

## **STOW PLANNING COMMISSION**

Minutes of the Stow Planning Commission meeting held on Tuesday, May 8, 2018 at 6:00 p.m.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mr. Brauer, Mrs. Harrison, Mr. Miller, Mr. Ross, Mr. Sprungle

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** None.

**ALSO PRESENT:** Director of Planning Rob Kurtz  
Planning Commission Secretary Pamela Daerr

**PRESS REPRESENTATIVE:** None

---

Mr. Brauer called the meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 6:00 p.m. and asked the audience to stand and say the Pledge of Allegiance. Roll call was taken.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Mr. Sprungle moved and Mr. Miller seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the April 24, 2018, meeting. The minutes were unanimously approved as submitted.

### **BUSINESS ITEMS:**

#### **P.C. 2018-007 – STOW MUFFLER SHOP – LOT SPLIT; 3265 KENT ROAD**

Mr. Fred Molai, Mr. Gordon Costlow and Mr. James Titmas were present to represent this item.

Mr. Kurtz: This is a request by Mr. Fred Molai, owner of the Stow Muffler Shop for the Planning Commission's approval of a lot split with variances to permit the creation of a lot for his existing business in the Stow Plaza property located at 3265 Kent Road. The Stow Muffler Shop has been in business at this location since 2001.

The proposed lot is 12,000 square feet in area. The applicant is also proposing to renovate the façade of the existing Muffler Shop and add landscaping north of the building. The proposed renovation includes the addition of a roof, new wall panels, and masonry at the lower level of the structure.

The applicant is requesting a variance from C.O.S. Section 1145.04 to create a lot 12,000 square feet in area (minimum 40,000 square feet required); and a variance from C.O.S. Section 1145.06 to locate a building 19 feet from the rear/side property line (minimum of 20 feet required).

This is the plaza, [pointing to the screen]. Additional landscaping is located here [pointing to the screen]. You may recall there was some discussion of closing this one entrance. The applicant can go in to detail with the reason they are not proposing that at this point. Primarily it has to do

with the main plaza owner who desires to keep that access open for his truck delivery which needs that access.

This is the existing shop [pointing to the screen]. What they are proposing is an asphalt shingle roof with new building materials, masonry at the lower level and enhanced wall panels above that between that and the roof.

There was general support the last time Planning Commission met when this was a study item.

Mr. Ross: I would like to hear more discussion on the other truck access point.

Mr. Kurtz: I will let the applicant address that.

Mr. Sprungle: Are there other lots that are similar in size? I find it hard to believe the Mexican restaurant is 40,000 square feet.

Mr. Kurtz: Not in that configuration but there are these lots here [pointing to the screen]. They are probably similar in area; I would guess around 12,000 square feet. They are about 60feet by 120 feet.

Mr. Sprungle: So there is some precedent in the area for some lots that are not standard size?

Mr. Kurtz: That's correct.

Mr. Ross: It appears like it is not a problem, but what is the distance from the new northern lot like to the other existing building?

Mr. Kurtz: It appears to be more than 20 feet. It is approximately 29 feet.

Mr. Ross: The reason I ask that is because under the Building Codes you can't make an adjacent building non-compliant. Since this is a new property line that would have to be considered.

Mr. Fred Molai – 3265 Kent Road – Stow, Ohio, Mr. Gordon Costlow – 1865 Arndale Road #C – Stow, Ohio and Mr. James Titmas – 1865 Arndale Road #C – Stow, Ohio were sworn in by the Planning Commission Secretary.

Mr. Ross: I would like a little background as to why the plaza owners thought this additional curb cut was necessary. When we looked at it before, it wasn't shown. I think we all kind of liked that aspect. It appears without the curb cut the truck traffic still works quite nicely.

Mr. Titmas: (Using the map of the truck traffic pattern.) The problem came up on the traffic pattern because they get several 50-foot tractor trailers in there. They are using this one [pointing to the screen] for the entrance and then they get the vehicle completely out of the public parking area so they can back into behind the shopping center.

This shopping center is unusual in that there isn't a complete drive through with a separate entrance and exit for truck traffic. Trying to get a truck in at the same time a truck is leaving was almost impossible.

Back in 2002, the City required the second exit for the trucks.

Mr. Kurtz: It was not a City requirement.

Mr. Titmas: I know it was approved at that time. It created the opportunity so you could have one location for a truck exit and another location for a truck entrance. Then the maneuvering to turn a, T-shaped type maneuvering was created so they could pull straight back and then back in behind the building. But there is no opportunity for the trucks to drive straight passed, or continuously passed the back of the main shopping center. Normally that would be the case but this is an exception where we don't have that opportunity.

When the trucks exit, typically it is much safer and more direct for them to have their own separate location for an exit. That is how it is being used now. It has been used that way for some 16 years. We have some photographs of the trucks using that for the exit. They're mutual traffic agreements between the parent shopping center and the out parcel that's created so that both can mutually use the paving for traffic and for parking as well. Although, as far as parking, they have the capability of 8 parking places which is adequate even if Fred elects to go on for the additional two bays he wants to add as the second phase.

Mr. Ross: Let me clarify. Everything you told me works just fine without this. Is there a written agreement that requires this as a part of your current lease agreement?

Mr. Molai: Yes.

Mr. Titmas: We have a letter from the shopping center owner that requested it remain.

Mr. Ross: Requested but not required.

Mr. Titmas: It's required. In the interest of safety. Really, if you tried to imagine...

Mr. Ross: That's not the question I'm asking. Is it a legally binding document that you have to live by or is it something they would just like?

Mr. Molai: This is something between him and me. He already said that. He would not let me have that if we are supposed to block that.

Mrs. Harrison: So he is not going to sell you the parcel? It's a part of the sale.

Mr. Ross: You didn't know that when you brought this to us the first time?

Mr. Molai: I did not know that at the time.

Mr. Costlow: I'm not sure the owner was aware they were going to block that either.

Mr. Molai: Right. To be quite honest with you, I had no idea when David Pelligra brought that \_\_\_\_\_ it was without my knowledge. We got caught off guard.

Mrs. Harrison: I think it would probably be difficult for the trucks coming out to make this right turn the way this island is right now [pointing to the screen]. That would be a lot tighter right turn than coming out this way [pointing to the screen].

Mr. Sprungle: I'm not so sure I agree. If they can turn from Kent Road in, they can turn out. It's tight, but they are amazing.

Mr. Titmas: You'll notice in one picture that even with the 45-degree exit, they still can't stay inside the lanes that are west bound. If you go straight out and try to turn west, they actually go over the center line. We feel it is important to keep the exit open.

Mr. Ross: That's true at any intersection you come across. That logic to me doesn't hold any water. Speaking for myself, I much preferred the plan you gave us before without the additional curb cut. Not only what it does for your project, but the traffic pattern on the existing lot continues to work. It may be more convenient for a truck driver, but I'm not here for convenience for a truck driver. I'm here to look for what we see for the City of Stow. I would prefer to see it the other way and I would like to see some sort of legal document that says you can't do it.

Mr. Sprungle: The problem is; he doesn't have to sell the property.

Mr. Ross: I understand that, but I would like to push the pedal to the metal and say look let's do what's best for this lot. I would like to see this project go forward.

Mr. Costlow: I'm sure the plaza owner would put it in the legal document. He really didn't want to close it off so I'm assuming he would put it in.

Mr. Titmas: Mr. Pappas did provide us with a letter that he wanted it to stay open. Mr. Titmas gave the letter to the Planning Commission for their review.

Mr. Kurtz: I do not have a copy in the file.

Mr. Ross: This is a request. That is all it is.

Mr. Costlow: That is all we asked for. He was pretty adamant that he wasn't interested in selling to Fred if the City was going to make him close it off.

Mr. Kurtz: I'm sure it wasn't suggested whether or not he would consider increasing the radius or widening the middle drive.

Mr. Titmas: We'd like to keep the truck traffic exiting out of the main plaza parking if at all practical.

Mr. Brauer: Which is right here [pointing to the screen] correct?

Mr. Titmas: All along that front entrance yes.

Mr. Kurtz: This is the main entrance [pointing to the screen].

Mr. Titmas: Yes, that's the main entrance and the trucks go straight back from there. Then they have the opportunity to turn to back up to get behind the plaza. Then the safest traffic situation would be that the exit and entrance of the trucks be separated.

If there was already a truck in the exit, a new truck could not enter into the property.

Mr. Brauer: Correct me if I'm wrong, these symbols those are tandem trucks on the drawing and we only have an exit closest to the muffler shop. We don't even have an entrance so to me, eliminating that does make sense. If it was a form on ingress and egress, I could probably go either way.

Mr. Titmas: We have the problem in that the considerations from Mr. Pappas are really not on the table. I don't think Fred would be in a position to alter Mr. Pappas's use of the property.

Mr. Ross: If he's the sole owner of this piece of property, then he has every right to do with it what he can within the confines of ...

Mr. Titmas: With the exception that Mr. Pappas and Mr. Molai have mutually agreed to cross traffic and cross parking privilege. He is in fact an outparcel to a shopping center.

Mr. Ross: At this stage of the game, that's hearsay so I don't know. Fred, does it make more sense, in terms of how your business operates not to have that curb cut?

Mr. Molai: Yes.

Mr. Ross: That's what I thought.

Mr. Titmas: Understand Fred, he's saying is it in your best interest to eliminate the exit.

Mr. Molai: No.

Mr. Ross: It's not better for your business?

Mr. Molai: No. It is not.

Mr. Ross: So you don't mind having people drive through.

Mr. Molai: Not at all, no. I'm behind the counter and I see that. Sometimes the traffic on this side [pointing to the screen] comes all the way here. Its backs up all the way to here [pointing to the screen]. So this would give them the opportunity to get out. That traffic from that light comes all the way to here [pointing to the screen] sometimes.

Mr. Titmas: That is on the east-bound lanes.

Mr. Ross: It just seems like we have a very intermittent problem here. It just seems like we're compromising a lot. Can you tell me a little bit, not that it's germane right now, but you're expecting to add on? How would that occur? Do you have any idea how that might happen to your existing building?

Mr. Molai: We have pictures to your point.

Mr. Titmas: There is one for the roof now and the other is for the additions.

Mr. Kurtz: It is not on the site plan.

Mr. Ross: You don't have a lot of room to add on and at that point you become very close to your property line. I'm just curious as to how that is going to impact this site in the future, if in fact you do that.

Mr. Brauer: How does the City stand on this?

Mr. Kurtz: There is no doubt I would prefer more green space. At the previous discussion with the Planning Commission that stood out as one of the most significant changes. I agree, it does seem like a large compromise. I haven't had any contact directly with the owner. He made it clear in his letter what he wants.

If Fred thinks there is a chance if staff sat down with the owner, I would be happy to do that and express Planning Commission's concerns and see if we can move forward. It's a deal between Mr. Molai and Mr. Pappas and I don't want to get in the middle, but if we can be of assistance, we can get them back on the next agenda.

I think it is an important project and I support the improvements he is proposing. The lot split is incidental and justifiable so I want to support this but I can't say I am crazy about the idea of an intermittent issue. I have discussed that with Mr. Titmas and Mr. Costlow prior to this meeting.

Mr. Ross: I think the truck traffic problems are minor in that respect and can function quite nicely without the additional path across the proposed new site. Having people walk from the parking that is across from your front door through truck traffic is not the safest thing to do. That would be eliminated if that weren't there. So there are a couple of things I think are speaking to that.

Just to get this into the record, this letter is from Mr. Pappas. It says,

"To whom it may concern,

We would like to keep all driveways open as shown in the original site plan of 2002."

This is a request, not a demand. I would like to see if Rob can work some magic and help our applicant get a really nice lot.

Mr. Brauer: I think we all agree, when we had this proposal before us previously, it was sharp. It was nice, it was clean, there was green space.

Mrs. Harrison: Is there a way to move the island west and widen the original drive that would take care of that whole truck issue.

Mr. Kurtz: Back in 2000 this plaza was one of our first streetscape programs. They had the old-time gas station with a diamond shape with an in and an out. This drive was here [pointing to the screen] and it didn't make any sense because it didn't line up with the building. So the City basically drew this [pointing to the screen] and said do that.

So the drive lines up with there [pointing to the screen]; we eliminated this one here [pointing to the screen] and left that one [pointing to the screen] as it was and that's fairly wide.

Before I leave this meeting is there any consideration I could suggest. The one that occurs to me, since this is one way, does it have to be 60 feet wide? For example, if this [pointing to the

screen] were kind of use the back of that parking space and do this [pointing to the screen] and fill that in. So we would at least get that green and still keep this opening.

Mr. Titmas: It was actually widened in 2002. It used to be narrower.

Mr. Molai: They asked me to put a new curb in back in 2001. Pull the asphalt out and put a new curb.

Mr. Kurtz: Right but we didn't ask that it be widened. We eliminated this former entrance that was there [pointing to the screen], but this [pointing to the screen] was not affected. We would require an entrance to be 60 feet wide.

Mr. Titmas: The curb was new.

Mr. Kurtz: Right. The curb was replaced but we wouldn't have recommended that width. So if that is a consideration as a backup, we would still get a significant amount of landscaping there.

Mr. Ross: I'm going to raise another issue which is in the interest of the potential property owner. You are aware the specification for paving to drive a truck of this weight is significantly different than the kind of traffic you would have without it. You'll end up being responsible for that piece of asphalt that these big trucks tear up.

Mr. Molai: I understand, Mike Pappas told me that and how much it cost to do that.

Mr. Ross: You can eliminate that if you don't have these big trucks going across your asphalt.

Mrs. Harrison: Rob, your suggestion would be to basically add a little triangle of green this this space in front of that parking space [pointing to the screen].

Mr. Kurtz: Basically, this is what I'm suggesting [pointing to the screen].

Mr. Sprungle: I hear what you're saying but that's minor.

Mr. Kurtz: Maybe so.

Mr. Sprungle: At the end of the day you still have a curb cut and you still have the traffic coming through. It doesn't really change a whole lot. It adds a little bit of green but I don't see where that's a significant improvement as opposed to eliminating the curb cut. I support the curb cut but I also respect the fact that he's not going to sell the property.

Mr. Molai: He was almost going to make the whole thing here [pointing to the screen] all landscaped and landscaped all back here [pointing to the screen] as well. It would make it really sharp. It would give it a beautiful look.

Mr. Ross: A compromise might be to expand the existing main drive to see if we can't accommodate both the plaza owner and this site.

Mr. Titmas: That would have to be done by Mr. Pappas because it is on his parcel.

Mr. Ross: Yes. I could support something like that.

Mr. Sprungle: What you're getting at is then we would require he put money into the renovation because it would be on his side of the property. I question why he would want to do that.

Mr. Kurtz: And losing his other access point.

Mr. Sprungle: All of a sudden this doesn't look like such a good deal.

Mr. Ross: Except he's gaining some revenue for a piece of property. It's not a one-sided deal.

Mr. Costlow: Do I understand what you would like to do is get Mr. Pappas and us at a round table and talk about this?

Mr. Kurtz: Yes. My main goal is to express Planning Commission's position on this so Mr. Pappas understands it. He can do with that what he wants.

Mr. Miller: I would like to express my opinion. From what I see, the parcel is being sold as a separate parcel. I would like to have that parcel with its own ingress and egress. Since this is being cut out I would look at the entrance you want to get rid of as part of his parcel and he needs his own separate entrance. Correct me if I'm wrong but you're going to have tow trucks coming in bringing in vehicles that need to be worked on. That could be an added value as muffler-shop business. It's a muffler-shop business. There's not going to be that much greenery around this kind of business, as I look at it.

My stance would be that I would like to see this entrance, this cut [pointing to the screen] for the semi-trucks to come around but that's not really in the scope that we're talking about, but I would like for him to have his own separate entrance to his own piece of property that he is purchasing.

Mr. Ross moved and Mr. Sprungle seconded to table PC 2018-007 until the next meeting.  
**Planning Commission tabled the item in order allow the applicant, staff and the property owner give further consideration to the existing curb cuts on the property.**

YEA: Brauer, Harrison, Miller, Ross, Sprungle.

NAY: None. The motion was passed 5-0.

### **P.C. 2018-010 – PUNEET SINGH- SITE PLAN FOR INDUSTRIAL BUILDING; MCCAULEY ROAD**

Mr. Puneet Singh – 3105 Preakness Drive – Stow, Ohio; Matt Scheetz – 8060 Frank Avenue – North Canton, OH 44720; and Kevin Noble – 1540 Corporate Woods Parkway – Uniontown, Ohio were present to represent this item and were sworn in by the Planning Commission Secretary.

Mr. Kurtz: This is a request by Mr. Puneet Singh of P3 Infrastructure, Inc. for the Planning Commission's approval of a site plan to permit the construction of an industrial building on a 4-acre parcel located at the northeast corner of McCauley and Allen Roads. The property is zoned I-2 Industrial and industrial uses are permitted by right subject to site plan approval. There is an existing dwelling and garage on the property that will be demolished as part of the project.

The proposed building is approximately 20,000 square foot in area and a future expansion of 20,000 square feet in area is also planned for the site. The exterior of the building will primarily consist of steel siding with a masonry finish along the bottom of the front elevation. The height of the structure is 28 feet. Loading and delivery activities will occur on the west side of the building.

The main entrance off of McCauley Road will be located on the western end of the site approximately 360 feet from the Allen Road intersection, and a secondary curb cut which will also serve as emergency access will be located at the eastern end of the site. A total of 15 parking spaces are proposed for the site and an additional 36 spaces are shown as future (land bank) for a total of 51 parking spaces. Using a blended parking requirement of 1 space/per 400 sq. ft. and 1 space/per 800 square feet a total of 75 parking spaces would be required for the 40,000 square foot structure.

The applicant is requesting a variance from C.O.S. Section 1181.04 to permit a reduction in the number of parking spaces provided. Staff would support this variance.

Preliminary storm water management plans have been submitted. The Engineering Department was comfortable where the garage and dwelling are located and that from a preliminary point they could meet their requirements.

Mr. Sprungle: This is parking [pointing to the screen] but this is also where the truck traffic comes through.

Mrs. Harrison: This is going to be the parking for now [pointing to the screen], this is going to be land banked [pointing to the screen].

Mr. Brauer: Current access for the dock doors.

Mr. Kurtz: Right. The Fire Department required an access completely around the building. I just gave a letter to the applicant this evening from the Fire Department. The access is shown as 16 feet and the Fire Department is requiring 20 feet. This is the first time we received that letter and I apologize to the applicant.

The Fire Department wanted that access whether the addition was in place or not. Mr. Singh has met with the Fire Department in terms of specifically what chemicals he is using and has given all the information to Fire Prevention and they were comfortable that they were going to meet the requirements.

Mr. Ross: What is the proposed use for the building?

Mr. Kurtz: Mr. Singh will elaborate but in general he creates material for the traffic engineering industry.

Mr. Singh: Polymers for construction.

Mr. Ross: The site looks pretty unencumbered. I don't inherently see an issue. Obviously, the Fire Department has weighed in. I think there is a provision for an additional hydrant. That's pretty normal for a building of this size; particularly if the scope is to be expanded for another 20,000 square feet.

Have they submitted a landscaping plan?

Mr. Sprungle: The only variance is a reduction in the number of parking spaces.

Mr. Kurtz: Right.

Mr. Ross: They have a lot of available space and most of it will be land banked.

Mr. Kurtz: Right. No, there is no landscape plan, but a buffer will be established along the western property there [pointing to the screen]. It is an Industrial District so there is nothing to buffer, so that is why I didn't request that.

Mrs. Harrison: So they need a widened drive or a fire hydrant?

Mr. Ross: They require both.

Mr. Kurtz: This says "or," you are right.

Mr. Singh: Let me start with the background of what we do. We manufacture coatings and adhesives that are used on roads and bridges. I started P3 Infrastructure about five years ago in Twinsburg. We have now grown to a size where we need more space. So we are taking a bold step building our own facility to manufacture.

Mrs. Harrison: Is this going to be in lieu of your Twinsburg facility?

Mr. Singh: No, we are going to exit that site.

Mrs. Harrison: How many employees do you have?

Mr. Singh: The reality is that our process is very simple in fairly large-size batches. So we are not very people intensive. Right now we have 5 employees. Our forecast is that within the next 5 years we will add at least another 5. The provision for parking spaces is that there is plenty of land banked spaces for as many parking spaces as we need. We just showed, in case it is an issue, that we at least have the minimum required. I don't even think we requested a variance.

Mr. Kurtz: Right, you did not request a variance, but it is required and on the record.

Mr. Ross: How about truck parking? I don't see any provision for semi's.

Mr. Singh: We don't have that high of a volume of truck traffic.

Mr. Ross: So nothing stays on site, other than at the docks?

Mr. Singh: No.

Mrs. Harrison: You don't have your own trucks?

Mr. Singh: No. That was a question the Building Engineer brought up and we did some quick math and we probably anticipate about 75 trucks in a year.

Mr. Miller: The Fire Department wants the drive for the emergency vehicles increased from 16 feet to 20 feet. The memo states, this drive must be installed as part of Phase I of the project or an additional on-site fire hydrant.

I want to know if he decided not to do the extension of the 20 feet and just do the extra fire hydrant, does that mean he can cut his costs by not having the entire "U" entrance/exit going around the entire property and just put a like a large round-a-bout.

Mr. Singh: That is a good question and was part of the discussion with the Fire Chief last time I was here. I had proposed that initially and he said, give me a turn around and a fire hydrant or extend this driveway a minimum of 16 feet. So this is a surprise to me they expanded that to 20 feet. I was told 16 feet at the last meeting. We chose to go all the way around because it makes more sense.

Mrs. Harrison: You were already planning on doing that as part of Phase I?

Mr. Singh: No, we were not planning, but after talking to the Fire Chief we felt this makes more sense. The nearest hydrant is across the street on McCauley.

Mr. Ross: Let me try to explain, probably the Fire Department's rationale. I can't speak for them but I kind of know where they are coming from. Normally the 20 foot is to accommodate outriggers on their trucks. They can get the truck on the 16 feet, that is not a problem. The question is when they have to fight a fire they put the outriggers down so they can take the ladder over. You can't do that on soft soil, so that is why in most cases they require something wider than you would normally expect for a drive.

Mr. Singh: All I am saying is that in the meeting they said 16 feet, so I went back to my folks and they based their estimates on that. It will be interesting to see why they changed their mind.

Mr. Miller: I was just seeing if there was some way we could help you save money.

How flammable is your product?

Mr. Singh: I approached Rob a year ago in June and said we were considering purchasing this property and gave him a list of my chemicals and the volumes I would be handling. None of them are listed flammable, so there is no flammability issue. The Fire Department has reviewed all the Safety Data Sheets, so I don't think that's an issue for me.

Mr. Miller: In the past we had a company that gave off a nasty odor. Is there anything that is going to be of that nature?

Mr. Singh: I can address that appropriately. For us to operate we have to apply for a permit to install and operate our machines through the air quality people. As of today, we have been exempt because it's the minimum. So when we're not handling any products that have solvents or vapors that carry then we are considered exempt. If you live nearby you won't be smelling anything.

Even though we are not required, we still have internal engineering controls, to control dust, because we do use pigments. We make striping systems, for example, that use powders. So we will have appropriate engineering controls anyways.

Mr. Ross: I assume there is adequate water here? Did you have them do a flow test to make sure you have adequate water for your fire suppression system?

Mr. Kurtz: A brand new waterline was recently placed down Allen Road and along McCauley. We had two meetings with the Fire Department and they did not indicate any problems.

Mr. Ross: So they don't have any concern about flow issues?

Mr. Kurtz: No issues.

Mr. Singh: We would like to still understand why the Fire Department changed their mind from 16 feet to 20 feet.

Mr. Kurtz: I don't know if they changed their mind. I don't remember if they stated the actual dimension of the road. I do remember a discussion to either provide a turnaround and a fire hydrant there which is still an option.

Mr. Singh: That doesn't make sense, this makes more sense. We plan to build the expansion rather quickly. We don't want to wait 25 years.

Mr. Kurtz: In terms of the width, Mr. Ross is correct. It seems wider than it needs to be but that is the reason. They have their outriggers and they set them down. That is why they request 20 feet.

Mr. Singh: It's a minor issue. Obviously it will cost us more but if that is the reason, that is the reason.

Mr. Miller: Consider it being 20 feet of asphalt, can they keep it 16 feet and then compressed \_\_\_ aggregate on either side of the driveway.

Mr. Ross: You're going to have to run that by the Fire Department because the Fire Code has pretty stringent requirements. The Fire Department establishes the specification for that road based on the weight of the equipment they put on it.

Mr. Singh: Some of these questions were asked at the last meeting. Even the Building Engineer recommended the \_\_\_ be a chip seal or a \_\_\_ rolled and a good reason was given that we need a pavement that can be snow plowed. We can't have three feet of snow and drive a fire truck through it safely. That made sense then and we didn't object. I'm just curious why they didn't tell us 20 foot at the time the Fire Chief was sitting there and why did they say 16 feet.

Mr. Miller: That's a good question.

Mr. Singh: That's why I want it on the record.

Mr. Ross: I suspect that is the answer you will get but you should confirm it with them.

Mr. Sprungle moved and Mr. Miller seconded to approve P.C. 2018-010. **Planning Commission recommended approval subject to the Building, Engineering and Fire Department approval of construction plans.**

YEA: Harrison, Miller, Ross, Sprungle, Brauer.

NAY: None. The motion passed 5-0.

**NEXT MEETING: Scheduled for May 22, 2018**

With no further business to discuss, Mr. Ross moved and Mr. Miller seconded the motion to adjourn. It was unanimously approved and the meeting was adjourned at 6:53 p.m.

---

Chris Brauer  
Planning Commission Chairman

---

Pamela H. Daerr, CPS  
Planning Commission Secretary