairman Sandora: Okay. Mr. Alvarez, you already did yours. Do you have any more comments?

Rito Alvarez: No.

Chairman Sandora: Anybody else on the Board have anything? Mr. Jordan you were about to say something.

Tom Jordan: The only other thing which has been covered was, as soon as the public utilities leave the right of way they are on private property. They are all private utilities once they do leave the property. If there is one dedicated line in my experience that would serve the rear building by itself sometimes there are easements recorded to the rear parties favor, but its probably is that they are all shared in common. I don't believe at any point that if I was involved in a real estate transaction that they would be recommended that we do do an easement on them. With that being said, again I feel the lot split consolidation is technically correct. I do believe a the property stands today it is out of compliance and to deny it at this point you are going to continue a noncompliance. The building is sitting over two property lines. Thank you.

Chairman Sandora: Anybody else? Can I have a motion to approve a site plan for a lot split and consolidation for this property.

Moved by Don Willey, seconded by Mayor Stefanik to **approve the site plan for a lot split and consolidation for 8868 and 8888 Ridge Road.**

Chairman Sandora: It has been moved and seconded. Mrs. Broestl, please call the roll.

Mike McCarthy: Yes
 Don Willey: Yes
 Mayor Stefanik: Yes
 Victor Bull: Yes
 Chairman Sandora: No

Yeas - Four. Nays - One

Motion carried. (4-0) – Lot split and consolidation approved for 8868-8888 Ridge Road.

Chairman Sandora: You are approved Mr. Unik, good luck.

Mr. Unik: Thank you.

Chairman Sandora: Anybody else have anything?

Julie Broestl: Yes. Mr. Chairman. Mr. Unik, you have withdraw from BZA. So, if you could please send a letter of withdrawal to the Building Department so that you can be excused from the Board of Zoning Appeals meeting. Okay?

Mr. Unik: Okay. Thank you.

Chairman Sandora: Motion to adjourn.

Don Willey: Mr. Chairman. We have a couple students here. Are you from North Royalton?

Boys said yes.

Don Willey: If you would like I have a copy of the United States Constitution if you would like to have that as part of your agenda and you will be given a test from page 28 next week. Thank you. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Sandora: Thank you Mr. Willey. Motion to adjourn.

Moved by Don Willey, seconded by Mayor Stefanik, to **adjourn the Planning Commission meeting of January 5, 2011.**

Chairman Sandora: It has been moved and seconded to adjourn. Mrs. Broestl, please call the roll.

Don Willey: Yes
 Victor Bull: Yes
 Mike McCarthy: Yes
 Mayor Stefanik: Yes
 Chairman Sandora: Yes

Yeas - all. Nays - none.

Motion carried. (5-0) – Meeting adjourned at 7:39 PM.

Approved: Chairman Tony Sandora _____

Date Approved: January 19, 2011

Attest: Julie Broestl _____