



**CITY OF TALLMADGE  
PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION  
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES**

July 29, 2021

6:00 p.m.

Council Chambers

*Per the RC-2 Schedule, meeting recordings and communications will remain on file in the Planning and Zoning Department*

I. Call to Order

Chair Gerald Taylor called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

II. Pledge of Allegiance

III. Roll Call

Commission Members present: Gerald Taylor  
Julie Oliver  
Patrick Larson  
Kevin Heilmeier  
Stephen Ryder

Administration present: Dave Kline, Mayor  
Megan Raber, Law Director  
Helene Hussing, Planning & Zoning Manager  
Michael Rorar, Director of Public Service  
Matt Springer, Economic Developer

IV. Agenda Additions

None

V. Correspondence and Communications

**Received a memo from the Planning and Zoning Manager regarding Additional Zoning Code Edits and 2 additional documents corresponding with the memo.**

VI. Cases

**Item PZ 21-07-05 Amendment to the Zoning Code Text**

City of Tallmadge, applicant/owner

**Proposed Zoning Code**

- For review & recommendation

Mrs. Hussing gave a short summary of the process for the discussion and introduced the changes to the Draft Zoning Code text dated June 28, 2021 which had been distributed for the joint workshop held on June 30<sup>th</sup>

*Changes and discussion*

1. Administration & Procedures

- a. **P. 19-Section 1102.12 Conditional Uses D Application and Review Procedure, (2) v, ...sign posting on the property indicating a ~~zoning change~~ conditional use request and website for information.**

2. Zones & Overlay Districts

- a. Section 1103.06 – to be modified – changes are forthcoming and will include
  - i. adjustments to the standards of the R-6 to more closely meet the purposes of the R-6 regulations.
- b. Section 1103.07 – correction to Title from Residence to Residential
- c. **P. 67-Section 1103.12 Design Control Overlay District (O-DC), K Development Standards for Height and Mass, a correction to the graphic to show a 3-story building.**

- d. **P. 71 & 80**-Section 1103.14 Neighborhood Center Overlay (NC-O), addition of Restaurants to the Building Typologies.
- e. **P. 77**-Section 1103.16 West Avenue Overlay (WA-O), addition of Mixed Use to the Building Typologies with a note that this excludes Residential Uses.

Mr. Larson: So the definition of mixed use is industrial/commercial... that type of zoning without residential. Is there any place in here... we've talked about mixed use before, and sometimes there's always a residential component as part of it?

Mrs. Hussing: Yes, that would be in the neighborhood center overlay. There the mixed use could be a residential and commercial use, for example.

Mr. Larson: How do we differentiate between the two?

Mrs. Raber: Because of how it's written in the code. The definition of mixed use is it's a mixed use. It's more than one type of use. The type of use would be defined by the overlay district itself.

Mayor Kline: On the Rocco skating plaza, up against the residential houses in the back, would we not allow some type of living space on the back half, working forward to the commercial mixed use out front?

Mrs. Raber: Right now the answer is no.

Mr. Taylor: Isn't the whole property zoned C-3 and C-4 all the way to the residential?

Mrs. Hussing: I believe so.

Mr. Ryder: Isn't the boundary of the overlay that extends to the back of that property? The overlay district is defined by a boundary, right?

Mrs. Raber: The overlay boundaries are going to be the next step in the process. That hasn't been totally laid out right now, but because it's zoned commercial, I would anticipate that that property would be subject to the overlay.

Mr. Ryder: Can we take that to Council or maybe decide a modification to the boundary or...?

Mrs. Raber: The overlay district boundary has not been determined at all. We have not mapped that for any of the new overlay districts.

### 3. Use Regulations

- a. **P.102**- In the Use Matrix (1104.05 D) Beverage – Microbrewery, Microdistillery or Microwinery have been updated as Permitted Uses rather than Conditional Uses in the West Avenue, Neighborhood Center and Design Control Overlay Districts.

Mr. Larson: If you have a Microbrewery, Microdistillery or Microwinery, does that mean that they can't serve food?

Mrs. Raber: If you look at the criteria or conditions for those uses, they are allowed to serve food.

Mr. Larson: What would be the difference between a Microdistillery serving food and a sit-down restaurant?

Mrs. Hussing: It's not a sit-down restaurant. It would be a liquor and beer sit down bar establishment. That is use standard 13. There are standards that they would have to comply with.

Mrs. Raber: I think the difference is that those are the actual production of beer, wine...

Mrs. Hussing: It's in section 1104.

Mr. Larson: The only reason I ask is that you've permitted the Microdistillery use but you've conditionally permitted the sit-down restaurant.

Mrs. Hussing: Not the sit-down restaurant, the sit-down bar.

Mrs. Raber: So now the restaurants, we will allow as a permitted use so instead of people having to come for fine dining because they have a restaurant and want to be able to sell alcohol, they would be permitted to do that. It would only be conditional if somebody comes and just wants to have a bar establishment but they're not having any food production.

Mrs. Hussing: Just to follow up on that, just because they don't have to come before you, they still have to comply with the standards that are listed in our Zoning Code, and they still have to apply for their liquor licenses and go through Council and all those steps that they have to take. We just want to take the conditional zoning off of restaurants to serve alcohol. We also added that the establishment shall not be located 500 ft (increased from 250 ft) to any adult entertainment business including those located beyond the City boundary.

Mr. Taylor: So a Microbrewery and a Microdistillery, they have a bar with sit down for maybe tasting type thing. Would they be purchasing drinks there or purchasing whole bottles to take out?

Mrs. Raber: It would depend on what their liquor license would allow but yes and usually they do.

Mr. Taylor: So the food associated with that type of establishment would not be formal dining, it would be snacks?

Mrs. Raber: It depends. I've seen it done different ways at different establishments. It just depends on what their model is but we're allowing for that flexibility.

Mr. Ryder: How about production? If they're shipping product out or...some of them are like a warehouse. Does that cover that?

Mrs. Raber: So right now if they were going into an area...they would have to decide what would work for them. I suppose right now...I would think that most of them don't probably have such large output that they need a large amount of trucks, but I guess if they did... if they were changing anything to the building to accommodate that, it would be the same as any other Site Plan Review. If they fit it into something that didn't need a Site Plan Review and is existing, then I suppose that is something for us to contemplate as an area of concern.

Mayor Kline: I think it would be beneficial if the front half of their building would be a tasting of what they are producing in the back but then the state laws would dictate the vats that they use and the building codes would provide all that and they would ship out cases of whatever product they are doing.

Mrs. Hussing: If there was no tasting or anything, it probably would fall under warehousing and distribution.

Mrs. Raber read off the definition of a Microbrewery, Microdistillery or Microwinery as called out in the Draft Code.

- b. **P. 106-** In the Use Matrix (1104.06 A) Alcohol Beverage Consumption (ABC) has been updated as Permitted Uses rather than Conditional Uses in the West Avenue, Southeast Gateway, Neighborhood Center and Design Control Overlay Districts.
- c. **P. 137-** (13) Beverage Sales - Liquor and Beer Sit Down/Bar Establishment & (14) Beverage - Microbrewery, Micro-distillery or Micro-winery, an additional standard requiring compliance with 1104.08 Y Alcohol Beverage Consumption
- d. **P. 147-** In the standards for the uses of 1104.07 E (33) Sexually Oriented Business, the standard *No such business shall be located on any lot within 1,000 feet of any other sexually oriented business* was added
- e. **P. 169-**In the standards for the uses 1104.08 Y Alcohol Beverage Consumption,
  - i. (5) ii, an increase of 250 feet to 500 feet from any Adult Entertainment Business.
  - ii. (5) iii, the noise levels generated by the operation of the establishment shall not exceed the level of background noise normally found in the area or would otherwise be intrusive, with exception to when a temporary permit for amplified sound is attained.

- iii. (5) iv, signs and other advertising on the exterior of the premises would be compatible with the character of the area.

4. Off-Street Parking – None

- a. Not changed in the draft but new item in our Zoning Code: 1105.02B - Parking of Recreational Equipment. The parking of recreational equipment and vehicles up to 25 feet in length and/or 10,000 pounds gross vehicle weight, including but not limited to travel trailers, motor homes, pickup campers, folding tent trailers, boats or boat trailers, and other similar recreational equipment and vehicles, semi-trailers, travel trailers, or other trailers or motor homes shall not be permitted on any street within the City, other than for the purpose of loading or unloading such equipment or vehicle. When located on property in a residential district for the purpose of loading or unloading, travel trailers, motor homes, boats or boat trailers, and other similar recreational vehicles shall not exceed a loading or unloading time of 72 consecutive hours. Under no circumstances shall any recreational vehicle or equipment be occupied or used for living, sleeping, housekeeping, storage or business purposes.

Mayor Kline: So, this is going to affect a lot of Tallmadge residents who have trailers and boats sitting in their driveway. Some are out there all summer long, some are there all year long. When you talk about it, it's a great thing because people get mad because this thing has been sitting on this driveway all year and I think they're living in it and so then we have to go investigate. I don't know how Code Enforcement could enforce this. 72 hours I just don't think is a good time amount. I know some people that bring them out for the summer months then put them back in storage. Some people put a blue tarp over it in their driveway and that's what we're trying to prevent. Some people building all new driveways so they can park on it. We'd really you're your input and what you guys are thinking.

Mrs. Oliver: My first question is, are we anticipating more Code Enforcement Officers being out there and looking for this or receiving complaints from citizens?

Mayor Kline: I think its complaint driven, but it is in the Code. This is one of the hard things in the Code. A lot of the allotments that have deed restrictions prohibit that.

Mr. Larson: But you know no one pays attention to deed restrictions. We can sit up here and make all the rules we want but if we don't have the ability to enforce it, is this something that can be a deterrent?

Mayor Kline: I like the idea of having some control over it but is 72 hours... or should it just be the summer months?

Mr. Larson: I'll give you an example. Back when my kids were young, we would take our camper out in the back yard and pop it up and the kids would sleep out. That would be a violation, correct?

Mrs. Oliver: Can I just interject? On my own street, there is one in a backyard that has been sitting there for years. It has never moved one time. Also on the same street, there is a boat and a camper parked in the same driveway, but I looked at them and neither of them is more than 25 feet long, so this does not address that. They've been sitting there, and the weeds are growing around them in the driveway but that doesn't address that so I'm going to say your camper wasn't more than 25 feet, so I don't know that you violate any portion of this. So it's only addressing those really large... Personally the very large motor home in the back yard doesn't really bother me that much because it's hidden away. I'm probably more upset by the very much smaller 2 that are down the street. I think a lot of people are going to report things that are not addressed on this versus the ones that are really in violation.

Mr. Heilmeier: What's the penalty?

Mrs. Raber: You go to the penalty section and all the penalties for any violation of the code is outlined there.

Mr. Heilmeier: If somebody calls up and says someone is in violation and we agree they're in violation, we go out to them, do we issue a ticket or a warning?

Mrs. Raber: The administrative procedure provide for notice then once they get notice, they have a chance to get into compliance and if they don't, then they can get cited for failure to comply with the Zoning Inspector and then they can get taken to court for failure to comply.

Mrs. Hussing: Our office does try to work with them before we give notice. First, we just have a friendly talk.

Mr. Heilmeier: I understand that. So this does not apply to a motorhome that's parked in the backyard or out of sight?

Mrs. Raber: Technically this does not specify back or front yard. So if somebody calls to complain about something in the backyard, technically it's in the residential area.

Mr. Ryder: If there is a building built specifically for it, it doesn't cover something like that?

Mrs. Raber: Well if it's enclosed...

Mr. Heilmeier: Well BZA approved a building for someone on Southeast to keep his camper in, but I see it sometimes during the summer up close to the house. So you're saying he would need to put it back in that building every 72 hours and your suggestion is 72 hours isn't long enough or too long?

Mayor Kline: Should we extend that longer?

Mr. Ryder: I would be in agreement to extending that to 30 days or something like that. Just give them more time because there are people who take them out to prep them and 72 hours seems kind of limited.

Mrs. Oliver: So if we would extend the time frame to 20 days for example... they have it out there for 20 days, they then remove it for 24 hours... does their 30 days start over again?

Mr. Heilmeier: I think this is a bigger problem than everyone is anticipating.

Mr. Larson: Was this put into the code for a specific reason?

Mayor Kline: It is complaint driven.

Mr. Larson: Ok, because I'm just wondering... up my street there is a guy that's got a boat in his backyard. He's got a building, but the boat is outside the building. I don't pay attention to it, so I don't know if he uses it every weekend and he moves it.... So, there is a situation that it's a recreation vehicle in the summertime possibly could be moving back and forth because they don't have any place to put it in, but they're going to be camping every other weekend.

Mrs. Oliver: But is it over 25 ft long? I've got a boat and a camper in one driveway, and they can't even pull in their own driveway fully, but I look at them and they're perfectly in compliance because they are not over 25 ft. Combined, they are more than 25 but that's the point. This does not apply to as many things as we think.

Mr. Larson: I think we're probably more worried, not about the active recreational guy who is using his boat or his motorhome during the summer months... we're worried about those that it never leaves, and I do think that 72 hours is too quick. 30 days is more reasonable.

Mayor Kline: We will look at it. It's in front of Council next week so we'll talk about it there too and come back to you on the September meeting.

Mr. Taylor: I'm not in agreement with 30 days or 72 hours. Maybe more like 15 days... the guy could move his trailer and bring it back 2 days later and start the clock over again. I have a guy in my neighborhood that has one over 25 feet and it sits there all summer and goes out maybe twice then it sits there all winter. Then another guy has a smaller one, under 25 ft, and he moves it in and out every other week. I guess we are looking at the big mammoth vehicles.

Mrs. Raber: So, 25 ft is not that long for a camper. The RVs are going to be over that fairly easily. I think most boats and trailers would fall under the 25 ft. I think in our garage sale section, we have not only consecutive days but also a total number of days, so maybe building in something like that with a little bit more flexibility for people but it still have a caps of total number of days in a calendar year. I personally don't like the first sentence because it should stop at "you're not allowed to park it on the street" period. And maybe we should say "when located in the front yard setback of a residential district, It can't be longer than..." and so that also gives people an opportunity if they can, to store it in their backyard or out of sight.

Mr. Ryder: So if you have an extra long driveway or a carport to store those things... those are the people that are going to be mad about this.

5. Landscaping & Buffering – None
6. Open Space Standards – None
7. Signs
  - a. Clarification to the measurement of Clearance. For a Freestanding Sign, the Maximum Clearance is 4 feet. For Projecting signs and Awning signs, the Minimum Clearance is 8 feet.
  - b. Sign definitions, related to Freestanding vs. Monument vs. Pole Signs. In the glossary, monument and pole signs were a sub-type of freestanding. However, in the text, we specifically identify monument and freestanding as separate signs, with no mention of pole signs. The glossary has been adjusted so there are just the two sign types (not subtypes of anything). Pole sign refers back to freestanding sign
8. Historic Regulations – None
9. City Development Standards – None
10. Appendix
  - a. Addition of definitions for:
    - i. Apiculture
    - ii. Ungulates
    - iii. Poultry and Fowl

**Additional material from Memo:**

2. Section 1104.07 B (7): Use Regulations, Principal and Conditional Use-Specific Standards, Poultry & Fowl  
The addition of a non-conforming clause that would limit the use to the life or presence of the animal on the property.

Mr. Larson: At the very beginning it says poultry and fowl and then it says similar farm animals. What does that mean, and do we want to define?

Mrs. Raber: Poultry, fowl, ducks, geese, swans.... Birdish categories. Peacocks...like kind is what we're thinking. We may want to change it from similar FARM animals and just say similar animals. So a type of bird we're not envisioning as a farm animal but is proposed.

Mr. Larson: Well I'll give you a great example. A predator... an eagle, a hawk... those type of things. I don't know that you'd want to encourage that.

Mr. Ryder: What about turkeys?...

Mrs. Raber: I mean... I don't know if the coop size would be sufficient for some of those but that's why we do state as maintained per the regulations of Ohio Department of Health so we also have that going for us that they would have to meet those conditions.

Mrs. Hussing: We did add the slaughtering of animals shall be prohibited because we do get complaints in our office about that.

Mr. Taylor: Do we cover anything about people that hunt deer and bring them back to their house and slaughter them there? It happens in Brimfield and Suffield.

Mr. Larson: It's happening in Tallmadge right now.

Mrs. Raber: That is meant to deal with the chickens but that does not include the deer which has been happening in the City for years and years and to regulate that would open quiet the discussion.

3. Section 1104.07 B (7): Use Regulations, Principal and Conditional Use-Specific Standards, Ungulates

- The distinction between larger and smaller ungulates.
- The maximum limit for one acre is increased to 2 animals under 500 lbs. It has come to our attention that as goats are herd animals and companion goats. If by themselves, they tend to be very noisy and possibly destructive as they are seeking attention. They may even die from loneliness if kept solo.

1. Section 1103.06: R-6 Residential Open Space Development District

Pg. 44: Changed min acreage to 100 acres.

Pg. 45:

- A table has been added to create a Dwelling Unit Area Distribution.
- The smallest size is set as a maximum %.
  - This is considered to be approximately a 20x30 townhome (2 story). The minimum 1st floor considers how an embedded garage may impact first floor livable area.
- Larger sizes are set as minimum % to require a mix, while also allowing flexibility.

Pg. 46: The text requiring 30% of lots meets the base district lot size requirements remains.

Pg. 49: Additional text with a scaled timeline for expiration of approved plans by project size.

- Note: 1102.14 step 5 speaks to PZC may require the FDP be submitted in phases, which in that case the plats will be phased as well. Under the current language, it would be based on how the city wants the FDP to be phased. A phased approach would likely be desirable for larger projects and the increased acreage of 100 acres.

Mr. Larson: I've had several conversations about this since we actually passed this legislation. My interpretation from the beginning was that when R-6 was born, that it was designed to take a challenged piece of property and allow the developer to work around the challenges to accomplish a project and develop a piece of land that normally under normal conditions couldn't be done. So, we come to the Tallmadge Reserve Development, and in my opinion, what the developer did was exploit the R-6 Zoning to his benefit by cramming all the houses on the developable piece of property and not even worrying about the back piece of property that is challenged. I could be wrong, but my point is this: let's just say we have a 100-acre parcel of property that wants to be developed and there's a determination that there are spots within the property that have challenges. I think I would much rather see, and I'm not sure how we would accomplish this, I would much rather see the developer come to us and say on this 100 acres that we want to develop that's R-1, these are the challenged areas, and we spot R-6 only for those areas. Instead of coming up with an arbitrary number, a percentage, because they may or may not be fair to the developer if 50% of the land is not buildable. My point is, if they come back and say we've got a wetland area here and here and a stream here and we decide that there's maybe 20 acres of that 100 that can't be as developed as an R-1, for example, then that's the criteria we use to give him the R-6 overlay for only that portion of that property that can't be developed under normal conditions. So, I know that you've worked hard on writing and rewriting and rewriting, I'm just offering that as a suggestion while we're going through this process... could that possibly

be a way to address what portion of a big parcel of property can be actually zoned R-6 for the overlay.

Mayor Kline: R-6 was designed to try to keep as much open space as possible and to get around amenities that we don't really want to destroy, but we wanted to keep and so therefore, my analogy... I point out a table and that's 100 acres, you're allowed to build 200 houses on the cookie cut or you can do half of them on half that table, but you leave half that table open space and keep the amenities, keep the streams but not just because it was unbuildable. So, R-6 was really to create bigger open spaces. That was the intent.

Mr. Larson: From my recollections of the discussions that we had, that was not how I recollect how that was passed.

Mrs. Raber: If you actually look at the R-6 the whole goal and purpose section, that part hasn't changed. That was not rewritten. That may have been one of the things that was discussed, I don't know, but the purposes are multifaceted.

Mr. Larson: But one of the major areas of concern was working around challenged portions of land.

Mayor Kline: And before, on a standard, you weren't allowed to use wetlands as your open space, but R-6 would allow that. There was a lot of discussion and I know our whole zoning code for the past 2½ years... this is a real important section of the code, but the code is 300 and some pages and this is 5 pages and Council is very concerned about these pages and so is Planning and Zoning and that's why we've asked to tweak it. Square footage of homes, we were concerned they weren't big enough. Nowadays, people don't want big open lots, some do some don't, and they're moving like hotcakes. This same type of development is going up all over Summit County. They're just adding these small lots with big homes.

Mrs. Raber: So, part of the changes reflected from the last time we met were to require a percentage of the property to be larger lot size by saying that they had to have that base zoning percent. I think 30% was called out and then the other change was to increase that square footage. However, I think we may have overshot slightly and so in discussing it, I think the change that you will see for your review now has more flexibility built in, but it has a maximum and a minimum of sizes, so it gives flexibility. For example, a single-family ranch home that would be potentially designed for seniors, actually have some of that housing stack, that would allow for those ranch homes to be built. The last amendment we made would not allow for that as a possibility. It was just too large of a square footage for that type of style but still building in that high end and requiring a certain percentage of that to be done that way. The other big change we made on the R-6 would be to say that it has to come with 100 acres. So, before the amount of acreage you could come with was 30 and now, we're saying that has to be 100 acres so that we can kind of see a bigger picture of what the development is. The other modification is to allow the builder a longer amount of time if they come with bigger amounts of property. In other words, trying to drive more master planning and comprehensive planning for as much as we can see in advance as possible so that we can really lay that out, that reward for coming with more property would be that they would have a longer time to build that.

Mr. Ryder: It think just to add to what Pat was saying, I think it would be helpful for this Commission to understand the objection to those types of developments when you're going with R-3 because my understanding is that they're a conservation development, so you are trying to preserve some element of that site. Whether it's farmland or wetlands or wooded areas, and it really needs a vision of what they're trying to accomplish by developing it with the larger lot sizes or smaller lots sizes, wherever you're going with that. I didn't see it with Ripley... I didn't see the vision for that, and I think it would be helpful for this Commission that they come with a plan that explains that "we're trying to preserve this element, and this is why we're doing it, and this is why we're using these pieces of the code".



Mrs. Raber: Well, yes that's a part of it but it's also partly to allow for flexibility in how it's built and quite frankly the cost of infrastructure for developments is so high at this point that they need some flexibility to where they don't have to necessarily put as much infrastructure in and in addition it seems like it's a popular thing right now. So, I think all those things come in to play. I think the intent of the R-6 was to allow for 1 more tool in the toolbox. To allow for a copesetic relationship between the City wanting to drive some development but also allowing the developer to have some flexibility in doing that development.

Mrs. Hussing: And I just want to add that the R-6 works in tandem with the open space chapter as well, which we have really beefed up. So, it will allow more of community spaces and spaces that each resident would be able to get to much easier and not that it's all in the back, that type of thing.

Mrs. Oliver: And I guess going back to some of the really great points you made Megan, our code, we can put anything we want out there as far as how we're going to restrict these developers but they're going to drive what needs to be done and what will actually happen, so we have to have something that, as you say, is flexible enough. Because they're taking a huge risk when you're thinking about purchasing a piece of property, putting in all the infrastructure, and not knowing if 3 years down the road these smaller lots with the bigger homes are going to go out of style and suddenly you've planned an entire development around that philosophy because it has been such a terrific sale in the past. So, we have to put things out there to make sure that they will continue to come to our community and will develop the property. We can put these restrictions out here all we want and then we may never have another soul come in and do another R-6 development because it's too restrictive. I think the direction we're going is great, but I certainly would like to take some time with this before we do anything further.

Mr. Taylor: I think with Ripley, that the infrastructure really drove that development because the back of that property was really not developable because of the sanitary and storm sewer so they pretty much just lopped that piece off of the property and developed the front part. So, in that case we have about 30 acres that's not developed. It's just woods...

Mrs. Raber: Are there any other comments or sections that anyone wanted to raise tonight? Otherwise what we would ask you to do is to get us feedback as quickly as possible because our next steps would be for this to go... it will stay in front of Council for a while. We would probably bring it back to you and we would ask for your recommendation to further it to Council at your September meeting and so we are looking to have any final edits before you make that recommendation so that when Council gets it, it's the recommendation that they're actually looking at and reviewing. So, the sooner the better if there is anything else.

Mr. Ryder: I have 1 comment, maybe just to get an understanding or a definition. This is on page 44 under the lot building standards table. For the minimum open space... 30% of gross development. Does that mean the area that's developed or maybe that should read 30% of the entire subdivision? I'm thinking the gross development area is the area that's actually developed with housing.

Mayor Kline: That is the total area of the subdivision, including public rights-of-ways. We went from the 30... the old subdivision regulations, you weren't allowed to use the public rights-of-ways or that open space, it had to be separated. R-6 allowed it to be gross area and now we went from 30 to 100.

Mr. Larson: Would we maybe want to point the definition of that back to the first line if we either call it the minimum project area or the gross acreage, just for clarification?

Mrs. Raber: Yes, I think that's a great point.

***The following motion was made by Mr. Heilmeier and seconded by Mrs. Oliver:***

**I move to continue this discussion at the September 2, 2021 meeting.**

All members voted in favor. (5-0)

VII. Adjournment

*A motion to adjourn was made by Mrs. Oliver and seconded by Mr. Larson.*

All members voted in favor. (5-0)

Meeting adjourned at 7:14 pm

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Kelli Funk, Secretary

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Gerald Taylor, Chairman