

## APC MINUTES

**APRIL 20, 2022**

Members present: Andy Fahl, Tom Chalfant, Adrian Moulton, Bob Lahey, Don Calhoun, John Reece, Steve Hernly, Coy Applegate, Jim Hufford, Terry Alfrey

Members absent: Amy Alka, Will Greer, Tom Kerns

Legal Representation: Jason Welch

Staff Present: Randy Abel, Executive Director, Debra Johnting, Recording Secretary

Others present: Michael Meadows, Ed Thornburg, Mayor Bob McCoy

D. Calhoun: It's seven o'clock, so we'll go ahead and get started with the Area Planning Commission meeting tonight. Did everybody have a chance to look over the minutes? Are there any changes or corrections on them?

J. Hufford: I'll make a motion to accept the minutes as presented.

A. Fahl: I second.

D. Calhoun: It's been moved and seconded to accept the minutes as presented. All those in favor say aye, all opposed no. Seeing none, the motion passes. On the agenda tonight we have APC2022-16-Z. JK Mack Investment Properties, LLC. Is there somebody that, if you'd like to come up and state your name and your address for the record. Go ahead and come up here so we can get you on the microphone.

M. Meadows: Michael Meadows, business address is 4201 West State Road 32, Winchester, Indiana.

D. Calhoun: Okay, so tell us what you are wanting to do?

M. Meadows: So we are looking at building a residential neighborhood. Develop that into twelve lots. Medium family, single homes.

D. Calhoun: So we're going to be changing it from M-2 to R-1.

M. Meadows: Correct.

D. Calhoun: Okay, does anybody on the board have any discussion or questions or anything you'd like to ask?

T. Chalfant: Can you build all the rest of this out in this field? Is it designed so it can be developed? Or are you just building out the road frontage? Do you intend to go farther into the field?

M. Meadows: We are unsure about that at the moment, I know there are some discussions about the other piece of property. So, I'm not sure how far that's going yet.

T. Chalfant: Have you owned this property very long?

M. Meadows: We just purchased it approximately nine days ago.

R. Abel: This is an extension of the existing Northtown Subdivision.

M. Meadows: Correct. Extending the Northtown Subdivision.

D. Calhoun: I assume it will be tied into the city sewer and all that.

M. Meadows: Correct, and water.

D. Johnting: On the map, the yellow line is the city limits so it's right inside the north end of the city limits.

T. Chalfant: Where do the city limits stop on the west side of Old 27?

B. McCoy: What is that crossroad there?

R. Abel: Is it Martin Street?

B. McCoy: The city limits goes all the way out to 225.

R. Abel: Okay.

T. Chalfant: Okay, the same as the other side.

D. Hill: On my side too?

B. McCoy: That I am really not sure of, I mean we've had discussions on who pays what but we've always worked it out with the county, but oh, Bob McCoy Winchester Mayor. But, it's 225. And a lot of that is a TIF area that was established back when Mayor Croyle was in office.

T. Chalfant: I'm just interested in where is the city limits on the west side of old 27? Do you know where it stops at? It's not parallel across?

B. McCoy: I really can't answer that question, Tom, I don't know.

D. Hill: What I think I understand is that it stops at the south corner of my field but I am not positive of that.

T. Chalfant: George can clarify that.

D. Hill: It seems like I am paying city taxes. [laughter]

B. McCoy: Is the last two digits on your property tax bill a 21 or a 20?

D. Hill: I don't even know.

B. McCoy: If it's a 20 you're in the county. If it's 21 you're in the city.

D. Calhoun: Is there anybody from the audience who would like to comment on the issue?

D. Hill: I'm just here to listen, just want to see what's going on.

B. McCoy: Well, I'd just like to add that the city is basically putting in infrastructure necessary for the subdivision to be built. We're going to be running the water as well as the sewer and actually prepping the area for possible larger manufacturing facility in the future in that area.

D. Calhoun: Does the board have any other questions or comments?

D. Hill: Are you planning to put all the mail boxes in individually, or would you consider grouping them together?

M. Meadows: That's a good question, and I am not sure.

D. Hill: Why don't you group them together? I would love to see you group them together, it's already a fight to get machinery through there now.

M Meadows: I can understand that. I will give that information to Jamie when he comes back home.

J. Hufford: I'm not familiar with the area too much, I have been down old 27, but do you have any surface water problems, like flooding or anything in that area?

M. Meadows: Not with that property, as it is up high. Most of the surface water is going over to the east towards new 27.

A. Fahl: I move for a roll call vote.

J. Hufford: I'll second.

D. Calhoun: It's been moved and seconded to have a roll call vote.

J. Welch: It would be for a favorable recommendation.

D. Calhoun: Okay.

A. Fahl: Yes is favorable and no is unfavorable?

J. Welch: Yes.

D. Calhoun: Did everybody hear that? Okay.

D. Johnting: John Reece, yes, Andy Fahl, yes, Don Calhoun, yes, Tom Chalfant, yes, Jim Hufford, yes, Bob Lahey, yes, Coy Applegate, yes, Terry Alfrey, yes, Adrian Moulton, yes, Steve Hernly, yes, and Amy Alka, Will Greer, and Tom Kerns are absent. Favorable recommendation. That will go to the City Council on the first Monday in May. Bob, do you have a meeting that night?

B. McCoy: We do not have, I mean it's on the schedule but I don't know whether we'll have business, and sometimes we cancel that. We will go ahead and have a meeting and that way we can get this done. That will probably be the only thing on the agenda, but plan on the first Monday of the month as a City Council meeting.

D. Johnting: So the meeting is Monday May 2<sup>nd</sup> at 6 o'clock. And I will get with Jamie next week to confirm the date and time.

M. Meadows: Thank you.

D. Calhoun: Okay, old business. Sign ordinance discussion.

R. Abel: Well, I think the simplest thing to do would be just to take item by item and decide what we want to change and what we don't want to change. Does that sound like the simplest way to do that? I think what I think what the Commissioners have suggested is 25 foot and something about the maintenance.

T. Chalfant: Right, we did pass a motion at our last, maybe it was the meeting before that, but anyway, we moved that we would like to see 25' signs, and that the maintenance be considered anything except taking down the sign. Otherwise that doesn't trigger changing the height of the sign. That was the motion that was passed.

B. McCoy: And the City of Winchester basically agrees with what Tom is saying. I think Randy had mentioned having a 15' setback. With a 15' setback you don't have an issue in a town with the 25' sign. Is that right?

R. Abel: I think that's what is in the current one is the 15' setback. Not in the amendment, but in the current.

J. Welch: So refacing would be considered okay, that would not be a change?

T. Chalfant: Right.

J. Welch: Okay. There's some case law that's opposite of that but I believe we can do that under statutory home rule. We can overrule that. So any changing of the face of the sign is okay unless they take the pole down, is that what you want to put in? Okay.

A. Fahl: So could we term that just general maintenance?

T. Chalfant: I assume, yeah.

J. Welch: We have to be pretty specific because there have been quite a few cases on that particular issue, believe it or not. We can be specific that anything except, as long as the pole remains in place that it will be considered routine maintenance. Is that what you are thinking?

T. Chalfant: I believe that would be okay.

R. Abel: Okay, so here's another question and one that just came up in the last few months, the anchor bolts went bad. Obviously the pole has to come down. Are you exempting that too?

T.Chalfant: Oh, to replace the anchor bolts?

R. Abel: Yes, because that's what rusts out on those.

T. Chalfant: I would think they would consider that maintenance, so that that would...

A. Fahl: So the pole could rust, or the pole could be involved in an accident, or a weather event. So grandma ran into the pole.

R. Abel: And flattened it, then what do you do?

A. Fahl: It's hard to think of everything, but...

R. Abel: So, the other option would be say, if you've got a pole sign existing on this date, of this amendment, it's grandfathered forever. If you're wanting to preserve what we have now, to me that would be, before you get into maintenance. To me that would be the way to go.

T. Chalfant: It gets very specific so, I would think that that would be the spirit of the intent of what the commissioners wanted.

R. Abel: Okay. To me, that would be a far simpler decision on my part. So, existing on the date of the amendment. And we'd probably put that under the exemptions section, signs that are exempted? I mean when I look, I don't know that we want to touch everything that I have looked up, because it would take forever, but one thing I did notice that some rural counties have that we do not have is an exemption for seed signs in agriculture. They allow like 30 signs four foot, and I think like five or six square feet. During the seed season so it's put up...

T. Chalfant: Yes, those are the test plot signs.

R. Abel: Yes, the test plot signs. And any other temporary, they're considered temporary signs, but we don't have that exemption under temporary signs. I mean, that's something to me that would be a pretty quick, simple fix if that's agreeable. I read a lot of things that are just common sense, but if they are not in there, somebody's going to come up and start asking, and then we're like well...it's not in there. I mean, do we need to vote on this? How do we need to do this?

J. Welch: I would say figure out what amendments you want to make and vote on each one individually.

J. Hufford: To me, temporary signs should be I think, exempt from the sign ordinance. Because if we don't, we're going to have realtors and everybody else coming in here to complain because they have to come in here and get a permit.

R. Abel: Temporary signs allow it temporarily.

J. Hufford: Right, that's what I am saying...

R. Abel: So, there's temporary signs listed in here and what you can do on a temporary sign. The maximum quantity is one per lot. So, realtors, one per lot. The maximum area is 15 square feet, maximum height ten square feet, setback is five feet. So, temporary is in here, but what I'm saying is that seed signs aren't in that, and you want to do more than one per lot.

J. Hufford: Oh yeah, you have to.

R. Abel: See, that's not reasonable to me.

J. Hufford: No, that's not, yeah.

R. Abel: This covers temporary for like realtors and stuff like that. So those are already covered, but I think we want to put an additional, in that exemption from temporaries, the seed signs. I've got wording and I don't know if I get in trouble for stealing it from other ordinances, but it's a pretty clear wording in other ordinances, that are comparable counties that I think you'd be happy with it. It basically says what I described 48 inches, I think it was six square feet. One said five and one said six, so six. Do you know how big the seed signs are?

T. Chalfant: Maybe 2' x 2.5'?

R. Abel: Two by two and a half? That's five square feet, so say six square feet, and you're safe. And we would allow them up so many days before and so many days after. Which I think would be reasonable.

A. Fahl: While we are talking about temporary signs, here is a pet peeve. Not so much seed corn, but maybe your garage sale and your political signs, are left past the event. They're trash. So, I don't know how we address that in an ordinance, but if Joe took the time to put them up, Joe can go pick them up when the event is over.

R. Abel: Yeah.

A. Fahl: But how you would put that in an ordinance I have no clue.

R. Abel: Well, I think our ordinance states that, doesn't it?

B. McCoy: Isn't there a rule that applies to political signs, anyway?

R. Abel: Yeah, political signs are covered in the state code.

B. Lahey: Yeah, they're supposed to be down the day after the election.

R. Abel: Yes. So many hours I think.

J. Hufford: So, we're going to have a growing season coming up. People are going to have garage sales and having signs up and everything else out there. And you're going to see it.

R. Abel: I mean there's a lot of things we could cover in this, but I'm thinking we probably want to individually kind of look at things and come back another day, but I don't mind, I kind of like doing this in increments, maybe? Is that better you think? Because, I think it's better to get it through the different legislative bodies if you say, here's five things are you okay with this? Rather than saying ten things and maybe having to come back with one thing they didn't like. So I hate to overload it and I hate to drag meetings out. But I like bringing up different issues, like the temporary signs or anything else you can think of and then let's research it. Because...

J. Hufford: I think temporary signs, especially yard signs and stuff like that, I see them hanging on telephone poles, light poles, around the town and they are still there, and the yard sale was over two months ago.

B. McCoy: And that's a violation of a city ordinance anyway.

J. Hufford: Yeah, but it isn't enforced very much though. The signs are still hanging there.

R. Abel: I mean, we don't have a good way to enforce them, because you don't want to pay Jason to take them to court and get an injunction, that's ridiculous. The other option might be to place some kind of a fine. But do you really want to do fines for something like a garage sale sign hanging on a telephone pole? I don't know. I mean, you could also just, I guess when I am driving down the road give me permission to go rip them off of there.

A. Fahl: There's a certain amount of signs that get put up with no intentions of ever being picked up. Your internet, and broadband, and work from home.

R. Abel: And most of those are on utility poles, which isn't legal.

J. Hufford: Tax season you see a lot of signs up advertising different people doing taxes.

R. Abel: I mean would it be possible to have the highway department, anybody driving a truck down the road pull over and stop and take them down? Or do we want to go there, yeah?

E. Thornburg: If the utility company doesn't care then why should we? I do know that the utility company does occasionally decide to care.

A. Fahl: I think we should care, because if the sign is put out for mother nature to do whatever with it's trashy. It's a bad look for the county.

E. Thornburg: So who's going to pay to clean that up?

R. Abel: The farmer probably.

A. Fahl: No one gets paid, mother nature just does whatever with them and I think that if it's possible, now's the time to address that. If we can come up with something. On my property, if there's a sign there that I didn't approve or don't like, it's in my dumpster the first chance I get.

E. Thornburg: And anybody who owns property has a right to do that.

R. Abel: We could definitely look into that, from the other ordinances, on the temporary sign duration, and I don't know that I have ever seen penalties for it but there may be something in there that allows the Area Planning Department to remove those. Some of them I know make you get permits for certain ones but not garage sales and stuff. And then you can definitely make them remove them once they get a permit. But I don't know if we want to go into that much detail either, that just adds a lot of work for the office. So I can look into that and see what other counties do and bring some options next time on that. One other thing I noticed on some of these. this last time we actually got the actual improvement location permit, which in detail gave the size of the signs and gave more detail than what we had in that excel file we handed out. So, in going through this, identified at least two different businesses that

have probably what I would say is the largest signs compared to the size of the building. And one is obviously gas stations. Because those are pretty small buildings, some of them. And so the sign is bigger. But, the other one was Dollar General Stores, believe it or not. So, the Family Dollar generally had about a fifty square foot sign on the pole sign, Dollar Generals are like a hundred square feet. Dollar General's front façade is 70 feet, and Family Dollars generally ran around 120. So the proportions really got flip flopped there. So in order, if you want to maintain kind of what was permitted in the past, we really need to increase those factor numbers that we just got done putting in. So, the 0.6 for a pole sign, so on Dollar General, which is the worst ones I found, and it would require on a pole sign a 1.4 factor, and I'd say let's go 1.5 just to be sure we don't get caught. I think that kind of keeps it in proportion on a 25' sign. I think the 0.6 would go better with the 15' sign. So, if we're going to a 25' sign, I'm asking that we also go to the 1.5 or 1.6 something like that. Does that sound reasonable to everybody? And then the other one was the wall signs, and the one that I found was almost a 2.2 factor, pretty big for a wall sign on one of the Dollar Generals. They didn't all come out the same, it was just like certain stores had a, for whatever reason had a bigger front façade than the others. The pole signs were worse than most of the wall signs. In the original ordinance, what it allowed was a twenty percent, which I am assuming meant you took the length times the height. And generally the height of most of those buildings is probably around twenty feet.

A. Fahl: Mayor McCoy, you've voiced concerns in the past, what are your thoughts now?

B. McCoy: I think the twenty five foot was a problem, or the fifteen was a problem, and the fact that we were forcing people to lower if they were changing artwork or whatever, so I think what the commissioners voted on, what you guys discussed, that fits. And I think that solves the Taco Bell problem, correct?

R. Abel: Yes.

Mayor McCoy: My biggest concern, and these guys don't want to see people here all the time for variances.

R. Abel: Nope.

B. McCoy: But I'm not concerned about that in Winchester, and Union City is pulling out of the sign portion. I am not concerned about having Winchester look like Westfield or whatever, you know. I mean, everybody is unique in their own way. The signs at different heights isn't a big deal for me. If a new business moves in and they're building a new business, yes, make them conform to the regulations. But other than that, I am fine with it.

A. Fahl: Okay, thank you.

R. Abel: I am thinking the last one that we corrected was like a 2.2 on the wall sign. But that is pretty good size. If the Family Dollar is 70', so that gives them a 280 square foot sign. That's pretty good size compared to what they asked for.

D. Johnting: They asked for 97 square feet. The one that's going into Parker City. Wall sign.

R. Abel: So then that would be 70.



J. Hufford: Wouldn't it be better to calculate these signs by the size of the building? Like say, 15% or something? Because you could have a real small building and this great big sign.

R. Abel: Well, the original one did twenty percent of the elevation. Which that's hard to figure, it's hard to measure the height of the building.

J. Hufford: So, how about the façade?

R. Abel: Well, that's what we did last time. What I am saying is that we need to tweak that factor a little bit probably. So, what she said was what, 96 feet?

D. Johning: 96 square feet is the pole sign, 97.5 is the building sign.

R. Abel: Okay, so that would be approximately 1.4 again. So, you could probably increase that to 1.6 and be safe on both of them. And the cumulative...I think the idea behind the cumulative numbers, is like it kind of gives the store a choice. So if you are a store that's right out on the road you might want a bigger wall sign. If you are sitting way back and you want a bigger pole sign and you don't care if your wall sign is a little smaller. I think that's the idea behind cumulative so you don't end up with two big signs. But, to me, I don't care.

J. Hufford: So, this doesn't take in window signs? For people who put signs in the windows of their business? I see that once in a while.

R. Abel: Some of those are exempted up to a percent. Ours doesn't say anything. Ours includes that, I think, as part of the wall sign. So, if you increase that to 1.6 it will probably include several of those signs.

J. Hufford: Not here so much, but I notice over in Greenville, they'll have some of those decorative signs that will take in the whole window.

R. Abel: And when you go in a restaurant, they always have specials, like at McDonalds and Arby's and stuff. I mean I am assuming that we'll come back and tweak this a little more. And I know we've talked about this before, it's a lot easier to start small and go bigger, than to go bigger and try to go smaller. So, I think we are pretty safe with the 1.6 on both of those. And does anybody care about the cumulative? We could throw it out completely? That's what I'm talking about.

J. Hufford: Now what's that now? The cumulative?

R. Abel: Because the cumulative, if you take the total of the pole sign and the total of the wall sign, the cumulative is always smaller. It makes them choose which one they want.

J. Hufford: I think that should be thrown out.

B. McCoy: So, like Tractor Supply. They have a sign out by the road, and they have one on their building. Technically are they in compliance today?

R. Abel: I don't know about them.

B. McCoy: Okay, I mean their signs don't seem out of proportion to me, whatsoever. They're not gaudy or whatever.

R. Abel: I didn't find that one in the ILP, so.

B. McCoy: I was just curious.

R. Abel: And all those franchises are standard sizes, anyway, right? So, I just see the cumulative as being a problem in the future too. I'd rather just focus on the pole and the wall and not worry about adding them together.

D. Calhoun: That sounds good to me.

J. Hufford: That's what I would do.

R. Abel: So does everybody think that's good to throw that out? So are we good with the 1.6 on both of them? I am guessing we might have to increase the wall sign in the future. In just thinking about it don't you believe that most of the wall signs are bigger than the pole signs? In what you have seen. I guess if the building is really big, they're going to get a bigger sign, so maybe that's what is making that thought come in. So let's try 1.6 for both of them for now, we'll go through a few more things before the next meeting.

A. Fahl: So, what's appropriate here Jason, do we need to vote on this?

J. Welch: If we're going to make the formal amendments we've got to vote on each one. It has to be prepared and sent out to the legislative bodies for approval. So, we would have to vote on each one of these amendments here, and we can vote on them as a group. I think it would probably be more appropriate to vote on each one of the amendments that Randy's proposed. And those actually need to be put into written form and sent out to each of the towns and count to be incorporated in. Is the intent then to keep everything that we have now, and then the new things would be comparable in size? Except for the new 25' height on signs? Is that what you are kind of trying to do Randy, with these factors?

R. Abel: Yeah, throw out the cumulative, and just do the 1.6 for wall and pole, and that's times the façade length. So it's proportional to the size of the front of the building.

J. Welch: And any existing sign today can stay. Is that pretty much the consensus? Even if it gets replaced or fixed or whatever? It can stay as it is, size wise and height wise?

J. Hufford: Where we're going to get in trouble is on water towers when they want to put signs on top of them? Like on Union City, they've got the city emblem on theirs? They're going to say you've got to reduce that sign down to 45'?

R. Abel: I have seen too, where they've exempted barns with the farmer's name on it, and those quilt squares on it, those are exempted, there's all kinds of stuff in there. If you really sit and think about it, but when you read them it's like oh yeah, that's obvious. But it's hard to sit and think about stuff like that. Yeah, let's add water towers. You know all that needs to be put under exemptions. Does anybody put out more than thirty seed signs? I'm not going to go count them anyway.

J. Hufford: What about a large business like Walmart, they might have multiple entrances, and they have a sign at each entrance? And then they have a service area, and all that. They put signs all around the building. It's going to be hard to write something that would cover everything.

R. Abel: I think directional signs you are allowed two per entrance, and up to four or something like that if I recall on those. If you've got multiple entrances. Does anybody think of anything else offhand?

J. Hufford: You've got Wayfare signs and stuff like that all covered right?

E. Thornburg: You might want to take bench signs off of the prohibited list.

R. Abel: Yes, we can do that, I forgot about that one. So we want to exempt benches.

E. Thornburg: Well, the dozen of them around the courthouse would probably carry a little angst, and they're stylish and people like them anyway.

R. Abel: So, how much stuff do we want to...

J. Welch: Well, the cleanest way to do this would be to get it drafted and bring it back to the meeting so it's exactly how it needs to be presented to everyone else. I feel like if we are just throwing this together it's not going to be exactly what we are going to be voting on. So I think what we should do, is put it all together in writing, bring it back to the next meeting where we have firm, written proposals, and then we can pass those and send those out. I think it's going to get too convoluted if we try to vote on this, how it is tonight. That's just my opinion.

D. Johnting: We do have happen to a meeting next month already.

R. Abel: But that means we only have a month to write it then. I do like the idea about benches, I did remember putting that on my list, and then I forgot about it. I think banners and stuff are exempt. I've seen in others that they are exempt and then they let them go to the cities? To make decisions on like the banners that hang around the squares and stuff.

J. Hufford: I know that over there they've just got a height requirement, you know it's so high above the street, other than that they don't say much.

D. Calhoun: So, you'll get all these changes done before the next meeting and then we'll vote on that?

R. Abel: We will try. Try, try, try. It's a busy time of year. If somebody's got some other ideas, just call us and let us know. I mean, we can always write in a second proposal and bring it back the next month too, time permitting.

J. Welch: I did have a question too, who's the Union City representative? Does anybody know what happened at the last meeting?

J. Hufford: What's that now?

J. Welch: I heard a rumor about Union City at the last meeting.

B. Lahey: As far as voting on the ordinance?

J. Welch: Yes.

B. Lahey: Yeah, we voted it down.

J. Welch: On the change?

B. Lahey: All of it. We're going to develop our own.

J. Welch: Okay, okay, has anybody sent...according to the statute, you're supposed to get...I was going to pass this word along to Ryan, and nobody was there...but if they want to propose a change, they have a few different options. The only thing they can really vote on was to amend what was there. If they want to totally delete all sign ordinances, they would have to really, either send that to us, give recommendation back to them, and they can pass it or not pass it.

B. Lahey: I'm not sure exactly, but we're going to develop our own ordinance.

J. Welch: Have Ryan call me.

B. Lahey: Okay.

J. Welch: Because, just on a whim voting to opt out is not really the way it can be done. If that makes sense, okay?

B. Lahey: Yeah.

J. Welch: So, I'm just asking you because you're here, I tried to call Ryan and he said he had no idea what was going on, he wasn't at the meeting, so...

B. Lahey: He's required to come to the meetings any more.

J. Welch: Okay. So, have someone call me from over there.

D. Calhoun: Is there anything else we need to discuss this evening?

J. Hufford: I make a motion that we adjourn the meeting.

A. Fahl: I second.

R. Abel: So, we have a variance possibly coming up. And it's BZA. And I think this will fix it. Do we want to give a recommendation to the BZA to wait until this ordinance is written before they start granting variances that may or may not cover what we're trying to change?

J. Hufford: I think that would be a good idea.

R. Abel: I mean, the problem is, is at Dollar General they haven't even got through the state planning yet, which is going to be months until that is ready to have a sign up, or even have foundations put in. I think the only reason they did it is because corporate always thinks it always takes a year to get stuff done, so they told the sign company, yeah, go ahead and do that, go ahead and do that. And we tried to explain to them, we're working on this and we think this will correct your situation.

D. Johnting: It will, but can I make him wait?

R. Abel: No, but just tell him that the recommendation of the APC is to deny sign ordinances until this is done. Especially if it's going to correct the issue. Because we are overburdening the BZA with things that really are, to me, we need to put the brakes on.

A. Fahl: Couldn't it just be tabled?

R. Abel: It could be, but the variance will be moot, if it's solved by the ordinance amendment. So, it could be tabled, I guess the BZA has the option to table the request.

J. Welch: You could tell them and then they could just withdraw it.

D. Johnting: I just can't tell them when, that's the problem we had with all the others is that...

R. Abel: But he's not at a stage where he's looking at putting it up next week. The other ones we had as soon as Winchester passed the ordinance, they came in and got the permit. That's not the way it's going to be with the Dollar General.

T. Chalfant: Which Dollar General?

D. Johnting: Parker City.

T. Chalfant: What about the one in Losantville?

R. Abel: That's Family Dollar/Dollar Tree.

D. Johnting: They've already got their...

R. Abel: And their signs, like I said, their signs are 50 square feet, they meet it, easy.

D. Johnting: They did have a variance hearing and they got it.

R. Abel: But that's when it was ten square feet. That's not on the current amendment.

D. Calhoun: Okay, it's been moved and seconded that we adjourn, so I thank everybody for coming.

---

President, Don Calhoun

---

Vice President, Andy Fahl

---

Recording Secretary, Debra Johnting