

DAYTON LEGAL BLANK, INC., FORM NO. 10148

Held

Monday, January 27,

6:40 p.m.

202003

CALL TO ORDER

The public hearing was called to order Monday, January 27, 2003 at 6:40 p.m., by President of Council Jon Snyder.

Council members present for the public hearing: Foltz, Kiesling, Lindower, Magel, McLaughlin, Osborne and Snyder. Also present for the public hearing were: Mayor Rice, Director of Administration Held, Director of Law Batista, Assistant Director of Law Treadon, Director of Finance Herr, City Engineer Benekos and Clerk of Council Bittle.

Mr. Snyder: In regard to a portion of Grassmere Street SE (at 50 foot right of way) beginning at the West lot line of part of Out Lot188. Inaudible... my apologizes on behalf of the council to the people here to testify, our meeting ran a little late and I apologize to you. Chairman Magel you want to go ahead and take over the meeting?
Mrs. Magel: Ah yes. Thank you.
Mr. Snyder: You're welcome.

Mrs. Magel: You beat me to the punch. I also wanted to apologize, but I think that the President and other council members will say I was keeping an eye on the time.
Mr. Snyder: That you was.
Mrs. Magel: About every two minutes I said we got to go.
Mr. Lindower: I didn't hear you say that.
Mrs. Magel: This meeting is for you the public between 6:30 and 7:00 for the public discussion of Grassmere. It has been petitioned by William Raderchak and a Robert Peterson for the vacation of Grassmere. They have gone through the six dates of which they advertised properly for in the paper. They went to the Planning Commission and their wish to vacate was denied on a vote of what I believe is 4 to 1. You are now here at a public meeting to discuss - to face council. And what I would like to do is split this up 15 minutes for the pros, 15 minutes for the cons. I have a feeling it's going to be overwhelmingly pro. So if I don't find it many for the cons we'll go back to the pros.

Mr. Snyder: Pardon me Chairman Magel, I beg your pardon, if I may interrupt...
Mrs. Magel: Yes.
Mr. Snyder: That gentleman sitting in the front row if you'd be so kind as to recognize him first. He does have an appointment and I would appreciate it.
Mrs. Magel: Okay.
Mr. Snyder: Thank you.
Mrs. Magel: That'd be fine.
Mr. Snyder: I'm sorry to interrupt.

Mrs. Magel: That's fine because I am now officially ready to open the meeting for the public to discuss the vacation of Grassmere. Sir, you have the privilege of being first.

Michael Dull: Thank you. Do you want my name and address or anything ...inaudible... that kind of stuff?
Mrs. Magel: Yes, we need for everyone who's going to speak tonight you need to come to the podium as he did, clearly speak your name and address.

Mr. Dull: Okay, Michael Dull. And I live at 990 Knoll. And I'll be brief. I just wanted to come. I have to go to another meeting. But I did want to express my views. I am for the vacation - vacating of this - of Grassmere. I don't want to see the cut through there. We get an awful lot of Glenoak students coming down Knoll after school anyway. And I was - there was another gentleman, Tony Scannelli, that lives, I think it's 1648 Meadowlane. I was talking to him earlier today. He was unable to come tonight because he had to attend a funeral. And he is also for the vacating of this. So there's two pros. Thank you.

Mrs. Magel: Thank you very much. At this point the meeting is open for all those in favor of the vacation. If you would like to ... speak please raise your hand. Sir. Yea, you stayed for a half an hour so I'll let you speak next.

Mr. Snyder: It's Mr. Caticchio.

Pat Caticchio: Inaudible... I thought I'd be the last because I'm the developer of Monticello...
Mrs. Magel: Oh, okay.
Mr. Caticchio: and I'd like these other people to speak first.
Mrs. Magel: You want to be last?
Mr. Caticchio: Yes.
Mrs. Magel: Okay, that'd be fine. Mam...

Goldie White: Who me?
Mrs. Magel: Yea.

Held Monday, January 27, 20 2003

Ms. White: Okay, my name is Goldie White. And I live at 903 Weber. And our streets were vacated. The council kindly helped us do that. And we're here to say that we're in support of Grassmere being vacated. Thank you.

Mrs. Magel: Thank you very much. Our streets would of - refers to Weber and Briar and they were vacated. And I think those streets do indicate that they are in support. They understand what it means and they support the vacation of the Grassmere. Mam...

Dawn Hearne: I'm Dawn Hearne. I live at 1200 Grassmere. My views are of course I do want the road vacated. It's not just the Glenoak traffic. We know that it's going to be - I have seen traffic come down through there thinking that it's already open. And I just know that it will increase the traffic through there. There's a blind curve on...

Mr. Lindower: Hillbrook.

Ms. Hearne: Hillbrook?

Mr. Lindower: Hillbrook.

Ms. Hearne: Hillbrook and Meadowlane as you come around. My children have to cross that to get up to Hillbrook to get a bus stop. The increased traffic again is just more odds of one of my children being hit. There is no sidewalks in that area. We have a lot of walkers and an increase in traffic will make that more difficult. And I just feel that it, as far as Monticello and us, it's going to be best for both of us not to have a through street there. Their homes are much larger and much more beautiful and to have a home - to have the through traffic as it is in that area, would just increase let's say possibilities of crime coming in and out. I can go on a vacation knowing that there's only ten homes on my street and my neighbors know the cars that are supposed to be in and out of that road. So yes, I am definitely for the vacating of Grassmere. Thank you.

Mrs. Magel: Thank you. Sir...

Bill Raderchak: My name is Bill Raderchak. 1224 Grassmere SE, North Canton. And I along with Mr. Peterson and the kindness of the AMC Development Company, have forwarded this petition to your attention. If I may I would like to have the - this is the map that I have made up. Distribute ...inaudible...

Mrs. Kiesling: Thank you.

Mr. Raderchak: for your attention.

Mr. Foltz: Pass them down...

Mr. Raderchak: The purpose for our petition was primarily to preserve our neighborhood, to maintain its peace and tranquility and to assure the safety of the citizenry by limiting the vehicular traffic in the area. A petition was circulated among the - not the Grassmere residents alone, but also adjacent areas. Which we found the people also to be in support and agreement with the action. There were legal requirements. The landowners of the adjacent properties in question, which was Mr. Peterson, myself and the Monticello Development Company, AMC. We, the primary petitioners, have agreed to this vacation of the street. We also have acceptance - a review and acceptance by the safety forces of the City of North Canton. This acceptance is documented - documented in your hands. We have forwarded the petition under the Ohio Revised Code, Section 723.06, which I believe we've met all those requirements. We know that there are prior actions that have set an acceptable precedent, it was earlier mentioned on Briar and Weber. There was an action accepted by the Planning Commission to vacate a portion of 11th Street NW. And we have knowledge of vacated connecting streets in the Surrey Hill Allotment on Everhard Road. So I think we have given due diligence in the exercising all we could do to assure that no harm would arise from this position to vacate. The map that I have provided there, if you will reference the indication of north in the left hand upper corner, you can see the area in yellow, which I have highlighted, proceeds from Main Street, South Main. This area has since the installation of the two lights, the one at Everhard and also the last one at 55th Street, this area in yellow has received the greatest amount of cut through traffic in the neighborhood allowing those people that have learned this route and there are many of them, that they can cut off waiting for those lights and the assemblage of traffic at different hours by cutting through from South Main either on Greenway or Knoll to Northfield and over to 55th. Given that that is a fact now, we foresee that the area in red, which goes along Meadowlane to Grassmere and of course with a little imagination you can see what the connection would be and the - which would allow any further traffic onto the roads through the beautiful Monticello development. Monticello I'm sure was laid out for its aesthetic value - a restricted access community. And in order to maintain the values of homes of a quarter million dollars and up, there was no grid pattern cut through there to give access to Market or through traffic in that regard. I think we all can recognize that homes on high traffic areas inhibited the sale of those types of homes and the values are thus decreased. We don't want to see that in our area. Also, that area that I outlined in yellow, the roadway infrastructure has been impacted by this increased traffic on Northfield. And if you want to take a drive that way you can see it for yourself. The chuckholes and the road surface deterioration that was probably never planned for in that area. There has been prior mention made of the Glenoak traffic and at the Planning Commission meeting this was made light of in regard to the fact that yes there will be a new Plain Township high school being built on some ground off of Schneider Road. However, in the area that I've outlined in blue you can see where we have been impacted by that traffic over a period of time and this, although like I say, was made light of. The Repository as of Wednesday, January 15th of this year, reported that the Plain Local continues to plan to break ground for their high school on Schneider Road in the Spring of 2004 and finish the new building by Fall of 2006. This gives the area residents

DAYTON LEGAL BLANK, INC., FORM NO. 10148

Held

Monday, January 27,

20 2003

another three years of putting up with that particular nuisance. And although that's not our primary concern, it is a - it will be impacting us for awhile. Our primary concern does still remain traffic cutting through from Cleveland Avenue. This would be not the Glenoak people, but the general public who swiftly learn of any cut throughs, shortcuts and what have you, especially in the light of the tie ups that we see at the two existing traffic lights. So in summation, I think you can readily understand that residents want this petition for vacating ...inaudible... the developer, AMC ...inaudible... There is existing precedence for such an action - acceptance of such an action. The safety forces find no problem with it. The legal requirements have been met. I think it's good for the city and all concerned parties. So I thank you for your attention. And if there's any questions I'll be glad to try and answer them.

Mr. Snyder: Thank you sir, we appreciate your comments.
Mr. Raderchak: Thank you.

Mrs. Magel: To be fair is there anyone in the audience who would like to speak against the vacation? Seeing none. We still have 10 minutes. Would anyone else like to speak? Sir.

Carl Hearne: Yea, my name is Carl Hearne. And I live at 1200 Grassmere. I have some additional signatures for a petition that I circulated that may not be part of your packet of information. Additional people along the neighborhoods that were in question of Meadowlane and whatnot. I've looked through the zoning rules and there appears to be a technicality as far as whether a street like ours should be turned into a dead end street. I think in this regard that we're looking at the possibility of having a breakaway chain at the end of the street so that safety forces could get through into Monticello as an emergency alternate access if something catastrophic happened on 55th and they were unable to get in that way. I think we're addressing the concern or the - what's written into the code and why they had some of these rules the way they have them. So I'm asking that the council vacate the end of the street with the provision that there could be a breakaway chain at the end of the street for emergency vehicles to get through. I think it would benefit both neighborhoods as far as property values and property values of course turns into tax dollars which this city - any community will also reap benefit from. So I think it would be good for all parties and concern. And since there's no one here opposed to it, I think the people are voicing their opinion. And thank you very much.

Mr. Snyder: Thanks Carl. I think Mr. Caticchio wants to speak.

Mrs. Magel: Yes sir...

Mr. Caticchio: I really don't know how to act tonight because this is one of the few times in my career that I'm on the same side...
Mr. Snyder: Normally when you're here it's a little more confrontational ...
Mr. Caticchio: It's an adversary confrontation - right.
Mr. Snyder: You didn't come with your attorney this evening did you?
Mr. Caticchio: Pardon.
Mr. Snyder: You by yourself this evening?

Mr. Caticchio: Yes, I'm ... I'm an attorney so I act as an attorney developer, whatever. Anyway I have to agree with the people of Grassmere and the adjoining property owners. The area south of our subdivision all the way down to 44th and even further south than that, as you all know it's a very quiet, very nice low traffic area. And there's plenty of access back and forth between Market and Main on 44th and 37th Street for instance. But when you get north of 44th then there's no east west traffic there and there's no north south traffic. If Grassmere is not closed in what we're going to create is a north south corridor along Vernon Street with a jog on Meadowlane and then into Grassmere and Grassmere right through the Monticello subdivision on 55th Street. So now as you also know, Monticello has two entrances and they're over a block apart. So there's plenty of access for emergency vehicles etc. to get there. What we would - if Grassmere is in fact vacated, what we would do is our end of Grassmere we would put a cul-de-sac in there. So that it - we would have to put a cul-de-sac in. I can't agree with the gentleman about putting a breakaway chain. First of all I don't think it's necessary because of the access - the double access on 55th Street. And breakaway chains in our experience do not work very well. So we would put in a cul-de-sac. We would rearrange our road and then we would - we wouldn't use the name Grassmere on that on our end of it on our side. I - over the - ever since we started Monticello, the people have always - all the people in there have always expressed the idea that they didn't want any through streets to the south, east or west. So we've tried - as a matter of fact we had four exits originally I believe, three of them we have eliminated and hopefully we can eliminate this one also.

Mrs. Magel: Yes...
Mr. Foltz: Okay. I have a question. Sir, when you say Grassmere from your end, does that come off of Alexandria Parkway? I'm looking at the previous entrance map.
Mr. Caticchio: Well...
Mr. Foltz: Is that what you would turn into a cul-de-sac, that extension there?
Unidentified: He doesn't have room.
Mr. Lindower: That's a dead end there.
Mr. Caticchio: So Grassmere comes off of Meadowlane - there's a triangle in here.
Mr. Foltz: Yea, we're right here.

Held Monday, January 27, 20 2003

Mr. Caticchio: Right.

Mr. Foltz: What were you proposing to do ...inaudible...?

Mr. Caticchio: Oh here, right here. This is Grassmere here - well here I have the larger plat? Could you that for a second?

Unidentified: Inaudible...cul-de-sac...

Mr. Caticchio: This is the entire - this is the entire subdivision here. This is Grassmere there. And what we would do then is we would put a cul-de-sac right in here.

Mr. Foltz: Okay. I'm seeing - so this is Alexandria here. This is going to be a cul-de-sac ...inaudible...

Mr. Lindower: Inaudible... right there.

Mr. Foltz: and you would come down here.

Mr. Caticchio: Alexandria - see actually this would - well yea Alexandria and then coming - but Shiloh runs into Grassmere.

Mrs. Magel: Jon, Jon...

Mrs. Kiesling: We don't have that on our map.

Mrs. Magel: I got to get them to agree to give the right of way up. So I need some time to talk to them...

Unidentified: Okay.

Mr. Caticchio: Yea...

Mr. Benekos: Would you consider putting the cul-de-sac over here?

Mr. Caticchio: We are. That's exactly ...inaudible... this is it right here.

Mr. Foltz: Inaudible...

Mr. Snyder: No no - well you know cause the right of way is going to the city.

Mrs. Magel: I have to get them to agree to do that.

Mr. Benekos: No, not here off of Grassmere this way, but this way off of Grassmere so they have a cul-de-sac on this side and they just go straight up here...

Mr. Caticchio: No, we couldn't do that. We would lose a lot because we have to...

Mr. Snyder: Why? If we...

Mrs. Magel: Because I have the ordinance here.

Mr. Snyder: Well yea, but they don't get the property. We vacated it...

Mrs. Magel: No, I have to get them to agree to do that.

Mr. Snyder: No. They don't have to agree to it. We did the same thing at Briar Weber, it went to the city.

Mr. Caticchio: We'd lose two lots because we have to put a cul-de-sac on our side.

Mr. Benekos: If we just took this street straight up, you put the cul-de-sac here and lots off of this side so the access to the cul-de-sac is off of Grassmere and then you just develop these lots straight like that.

Mrs. Magel: And they agreed.

Mr. Snyder: Oh yea but it - I mean otherwise you're going to have to put a cul-de-sac in there.

Mrs. Magel: Alright. At least I'll make the statement...

Mr. Snyder: Yea.

Mrs. Magel: That we will do that.

Mr. Snyder: As long as - but the property goes to the city. Because if it goes to the property owners you're going to have to put a cul-de-sac in there. That's in the sub rules.

Mr. Caticchio: Well we would lose - if we would lose any lots then you know I couldn't agree to that.

Mr. Benekos: I don't think you'd lose lots. But the access to those lots would be off of here that way they can...

Mr. Caticchio: Oh no no, we couldn't do that. We couldn't - this is part of the Monticello subdivision.

Mr. Benekos: Yea.

Mr. Caticchio: We have to retain it as part of the subdivision.

Mr. Benekos: It would still be part of it, but the access would be...

Mr. Caticchio: No, no no.

Mr. Benekos: Okay.

Mr. Caticchio: We can't have access from...

Mr. Benekos: Okay. Cause they still need to have a turnaround over here.

Mr. Caticchio: Well they might need some kind of a turnaround. Right.

Mr. Benekos: Right. And if we would...

Unidentified: You mean these people need a turnaround?

Mr. Benekos: Right. Cause...

Unidentified: Cause there never was one to start with in this end of Grassmere.

Mrs. Kiesling: Who would be responsible to pay for that turnaround?

Mr. Lindower: A dead end on Grassmere is no problem.

Mr. Benekos: Inaudible...

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

DAYTON LEGAL BLANK, INC., FORM NO. 10148

Held

Monday, January 27,

20 2003

Mr. Caticchio: Inaudible...
Unidentified: There was only a few houses there.
Mr. Benekos: There needs to be one...inaudible... yea...

Mr. Held: Do you have a copy of that?

Mr. Lindower: People...inaudible...

Mrs. Magel: Alright are there any other questions? I'd like to ask a question of the Ward 4...
Unidentified: Ward 3...
Mrs. Magel: it's Ward 3 Councilman.
Mr. Lindower: It's Ricky...
Mrs. Magel: I have prepared legislation that we could amend the agenda for tonight. There would be an ordinance thing that we would accept the vacation approved and adopted upon the contingency of abutting owners understanding that they have to transfer any interest that they may have to the City of North Canton. I think there was an agreement on that. Mr. Peterson, Mr. Raderchak...
Mr. Raderchak (speaking from audience): Inaudible...
Mrs. Magel: Okay, you understood that?
Mr. Raderchak: Inaudible... if you could define that a bit for me. I think I do but then again...

Mr. Snyder: The portion being vacated normally go to the abutting property owners. But in this case it's going to the City of North Canton rather than the property owners. Otherwise we would be back into the same situation where you would need to build a cul-de-sac - some way to alleviate the people going back there.

Mrs. Magel: This is exactly how we did it with Briar and Weber.
Mr. McLaughlin: And what it does is...
Mr. Raderchak: Inaudible... understand.
Mr. McLaughlin: I'm sorry.
Mr. Raderchak: I do understand I just want to be very specific as far as ...inaudible...
Mr. McLaughlin: The one thing it does do, it does - they will retain the public easements for their sewer and the water - the water mains. I want to make sure that's perfectly clear for Monticello so that's why it comes back to the city...
Mr. Raderchak: Inaudible...
Mrs. Magel: Right.
Mr. McLaughlin: so they can maintain their easement rights to go through there.
Unidentified: They have to retain their rights.
Mr. McLaughlin: Right right. And that's - and I've got a copy here I was going to give to everybody - I'll pass it around to council. It's a letter that Pat so graciously gave us the first time and it advised that they would have no objections to the vacation of the land. But of course that public easements are retained for the sewer and water main. So I want to pass around... Also - I'm sorry Kathy, can I - is it okay if...
Mrs. Magel: It's your ward.
Mr. Caticchio: Inaudible...
Unidentified: There was only a few houses there.
Mr. Benekos: There needs to be one...inaudible... yea...

Mr. McLaughlin: Okay. Also I have a statement here from the City of North Canton....
Mr. Lindower: I've got it.
Mr. McLaughlin: The North Canton Fire Department does not oppose the vacating of Grassmere. I've got a copy of that for everybody too to see. I think one of the things we've got to look at here is this is not going to set precedence with anything. We've done it before. We've done it with Briar. We've done it with Weber. We've also done it which you - I don't think anybody realizes that we done it back on - find my paperwork here, October of 2000 when we vacated a portion of 11th Street for the church going - so 11th Street wouldn't go through there. And we done that ...inaudible... the Planning Commission came to us and we got it approved. There is a couple things that we have to look at too and I think one of them is you know is October the 4th at a 2000 Planning Commission meeting where we vacated a petition to vacate a portion of 11th Street by Ned Lehman residing at 244 Donner Avenue, for the purpose of the Faith United Methodist Church, they didn't want 11th Street to go through. The other thing is there is a - there was a case in this Washington Township where the City of Louisville sued to keep two township roads closed and they won. The city wanted to connect the roads to a new development, which had a negative effect on the township neighborhood and they won that case. But I think that also back when we did Briar and Weber I think that one of the things that they looked at from their lawyer's point of view, was a case that was pending up in Cleveland with the City of Cleveland and Shaker Heights and went to the Supreme Court of Ohio, the Supreme Court ruled that the cities could do what they want with the municipalities to keep the traffic patterns limited to a municipality. I've got a copy of that if anybody wants to see. And they also referred back to the revised code of 723-01. And I've got - it tells you about what municipalities can do on controlling traffic, highways, streets, alleys, whatever. And I think that's one of the things we've got to look at. One of things I do want to bring out is when we had the Planning Commission meeting I don't thing they brought up - the Planning Commission wouldn't listen to the fact that I think there's a blind spot that one of the - that Don brought up and there's a bad blind spot, by

Held Monday, January 27, 20 2003

connecting those streets you're going to have a major problem with the traffic going through there speeding down Meadowland and even going up to Grassmere and everything else like that.
Unidentified: I hope not.

Mr. McLaughlin: The other problem you have is mailboxes are on the opposite sides. I don't know how many times in the last two years I've got calls from little old ladies being almost hit crossing the street trying to get their mail with the amount of traffic from the kids from the high school and everybody speeding back through that area. And I think it is a hazardous area back through there. I think the other thing we've got to look at and Bill is right, that Knoll is being used as a cut through to Easthill. And I think it's going to get worse once that bridge starts on South Main starts be redone this upcoming summer. You're going to have a major problem with people cutting through there. I - the increased traffic of going from either on Grass - or on Meadowlane or Knoll cutting over to Easthill once that bridge is all increased to three lanes each way. I think that's...inaudible...

Mr. Snyder: Mr. McLaughlin, I'm - I apologize for my interference but I must ...inaudible... bring your brief comments to a close. Because I have to get a meeting started. I apologize, I don't want to cut you off...
Mr. McLaughlin: First time you every told me I was long winded. You know that?
Mr. Snyder: Normally you're very much ...inaudible...
Mr. McLaughlin: For all these years I've known you...
Mr. Snyder: Thank you. I know that and I apologize for that. But a...

Mr. McLaughlin: But again I'm totally in favor of this thing. I'd like to see this thing done. To me it was a no-brainer for the Planning Commission when we went ...inaudible... So I'd like to see this done as quick as we can.

Mr. Snyder: I will say one thing, there's a little bit of a problem here on interpretation. It did come from the Planning Commission as a recommendation not to close the property. Normally in our zoning ordinance at present it requires two-thirds affirmative to overrule the Planning Commission. However, that is in matters of issues of zoning. This is not a matter of zoning, this is a matter of vacation. So I - although I appreciate the fact that you want to read it tonight, it is either five or six votes required. And I just asked for an opinion of the Law Director and as any good attorney ...inaudible... do when he doesn't know the answer, he's going to research it and get to us. So it would be matter in the - of the fact...
Mr. Lindower: Where'd you find a good attorney?
Mr. Snyder: if you have six affirmative votes I would recommend you read the first reading tonight. However, it might only require five. But if you - Chairman Magel, if you feel you have six affirmative votes I would go ahead and do that and you would be - so that would be up to you at the time when we do come to the general meeting. Is that alright? Mr. Caticchio...

Mr. Caticchio (speaking from audience): I just want to make an offer. In the event that you want a cul-de-sac at the exist - at that area, I'll build it.
Mr. Snyder: That's very kind of you. Thank you.
Mr. Caticchio: At no cost.
Mr. Snyder: Thank you very much sir, appreciate it.
Mr. McLaughlin: You have any Indians tickets for next year? Just thought I'd ask.
Mr. Snyder: I know he's got a lot for sale though.

Mr. Osborne: Mr. President...

Mrs. Magel: Well I need to conclude this because we have a 7:00 meeting here.
Mrs. Kiesling: That's fine.

Mr. Osborne: I'd like to make some comments if we could have a couple more minutes...
Mrs. Kiesling: Can we make the comments when we read it?
Mr. Osborne: or I can make them after we start the meeting.

Mr. Snyder: Yes I was going to - are - Chairman Magel, you intend to introduce that legislation? I think...
Mrs. Magel: I was - I was about to make a recommendation and then have comments from council - if I have six.
Mr. Snyder: Well I was going to say if that's the case, when you introduce it we'll allow debate if that's...
Mrs. Magel: Oh of course, as we do any...
Mr. Snyder: was that - yea, right. Is that alright with you?
Mr. Osborne: Yea, that's fine with me.
Mrs. Magel: Okay.
Mr. Snyder: Okay, that's what we'll do then.

Mrs. Magel: Alright. My recommendation is, it has been brought to our attention there has been due diligence, everything has been done correctly, there has been signatures, tonight we even had more signatures. Obviously the local neighborhood is behind them. I thought it was more than gracious that

Held Monday, January 27, 20 2003

what this developer just said tonight. That is overwhelming. With that kind of cooperation I absolutely would recommend the vacation of Grassmere. However, now there is a problem between - we don't know if there's five or six votes. And I would like to have the first reading tonight so that you would see where council stands. I need a comment from council. Do I have six votes? Do I have six votes?

Mr. McLaughlin: Yes.
Unidentified: Yea.
Mrs. Kiesling: Yes.
Mr. McLaughlin: I think you do have six votes.

Mr. Osborne: Can I speak?

Mr. Snyder: Well I'll allow you to speak...
Mrs. Magel: Whenever we have the...
Mr. Snyder: when we come up to where we have to be...
Mr. Osborne: Okay.
Mr. Snyder: If you don't mind sir...
Mr. Osborne: Oh, okay.
Mr. Snyder: I'd appreciate that. Thank you.

Mrs. Magel: Ward 3 Councilman, I would like then to amend the agenda.
Mr. Snyder: Well we'll...
Mrs. Magel: Inaudible... Mr. President, amend the agenda...
Mrs. Kiesling: We'll amend it when we get there.
Mr. Snyder: Madam Chairman, we'll do that at the - at that point and I'll allow you do that...
Mrs. Kiesling: Yea.
Mrs. Magel: That'd be fine.

Mr. Snyder: Thank you very much. If there'd be no other comment, I'll adjourn this public hearing at 7:08 or 9 or whatever it is. Thank you.

PRESIDENT OF COUNCIL

ATTEST:

CLERK OF COUNCIL