

January 11, 2018
MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
Springfield, Missouri

The Planning and Zoning Commission met in regular session January 11, 2018 in the City Council Chambers. Chairman Randall Doennig called the meeting to order.

Roll Call - Present: Randall Doennig (Chairman), David Shuler, Joel Thomas, Cameron Rose, Natalie Broekhoven and King Coltrin. Absent: Dee Ogilvy and Melissa Cox. Staff in attendance: Bob Hosmer, Principal Planner, Mary Lilly Smith, Planning Development Director, Tom Rykowski, Asst. City Attorney, Derrick Estell, Public Works Traffic Engineer, Julie Hawkins, Public Works Project Engineer.

MINUTES: The minutes of December 14, 2017 were approved.

COMMUNICATIONS :

Bob Hosmer reported on City Council meeting actions.

CONSENT ITEMS:

Request to Dispose 522 (Fire Station #1)
235 North Kimbrough Avenue
Applicant: City of Springfield

Request to Dispose 523 (Fire Station #6)
1201 South Campbell Avenue
Applicant: City of Springfield

COMMISSION ACTION:

Ms. Broekhoven to **approve** Consent Agenda items - Request to Dispose 522-Fire Station #1 (235 North Kimbrough Avenue) and Request to Dispose 523-Fire Station #6 (1201 South Campbell Avenue). Mr. Cameron seconded the motion. Ayes: Doennig, Shuler, Thomas, Rose, Broekhoven, and Coltrin. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Cox and Ogilvy

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

Stream Buffer Zoning Flexibility Amendments
Citywide

Applicant: City of Springfield - Public Works & Environmental Services

Mr. Hosmer asked that this be **TABLED** and presented at the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting on February 15, 2018.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Mr. Rose motioned to **TABLE** Stream Buffer Zoning Flexibility Amendments (Citywide). Mr. Thomas seconded the motion. Ayes: Doennig, Shuler, Thomas, Rose, Broekhoven, and Coltrin. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Cox and Ogilvy

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Z-1-2018

5389 West Sunshine Street

Applicant: CMH Homes, Inc.

Mr. Hosmer stated that this is a request to rezone approximately 12.72 acres of property generally located at 5389 West Sunshine Street from County M-1, Light Manufacturing to HC, Highway Commercial District and establishing Conditional Overlay District No 144. The Growth Management and Land Use Plan designates this area as appropriate for light industrial, office and office-warehouse, however, the request is also consistent with the West Sunshine/Highway 60 Corridor Study which identifies the subject property within a

Community Activity Center (shopping, recreation and employment). Since this is a MoDOT roadway, a traffic study will be required depending on development. Improvements may be required at the existing crossover (turn lanes) and/or drives. All accesses will need to come from Maple Leaf Lane. Existing drive to the east of Maple Leaf will need to be removed.

Water and sanitary sewer mains will need to be extended to the property. Stormwater detention will be required onsite. The property was annexed into the City 2005. GR zoning was proposed however, the property was removed from the rezoning by the applicant and the property remained zoned County M-1, Light Manufacturing. The Transportation Plan classifies West Sunshine Street as a primary arterial roadway. The Conditional Overlay District will require a traffic study at the time of development. Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Doennig opened the public meeting.

Mr. Geoff Butler, 319 N. Main, representing the owner and gave a short history of the property. Noted that the owners want the property zoned to sell it and the neighborhood was in favor of the rezoning due to the possible enhancement of their property values.

Mr. Doennig closed the public meeting.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Ms. Broekhoven motioned to **approve** Z-1-2018 (5389 West Sunshine Street). Mr. Shuler seconded the motion. Ayes: Doennig, Shuler, Thomas, Rose, Broekhoven, and Coltrin. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Cox and Ogilvy.

Z-2-2018 w/COD #142
2100 East Sunshine Street
Applicant: E Sunshine Land, LLC

Preliminary Plat - Linwood Heights Revenge
2100 East Sunshine Street
Applicant: E Sunshine Land, LLC

Mr. Hosmer stated that the applicant would like the cases to be considered together.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Mr. Coltrin motioned to **combine** Z-2-2018 w/COD #142 and Preliminary Plat - Linwood Heights Revenge (2100 East Sunshine Street). Mr. Rose seconded the motion. Ayes: Doennig, Shuler, Thomas, Rose, Broekhoven, and Coltrin. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Cox and Ogilvy

Mr. Hosmer stated that this is a request to rezone approximately 0.12 acre of property generally located at 2104 East Sunshine from R-SF, Single-Family Residential District, to O-1, Office District, and establishing Conditional Overlay District No. 142. The Growth Management and Land Use Plan designates this area as appropriate for Medium-Intensity Retail, Office or Housing. This mixed category indicates that a variety of office, commercial and/or mid-or high-density housing may be appropriate at major intersections or along certain roadway corridors. The Major Thoroughfare Plan classifies Sunshine Street as a primary arterial roadway which supports the proposed land use. This rezoning will create a mixed zoned lot and the applicant will be required to place a bufferyard between the two different districts on their own property. A Type C will require at least a 15ft wide bufferyard between O-1 and R-SF zoning districts. Maximum height of 35 feet and no building shall be higher than a 45-degree bulk plane adjacent to R-SF Districts.

Mr. Hosmer also stated that this is a request to approve a 10-lot plat generally located in the 2300 block of West Sunset. The Plan identifies this as an appropriate area for Light Industrial, Office and Office warehouse. The 14 acres of property is zoned GM, General Manufacturing. All streets have been constructed. If Planning and Zoning Commission approves the preliminary plat, then the plat will be forwarded to City Council for acceptance of easements. An approved preliminary plat is active for two (2) years.

Staff recommends approval for both the zoning and the preliminary plat.

Mr. Doennig opened the public meeting

Mr. Jared Rasmussen, 550 St. Louis Street, representing the applicant. This is a spike strip and the insurance company next to it is planning to expand their parking lot. At the neighborhood meeting, the neighbors were pleased about the buffer and offered no negative comments.

Mr. Doennig closed the public meeting.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Mr. Coltrin motioned to **approve** Z-2-2018 w/COD #142 (2100 East Sunshine Street). Ms. Broekhoven seconded the motion. Ayes: Doennig, Shuler, Thomas, Rose, Broekhoven, and Coltrin. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Cox and Ogilvy

COMMISSION ACTION:

Ms. Broekhoven motioned to **approve** Preliminary Plat - Linwood Heights Revenge (2100 East Sunshine Street). Mr. Coltrin seconded the motion. Ayes: Doennig, Shuler, Thomas, Rose, Broekhoven, and Coltrin. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Cox and Ogilvy.

Z-3-2018 w/COD #143

1120-1130 & 1121-1131 East Latoka Street

Applicant: One Hundred Two Glenstone, Inc.

Mr. Hosmer stated that this is a to rezone approximately 0.82 acres of property generally located at 1120, 1121, 1126, 1127, 1130, 1143 East Latoka Street from a R-SF, Residential Single Family to a R-MD, Medium-density Multi-Family Residential District and establishing Conditional Overlay District No. 143. The Multi-Family Development Location and Design Guidelines assessed this site which resulted in a density of 20 dwelling units per acre. No traffic study was required however, a sidewalk is required to be constructed on at least one side of the street as a part of this rezoning. Onsite Stormwater detention will required and buyout in lieu of stormwater detention will not be allowed. A bufferyard adjacent to R-SF zoning will be 10 feet width with one understory tree, two evergreen and ten shrubs per 100 linear feet per code. A 45-degree bulk plane is required adjacent to the R-SF district. The bulk plan would be required on the east and south of the development (one to one ratio). A maximum density of 20 dwelling units per acre for a maximum of 16 dwelling units (8 dwelling units on the south-side of Latoka Street and 8 dwelling units on the north-side of Latoka Street). Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Doennig open the public hearing.

Mr. Derek Lee, 1200 E. Woodhurst, representing the owner. Currently there are 6-houses on the properties and will be replacing those with 16-one bedroom units, matching the approximate density now.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Mr. Rose motioned to **approve** Z-3-2018 w/COD #143 (1120-1130 & 1121-1131 East Latoka Street). Mr. Thomas seconded the motion. Ayes: Doennig, Shuler, Thomas, Rose, Broekhoven, and Coltrin. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Cox and Ogilvy.

Planned Development 362

3745 South Cox Avenue

Applicant: Modern Tractor & Supply Company

Mr. Hosmer stated that this is a request to rezone property generally located at 3745 South Cox Avenue from Planned Development No. 141, 6th Amendment to Planned Development No. 362. The Growth

Management and Land Use Plan identifies this area as appropriate for High Intensity Retail, Office or Housing. The intent of the PD is to provide office uses and a television commercial studio however, studio and offices uses are not currently permitted in the PD. The City recognizes Cox Avenue as a public street and Westview and Butterfield as private streets. Cox Avenue is classified as collector roadway in the Transportation Plan. The existing PD allows eating and drinking establishments and antique/gift shops which are typically allowed in the General Retail District, but also allows uses such as day care centers and community centers which are typically allowed in the O-1, Office District.

The proposed changes will allow television commercial studios, catering services and office uses as permitted in the O-1, Office District, prohibiting these uses; Cemeteries, Water reservoirs, water standpipes and elevated and ground-level water storage tanks, Substance abuse treatment facilities for 50 or fewer residents, Telecommunication towers, Bowling alleys, Roller skating and ice skating arenas and Miniature golf. A traffic study is not required. Detention and water quality is already provided. Each structure on Lot 1 will be limited to the same foot print as the existing structures. Individual buildings can increase in square footage by adding a maximum of 20% in generally the same foot print. Lot 2 is limited to two new buildings, a 15,000-square foot maximum building area for studio uses and a 7,000-square foot maximum building area for an office building. Design requirements have been added for each lot. Maximum structure heights will remain at two (2) stories. Lot 1 shall have a 10 foot bufferyard installed along the north property line if an existing building is removed and replaced (existing driveway). Lot 2 shall have a 10 foot bufferyard/ landscaping installed along the West property line and south of the office building as shown on the site plan. There shall be a 15 foot bufferyard with at least three canopy trees and 6-foot wood privacy fence installed along the west property line between the office building and swimming pool as shown on the site plan. The Final Development Plan shall conform to the site plan. Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Thomas asked if this is currently two properties and Mr. Hosmer stated that it is not two properties, the applicant is proposing to subdivide the property. The property owner is going to build a studio and is retaining it as part of the existing family farm.

Mr. Doennig noted that Commission received a letter from the neighborhood regarding ingress/egress to the proposed parking lot (west of the new studio) which comes from Westview Street. If the zoning is approved, is the Commission requiring for the existence point of ingress/egress at Westview Street or can they can access from Cox Road (across the property) to the proposed parking area and not have access off Westview Street and the City will not require access?

Mr. Hosmer noted that they can provide for access easements from Cox Road which is a dedicated street. The City of Springfield recognizes the private streets in Chesterfield Village and there are no problems in getting access from the property to the private street that the City recognizes.

Mr. Doennig opened the public hearing.

Mr. Derek Lee, 1200 E. Woodhurst, representing the applicant. It was requested that the access be off Westview because of the two lots being separated. The owners of the farm (historic farm) want to keep it preserved as it is and they wanted the drive to be separate. At the neighborhood meeting, there were several comments, such as screening between the pool and the proposed office building and we will be providing a 6-foot privacy fence and 3 canopy trees, dumpster location and we put in language about signs. Neighbors expressed concern about the large building on lot 2 not being attractive, so we added language that is in the multi-family design guidelines about architectural features and windows. The proposal was originally submitted with General Retail but was changed to limited Office (O-1) uses.

Mr. Gary McCurter, 2304 W. Westview Street, President of the Chesterfield Homeowners Association. Voiced concern over the (Chesterfield Village owns private Westview Street) use of their private street and does not give permission for vehicles/trucks accessing Westview Street from the proposed studio. He noted that he has sent documentation/letter (part of staff report) stating the details of their opposition.

Ms. Sarah Hitesman, 2308 W. Westview Street. Stated her reason for opposition is the esthetic view from her home, and purchased home for a residential, not an industrial area, concerned with the heavy traffic to

the studio and that Westview Street is a private street and any damage is the responsibility of Chesterfield Village. She also noted that there are two other streets with access into the property.

Mr. Doennig closed the public hearing.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Mr. Rose motioned to **approve** Planned Development 362 (3745 South Cox Avenue). Mr. Coltrin seconded the motion. Ayes: Doennig, Shuler, Thomas, Rose, Broekhoven, and Coltrin. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Cox and Ogilvy.

Conditional Use Permit 433

1518 East Dale Street

Applicant: Springfield Public Schools

Mr. Hosmer stated that this is a request to approve an adaptive use of a non-residential structure in a R-TH, Residential Townhouse District to convert a vacant elementary school (Pepperdine Elementary School) into professional and business offices for a non-profit organization located at 1518 East Dale Street. The Growth Management and Land Use Plan element of the Comprehensive Plan identifies this as an appropriate area for Low Density Housing. Schools are allowed. Dale Street is classified as a collector roadway and Delaware Avenue is classified as a local roadway in the Transportation Plan. The applicant is requesting a Conditional Use Permit to allow a professional and business office use within the existing and vacant Pepperdine Elementary School in a R-TH, Residential Townhouse District. Adaptive use of a non-residential structure is allowed in a R-TH District with a conditional use permit. The planning and zoning commission and city council has authority to determine if the proposed use would or would not have significant adverse impacts on the surrounding neighborhood. If the building is damaged or destroyed more than 75% or if a conditional use is discontinued or abandoned for a period of 12 consecutive months it must conform to R-TH. No conditional use permit shall be valid for a period longer than 18 months from the date on which the city council ordinance unless a building or occupancy permit is obtained.

The proposed conditional use permit requirements:

- Hours of operation until 9:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and Saturdays from 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. (extended hours would be for special events, demonstrations, training sessions and neighborhood or public meetings and events), normal hours would be from 7am to 6pm.
- Signage one free-standing sign with a maximum sign area of 20 square feet and wall signs with a maximum sign area of ten percent of the facade. Wall signs shall only be located on facades with street frontage. Signs shall not be internally lit or externally illuminated.
- Expansions not to exceed 20 percent of the existing floor area of the structure or 1,000 square feet, whichever is less.
- Parking, landscaping and screening will meet city standards.
- Must conform to the attached site plan.

Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Doennig opened the public hearing.

Ms. Lindsay Reichert, 430 S. Glenstone Avenue, representing the owner. Community Partnership of the Ozarks (CPO) is wanting to relocate their Affordable Housing office and other organizations, noting that it only requires the addition of an elevator to make this workable and sees the addition of a community garden on location. She noted that there will be no over-night stays and housing on the premises and will work other partnerships to satisfy those situations.

Mr. Tommy Pike, 1602 E. Dale Street, lives across the street and would like the building torn down and made into a park and stated concerns of homeless people wandering around in his neighborhood. He also stated that he is worried about over-night lodging and the possibility of dingy homes being erected and that it

may cause the value of the homes to go down as well as expressing concern of having parking problems if they hold classes late at night.

Ms. Michelle Garand, 789 S. Jester Avenue. Works for Community Partnership of the Ozarks (CPO) as the director of Affordable Housing and Homeless Prevention. She noted that CPO has a long history with Springfield and is investing in the neighborhood and reducing barriers for people. She stated that CPO is a one-stop-center to help homelessness for veterans, youth, families and chronically homeless individuals and their hours will be from 8:00am to 9:00pm and the nearest bus stop is across the street.

Mr. Coltrin reaffirmed their hours of operation and no over-night lodging.

Mr. Doennig closed the public hearing.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Mr. Rose motioned to **approve** Conditional Use Permit 433 (1518 East Dale Street). Ms. Broekhoven seconded the motion. Ayes: Doennig, Shuler, Thomas, Rose, Broekhoven, and Coltrin. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Cox and Ogilvy.

Preliminary Plat - Battlefield Business Center No. 13

2300-2400 West Sunset Street

Applicant: Battlefield Business Center II, LLC

Mr. Hosmer stated that this is a to approve a 10-lot plat generally located in the 2300 block of West Sunset. The Plan identifies this as an appropriate area for Light Industrial, Office and Office warehouse. The 14 acres of property is zoned GM, General Manufacturing. All streets have been constructed. If Planning and Zoning Commission approves the preliminary plat, then the plat will be forwarded to City Council for acceptance of easements. An approved preliminary plat is active for two (2) years. Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Doennig opened the public hearing.

Mr. Rick Wilson, 1835 South Stewart, representing the owner. Noted that this is the last phase of an older industrial park and owner had allowed the plat to expire. Detention is place and each lot will have water quality.

Mr. Doennig closed the public hearing.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Mr. Coltrin motioned to **approve** Battlefield Business Center No. 13 (2300-2400 West Sunset Street). Mr. Thomas seconded the motion. Ayes: Doennig, Shuler, Thomas, Rose, Broekhoven, and Coltrin. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Cox and Ogilvy.

Preliminary Plat - ISSO Temple Subdivision

1411 West Kearney Street

Applicant: Gray & Associates, LLC

Mr. Hosmer stated that this is a request to approve a 2-lot Plat generally located at 1411 West Kearney Street. The Plan identifies this area as Medium-Intensity Retail, Office or Housing. This 3.93-acres of property is currently zoned HC, Highway Commercial. Lot 2 will not have access to Fort Avenue unless the street and sidewalks are constructed per city standards. An access easement will be required to allow Lot 2 access to Kearney Street. If Planning and Zoning Commission approves the preliminary plat, then the plat will be forwarded to City Council for acceptance of easements. An approved preliminary plat is active for two (2) years. Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Doennig opened the public hearing.

Mr. Michael Gray, 2548 N. State Hwy F, Ash Grove, representing of the applicant. Plan to use the access easement across the Dairy Queen lot to access the back part which was previously laser-tag/paint-ball/batting-cages business and do not plan to access Fort Avenue.

Mr. Doennig closed the public hearing.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Mr. Coltrin motioned to **approve** Preliminary Plat - ISSO Temple Subdivision (1411 West Kearney Street). Ms. Broekhoven seconded the motion. Ayes: Doennig, Shuler, Thomas, Rose, Broekhoven, and Coltrin. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Cox and Ogilvy.

OTHER BUSINESS:

Short-Term Stay Rental Amendments

Citywide

Applicant: City of Springfield

Mr. Neal stated that this is a request to Clarify Home Occupation requirements in residential districts regarding renting of sleeping rooms. Renting sleeping rooms and serving meals to not more than two persons (and not exceeding three unrelated) not members of the family occupying the dwelling unit for more than 30 days provided on off-street parking space is provided for each person. Staff is proposing amendments that reflect language that is consistent with the City's bed and breakfast and other code requirements and utilizes other city's recent code proposals and amendments.

Short-term stay: The rental of an entire dwelling, or any portion thereof, for a period of not more than 30 days, where the owner is engaged in a contract for the rental of that specific dwelling, or any portion thereof. Short term stays are further categorized as Type 1, 2 or 3:

Short Term Stay Type 1

- Is rented for periods of less than 30 consecutive days; and
- Is located within a R-SF or R-TH zoning district; and
- Is owner-occupied primary residence and is not rented for more than 95 days in a calendar year.
- [No more than three unrelated persons in R-SF or R-TH, no exemptions for this use]

Short Term Stay Type 2

- Shall only be located in the primary structure.
- No exterior alterations that would change the single-family character.
- No residential structure shall be removed for parking or to expand.
- Shall not be rented solely for receptions, parties, weddings or any similar activities.
- The owner of a Short Term Stay Type 2 shall provide certain notifications.
- It shall be a violation of this section to advertise or promote a Short Term Stay Type 2 which is not in compliance with the provisions of this section.
- A certificate of occupancy and annual business license shall be obtained.

Short Term Stay Type 3

- No more than two (2), Short Term Stay Type 3's are allowed on a premise.
- Shall not be rented solely for receptions, parties, weddings or any similar activities.
- The owner of a Short Term Stay Type 3 shall provide certain notifications.
- It shall be a violation of this section to advertise or promote a Short Term Stay Type 3 which is not in compliance with the provisions of this section.
- A certificate of occupancy and annual business license shall be obtained.

Ms. Broekhoven asked how staff came up with the quantity in the separation requirements of 500-feet versus 300-feet and the 95-day rental.

Mr. Neal noted that the 500-foot separation requirement comes from the current Bed and Breakfast ordinance and a few other cities that were using the separation requirement and the 95-day rental derives from the Kansas City ordinance.

Mr. Coltrin asked various questions and voiced concerns regarding the proposed ordinance and believes that the City of Springfield may be over-regulating Short-Term Stay Rental Amendments. Main concerns were the 500-foot separation requirement and the 95-day rental limit and believes that these tend to be self-regulating and is encouraging staff to get more statistics from other cities to help with the development of the ordinance.

Mr. Neal noted that we are using information/data from various cities to develop the current amendments and noted that if we need to get more statistics from other city's we can certainly get that information.

Mr. Thomas asked for any specific problems that the City has had with Short-Term Stay Rentals and if the City must set-up new regulations and how long is the approval time, approximate cost and enforcement.

Mr. Neal noted that Short-Term Stays are not legal and if someone wants to set up (Type 1) they would need a business license/ service agent fee (approximate \$25.00), certificate of occupancy (approximate \$35.00) and making sure they are not within 500-feet of another Short-Term Stay Rental unit.

Ms. Smith stated that the City has received complaints about properties operating as Short-Term Stay Rentals and currently not allowed in our zoning ordinance. There have been concern looking at the separation as it is essentially operating a commercial activity in a single-family neighborhood. If there, for example a row of Short-Term Stay Rentals, then the character of the single-family neighbor is changed. The challenge is to balance the new business model with preserving single-family neighborhoods by addressing separation requirements and having the Type-1 (owner-occupied) opportunity.

Mr. Rose asked about the history of complaints and if they are a daily occurrence and what type of enforcement actions are being taken and by which department.

Ms. Smith noted that enforcement is the responsibility of Building Development Services (BDS) and they respond on a complaint basis and currently do not have a listing of complaints available tonight and noted that complaints do come in sporadically.

Mr. Doennig asked about the current count of Short-Term Stay Rentals and Mr. Neal said that the number is based on a count from last summer (2017) is 78 approximately and that there can only be one Short-Term Rental Stay within 500-feet along or across the street.

Ms. Broekhoven asked about current Short-Term Stay Rentals. Mr. Neal stated that would have to come into compliance.

Mr. Doennig opened the public hearing.

Mr. Jerry Reynolds, 2833 E. Normandy, voiced his concerns about the downside of the Short-Term Stay Rentals, noting drug-trafficking, brothels, and employers using for a group of employees (truckers/railroad, etc.) for a quick overnight. He stated that people get concerned over the devaluing of their property and saw a property today where it was being used for a group of 17 people.

Mr. Johnny Lively, 2002 S. Arcadia, wants short-term-rentals, but against any regulations and fees, noting that the money earned by local short-term-rental goes back to the City and not big operations and want to terminate the less than 30-day consecutive requirement.

Ms. Julia Blackmon, 1254 E. Meadowmere, supports the short-term rental community and does not see the any problem and asks why fix it.

Mr. John Horner, 1622 E. Walnut Street, supports short-term-rentals and currently has 3 units, two in the Rountree district and one in historic district. He stated that he takes care of his properties and believes that regulations are heavy handed and need less regulations as well as incentives to promote short-term-rentals. He also voiced his concern over the proposed 500-foot separation requirement.

Ms. Jenna Lively, 2002 S. Arcadia, supports short-term-rentals and has had only a good positive experience.

Mr. Blake Brewer, 2012 S. Arcadia, support short-term rentals, however opposed to the regulations as well as the cost associated with complying to obtain the appropriate licenses, etc.

Mr. Doennig closed the public hearing.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Mr. Coltrin motioned to **approve** Short-Term Stay Rental Amendments (Citywide). Ms. Broekhoven seconded the motion. Ayes: Doennig and Coltrin. Nays: Shuler, Thomas, Rose, and Broekhoven. Abstain: None. Absent: Cox and Ogilvy.

Elections 2018 Chair and Vice Chair Citywide

Mr. Doennig asked for the nominations for Chair. Mr. Rose nominated Randy Doennig as Chair.

Mr. Rose motioned to vote for Randy Doennig as Chair. Mr. Coltrin seconded the motion. The motion **carried** as follows: Ayes: Doennig, Shuler, Thomas, Rose, Broekhoven, and Coltrin. Abstain: None. Absent: Cox and Ogilvy.

Mr. Doennig asked for the nominations for Vice-Chair. Ms. Broekhoven nominated King Coltrin as Vice-Chair.

Ms. Broekhoven motioned to vote for King Coltrin as Vice-Chair. Mr. Rose seconded the motion. The motion **carried** as follows: Ayes: Doennig, Shuler, Thomas, Rose, Broekhoven, and Coltrin. Abstain: None. Absent: Cox and Ogilvy.