

MINUTES
ELKHART COUNTY PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
HELD ON THE 10TH DAY OF JULY 2014 AT 9:00 A.M.
MEETING ROOM – DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SERVICES BUILDING
4230 ELKHART ROAD, GOSHEN, INDIANA

1. The regular meeting of the Elkhart County Plan Commission was called to order by the Chairperson, Steve Warner, with the following members present: Jeff Burbrink, Steve Warner, Roger Miller, Steve Edwards, Tom Stump, and Blake Doriot. Tony Campanello, Douglas Miller, and Frank Lucchese were absent. Staff members present were: Chris Godlewski, Plan Director; Brian Mabry, Planning Manager; Mark Kanney, Planner; Duane Burrow, Planner; Kathy Wilson, Administrative Manager; and James W. Kolbus, Attorney for the Board.

2. A motion was made and seconded (*Doriot/Edwards*) that the minutes of the regular meeting of the Elkhart County Plan Commission held on the 12th day of June 2014 be approved as submitted and the motion was carried unanimously.

3. A motion was made and seconded (*Doriot/Stump*) that the legal advertisements, having been published on the 28th day of June 2014 in the Goshen News and the 29th day of June in the Elkhart Truth, be approved as read. The motion was carried with a unanimous vote.

4. A motion was made and seconded (*Burbrink/Stump*) that the Elkhart County Zoning Ordinance and Elkhart County Subdivision Control Ordinance be accepted as evidence for today's hearings. With a unanimous vote, the motion was carried.

5. The applications for a zone map change from A-1 to a Detailed Planned Unit Development-A-1 and for Secondary approval of a Detailed Planned Unit Development known as **SUPERIOR HARDWOODS DPUD**, for Myron D. & Joyce I. Martin (owners) and Maynard Yoder (developer) represented by Philip C. Barker, on property located on the South side of SR 4, 692 ft. West of CR 37, common address of 13146 SR 4 in Clinton Township, were presented at this time.

Duane Burrow presented the Staff Reports/Staff Analyses, which are attached for review as *Case #13146SR 4-140529-1* and *Case #13146SR 4-140529-2*, and clarified that the high point of the parcel is near the center. The area once mined for sand and gravel has regrown nicely, but the mining did at one time limit development of the parcel to the North two-thirds of the site, he also said. The condition recommended by staff, appearing on page 2b of the Staff Report/Staff Analysis of *Case #13146SR 4-140529-1*, is taken from the current ordinance's E-district landscaping standards.

Tom Stump asked what the estimated cost of the required trees was, but Mr. Burrow said the cost was not evaluated. Mr. Barker did not know the cost either, and Mr. Burbrink said cost depends on tree type. Cheap two-inch trees cost \$60–\$70 each. Bigger trees cost approximately \$400 each, but the cost depends on whether they will be spaded in. Philip C. Barker, Cardinal Point Surveying, 1002 Zollinger Road, Goshen, said that the developer has been interested in planting ornamental pear trees at the front of the property as part of maintaining an attractive site.

Mr. Barker, who was present on behalf of the petitioners, said also that the owners will sell the subject property to the developer upon approval of the petitions. Maynard Yoder is in favor of

the condition providing for the planting of trees and will install arborvitae or similar screening along the West property line.

Mr. Barker went on to say that the property, which is sandy and gravelly, is well drained, and no drainage problems are anticipated. The maximum number of employees is 12, and all employees will ride bicycles to work, as the shop is Amish and will appear in an Amish community. Ample room for parking is provided, but no vehicles except those of salespeople will be parked. Only five vehicles per day are expected.

Steve Warner asked whether the drive will accommodate semis so they do not have to back out onto SR 4, and Mr. Barker said yes, the building will be 180 ft. from centerline. He will apply for a state highway permit upon approval of the DPUD, and the entrance will be subminor.

There were no remonstrators present.

A motion was made and seconded (*Burbrink/Doriot*) that the public hearing be closed and the motion was carried with a unanimous vote.

The Board examined said requests and after due consideration and deliberation:

Motion: Action: Approve, **Moved by** Roger Miller, **Seconded by** Tom Stump, that the Advisory Plan Commission recommend to the Board of County Commissioners that the request for a zone map change from A-1 to a Detailed Planned Unit Development-A-1 to be known as ***SUPERIOR HARDWOODS DPUD*** be approved in accordance with the Staff Analysis with the following condition imposed:

1. That the Site Plan/Support Drawing be amended, as permitted by the general intent of the Planned Unit Development process, which is to integrate with the adjacent land uses (farmsteads), by adding the following note: "That one 2" diameter tree be installed and maintained for every 40 feet of frontage (at least seven trees). To be installed in the first planting season prior to the estimated time of issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy."

Vote: Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote (**summary:** Yes = 6).

Yes: Blake Doriot, Jeff Burbrink, Roger Miller, Steve Warner, Steven Edwards, Tom Stump.

Motion: Action: Approve, **Moved by** Blake Doriot, **Seconded by** Jeff Burbrink, that the request for Secondary approval of a Detailed Planned Unit Development known as ***SUPERIOR HARDWOODS DPUD*** be approved in accordance with the Staff Analysis.

Vote: Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote (**summary:** Yes = 6).

Yes: Blake Doriot, Jeff Burbrink, Roger Miller, Steve Warner, Steven Edwards, Tom Stump.

6. ***Major/Minor Change Request for Bristol Park for Industry, Phase 3, DPUD M-1 Site Plan/Support Drawing***

Mr. Burrow outlined the changes as follows: (1) rotation of the building and pavement footprint, which will reduce impact on the wooded area; (2) reduction of the size of the building, from 109,950 sq. ft. to 79,560 sq. ft.; (3) reduction of the number of parking spaces, from 57 to 55; (4) addition of a plan for future parking; (5) removal of the loading dock from the North side of the building; and (6) reduction of the number of storage tanks, from 8 to 4. The storage areas now appearing along the drives on the Site Plan/Support Drawing were announced during the November 14, 2013, public hearing and are not the result of a change, Mr. Burrow noted.

Mr. Stump asked to be reminded of the type of manufacturing, and Mr. Burrow said plastic extrusion.

Mr. Burrow asked Chris Marbach, Marbach, Brady & Weaver, Inc., 3220 Southview Drive, Elkhart, who was present on behalf of the petitioner, for the date of Bristol's annexation of the subject property, and Mr. Marbach replied that July 3, 2014, was the date after which the annexation could be recorded. Thus the Plan Commission will make its recommendation to the Bristol Town Council rather than the Board of County Commissioners, Mr. Burrow said. If the change is considered minor, staff may begin the building permit process. If the change is considered major, the Plan Commission must hold a public hearing.

Mr. Doriot observed that almost every change submitted results in a reduction in intensity and said he thought the change was minor. Mr. Burbrink stated agreement.

Following Board examination of the change to Bristol Park for Industry, Phase 3, DPUD M-1, outlined above by Mr. Burrow, and consideration of the nature of the change as summarized above:

Motion: Action: Approve, **Moved by** Blake Doriot, **Seconded by** Tom Stump, that the changes to Bristol Park for Industry, Phase 3, DPUD M-1 be considered a minor change by the Advisory Plan Commission. The motion was carried with a unanimous vote.

Motion: Action: Approve, **Moved by** Blake Doriot, **Seconded by** Tom Stump, that the Advisory Plan Commission approve the minor change to Bristol Park for Industry, Phase 3, DPUD M-1. The motion was carried with a unanimous vote.

7. *Southwest/Foraker Sewer Project*

Chris Godlewski said that Kenneth Jones, Jr., would come forward to present the project, which is a public utility. James Kolbus asked whether any Plan Commission action is required, and Mr. Godlewski said no.

Kenneth Jones, Jr., Jones Petrie Rafinski, 4703 Chester Drive, Elkhart, distributed to the Board a map titled "Area of Potential Effect" [*included with minutes as Petitioner Exhibit #1*]. JPR, he said, is under contract with the Elkhart County Stormwater Board and is working also with the Elkhart County Regional Sewer District to address the Southwest/Foraker sewer topic.

The problem, identified by the health department in letters to boards including the Elkhart County Stormwater Board and the Elkhart County Regional Sewer District, is contaminated surface water in Weaver Ditch, which runs East of Foraker, and Yellow Creek, which runs West of the Southwest area. Mr. Jones said that the health department performed dye testing of surface water and worked with the City of Elkhart to perform faucet water sampling in an effort to test groundwater, but he could not say what the exact results of the testing were. Mr. Doriot said that 1.2 million colonies of *E. coli* were found per liter in Weaver Ditch, while the legal limit for full-body contact is 235 colonies per liter. Mr. Stump asked whether anyone has gone swimming in Weaver Ditch, and Mr. Doriot said the surveyor department has asked kids to get out of the ditch. Mr. Stump then asked whether the proliferation of *E. coli* was due to human or agricultural activity, and Mr. Doriot said a combination. Tiles installed in the 1980s or late 1970s run from the houses along CR 13, South of CR 142, to Weaver Ditch, and complaints concerning the tiles have been received from homeowners. There have also been contamination problems associated with the dairy operation at 66569 CR 13, but the owners have recently invested in a manure digester that addresses them, Mr. Doriot said. Basement sewage backup is also experienced by an old bank building in the area.

Mr. Jones turned his attention to Southwest and said that the health department's letters also discuss the finding, the result of dye testing, that 15 of 31 Southwest homes flush directly into Yellow Creek. While Foraker and Southwest were developed approximately 100 years ago, the average home today releases 300–350 gallons of wastewater per day, and the contents of wastewater are more varied today than they were then.

JPR's first project step, said Mr. Jones, was creation of a preliminary investigative report (PIR), which defines an economical community wastewater collection and treatment system for the area. Options for such a system were studied over several months, and one option was a wastewater pipe to Wakarusa and the use of its facility. But the isolation of Southwest and Foraker and the small size of their populations meant that the costs for that option could not be shouldered.

The second project step, Mr. Jones said, was to determine funding. Since Foraker and Southwest are unincorporated, JPR asked the USDA rural development section, which frequently funds such projects, to fund the current project by grant, loan, or a combination. Before doing so, JPR needed to convert the PIR to a preliminary engineering report (PER), required by the USDA, which must include an environmental report. The environmental report requires that various federal, state, and local agencies, including the Elkhart County Advisory Plan Commission, be notified of JPR's analysis and provide an overall opinion about the project.

Mr. Jones then said that the opinion needed from the Plan Commission concerns whether the project would promote, for example, the development of a piece of farmland in the subject area, given that the solution being proposed is not designed for expansion. The current project corrects an existing problem and does not promote development in the area, which is shown to feature heavy soils. JPR in fact recommends against expandability because the Southwest/Foraker population is not large enough to shoulder the costs—a conventional treatment facility is not feasible in an area of fewer than approximately 300 homes—and the best way to encourage proper development in the area, Mr. Jones said, is to require that building parcels be large enough to accommodate conventional septic systems.

Mr. Doriot indicated the M-1 zoning along the railroad in the Foraker area and said that in spite of it, the infrastructure, including roads, is not suitable for a use like Forest River's manufacturing, and Mr. Burbrink agreed. Mr. Doriot asked whether the JPR proposal would have enough expandability to support infill lots or house additions, and Mr. Jones said yes, just enough. Mr. Doriot and Mr. Jones then agreed that the proposal would not support a new factory, and Mr. R. Miller and Mr. Jones agreed that any factory placement would be responsible for its own septic system, with Mr. Doriot commenting that any septic system would not be cost effective because of the lack of area and good soil. Mr. Stump then said that some innovative waste disposal measures, including conventional treatment plants and conventional septic systems with large drain fields, are used for homes at lake areas in Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Michigan.

Mr. Jones then said that the proposal comprises a community leach field system, also known as a low-pressure collection system or step system. In such a system, homes still have their own septic tanks for retention of solids, but effluent is pumped to a common leach field area, from the septic tanks to the field via a small-diameter force main, and soil testing has revealed possible locations for the common area. He said that a Mishawaka company that operates community leach field areas was consulted to determine operating costs and design life, and the USDA issues a 40-year note with a very low interest rate, whereas the conventional state revolving-fund note cutoff is at 20 years.

The regional sewer district has asked how a 40-year note would work with a 25-year leach field, and Mr. Jones said the response was that “you make that right by building into the monthly rate . . . a reserve fund for replacement at that time.” The preliminary design, for which Stewart Mead has been consulted, includes aerobic treatment units (ATUs) that introduce oxygen into the process and should extend the life of the leach field, Mr. Jones added.

Mr. Jones then said that JPR has a viable solution but that it is not expected to be popular, as it will result in a monthly sewer bill for homeowners. Homeowners must understand, though, that septic systems are a liability and will eventually cost money in some way. JPR is trying to demonstrate for IDEM that the county is taking steps toward correcting the problems identified by the health department before IDEM itself approaches the Board of County Commissioners about the problems, and the health department does not want to be the “bad guys” someday, telling a homeowner that his or her home is uninhabitable, Mr. Jones said. JPR has sent a form letter to Chris Godlewski soliciting a response from the Advisory Plan Commission and asked that the response mention that the project does not encourage development but corrects an existing planning issue.

Mr. Jones commented also that the outlying areas, those between Southwest and Foraker, were, at first, part of JPR’s study, but JPR later determined that properties there are large enough to allow for correction of septic problems. Properties in “downtown” Foraker or Southwest, however, are not, and Mr. Doriot stated agreement.

Motion: Action: Approve, **Moved by** Jeff Burbrink, **Seconded by** Steven Edwards, that the Plan Commission ask Mr. Godlewski to write a letter on its behalf supporting this project.

Mr. Stump said that before he could support the motion he would need more information from Mr. Jones about what the project is and what the costs for the area residents will be. Mr. Doriot asked what the present projection of monthly cost for the residents is, and Mr. Jones responded \$70.24 per residential equivalency unit (REU), though the stormwater board’s goal is around \$65.00. Mr. Stump asked whether residents would be charged by the gallon, and Mr. Jones responded that the fee is a flat, monthly fee. Mr. Jones recommended against metering, which increases project costs and requires that all affected residents sign a right-of-entry allowing meter reading and maintenance.

Mr. Stump then asked how the project would protect against a leaky stool and expressed worry about overuse of water, which would lead to a flooding of the drain field. He said there must be some control over water usage. Mr. Jones responded that leach field design includes a peaking factor, which means that a facility on the average day is functioning at half its available capacity and can handle water usage increases on days like holidays. JPR overdesigns community leach fields in accordance with this, Mr. Jones said. Mr. Stump then expressed concern over bigger uses like daycares, which will be responsible for future system failure, and Mr. Jones said that a flow meter will be installed at the leach field and reports of average daily flow have to be submitted to the state health department. More intense uses, such as daycares, have to be addressed by a rate ordinance created and adopted by the regional sewer district. Such uses, single-family homes with home-based businesses, might comprise two REUs, “so they’ll pay for that additional use,” and the system will have to be designed to handle such use.

Mr. Jones then mentioned an additional JPR study of the taking offline of three community systems for the Steuben Lakes Regional Waste District in Angola. In the 1970s, community leach fields were placed in the lake areas around Angola, but many of those were replaced by

conventional treatment systems around 2005 because of the increase in supporting population. One community system in the area in question was designed to handle 16,500 gallons per day and today in fact receives 16,000 gallons per day, from 109 homes. That same system installed today would have twice the capacity, as the state health department now requires capacity of 150 gallons per day per bedroom, not per home.

Mr. Doriot commented that about two years ago non-Elkhart County members of the MS4 partnership said they would call IDEM unless the county did something about the Foraker/Southwest problem. Had IDEM been contacted, Mr. Doriot said, it would have mandated that a sewer project be undertaken and that sewage be pumped to Wakarusa, and the county would have had no say. The mandate would have been via an agreed order. Mr. Stump asked how often IDEM makes such orders, and Mr. Doriot responded that systems for the towns of Wyatt and Macy were the result of agreed orders.

Mr. Jones explained that the first response to an order is acknowledgment of the problem and promise of work toward a solution, a response that IDEM usually accepts. A lawsuit may follow, however. Mr. Stump mentioned that one reason for septic system failure is overuse of water, resulting from a running stool, among other things, and again recommended that a way of controlling water usage be implemented, by way of a meter on the pump or on a wall. Otherwise the system has a chance of being ruined, he said. "So I would strongly recommend that that's in your plan someplace," he emphasized. Mr. Jones then responded that homeowners no longer are responsible for septic tank pumping after step pumps are installed. The Elkhart County Regional Sewer District (RSD) and its operator are instead responsible, as it is in the best interests of the RSD to protect the community leach field. The RSD would decide whether what Mr. Stump recommends should be implemented, he said. At least one resident of either Southwest or Foraker will be appointed to the RSD board, the governmental entity that will eventually take responsibility for the system, Mr. Jones added, mentioning also that there are a few community leach field installations in St. Joseph County that are nongovernmental, neighborhood solutions. JPR also has sought input from those neighborhoods.

Mr. Stump said that he understands that community systems work well if the water is monitored. Users need to be able to use water but also need to be encouraged to conserve it. Mr. Jones agreed and said Mr. Stump's concerns were legitimate.

Mr. Burbrink held that the problem and the solution have been identified and that design, while important, is not the Plan Commission's job. In light of the number of people who have been involved in the process for a long time, the Plan Commission's job is to ask, is this something we can do to make this a better land use?

Mr. Stump asked Mr. Burbrink to restate his motion, and Mr. Burbrink did so. Mr. Stump then repeated his inability to support the motion, as he did not know what the plan was, but said he could support a motion that substituted the phrase "a plan" for "the plan." Mr. Godlewski agreed that the motion could be general in nature.

Mr. Doriot suggested the motion be "The Plan Commission agrees that we should move forward on solving the wastewater problem in Foraker/Southwest," and Mr. Stump said he could support that.

Steve Warner asked Mr. Burbrink whether he would be willing to amend his motion, and Mr. Burbrink instead asked that the Commission vote on the first motion.

Vote: Motion passed (**summary:** Yes = 5, No = 1, Abstain = 0).

Yes: Blake Doriot, Jeff Burbrink, Roger Miller, Steve Warner, Steven Edwards.

No: Tom Stump.

8. *Plan Commission Fees*

Mr. Godlewski said that Mr. Mabry performed a Plan Commission time-logging study at Mr. Warner's request. Mr. Mabry then called Board attention to the spreadsheet provided in the members' packets. All Planning staff members and code enforcement officers tracked time spent on several selected applications, Mr. Mabry said. He mentioned that he would prefer to have added far more applications to the study and spent more time on it, but the present study does capture at least one of all the commonly received applications, and the spreadsheet has one portion for BZA and one for Plan Commission. He added that more detail, including each planning assistant's time spent, for example, is available for Plan Commission member review, discussed the notes at the bottom of the provided sheet, which explain how the figures in the first two columns are derived, and reviewed the rest of the column headings.

No changes to Plan Commission fees are recommended, Mr. Mabry noted, as the lowest recovery figure is 55 percent, but changes to four BZA application fees are recommended, as the recovery figures for those applications are considered too low. Coverage of 30 percent was the goal discussed, and the developmental variance fee is the only one that does not achieve it. Mr. Mabry then clarified his recommendations, that approval of the four fee increases shown on the spreadsheet be given and that an item seeking amendment of the fee portion of the Plan Commission Rules of Procedure be placed on the August 2014 Plan Commission agenda.

Mr. Kolbus asked whether the Country Wood Secondary appeared before departments other than Planning and said that recovery should not exceed cost. Mr. Mabry said that it did go to the departments represented by the Technical Review Committee to ensure its conformity with the approved Primary application and that if Technical Review Committee time and cost were included in the first column, the recovery percentage would be lower. Mr. Kolbus asked whether it would be below 100, but Mr. Mabry did not know.

Mr. Doriot asked whether the County Council views Plan Commission work as fee supported or as a service and expressed understanding of the costs to staff and the need to budget tightly, but also noted that what is not being looked at is the revenue generated by BZA-approved and Plan Commission-approved projects. He cited Smart Cabinetry's new \$6 million building, which resulted in \$180,000 in property taxes, the associated increase in land value, which resulted in \$60,000 per year in property taxes, and the arrival of 30-40 new Smart Cabinetry employees who earn a combined \$2 million per year. A further question, Mr. Doriot suggested, should be, how does revenue generated compare with services required? Two hundred dollars to a variance client with a comparatively small project is a lot of money, he added.

Mr. Kolbus asked for Mr. Stump's input, as he is a member of the County Council, and Mr. Stump said that he normally supports user fees and expects them to match the county's or city's costs. He said he understood Mr. Doriot's comments but supports the increases in question, asking whether it is his responsibility as a regular citizen of the county to supplement the county's costs for

work done in support of small-project applicants like those Mr. Doriot mentioned. Mr. Doriot is right, Mr. Stump said, about the revenue large projects bring to the county and asked whether Elkhart County's PUD and rezoning application fees are similar to those of other counties. Mr. Doriot responded by citing Kosciusko County's minor subdivision fees, which are smaller than Elkhart County's. "Government here is to serve everybody," he said and stated agreement with Mr. Stump's concern over regular citizens' responsibility for supplementing the county's costs for small projects. Mr. Stump said that application fees are small compared with large companies' building costs, but Mr. Doriot replied that Smart Cabinetry was seriously looking at Kosciusko County and that he "was actually told that if they'd have realized to start with what was going on, they would have been looking harder at Milford." Mr. Stump asked whether this was because of Elkhart County's fees, and Mr. Doriot said it was "just because of other things"

Steve Warner then expressed appreciation for the work that staff did on the study.

The Board examined the Plan Commission fee study and considered Mr. Mabry's two recommendations as outlined above, and after due consideration and deliberation:

Motion: Action: Approve, **Moved by** Tom Stump, **Seconded by** Roger Miller, that consideration of an amendment to the Uniform Schedule of Fees of the Elkhart County Advisory Plan Commission Rules of Procedure be made an item for the August 14, 2014, Plan Commission agenda.

Vote: Motion passed (**summary:** Yes = 5, Abstain = 1).

Yes: Jeff Burbrink, Roger Miller, Steve Warner, Steven Edwards, Tom Stump.

Abstain: Blake Doriot.

After the motion and vote, Mr. Burbrink said that as a result of his addition of grand total figures and application fee figures for six of the eight Plan Commission projects listed on the spreadsheet, he determined that the application fees represented about 59 percent of the cost. Mr. Godlewski responded that the county therefore subsidizes about one-third of project costs, and Mr. Burbrink agreed. Mr. Warner stated he thought the figure was fair; the county subsidizes some of the costs and users pick up the rest. Mr. Godlewski then said that in most communities, building department fees, not local plan commission fees, are close to cost. When building department recoupment and plan commission recoupment are averaged, though, total recoupment is about 50 percent, a good target. Mr. Stump asked whether the grand totals given include only labor costs, or direct costs, and not "any fringe benefit costs that you've applied to this," and Mr. Godlewski said the grand totals do only include labor costs. Mr. Stump asked whether addition of all the fringe benefits would cause the recovery percentages to drop, and Mr. Godlewski said it would. "I think it's labor costs plus a third of that generally," Mr. Godlewski said.

9. ***2015 Plan Commission Budget***

Mr. Godlewski distributed to the Board copies of the Plan Commission budgets for 2014 and 2015 [*included with minutes as Staff Exhibit #1*] and said that a 3 percent raise is slated for the human resources department and the Commissioners for 2015. The Council has not yet voted on the raise, however. Mr. Burrow's August 2014 retirement will result in a lower salary for the Planner III position, and this will bring the 2015 total estimate down to approximately \$436,000. He continued to review the total budget estimates on page 2 of each budget and said that 2014's should show \$443,000, not \$436,571, because of the Planning intern appropriation. The hearing for the budget

will not be held until September 2014, so changes may be made.

Mr. Doriot asked whether more money will be available for a Planner III candidate who has 20 or 25 years of experience, and Mr. Godlewski's response was that the amount will need to fit within the range set by the personnel committee. A request for an amount above the midpoint has to be presented to the personnel committee and the County Council, a two-month process.

Mr. Godlewski concluded by noting that Planning and Code Enforcement are the two budgets that affect the general fund, and there is a 1 percent increase from 2014 to 2015. If the 3 percent salary increase is considered with personnel taken out, the overall result is a reduction. Mr. Kolbus asked what action was needed, and Mr. Godlewski said a motion to accept the 2015 budget.

The Board examined the 2015 Plan Commission budget, and after due consideration and deliberation:

Motion: Action: Approve, **Moved by** Blake Doriot, **Seconded by** Tom Stump, that the Advisory Plan Commission accept the 2015 Plan Commission budget. The motion was carried with a unanimous vote.

** It is noted that Jeff Burbrink stepped down from the Board at this time.*

10. **Zoning Ordinance**

Mr. Godlewski asked whether any Plan Commission member had questions about the zoning ordinance rewrite, and Mr. Doriot asked for the date of the next committee meeting. Mr. Godlewski responded July 16, 2014. Mr. R. Miller asked about the status of the Planning intern and whether any funds for the intern position were budgeted for 2015. Mr. Godlewski's response was that the intern is working on the graphics and that \$6,500 has been budgeted for an intern for summer 2015.

11. A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Mr. R. Miller and seconded by Mr. Edwards. With a unanimous vote, the meeting was adjourned at 10:16 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel Dean, Recording Secretary

Steve Warner, Chairman