

**CITY OF AURORA
PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
February 6, 2019**

The Aurora Planning Commission met in a regularly scheduled meeting on Wednesday, February 6, 2019, in the Council Chambers of Aurora City Hall. The Planning Commission Chairman Kathi Grandillo called the meeting to order at 6:52p.m. following the public hearing. Mr. French and Dr. Benshoff were given the oath of office prior to the start of this meeting by Marie Lawrie, acting Planning Commission Clerk.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Laura Duguay
 Peter French
 Sarah Gilmore
 Kathi Grandillo
 Dixie Benshoff

Also Present: Denise Januska, Director, Planning, Zoning & Building Division
 Justin Czekaj, City Engineer
 Dean DePiero, Law Director, arrived late at 6:55 p.m.
 Marie Lawrie, Acting Commission Clerk
 John Kudley, Councilman
 George Horvat, Council President
 James Vaca, Councilman
 Harold Hatridge, Councilman
 Ken Lahmers, Aurora Advocate

Kathi Grandillo swore in those in attendance who wished to speak.

ORGANIZATIONAL/ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Ms. Grandillo opened the floor for nominations for Chairman.

Mr. French nominated Kathi Grandillo as Chairman. This nomination was seconded by Dr. Benshoff.

Hearing no further nominations, Ms. Grandillo closed the nominations.

MOTION: To elect Kathi Grandillo as the 2019 Chairman of the Planning Commission

Mr. French moved; Dr. Benshoff seconded, and the motion carried 5-0 on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Mr. French, Dr. Benshoff, Ms. Duguay, Ms. Gilmore, Ms. Grandillo

Nays: None

Ms. Grandillo opened the floor for nominations for Vice Chairman.

Ms. Duguay nominated Peter French as Vice Chairman. This nomination was seconded by Ms. Gilmore.

Hearing no further nominations, Ms. Grandillo closed the nominations.

MOTION: To elect Peter French as the 2019 Vice Chairman of the Planning Commission

Ms. Duguay moved; Ms. Gilmore seconded, and the motion carried 5-0 on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Ms. Duguay, Ms. Gilmore, Ms. Grandillo, Dr. Benshoff, Mr. French

Nays: None

Ms. Grandillo opened the floor for nominations for Second Vice Chairman.

Kathi Grandillo nominated Laura Duguay as Second Vice Chairman. This nomination was seconded by Ms. Gilmore.

Hearing no further nominations, Ms. Grandillo closed the nominations.

MOTION: To elect Laura Duguay as the 2019 Second Vice Chairman of the Planning Commission

Ms. Grandillo moved; Ms. Gilmore seconded, and the motion carried 5-0 on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Ms. Grandillo, Ms. Gilmore, Dr. Benschhoff, Ms. Duguay, Mr. French

Nays: None

Confirmation of the Planning Commission Clerk was postponed until the next meeting.

AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA

MOTION: To remove DWGM, LLC, 13 New Hudson Road – CZC – Comparable Use (1901004) from the agenda

Mr. French moved; Dr. Benschhoff seconded, and the motion carried 5-0 on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Mr. French, Dr. Benschhoff, Ms. Duguay, Ms. Gilmore, Ms. Grandillo

Nays: None

SUBMISSION OF SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: To adopt the minutes of the December 5, 2018 meeting, as submitted

Ms. Duguay moved; Mr. French seconded, and the motion carried 4-0-1 on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Ms. Duguay, Mr. French, Ms. Gilmore, Ms. Grandillo

Nays: None

Abstentions: Dr. Benschhoff

AGENDA ITEMS

JW Congregation Support Inc., 554 & 610 S Chillicothe Road, Conditional Zoning Certificate – To allow a place of worship in an O-1 Zoning District (1901001)

Amos Nichols, 4230 Lafayette Plain City Road, London, Ohio 43140 was present for the discussion. Mark Stoner, 1593 Bobwhite Trail, Stow, Ohio 44224 was also on hand. They were seeking a conditional zoning certificate. Many of the friends of the kingdom hall work and live in Aurora and were present at the meeting. Mr. Nichols explained that they have sought a property in Aurora for over a year. He further stated that his group has many of the same concerns as he heard mentioned in the public hearing about safety and traffic. He explained that the building is small at 2500 square feet. He expected 40 parking spaces. He stated that the mid-week meeting is usually at 7:00 p.m. and they meet on Sundays as well. He explained that they do not host events, such as spaghetti dinners or raffles. They will use the facility for bible education and ministry.

Mark Stoner passed out an aerial map of surrounding uses.

MOTION: To accept the aerial map for consideration

Dr. Benshoff moved; Ms. Gilmore seconded, and the motion carried 5-0 on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Dr. Benshoff, Ms. Gilmore, Ms. Grandillo, Ms. Duguay, Mr. French

Nays: None

Mr. Stoner explained that the map included the O-1 zoning district and stated that a church exists within that district currently. He stated that the desire was to be approved for conditional zoning based on that fact. He spoke to the positioning of the building. The original plan was to purchase just one of the lots and improve it. The seller would not agree to that. If it was necessary to use both lots, the group would do so. With the idea of bringing commerce to the city, the group would consider using the second lot for that purpose.

Marc Iafano, Design Lead for JW Congregation Support Inc. was present to discuss the application. His address is 4343 Cherryhurst Drive, Stow, Ohio 44224. He spoke about the traffic concern. He stated that meetings are 7:00 p.m. or after. He explained that the driveway was positioned to have the least impact on traffic. Daytime use of the facility was stated to be sporadic. He stated that with the small size of this development, traffic should have less impact than if it was developed as a full commercial site. The group feels that this would be ideal to help with traffic flow and would not make it worse. He stated that 1/3 of the traffic exiting the parking lot would be turning right and going toward Streetsboro and would not create any issues.

Ms. Grandillo asked about the schedule of meetings. The answer was three nights a week a meeting would be held at 7:00 p.m. and three Sunday meetings spread throughout the day.

Ms. Grandillo asked for member questions or comments.

Ms. Duguay asked if the facility would have any additional uses such as youth activities or room rental or sharing with other groups. The answer was no. Occasionally smaller groups of friends 10 - 15 people will use the facility. She asked for the times of the Sunday services. The answer was approximately 10:00 a.m., 1:00 p.m. and 3:00 p.m. She further asked about how many cars/people would be expected. The answer was 30 – 40 cars with 80 – 100 people.

Mr. French stated that he reviewed their website for more information. He further stated that Aurora residents currently attend in Chagrin Falls and Twinsburg hosts the residents of Sagamore Hills. He asked for more information about the congregations that are currently in place and attending other facilities. The answer was that if this building is erected, the group would consolidate to this more central location. The other two locations would be eliminated.

Mr. French asked if this new building would be comparable to the other two locations. The answer was that most of the buildings are this standard size. Mr. French asked about assembly when multiple congregations come together at one time. He asked if they were considering building a facility of that size. The answer was no with an explanation that Willoughby has a large facility used for an assembly.

Mr. French asked if the group has purchased this property. The answer was no but there is a signed purchase agreement in place and they are doing their due diligence to be sure that it is a viable property and can get the approvals needed to build. Mr. French reminded the applicant that this property is not zoned for what they want to develop. He made mention of the re-zoning of this area in an effort with the Master Plan to create a business corridor. He asked if this was a specific area the city is looking at to develop businesses.

Denise Januska explained that the area was re-zoned as office. The office district is designed for offices and some services including medical offices, etc. The area has been zoned office for approximately 10 – 15 years now and can be developed as such.

Mr. French asked Ms. Januska to confirm that the church within the district was there before the re-zoning took place. Ms. Januska verified that fact and stated that after the re-zoning the church became a non-conforming use.

Mr. French explained in detail the conditions that exist during heavy use of the current outlet stores and his concerns for their parking lot at that time. He asked if they had considered that and how they might deal with that issue. The answer was that they planned to work with the local police on those days of high traffic.

Mr. French stated that the group self builds their structures. He asked what time frame was expected to complete the construction. The answer was that 5 – 6 months was expected. Mr. French had concern about a construction site in front of the schools and asked about how the group would secure their construction site. The answer was that they would keep the site fenced-in during construction and they would have someone on site, even after hours to be sure that the site was secured.

Mr. French stated that the conceptual plan would need to be approved through the city.

Ms. Grandillo asked if the buildings that housed the congregations moving to the Aurora building would be rented or sold. The answer was that they would sell them. She further asked if they would be agreeable to hire a security person during the heavy shopping season, if needed. The answer was yes, if needed.

Ms. Gilmore asked if the United Methodist Church on State Route 43 has been vacated. Ms. Januska confirmed that they were closing. Ms. Gilmore asked them if they considered that property. Mr. Stoner stated that the cost of that property is \$500,000.00 and is larger than their needs. The cost of demolition or renovation would not be cost effective. Mr. Stoner also stated that the Master Plan explains that the office corridor is meant for well-located and designed office building sites, to accommodate professional offices and non-profit organizations. He stated that the church is non-profit and the Master Plan offers that provision in the office district.

Dr. Benshoff asked if growth was a goal of the congregation. The answer was that the focus is to teach, and when the congregation grows larger than the facility can accommodate, groups are relocated before expansion is considered. Their goal was not to expand the parking lot or impact traffic. Dr. Benshoff also asked what the plans would be for the building if they do out-grow it. The answer was that this facility would not be increased. The group studies and projects 5 – 15 years of growth rate. They stated that this building would accommodate their needs for a long time. If they had unpredicted growth, they would move congregations to other available facilities. Adding a Saturday service to alleviate Sunday traffic was also stated to be on option. Dr. Benshoff further asked if there was any auxiliary uses for the building. The answer was no.

Dr. Benshoff asked the city if any traffic studies have been done previously that are available to the Planning Commission members. Mr. Czekaj explained that the traffic study would be submitted for study after the preliminary site plan is presented to Planning Commission.

Ms. Gilmore asked the city what needs to happen throughout this process to ensure that the architecture of the building conforms to the Western Reserve architecture that is prevalent in Aurora. Ms. Januska explained that if the applicant receives conditional zoning and approval of a site plan, the next step would be to appear in front of the Architectural Board of Review. Their architecture would then be reviewed using the guidelines of that board.

Ms. Duguay asked if the members go out into the field to share their message after the meetings. She questioned whether the 30 – 40 vehicles would exit together into the field or any persons would go on foot. She also wanted to know how far the groups travel to share that message. The answer was that the friends are spread-out quite a distance. The small meeting will go out between 9:00-9:30 a.m. during the week. Larger groups would go out on Saturday or Sunday after the meetings. That group would not be as large as the congregation that meets on Sundays. Also, some groups meet in homes in other towns. It is not all the friends all at once.

Ms. Grandillo asked for public comments.

Deb Conti, 234 S. Chillicothe Road was present to make public comment. She asked about all the hard surface that would be constructed on the lot and whether a retention basin would be necessary to manage storm water. She was concerned about placement of a retention basin as it pertains to children and the amount of water run-off existing currently on the property with the soft surface that is there now. She further stated that living along this congested area is very challenging giving personal examples of her driveway during heavy shopping times.

Melissa Frost, 29 Lexington Way was present to comment. She spoke about the amount of turn-around traffic she gets on her driveway during heavy shopping days, which she described as every weekend.

Harold Hatridge, 195 Devorah Drive was present to comment. He was aware that traffic and drainage are concerns with this project. He would like to be kept up-to-date on these issues. He asked if there would be a playground area. He further asked if congregations were consolidated, how many more cars would that bring. He wanted to know the timeline for project. He stated that the Western Reserve architecture for the building is a must, reminding everyone that the historic district is just down the road.

Missy Maxwell, 36 Lexington Way was present to make comment. She stated that the current church was present before the housing was erected. She quoted Aurora Codified Ordinance section 1153.04 (v) which states that an applicant may submit an application for a conditional zoning certificate for a building or use which is not specifically listed as a permitted use or a conditionally permitted use in a district. She stated that a place of worship is specifically listed under R- 1, R-2, R-3, R-4, R-5 and Mixed-Use. She asked that the commission stay consistent with code or put the area on the ballot for a community vote to re-zone the property. She stated that this was not the first time an application was entertained for a comparable use and she understood that we have to hear everyone, but it does not fit the zoning. She mentioned how often she must call the police on tax-free weekend and Black Friday. She stated that a lot of the church times would happening during the same times Aurora Farms has events.

Delbert Dunbar, 43 Greenbriar Drive was present to comment. He informed the commission about the water issues the Hope Luthern Church has dealt with. He mentioned lawsuits and the amount of money spent trying to alleviate water issues. He further mentioned the traffic problems that exist without a turning lane. He stated that with more development comes more traffic problems.

George Horvat, 127 Chelmsford Drive, was on hand to make comment. He asked if the group was buying both parcels. The answer was yes. He asked if moving the building further north was a consideration. He asked if there would be consideration of moving the ingress/egress to line up with the outlet stores ingress/egress.

Jim Vaca, 1101 Moneta Avenue, was present for public comment. He believed that Independence Village was mandated to put in the ingress/egress. He further stated that he did not believe that the Hope Luthern Church was mandated to do the same. He stated that when members from Streetsboro come and try to turn left, there will be a back-up. He understood that the site plan was conceptual, but recommended a turn lane. He stated that a turn lane should take care of the issue.

Hearing no further comments, Ms. Grandillo closed public comment.

Ms. Grandillo stated a traffic study will be required and reiterated Mr. Vaca's statement that the rules have changed dramatically since the Hope Lutheran Church was constructed. She further stated that drainage is always addressed in Engineering. Ms. Grandillo stated that the time frame will depend on how long the plans are under review with Engineering. It was not possible to determine at this time. She stated that relocation of the building is a possibility if the project moves forward.

She gave the applicant a change to address the public comments. Mr. Stoner stated that no matter where they would try to erect their church, the same process would apply. There is no area where a church is specifically permitted without a conditional zoning certificate. He stated that the concern pertaining to growth will be addressed by the occupancy load of the structure. He stated that they could not violate that maximum number of occupants. He addressed construction time frame questions. He offered the website for reference. Previous projects are well documented there and they are very well organized and efficient.

Ms. Grandillo asked the members if they had any additional questions. Ms. Duguay asked for an answer to the playground equipment. The answer was no. It was stated that the group is already looking into storm water and Western Reserve architecture. He stated that all those conditions will be met.

Dr. Benshoff asked for a point of clarification. She was not questioning the maximum occupancy load, but the plans for the group after they outgrow the facility. The answer was that they have no intention of expanding this location or parking lot. They would like to keep that footprint. They would relocate congregations if necessary.

MOTION: To accept the conditional zoning certificate application for JW Congregation Support Inc for study

Mr. French moved; Ms. Duguay seconded, and the motion carried 5-0 on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Mr. French, Ms. Duguay, Ms. Gilmore, Ms. Grandillo, Dr. Benshoff

Nays: None

Chapter 1317.01 Property Maintenance Standards (1901002)

Ms. Januska explained that this document represents a group effort between the Planning, Zoning and Building Division and the Law Department to create a simple, easy to understand maintenance code. She stated that the department receives complaints about neglected houses. She further stated that there is no maintenance code in place now and that previous attempts in the past were not successful. She stated that this is a working document that addresses the exterior maintenance of a home and asked that the Zdocument be accepted for study.

Mr. DePiero added that he has worked for 10 communities in his career and was surprised 5 years ago when he began working with Aurora that no maintenance code existed. He stated that Aurora is possibly the nicest community he has worked with and that to continue with the great content of housing in this community, you must have a tool to use. The intent is not to charge homeowners with a crime, but to give incentive to paint and clean up the property. He stated that it is a working document and he believes the city needs something on the books.

Ms. Grandillo asked the membership for questions or comments.

Mr. French agreed. He stated that it was long overdue. He asked about the penalty portion of the document. Mr. DePiero stated that penalties would be reserved for those cases where a landlord will not address issues or repeat offenders may face additional consequences. He further stated that charging a homeowner is a last resort. Finding

a resolution would be the goal. It would not be the policy of the city to immediately penalize someone, but to encourage compliance. Mr. French asked if the penalties were enforceable. The answer was yes.

Ms. Duguay had no questions. Ms. Gilmore stated that she was very excited to see this. She asked about what we have currently to address this situation. Mr. DePiero pointed out Aurora Codified Ordinance section 660.18 that addresses junk vehicles and debris which is not a very helpful tool. Ms. Gilmore asked where you start with trying to approach homeowners in this situation. Mr. DePiero stated that the first piece is an education campaign. A friendly warning with a reasonable deadline would follow. Ms. Gilmore asked if we were moving in the direction of inspecting the homes on a regular bases. The answer was no. Mr. DePiero stated that this might be complaint driven based on the amount of manpower that would be necessary to complete inspections. This would address the worst offenders. Ms. Januska explained currently when we receive a complaint, an inspector is sent out to take photographs and leave a warning. A letter is sent out that usually brings the situation into compliance. Occasionally a ticket is issued for non-compliance, but not that often. This document will allow the department to address gutters and paint, etc.

Dr. Benshoff stated that she was thrilled to see this document. She commented that the stick would work if it was the correct size and used. She asked if there were incentives included. Mr. DePiero stated that the city could discuss and may consider just that. Dr. Benshoff asked about a boat with a tarp. Ms. Januska stated that this type of situation is covered under Aurora Codified Ordinance 1163 – Parking and Loading Regulations, depending on the length and width of the boat. Mr. French stated that some homeowner’s associations address that issue. Dr. Benshoff stated that it might be difficult for those associations to enforce. Ms. Januska explained that this document would represent what the city would enforce and that the city would support homeowner’s associations but that they would need to enforce their own by-laws. When asked about the process involved with recreational vehicle complaints, Ms. Januska explained that when she receives a complaint she sends an inspector out and works with the Police Department to remedy the situation. If a remedy cannot be reached, a ticket can be written and the vehicle owner can be prosecuted.

Ms. Grandillo was excited to see this document as well. She mentioned that Boy Scouts and the Rotary Club may be available to help out.

Ms. Grandillo asked for public comment.

John Kudley, 520 W Pioneer Trail was on hand to make public comment. He stated that this issue has come before council many times over the years and this document may be the mildest rendition to date. He asked for public assistance to be included.

Deb Conti, 234 S Chillicothe Road was on hand to comment. She stated that with a fixed income and water and sewer rates increasing, it is difficult to find the funds to paint her house. She remembered a fund in the past that offered loans with a low interest rate to make home improvements. She asked why the community is not coming forward to help people. She stated that this document could become a neighbor issue. She stated that she has a problem with the word “blight”. She stated that feuding neighbors will use this against each other. Grass and weeds are already addressed currently. However; she was aware of someone who needs to address 6 trees in their yard, but is having trouble finding the funds to resolve the issue. She stated that many people are aware of the problems with their property but cannot find a way to finance it. She was not convinced that you can look at a person’s income and state that they have enough funds to take care of the situation. She stated that accessory structures that are razed may be irreplaceable with today’s codes including hers. She was against the document for the simple reason that it gives the city permission to come on personal property and tell a homeowner what they can and can’t do with it. She did not buy into a subdivision with an HOA. She further stated that with speaking to contractors who deal with communities that enforce maintenance codes, the result is doing the minimum home

improvement to pass the inspection and not completing a quality renovation. She does not want to see that in Aurora. If you must address this, find a funding solution. She further stated that some of the city owned properties could fall under this document as well.

Harold Hatridge, 195 Devorah Drive was on hand to comment. He stated that his first year on council he dealt with a maintenance code. He had 4 – 5 instances within his ward where a maintenance code would have been helpful; however, he is against anything that is really intrusive to the homeowner. He stated that a fine line exists. He was aware that the document is a work in progress, but he asked that administration be careful with it. He asked who would enforce this document. He stated that this could be a good way to get back at your neighbor. He further stated that he was concerned with fixed incomes of senior citizens. He questioned the amount of the fine. He was nervous of the wording that stated the homeowner could be guilty of a misdemeanor of the fourth degree. He asked if there was an appeal process. Mr. Hatridge stated that we do need something on the books, but that we need to add and subtract from this draft. Ms. Januska stated that the Planning, Zoning, and Building Department would enforce the code. She stated that the amount of the fine was not definite at this time and could be lowered. She also explained that the Building Code Board of Appeals would be prepared to make decisions if a homeowner wanted to appeal the decision of the department director.

Jim Vaca, 1101 Moneta Avenue was on hand to comment. Mr. Vaca stated he has dealt with this issue for 30 years. He stated that he was opposed to a maintenance code 4 times prior and this document is not bad. Past attempts were many pages long and based on many different sources. He questioned whether this would cover rain gardens? Stuff on the front porch? Working refrigerators located outside? Cleaning algae growth off your siding? Parking on the front lawn? He stated that Ms. Januska is kind-hearted, but we need to enforce codes on the book. He mentioned some programs he knew of that might provide assistance. In conclusion, he liked the document better than previous attempts. He would contact the department with further comments.

Melissa Frost, 29 Lexington Way was on hand to make comment. She asked that vague wording be taken out. As a member of an HOA, she stated that what one person thinks is unsightly, another does not.

Missy Maxwell, 36 Lexington Way, was on hand to make comment. She stated that under the penalty section, some type of warning system should be outlined. She further stated that a lien might be more appropriate on a property than issuing a misdemeanor of the fourth degree. She stated that HOA's put a lien on the property and that is friendlier. She stated that current code already covers landscaping and that she has been told that the portion about weeds will not stand up in court.

Hearing no further comment, Ms. Grandillo closed public comment.

MOTION: To accept Chapter 1317.01 Property Maintenance Standards for study

Ms. Gilmore moved; Dr. Benshoff seconded, and the motion carried 5-0 on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Ms. Gilmore, Dr. Benshoff, Ms. Duguay, Mr. French, Ms. Grandillo

Nays: None

Chapter 1319.01 Rental Registration (1901003)

Ms. Januska explained that the Master Plan Review Commission discussed this topic. It was further discussed at city council. She stated that a campaign would accompany this to inform property owners of the need to register. She further stated that this was not meant to be a housing code and that there would be no home inspections. This is intended to determine how many and the locations of the rental properties within the city.

Ms. Grandillo asked the membership for questions or comments.

Ms. Duguay asked if someone living in a house owned by a family member would be considered a rental. Mr. DePiero stated that it might still be considered a rental that would be registered. He stated that it could be written in a different way and Planning Commission can discuss that.

Mr. French asked if an Airbnb would qualify. The answer was no. Mr. French asked if the registration moves with the sale of the unit. He was not interested in having homes marketed as a great rental property. The answer was that it would not move with the property and the wording could be adjusted to be more clear on that topic. The registration would end and the new owner would need to register. Mr. French asked what the minimum time of rental is for the home to fall under this legislation. The answer was that it would be added and likely be 30 days.

Ms. Gilmore asked about the wording in (c)(3). It was explained that the registration does not transfer and that anyone who purchases a home and intends to rent it must register within 30 days. The wording may be adjusted to better convey that message. She asked for clarification on how often they must renew the registration. The document stated every other year. That may be up for discussion. Ms. Gilmore asked how to get in touch with owners. Ms. Januska stated that the Portage County Auditor website will list the property owner and not the occupant. This is public information.

Dr. Benschhoff was impressed with the document. She asked if there were standards for rental properties. The answer was no. Ms. Januska stated that the only type of inspection done by the Building Department would be to determine if a structure is unsafe.

Ms. Grandillo asked for public comment.

Jim Vaca, 1101 Moneta Avenue was on hand to make comment. He stated that 1/3 of the city rentals are located in Geauga Lake area. He recommended informing the public by the local newspaper. He was not in favor of the amount of the registration fee. He would like to see it reduced. He was not sure you could find all the renters. On a sidebar, he mentioned having snowplow contractors register. That would be helpful when there is snowplowing damage.

Deb Conti, 234 S. Chillicothe Road was on hand to comment. She could see property owners being offended by this registration and fee system when they are providing living situations for their children. Under section (b)(1) the "non-owner" may need to be clarified. She asked about people who rent a room in a home. She stated she was not against this, but she thought it needed some work.

Missy Maxwell, 36 Lexington Way was on hand to make comment. She stated that she felt the fee was steep and she didn't understand why it needed to be renewed every two years when you aren't asking for the rental agreement. She stated that if ownership does not change, why would they need to renew. She further stated that it seemed like a money grab. She thought some properties should be grandfathered in. She wasn't sure a commercial apartment building should need to register. She thought maybe it might be necessary for single family homes only.

John Kudley, 520 W. Pioneer Trail was on hand to comment. He stated that when council approved the Master Plan they wanted to see this registration in place. This is designed to protect the renter, just as the building codes ensure quality work by contractors. He stated that it may be difficult to prove who is and is not a family member. He further stated that even though it may not be necessary to provide the city with a copy of the rental agreement, it may be worth having confirmation that an agreement exists beyond a handshake.

Harold Hatridge, 195 Deborah Drive was on hand to comment. He stated that he liked the document but wanted to see it tweaked. His main concern was an out of town landlord who does not regularly see the property. He further stated that the rental registration and the maintenance code go hand in hand to make sure the property is taken care of. He thanked the members for the job they do on the board.

MOTION: To accept Chapter 1319.01 Rental Registration (1901003) for study

Ms. Gilmore moved; Ms. Duguay seconded, and the motion carried 5-0 on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Ms. Gilmore, Ms. Duguay, Mr. French, Ms. Grandillo, Dr. Benshoff

Nays: None

Ms. Januska encouraged everyone to email her with comments and suggestions for the documents. She will be continuing to work on the code sections.

MISCELLANEOUS

Mr. Horvat thanked everyone on the board for their hard work and preparation. He also thanked them for re-electing Kathi Grandillo as Chairman. He stated that she does an excellent job keeping city council informed.

Mr. Kudley spoke to the membership about the project at 13 New Hudson Road. He wanted to let the membership know that this project has been in front of Landmark Commission. He stated that the applicant has been very considerate of all the suggestions and comments of the Landmark Commission and the Aurora Historical Society as it pertains to the addition. He stated that they even moved the addition back from the road to address concerns. He wanted the members to have this information in the event that he is unable to attend the next meeting.

Ms. Grandillo addressed public comment by Missy Maxwell asking how to stay informed about upcoming meetings. She was informed to follow the city website for details. Ms. Grandillo also explained that letters go out to homeowners within 400 feet of a residential site and 750 feet of a commercial/industrial site when there is a public hearing.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: To adjourn the meeting at 8:50 p.m.

Dr. Benshoff moved; Mr. French seconded, and the motion carried 5-0 on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Dr. Benshoff, Mr. French, Ms. Gilmore, Ms. Grandillo, Ms. Duguay

Nays: None

Kathi Grandillo-Chairman

Marie Lawrie, Clerk