

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

November 12, 2015

The Planning Commission convened in Courtroom No. 2 at Painesville City Hall for their regular meeting. Chairman Komjati called the meeting to order at 7:30 PM. He asked the Secretary to call the roll. Members in attendance were Ms. Leah Kuhlmann, Ms. Carol Fleck, Mr. Mark Wainwright and Chairman David Komjati. Ms. Christine Shoop was absent. Also present was the Assistant City Manager/Community Development Director Douglas Lewis, City Planner Lynn White, Assistant Law Director James Lyons, and Secretary Tina B. Pomfrey.

MINUTES: Chairman Komjati asked for additions or corrections for the Planning Commission Meeting of October 8, 2015. There being none, he asked for a motion. Motion by Ms. Kuhlmann, seconded by Ms. Fleck to accept the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from October 8, 2015 as written. Chairman Komjati asked the Secretary to call the roll. On roll call, Ms. Kuhlmann, Ms. Fleck, Mr. Wainwright and Chairman Komjati said "yes". Motion carried, 4-0.

NEW BUSINESS: (Public Hearing Items)

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT:

- **Review of Conditional Use Permit (Refusal No. 2111) issued to Lakeview Bluffs LLC and Tierra Solutions, Inc.** for soil removal at Elm Street (Parcel Numbers 15-A-019-0-00-013-0; 35-A-002-0-00-002-0; and 35-A-002-0-00-003-0): Permit granted February 21, 2007; reviewed December 13, 2007; extension granted December 2008, November 2009, December 2010, December 2011; October 2012, December 2013 and December 2014 with the stipulations that were agreed upon for the original permit and that Condition #18 be invoked so that the applicant provides a progress report to the Planning Commission by no later than the December Planning Commission meeting in 2015.

Mr. Todd Davis, president of Hemisphere Corporation, developer of Lakeview Bluffs, was present for the meeting. He explained that most of the work done this year was problem resolution but significant progress has been made this year. Mr. Davis stated the project received releases of liability for 80 of the most contaminated acres across the lakefront. He indicated that two other releases are before the Ohio EPA and there is hope that it will be done by January 2016. This will achieve most of the clean-up of the 200 acres along the lakefront. The next phase focus for next year is OU 7, which was actively remediated this year, it is 180-acre parcel dedicated to golf course and recreational uses. It is slowly going through EPA regulatory process. There has been work done at OU 13, the landfill owned by Painesville Township and OU 11, property contiguous to the landfill. There is a 100 acre piece of property, that was just released from liability. OU 5, pending for many years, achieved resolution this year as well.

Chairman Komjati asked the percentage of completion that has been signed off on. Mr. Davis stated the completion of remediation is more than 70% of the site, at least the portions that Tierra Solutions owns and Hemisphere is developing. OU 7, north of the river, will require additional significant, capping activity, however, from a layman's perspective; the significant majority has been remediated. It just needs to work its way through the EPA sign-off process.

Mr. Komjati asked if the property could be developed once the EPA signs off on it or must everything be signed off before developed. Mr. Davis stated yes, development could occur, however, a critical piece has yet to be approved by the EPA; four holes of the golf course. The recreational areas need to be in place before development will commence.

Chairman Komjati explained that he was interested in showing the public that there was progress being made and that there is an end in sight.

Mr. Davis replied that he is very eager as well; however, it is critical to have EPA approval on every step of the process. It is meticulous in nature, given the history of the site, and it is difficult to push the EPA to move more quickly.

Chairman Komjati asked the time period of the project.

Mr. Davis stated from a market perspective, the OU 7 timeline is about two years from final approval and remediation. The total site is over 11,000 acres. It is hard to be patient, but he is optimistic to make progress consistently.

Mr. Lewis stated that the reason the CUP was in place was to move the soil from the south side of the property to the north side. He asked Mr. Davis if there would still be a need to excavate and move soil in the future. Mr. Davis replied yes, the significant volume of soil from the area where the CUP has been granted will be used to do the remediation of OU 7 and the golf course will use a huge amount of soil from that area as well. Additionally, the school district has been offered soil to remediate their ball fields

Chairman Komjati asked for a motion. Motion by Ms. Kuhlmann, seconded by Mr. Wainwright to approve the request for an additional year, with the stipulations that were agreed upon for the original permit and that Condition #18 be invoked so that the applicant provides a progress report to the Planning Commission by no later than the December Planning Commission meeting in 2016. On Roll Call, Ms. Fleck, Mr. Wainwright, Ms. Kuhlmann, and Chairman Komjati answered "yes". Motion carried.

- **Annual Review of Conditional Use Permit (Refusal No. 2227) issued to Steele Mansion Suites, LLC** for operation as an inn at 348 Mentor Avenue (Permanent Parcel Number 15-C-017-0-00-028-0). Conditional Use Permit granted on July 11, 2012. Temporary occupancy issued October 22, 2014.

Mr. and Dr. Arthur Shamakian, 1664 North Shore Drive, representing the Steele Mansion, were present to discuss the CUP. Mr. Shamakian requested removal of some of the restrictions that were initially imposed on the inn at the time the original Conditional Use Permit was granted. He expressed the belief that some of the restrictive conditions placed on the CUP were because the establishment was an unknown commodity. Over the course of the last year, however, the inn has proved to be an asset to the city. He said some of the restrictions limit the full use of the mansion and inhibits the ability to generate income for maintenance of the building. Some of the restrictions are redundant as well. He stated the mansion fits well within the neighborhood and he is hopeful that the Planning Commission will lift some of the restrictions.

Chairman Komjati asked if the reception of the mansion is what the Shamakian's hoped it would be. Mr. Shamakian replied the reception of the mansion by the community has been overwhelming; the event calendar has been solidly booked. The room bookings are slower than anticipated, but they are getting better and he is hopeful it will improve.

Chairman Komjati asked Mr. and Dr. Shamakian if the restrictions of the Conditional Use Permit has perhaps affected the room reservations. Mr. Shamakian replied no, but he does feel that some of the conditions are "silly". The registration of the guests for events comes to mind. In addition, the size of the meetings is an issue. Mr. Shamakian stated that the mansion could accommodate many more than the CUP allows. He believes other sections of the code can take care of issues with crowds, such as the noise restriction code in the City.

Ms. Kuhlmann asked Mr. Shamakian how he feels about the dining stipulation in the recommendation to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Shamakian replied there is a big demand for brunches, and they would like to have the ability to serve something to people for brunches or teas. He would like to have a young chef someday come to the mansion to "set the world on fire". Ms. Fleck stated that New Day Cleveland had a nice piece on the Steele Mansion and it was a positive piece for Painesville as well.

Chairman Komjati asked what projects are in the works for the next year. Dr. Carol Shamakian replied they have bookings out to 2017. They will be rolling out wine tours and murder mystery weekends. This year they became an affiliate of Quail Hollow Country Club so they will be working with Quail Hollow and golf packages available for guests that come in from other parts of the country. She stated that the response of the neighborhood has been overwhelming.

Mr. Lyons asked Mr. & Dr. Shamakian if they wanted to eliminate the last clause regarding the guest register that defines the guests or one that is a participant in a special event or a business meeting offered by the inn. Mr. Lyons stated that is the reason the CUP limited the events to 50 guests. By expanding the definition of guest, the City could inquire if the guest signed in to verify the condition was being followed. It was well thought out. Mr. Lyons asked if the condition was an unnecessary hardship for the applicant and in the best interest of the City, the neighborhood and the surrounding community members to rescind. He asked if it was a hardship to register those who participate in special events. Mr. Shamakian stated it is difficult to supervise guest numbers that fluctuate during an event, especially weddings.

Mr. Lyon asked if the applicants understood that they were in an R-2 district and how the removal of the conditions will affect the surrounding community. Yes, Mr. Shamakian replied; the inside events are not a problem. The outside events should not be an issue either because there is a fence to the west buffering the property. In addition, the pergola and porch on the west of the inn have tables that are positioned as far back as they can be and the neighbor's garage acts as a buffer.

Mr. Lyons replied that if there were more than 50 people, a fence would not adequately buffer 200 people. Mrs. Shamakian countered that she could not accommodate 200 people, but perhaps 150, and they would use the parking area and backyard.

Mrs. Fleck indicated that there is a large greenhouse in the back as well.

Chairman Komjati asked if there were any complaints regarding the property. Ms. White replied no; the Police Department has no complaints on record and Code Enforcement officers have no pending property violations.

Mr. Lyons said that in addition to having a bed and breakfast that serves meals to the guests, permission is requested to operate a food service establishment as well. He asked Mr. & Dr. Shamakian if they planned to operate as a restaurant open to the public. Mr. Lyons supposed that the restaurant could operate for lunch and dinner, seven days a week and declared that if that was the plan, then the inn becomes a hotel. Dr. Shamakian stated that as the mansion operates, she does not have time to do both, but there are guests that would love to come in for a lunch or tea or an occasional dinner, and to do so under the current CUP it makes it difficult. If they could set it up under a restaurant structure, it would allow the inn another level of service while bringing in additional revenue. Dr. Shamakian stated that they try their best to make the mansion the best it can be. They must employ every avenue of income to make it a profitable venture and still be good neighbors to everyone around the inn.

Mr. Lyons asked if there were any limitations of service, could one day do it. Dr. Shamakian said it is difficult to anticipate the dates and times that customer request service. She expressed that she wants to use the space profitably, seven days a week and the restrictions limit the ability to be flexible and limits the income the mansion can yield.

Mr. Lyons stated that the special events under the current Conditional Use, are limited to 50 persons and weekends, Friday, Saturday and Sunday. Mr. Lyons questioned how much beyond that limitation do they wish to expand.

Mr. Shamakian stated the limits were for the capacity, 200 guests. Discussion ensued. Mr. Lyons asked if any studies have been done about the impact to the neighborhood. Mr. Shamakian acknowledged that no formal study has been done.

Mr. Lyons asked how many people typically attend business meetings. He guessed about 50 guests. Dr. Shamakian remarked that she has had requests for 100 guests for meetings, seminars and trainings, on multiple days. Discussion ensued regarding the increased numbers of attendees. Dr. Shamakian stated an increase to 80 people would help. More discussion ensued.

Dr. Shamakian stated there are limits to the attendance because of the way the mansion is arranged, however, she would like to be able to hold simultaneous events.

Mr. Lyons stated that the Shamakians are asking for relief from the Conditional Use restrictions without any real sense of knowing how it will affect the neighbors, particularly those next door. Mr. Lyons commented that they are asking the City to "trust" them.

Dr. Shamakian stated that she would like the ability to make decisions to keep the Inn alive financially. If the number is limited to 50 people, the ability for the inn to survive financially is also limited. She indicated that everyone in the community watches them and they are incredibly conscious how they affect the community and want to do what is best for the City and the neighborhood but still be able to make a living.

Mr. Lyons asked how late the meetings would run. Mr. Shamakian said by contract everything is over at 10:30 pm with a half hour clean up. Mr. Lyons said then they would not have any problem with the City putting on restrictions then.

Ms. Kuhlmann said it sounds as though the main concern is the quantity of people rather than the times of business. Ms. Shamakian said time of operation is an issue as well, especially on Sunday. The time restrictions cut into times of business. She said that she is not able to have fundraisers on Sunday, as she is limited to business until only 6 pm; this is an unfair restriction of the ability to do business.

Mr. Lyons stated that the Shamakians decided to build the operation in an area that required regulations, so an unnecessary hardship must be proven. The Planning Commission must find that it is in the best interests of the City, the neighborhood and the surrounding community members. These restrictions were part of the code to allow an inn to operate in an R-2 residential district. Mr. Lyons stated he is asking the questions to create a record, a factual basis for making the decision that they do.

Dr. Shamakian stated that now they have a record of accomplishment and in her opinion, they have demonstrated that they can be an asset to the community.

Mr. Lyons stated there is a big difference from having 200 people on site as opposed to 50 people.

Chairman Komjati indicated that he thought the restrictions placed on the property are a hardship in the ability to generate revenue, and he thinks that anyone who has been to the Steele Mansion would trust the Shamakian business sense. He added that although the establishment has been scrutinized, there have been no complaints from the Police Department or violations with the Community Development Department. This indicates to him that Mr. and Dr. Shamakian want to be good business and residential neighbors and you have taken the surrounding neighborhood to heart. By the removal of some of the restrictions, this will not create this "big party center" and disrupt the neighborhood, but will allow the business to grow. It will generate additional revenue and put more money back into the City, enhancing the tax base, so Chairman Komjati declared he is in favor of removing restrictions to grow the business. Ms. Fleck mentioned also that a stipulation could be added to return to the Planning Commission in a year's time to review the CUP again.

Mr. Lyons added that he and the City Planner discussed adding a snap-back provision to allow the initial provisions to be reimposed should there be a problem in the neighborhood. If there are bad effects on the neighborhood then the provisions could be reinstated.

Ms. White reviewed the conditions outlined in the memorandum to the Planning Commission. She stated that the Planning Commission is able to modify these conditions if they feel the need. Ms. White also added that she spoke with Building Department and Police Department and spoke with the Fire Inspector, who stated that the Police Department would make the Fire Department aware of occupancy code violators.

Mr. Lyons asked about the number of parking spaces. Mr. Shamakian stated there are 64 spaces in the lot at the inn and they have a written shared parking agreement with the First Church of Christ. If they needed to use the overflow parking with First Church of Christ and the lot was unavailable, then obviously the Inn could not host the event.

Ms. Kuhlmann asked if the condition for signage and guest registry are being removed. Ms. White replied that the guest register is still in effect for overnight guests but not for attendees of special events or meetings. She indicated that the sign stipulation was removed so that they could increase the size of their sign, which was limited to a size of 6 sq. ft. The average sign size in that area is 19 sq. ft., but some of those signs received variances. The largest allowable sign in a non-residential district in the residential section of the zoning code is 16 sq. ft., which she deemed acceptable. Since signage is required to be placed behind the setbacks, a sign limited to 6 sq. ft. is really too small, she said.

Mr. Lyons stated that if the Planning Commission wished, they could keep this meeting open to give the

members of the community an opportunity to comment. Chairman Komjati said he did not believe it was necessary to keep the meeting open, especially since there were no complaints.

Ms. Fleck moved, seconded by Ms. Kuhlmann, that the Commission approve the following finding of fact:

That conditions number (5) Signage, (13) Guest Register, (14) Dining/meals, (18) Special Events and (19) Business Meeting in the existing Conditional Use Permit constitute an unnecessary hardship on the applicant and that it is in the best interest of the City, the neighborhood and the surround community members to amend and/or delete these conditions as is set forth in the City Planner Lynn White's Memo to the Planning Commission that is dated 11.06.2015.

On roll call, Mr. Wainwright, Ms. Kuhlmann, Ms. Fleck and Chairman Komjati answered "yes". Motion carried, 4-0.

Ms. Kuhlmann motioned, seconded by Mr. Wainwright, to approve the Conditional Use Permit for an additional year, with the following conditions, No's.1 through 24, as outlined in the City Planner's memo to the Planning Commission dated 11.06.2015:

1. The permit is for the applicant only and may not be transferred or assigned without the approval of the Planning Commission. If more than 50% of ownership interest is transferred to other than the four (4) identified Shamakian family members, this permit shall be null and void;
2. The parking lot shall solely be used for the parking of non-commercial vehicles and vehicles carrying up to 15-passengers;
3. No commercial repair work or service of any kind shall be conducted on such parking lot;
4. There shall be no charge made for parking in such parking lot;
5. Signage.
 - A. Shall conform to Chapter 1135 non-residential freestanding signs relating to setback and height. Identification signs shall not exceed (16) sixteen square feet in area and shall not be internally illuminated. Such signage may be illuminated by indirect lighting where such sources of light are not visible from adjoining properties or the road right-of-way.
 - B. The design of the sign shall be compatible with the design of the inn, the surrounding neighborhood and Historic District standards, if any. Signs for the inn shall be reviewed by the Administrator and conform to the requirements of the zoning district.
6. Certificate of compliance. Shall be renewed on an annual basis.
7. Alteration/addition. In the event any exterior changes are made, such changes shall match or be compatible with the existing structure and in compliance with zoning requirements.
8. Guest rooms. The inn shall contain no more than 20 guest rooms. Guest rooms shall be contained within the principal structure. No rented room shall have an independent side entrance.
9. Room size. Guest rooms shall have a minimum of 100 square feet per room for single occupancy, 200 square feet per room for double occupancy, plus 40 square feet for each additional room occupant.
10. Length of stay. Guests may not stay longer than 21 consecutive days at any one stay.
11. Character. The scale and appearance of the inn shall remain primarily residential in character. The structure in which the inn is located shall be architecturally or historically significant.
12. Facilities. Shall consist of no more than two residential dwellings on a maximum of two parcels. Adjacent parcels shall be adjoining contiguous parcels that are not separated by a public right-of-way. The main dwelling shall serve as the inn and the dwelling unit accessory to a principal use on the adjacent property may house the owner/proprietor, caretaker, security guard, custodian or a similar position generally requiring residence on the site. The secondary dwelling shall not contain guest rooms.
13. Bathrooms. There shall be one bathroom per two guest rooms. As used in this subsection, "bathroom" shall include a sink, lavatory and tub or shower.
14. Guest register. A guest register listing the name, address, and phone number of all paying guests shall be maintained and available for inspection. A "guest" shall be defined as a person or persons who pay for and have signed the register for an overnight stay at the inn
15. Alcoholic beverages. Sale and consumption of alcoholic beverages to guests and their invitees upon approval of appropriate liquor license by the State of Ohio.
16. Cooking. No cooking facilities of any type are allowed in any rented room, nor is there to be direct access to the cooking facility from any rented room.
17. Commercial use. Up to 25% of the gross area of the first floor of an inn may be in non-living accessory uses, including newsstands, gift shops, lounge, and similar incidental uses provided any incidental service is approved by the Commission and conducted primarily as a service to guests. There must not be an entrance to such place of business except from inside the building.
18. Outdoor storage. There shall be no outdoor storage of materials or equipment.
19. Accessory building. Any building that is accessory to the principal use shall not have guest rooms or be

used to host events.

20. Security. The owner shall provide a security plan that is acceptable to the City.
21. Inspections. The facility must be in compliance with all appropriate health, safety and fire regulations.
22. Annual review. An annual review shall be conducted by the Planning Commission after each year of operation of the Inn to determine appropriateness and compliance with the approved conditions.
23. The Planning Commission, at future annual review hearings, shall have the right to re-impose the deleted conditions for dining/meals, special events and business meetings. The Planning Commission may determine, during the annual review hearing, that it is necessary to re-impose those conditions in order to meet the standards set forth in ordinance 1143.04 and because it is in the best interest of the City, the neighborhood and the surrounding community members to re-impose these standards
24. Special Event hours of operation shall be no later than 10:30 pm with a clean-up no later than 11:00 pm.

On Roll Call, Ms. Kuhlmann, Ms. Fleck, Mr. Wainwright and Chairman Komjati answered “yes”. Motion carried, 4-0.

- **Temporary Structure and Uses:** Lake Erie College was granted the placement of a temporary modular unit at Recreation Park on June 12, 2008 with extensions granted in December 2008; November 2009; November 2010; November 2011; December 2012; April 2014. Lake Erie College is requesting an additional one-year extension of their permit for the modular unit for the 2015-2016 seasons without the stipulation that it be removed by December 1, 2016.

Mr. Reid Guarnieri was present, representing Lake Erie College, 391 West Washington Street. Mr. Guarnieri explained that Lake Erie College (LEC) is again requesting a renewal of the permission to use the temporary structure at Recreation Park. He reiterated that LEC is in cooperative effort with Painesville City School District to enhance the site and maintain the facility. The structure allows for use of the premises more effectively and has been improved and remains in good repair. Lake Erie College funded the sidewalk from structure to track area and is willing to keep the building in a good state of repair.

Mr. Komjati asked the primary use of the structure. Mr. Guarnieri said the LEC training staff uses the space to prepare all their sports teams that compete in Rec Park, as well as the school district. The visiting team uses the other permanent structure locker room on the site.

Ms. Fleck asked for a definition of temporary. Mr. Guarnieri replied “not permanent”. Ms. Fleck commented that when Mr. Guarnieri visited the Planning Commission previously, he asserted that the college was forming a subcommittee to have funding in place, as well as a strategic plan to either incorporate the structure into a new structure or to upgrade the structure altogether. She stated the deadline for removal of the unit is December 2015 and asked how this was coming.

Mr. Guarnieri expressed that it is common knowledge that Lake Erie College and the Painesville School District are of limited resources. The contract that is in place has been fully renegotiated. He mentioned that the college has recently experience a presidential transition and part of the college’s presidential search profile is to procure someone who is a good fundraiser to enhance the tithes to the community. He stated he would like to see a capital campaign created and is willing to push for it to make it happen.

Chairman Komjati asked if there was ever talk of a joint project between the college and the school district.

Mr. Guarnieri responded yes, it has been discussed but there is not much action on it. The baseball coach would like to see a scoreboard placed on the baseball diamond in honor of a LEC student who passed. The baseball diamond has received more focus and there have been more cooperative efforts from the beginning. The dugouts and turf were installed with funds from Lake Erie College. Mr. Guarnieri said he has tried to initiate a plan for corporate sponsorship at the park and create a shared account to make improvements to both programs, but the idea never really took-off and he still thinks there is opportunity there. Mr. Guarnieri stated that so much more can be done and everyone at Lake Erie College understands that.

Chairman Komjati acknowledged that is what is so frustrating about this situation; everyone seems to have a good relationship yet the plans for fundraising and such never materialize. It would be nice if the wishes of the Planning Commission were taken seriously.

Mr. Guarnieri stated he does not take the Commission for granted; he is frustrated as well. The athletic program students raise close to 50 % of the operating budget through letter writing, having events, selling merchandise.

Chairman Komjati stated there is going to have to be some blitz from the alumni association to fundraise enough for this. Mr. Guarnieri stated the emphasis for fundraising is being placed on the presidential search.

Ms. Fleck stated she would like to see a meaningful plan that addresses this problem in a more serious way.

Mr. Guarnieri stated he is limited by the fact that the land is not owned by Lake Erie College.

Chairman Komjati asked if the schools would object to putting a permanent structure up. Mr. Guarnieri stated it has been difficult to schedule meetings to develop a plan.

Chairman Komjati offered that he would think this would be a priority for Lake Erie College, especially the athletic director.

Mr. Wainwright declared he is frustrated with the excuses from Lake Erie College. He said he hasn’t seen any

action towards building a permanent facility and lamented that the discussion is right where it started six or seven years ago.

Mr. Guarnieri stated not having the temporary structure would create a larger burden on the property holder and the parties who use the facility, the students. Chairman Komjati asked what would happen if the extension was not approved. Mr. Guarnieri said they would have to use the structures in place and unfortunately, there is not enough space.

Ms. Fleck asked Mr. Guarnieri if he would be willing to come back to the Planning Commission in a year with an earnest plan. Mr. Guarnieri said he would suggest that Lake Erie College and the school district to have regular meetings. Mr. Wainwright indicated that the Commission cannot impose anything on the school district, as they are not requesting the extension; Lake Erie College is. Mr. Guarnieri replied that both would be affected by this, the school district would suffer as well.

Ms. Kuhlmann said extensions were granted for six years, resources are limited and that there are ideas but no project plan or anything to identify priorities. She challenged the motivation to conceive a plan if extensions keep being granted.

Mr. Guarnieri responded that it is a cooperative effort between LEC and the school district. He said he needs cooperation too from the schools to move this forward. He said taking this structure away will harm people and this is no greater motivation for him. Mr. Guarnieri would regret having to see the students do without: they already do without so much. They are at the mercy of funding.

Mr. Lyons asked how large a building would be required to satisfy the needs of the athletic program and what the costs would be to build a permanent structure.

Mr. Guarnieri apologized but said he is not sure. He believes it is under \$500,000. Mr. Lyons asked if Mr. Guarnieri would be able to assemble a proposal to bring to the Planning Commission in 6 to 9 months, including plans for the facility, a timetable, costs and fundraising efforts. Mr. Guarnieri replied yes, absolutely.

Ms. Fleck asked, should the Planning Commission renew the request for another year, is Mr. Guarnieri willing to report to the commission in April 2016 with a subcommittee, comprised of college personnel and a representative from the school district. Mr. Guarnieri replied yes.

Chairman Komjati asked Mr. Wainwright if the HHS Boosters might partner with the college to organize something that will be beneficial to both the schools and the college. Mr. Wainwright said although he couldn't speak for all the boosters, he did not see why not.

Chairman Komjati stated in April, the Planning Commission would like to see stakeholders, athletic boosters, alumni, plan square footage, preliminary numbers for costs and timeframe for fundraising, ground breaking timetable; a punch list to be held accountable to.

Ms. Kuhlmann said she thinks they need a steering committee for the approval process. Discussion ensued regarding the presidential search process.

Mr. Guarnieri said he wants to make the athletic program something that people can be proud of. Ms. Fleck stated that the Planning Commission values the relationship with Lake Erie College and, if this plan is moved along in a meaningful way, it will lessen the problems in the long run.

Ms. Fleck moved, seconded by Mr. Wainwright, to renew the Temporary Structure and Use of the modular unit at Recreation Park until December 31, 2016, with the following conditions, to be presented to the Planning Commission at the April 2016 meeting:

1. A list of stake holders/subcommittee
2. A physical design of a new permanent structure with cost estimate
3. A strategic plan

On Roll Call, Ms. Fleck, Mr. Wainwright, Ms. Kuhlmann and Chairman Komjati answered "yes". Motion carried, 4-0.

OTHER MATTERS THAT MAY PROPERLY COME BEFORE THE PLANNING COMMISSION

Ms. White reminded those attending the Planning and Zoning Workshop that it is tomorrow.

Also next month will be Christine Shoop's last meeting, so a vacancy will be open on the Planning Commission.

Chairman Komjati asked for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Wainwright, seconded by Ms. Fleck.. On Roll Call, Mr Wainwright, Ms. Kuhlmann, Ms. Fleck, and Chairman Komjati answered "yes". Motion carried, 4-0. The meeting adjourned at 9:21 pm.