

Canal Winchester

*Town Hall
10 North High Street
Canal Winchester, OH 43110*



Meeting Minutes - FINAL

December 17, 2018

7:00 PM

City Council

*Bruce Jarvis – President
Mike Walker – Vice President
Jill Amos
Will Bennett
Bob Clark
Mike Coolman
Patrick Lynch*

- A. Call To Order *Jarvis called the meeting to order at 7:08 p.m.*
- B. Pledge of Allegiance - Clark
- C. Roll Call *Present 7 – Amos, Bennett, Clark, Coolman, Jarvis, Lynch, Walker*
- D. Approval of Minutes

[MIN-18-055](#) 12-3-18 Work Session Minutes ([Work Session Minutes](#))

[MIN-18-056](#) 12-3-18 Public Hearing Minutes ([Public Hearing Minutes](#))

[MIN-18-057](#) 12-3-18 City Council Meeting Minutes ([Council Minutes](#))

A motion was made by Bennett to approve Minutes 18-055, 18-056, 18-057, seconded by Coolman. The motion carried with the following vote:

Yes 7 - Bennett, Coolman, Amos, Clark, Jarvis, Lynch, Walker

E. Communications & Petitions – NONE

Jarvis: we received the exterior elevations from Westport Homes and also floor plans; those came in a little bit later; possibly earlier today or yesterday; Mrs. Jackson are there any other communications that you're aware of; Jackson: I do not have anything;

F. Public Comments - Five Minute Limit Per Person

G. RESOLUTIONS

[RES-18-019](#) A Resolution Approving The Mayor's Appointment Of Joseph Wildenthaler To Serve A Four Year Term As A Member Of The Planning And Zoning Commission Expiring On December 31, 2022 ([Resolution](#))

Development

- Adoption

A motion was made by Coolman to adopt resolution 18-019, seconded by Walker. The motion carried with the following vote:

Yes - Coolman, Walker, Amos, Bennett, Clark, Jarvis, Lynch

[RES-18-020](#) A Resolution Approving The Mayor's Appointment Of Joseph Donahue To Serve A Four Year Term As A Member Of The Planning And Zoning Commission Expiring On December 31, 2022 ([Resolution](#))

Development

- Adoption

A motion was made by Amos to adopt resolution 18-020, seconded by Walker. The motion carried with the following vote:

Yes - Amos, Walker, Bennett, Clark, Coolman, Jarvis, Lynch

RES-18-021
Development

A Resolution Approving The Mayor’s Appointment Of Jamoya Cox To Serve A Four Year Term As A Member Of The Landmarks Commission Expiring On December 31, 2022 ([Resolution](#))

- Adoption

A motion was made by Lynch to adopt resolution 18-021 seconded by Coolman. The motion carried with the following vote:

Yes - Lynch, Coolman, Amos, Bennett, Clark, Jarvis, Walker

RES-18-022
Development

A Resolution Approving The Mayor’s Appointment Of Richard Dobda To Serve A Four Year Term As A Member Of The Landmarks Commission Expiring On December 31, 2022 ([Resolution](#))

- Adoption

A motion was made by Clark to adopt resolution 18-022 seconded by Coolman. The motion carried with the following vote:

Yes - Clark, Coolman, Amos, Bennett, Jarvis, Lynch, Walker

RES-18-023
Finance

A Resolution To Approve The Distribution Of 2019 Bed Tax Grant Funds ([Resolution, 2019 Bed Tax Recommendations](#))

- Adoption

A motion was made by Coolman to adopt resolution 18-023, seconded by Walker. The motion carried with the following vote:

Yes – Coolman, Walker, Amos, Bennett, Clark, Jarvis, Lynch

H. ORDINANCES

Tabled

ORD-18-029
Development
Sponsor: Jarvis

An Ordinance To Amend Part 11 Of The Codified Ordinances And The Zoning Map Of The City Of Canal Winchester, Rezoning An Approximately 11.954 Acre Tract Of Land From Exceptional Use (EU) To Planned Residential District (PRD), Owned By The Dwight A. Imler Revocable Living Trust, Located On The Southeast Corner Of The Intersection Of Hayes Road and Lithopolis Road And Consisting Of Parcel Number 184-002994, And To Adopt A Preliminary Development Plan And Development Text For A Proposed 79.5 Acre Planned Residential Development (Middletown Farms) ([Ordinance, Exhibit A, Exhibit B, P&Z Recommendation](#))

- Tabled at Third Reading

Jarvis: the applicant and representatives are here this evening; before we have our internal discussion it would be appropriate to hear what they have to say; and they provided us with some materials as promised regarding the exterior elevations; I'm not sure who's doing the speaking this evening but you're welcome to come on up;

Jack Mautino, Division President Westport Homes: thank you very much and I appreciate council's time this evening; at recommendation of council we, the applicant went back to the planning commission on November the 13th where we did receive unanimous approval from planning commission on two specific matters; those two specific matters were one: the proposed requirement regarding the porch placement and its proximity to the garage; I know planning commission at that time was recommending that the garage sit four feet behind the front body of the home or the front livable wall of the home and that; and we received approval; again, unanimous approval from planning commission to where the porch or the garage would not be any further beyond the front of the porch or sit behind the porch itself; the other matter that was addressed there was the lot coverage in which we agreed that the home would not cover more than 30 percent of the lot; one question was raised on the last presentation we made about the planning commission and to council was are we representing homes that Westport Homes was going to be building; so again at that recommendation we decided to go ahead and show specifically some elevations that we are proposing for Middletown and that these are homes that we are currently building; do we have that presentation or I can certainly pass it out; I'd be happy to go ahead and pass it out; the plans I'm showing here are elevations of Westport Homes that are currently offered; and where the garage has been adjusted to where it does not exceed the front of the porch; so there's roughly nine plans here and these are Westport Homes that are being proposed in Middletown Farms; now several of these are the same model style; the very first two pictures that you're looking at there of these elevations are of a Denali; one is a Denali Farmhouse style and the other is a Denali Craftsman style; I show these only because you can see that they're quite discernable and other than the name Denali I don't necessarily think that you would look at those two homes and you would think that they're the same house style; but we do put elevations or facades on those homes; all of the homes I'm showing you here would comply with what planning commission had unanimously approved; so I wanted to make sure that I gave you all a sample; and I believe last time I was here I had presented a few plans that were not Westport Homes but were shown to you in concept; the other presentation that we made to planning commission that I believe would be fair to present to council as well; I believe it was at the request of council or one of the council members, I don't recall specifically stated that if you were to push the garage back by four feet how would that impact the lookability of the home on the inside; we had often discussed mud rooms and we had discussed entry areas off of the garage; so what we did is we took four examples; and these are the same examples that you have; several of them are in your packets of the elevations; let me just run through them with you fairly quickly here; the very first plan that you have is a Baxley Two I believe it's titled at the top there; so if you took that Baxley Two and shoved that garage back by four feet how does it impact the home; well the first thing that it would do on this particular ranch plan is it would reduce the square footage by 142 square feet; at roughly a nominal amount of \$100 - \$120 a square foot you're looking at a reduction in terms of purchase price by \$15 to \$18 thousand; the master bedroom depth is reduced by three feet nine inches; the laundry room as you can see is considerably smaller and no laundry tub option would be made available; the master closet is considerably smaller; the master bath would only allow one vanity; a window would be eliminated; and a rear guest closet is eliminated; if you take the next plan which is a Hawthorne; Jarvis: while you were looking at this I understand the concept; everything just kind of accords together but did you also take into consideration a change in the footprint, the foundation would no longer be symmetrical but maybe have a bump out; is that something you've thought about; Mautino: all possible but keeping within the basic footprint and the square footages; to your point it's like an amoeba; if you push on one the other one has to go someplace to pick up the additional square footage in some aspects; what we wanted to represent here in doing that it gets us completely redesigning the home to allow for that garage to sit back; Jarvis: right; there would be some additional engineering costs at the least to do that; Mautino: correct; if we wanted to keep within the basic envelope and just push the garage back by that four feet I think that you can see here the radical impact that it does have on each of these floor plans; two of them ranches and two of them two stories; and again wanting to just give those examples; we still feel very strongly that the architectural adjustments that we have made to the homes by having the front porch be a minimum of 100 square feet; adding the architectural detail to the garages; keeping them no closer of behind the front porch; this in itself allows for better livability in the home; when we start having to

redesign homes for one particular community then we have to avoid that community; we have to look someplace else; if we're designing homes for just one community or one subdivision; we do meet the side load requirement; we have addressed the snout houses that the 2006 code was written to; and we do feel that with this architecture along with planning commission's approval that we are ready to move forward; Clark: can you give me the square footage of each one of these; the Baxley Two and the Hawthorne; just go through each one of those and give me square footage; Mautino: I'm going to have to go from the top of my head; the Baxley Two is roughly 1,800 square feet; the Hawthorne Two is 2,150; the Denali is 3,300; and the Newport Two is 3,100; Clark: thank you; Coolman: sire the question I have is on some of your models some of these elevations you stated that you feel that you've met the square footage on the front porches; the Sycamore models I question; we were talking about 100 square feet; are those porches 100 square feet; Mautino: yes; let me check that Sycamore model; Amos: looking at it the door is recessed; that is one of the things we talked about; and it doesn't look like much area at all in that; the same with the Campton; Coolman: the Campton as well; Tom's pointing out of me that as a text requirement; it's in our text so that; I would say the likelihood that the Sycamore D Farmhouse would not be 100 square feet but with the depth and just looking at the two dimension of the Sycamore that probably is; but what I would say as Tom pointed out it is a text requirement so all of the porches would be at minimum 100 square feet; Hollins: and it might be an appropriate time, Tom or Molly, either one can you update council on the status of the text

Molly Winn, attorney, Westport Homes: good evening; thank you; the revised text was sent early this morning as a clean version; the marked up version was sent on Friday; it reflects the new lot coverage standard which is now code compliant at 30 percent; as Jack and Tom pointed out it does have the 100 square foot limitation for the front porches; meaning that per the legal document governing the property the front porches cannot be any smaller than 100 square feet; so while those elevations may not reflect it exactly the applicant has committed to 100 square feet total in the porch area; I believe those are the only new subset changes to the new revised textural requirements that were sent over; Hollins: did we address infrastructure, Molly, in the text; Haire: there is a commitment in the text of a number of infrastructure related items that we'd ask in terms of some right-of-way dedications, some funding to commit to improvements on Lithopolis Road and Hayes Road due to the impact of traffic from this development; and then the outstanding item that still remains is the commitment for infrastructure on Oregon Road; the applicant has committed that they're responsible for a portion of the traffic there but we haven't got up to a final decision to what that commitment level will be based on the total scope of that project; we'll still work on revising that prior to getting to a final development plan; Winn: and to Mr. Haire's point those are final development plan items; this is a land use hearing; those are not typically items we would proceed to in the event we were not able to get the rezoning; they are engineering and right-of-way dedication issues; I am prepared to speak to them; the applicant is prepared to pay for the traffic impact that they create on Oregon Road based on the traffic study that's been approved by city staff and that was completed; we also are committed to donating 40 feet of additional right-of-way to the center line of Lithopolis; donating 40 feet of right-of-way to the center line of Hayes; and 30 feet of right-of-way to Oregon; so those items have been flushed out with staff; some of the more specific would go to final development items; Hollins: and I just want to point out to council we have asked them to include to the extent possible in the text so we get as clean an ordinance as possible any of the commitments concerning the architecture, concerning the infrastructure; I believe was all that distributed to you ahead of time; the red line version of the text and the clean version of the text; Amos: it was not; Hollins: what is attached to the ordinance right now is the old version of the text; and really it's just a reference in your packet because it's such a large exhibit; I think the latest version specifically attached is the April 23rd 2018 version of the text if and when we were going to take action on this ordinance we'd want a motion to amend to substitute the most updated version of the text for this April 23rd version as exhibit B to the ordinance; in other words we'd want to incorporate the latest negotiated version of the text into our ordinance rather than reference an old version; Jarvis: I understand; does that include the things that were just addressed as far as cost sharing; and when I hear you say that you're willing to pay for the impact to the degree that the city is requesting; Winn: my understanding is that those negotiations are ongoing; I believe that the traffic impact study that was commissioned indicated 41.7 percent increase in traffic on Oregon Road as a result of Westport's development and the applicant has committed and will commit to funding at that level; it is my understanding that that is agreeable to staff; but I believe those discussions are ongoing; Clark: Lucas where does that money come from; is that out of the general fund or is that out of our street

program; is it taking away from other streets or what; Haire: when you reference the money you mean if we were to improve that roadway at some point; Clark: yes our share; Haire: it's something we would plan for over time; it's obviously something that we're still working on negotiating and still determining what the scope of a project would be if we were to do anything in the future; but it's not really part of the discussion for this evening; it's something we will work out prior to getting to a final development plan; Clark: another questions; have we in the past in past developments paid for residential not commercial roads to build out of a general fund or street funds or has the developer paid the share of the development; Haire: it's been various combinations; Jarvis: back in April you asked us to look at our residential standards and reconsider in light of modern times and different practices and such; that was done; it went through the whole process and such and what came out of it was actually a set of standards that were probably more restrictive or limiting I guess than what the previous ones were; now we realize that you aren't bound by this; this is a planned residential district; all the cats are in the air right; we can do whatever we feel is correct; but I have a question for you; a proposition; with those new standards and I hope you're familiar with them and I will guess I will say excluding the four foot setback on the garage, you've addressed that; its apparently something that you're not able or willing to do; but the rest of the standards that are contained in our new residential standards, we haven't formally adopted them yet but the direction is clear; it's been vetted through planning and zoning and we've even had a BIA review of it and they did not flag anything in there as being excessive or unrealistic; Winn: I'll address that; just to start as you noted the standards are not in effect; it is challenging when the applicant goes through the process, operates in good faith, and feels like they try to work with planning commission and work with council in order to meet what you're looking for in your community and to meet what you're looking for with the proposed legislation to have the ball moved sort of toward the end; this development was designed with an eye towards the existing code and existing law governing planned residence developments; Mr. Melchi the executive director of the BIA is here this evening; he is prepared to speak regarding the level of involvement that the BIA has had with this process; I think that you will find that while nothing was flagged that's because he was instructed that the time to bring up any issues with the standards would be here at council this evening; so perhaps that review by the BIA is not as extensive as we would hope; to talk about what the applicant has done; it does comply with the proposed standards; we have reviewed them; we've evaluated them; the first kind and I will run through my chart here quickly and I can slow down if you like or not go into as great of detail as you want; but the new code does require trim around the windows at each elevation; the applicant is ready and willing to comply with that; the new code also requires some pretty stringent requirements regarding building materials; the applicant is largely complying with that; However the applicant's development will have .44 vinyl siding versus the .46 that is proposed; with respect to the roof pitches the main roof pitches are 6 ½; the secondary are 4 ½ per the proposed legislation; the applicant is proposing 6 ½ and 5 ½ for secondary; and they are also willing to comply with the 8 inch overhang requirement for the gable and eve restrictions; so those are the kind of general areas where the applicant will comply; this development is going to look like what you've asked for; as to the diversity requirement, candidly the diversity requirement speaks to the design elements of the home; I think in that way it's both potentially overly restrictive as well as under restrictive; you could have a home next to another home that has a different design but has the same facade; and we would submit what was probably sought to be regulated here is two houses that look the same that are right next to each other; the other sort of issue we take with the diversity requirement as it is that as it is it's a minimum of three homes on either side you're potentially talking then about seven homes on one side of the street as well as three homes across the street; so you're looking at a pretty significant requirement; it's our experience where we look at this typically most homes are two and they regulate the facade; just to speak to that again we've also found that this is the type of item that is largely policed by the market; people typically don't want to build the same home that their neighbor has; there is sort of an eye to that when people build new homes in planned communities; so that requirement is not met and I'll let John during that time speak to sort of the issues with that; the chimneys follow your old code; regarding cantilever and shed chimneys that are permitted if they're on the rear of the home; the flat front entries the applicant will comply with that; they've committed to the 100 square foot minimum porch requirements; so we do meet the new proposed legislation based on that; any questions about anything I've covered so far; Jarvis: I don't know; you've covered a lot of things in a quick amount of time; I'm not sure I've got a clear picture of where the deviations are; I tried to take some notes but; the gist if what I'm hearing you saying is you don't have any problem with the standards that we developed other than that four foot setback;

Mautino: I'll speak to a couple of the standards that are proposed that we would have issue with that Molly hasn't mentioned yet; and again I'll let John speak to that; if I'm going from memory I believe any more than twelve inches of foundation would be wrapped in a cultured stone/cultured brick that could be applied toward subsurface; that's one that we would have issue with; Jarvis: above grade; yeah; Mautino: yeah; we would also have issue with the fact that I believe it's you want two architectural elements on the sides of the home on each floor; I believe how the code is written today is only two architectural elements on a gable; also the way the new code is being proposed is that windows closer than ten feet together can only be deemed as one architectural element; there are fireplace chimneys extending beyond the boxes themselves cantilever (inaudible) there's some give and take in there; my fear is simply this; now we're dictating so much cost on the exterior of the home that when does the customer choose what and how they want on the inside of the home; that's the fear; do I wrap my twelve inch foundation in stone or do I buy the granite counter tops or the surfaces or the appliance package; and my bigger concern with this is there's not a single appraiser that will give you value for those items; they'll give you value for extra square footage; they'll give you value for a finished basements; they'll give you value for more bathrooms; they'll give you value for granite counter tops; they're not giving you value for a third element on the side of a home or on two sides of the home; Jarvis: your points are taken but you have to put yourself in our shoes too; we have not had a new residential development in this city in well over ten years; I mean they're still building out form old standards; we cringe sometimes because of what was set in place back then and what we had to live by; this is our first opportunity to do something that we all feel pretty strongly about and unfortunately you're the first one through that door in over ten years; I don't know how to leave this right now; if we need more time to rack and stack this we're really coming together in the middle somewhere I think it's worth it if you're not or if you are asking us to take action on it this evening we're prepared to do that; but I don't know that it's going to be to your liking based on what I understand because the standard are important to all of us; while there's some room for some give and take here and there there's a lot more than just a couple of things it's quite a few things; and I understand what you do on the outside would somebody opt to do deluxe things on the inside; I don't know; I'm not in this business; I don't know; it's been a long time since I bought a house and I don't know what somebody would do; I think if they have enough money they would do whatever they want to do; that's the way it works right; anyone else on council; Lynch: I see people do crazy things inside of homes; we can't dictate that; but what we can do is dictate what our community is going to look like from the exterior; and that's what we're trying to accomplish with these updated codes; and like Mr. Jarvis said your kind of the first up to bat; Mautino: I think we agree on more than what we disagree on; and we have come a long way from where we've started; Lynch: I've noticed there's a lot of marrying between the 1130 codes and the new codes that we've brought forward; we did talk about putting trim around all the windows; that's not in 1130 but that is in our new code; you did talk about adding the soffit fascia and that's in our new codes not the old ones; the chimney you've moved to the back and it's not on the side; but it's still not an all the way to the ground masonry structure correct; Mautino: correct; Lynch: there's another one that was added in there but I didn't get that on my notes; you had mentioned it right before the chimney; siding's a .44 instead of .46; so what's the cost difference to you between .44 and an upgraded .46; Mautino: I'm not familiar with a .46; we use .44 in I believe Pickerington and Delaware; Lynch: what did you use in Commercial Point; Mautino: probably .42; but we also as Tom is pointing out to me we do have hardy fronts; so all of the homes are hardy fronts or cementitious material; she might have also pointed out the eight inch overhangs on the eaves; Lynch: oh yes she did mention that; Mautino: we're using again going back to two architectural elements on the side; so I think we are some hybrid between the two codes particularly with the porches and the garage and the architectural elements on the garage; I do believe that this is considerably more; the other thing that I have to look at and I think that you all have to look at as well is just simply a price point today of between \$350,000 to \$425,000; with applying those additional standards I would say that you're taking the home up an additional between \$15,000 and \$20,000 in cost; and at some point you effectively put an economic moratorium in place; well the rear elevations I believe is three architectural elements; which is easy to meet; Bennett: I guess I wanted to hear more about the respected just being two models on either end instead of the three; you said you had someone here that was going to speak to that; and then there was more that can be done with the facade than just the model; Mautino: I'll give you a great example; take the first two photos; just the first two and I do apologize one and two would not be permitted but the D elevation; these two homes would not be permitted next door or they would have to be three lots away the way your proposed code is written today; simply because they're both a Denali; and the next one couldn't be built; my point being the way the code should

be written is based on elevation; not on the name of the home; and today the way the proposed code is it states model not model elevation; so that's the point that we're trying to make; Jarvis: but to that same point model elevation you could make a minor change and you've created a new elevation but they're essentially the same house; I know that's not the case here; Mautino: there may be some examples here that you'd look at and think well those shouldn't be permitted; and the other simple thing that a builder will come along and do is rename them all; Lynch: call them different models; Mautino: so I guess it really comes down to and as Molly had pointed out it's not unusual for very stringent communities like Dublin to have a two lot separation between the same style; three lots using the same name and then imposing that across the street as well you're wiping out an entire street with one model stop; once that model would be built, I'm exaggerating, but it would have significant impact; Bennett: when you talk about the two lots of separation though is there a difference in the facade that you allow; let's say they're two lots apart are the facades drastically different; how close can I put that facade or how soon can I repeat the same facade; Mautino: it would not be directly across the street; so if this were on lot one the next closest would be lot four; Bennett: the exact same house; Lynch: so you have to have at least four units between each facade; Mautino: the same house elevation facade shall not be directly across the street and a minimum of two lot separation shall be required between the same house elevations facade on the same side of the street or diagonal from one another; Lynch: it seems like there's enough separation between these models and facades to separate them from being the same model; Coolman: they have seven different styles with each name of the style with two options; that's fourteen options here; Mautino: this is just a sample; we offer 23 different plans; Coolman: what are you going to offer here; Mautino: probably between ten to twelve models of which those twelve would have four elevations each; so upwards of 48 different styles; Hart: part of what we did and what we have in the text, it was designed and it was based on the current code, the existing code, but with the exception of saying elevations and facades not saying house design or house model; that really comes from us taking a look at other jurisdictions; we looked at Dublin in particular; they don't actually mandate a diversity standard in their code; but every one of their pud's that gets passed up there has this two lot separate; the same language that we picked out; we looked at Ballantrae, the latest part of Muirfield, Riviera and Autumn Rose Woods and they all have that six lot box where diagonally and on either side you can't repeat a house that's the same or similar; there's going to be some front elevations, I think Molly pointed this out, where you can have two different house models but the fronts look too much the same because builders can change fronts a lot as Jack pointed out; so that's the standard we're used to; it's very common throughout the market; and where jurisdictions do dictate a diversity standard that's what they go to; nobody has a three lot on either side and three lots on either side across the street standard; you're going to tell a lot of people no you can't have that house is our concern; Jarvis: would it be possible to hear from the gentleman representing the BIA; his thoughts on the standards;

Johnathan Melchi, Executive Director BIA: I'd be happy to; I want to make sure not to mingle us; our policy is typically not to comment on one of our builders developments; I want to make sure that this is not taken into context with their proposal; I appreciate the challenge you guys have; as you mentioned it's been since 2006 that this code has been updated; our builders agree that it needs to be updated; as we showed then the 2006 code as they read it they said well this isn't good either; so our preference as an organization and we're trying to be a little better at this is to work with the development if the code; and the situation here unfortunately was that we were not aware of the change until a week ago for a planning and zoning meeting where we saw the code; Mr. Haire was kind enough to meet with us and we had an interesting good conversation I thought; some things we needed to do better but to your point Mr. President on not having any changes we sent over red line changes to Mr. Haire and Andrew of some of the challenges we had; and we did talk through those; I would probably name three items that I think we had the biggest challenge with; the four foot garage recess is a major problem for all the builders that we talked to for many of the reasons that Jack outlined; primarily the square footage in the change; it was something that we were informed that the drafting committee was very serious about and that we would likely not have any luck changing but having talked to our builders this is a major sticking point for pretty much everybody that is in this marketplace or marketplace of a similar today; other challenges we had were the lot diversity which Jack alluded to; we in our email over had proposed two lot separation that was outlined in Dublin; I got some push back from my members on that but I think that's something that we absolutely could live with; other challenges were the request that driveways be merged when possible to

reduce the appearance of driveways; I think that's a novel concept except that consumers have told our builders by and large that that's not what they prefer; they do not prefer to share a driveway with their neighbor; you're trying to have a holiday party and all of a sudden you're parking in your neighbors side and they get irritated; it's just not a consumer preference; we do understand that the 2006 code is not great; the four sided elevations; we pushed back and forth between our members and Mr. Haire had asked us for some alternatives and quite frankly we couldn't get to any for some of the reasons Jack alluded to about increasing from two on a side to four; as my member said it just feels like we're putting stuff up to check a box; our opinion of this, and fear of this is it's going to set a mood in which no new builders will want to come into the marketplace and that the cost will be such that it's going to have a chilling effect; our recommendation or what I would ask of council is to give us some time to work with you and with staff directly to come to alternatives on some of the issues that we outlined; if council is intent on the four foot garage thing I can tell you it's the number one thing that folks as they read it come up with; the diversity models is the second thing; driveways third; there's a lot; if you talk to a number of builders some would have issues with the porch size requirements; I think by and large if you look at the proposal and section B it talks about to encourage design flexibility and creativity but the standards proposed are so prescriptive that there's not going to be design flexibility or creativity; there's going to be the same house over and over again which is what I think you'd want to avoid; Jarvis: can I ask you to clarify that a little bit because I don't understand how you get there with the way it's written unless I completely misunderstand it; Melchi: well I think as far as some of the requirements you have put in place as far as the design of the house including the porch size, so if two neighbors decide they want to have porches the houses are going to look relatively similar because you've already mandated where the garage is; you've mandated what the front porch looks like; you've mandated what features need to be there and I think you're going to have similar looking houses; council respectfully read these and I went around my neighborhood and I felt kind of bad about where I live because my garage is even with my porch but I would respectfully ask if you have an opportunity look at your homes and your neighbors and your friends here in Canal and see if they would meet this standard; and you have a great opportunity to move forward and as one of the councilmen said to set the stage for what Canal is going to look like in the future and we want to be a part of that; there's some challenges there and there's some things that my members are going to have to give on; and I think we know that; our hope is that we can be part of that process before you make a decision that we think could have a long term effect; Jarvis: thank you; Mr. Haire do you have any thoughts or observations on this discussion; you've been through the process every step of the way; Haire: yeah we had the opportunity to meet with some representatives of the BIA and went through the code prior to it going to planning and zoning; planning and zoning had asked us to do that so we did set up a meeting; they provided the red line version; we met with them and discussed the red line version; we altered the code based on those discussions; we had a number of alterations that took place; we asked for more input from the BIA; and I didn't have any further communication with them until Friday when I received an email from them; so there wasn't any other communication after that; I think we met in October I want to say it was; there wasn't other input; we did have a few differences that we thought were significant and some of the council members were on that committee; I think the priority was front entrances and garages being secondary to the home; so those were the main things that we were looking at that I still think are the major differences we have; and then the models were also a major difference we have in terms of diversity; the diversity the idea there being that we didn't want communities that the same builder developing the entire community and making one minor tweak to the home to meet our guidelines in terms of diversity; and we see a lot of that currently in terms of what's being developed in Canal Winchester; we have currently two active builders in the community; probably 75-85 percent of the homes each of those builders are probably two to three models that they're building and they are very minor tweaks; maybe they flip the side the garage is on and then they're building right across the street from each other; it happens frequently and that came up frequently in our observations from our committee; so it's something we said we really wanted to have more diversity in the houses themselves; Walker: as far as the side load garages that was quite a few back in 2006 in those plans; has that been met as well; Haire: we had a standard for 20 percent side load and I believe we increased that to 25 percent; but we also allowed a detached garage to count towards that 25 percent; Jarvis: up to

this evening I just kind of felt like new information coming out; new information; new information; I think tonight represents kind of everybody has made their case and I don't know that there's anything new; currently this ordinance is poised for third reading; it is tabled and I guess I'm asking the applicant if you want us to take it off the table this evening and take action or whether you think that there is more to talk about; Bennett: before we answer that question, sir I was looking on the website at the Ballintrae homes that you have outlined; Mautino: we don't build in Ballintrae; I think Tom referenced that as one of the communities in which they had looked at their duplication; Westport Homes does not build in Ballintrae; Jarvis: I do have one question Mr. Mautino regarding the recent acquisition of Westport Homes and whether that has any impact on this at all when we're talking about models and such; whoever acquired, the parent company, probably has their own philosophy; I'm wondering; I know this one is already in the pipeline but do you foresee that as a factor in any of this; Mautino: it's a very good question; a very valid question; Westport Homes was recently acquired by DR Horton; DR Horton is headquartered in Fort Worth, Texas they are the largest home builder in the United States; I believe last year they closed about 55,000 homes; they have operations everywhere from Honolulu and Maui up into Seattle and down on the west coast and along the east coast; Florida and Texas; last years' revenues were roughly 16.1 billion; do they have a full menu of plans; they do; you can only imagine the plans that are being built in those multiple markets from Seattle to Orlando; we did not change our name nor do we intend to change our name; Westport has built a great brand here over the last twelve to fourteen years; we are a division of DR Horton; we will continue to operate; I was recently in Indianapolis meeting with our regional architect as well as our regional purchasing operations manager; we've been told we are business as usual; that we build great homes today; we have great designs that sell very well in the mid-west; they do not have an operation in the mid-west; I'd say Chicago would be the closest; hence the reason they acquired our operations in Columbus; to answer the question simply it is business as usual; name as usual; status as usual; and we will continue to grow the footprint in central Ohio, Indianapolis and Fort Wayne; with respect to the question where do we go from here; it's a great question because I feel like I'm in a rabbit hole; I don't know where this thing goes or where it comes out; I am quite concerned of how much cost we are adding to these homes; I think we're getting to a point that maybe a simple meeting with select members of council to go through the proposed code along with where we stand today on a line by line item; it might be beneficial; if that would be the case I'd be happy to meet with members of council to go through the proposed code along with where we stand today; and is this that migration; I will tell you that if the code were adopted as it is today this would be a very short conversation I think for both of us; Hollins: Jack can I make one more suggestion; Mautino: please; Hollins: we did receive your phasing plan and a bunch of the first stuff out of the shoot is off of not Oregon but Hayes Road which also gives us time to figure out the Oregon Road impact and what not; those are some of the bigger lots; looking at it on a phase by phase basis I wonder if, it's awfully hard to do this stuff in the abstract sometimes; if there would be a compromise where I think that's 40 some lots; of you build those under your proposal then we could look at it; I don't know what your build out schedule is but maybe revisit the standards before we get into a whole bunch more lots off Oregon Road; and again that's not something you have to answer tonight; but it's a big subdivision: I'm sure it's going to take a while to build out; and some of these thing, the models, our experience in the past has been the models evolve over time anyway; and we'd be back revisiting these standards potentially anyway; if there's any way to split the baby; I don't know; you've got to buy a whole parcel of land is the problem with that; subsequent phases wouldn't necessarily have approval of your design yet; it would be pushed off; kick the can down the road as they say; something to think about; Mautino: to that point for us to close on the property we would need to have a zoning; and that would be very difficult though; I appreciate the suggestion; I think maybe at this point it would be; again, I'm very willing to sit down with members of council to move through this; I do have; the one question that sticks in my mind that I'd be remiss if I didn't ask is that simply we were back before planning commission; who was the author of the new code or the proposed code; Jarvis: that's one of the review steps; but we're not bound by their recommendation; Mautino: understood; but we did receive a unanimous approve from them; Jarvis: yes sir; noted; Walker: I'd like to follow up just a quick question on the side loaded garages; there's thirteen pictures here and I know there'll be more; but there's only one which is the Denali C Craftsman; that second illustration to me

right now let's say 25 percent and your standards 20 the old; that's going to be a the side load garage 20 percent of the development; Mautino: every home that I show you here can be built as a side load; and every home that we would offer can also be built and a side load; I only use this is one example; Walker: that was my next question; every home; okay; and tight now are you at that 20 percent; Mautino: we are; Jarvis: and to be clear this portfolio that you sent and handed put hard copy this is it right; there's nothing you're taking away or adding to; Mautino: oh no; I would be adding to many of the plans; this was a sample of the plans that we would propose in Middletown; Bennett: you'd have to take out the Sycamore Two's; because those wouldn't be relevant for this development; Mautino: the Farmhouse elevation; Lynch: is there much of a cost increase in doing a side load as opposed to a front; you would need a wider lot; Mautino: it's about \$8,000 for a side load; it's more the driveway and the turn and the concrete; Lynch: would you have to have a wider lot too; Mautino: as you know we've gone from initially we were at 65 foot wide lots and now we're at 75, 80 and 85 to allow for the side loads; Lynch: to allow for the 20 percent; Mautino: that's correct; Coolman: can I ask you a question please; now that you are bought out by America's largest home builder; multi-billion dollar company; do you see that as giving you any advantage concerning material costs, labor costs or things of that nature; coming into central Ohio; Mautino: that's another good question; yes and no; yes form the standpoint that we do have national purchasing contracts; today we use Kohler; they have a contract with Moen; that's one example there; but many of the contracts we have are already in place; but buying 52,000 is different than buying 350; most of it though is handled in rebates and not so much in pricing; so the more volume the better rebates that you get; so that's on the buying side; but on the labor side no not at all; Bennett: I think they've offered to sit down and have a side discussion with select members of council; I would be one to think that maybe it would be wise to sit to take this discussion; Jarvis: here's why I hesitate to do that; this was suggested earlier and I don't speak for you or anyone else here; and if I was convinced personally that this project was the greatest thing for Canal Winchester's future and someone else and someone else didn't it just come snack and now we're having the debate at this level; you make a decision with your vote; unless there's information that we don't have; I guess that's part of why I'm a little uncomfortable; I feel like the information has come in dribs and drabs; and I still don't feel like I understand; that I have crystal clear clarity as to what is being proposed; and in the absence of that the safe answer is no; Hart: Mr. President if I may; the reason for that request would be that we're also unclear whether there's a real good understanding on a line for line basis; whether the comparison between the code before you, the old code and how our text is in the middle; that's not real clear to us that everybody in this room is on the same page on those three items as well; and we would like a chance to walk through that in detail; we have evolved a great deal and have arrived here after a whole year; and it is hard to deal with something new on the table but to really understand and to have what we think would be fair would to have that understanding be clear; now we could do that differently; we could produce a document that goes line by line and gives you the three comparisons; Jarvis: a crosswalk between; I think that would be very beneficial; Hart: it's hard not to have a good deal of time walking through those things as well; and it's difficult to get a clear understanding on that kind of thing and those comparisons without some face to face; so I guess our next step is we could produce such a document; with holidays and we're into next year and it is a lot of detail; it might help if you have some indigestion after the holiday meal to get you to sleep; that is something we could do; Amos: Mr. Jarvis, I would appreciate the time to look through what Mr. Hollins has sent us tonight because some of this because the red line we have not had a chance to view it; Jarvis: yeah that was an example of some new information; it's a moving target and if somebody, anybody can actually sit there and look at it and say okay here's what the new standards say; here's what you've already rogered up to; and here's where the disconnects are item by item; I think we can probably make an informed decision; but right now I don't feel like we're there and having a break out meeting with some members of council is problematic I think ; I have no problem with council representation but I would prefer to have staff host that meeting and it would be just to clarify what the issues are and what your position is on it and I think we can make a decision based on that; if you're willing to go through that; Hart: we'll take the next step of preparing the document and sending it in; and then however procedurally council is comfortable we would work with that of course; no matter what the; the venue or the format is the issue is that detail and that comparison; Jarvis: and not just verbal but something in writing; Hart: we're feeling

really strongly that we made a good faith effort that it will work in the market; that the houses are going to look; they will be a significant improvement over what is being built today; they will be different; but I guess we have to walk through that; Jarvis: it may feel like we're moving the goal post but it's really kind of a maturing of our thought; the standards are the only thing we've got that is a documented objective; there's seven of us here; we can come up with seven opinions of what we think; if it looks good here and there; so those standards are the only thing that we all sort of get behind; of we use that as a source document for this crosswalk that we're talking about; and of staff has no objection to participating in something like that with the Westport representatives; Mr. Haire I'm kind of addressing you: Lynch: are you including council in that too; Jarvis: if I get up to three members of council if you'd like to participate in that; I would like to be there myself; so that leaves two seats open if you would like; this is something that would probably happen during business hours; so there's that; Bennett: I'm okay with not participating; I feel like there are several members of council that (inaudible) I would lean on their opinions as well; I feel like I have very similar views; I think most of us have the same impression truthfully; Jarvis: I sense that myself; so any cross section of council I think would be pretty representative of the whole; Bennett: I agree; Clark: a big thing for me is your asking us to go we would not have to spend money on a road if we weren't doing this development; I know you're saying your only percentage is 41.5 percent but it's still money we have to go and find and spend on a development; I feel that you should take the whole 100 percent and build what is needed there and if you can't get there I've got issues with that; Hart: Mr. President, Mr. Clark I'd love to go over with you sometime if you would want to the law in traffic and how that law works and the proportionality test that we're supposed to fund; the impact we create; but we're not responsible for traffic that already exists; and roads get built and sewers get built with a combination of that impact and the greater good; that's what we face; that's how it's done everywhere; a new development and the traffic study documents this; a new development doesn't necessarily trigger any new improvements; but it does trigger us contributing to the traffic we create; Hollins: it's another good issue for this meeting; and Bob honestly I think you'd be a good third because of the infrastructure; Walker: I have I believe a fair question; when you first met with our Development Director Mr. Haire, the third reading, this is tabled; it's still tabled and we're just now receiving thirteen images and there's 30 or 40 possible of what your product is; and is that typical; I'm just curious; Mautino: it was sent electronically a couple of days ago; but your point is taken; Hart: in fairness we don't see what we produce; this is real different than the presentation we made a couple months ago to both here and planning commission; both if what we showed are illustrative to what the standards in our text would allow to be built; in that presentation we had some other people's product and some product that was in another community but they both; it's not everything; we're governed by a text; if it passes it dictates the standards; we're just showing what that allows; you know going back to the beginning; we proposed empty nester on the site; we proposed smaller lots; we had a lot of evolution; Walker: I've been on council three years and there's not been a lot come through so I'm just curious how it typically works; Hart: I'd say it's typical at the end a council representing the folks of a community want to see those images; Jarvis: is there anyone else on council who would like to participate; Jarvis: Mr. Lynch, Mr. Clark, myself; Mr. Hollins would you facilitate this at least to the point of getting it organized; Hollins: sure; and I am out of the country; I got two kids overseas in college from Sunday until January the 10th; and I'll have jet lag on the 11th; now when do we want to try; and I wasn't planning on doing it over the holiday because I figured you guys weren't anyway; Lynch: I'm out of the country too from the 11th until the end of January; Hollins: holy cow I should hand off the baton as I'm coming back; Hart: Mr. President maybe what we should do is to contact Gene; Hollins: yeah I don't need to be there and one thing I'd like to give you is a good three ring binder at this point as to where we get stuff; dribs and drabs; we need to get it all together; Hart: we'll produce the comparison and I think it's appropriate that Mr. Haire and Mr. Moore look at that and make sure they're comfortable that we did it right and that will maybe trigger the next step; let us produce the comparison first; Jarvis: as Mr. Walker pointed out we're probably hanging onto those elevations a little harder than what you think; you're showing them as just kind of a suggestive and we're locking in on details because that's where we've been burned and that's what the standards were supposed to address; some of the discussion we've had this evening is well what you're asking for is not what you really want and now it's pretty confusing; and again whenever

you're confused you feel like you're getting mixed messages or not enough information or whatever; the easiest thing to do is to shut down; I'm glad that we're taking this to another level and that we're going to try to demystify all that and get everything on the table; sounds like January is not working really good here for us; Hollins: I don't need to be there at the meeting; I can facilitate getting it; Jarvis: so if it happens shortly after the first Mr. Lynch will be here; Lynch: you guys probably want to get this thing rolling; Mautino: one last point upon the illustrations as a builder we are constantly evolving product to the marketplace; so I get the fact that we're looking as Tom pointed out these are illustrations within the confines of the text; and we would continue to do that; we're introducing new elevations and new product at least twice a month in our sales meeting to our people; no different than automobile models are changing continuously; Lynch: you have three communities where you're building similar products to this; in communities that we get a little closer to what we seem to be asking for; let's start with these right here; do you have three communities that these homes are built in; Mautino: as far as the garage porch treatment; Lynch: as is here; Mautino: it might be offset slightly maybe by a foot or two where the garage would be forward by a foot or two; we were increasing the depth of the porches to meet the garages; Lynch: so you have no communities where the garages do not extend past the front porch correct; Mautino: that's correct; Lynch: what communities do you have where they do extend; let's go with what you have; Mautino: the Corners of Johnny Cake in Berlin Township; Lynch: in Berlin Township; Mautino: it's at the corner of 3B and Cheshire Road right there by Double Eagle Golf Course; Lynch: what's the name of the community; Mautino: the Corners at Johnny Cake; Lynch: what's another one; Mautino: the Meadows at Mill Creek in Ostrander; Lynch: any other; Mautino: the other would just be coming up out of the ground now; and that's the Reserves of Hidden Creek in Berkshire Township; Lynch: in what township is that in; Mautino: Berkshire next to Berlin; just to the east of Berlin Township in Delaware; Jarvis: thank you everyone for your time; no action to that particular ordinance this evening;

Third Reading - NONE

Second Reading

ORD-18-045

Development

Sponsor: Lynch

An Ordinance To Amend Part 11 Of The Codified Ordinances And Adopt The Official Woodlands Map For The City Of Canal Winchester ([Ordinance, Exhibit A](#))

- Second Reading Only

ORD-18-046

Development

Sponsor: Clark

An Ordinance To Amend Part 11 Of The Codified Ordinances And The Zoning Map Of The City Of Canal Winchester, Rezoning An Approximately 69.237 Acre Tract Of Exceptional Use (EU) To Limited Manufacturing (LM), Owned By Gender/Thirty Three, Located On The North Side Of Winchester Boulevard (PID 184-000532 And 184-000871) ([Ordinance, Exhibit A](#))

- Second Reading Only

ORD-18-047

Development

Sponsor: Coolman

An Ordinance Adopting Section 1198 Of The Codified Ordinances Regarding Residential Appearance Standards ([Ordinance, Exhibit A](#))

- Second Reading Only

An Ordinance Amending Section 11991 Of The Codified Ordinances Regarding Landscaping And Screening ([Ordinance](#))

[ORD-18-048](#)*- Second Reading Only*

Development

Sponsor: Lynch

First Reading[ORD-18-050](#)

Construction Services

An Ordinance To Authorize The Mayor To Enter Into A Contract With Quality Control Inspection, Inc. For Consulting Services Relating To Construction Inspection For The Period From January 1, 2019 Through December 31, 2019 ([Ordinance, QCI Agreement](#))

- First Reading Only

Jarvis: can someone address the time frames since it starts January 1st; is there an overlap with the existing contract or we don't need their services; Haire: we don't need their services I don't believe; but we have an existing contract in place; Jarvis: so if this was what 30 days plus; Jackson: you're fine;

[ORD-18-051](#)

Construction Services

An Ordinance To Authorize The Mayor To Amend A Contract With American Structurepoint, Inc. For Consulting Services Relating To Construction Inspection For The Period From January 13, 2019 Through January 13, 2020 ([Ordinance, Agreement](#))

*- First Reading Only***I. Reports**

Mayor's Report

[18-137](#)[November 2018 Mayor's Court Report](#)

Jarvis: I know that we did receive the November Mayor's court report in our packets;

A motion was made by Bennett to approve the November Mayor's court report, seconded by Clark. The motion carried with the following vote:

Yes 7 - Bennett, Clark, Amos, Coolman, Jarvis, Lynch, Walker

Fairfield County Sheriff

Cassel: you have your stats for November in front of you; I'm not going to read them all off to you like I usually do; I will tell you that the first shift average busy time was 57.2 percent; second shift average busy time was 60.3 percent; and third shift was 60.1; so we're right where we need to be; and I'm pretty excited about 2019; I look forward to the new deputies that we're getting; January the 6th we have shift change so I'll be getting a lot of new deputies and I look forward to training them how we want them to be and how we want them to patrol; also I think in 2019 we're going to have a great year in Canal Winchester; that's all; Bennett: I do appreciate the summaries; I think at one point you talked about patrolling neighborhoods more frequently and having the deputies log that time; will that be reflected in these reports in 19; I can have them do that; it's actually reflected in their downtime and on their log sheets; so if I mark in your neighborhood at 21:00 hours and I patrol that area on foot or in my cruiser til 21:30 then that's 30 minutes of downtime; so it's already reflected in it; Bennett: okay I just didn't know if; Cassel: yeah that's where some of your downtime comes from; Bennett: okay thanks;

Law Director

Hollins: I just have a request for a quick executive session at the end of our regular meeting to discuss pending or imminent litigation; Bennett: I want it noted for the record Gene said quick; Jarvis: one more for 2018; Hollins: not quite as quick as Bob;

Finance Director[18-139](#)[Finance Director's Report](#)

Jackson: thank you Mr. Jarvis; I do not have anything;

Public Service Director[18-138](#)[Public Service Director's Report](#)

Peoples: same here sir;

Development Director

Haire: I don't really have anything else to add; I'll reach out to those members that indicated an interest once I receive something from the applicant; then we'll try to get something scheduled for the first week in January if everyone is available then; Jarvis: I will try to make myself available then; Amos: I would serve as a backup if somebody can't; Jarvis: I'm hoping this is a one and done thing; I don't know what it is about this particular application but it makes you uncomfortable because information is not exactly coming together; usually it's a little more cut and dry; I'm not sure whether that's because we're rusty and we haven't done it in such a long time; this group of people has never gone through something like this and it's much that's on the line right; Lynch: I think we're overly cautious; which is not a bad thing; Jarvis: no it's not necessarily a bad thing; Coolman: they keep presenting material to us and you ask them about it and they say well that's just a rendering; they may not be what you get; and I think that's what we're all hanging our hat on; if that's not what we're going to get then why are we even being shown it; Clark: Pat didn't you say that 4.7 is being used up in some developments; Lynch: there are a lot of communities that are just forgoing vinyl siding and using all cementitious all the way around; Clark: so we could go even more extreme than requiring the 4.6; Walker: right now 4.4 is what they said they're going for but 4.6 is in our new code; Lynch: they conceded on some things marrying into the new code from the old code; they have; but it's just not enough; I don't think they really get that point that we kind of want to change how houses are built here; we've got an inventory of homes here; not bigger homes; just good quality homes that will last a long time; and I don't think that's asking too much; but they don't seem to be getting that; they want to continue a medium grade home for us; Lynch: yeah a medium grade; we have a lot of medium grade homes; Coolman: we do; we have a big inventory; Lynch: they were asking about houses and none of us would have houses that meet the new standard; mine would; they do exist; Jarvis: I'm not sure what that was exactly; I was glad to hear from BIA in any shape or form I guess;

J. Council Reports

Organizational Meeting/Work Session/Council - Monday, January 7, 2019 at 6:00 p.m.

Jackson; Gene and I have to speak about that because it says in the charter we have an organizational meeting every year; it was on my list of things to discuss with you in the morning Gene

Work Session/Council - TUESDAY, January 22, 2019 at 6:00 p.m.

CW Human Services - Mr. Lynch

Lynch: last week they did the adopt a family; they serviced 60 families; between 200-250 children; next event will be in February the weekend of the super bowl; Bennett: Sunday February 3rd; Jarvis: they were one of the grant recipients;

Lynch: so it will be that Saturday, February 3rd; Jarvis: the grant that they applied for I know that behind or beside the building there was some community gardens going in over there but those are actually basically to supplement what they are able to give people; it's not a community garden where you get a plot and keep what you grow; it's to supplement what goes into; Lynch: it all goes into the general pool to give out to people; and a lot of the help came from the church next door; Jarvis: doing the planting and weeding and all that; Coolman: and they allow community members to come in there and volunteer their time to take care of the gardens if you so see fit; a lot of people like to garden but they don't have it; so if you want to volunteer

CWICC - Mr. Clark

Clark: next meeting January 30th 11:30 Interurban building;

CWJRD - Mr. Bennett/Mrs. Amos

Bennett: our next meeting is this Thursday, December 20th 7:00 p.m. Town Hall; we had a budget meeting last Saturday that lasted about 3 ½ hours; it was a good meeting; I think we went through all of our programs; Jarvis: is that planning; Bennett: yeah it was planning looking at 2019; because we have to adopt all of our budgets; Jarvis: how'd you do for this year; Bennett: very well; the final numbers aren't in so what happens in the last two months of the year really we don't have any income; the last two months really become expenses; because our last registration for basketball closed early; so basketballs runs from November through January; so the last couple months of the year is all expense; so we'll have a better idea later this week when we receive the fiscal reports; worst case scenario we are flat which is actually our goal; we are actually not trying to raise funds; Jarvis: break even; Bennett: break even is our goal; and I think over the last two years previous from this, we maybe had from our 19 programs generated somewhere around \$5,000 in revenue not in deficit; Jarvis: I'm surprised it wouldn't be a bigger number than that; I mean \$45 or \$50 a kind times x number of programs you think it would add up to more there; Amos: when you figure in our fees for our fields then the uniform costs they pay out of that plus the fees; Jarvis: oh you're talking about the net; alright;

Destination: Canal Winchester - Mr. Walker

Walker: next meeting Interurban January 22nd 2019 at 6:30

K. Old/New Business

Jarvis: I wanted to say something about Christmas in the Village and commend staff for what they did; they make it look easy; Matt your guys in particular with the lights and everything; Amanda the communications; everything is always good and it gets a little bit better each year; that's hard to do; that's hard to get on top of that every year but you guys manage to do it; on behalf of the community thank you; Lynch: I'd like to add to that too; in addition the festival down here went well and the light parade was killer; 25 floats in that this year; it was very well done; they put a lot of time and effort into it; so thank you for doing that; Amos: well I'll thank my two cohorts over there; I had Mr. Peoples and Cassel; poor things get stuck with me; I get dumped on them and they were so gracious; and Mr. Peoples helped me direct traffic and Cassel and his group helped lead the parade and block off streets because we certainly couldn't do it because we are the slowest moving parade ever; but it turned out really well; Walker: I believe your second only to the Macey's parade on Thanksgiving day because that was fantastic; Amos: we said we would be the Massey's day parade; Walker: it was very impressive;

Lynch: I just want to note that I will be absent from the January 22nd meeting;

L. Adjourn to Executive Session @ 8:45 p.m.

A motion was made Bennett to adjourn to executive session and seconded by Amos. The motion carried with the following vote:

Yes 7 - Bennett, Amos, Clark, Coolman, Jarvis, Lynch, Walker

Council returned from Executive Session @ 8:57 p.m.

M. Adjournment @ 8:57 p.m.

A motion was made by Walker to adjourn, seconded by Bennett. The motion carried with the following vote:

Yes 7 - Walker, Bennett, Amos, Clark, Coolman, Lynch, Jarvis