1	
2	
3	
4	CITY OF MEDINA BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
5	CASE Z25-09
6	999 LAFAYETTE ROAD
7	
8	
9	
10	Transcript of Proceedings held on Thursday,
11	the 12th day of June, 2025, before the
12	City of Medina Board of Zoning Appeals, commencing
13	at approximately 7:00 p.m., as taken by
14	Meghan Bobrowski, Notary Public within and for
15	the State of Ohio, and held in Medina City Hall,
16	132 North Elmwood Avenue, Medina, Ohio 44256.
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	MEDINA COURT REPORTERS 209 North Broadway Street
24	Medina, Ohio 44256 (330) 723-2482
25	office@crmedina.com

1	APPEARANCES:
2	Bert Humpal, Chairman, Mark Williams, Member,
3	Paul Roszak, Member, Logan Johnson, Member,
4	Steven Cooper, Member.
5	City of Medina Planning and Community Development Department,
6 7	Andrew Dutton, Community Development Director, Sarah Tome, Administrative Assistant.
8 9	Roetzel & Andress by R. Todd Hunt, Esq. on behalf of the City of Medina Board of Zoning Appeals.
10	Gregory A. Huber, City of Medina Law Director,
11	on behalf of the City of Medina Board of Zoning Appeals.
12	Tucker Ellis, LLP by Anthony R. Vacanti, Esq.
13	on behalf of the Applicants.
14 15	Berns, Ockner & Greenberger, LLC by Majeed G. Makhlouf, Esq.
	on behalf of Minit Mart, LLC.
16 17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	(Whereupon, all persons intending to
2	testify were placed under oath by the notary.)
3	
4	PROCEEDINGS
5	CASE Z25-09
6	CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Be
7	comfortable.
8	Before we begin our first case this
9	evening, we are, I believe, going to consider
10	going into executive session of the Board for
11	counsel.
12	Is there a motion?
13	MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, I'd
14	make a motion that we go to executive session
15	to receive legal counsel from our attorney.
16	CHAIRMAN: Second?
17	MR. ROSZAK: Second.
18	CHAIRMAN: And a roll call,
19	please.
20	MS. TOME: Humpal?
21	CHAIRMAN: Yes.
22	MS. TOME: Johnson?
23	MR. JOHNSON: Yes.
24	MS. TOME: Roszak?
25	MR. ROSZAK: Yes.

1	MS. TOME: Williams?
2	MR. WILLIAMS: Yes.
3	MS. TOME: Cooper?
4	MR. COOPER: Yes.
5	MS. TOME: Motion carried.
6	CHAIRMAN: We shall return
7	after conversation with legal counsel, and then
8	we'll continue.
9	(Whereupon, the meeting stood in
10	recess while the Board entered executive
11	session.)
12	CHAIRMAN: We're back to
13	order. Thank you for bearing with us.
14	Our first case this evening is Z25-09, the
15	appeal at 999 Lafayette Road.
16	Andrew.
17	MR. DUTTON: (Displaying case
18	packet.)
19	Thank you. I just wanted to briefly go
20	over the application here.
21	So here you have the property on the
22	northeast corner of Lake Road and Lafayette
23	Road, which is 1.96 acres, so it's GC,
24	general commercial.
25	So there was an application to the

Planning Commission for a site plan and conditional zoning certificate approval for a project, as shown on the slide there, with a convenience store and center, drive-through building counterclockwise around it, a typical passenger vehicle fueling station on the south side, and a truck fueling station on the north side. The conditional zoning certificate was necessary due to the drive-through and the filling station, which are both conditional uses in the GC zoning district -- I'm sorry, C-3 zoning district. Excuse me.

There is also a graphic of the exterior of the building for rendering.

The application also required variances, which were heard by the Board, to the number of access drives. Two were permitted for a service station/fueling station. Three are proposed, one on Lafayette and two on Lake - one ingress, one egress - for trucks; also to the width of the access drives.

At the Planning Commission's March 13th,
2025 meeting, they approved both the site plan
and the conditional zoning certificate
applications with a number of conditions.

The first was their approval of variances -requested variances by the Board of Zoning
Appeals. That was the access drives, the
number and the width. Those were approved by
the Board of Zoning Appeals. Two through four
on the slide were rather minor - a connection
to a public sidewalk, adding two trees, and a
detail of the light fixture - and the fifth was
that semi-trucks shall be prohibited from
turning into the property at the Lafayette Road
entrance, which was discussed at the meeting
and included as a condition.

The Planning Commission also adopted a Final Decision and Conclusions of Fact at their April 10th, 2025 meeting.

The approval from the Planning Commission has been appealed to the Board of Zoning Appeals by an attorney representing an adjacent property owner, Majeed Makhlouf. You have the appeal in your packet, along with documents provided by Anthony Vacanti, representing the Applicant of P25-02, and the City's response, a Final Decision and Conclusions of Fact adopted by the Planning Commission, documents submitted to the Planning Commission for their review at

the March 13th meeting, and then transcripts 1 2 and meeting minutes from both the March 13th and April 10th Planning Commission meetings. 3 You also have recent e-mail correspondence from 4 the attorneys to City staff, which was received 5 today. You also have a hard copy of that 6 7 correspondence in front of you. So based on the appeal, Section 8 9 1107.08(i)(4) designates criteria applicable to appeals. It states, "The Board shall reverse 10 11 an order of a zoning official only if it finds that the action or decision appealed: 12 Was arbitrary or capricious; or 13 "A. 14 Was based on an erroneous finding of a materiel fact; or 15 16 " C . Was based on erroneous interpretation of this Ordinance or zoning law; or 17 Constituted an abuse of discretion." 18 "D. 19 Thank you. 2.0 CHAIRMAN: Thank you. 21 Is the applicant present? 22 Come to the first table. 23 I think you may have to find the green 24 light on the microphone, if you would. 25 Name and address, please, sir.

Majeed Makhlouf. 1 MR. MAKHLOUF: I'm a partner with the law firm of Berns, 2 Ockner & Greenberger; 3201 Enterprise Parkway, 3 4 Beachwood, Ohio. CHAIRMAN: 5 Okay. Counsel, would you --6 7 MR. HUNT: Yeah. I've been asked to sort of frame the issues for this 8 evening based upon what the parties have submitted to the Board and to myself and to the 10 11 law director, Mr. Huber. First of all, there was an issue raised as 12 to whether the Board of Zoning Appeals has 13 jurisdiction over this appeal that has been 14 brought. And the second issue -- these are two 15 16 preliminary matters before we would get to the 17 substance of the appeal itself, and that is 18 whether this should be an appeal de novo, which 19 means that it would be an evidentiary hearing

20

21

22

23

24

25

hearing.

And I've advised the Board that perhaps -they have received your written reasons why you have taken these positions, and I thought it would be helpful if the Board would permit that

or whether it should not be an evidentiary

1	counsel for each of those parties give a very
2	brief and I don't know if you want to,
3	Mr. Chairman, put any time limit on it, to make
4	an argument with respect to each of those
5	issues.
6	CHAIRMAN: Do you think five
7	minutes each is adequate?
8	MR. HUNT: That's plenty.
9	MR. MAKHLOUF: Sure. Thank you.
10	I'll try to be very quick.
11	CHAIRMAN: Do you
12	Go ahead. I'm sorry.
13	MR. MAKHLOUF: A number of
14	points.
15	We believe that this appeal should be heard
16	de novo by the Board of Zoning Appeals, and
17	that is actually required by the express
18	language of the City Code. Your code does not
19	distinguish on the application process or the
20	hearing process between a variance and an
21	appeal. Both are addressed in the same section
22	and the in 1107.08, and it actually
23	specifically provides in the in Section (e)
24	that "Within thirty days of receiving a
25	complete application, the Planning Director

shall forward the application, along with any supporting materials and plans, to the Board. Notice of the hearing shall be published in a newspaper of general circulation in the City at least ten days prior to the date of the hearing ..."

This is not an oral argument. The idea that this is an oral argument is that after the fact it's against the express language of the code; the code treats it as an evidentiary hearing by the express language of that code.

A couple of other reasons why the Board should consider this, this appeal de novo. We have a number of objections to the evidence, that that is before the Board of Zoning Appeals. So I'll give you one of them.

You have in front of you the

Conclusions of Fact from the Planning

Commission. Those are improperly -- if you

were to agree with the decision of the -- with

the decision of your legal counsel that you're

restricted to the record that was before the

Planning Commission, those Conclusions of Fact

are improperly before the Board, and we submit

that the well has been poisoned. You've read

them. They've been submitted to you. You've had them for too long.

The -- in this case, the procedural history is very proper. The hearing was on March 13.

The notification of the decision -- the written notification of the decision was issued and served on the parties on March 14, which triggered the appeal. We are in the

Ninth District Court of Appeals, and the Court in the Ninth District Court of Appeals have been very clear that notification of the decision to the parties can be treated -- is the final order and triggers the timeline for the appeal. We appealed on March 25th. At that point the Planning Commission was divested of jurisdiction.

And then after the Planning Commission was divested of jurisdiction on March 25th, it proceeded to adopt those Conclusions of Fact on April 10th. It did not have the jurisdiction to adopt those Conclusions of Fact, nor should they be before you. They're not part of the evidence or the case that was made to the Planning Commission and they're improperly before you and the well has been poisoned.

We've also had the Planning Director give you a summary today, and even facts outside of the record in terms of what happened with the variances. Again, we -- it's too late at this point, that the Board has proceeded in a matter that prevents -- prevents it from -- from proceeding on this simply as if it were an appeal, even if the express language of the ordinance that it required.

Thirdly, you don't have a complete transcript. There are a number of places in this transcript, which provide -- even for deliberation by the Planning Commission members, where the transcript provides that it was done outside of the hearing of the notary, that the notary could not transcribe it because it was outside of the hearing of the notary. So there is part of the record that does not exist in front of you; incomplete.

I'll give you an example. If you go to the transcript on Page -- Page 16 of the transcript, there is a note "... a discussion amongst the board members was then had out of the hearing of the notary." So you do not have a complete transcript of the record before the

1	Planning Commission in front of you
2	CHAIRMAN: We're close to
3	five minutes.
4	MR. MAKHLOUF: Okay.
5	to be able to to do that.
6	Again, so we I'll reserve we'll move
7	separately to strike the Conclusions of Fact
8	and the letter from the Planning Director, but
9	I those bases and the express language of
10	the ordinance requires the Board to hold a
11	hearing tonight.
12	MR. HUNT: I believe it's
13	Mr. Vacanti. You're representing the other
14	party?
15	MR. VACANTI: Correct, the
16	applicants.
17	MR. HUNT: If you would like
18	to sit at the
19	MR. VACANTI: Sure.
20	CHAIRMAN: So please
21	introduce yourself again, please.
22	MR. VACANTI: Absolutely, yeah.
23	Good evening, Members of the Board.
24	Is this on?
25	CHAIRMAN: Green light.

MR. VACANTI: Now it is. 1 All 2 right. 3 CHATRMAN: Yes. 4 MR. VACANTI: Good evening Members of the Board. My name is Tony Vacanti. 5 I represent the applicants of the conditional 6 7 use and site plan approval. I'm a partner of Tucker Ellis. Tony Vacanti; 950 Main Avenue, 8 9 Suite 1100, Cleveland, Ohio. I appreciate the Board's entertainment of 10 11 these jurisdictional issues, and I will be brief. 12 First off, dealing with jurisdiction. 13 There are a couple of issues with jurisdiction. 14 15 One, based off of the plain language of your codified ordinances and your home rule 16 17 municipality, you can adopt your own 18 procedures. It states -- and it does treat variances 19 20 different than appeals. And this is an appeal. It states that any application for an appeal 21 must be notarized. Sounds like a technical 22 23 issue, and it is, but it's important. We have 24 to strictly follow what your code provides.

In the application, the -- counsel for the

objecting business here did sign the application as agent, but it was not notarized; did not follow the proper procedure. So on that basis, in and of itself, the appeal was not perfected pursuant to your codified ordinances and it should be dismissed.

Put that technical reason aside. There are two additional reasons why this Board doesn't have jurisdiction over this appeal. One, there's no standing here. Under your ordinances, only an aggrieved person can appeal a decision from a board, like the Planning Commission in this instance, subject to certain objections. I won't bring that up now.

They have to be aggrieved. That's a term of art under Ohio law. And I lay it out in my letter that you have at the end of your packet. To be an aggrieved person, you have to establish -- and it's the first thing, you know, a lot of us do when we attend a hearing like the Planning Commission hearing. If you're opposing something, you establish why your client opposing it has some special impact that's going to be caused by the approval

before the Planning Commission.

2.0

Here Mr. Makhlouf appeared with the store manager and simply asserted, as the lawyer, that the special impacts are going to be devaluation of his client's property and potential traffic issues and potentially maybe visibility issues. Zero support, factual support, for those assertions.

Under Ohio law, attorney statements aren't fact, they're argument. Even if we like to bluster and puff and huff, we aren't witnesses, we're advocates. So those statements certainly do not establish it. They're certainly completely unfounded and not based on fact.

The store manager did appear and submitted some photographs of trucks stacking up almost two miles away - this is on the record - almost two miles away on Smith Road by the rail line. That was fleshed out really quickly in the transcript.

There's one additional picture of a single truck near the property. The store manager isn't a traffic expert, not an engineer. There is no substance to his claims and so, therefore, there's been a complete failure to

establish that the objecting business is an aggrieved person who has the ability to appeal to this Board. They have the opportunity, full opportunity with a hearing to present testimony, witnesses. They failed to do that. They failed to preserve their ability to appeal. There is such an ability to this Board, and that is also why it should be dismissed.

With regards to the de novo review,
briefly. 1107.08 does distinguish between
variances and appeals. We can go through it.
There's a different criteria for appeals than
variances. There are different application
requirements for appeals than variances.

Yes, there's a provision for notice of hearing, as Mr. Makhlouf said, but that dealt with -- if you look at the plain language, it deals with variances.

And it doesn't say evidentiary hearing, it says a hearing. So that -- you know, that is not a basis to open this up. The criteria you're supposed to review is based on the record before the Planning Commission.

It wouldn't make any sense if all of a

sudden they can get a second bite at the apple and have the record and then you have to determine that the Planning Commission erred because they didn't have all this evidence before them. They had their shot, they had their bite at the apple. This is simply a situation of trying to thwart business competition, which is not allowable under Ohio law, and this City should not allow that.

Thank you. I appreciate your time.

MR. MAKHLOUF: If I may just respond to a couple of those points?

CHAIRMAN:

Two minutes.

MR. MAKHLOUF: Okay. Number one, with respect to the application form, the ordinance specifies that it's on a form that is approved by the Planning Director. We applied on the form that is approved by the Planning Director, the form that the Planning Director uses a certification in lieu of notarization. The form, the ordinances entrust the -- and delegate that duty to determine completeness of the application to the Planning Director. We even had it confirmed in writing that the application was determined complete and

accepted.

And it wouldn't have been referred to the Board of Zoning Appeals had it not been deemed complete and accepted, which was had here -- and actually the director even asked for revisions to the application, and we did revise it before it was submitted, so it was -- the person with the duty to make that determination made that determination. It's done and it's final.

Secondly, that's an issue because -- it's a technical issue, but it's an issue of form.

The application was submitted timely, it was submitted on the form that was submitted by the City, it was accepted. We could always amend the application if the Board feels strongly about the notarization, but that is not a basis to dismiss an application. It can always be amended. But we submit that it was already deemed complete and submitted to the Board.

There is no reason to do that.

Number two, in terms of standing, we were before the Board -- we were before the Planning Commission. We spoke. We are one of the property owners that was given notice of

1	the hearing, and we have to come, so under the
2	City's own ordinances, we are within the
3	purview of properties that are affected and
4	received that notice and showed up at the
5	Planning Commission. There clearly is an
6	impact on our property, and the fact that we
7	showed up, why else would we be here if there
8	is no impact on our property? And actually
9	there's case law that specifically cites that
10	very issue. The fact that a property owner
11	even showed up and spoke at the hearing,
12	they're a party to it and they're entitled to
13	appeal.
14	MR. VACANTI: If I may have
15	just have one minute?
16	CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.
17	MR. VACANTI: Thirty seconds.
18	All right.
19	With regard to the application form,
20	Mr. Makhlouf is an experienced attorney. We
21	all know to look at the ordinances as to what
22	is required. We're put on notice to follow
23	what the ordinances say. I double-check them
24	all the time because there are mistakes. So
25	that's a duty of the applicant to make sure the

application conforms, not to pass the buck back off to the City.

And, two, with regard to the de novo review - I had mentioned this in my letter the law director on May 7th issued a written opinion that the -- your review should be based on the record before the Planning Commission. The objecting business owner is familiar with the appeal process, that he could have appealed that decision, and that appeal deadline would have been May 21st. That deadline is long gone. The ability to appeal and challenge that final determination of the law director with regards to the scope of this Board's review has been waived, and it's binding and we relied on that determination that wasn't appealed as well.

Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MAKHLOUF: The law director is not an officer entrusted with enforcing the zoning code. That was not a legal -- that was not a -- and actually the record is, we immediately objected to it and we were told that we will talk about it, but that -- the idea that that was waived is quite outrageous.

1 But, two --2 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Why does he get 3 to talk? I mean --4 MR. HUNT: You started talking. 5 6 MR. MAKHLOUF: Yeah. 7 CHAIRMAN: I think your time is pretty --8 9 MR. MAKHLOUF: Okay. MR. HUNT: We've heard the 10 11 arguments. As the parties' counsel have said, I have made decisions and opinions given to the 12 Board with respect to this that they have 13 14 jurisdiction over this appeal and that this should be a non-evidentiary hearing. There's a 15 16 support in our code, and I don't know anywhere 17 in the United States jurisprudence that a party 18 gets a second evidentiary hearing without a 19 finding of error by a -- that was committed by 20 the tribunal below. So that's why we're here 21 today, to see if there was an error. 22 You will also have a right of appeal from 23 this final decision to the Court of Common Pleas of Medina County. As you know, there is 24 25 already an appeal pending of this Board's

1	decisions on variances in this case. That is a
2	matter of public record. And the there was
3	a full-blown quasi-judicial hearing in front of
4	the Planning Commission in March of this year
5	on this matter. This appeal to the Board of
6	Zoning Appeals is like any other appeal that
7	comes before the Board, whether it's a variance
8	or whether it's an appeal from the zoning
9	administrator, who is interpreting the code,
10	who doesn't give a hearing. We've had a
11	hearing.
12	So my position - I think it's been public
13	since May, if not earlier - has been that this
14	is not an evidentiary hearing and this Board
15	has jurisdiction to do this hearing.
16	CHAIRMAN: And that would
17	call for a motion that we do have jurisdiction
18	and accept the
19	MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, I
20	would make a motion that based on counsel's
21	advice, the Medina City Board of Zoning Appeals
22	does have jurisdiction for this hearing.
23	CHAIRMAN: And is there a
24	second?
25	MR. ROSZAK: Second.

1		CHAIRMAN:	Sarah, please
2	call the	roll.	
3		MS. TOME:	Johnson?
4		MR. JOHNSON:	Yes.
5		MS. TOME:	Roszak?
6		MR. ROSZAK:	Yes.
7		MS. TOME:	Williams?
8		MR. WILLIAMS:	Yes.
9		MS. TOME:	Cooper?
10		MR. COOPER:	Yes.
11		MS. TOME:	Humpal?
12		CHAIRMAN:	Yes.
13		MS. TOME:	Motion carried.
14		CHAIRMAN:	Thank you.
15		MR. HUNT:	Okay. And then
16	there nee	eds to be a motion wit	th respect to an
17	evidentia	ary hearing. Whether	it's an
18	evidentia	ary hearing or not, th	nat is a matter
19	that's wi	ithin the discretion (of the Board based
20	on the le	egal advice, legal arg	guments that are
21	being mad	de.	
22		CHAIRMAN:	Is there a motion
23	from the	Board?	
24		MR. COOPER:	I'd like to make
25	a motion	that this is not an	evidentiary

1	hearing based on legal advice.	
2	MR. WILLIAMS:	Second.
3	CHAIRMAN:	Second.
4	Sarah, you may call the ro	oll, please.
5	MS. TOME:	Roszak?
6	MR. ROSZAK:	Yes.
7	MS. TOME:	Williams?
8	MR. WILLIAMS:	Yes.
9	MS. TOME:	Cooper?
10	MR. COOPER:	Yes.
11	MS. TOME:	Humpal?
12	CHAIRMAN:	Yes.
13	MS. TOME:	Johnson?
14	MR. JOHNSON:	Yes.
15	MS. TOME:	Motion carried.
16	CHAIRMAN:	And with that, we
17	turn to counsel.	
18	MR. MAKHLOUF:	Thank you.
19	A couple of procedural iss	sues just to
20	protect the record.	
21	We also obviously object t	to the Board's
22	decision not to hold an evider	ntiary hearing.
23	This is an internal process wi	thin the City to
24	reach the City's final decision	on. The City's
25	final decision is reached toda	y. It was not

the Planning Commission's decision under the City's own code, and there is nothing in the code that prevents the applicant from presenting any additional evidence. anything, the express language of the code speaks of the hearing that would be -- and there is a difference between a hearing and a meeting, and the language uses the hearing, the very same hearing, for a variance, and as Mr. Hunt indicated, even if -- if there was a decision of the zoning administrator that was appealed, you would be entitled to a hearing. Your code nowhere distinguishes between the type of procedure that you would follow, whether it's an appeal from the Planning Commission or it's an appeal from the zoning administrator.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So with that, we object and we state our objections on the record.

I do have at least two witnesses with me here, a traffic engineer by the name of Andrew Pierson with Langan Engineering, who's ready to testify, and we will proffer his testimony on the record; and Mr. Greg Soltis, a professor at Cleveland State University Urban

1	Planning, who has a report that we will also
2	proffer into the record.
3	MR. HUNT: Mr. Chair, I
4	think it would be appropriate that after the
5	oral arguments in the case, based on the
6	Planning Commission record, if Mr. Makhlouf
7	have the opportunity, with the court reporter
8	present, to make his proffer, so
9	MR. MAKHLOUF: Thank you.
10	MR. VACANTI: Just Mr. Hunt,
11	and, Mr. Chair, just one thing I would request.
12	I would request that the proffer occur after
13	the vote of this Board, because otherwise it's
14	evidence outside of the record and it's hard,
15	especially for a lay board, to distinguish and
16	taint the record. So I have no problem with
17	the proffer, but I think it should be after the
18	vote's taken and it be on the record.
19	MR. HUNT: That would be
20	fine.
21	MR. VACANTI: Okay.
22	MR. HUNT: As long as we get
23	the proffer in the record. I assume this case
24	is going to the Court of Common Pleas, as part
25	of it is already there, and Judge Hutson is

very adept to these sort of issues.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MAKHLOUF: Also for purposes of the record, I formally move to strike the Planning Commission's Conclusions of Fact from the record. As I've explained previously, the Planning Commission does not have jurisdiction to enter those Conclusions of Fact when it did. The decision was voted on March 13. written notification of the decision that triggered the appeal period happened on March 14. It was served on the applicant and it was served on us, and then we appealed on March 25th, which divested the Planning Commission of jurisdiction over the matter. The Planning Commission, after the institution of the appeal, proceeded to have these Conclusions of Fact, which were not part of the record before the Planning Commission and should be stricken from the record and cannot be considered by the Planning Commission.

I similarly move to strike the April 10th letter from the Planning Director to the Board of Zoning Appeals. It references much of the -- the -- sorry.

I move to strike the June 3rd memo from the

Planning Director to the Board of Zoning
Appeals. It relies on the Conclusions of Fact
and has information outside of the record that
was before the Planning Commission as well.
Those are not properly before the Board. But
obviously the Planning Commission is the big
issue here, that it did not have jurisdiction
to enter the Conclusions of Fact when it did.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HUNT: My advice to the Board is that to not strike the Conclusions of Fact. I've been practicing for forty-one years. I started when I was ten years old practicing -- actually, no, thirty years old, and I don't know how many occasions I can cite where a board has filed Conclusions of Fact with the common pleas court after the appeal to the court was filed. It's So it's really not a very common. jurisdictional issue, it is an act that's taken in aid of the appeal and totally proper and never has been stricken from the record in a court of law. I don't think it's appropriate to strike here for today.

And in terms of any letter from Mr. Dutton that might contain the Conclusions of Fact or

reference to them, I can rely on the same 1 2 opinion. 3 And I don't know what other facts were in the record, other than the fact that there were 4 variances that were granted. Of course those 5 were granted after the Planning Commission's 6 7 decision and hearing, but they are a matter of 8 certainly public record, and you are the ones 9 who granted the variance, so take that out of your mind with the variance, with respect to 10 11 listening to the arguments of the counsel this 12 evening. And I think you need to make a motion as to 13 14 whether you're going to strike the conclusions 15 or not. 16 MR. VACANTI: And just for the 17 record, on behalf of the applicant, for the 18 Planning Commission, we concur with Mr. Hunt's 19 conclusions and adopt them as ours. 20 MR. MAKHLOUF: Obviously we 21 object and the Planning Commission did not have 22 jurisdiction to enter the conclusions. 23 CHAIRMAN: Seek a motion from the Board. 24 25 MR. WILLIAMS: I make a motion

1	that we do not strike the Conclusions of Fact
2	nor the letter from the zoning official.
3	CHAIRMAN: And a second?
4	MR. ROSZAK: Second.
5	CHAIRMAN: Sarah, will you
6	call the roll, please.
7	MS. TOME: Williams?
8	MR. WILLIAMS: Yes.
9	MS. TOME: Cooper?
10	MR. COOPER: Yes.
11	MS. TOME: Humpal?
12	CHAIRMAN: Yes.
13	MS. TOME: Johnson?
14	MR. JOHNSON: Yes.
15	MS. TOME: Roszak?
16	MR. ROSZAK: Yes.
17	MS. TOME: Motion carried.
18	CHAIRMAN: Motion carried.
19	Thank you.
20	MR. MAKHLOUF: I will also
21	launch another objection, that the City failed
22	to issue notice of the hearing or the
23	hearing that we're here today on to the
24	neighboring property owners as required by your
25	zoning code, specifically requiring the service

of the notice on property owners within a 1 2 certain radius of the appeal, that that did not take place where we are here today. 3 4 CHATRMAN: Noted. Thank 5 you. MR. MAKHLOUF: Thank you. 6 7 All right. The last at least line of objections I would have is, I think there has 8 9 been a pattern here with -- again, there's lawyers here and we argue and I think sometimes 10 11 when the outside world sees us -- you know, Mr. Hunt is a friend, Mr. Vacanti is a friend, 12 but I think we have clients and we have 13 14 interest to represent here. 15 But I -- there has been a pattern here 16 from the property owner or from the applicant 17 of ex parte communications with the City 18 without any copies to us. So there was the 19 initial request to table the hearing from May 2.0 to June, that we did not get any copy of it, 21 and specific requests to restrict the evidence 22 and the type of hearing without any notice to 23 us. 24 The City responded to that request with a 25 letter from the law director, and even the

law director's letter specifically said that the Board will grant the continuance, not that the Board is likely to grant the continuance, from our experience, or may; the Board will grant the variance.

In fact, I think a determination was made and conveyed to the applicant and we only received notice of it after the fact through notification from the -- through an e-mail from -- from Mr. Dutton that forwarded that correspondence to me to alert me to it after it was made -- after the City had responded to Mr. Vacanti's letter.

And then secondly, even today I understand there was a letter submitted to the City. I haven't checked my e-mail, but I believe I was not copied on it when I looked at the cc's, so it's repeated ex parte communications with the Board and its representatives without any copy to us or any opportunity to respond. Literally walking in at the hearing, Mr. Dutton handed me a copy - and it's not Mr. Dutton's job to hand me a copy of that letter - handed me a copy of the letter from Mr. Vacanti that I was supposed to instantaneously respond to it, but that

1	letter had already been submitted to the Board,
2	and I was handed it after the Board, which is
3	an improper practice.
4	So we object for that practice of what
5	happened there.
6	MR. VACANTI: Mr. Chair, if I
7	may respond? Just because I mean, it's
8	calling into question some ethical matters,
9	then I think it's appropriate for me to
10	respond. Or I can wait until my turn, but I
11	think
12	CHAIRMAN: A minute or two.
13	MR. VACANTI: Pardon me?
14	CHAIRMAN: Can you do it
15	very quickly?
16	MR. VACANTI: Yeah, absolutely.
17	There's been no ex parte communication with
18	members of this Board. I would ask any member
19	of the Board, if you communicated directly with
20	me, you know, please identify your on the
21	merits of this matter, please identify
22	yourselves.
23	(No response.)
24	MR. VACANTI: Okay.
25	My client has a constitutional right under

the Ohio Rules of Professional Conduct to communicate with its government. All right? Those are not ex parte communications. I didn't communicate with board members, I communicated with the law department. Entirely proper under the Ohio Rules of Professional Conduct. I've given seminars on this.

Mr. Makhlouf, the record shows there's been e-mails that he had been e-mailing with the law department and Mr. Hunt and I wasn't copied on it. My clients' application, which he appealed, I wasn't given a courtesy copy. My client wasn't given any type of courtesy copy. So if he was so concerned about it, his activities, which are shown in the record, are at the same level.

So I submit to you this is not ex parte.

My letter was in the record. I checked the record before I came, as I always did; it was included in it. So all he had to do was click on the packet for tonight's hearing, which I always double-check before the hearing, my letter was included.

If Mr. Makhlouf failed to do that, out of

all due respect, that's not on you guys, it's 1 2 not on me, it's on the competing business. MR. MAKHLOUF: If I may just 3 4 respond to the factual issues here? CHAIRMAN: Just briefly. 5 MR. MAKHLOUF: The -- and just 6 7 so that the record is very clear, the letter was sent to the City and the City responded to 8 9 the letter and we received a copy of it after the response. So that is number one. 10 And two, the letter today, this is an 11 12 appeal. We're here for an appeal. We're being told that the -- it's quasi-judicial and 13 parties of the appeal are not receiving notice 14 15 of -- it's just the entire process has been --CHAIRMAN: The objections 16 17 and response are so noted. Thank you. 18 MR. MAKHLOUF: All right. 19 With respect to the appeal, we have 20 highlighted a number of issues in the appeal 21 application, and I would go through them briefly for the Board, and the Board has the 22 23 transcript and we will also proffer the 24 evidence. 25 The applicant had to prove its case beyond

a reasonable doubt. This is effective -- this is the requirement under your code, and it presented no evidence. At the hearing it literally said nothing. It -- the only time was after the fact when it was asked questions when we pointed out. And there was no evidence presented by the applicant, not even a presentation of its plan. The Planning Commission effectively did the work for the applicant instead of the applicant which bears the burden of proof of doing the work.

The decision of the Planning Commission is contrary to the criteria of the -- of your code. Section 1152.03 has the criteria that the Planning Commission had to consider and that this Board, which sits -- has the same powers as the Planning Commission, I may emphasize, in your code. You sit in the place of the Planning Commission, which again is contrary to the no de novo hearing here. You sit in the place of the body from which the appeal was lodged; had to make a determination that there's seven criteria:

That the use will be harmonious with and in accordance with the general objectives or with

any specific objectives of the Land Use and Thoroughfare Plan of current adoption. That did not happen;

Will be designed, constructed, operated, and maintained so as to be harmonious in appearance and with the existing or intended character of the neighborhood. That did not happen. It was not -- it's not in accordance with the character of the neighborhood and there was no testimony or anything to that effect.

We've presented evidence regarding the traffic issues. I think the -- a plain review of the record shows that the Planning Commission was blindsighted in the sense that it saw a competitor across the street, or what they deemed to be a competitor, object to the application, and in their mind that was sufficient, and that's not a proper basis, and they were willing to ignore everything else based on who the applicant is.

Just to give you an example, when we were talking about traffic, this is a site plan that involves a major retail component - drive-through, gas pumps in the front, semi gas

pumps in the back, areas for large trucks to park. The City did not require any traffic impact study or even a traffic analysis. It's an issue that we repeatedly raised. The City did not even have in front of it any evidence. We asked them and we raised it in the record - and the record is in front of you - "Do you have -- do you know how many trips are generated by the site?" Nobody on the Planning Commission knew anything about the number of trips.

The response that we got, and that's on the record, is "There is not going to be additional traffic because they're taking your client's customers; therefore, it's not additional traffic."

Think of the precedent that this Board is setting by taking that position. Any time you have a McDonald's coming in across from a Burger King and "You don't have to do a traffic impact study because you're taking your traffic from Burger King." That is effectively what the City is saying.

But that is not true. And we argued before the Planning Commission a number of issues.

-1	
1	Number one, there's the gravitational model.
2	That's why these types of businesses often
3	locate next to each other, because it draws
4	more customers into the area.
5	Our customers are not going to we're not
6	worried about competition. There's a rewards
7	program. Many of our customers have a rewards
8	program. They'll come because they want their
9	discount. They have a BP discount.
10	MR. VACANTI: I'm just going to
11	object for the record. Mr. Makhlouf is
12	testifying, and none of this is in the record,
13	so if we're limiting it to the record, we
14	should limit it to the record.
15	CHAIRMAN: We do overrule to
16	the objection.
17	MR. MAKHLOUF: Yes. I direct
18	the Board
19	MR. HUNT: He's speaking.
20	MR. MAKHLOUF: I'm sorry. Oh, I
21	thought he was asking me to respond to the
22	objection. I'm sorry.
23	MR. HUNT: No.
24	MR. MAKHLOUF: You overruled the
25	
45	objection?

1	CHAIRMAN: Yes.
2	MR. MAKHLOUF: Thank you.
3	And I would point the Board sorry, I
4	thought you were asking me to respond to the
5	and I was going to point you to the record on
6	Page 19.
7	MR. HUNT: I think it's
8	important that I caution you, though, to be on
9	the record, I remember the argument about
10	gravitational
11	MR. MAKHLOUF: That was in the
12	record.
13	MR. HUNT: Yes. Yes.
14	MR. MAKHLOUF: And so is
15	Ms. Russell's question. "I guess my question
16	here would be, why would there be more traffic?
17	I think the issue is that there would be less
18	traffic going to your business and some going
19	to the competitor across the street because
20	it's a similar business. So I don't know why
21	there would be more traffic."
22	That is directly in the record, what the
23	Planning Commission was saying, which is
24	completely wrong.
25	We've addressed the proximity of the

workability of the site plan in terms of
Lafayette having the curb cuts within the turn
lanes. Three cars within the turning lane.
What we're talking about here is effectively a
site that is a bowling alley and we're trying
to sandwich a use in that bowling alley that
just simply does not have the necessary width
on Lafayette to belong there.

And the site doesn't work. When you look to the condition that the Planning Commission made -- which, again, I think that you can't have -- semis cannot have turn-in access to the site from Lafayette, but it's okay for the semis to turn out from Lafayette? That is the Planning Commission decision that is in front of you. They only prevented semis from entering the site from Lafayette, they did not prevent semis from leaving the site on Lafayette.

When you look to the character of the neighborhood that you have, we argue it would show how Smith Road is more of an industrial area. Lafayette is really more of a business office, more kind of a -- yes, there is some industrial uses, but they're not of the kind of

1	intensity with semis going through them quite a
2	bit. There's residential
3	MR. VACANTI: I hate to do
4	this, but I'm going to have to object again,
5	and I don't want to that is not in the
6	record, that that Smith Road has more
7	industry and it's not industry on Lafayette.
8	None of this was testified to. And
9	certainly
10	MR. MAKHLOUF: The Board can
11	MR. VACANTI: Mr. Makhlouf
12	isn't able to testify.
13	MR. MAKHLOUF: The Board can
14	simply look to the area plans that were in the
15	record.
16	MR. VACANTI: There are no area
17	plans in the record.
18	CHAIRMAN: Objection
19	sustained.
20	MR. MAKHLOUF: Okay. We've
21	explained how that use will be hazardous and
22	cause traffic issues to my client's property.
23	The issue here is not competition. The issue
24	here is that you were going that site being
25	sandwiched where it does not belong, it's a

1	conditional use. Being sandwiched where it
2	does not belong is going to create traffic
3	issues that will be detrimental to my
4	property to my client's property values.
5	It will inhibit my client's use of its
6	property. It will clearly create and
7	Mr. Deluca testified on how it will create
8	hazards and how it will interfere with the
9	traffic of the surrounding public streets. I
10	think Mr. Vacanti laughs, but it's two miles
11	away. That is precisely where the traffic -
12	much of it - is coming from, and would be
13	impacted
14	MR. VACANTI: Objection again.
15	That's not in the record, that that traffic on
16	Smith Road comes through Lafayette. Again, I
16 17	Smith Road comes through Lafayette. Again, I hate to do this, so I don't but I need to
17	hate to do this, so I don't but I need to
17 18	hate to do this, so I don't but I need to preserve it.
17 18 19	hate to do this, so I don't but I need to preserve it. MR. MAKHLOUF: I think
17 18 19 20	hate to do this, so I don't but I need to preserve it. MR. MAKHLOUF: CHAIRMAN: Sustained.
17 18 19 20 21	hate to do this, so I don't but I need to preserve it. MR. MAKHLOUF: CHAIRMAN: MR. MAKHLOUF: Okay. I
17 18 19 20 21 22	hate to do this, so I don't but I need to preserve it. MR. MAKHLOUF: I think CHAIRMAN: Sustained. MR. MAKHLOUF: Okay. I think I think that objection precisely
17 18 19 20 21 22	hate to do this, so I don't but I need to preserve it. MR. MAKHLOUF: I think CHAIRMAN: Sustained. MR. MAKHLOUF: Okay. I think I think that objection precisely shows the problem that was before the

You had an application before the

Planning Commission where the property owner

or the applicant bore the burden to prove all

these elements beyond a reasonable doubt, and

we have Mr. Vacanti saying that the

Planning Commission made a decision that

there will be no traffic issues without having

a clue where the traffic will be coming from.

I think that objection speaks volumes to the

error that happened here and why it would be

reversed.

We ask you to reverse the decision of the Planning Commission to allow us to have an evidentiary hearing. We want to put the record in front of you.

Again, this is not about competition. This is not about any of these issues. It's about this will have real detriment on our property, it will have detriment on the area, it's not harmonious with the area that exists.

If you -- we've also pointed out that the approval fails to comply with Sections 1109 and 1137 of the Revised Code. And when you look to 1109 -- again, this is for the site plan, what it needed to have. It -- it requires that

"All the development features including the principal buildings, open spaces, service roads, driveways and parking areas are located ... to minimize the possibility of any adverse effects upon adjacent development."

That's not what this does. We've shown how there's adverse effect from this adverse -- from this development.

There is another issue I just need to point out. This will be for the Court, because we will bring a constitutional claim in addition, and if the Board were to approve the -- affirm the decision of the Planning Commission, there is a constitutionality issue here with the City Ordinance in the sense of there is zero criteria as to when a traffic impact study would be required, and two property owners -- basically it's on the whim of the City Engineer without any criteria to do that.

And this issue was brought up, and you were told the traffic engineer simply just did not require a traffic impact study. Based on what criteria? Based on what? There is nothing before the Planning Commission on that.

So with that, I think you have our

arguments.

2.0

2.4

We did request the Planning Commission repeatedly to not make a decision that night, to table it, to give us an opportunity to come with more evidence because we did not have it. By the time we received the notice it was too late. We offered to bring a traffic engineer. We offered to bring a land use plan. We asked for the opportunity to do that, and we were denied that opportunity with the idea that you had to be there and it was there in front of you. We specifically made that request to the Planning Commission, and the Planning Commission refused to table it or give us the opportunity to do that.

And with that, I move to proffer the evidence that we wanted to proffer.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Counsel, care to add or comment?

MR. VACANTI: Yes. I'll try to

be brief, though.

CHAIRMAN: Please.

MR. VACANTI: Before I get into

some of the merits, I want to address a few things that my esteemed colleague has raised.

He keeps citing to the fact that the burden was beyond a reasonable doubt under your codified ordinances. Remember, there are two issues here, site plan review and conditional use -- or -- yeah, review.

Under Chapter 1109, which governs site plan review, nowhere will you find a beyond a reasonable doubt standard. That is not the standard. It's been misrepresented - I'm sure unintentionally - to this Board. So there is no burden beyond a reasonable doubt for my client to have established that. Regardless, it did, as I'll discuss.

Two, under Chapter 1153 dealing with conditional zoning certificates, my esteemed colleague here keeps saying that the burden was on the applicants to prove beyond a reasonable doubt. If you look at the language in 1153.03 for basis of determination - and this is where Mr. Makhlouf is getting this notion - it states, "The Planning Commission shall establish beyond a reasonable doubt ..."

So that's not just based off of my clients' testimony or the representatives. It's also based off of the architect-stamped plans and

surveys submitted, the application and its narrative, the staff report, the review from the fire department, the review from the Engineer, and all of those items. All right?

And as I'm about to walk through, you'll see the overwhelming evidence supports the Planning Commission's decision beyond a reasonable doubt based off of all the evidence on the record and pretty much no probative, reliable, or substantial evidence presented to the contrary.

What you've heard a lot about from counsel, legal counsel from the objecting business, is that this site doesn't work. Well, that's the opinion of legal counsel, which isn't fact, and that wasn't in the record.

"This site is a bowling alley and supposed to be squeezed in." Mr. Makhlouf is legal counsel. He's not an engineer, not a planner. He's here in his capacity as lawyer, and I cited to the case law in my letter, the U.S. -- or Ohio Evidence Rule, attorney's statements are not considered evidence.

Mr. Makhlouf indicated that a traffic study is needed. Again, Mr. Makhlouf is -- nowhere

2.4

in the record does anyone other than.

Mr. Makhlouf state that. And, again, he's a lawyer, not a traffic engineer, not a planner. His statements should not be considered as probative, reliable, and substantial evidence. Mr. Makhlouf, as legal counsel, stated here and before the Planning Commission that "This is detrimental to the value of my client's --" his client's property and the use.

First of all, that use was never brought up, it was only traffic and value, and it was only Mr. Makhlouf's conclusory statements as legal counsel. There was no appraisal evidence, there was no engineering or planning evidence.

Mr. Deluca, the store manager, did testify that there is going to be increased traffic based off of pictures, tried to misrepresent to the Planning Commission pictures from two miles away - all right? - but was called out. And certainly he has no expertise to opine.

The City Engineer does, and the testimony showed the City Engineer, who's an engineer, reviewed it and determined that there was not

an issue.

Mr. Makhlouf says that all they wanted was an opportunity to present and they just didn't have enough time. Certainly he could have showed up with his clients and established that for some unforeseen circumstances out of their control they couldn't prepare for this hearing. They didn't. All they said, that this Board should table it because it shouldn't be conditioned on variances. All right?

There's no other evidence as to the reason why it should have been continued. This application was filed by my clients in November and here we are.

So putting those items aside, let's take a look at the criteria again. All right?

Mr. Makhlouf is talking about all this other criteria. As been instructed, the criteria is whether the Planning Commission's decision's arbitrary, capricious, was it based on an erroneous finding of material fact or an erroneous interpretation of the zoning ordinance or laws, or if it constitutes an abuse of discretion. The only way that criteria makes sense is if you're reviewing the

record before the Planning Commission, which is what you're doing now.

So let's take a look at that record. All right?

First and foremost, Minit Mart on the record objected to both the site plan and conditional use approval because variances were needed. All right?

Thereafter, the Board -- or the Commission pushed back - and this is in the record - saying, "Well, we're allowed to condition approvals on things like variances," and Mr. Makhlouf agreed. Moot issue.

Thereafter, he raised no objection to the site plan, other than the fact that it was being -- the approval of it was being approved.

So all these items that he's talking about the site plan, they were never raised, even by the attorney, and under Ohio law those arguments are waived now. Even if they are supposed to be factual statements -- and they're not, but if you were to accept that based on the site plan, they've been waived because they weren't raised before the Planning Commission.

1	Let's say they weren't waived. All right?
2	As you'll see in the letter submitted that's
3	part of the record, that was available publicly
4	online prior to this hearing, you'll see my
5	letter and there are two exhibits attached. I
6	went through the record and summarized it.
7	Exhibit A deals with the site plan
8	criteria, and I have broken down the evidence
9	in the record that supported each individual
10	criteria and the purported contrary evidence.
11	Now, I can walk through this or I can
12	incorporate it by reference. I'm going to
13	incorporate it by reference just just, you
14	know, so you have the details, but I'll just
15	briefly briefly rush you know, run
16	through it.
17	The first
18	CHAIRMAN: We have received
19	those in an e-mail today.
20	MR. VACANTI: Yes. I'll
21	summarize it fast.
22	CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.
23	MR. VACANTI: Yeah. So the
24	first criteria is set forth in Section
25	1109.02(c)(1) to (2). All right?

The site plan shows that a proper relationship exists between thoroughfares, service roads, driveways, parking areas, you know, and encourages pedestrian and vehicular traffic safety and shows all the development features.

The evidence in the record, the application narrative:

"Describing the site plan and how it is designed to segregate automobile traffic from tractor-trailer traffic and allow full access to rights-of-way;

"An agreement in the record to add tractor-trailer --" or permitting tractor-trailer access on Lafayette, I believe.

"Architecturally stamped and surveyed stamped site plans and renderings showing the vehicular approaches, streets, parking areas, and sidewalk."

Providing a sidewalk on my clients' -- or on the subject property itself, which is unusual. The City Engineer wanted that.

Normally it's within the right-of-way, but the City Engineer had some concerns over the site constraints here, that there might be a safety

issue, and my client agreed to allow the City to have a sidewalk on its property. All right? That's encouraging proper pedestrian safety.

The Planning staff report's evidence and Planning staff testimony - all right? - concerning the project and how it satisfies the applicable criteria and recommending approval. There is testimony in the record concerning how this use will serve the existing traffic, not increase. All right?

There was broker testimony by

Mr. Gerspacher, testifying that this use is a
benefit to the industrial uses and properties
in the vicinity because they need fuel. All
right?

There was testimony concerning the
City Engineer and fire department review, and
they had no concerns, and it was determined
there was no need for a traffic study.

And contrary to that, on this single criteria, there were conclusory statements by Mr. Makhlouf concerning the access points and increase in traffic and all those things. As I mentioned before, those should be discounted, it's not evidence.

There was also the other supported conclusory testimony of the store manager with the misrepresenting pictures that traffic is going to increase. Again, it's unsupported, so under Ohio law it should be dismissed.

There was one resident who lives all the way on the other side of Medina - her address is in the record - that said she was concerned about the existing traffic. That's it. That's it.

The Planning Commission reviewed all that and approved the site plan.

Next criteria, Section 1109.02(c)(3) and (6). I'll summarize, "The site plan includes adequate provision for screening of parking areas, service areas -- "provides landscaping and those types of -- it's all written in here.

Again, application narrative, architecturally stamped and designed survey showing the land -- substantial landscaping.

It's been characterized by the Commission and the staff as substantial landscaping along Lake Road.

My client agreed to add additional trees along Lafayette in a green area. All right?

You had the staff planning report identifying the development of the site, describing the adjacent properties. They recommended two more trees. My client agreed and they recommended approval with conditions.

Planning staff testimony talked about redevelopment -- the addition of two trees and recommended approval based on the criteria.

Testimony from Mr. Berry, our architect,
that Appellant - meaning Mr. Makhlouf's client
- has similarly sized curb cuts - okay? - as my
client. So it's consistent with the character
of the area and good design.

Again, the Planning Commission reviewed that and rendered its determination that the site plan approval was proper.

Next criteria is Section 1109.02(c)(4).

This deals with grading and surface drainage provisions that are reviewed and approved by the City Engineer, and the design and construction standards are all up to snuff.

That's not the technical term, but that's it in summary.

The evidence in the record support a satisfaction of that criteria. Again, the

site plans, Planning staff report and recommendation, Planning staff report confirming the refuse area was properly enclosed - all right? - Planning staff testimony concerning that the criteria was established and satisfied, testimony concerning the Engineer who didn't have any concerns about the engineering stuff. There was an indication that there's going to have to be some underground stormwater management and that the applicant - my clients - would have to reach an agreement with the City as to that. So that was addressed and it would have to be subject to an agreement. Evidence in opposition or calling into question any of that; none.

Site plan criteria in Section

1109.02(c)(7), "The design of the building
should be developed with consideration given to
the relationship of adjacent development in
terms of building height, mass, texture,
materials, line and pattern and character."

Again, you have the designs, the concept, the
site plan, Planning staff report describing the
area, the commercial area, and industrial uses
that this would serve; broking -- broker

testimony concerning the character of the surrounding property which is industrial and commercial; Planning staff report and testimony that the elevation with the proposed stucco-like material is acceptable because it incorporated different colors and recessed panels; testimony from the architect and comments from Mr. Makhlouf and Commission

Member Russell about how Appellant
Mr. Makhlouf's client - has a similar business operating across the street. Reported contrary support in the record; none.

Site plan criteria, Section 1109.02(c)(8),
"Building location and placement should be
developed with consideration given to
minimizing removal of trees ..."

This is an existing property with a structure on it. We're adding landscaping and trees. The site plan, Planning staff report, Planning stuff testimony all established that. Purported contrary support, none.

Criteria for site plan, Section

1109.02(c)(10), "On-site circulation shall be designed to make possible adequate fire and police protection."

Again, the plans, the concepts, the narrative, the staff report, the staff testimony, the agreement of my client to add a no-access-to-trucks sign along where the access points at the request of the City, the testimony concerning City Engineer and fire department review and approval and no concern. Contrary evidence; none. Site plan criteria, Section 10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1109.04(c)(10)(D) --

MR. HUBER: Anthony, are you going to read every one of these that are attached to your letter? We're going to be here all night if that's what you're going to You've already admitted it into the record.

MR. VACANTI: Okay. I will use that as an example. Let me just posit, and you're free to review this, it continues on just like that.

So the evidence in the record on all these issues, both conditional use -- I also, in Exhibit B, walked through the conditional use approval criteria, and I cite to the testimony, the staff report, the stamped plans, the

architect's testimony - all right? - the

City Engineer's review and the fire

department's review, and compared to what

contrary evidence was there on the record,

the only contrary evidence was not evidence,

it was legal -- it was statements by a lawyer,

and it was conclusory statements by the site

manager.

So I think it's clear based on the criteria, site plan, was there enough evidence?

More than enough.

Conditional use application. Was the Planning Commission -- did it establish beyond a reasonable doubt that the site plan criteria, some of which I just walked through, was supported by the evidence? Yes.

So let's not kid ourselves here. This is a case of a competing business, not with legitimate concerns over the public health, safety, welfare. If they had legitimate concerns, they would have been involved earlier on in the process and not showed up to ambush and hijack these proceedings to gain and keep a competitive advantage. Under Ohio law that is not acceptable, and I ask that this Board not

fall prey to what is really going on here. 1 2 So for all the reasons set forth here and 3 all the reasons set forth in the record, all the reasons set forth in my letter, I ask that 4 this Board please affirm your colleagues' on 5 the Planning Commission's decision. They have 6 7 the expertise, they took time, they reviewed all of this, as did the City staff, as did our 8 9 architect, and affirm the Planning Commission's decision. 10 11 Also, I still want to posit a continuing objection over -- to the jurisdiction of this 12 Board and the ability -- standing of 13 14 Mr. Makhlouf's client to appeal. I appreciate your attention --15 CHAIRMAN: 16 Thank you. 17 MR. VACANTI: -- in this 18 matter. And thank you, Mr. Huber, for moving me 19 20 along. 21 MR. MAKHLOUF: If I may, just a quick clarification of a few issues here? 22 23 Number one --24 Sorry. 25 MR. HUNT: You need to have

1	his permission.
2	MR. MAKHLOUF: Oh, sorry.
3	CHAIRMAN: Repeat your
4	question.
5	MR. MAKHLOUF: If I may,
6	clarification of a few issues just to respond
7	to the other
8	CHAIRMAN: Can you keep it
9	to a minute or two, please?
10	MR. MAKHLOUF: I'll try my best.
11	Just very quick.
12	CHAIRMAN: I'll cut you off.
13	MR. MAKHLOUF: Number one, just
14	with respect to this June 12th letter - and
15	Mr. Dutton can correct me if I'm wrong - that
16	letter was submitted today. It's dated today.
17	I was on the City's website today. It was
18	not on the website. I printed a copy that I
19	have with me here today. I don't know what
20	time it was submitted, but it was not on the
21	City's website as of today. The only time I
22	saw that was literally walking in here, Mr.
23	Dutton handed me a copy of it. And we're
24	talking about an appeal with different parties
25	a part of it without any copy to me.

Number two, in terms of the -- requesting the Planning Commission to table the application, Mr. Vacanti said that the basis for tabling would be variances. That is incorrect. That was one of the bases cited. If you look to Page 13, we specifically said -- he said the application's been there since November. The application has not been there since November. The application is dated and stamped February 21 and the hearing was on March 13.

And I told the Planning Commission it just was submitted on February 21. The Commission at least has forty-five days under its rules.

"Give us the chance - because we just learned of this - to bring you the traffic experts who would testify as to the impact of this." So this specifically was a request that was made of the Planning Commission, and the Planning Commission denied it.

And even with respect to the variances, the discussion, the way that the record works, the discussion happened, as we said, "There are substantial variances here. You should wait until the Board of Zoning Appeals rules on

them." 1 And they said that it could be conditioned. 2 3 And we said "Yes, it could be conditioned, 4 but we're talking about very substantial variances here and it's a conditional use. You 5 don't have to vote on it." Denied and they 6 7 refused to do that. 8 So the idea that we waived any of that 9 stuff is just contrary to the express language 10 of the transcript. 11 We ask that you reverse the Planning Commission, at a bare minimum, to remand it 12 back to the Planning Commission for further 13 14 consideration. 15 MR. VACANTI: Mr. Chair, can I 16 have just fifteen seconds? Just fifteen 17 seconds, I promise. I would appreciate --18 CHAIRMAN: I'm watching the 19 clock. 20 MR. VACANTI: Okay. I draw 21 your attention to the record, Application 22 Number P25-02; date of application, 23 November 20th, 2024. 24 CHAIRMAN: Counsel suggests 25 that the Board go into executive session to --

1	MR. HUNT: And the reasons
2	for that being, number one, imminent threat of
3	court action.
4	Thank you, Mr. Makhlouf.
5	MR. MAKHLOUF: You're welcome.
6	MR. HUNT: Number two is to
7	obtain legal advice from the Board's counsel,
8	legal counsel.
9	Number Three, the case law of Ohio is very
10	clear that quasi-judicial boards have the
11	authority to deliberate in private and but
12	no decision can be made unless it's made
13	publicly.
14	CHAIRMAN: Do you make that
15	motion?
16	MR. WILLIAMS: I do make the
17	motion, for those reasons as stated by counsel.
18	MR. COOPER: And a second.
19	MR. MAKHLOUF: And just a
20	reminder that we need to do a proffer.
21	Sorry.
22	CHAIRMAN: Moved and
23	seconded.
24	MR. HUNT: We will make sure
25	you get the opportunity to proffer probably to

1	the side with Mr. Vacanti present - would that
2	be acceptable? - so it gets into the record.
3	MS. TOME: Cooper?
4	MR. COOPER: Yes.
5	MS. TOME: Humpal?
6	CHAIRMAN: Yes.
7	MS. TOME: Johnson?
8	MR. JOHNSON: Yes.
9	MS. TOME: Roszak?
10	MR. ROSZAK: Yes.
11	MS. TOME: Williams?
12	MR. WILLIAMS: Yes.
13	MS. TOME: Motion carried.
14	CHAIRMAN: Okay.
15	(Whereupon, the meeting stood in
16	recess while the Board entered executive
17	session.)
18	PROFFER BEGINS
19	(Whereupon, the following proffer was
20	had in the presence of Attorney Makhlouf,
21	Attorney Vacanti, Greg Soltis, and
22	Andrew Pierson.)
23	MR. MAKHLOUF: We proffer the
24	testimony of Greg Soltice, and he has the
25	expert report that's been submitted into the

1 record. MR. VACANTI: 2 Is there a copy? 3 MS. TOME: I was going to 4 say, can I have a copy? MR. VACANTI: Okay. 5 I guess we're incorporating this into the proffer? 6 7 MR. MAKHLOUF: Yes. He's going to explain it. 8 9 Go ahead. MR. SOLTIS: This is an 10 11 analysis of the evolution of the built environment in Medina that caused this 12 condition for industrial uses to be in conflict 13 14 with other uses, and it's an analysis of West Smith Road and West -- or Lafayette Road 15 16 and their appropriateness for truck traffic. 17 It analyzes their conditions and basically 18 recommends that a gas station on that corner, 19 because of its intensity -- it will increase 20 the intensity of use, potentially alter the 21 characteristics of Lafayette Road, would not be advised. 22 23 Additionally, the Comprehensive Plan puts 24 forth that it requires or recommends traffic

studies, and it also requires the maintenance

and enhancement of existing roads, and the 1 addition of this and added truck traffic would 2 be detrimental to the neighborhoods of Medina 3 and Southwest Medina. 4 There's more details in there, but that's 5 kind of a summary. 6 7 MR. VACANTI: And just, you know, for the record on the proffer, I'd 8 9 reserve my right to cross-examine if this is ever -- and challenge the qualifications of 10 11 Mr. Soltis, who does not appear to be a traffic 12 engineer, and the reliability of this expert -alleged expert report. His qualifications are 13 14 not included as part of that, and this is not a traffic study. 15 16 MR. MAKHLOUF: Thank you. And just for the record, we do have a 17 18 traffic engineer who's about to proffer his testimony. 19 20 Mr. Soltis, if you can quickly, for the 21 record, state your qualifications and your 22 history. I am AICP 23 MR. SOLTIS: certified. I work at RDL Architects as 24 25 a --

1	PROFFER ADJOURNED
2	(Whereupon, the Board then re-entered
3	the room.)
4	MR. HUNT: Hello. Why don't
5	we go back to order.
6	CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We'll
7	come back to order and resume.
8	Comments or thoughts from the Board?
9	MR. WILLIAMS: No.
10	MR. HUNT: May I?
11	CHAIRMAN: Yes, Counsel.
12	MR. HUNT: I do appreciate
13	the demeanor of counsel this evening and
14	ability to counsel. Very good arguments this
15	evening.
16	Thank you.
17	CHAIRMAN: Thank you,
18	Counsel.
19	MR. WILLIAMS: If I could make a
20	motion, Mr. Chairman?
21	CHAIRMAN: Yes, you may.
22	MR. WILLIAMS: Having heard
23	the oral arguments from counsel, I make a
24	motion to deny the appeal and affirm the
25	Planning Commission decision, and its decision

1	will be finalized upon the special legal
2	counsel submitting draft findings that support
3	the decision of the Board for its review and an
4	adoption at our next regular meeting.
5	CHAIRMAN: Do we have a
6	second?
7	Counsel?
8	MR. HUNT: When is that next
9	meeting?
10	MR. WILLIAMS: Uh
11	CHAIRMAN: Second Thursday
12	in July.
13	MS. TOME: July 10th.
14	MR. WILLIAMS: July 10th?
15	MS. TOME: Yes.
16	MR. WILLIAMS: On July 10th.
17	CHAIRMAN: Is that
18	appropriate? Does that work for you?
19	MR. COOPER: I second that
20	motion.
21	CHAIRMAN: Call the roll,
22	Sarah.
23	MS. TOME: Humpal?
24	CHAIRMAN: Yes.
25	MS. TOME: Johnson?

1	MR. JOHNSON: Yes.
2	MS. TOME: Roszak?
3	MR. ROSZAK: Yes.
4	MS. TOME: Williams?
5	MR. WILLIAMS: Yes.
6	MS. TOME: Cooper?
7	MR. COOPER: Yes.
8	MS. TOME: Motion carried.
9	CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
10	Appeal denied.
11	MR. MAKHLOUF: And as Mr. Hunt
12	knows, it's my duty to inform the Board that we
13	intend to appeal in the Court of Common Pleas.
14	MR. HUNT: Thank you.
15	MR. MAKHLOUF: And with that, we
16	ask that we continue to proffer the evidence.
17	MR. HUNT: Yes.
18	MR. MAKHLOUF: Now?
19	MR. HUNT: Yes.
20	Do you need the court reporter for the next
21	case? Are you going to be able to get through
22	fairly quickly?
23	MR. MAKHLOUF: We're almost
24	done.
25	MR. HUNT: Okay. The court

1	reporter has to be here for the next case.						
2	MR. VACANTI: Thank you,						
3	members of the Board. I appreciate your time						
4	this evening.						
5	(Meeting concluded.)						
6	PROFFER CONTINUED						
7	(Whereupon, the following proffer was						
8	had in the presence of Attorney Makhlouf,						
9	Attorney Vacanti, Greg Soltis, and						
10	Andrew Pierson.)						
11	THE NOTARY: Mr. Soltis, could						
12	you repeat your qualifications?						
13	MR. SOLTIS: I'm AICP						
14	certified. I work at RDL Architects and as						
15	a planner and architectural designer, and I						
16	teach urban design at Cleveland State						
17	University and have done so for about ten						
18	years.						
19	MR. MAKHLOUF: Have you ever						
20	testified in any proceeding before?						
21	MR. SOLTIS: Yes.						
22	MR. MAKHLOUF: Zoning						
23	proceeding?						
24	MR. SOLTIS: I have.						
25	MR. MAKHLOUF: Have you been						

1	accepted as an expert?					
2	MR. SOLTIS: Yes.					
3	MR. MAKHLOUF: Thank you.					
4	MR. SOLTIS: And I'm on					
5	Downtown Design Review Committee for Downtown					
б	Cleveland as well.					
7	MR. MAKHLOUF: And with that,					
8	we offer the proffer the testimony of					
9	Mr. Andrew Pierson.					
10	Mr. Pierson, if you can begin by describing					
11	your background and history for the record.					
12	MR. PIERSON: Hello. My name					
13	is Andrew Pierson. I'm a professional					
14	engineer, work for Langan International. I've					
15	been a traffic engineer in Northeast Ohio for					
16	roughly twenty-nine years. Over that time I've					
17	done several hundred traffic impact studies and					
18	various studies, a handful for the City of					
19	Medina and surrounding areas.					
20	Here to present customary study procedures,					
21	specifically mentioned in the State Highway					
22	Access Management Manual that ODOT has					
23	published. It specifies various times that a					
24	traffic impact study or a traffic analysis is					
25	required.					

I will preface that the City of Medina is a home rule, they do not necessarily have to follow the access management manual, but it is a de facto manual that is being used throughout Ohio when there is no access management for a specific city.

I'll first preface that I looked at the number of trips for this type of site, which would be a twelve-pump gas station with a specific-size convenience store that is specified in the ITE Trip Generation Manual. It specifies that roughly -- well, actually exactly three hundred and twenty-four trips are expected in the a.m. peak and three hundred -- or sorry, two hundred and seventy-three is in the p.m. peak. That is the amount of vehicles entering and exiting -- actually half would be entering, half would be exiting during that peak hour.

Based on the access management manual, this type of roadway, it would be considered a high-volume of number of vehicles that would enter and exit. The manual specifies that anything over two hundred trips would be a specific situation that a TIS - or a full

traffic impact study - would be required.

Anything sixty to two hundred would be a traffic analysis, and we would just look at the driveways themselves, not the surrounding intersections.

2.0

So in this situation, the surrounding intersections would be analyzed in a traffic impact study typically. In this case, my understanding is there was no traffic study performed for this site.

The secondary item that I want to reference, in what is commonly referred to as the SHAMM, which is the State Highway Access Management Manual, it does specify in 4.4, "Driveways located too close to intersections can cause operational and safety problems."

They provide a table that specifies two hundred and fifty feet is the preferred distance between an intersection and a nearby driveway. That is to give, based on the manual, appropriate corner clearance distance. "In most cases driveways near intersections shouldn't allow full access movements in and out if these movements are required to cross left-turn lanes ..."

In this case the access on Lafayette would cross over a left-turn lane, which is contrary to the access management. In my twenty-nine years' experience, we are trying to get rid of these kind of access, because any time I do a safety study of a corridor, we try and eliminate these because these inherently are the highest crash locations because traffic has a hard time exiting with very limited sight distance.

Further, the manual states, "Driveways should not be permitted within the boundaries of a turn lane, but if there's no other option, consideration should be given to limiting the drive to right-in/right-out ..."

It's my opinion, based on dealing with ODOT and surrounding agencies, that typically access is provided on the side street and right-in/right-out is provided on the main line in these kind of situations. Access is not denied, it is just restricted because the right-in is a very free-flow movement, and a right-out there's very little confliction. It's the left turns that cause a considerable potential for crashes in this kind of scenario.

1	And I don't know why the City Engineer did						
2	not require a traffic impact study, but I will						
3	say that in my twenty-nine years I have done						
4	dozens of convenience stores with gas stations						
5	with this amount of pumps, and I've never not						
6	been able to have a traffic impact study						
7	required. Various dozens of cities and ODOT						
8	would definitely have required a full traffic						
9	impact study based on their criteria.						
10	MR. MAKHLOUF: Does the						
11	City of Medina have a traffic access manual?						
12	MR. PIERSON: Not to my						
13	understanding.						
14	MR. MAKHLOUF: Okay.						
15	MR. VACANTI: Just for the						
16	record, I have a continuing objection to this						
17	and reserve the right to cross-examine if this						
18	evidence is to be admitted. I object to the						
19	reliability, the helpfulness, and relevance of						
20	the testimony provided as the City of Medina is						
21	a home-rule municipality and the traffic has						
22	its own traffic engineer and policies.						
23	Again, I want to just preserve the						
24	objections and the right to cross-examine if						
25	that is introduced.						

1	And, also, object; no expert report has						
2	been provided.						
3	MR. MAKHLOUF: We're more than						
4	happy to make Mr. Pierson available for						
5	cross-examination at the evidentiary hearing in						
6	court per Revised Code Section 2506.03.						
7	MR. VACANTI: Which we						
8	repeatedly object to the appropriateness of						
9	such hearing.						
10	And just to confirm, Mr. Pierson, you did						
11	not perform a traffic impact study?						
12	MR. PIERSON: I did not.						
13	MR. VACANTI: All right. Thank						
14	you.						
15	MR. MAKHLOUF: Thank you.						
16	MR. VACANTI: Thank you so						
17	much.						
18	PROFFER CONCLUDED						
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							

STATE OF OHIO 1 ss: 2 COUNTY OF MEDINA. CERTIFICATE 3 4 I, Meghan A. Bobrowski, Notary Public within and for the State of Ohio, duly commissioned and 5 qualified, hereby certify that before the giving of 6 7 their testimony, all persons were first duly sworn to testify to the truth, the whole truth, and 8 9 nothing but the truth in this case aforesaid. I further certify that said hearing was held at 10 11 the time and place specified in the above case and was concluded on the 12th day of June, 2025. 12 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand 13 and affixed my seal of office at Medina, Ohio this 14 3rd day of July, 2025. 15 16 Meghan A. Bobrowski 17 Meghan A. Bobrowski Notary Public within and for 18 the State of Ohio. 19 My commission expires 05/20/27. 20 21 22 23 24 25

0	2	added [1] - 69:2	alleged [1] - 69:13	APPEARANCES [1] -
0	3	adding [2] - 6:7, 59:18	alley [3] - 42:5, 42:6,	2:1
05/20/27 [1] - 80:19	3201 [1] - 8:3	addition [3] - 46:11,	49:17	appeared [1] - 16:2
	330 [1] - 1:24	57:7, 69:2	allow [5] - 18:9, 45:13,	Appellant [2] - 57:10,
1	3rd [2] - 28:25, 80:15	additional [6] - 15:8,	54:11, 55:1, 76:23	59:9
		16:21, 26:4, 39:13,	allowable [1] - 18:8	apple [2] - 18:1, 18:6
1.96 [1] - 4:23	4	39:15, 56:24	allowed [1] - 52:11	applicable [2] - 7:9,
10th [7] - 6:15, 7:3,		additionally [1] -	almost [3] - 16:16,	55:7
11:20, 28:21, 71:13,	4.4 [1] - 76:14	68:23	16:17, 72:23	Applicant [1] - 6:22
71:14, 71:16	44256 [2] - 1:16, 1:24	address [3] - 7:25,	alter [1] - 68:20	applicant [14] - 7:21,
1100 [1] - 14:9		47:24, 56:7	ambush [1] - 61:22	20:25, 26:3, 28:11,
1107.08 [2] - 9:22,	6	addressed [3] - 9:21,	amend [1] - 19:15	30:17, 32:16, 33:7,
17:11	6) [1] - 56:14	41:25, 58:13	amended [1] - 19:19	36:25, 37:7, 37:10,
1107.08(i)(4 [1] - 7:9 1109 [3] - 45:22,	0) [1] = 30.14	adept [1] - 28:1	amount [2] - 75:16,	38:21, 45:3, 58:11
45:24, 48:6	7	adequate [3] - 9:7,	78:5	applicants [3] - 13:16, 14:6, 48:17
1109.02(c)(1 [1] -		56:15, 59:24 adjacent [4] - 6:18,	analysis [5] - 39:3,	Applicants [1] - 2:13
53:25	723-2482 [1] - 1:24	46:5, 57:3, 58:19	68:11, 68:14, 74:24, 76:3	Application [1] -
1109.02(c)(10 _[1] -	7:00 [1] - 1:13	40.5, 57.5, 56.19 ADJOURNED [1] -	76.3 analyzed [1] - 76:7	65:21
59:23	7th [1] - 21:5	70:1	analyzes [1] - 68:17	application [32] -
1109.02(c)(3 [1] -		Administrative [1] -	Andress [1] - 00.17	4:20, 4:25, 5:15,
56:13	9	2:6	Andrew [7] - 2:6, 4:16,	9:19, 9:25, 10:1,
1109.02(c)(4)[1] -		administrator [3] -	26:22, 67:22, 73:10,	14:21, 14:25, 15:2,
57:17	950 [1] - 14:8	23:9, 26:11, 26:17	74:9, 74:13	17:14, 18:15, 18:23,
1109.02(c)(7 [1] -	999 [2] - 1:6, 4:15	admitted [2] - 60:15,	Anthony [2] - 2:12,	18:25, 19:6, 19:13,
58:17		78:18	6:21	19:16, 19:18, 20:19,
1109.02(c)(8 [1] -	Α	adopt [4] - 11:19,	anthony [1] - 60:11	21:1, 35:12, 36:21,
59:13	a.m [1] - 75:14	11:21, 14:17, 30:19	appeal [47] - 4:15,	38:18, 45:1, 49:1,
1109.04(c)(10)(D _[1] -	ability [6] - 17:2, 17:6,	adopted [2] - 6:13,	6:20, 7:8, 8:14, 8:17,	51:13, 54:7, 56:18,
60:10	17:7, 21:12, 62:13,	6:23	8:18, 9:15, 9:21,	61:12, 64:3, 64:8,
1137 [1] - 45:23	70:14	adoption [2] - 38:2,	10:13, 11:8, 11:14,	64:9, 65:22
1152.03 [1] - 37:14	able [4] - 13:5, 43:12,	71:4	12:8, 14:20, 14:21,	application's [1] -
1153 [1] - 48:14	72:21, 78:6	advantage [1] - 61:24	15:4, 15:9, 15:12,	64:7
1153.03 [1] - 48:18	absolutely [2] - 13:22,	adverse [3] - 46:4,	17:2, 17:7, 20:13,	applications [1] - 5:25 applied [1] - 18:17
12th [3] - 1:11, 63:14,	34:16	46:7	21:9, 21:10, 21:12,	appried [1] - 18.17 appraisal [1] - 50:14
80:12 13 [4] - 11:4, 28:8,	abuse [2] - 7:18, 51:24	advice [5] - 23:21, 24:20, 25:1, 29:9,	22:14, 22:22, 22:25, 23:5, 23:6, 23:8,	appreciate [6] - 14:10,
64:6, 64:11	accept [2] - 23:18,	24.20, 25.1, 29.9, 66:7	26:15, 26:16, 28:10,	18:10, 62:15, 65:17,
132 [1] - 1:16	52:22	advised [2] - 8:22,	28:16, 29:17, 29:20,	70:12, 73:3
13th [3] - 5:22, 7:1, 7:2	acceptable [3] - 59:5,	68:22	32:2, 36:12, 36:14,	approaches [1] -
14 [2] - 11:7, 28:11	61:25, 67:2	advocates [1] - 16:12	36:19, 36:20, 37:22,	54:18
16 [1] - 12:21	accepted [4] - 19:1,	affected [1] - 20:3	62:14, 63:24, 70:24,	appropriate [5] - 27:4,
19 [1] - 41:6	19:4, 19:15, 74:1	affirm [4] - 46:12,	72:10, 72:13	29:22, 34:9, 71:18,
	Access [2] - 74:22,	62:5, 62:9, 70:24	appealed [8] - 6:17,	76:21
2	76:13	affixed [1] - 80:14	7:12, 11:14, 21:9,	appropriateness [2] -
	access [19] - 5:17, 5:21, 6:3, 42:13,	aforesaid [1] - 80:9	21:16, 26:12, 28:12,	68:16, 79:8
2) [1] - 53:25	54:11, 54:15, 55:22,	agencies [1] - 77:17	35:13	approval [14] - 5:2,
2024 [1] - 65:23	60:4, 75:3, 75:5,	agent [1] - 15:2	appeals [5] - 7:10,	6:1, 6:16, 14:7,
2025 [5] - 1:11, 5:23,	75:20, 76:23, 77:1,	aggrieved [4] - 15:11,	14:20, 17:12, 17:13,	15:25, 45:22, 52:7,
6:15, 80:12, 80:15	77:3, 77:5, 77:17,	15:16, 15:19, 17:2	17:15	52:16, 55:7, 57:5,
209 [1] - 1:23	77:20, 78:11	agree [1] - 10:20	APPEALS [1] - 1:4	57:8, 57:16, 60:7, 60:24
20th [1] - 65:23	accordance [2] -	agreed [4] - 52:13,	Appeals [17] - 1:12, 2:9, 2:11, 6:3, 6:5,	approvals [1] - 52:12
21 [2] - 64:10, 64:13	37:25, 38:8	55:1, 56:24, 57:4	6:18, 8:13, 9:16,	approvais [1] - 32.12 approve [1] - 46:12
21st [1] - 21:11	acres [1] - 4:23	agreement [4] - 54:13,	10:16, 11:9, 11:10,	approved [7] - 5:23,
2506.03 [1] - 79:6	act [1] - 29:19	58:12, 58:14, 60:3	19:3, 23:6, 23:21,	6:4, 18:17, 18:18,
25th [3] - 11:14, 11:18, 28:13	action [2] - 7:12, 66:3	ahead [4] - 9:12,	28:23, 29:2, 64:25	52:16, 56:12, 57:19
20.10	activities [1] - 35:16	20:16, 53:22, 68:9 AICP [2] - 69:23, 73:13	appear [2] - 16:15,	April [4] - 6:15, 7:3,
	add [4] - 47:19, 54:13,	aid [1] - 29:20	69:11	11:20, 28:21
	56:24, 60:3	alert [1] - 33:11	appearance [1] - 38:6	arbitrary [2] - 7:13,

51:20 architect [4] - 48:25, 57:9, 59:7, 62:9 architect's [1] - 61:1 architect-stamped [1] - 48.25 Architects [2] - 69:24, 73:14 architectural [1] -73:15 architecturally [2] -54:16, 56:19 area [11] - 40:4, 42:23, 43:14, 43:16, 45:19, 45:20, 56:25, 57:13, 58:3, 58:24 areas [7] - 39:1, 46:3, 54:3, 54:18, 56:16, 74:19 argue [2] - 32:10, 42:21 argued [1] - 39:24 argument [5] - 9:4, 10:7, 10:8, 16:10, 41:9 arguments [8] - 22:11, 24:20, 27:5, 30:11, 47:1, 52:20, 70:14, 70:23 art [1] - 15:17 aside [2] - 15:7, 51:15 asserted [1] - 16:3 assertions [1] - 16:8 **Assistant** [1] - 2:6 assume [1] - 27:23 attached [2] - 53:5, 60:13 attend [1] - 15:21 attention [2] - 62:15, 65:21 attorney [5] - 3:15, 6:18, 16:9, 20:20, 52:19 Attorney [4] - 67:20, 67:21, 73:8, 73:9 attorney's [1] - 49:22 attorneys [1] - 7:5 **AUDIENCE** [1] - 22:2 authority [1] - 66:11 **automobile** [1] - 54:10 available [2] - 53:3, 79:4 Avenue [2] - 1:16, 14:8

В

background [1] -74:11 bare [1] - 65:12 based [27] - 7:8, 7:14, 7:16, 8:9, 14:15, 16:14, 17:23, 21:6, 23:20, 24:19, 25:1, 27:5, 38:21, 46:22, 46:23, 48:23, 48:25, 49:8, 50:19, 51:20, 52:23, 57:8, 61:9, 75:20, 76:20, 77:16, 78:9 bases [2] - 13:9, 64:5 basis [6] - 15:4, 17:22, 19:17, 38:20, 48:19, 64:3 **Beachwood** [1] - 8:4 bearing [1] - 4:13 bears [1] - 37:10 begin [2] - 3:8, 74:10 **BEGINS** [1] - 67:18 behalf [5] - 2:8, 2:10, 2:13, 2:15, 30:17 belong [3] - 42:8, 43:25, 44:2 **below** [1] - 22:20 benefit [1] - 55:13 Berns [2] - 2:14, 8:2 Berry [1] - 57:9 Bert [1] - 2:2 best [1] - 63:10 between [6] - 9:20, 17:11, 26:7, 26:13, 54:2, 76:19 beyond [9] - 36:25, 45:4, 48:2, 48:7, 48:11, 48:17, 48:22, 49:7, 61:13 big [1] - 29:6 binding [1] - 21:15 bit [1] - 43:2 bite [2] - 18:1, 18:6 blindsighted [1] -38:15 blown [1] - 23:3 bluster [1] - 16:11 BOARD [1] - 1:4 board [5] - 12:23, 15:12, 27:15, 29:15, 35:4 Board [74] - 1:12, 2:8, 2:10, 3:10, 4:10, 5:16, 6:2, 6:5, 6:17, 7:10, 8:10, 8:13, 8:22, 8:25, 9:16, 10:2, 10:12, 10:15, 10:24, 12:5, 13:10, 13:23, 14:5, 15:8, 17:3, 17:8, 19:3,

19:16, 19:20, 19:23,

23:14, 23:21, 24:19,

22:13, 23:5, 23:7,

24:23, 27:13, 28:23, 29:1, 29:5, 29:10, 30:24, 33:2, 33:3, 33:4, 33:19, 34:1, 34:2, 34:18, 34:19, 36:22, 37:16, 39:17, 40:18, 41:3, 43:10, 43:13, 46:12, 48:10, 51:8, 52:9, 61:25, 62:13, 64:25, 65:25, 67:16, 70:2, 70:8, 71:3, 72:12, 73:3

Board's [5] - 14:10, 21:14, 22:25, 25:21, 66:7

boards [1] - 66:10 Bobrowski [3] - 1:14, 80:4, 80:17 body [1] - 37:21 bore [1] - 45:3

boundaries [1] - 77:12 bowling [3] - 42:5, 42:6, 49:17

brief [3] - 9:2, 14:12, 47:21

BP [1] - 40:9

briefly [6] - 4:19, 17:11, 36:5, 36:22, 53:15

bring [5] - 15:14, 46:11, 47:7, 47:8, 64:16

Broadway [1] - 1:23 **broken** [1] - 53:8 **broker** [2] - 55:11,

58:25 **broking** [1] - 58:25

brought [3] - 8:15, 46:20, 50:11 **buck** [1] - 21:1

building [4] - 5:5, 5:14, 58:17, 58:20 Building [1] - 59:14 buildings [1] - 46:2

built [1] - 68:11 **burden** [5] - 37:11, 45:3, 48:1, 48:11,

48:16 **Burger** [2] - 39:20, 39:22

business [11] - 15:1, 17:1, 18:7, 21:8, 36:2, 41:18, 41:20, 42:23, 49:13, 59:10, 61:18

businesses [1] - 40:2

C

C-3 [1] - 5:12 cannot [2] - 28:19, 42:12 capacity [1] - 49:20 capricious [2] - 7:13, 51:20 care [1] - 47:19 carried [7] - 4:5, 24:13, 25:15, 31:17, 31:18, 67:13, 72:8 cars [1] - 42:3 **CASE** [2] - 1:5, 3:5 case [19] - 3:8, 4:14, 4:17, 11:3, 11:23, 20:9, 23:1, 27:5, 27:23, 36:25, 49:21, 61:18, 66:9, 72:21, 73:1, 76:8, 77:1, 80:9, 80:11 cases [1] - 76:22 caused [2] - 15:25, 68:12 caution [1] - 41:8 cc's [1] - 33:17 center [1] - 5:4 certain [2] - 15:14, 32:2 certainly [6] - 16:12, 16:13, 30:8, 43:9, 50:22, 51:4 CERTIFICATE [1] -80:3 certificate [3] - 5:2, 5:8, 5:24 certificates [1] - 48:15 certification [1] -18:20 certified [2] - 69:24, 73:14 certify [2] - 80:6, 80:10 Chair [4] - 27:3, 27:11, 34:6, 65:15 CHAIRMAN [64] - 3:6, 3:16, 3:18, 3:21, 4:6, 4:12, 7:20, 8:5, 9:6, 9:11, 13:2, 13:20, 13:25, 14:3, 18:13, 20:16, 22:7, 23:16, 23:23, 24:1, 24:12, 24:14, 24:22, 25:3, 25:12, 25:16, 30:23, 31:3, 31:5, 31:12, 31:18, 32:4, 34:12, 34:14, 36:5, 36:16,

40:15, 41:1, 43:18, 44:20, 47:18, 47:22,

53:18, 53:22, 62:16,

63:3, 63:8, 63:12, 65:18, 65:24, 66:14, 66:22, 67:6, 67:14, 70:6, 70:11, 70:17, 70:21, 71:5, 71:11, 71:17, 71:21, 71:24, 72:9

Chairman [4] - 2:2, 9:3, 23:19, 70:20 chairman [1] - 3:13 challenge [2] - 21:12, 69:10 chance [1] - 64:15

chance [1] - 64:15 **Chapter** [2] - 48:6, 48:14

character [6] - 38:7, 38:9, 42:20, 57:12, 58:21, 59:1

characteristics [1] - 68:21 characterized [1] -

56:21 **check** [2] - 20:23, 35:23

checked [2] - 33:16, 35:19 **circulation** [2] - 10:4,

59:23 circumstances [1] -

51:6 **cite** [2] - 29:15, 60:24 **cited** [2] - 49:21, 64:5

cites [1] - 20:9 cities [1] - 78:7 citing [1] - 48:1 city [1] - 75:6

CITY [1] - 75:6 CITY [1] - 1:4 City [43] - 1:12, 1:15,

2:5, 2:8, 2:10, 2:10, 7:5, 9:18, 10:4, 18:9, 19:15, 21:2, 23:21, 25:23, 31:21, 32:17, 32:24, 33:12, 33:15, 36:8, 39:2, 39:4, 39:23, 46:15, 46:18,

50:23, 50:24, 54:22, 54:24, 55:1, 55:17, 57:20, 58:12, 60:5, 60:6, 61:2, 62:8, 74:18, 75:1, 78:1,

78:11, 78:20 **City's** [7] - 6:22, 20:2, 25:24, 26:2, 63:17,

63:21 claim [1] - 46:11 claims [1] - 16:24 clarification [2] -62:22, 63:6

clear [4] - 11:11, 36:7, 61:9, 66:10

clearance [1] - 76:21 clearly [2] - 20:5, 44:6 Cleveland [4] - 14:9, 26:25, 73:16, 74:6 click [1] - 35:21 client [12] - 15:24, 34:25, 35:14, 48:12, 55:1, 56:24, 57:4, 57:10, 57:12, 59:10, 60:3, 62:14 client's [7] - 16:5, 39:14, 43:22, 44:4, 44:5. 50:9 clients [4] - 32:13, 51:5, 51:13, 58:11 clients' [3] - 35:12, 48:23, 54:20 clock [1] - 65:19 close [2] - 13:2, 76:15 **clue** [1] - 45:8 Code [3] - 9:18, 45:23, 79:6 code [16] - 9:18, 10:10, 10:11, 14:24, 21:21, 22:16, 23:9, 26:2, 26:3, 26:5, 26:13, 31:25, 37:2, 37:14, 37:18 codified [3] - 14:16, 15:5, 48:3 colleague [2] - 47:25, 48:16 colleagues' [1] - 62:5 colors [1] - 59:6 comfortable [1] - 3:7 **coming** [3] - 39:19, 44:12, 45:8 commencing [1] comment [1] - 47:19 comments [2] - 59:8, commercial [3] - 4:24, 58:24, 59:3 commission [1] -80:19 Commission [72] -5:1, 6:13, 6:16, 6:24, 6:25, 7:3, 10:19, 10:23, 11:15, 11:17, 11:24, 12:13, 13:1, 15:13, 15:22, 16:1, 17:24, 18:3, 19:24, 20:5, 21:7, 23:4, 26:16, 27:6, 28:6, 28:14, 28:15, 28:18, 28:20, 29:4, 29:6, 30:18, 30:21, 37:9, 37:12, 37:15, 37:17, 37:19, 38:15, 39:10,

39:25, 41:23, 42:11, 42:15, 44:24, 45:2, 45:6, 45:13, 46:13, 46:24, 47:2, 47:13, 47:14, 48:21, 50:8, 50:20, 52:1, 52:9, 52:25, 56:11, 56:21, 57:14, 59:8, 61:13, 64:2, 64:12, 64:13, 64:19, 64:20, 65:12, 65:13, 70:25 Commission's [8] -5:22, 26:1, 28:4, 30:6, 49:7, 51:19, 62:6. 62:9 commissioned [1] -80.5 committed [1] - 22:19 Committee [1] - 74:5 common [2] - 29:16, 29:18 Common [3] - 22:23, 27:24, 72:13 **commonly** [1] - 76:12 communicate [2] -35:2. 35:4 communicated [2] -34:19, 35:5 communication [1] -34:17 communications [3] -32:17, 33:18, 35:3 Community [2] - 2:5, 2:6 compared [1] - 61:3 competing [2] - 36:2, 61:18 competition [4] - 18:8, 40:6, 43:23, 45:16 competitive [1] -61:24 competitor [3] -38:16, 38:17, 41:19 complete [7] - 9:25, 12:10, 12:25, 16:25, 18:25, 19:4, 19:20 completely [2] -16:14, 41:24 completeness [1] -18:22 comply [1] - 45:22 component [1] - 38:24 Comprehensive [1] -68:23 concept [1] - 58:22 concepts [1] - 60:1 concern [1] - 60:7 concerned [2] - 35:15,

56:8

concerning [8] - 55:6,

46:14

55:8, 55:16, 55:22, 58:5, 58:6, 59:1, concerns [5] - 54:24, 55:18, 58:7, 61:19, 61:21 CONCLUDED [1] -79:18 concluded [2] - 73:5, 80:12 Conclusions [16] -6:14, 6:23, 10:18, 10:23, 11:19, 11:21, 13:7, 28:4, 28:7, 28:17, 29:2, 29:8, 29:11, 29:16, 29:25, conclusions [3] -30:14, 30:19, 30:22 conclusory [4] -50:13, 55:21, 56:2, 61:7 concur[1] - 30:18 condition [4] - 6:12, 42:10, 52:11, 68:13 conditional [13] - 5:2, 5:8, 5:10, 5:24, 14:6, 44:1, 48:4, 48:15, 52:7, 60:22, 60:23, 61:12, 65:5 conditioned [3] -51:10, 65:2, 65:3 conditions [3] - 5:25, 57:5, 68:17 Conduct [2] - 35:1, 35:7 confirm [1] - 79:10 confirmed [1] - 18:24 **confirming** [1] - 58:3 conflict [1] - 68:13 confliction [1] - 77:23 conforms [1] - 21:1 connection [1] - 6:6 consider [3] - 3:9, 10:13, 37:15 considerable [1] -77:24 consideration [4] -58:18, 59:15, 65:14, 77:14 considered [4] -28:20, 49:23, 50:5, 75:21 **consistent** [1] - 57:12 constituted [1] - 7:18 **constitutes** [1] - 51:23 constitutional [2] -34:25, 46:11 constitutionality [1] -

constraints [1] - 54:25 constructed [1] - 38:4 construction [1] -57:21 contain [1] - 29:25 continuance [2] -33:2, 33:3 continue [2] - 4:8, 72:16 **continued** [1] - 51:12 **CONTINUED** [1] - 73:6 continues [1] - 60:19 continuing [2] - 62:11, 78:16 contrary [12] - 37:13, 37:20, 49:11, 53:10, 55:20, 59:11, 59:21, 60:8, 61:4, 61:5, 65:9, 77:2 control [1] - 51:7 convenience [3] - 5:4, 75:10, 78:4 conversation [1] - 4:7 conveyed [1] - 33:7 cooper [4] - 4:3, 25:9, 31:9, 67:3 Cooper [3] - 2:4, 24:9, 72:6 **COOPER** [9] - 4:4, 24:10, 24:24, 25:10, 31:10, 66:18, 67:4, 71:19, 72:7 copied [2] - 33:17, 35:11 copies [1] - 32:18 copy [14] - 7:6, 32:20, 33:19, 33:22, 33:23, 35:13, 35:14, 36:9, 63:18, 63:23, 63:25, 68:2, 68:4 corner [3] - 4:22, 68:18, 76:21 correct [2] - 13:15, 63:15 correspondence [3] -7:4, 7:7, 33:11 corridor [1] - 77:6 Counsel [2] - 70:11, 70:18 counsel [26] - 3:11, 3:15, 4:7, 8:6, 9:1, 10:21, 14:25, 22:11, 25:17, 30:11, 47:19, 49:12, 49:13, 49:15, 49:19, 50:7, 50:14, 65:24, 66:7, 66:8, 66:17, 70:13, 70:14, 70:23, 71:2, 71:7

counsel's [1] - 23:20

counterclockwise [1]

- 5:5 County [1] - 22:24 COUNTY [1] - 80:2 couple [4] - 10:12, 14:14, 18:12, 25:19 course [1] - 30:5 Court [7] - 11:9, 11:10, 22:23, 27:24, 46:10, 72:13 court [8] - 27:7, 29:16, 29:17, 29:22, 66:3, 72:20, 72:25, 79:6 COURT [1] - 1:23 courtesy [2] - 35:13, 35:14 crash [1] - 77:8 crashes [1] - 77:25 create [3] - 44:2, 44:6, 44:7 criteria [31] - 7:9, 17:13, 17:22, 37:13, 37:14, 37:23, 46:16, 46:19, 46:23, 51:16, 51:18, 51:25, 53:8, 53:10, 53:24, 55:7, 55:21, 56:13, 57:8, 57:17, 57:25, 58:5, 58:16, 59:13, 59:22, 60:9, 60:24, 61:10, 61:14, 78:9 cross [6] - 69:9, 76:24, 77:2, 78:17, 78:24, 79:5 cross-examination [1] - 79:5 cross-examine [3] -69:9, 78:17, 78:24 curb [2] - 42:2, 57:11 current [1] - 38:2 **customary** [1] - 74:20 customers [4] - 39:15, 40:4, 40:5, 40:7 cut [1] - 63:12 cuts [2] - 42:2, 57:11

D

date [2] - 10:5, 65:22 dated [2] - 63:16, 64:9 days [3] - 9:24, 10:5, 64:14 de [7] - 8:18, 9:16, 10:13, 17:10, 21:3, 37:20, 75:4 deadline [2] - 21:10, 21:11 dealing [3] - 14:13, 48:14, 77:16 deals [3] - 17:19, 53:7, 57:18

dealt [1] - 17:18 decision [30] - 7:12, 10:20, 10:21, 11:5, 11:6, 11:12, 15:12, 21:10, 22:23, 25:22, 25:24, 25:25, 26:1, 26:11, 28:8, 28:9, 30:7, 37:12, 42:15, 45:6, 45:12, 46:13, 47:3, 49:7, 62:6, 62:10, 66:12, 70:25, 71:3 Decision [2] - 6:14, 6:23 decision's [1] - 51:19 decisions [2] - 22:12, deemed [3] - 19:3, 19:20, 38:17 **definitely** [1] - 78:8 delegate [1] - 18:22 deliberate [1] - 66:11 deliberation [1] -12:13 Deluca [2] - 44:7, 50:17 demeanor [1] - 70:13 denied [5] - 47:10, 64:20, 65:6, 72:10, 77:21 deny [1] - 70:24 department [5] - 35:5. 35:11, 49:3, 55:17, 60:7 Department [1] - 2:5 department's [1] -61:3 **Describing** [1] - 54:9 describing [3] - 57:3, 58:23, 74:10 **Design** [1] - 74:5 design [4] - 57:13, 57:20, 58:17, 73:16 designates [1] - 7:9 designed [4] - 38:4, 54:10, 56:19, 59:24 designer [1] - 73:15 designs [1] - 58:22 detail [1] - 6:8 details [2] - 53:14, 69:5 determination [8] -19:8, 19:9, 21:13, 21:16, 33:6, 37:22, 48:19, 57:15 determine [2] - 18:3, 18:22 determined [3] -18:25, 50:25, 55:18 detriment [2] - 45:18,

50:8, 69:3 devaluation [1] - 16:5 developed [2] - 58:18, 59.15 development [6] -46:1, 46:5, 46:8, 54:5, 57:2, 58:19 Development [2] -2:5. 2:6 difference [1] - 26:7 different [5] - 14:20, 17:13, 17:14, 59:6, 63:24 direct [1] - 40:17 directly [2] - 34:19, 41:22 director [6] - 8:11, 19:5, 21:5, 21:13, 21:19, 32:25 Director [11] - 2:6, 2:10, 9:25, 12:1, 13:8, 18:17, 18:19, 18:23, 28:22, 29:1 director's [1] - 33:1 discount [2] - 40:9 discounted [1] - 55:24 discretion [3] - 7:18, 24:19, 51:24 discuss [1] - 48:13 discussed [1] - 6:11 discussion [3] -12:22, 64:22, 64:23 dismiss [1] - 19:18 dismissed [3] - 15:6, 17:9, 56:5 displaying [1] - 4:17 distance [3] - 76:18, 76:21, 77:10 distinguish [3] - 9:19, 17:11, 27:15 distinguishes [1] -26:13 district [2] - 5:11, 5:12 District [2] - 11:9, 11:10 divested [3] - 11:15, 11:18, 28:13 documents [2] - 6:20, 6:24 done [6] - 12:15, 19:9, 72:24, 73:17, 74:17, double [2] - 20:23,

35:23

double-check [2] -

doubt [9] - 37:1, 45:4,

48:2, 48:8, 48:11,

20:23, 35:23

45:19

detrimental [3] - 44:3,

48:18, 48:22, 49:8, 61:14 down [1] - 53:8 **Downtown** [2] - 74:5 dozens [2] - 78:4, 78:7 draft [1] - 71:2 drainage [1] - 57:18 draw [1] - 65:20 draws [1] - 40:3 drive [4] - 5:4, 5:9, 38:25, 77:15 drive-through [3] -5:4, 5:9, 38:25 drives [3] - 5:17, 5:21, 6:3 driveway [1] - 76:19 driveways [4] - 46:3, 54:3, 76:4, 76:22 Driveways [2] - 76:15, 77:11 due [2] - 5:9, 36:1 duly [2] - 80:5, 80:7 during [1] - 75:18 **Dutton** [6] - 2:6, 29:24, 33:10, 33:21, 63:15, 63:23 **DUTTON** [1] - 4:17 **Dutton's** [1] - 33:22 duty [4] - 18:22, 19:8, 20:25, 72:12

26:22

69:1

14:10

26:12

68:12

Ε

e-mail [4] - 7:4, 33:9, error [3] - 22:19, 33:16, 53:19 22:21, 45:10 **e-mailing** [1] - 35:10 **especially** [1] - 27:15 **e-mails** [1] - 35:10 Esq [3] - 2:8, 2:12, effect [2] - 38:11, 46:7 2:14 effective [1] - 37:1 establish [6] - 15:20. **effectively** [3] - 37:9, 15:23, 16:13, 17:1, 39:22, 42:4 48:22, 61:13 effects [1] - 46:5 established [4] egress [1] - 5:20 48:12, 51:5, 58:6, **elements** [1] - 45:4 59:20 elevation [1] - 59:4 esteemed [2] - 47:25, eliminate [1] - 77:7 48:15 ethical [1] - 34:8 Ellis [2] - 2:12, 14:8 evening [9] - 3:9, **Elmwood** [1] - 1:16 4:14, 8:9, 13:23, **emphasize** [1] - 37:18 14:4, 30:12, 70:13, enclosed [1] - 58:4 70:15, 73:4 encourages [1] - 54:4 Evidence [1] - 49:22 encouraging [1] evidence [37] - 10:14, 55:3 11:23, 18:4, 26:4, end [1] - 15:18 27:14, 32:21, 36:24, enforcing [1] - 21:20 37:3, 37:6, 38:12, engineer [12] - 16:23, 39:5. 47:5. 47:17. 26:21, 46:21, 47:7, 49:6. 49:8. 49:10. 49:19, 50:3, 50:24, 49:23, 50:6, 50:15, 69:12, 69:18, 74:14, 50:16, 51:11, 53:8, 74:15, 78:22

Engineer [11] - 46:18, 53:10, 54:7, 55:4, 49:4, 50:23, 50:24, 55:25, 57:24, 58:14, 54:22, 54:24, 55:17, 60:8, 60:21, 61:4, 57:20, 58:7, 60:6, 61:5, 61:10, 61:16, 72:16, 78:18 Engineer's [1] - 61:2 evidentiary [13] - 8:19, 8:20, 10:10, 17:20, Engineering [1] -22:15, 22:18, 23:14, 24:17, 24:18, 24:25, engineering [2] -25:22, 45:14, 79:5 50:15, 58:8 evolution [1] - 68:11 enhancement [1] ex [5] - 32:17, 33:18, enter [4] - 28:7, 29:8, 34:17, 35:3, 35:18 30:22, 75:23 exactly [1] - 75:13 entered [3] - 4:10, examination [1] - 79:5 examine [3] - 69:9, 67:16, 70:2 entering [3] - 42:17, 78:17, 78:24 example [3] - 12:20, 75:17, 75:18 Enterprise [1] - 8:3 38:22, 60:18 entertainment [1] excuse [1] - 5:12 executive [5] - 3:10, 3:14, 4:10, 65:25, entire [1] - 36:15 67:16 entirely [1] - 35:6 Exhibit [2] - 53:7, entitled [2] - 20:12, 60:23 exhibits [1] - 53:5 entrance [1] - 6:11 exist [1] - 12:19 entrust [1] - 18:21 entrusted [1] - 21:20 existing [5] - 38:6, environment [1] -55:9, 56:9, 59:17, exists [2] - 45:20, 54:2 erred [1] - 18:3 exit [1] - 75:23 erroneous [4] - 7:14, exiting [3] - 75:17, 7:16, 51:21, 51:22 75:18, 77:9 expected [1] - 75:14 **experience** [2] - 33:4, 77:4 experienced [1] -20:20 expert [6] - 16:23, 67:25, 69:12, 69:13, 74:1, 79:1 expertise [2] - 50:22, experts [1] - 64:16 expires [1] - 80:19 explain [1] - 68:8 explained [2] - 28:5, 43:21 express [7] - 9:17, 10:9, 10:11, 12:8, 13:9, 26:5, 65:9

F

exterior [1] - 5:13

Fact [16] - 6:14, 6:23, 10:18, 10:23, 11:19, 11:21, 13:7, 28:4, 28:7, 28:17, 29:2,

29:8, 29:11, 29:16, 29:25, 31:1 fact [14] - 7:15, 10:9, 16:10, 16:14, 20:6, 20:10, 30:4, 33:6, 33:8, 37:5, 48:1, 49:15, 51:21, 52:15 facto [1] - 75:4 facts [2] - 12:2, 30:3 factual [3] - 16:7, 36:4, 52:21 failed [4] - 17:5, 17:6, 31:21, 35:25 fails [1] - 45:22 failure [1] - 16:25 fairly [1] - 72:22 fall [1] - 62:1 familiar [1] - 21:8 fast [1] - 53:21 features [2] - 46:1, 54:6 February [2] - 64:10, 64:13 feet [1] - 76:18 few [3] - 47:24, 62:22, 63:6 fifteen [2] - 65:16 fifth [1] - 6:8 fifty [1] - 76:18 filed [3] - 29:15, 29:17, 51:13 filling [1] - 5:10 final [6] - 11:13, 19:10, 21:13, 22:23, 25:24, 25:25 Final [2] - 6:14, 6:23 finalized [1] - 71:1 findings [1] - 71:2 fine [1] - 27:20 **fire** [5] - 49:3, 55:17, 59:24, 60:6, 61:2 firm [1] - 8:2 first [13] - 3:8, 4:14, 6:1, 7:22, 8:12, 14:13, 15:20, 50:11, 52:5, 53:17, 53:24, 75:7, 80:7 five [3] - 9:6, 13:3, 64:14 fixture [1] - 6:8 fleshed [1] - 16:19 flow [1] - 77:22 follow [5] - 14:24, 15:3, 20:22, 26:14, 75:3 following [2] - 67:19, 73:7 foremost [1] - 52:5 form [8] - 18:15,

18:16, 18:18, 18:19,

18:21, 19:12, 19:14, 20:19 formally [1] - 28:3 forth [5] - 53:24, 62:2, 62:3, 62:4, 68:24 forty [2] - 29:12, 64:14 forty-five [1] - 64:14 forty-one [1] - 29:12 forward [1] - 10:1 forwarded [1] - 33:10 four [2] - 6:5, 75:13 frame [1] - 8:8 free [2] - 60:19, 77:22 free-flow [1] - 77:22 friend [2] - 32:12 front [11] - 7:7, 10:17, 12:19, 13:1, 23:3, 38:25, 39:5, 39:7, 42:16, 45:15, 47:12 fuel [1] - 55:14 fueling [2] - 5:6, 5:7 full [6] - 17:3, 23:3, 54:11, 75:25, 76:23, 78:8 full-blown [1] - 23:3

G

gain [1] - 61:23 gas [5] - 38:25, 68:18, 75:9. 78:4 GC [2] - 4:23, 5:11 general [3] - 4:24, 10:4, 37:25 generated [1] - 39:9 Generation [1] - 75:11 Gerspacher [1] -55:12 given [8] - 19:25, 22:12, 35:7, 35:13, 35:14, 58:18, 59:15, 77:14 glad [1] - 44:24 government [1] - 35:2 **governs** [1] - 48:6 grading [1] - 57:18 grant [3] - 33:2, 33:3, 33:5 granted [3] - 30:5, 30:6, 30:9 graphic [1] - 5:13 gravitational [2] -40:1, 41:10 green [3] - 7:23, 13:25, 56:25 Greenberger [2] -2:14, 8:3 Greg [4] - 26:24, 67:21, 67:24, 73:9

Gregory [1] - 2:10

guess [2] - 41:15, 68:5 **guys** [1] - 36:1

H half [2] - 75:17, 75:18

Hall [1] - 1:15

80:13

77:9

hand [2] - 33:22,

handed [4] - 33:21,

handful [1] - 74:18

hard [3] - 7:6, 27:14,

37:24, 38:5, 45:20

hate [2] - 43:3, 44:17

happy [1] - 79:4

harmonious [3] -

33:23, 34:2, 63:23

hazardous [1] - 43:21 hazards [1] - 44:8 health [1] - 61:19 heard [5] - 5:16, 9:15, 22:10, 49:12, 70:22 hearing [53] - 8:19, 8:21, 9:20, 10:3, 10:6, 10:11, 11:4, 12:15, 12:17, 12:24, 13:11, 15:21, 15:22, 17:4, 17:17, 17:20, 17:21, 20:1, 20:11, 22:15, 22:18, 23:3, 23:10, 23:11, 23:14, 23:15, 23:22, 24:17, 24:18, 25:1, 25:22, 26:6, 26:7, 26:8, 26:9, 26:12, 30:7, 31:22, 31:23, 32:19, 32:22, 33:21, 35:22, 35:23, 37:3, 37:20, 45:14, 51:7, 53:4, 64:10, 79:5, 79:9, 80:10 height [1] - 58:20 held [3] - 1:10, 1:15, 80:10 hello [1] - 70:4 Hello [1] - 74:12 helpful [1] - 8:25 helpfulness [1] -78:19 hereby [1] - 80:6 hereunto [1] - 80:13 high [1] - 75:22 high-volume [1] -75:22 highest [1] - 77:8 highlighted [1] - 36:20 Highway [2] - 74:21, 76:13 hijack [1] - 61:23

history [3] - 11:3, 69:22, 74:11 hold [2] - 13:10, 25:22 home [3] - 14:16, 75:2, 78:21 home-rule [1] - 78:21 hour [1] - 75:19 HUBER [1] - 60:11 huber [1] - 62:19 Huber [2] - 2:10, 8:11 huff [1] - 16:11 Humpal [5] - 2:2, 3:20, 31:11, 67:5, 71:23 humpal [2] - 24:11, 25:11 hundred [7] - 74:17, 75:13, 75:14, 75:15, 75:24, 76:2, 76:17 **HUNT** [27] - 8:7, 9:8, 13:12, 13:17, 22:4, 22:10, 24:15, 27:3, 27:19, 27:22, 29:9, 40:19, 40:23, 41:7, 41:13, 62:25, 66:1, 66:6, 66:24, 70:4, 70:10, 70:12, 71:8, 72:14, 72:17, 72:19, 72:25 Hunt [3] - 2:8, 26:10, 27:10

ī

hunt [3] - 32:12,

35:11. 72:11

Hunt's [1] - 30:18

Hutson [1] - 27:25

idea [4] - 10:7, 21:25, 47:10, 65:8 identify [2] - 34:20, 34:21 identifying [1] - 57:2 ignore [1] - 38:20 immediately [1] -21:23 imminent [1] - 66:2 impact [16] - 15:24, 20:6, 20:8, 39:3, 39:21, 46:16, 46:22, 64:17, 74:17, 74:24, 76:1, 76:8, 78:2, 78:6, 78:9, 79:11 impacted [1] - 44:13 impacts [1] - 16:4 important [2] - 14:23, 41:8 **improper** [1] - 34:3 improperly [3] - 10:19, 10:24, 11:24 **IN** [1] - 80:13

in/right [2] - 77:15, 77:19 included [4] - 6:12, 35:21, 35:24, 69:14 includes [1] - 56:14 including [1] - 46:1 incomplete [1] - 12:19 incorporate [2] -53:12, 53:13 incorporated [1] -59:6 incorporating [1] -68:6 incorrect [1] - 64:5 increase [4] - 55:10, 55:23, 56:4, 68:19 increased [1] - 50:18 indicated [2] - 26:10, 49:24 **indication** [1] - 58:8 individual [1] - 53:9 industrial [6] - 42:22, 42:25, 55:13, 58:24, 59:2, 68:13 industry [2] - 43:7 inform [1] - 72:12 information [1] - 29:3 ingress [1] - 5:20 **inherently** [1] - 77:7 inhibit [1] - 44:5 initial [1] - 32:19 instance [1] - 15:13 instantaneously [1] -33:25 instead [1] - 37:10 **institution** [1] - 28:15 instructed [1] - 51:18 intend [1] - 72:13 intended [1] - 38:6 intending [1] - 3:1 intensity [3] - 43:1, 68:19, 68:20 interest [1] - 32:14 interfere [1] - 44:8 internal [1] - 25:23 International [1] -74:14 interpretation [2] -7:16, 51:22 interpreting [1] - 23:9 intersection [1] -76:19 intersections [4] -76:5, 76:7, 76:15, 76:22 introduce [1] - 13:21

introduced [1] - 78:25

involved [1] - 61:21

involves [1] - 38:24

McDonald's [1] -

issue [20] - 8:12, 8:15, 14:23, 19:11, 19:12, 20:10, 29:7, 29:19, 31:22, 39:4, 41:17, 43:23, 46:9, 46:14, 46:20, 51:1, 52:13, 55:1 issued [2] - 11:6, 21:5 issues [20] - 8:8, 9:5, 14:11, 14:14, 16:6, 16:7, 25:19, 28:1, 36:4, 36:20, 38:13, 39:25, 43:22, 44:3, 45:7, 45:17, 48:4, 60:22, 62:22, 63:6 ITE [1] - 75:11 item [1] - 76:11 items [3] - 49:4, 51:15, 52:17 itself [3] - 8:17, 15:4, 54:21

J

job [1] - 33:22 JOHNSON [6] - 3:23, 24:4, 25:14, 31:14, 67:8, 72:1 johnson [1] - 25:13 Johnson [6] - 2:3, 3:22, 24:3, 31:13, 67:7, 71:25 Judge [1] - 27:25 judicial [3] - 23:3, 36:13, 66:10 July [5] - 71:12, 71:13, 71:14, 71:16, 80:15 June [5] - 1:11, 28:25, 32:20, 63:14, 80:12 jurisdiction [16] -8:14, 11:16, 11:18, 11:20, 14:13, 14:14, 15:9, 22:14, 23:15, 23:17, 23:22, 28:6, 28:14, 29:7, 30:22, 62:12 jurisdictional [2] -14:11, 29:19 jurisprudence [1] -22:17

K

keep [2] - 61:23, 63:8 keeps [2] - 48:1, 48:16 kid [1] - 61:17 kind [6] - 42:24, 42:25, 69:6, 77:5, 77:20, 77:25 King [2] - 39:20, 39:22 knows [1] - 72:12

L

Lafayette [18] - 4:15, 4:22, 5:19, 6:10, 42:2, 42:8, 42:13, 42:14, 42:17, 42:19, 42:23, 43:7, 44:16, 54:15, 56:25, 68:15, 68:21, 77:1 **LAFAYETTE** [1] - 1:6 Lake [3] - 4:22, 5:19, 56:23 Land [1] - 38:1 land [2] - 47:8, 56:20 landscaping [4] -56:16, 56:20, 56:22, 59:18 lane [3] - 42:3, 77:2, 77:13 lanes [2] - 42:3, 76:25 Langan [2] - 26:22, 74:14 language [11] - 9:18, 10:9. 10:11. 12:8. 13:9. 14:15. 17:19. 26:5, 26:8, 48:18, 65:9 large [1] - 39:1 last [1] - 32:7 late [2] - 12:4, 47:7 laughs [1] - 44:10 launch [1] - 31:21 law [20] - 7:17, 8:2, 8:11, 15:17, 16:9, 18:9, 20:9, 21:5, 21:13, 21:19, 29:22, 32:25, 33:1, 35:5, 35:10, 49:21, 52:19, 56:5, 61:24, 66:9 Law [1] - 2:10 laws [1] - 51:23 lawyer [4] - 16:3, 49:20, 50:3, 61:6 lawyers [1] - 32:10 lay [2] - 15:17, 27:15 learned [1] - 64:15 least [4] - 10:5, 26:20, 32:7, 64:14 leaving [1] - 42:18 left [3] - 76:25, 77:2, 77:24

left-turn [2] - 76:25,

legal [16] - 3:15, 4:7,

10:21, 21:21, 24:20,

25:1, 49:13, 49:15,

49:18, 50:6, 50:14,

61:6, 66:7, 66:8,

77:2

71:1 legitimate [2] - 61:19, 61:20 less [1] - 41:17 letter [25] - 13:8, 15:18, 21:4, 28:22, 29:24, 31:2, 32:25, 33:1, 33:13, 33:15, 33:23, 33:24, 34:1, 35:19, 35:24, 36:7, 36:9, 36:11, 49:21, 53:2, 53:5, 60:13, 62:4, 63:14, 63:16 level [1] - 35:17 lieu [1] - 18:20 light [3] - 6:8, 7:24, 13:25 likely[1] - 33:3 limit [2] - 9:3, 40:14 limited [1] - 77:9 limiting [2] - 40:13, 77:14 line [4] - 16:18, 32:7, 58:21, 77:19 listening [1] - 30:11 literally [3] - 33:20, 37:4, 63:22 lives [1] - 56:6 **LLC** [2] - 2:14, 2:15 **LLP** [1] - 2:12 locate [1] - 40:3 located [2] - 46:3, 76:15 **location** [1] - 59:14 locations [1] - 77:8 lodged [1] - 37:22 Logan [1] - 2:3 look [11] - 17:18, 20:21, 42:10, 42:20, 43:14, 45:23, 48:18, 51:16, 52:3, 64:6, 76:3 looked [2] - 33:17, 75:7

M

mail [4] - 7:4, 33:9, 33:16, 53:19 mailing [1] - 35:10 mails [1] - 35:10 Main [1] - 14:8 main [1] - 77:19 maintained [1] - 38:5 maintenance [1] - 68:25 Majeed [3] - 2:14, 6:19, 8:1 major [1] - 38:24 Makhlouf [25] - 2:14,

6:19, 8:1, 16:2, 17:17, 20:20, 27:6, 35:9, 35:25, 40:11, 43:11, 48:20, 49:18, 49:24, 49:25, 50:2, 50:6, 51:2, 51:17, 52:13, 55:22, 59:8, 66:4, 67:20, 73:8 MAKHLOUF [52] - 8:1, 9:9, 9:13, 13:4, 18:11, 18:14, 21:19, 22:6, 22:9, 25:18, 27:9, 28:2, 30:20, 31:20, 32:6, 36:3, 36:6, 36:18, 40:17, 40:20, 40:24, 41:2, 41:11, 41:14, 43:10, 43:13, 43:20, 44:19, 44:21, 62:21, 63:2, 63:5, 63:10, 63:13, 66:5, 66:19, 67:23, 68:7, 69:16, 72:11, 72:15, 72:18, 72:23, 73:19, 73:22, 73:25, 74:3, 74:7, 78:10, 78:14, 79:3, 79:15 Makhlouf's [4] -50:13, 57:10, 59:10, 62:14 management [5] -58:10, 75:3, 75:5, 75:20, 77:3 Management [2] -74:22, 76:14 manager [6] - 16:3, 16:15, 16:22, 50:17, 56:2, 61:8 Manual [3] - 74:22, 75:11. 76:14 manual [7] - 75:3, 75:4, 75:20, 75:23, 76:20, 77:11, 78:11 March [12] - 5:22, 7:1, 7:2, 11:4, 11:7, 11:14, 11:18, 23:4, 28:8, 28:11, 28:13, 64:11 Mark [1] - 2:2 Mart [2] - 2:15, 52:5 mass [1] - 58:20 material [2] - 51:21, 59:5 materials [2] - 10:2, 58:21 materiel [1] - 7:15 matter [8] - 12:5, 23:2, 23:5, 24:18, 28:14, 30:7, 34:21, 62:18

matters [2] - 8:16,

34:8

39:19 mean [2] - 22:3, 34:7 meaning [1] - 57:10 means [1] - 8:19 **MEDINA** [3] - 1:4, 1:23, 80:2 Medina [19] - 1:12, 1:15, 1:16, 1:24, 2:5, 2:8, 2:10, 2:10, 22:24, 23:21, 56:7, 68:12, 69:3, 69:4, 74:19, 75:1, 78:11, 78:20, 80:14 meeting [10] - 4:9, 5:23, 6:11, 6:15, 7:1, 7:2, 26:8, 67:15, 71:4, 71:9 Meeting [1] - 73:5 meetings [1] - 7:3 Meghan [3] - 1:14, 80:4, 80:17 member [1] - 34:18 MEMBER [1] - 22:2 Member [5] - 2:2, 2:3, 2:3, 2:4, 59:9 members [5] - 12:14, 12:23, 34:18, 35:4, 73:3 Members [2] - 13:23, 14:5 memo [1] - 28:25 mentioned [3] - 21:4, 55:24, 74:21 merits [2] - 34:21, 47:24 microphone [1] - 7:24 might [2] - 29:25, 54:25 miles [4] - 16:17, 16:18, 44:10, 50:20 mind [2] - 30:10, 38:18 minimize [1] - 46:4 minimizing [1] - 59:16 minimum [1] - 65:12 Minit [2] - 2:15, 52:5 minor [1] - 6:6 minute [3] - 20:15, 34:12, 63:9 minutes [4] - 7:2, 9:7, 13:3, 18:13 misrepresent [1] -50:19 misrepresented [1] -48.9 misrepresenting [1] -56:3 mistakes [1] - 20:24 model [1] - 40:1

moot [1] - 52:13 most [1] - 76:22 Motion [1] - 31:17 motion [21] - 3:12, 3:14, 4:5, 23:17, 23:20, 24:13, 24:16, 24:22, 24:25, 25:15, 30:13, 30:23, 30:25, 31:18, 66:15, 66:17, 67:13, 70:20, 70:24, 71:20, 72:8 move [5] - 13:6, 28:3, 28:21, 28:25, 47:16 moved [1] - 66:22 movement [1] - 77:22 movements [2] -76:23, 76:24 moving [1] - 62:19 MR [167] - 3:13, 3:17, 3:23, 3:25, 4:2, 4:4, 4:17, 8:1, 8:7, 9:8, 9:9, 9:13, 13:4, 13:12, 13:15, 13:17, 13:19, 13:22, 14:1, 14:4, 18:11, 18:14, 20:14, 20:17, 21:19, 22:4, 22:6, 22:9, 22:10, 23:19, 23:25, 24:4, 24:6, 24:8, 24:10, 24:15, 24:24, 25:2, 25:6, 25:8, 25:10, 25:14, 25:18, 27:3, 27:9, 27:10, 27:19, 27:21, 27:22, 28:2, 29:9, 30:16, 30:20, 30:25, 31:4, 31:8, 31:10, 31:14, 31:16, 31:20, 32:6, 34:6, 34:13, 34:16, 34:24, 36:3, 36:6, 36:18, 40:10, 40:17, 40:19, 40:20, 40:23, 40:24, 41:2, 41:7, 41:11, 41:13, 41:14, 43:3, 43:10, 43:11, 43:13, 43:16, 43:20, 44:14, 44:19, 44:21, 47:20, 47:23, 53:20, 53:23, 60:11, 60:17, 62:17, 62:21, 62:25, 63:2, 63:5, 63:10, 63:13, 65:15, 65:20, 66:1, 66:5, 66:6, 66:16, 66:18, 66:19, 66:24, 67:4, 67:8, 67:10, 67:12, 67:23, 68:2, 68:5, 68:7, 68:10, 69:7, 69:16, 69:23, 70:4, 70:9, 70:10, 70:12, 70:19,

70:22, 71:8, 71:10, 71:14, 71:16, 71:19, 72:1, 72:3, 72:5, 72:7, 72:11, 72:14, 72:15, 72:17, 72:18, 72:19, 72:23, 72:25, 73:2, 73:13, 73:19, 73:21, 73:22, 73:24, 73:25, 74:2, 74:3, 74:4, 74:7, 74:12, 78:10, 78:12, 78:14, 78:15, 79:3, 79:7, 79:12, 79:13, 79:15, 79:16 MS [38] - 3:20, 3:22, 3:24, 4:1, 4:3, 4:5, 24:3, 24:5, 24:7, 24:9, 24:11, 25:5, 25:7, 25:9, 25:11, 25:13, 25:15, 31:7, 31:9, 31:11, 31:13, 31:15, 31:17, 67:3, 67:5, 67:7, 67:9, 67:11, 67:13, 68:3, 71:13, 71:15, 71:23, 71:25, 72:2, 72:4, 72:6, 72:8 municipality [2] -14:17, 78:21 must [1] - 14:22

Ν

notice [11] - 10:3, name [4] - 7:25, 14:5, 17:16, 19:25, 20:4, 26:21, 74:12 20:22, 31:22, 32:1, narrative [4] - 49:2, 32:22, 33:8, 36:14, 54:8, 56:18, 60:2 47:6 near [2] - 16:22, 76:22 notification [5] - 11:5, nearby [1] - 76:19 11:6, 11:11, 28:9, necessarily [1] - 75:2 33:9 necessary [2] - 5:9, notion [1] - 48:20 42:7 November [4] - 51:13, need [8] - 30:13, 64:8, 64:9, 65:23 44:17, 46:9, 55:14, novo [6] - 8:18, 9:16, 55:19, 62:25, 66:20, 10:13, 17:10, 21:3, 72:20 37:20 needed [3] - 45:25, nowhere [3] - 26:13, 49:25, 52:8 48:7, 49:25 needs [1] - 24:16 number [21] - 5:16, neighborhood [3] -5:25, 6:4, 9:13, 38:7, 38:9, 42:21 10:14, 12:11, 18:14, neighborhoods [1] -19:22, 36:10, 36:20, 69:3 39:11, 39:25, 40:1, neighboring [1] -62:23, 63:13, 64:1, 31:24 66:2, 66:6, 66:9, never [4] - 29:21, 75:8, 75:22 50:11, 52:18, 78:5 Number [1] - 65:22 newspaper [1] - 10:4 next [7] - 40:3, 56:13, 57:17, 71:4, 71:8,

72:20, 73:1

78:3

[1] - 60:4

60:8

night [2] - 47:3, 60:14

nine [3] - 74:16, 77:3,

Ninth [2] - 11:9, 11:10

no-access-to-trucks

non-evidentiary [1] -

none [6] - 40:12, 43:8,

normally [1] - 54:23

North [2] - 1:16, 1:23

Northeast [1] - 74:15

notarized [2] - 14:22,

NOTARY [1] - 73:11

notary [5] - 3:2, 12:15,

12:16, 12:17, 12:24

Notary [3] - 1:14, 80:4,

noted [2] - 32:4, 36:17

nothing [4] - 26:2,

37:4, 46:23, 80:9

northeast [1] - 4:22

notarization [2] -

18:20, 19:17

15:2

80:18

note [1] - 12:22

north [1] - 5:7

58:15, 59:12, 59:21,

nobody [1] - 39:9

non [1] - 22:15

0 oath [1] - 3:2 object [10] - 25:21, 26:18, 30:21, 34:4, 38:18, 40:11, 43:4, 78:18, 79:1, 79:8 objected [2] - 21:23, 52:6 objecting [4] - 15:1, 17:1, 21:8, 49:13 objection [11] - 31:21, 40:16, 40:22, 40:25, 43:18, 44:14, 44:22, 45:9, 52:14, 62:12, 78:16 objections [6] - 10:14, 15:14, 26:19, 32:8, 36:16, 78:24 objectives [2] - 37:25, 38:1 obtain [1] - 66:7 obviously [3] - 25:21, 29:6, 30:20 occasions [1] - 29:15 occur [1] - 27:12 Ockner [2] - 2:14, 8:3 **ODOT** [3] - 74:22, 77:16, 78:7 **OF** [4] - 1:4, 80:1, 80:2 offer [1] - 74:8 offered [2] - 47:7, 47:8 office [2] - 42:24, 80:14 office@crmedina. com [1] - 1:25 officer [1] - 21:20 official [2] - 7:11, 31:2 often [1] - 40:2 **OHIO** [1] - 80:1 Ohio [20] - 1:15, 1:16, 1:24, 8:4, 14:9, 15:17, 16:9, 18:8, 35:1, 35:6, 49:22, 52:19, 56:5, 61:24, 66:9, 74:15, 75:5, 80:5, 80:14, 80:18 old [2] - 29:13, 29:14 On-site [1] - 59:23 one [20] - 5:19, 5:20, 10:16, 14:15, 15:9,

16:21, 18:15, 19:24,

20:15, 27:11, 29:12,

60:12, 62:23, 63:13,

open [2] - 17:22, 46:2

operated [1] - 38:4

36:10, 40:1, 56:6,

64:5, 66:2

ones [1] - 30:8

online [1] - 53:4

operating [1] - 59:11 operational [1] - 76:16 **opine** [1] - 50:22 opinion [4] - 21:6, 30:2, 49:15, 77:16 **opinions** [1] - 22:12 opportunity [10] -17:3, 17:4, 27:7, 33:20, 47:4, 47:9, 47:10, 47:15, 51:3, 66:25 opposing [2] - 15:23, opposition [1] - 58:14 option [1] - 77:13 oral [4] - 10:7, 10:8, 27:5, 70:23 order [5] - 4:13, 7:11, 11:13, 70:5, 70:7 Ordinance [2] - 7:17, 46:15 ordinance [4] - 12:9, 13:10, 18:16, 51:23 ordinances [8] -14:16, 15:6, 15:11, 18:21, 20:2, 20:21, 20:23, 48:3 otherwise [1] - 27:13 ourselves [1] - 61:17 outrageous [1] -21:25 outside [6] - 12:2, 12:15, 12:17, 27:14, 29:3, 32:11 **overrule** [1] - 40:15 overruled [1] - 40:24 overwhelming [1] own [4] - 14:17, 20:2, 26:2, 78:22 owner [5] - 6:19, 20:10, 21:8, 32:16, 45:2 owners [4] - 19:25,

31:24, 32:1, 46:17 Р

p.m [2] - 1:13, 75:16 P25-02 [2] - 6:22, 65:22 packet [4] - 4:18, 6:20, 15:18, 35:22 Page [4] - 12:21, 41:6, 64:6 panels [1] - 59:7 pardon [1] - 34:13 park [1] - 39:2 parking [4] - 46:3, 54:3, 54:18, 56:15

Parkway [1] - 8:3 part [7] - 11:22, 12:18, 27:24, 28:17, 53:3, 63:25, 69:14 parte [5] - 32:17, 33:18, 34:17, 35:3, 35:18 parties [6] - 8:9, 9:1, 11:7, 11:12, 36:14, 63:24 parties' [1] - 22:11 partner [2] - 8:2, 14:7 party [3] - 13:14, 20:12, 22:17 pass [1] - 21:1 passenger [1] - 5:6 pattern [3] - 32:9, 32:15, 58:21 Paul [1] - 2:3 peak [3] - 75:14, 75:16, 75:19 pedestrian [2] - 54:4, 55:3 pending [1] - 22:25 per [1] - 79:6 perfected [1] - 15:5 perform [1] - 79:11 **performed** [1] - 76:10 perhaps [1] - 8:22 period [1] - 28:10 permission [1] - 63:1 permit [1] - 8:25 permitted [2] - 5:17, 77:12 permitting [1] - 54:14 person [4] - 15:11, 15:19, 17:2, 19:8 persons [2] - 3:1, 80:7 photographs [1] -16:16 picture [1] - 16:21 pictures [3] - 50:19, 50:20, 56:3 PIERSON [3] - 74:12, 78:12, 79:12 Pierson [8] - 26:22, 67:22, 73:10, 74:9, 74:10, 74:13, 79:4, 79:10 place [4] - 32:3, 37:18, 37:21, 80:11 **placed** [1] - 3:2 placement [1] - 59:14 places [1] - 12:11 plain [3] - 14:15, 17:18, 38:13 plan [28] - 5:1, 5:23, 14:7, 37:8, 38:23, 42:1, 45:24, 47:8,

48:4, 48:6, 52:6,

52:15, 52:18, 52:23, 53:7, 54:1, 54:9, 56:12, 56:14, 57:16, 58:16, 58:23, 59:13, 59:19, 59:22, 60:9, 61:10, 61:14 Plan [2] - 38:2, 68:23 planner [3] - 49:19, 50:4, 73:15 planning [3] - 50:15, 57:1, 57:6 Planning [96] - 2:5, 5:1, 5:22, 6:13, 6:16, 6:24, 6:25, 7:3, 9:25, 10:18, 10:23, 11:15, 11:17, 11:24, 12:1, 12:13, 13:1, 13:8, 15:13, 15:22, 16:1, 17:24, 18:3, 18:17, 18:18, 18:19, 18:23, 19:24, 20:5, 21:7, 23:4, 26:1, 26:15, 27:1, 27:6, 28:4, 28:6, 28:13, 28:15 28:18, 28:20, 28:22, 29:1, 29:4, 29:6, 30:6, 30:18, 30:21, 37:8, 37:12, 37:15, 37:17, 37:19, 38:15, 39:10, 39:25, 41:23, 42:10, 42:15, 44:24, 45:2, 45:6, 45:13, 46:13, 46:24, 47:2, 47:13, 47:14, 48:21, 49:7, 50:7, 50:20, 51:19, 52:1, 52:24, 55:4, 55:5, 56:11, 57:14, 58:1, 58:2, 58:4, 58:23, 59:3, 59:19, 59:20, 61:13, 62:6, 62:9, 64:2, 64:12, 64:19, 65:11, 65:13, 70:25 plans [8] - 10:2, 43:14, 43:17, 48:25, 54:17, 58:1, 60:1, 60:25 pleas [1] - 29:16 Pleas [3] - 22:24, 27:24, 72:13 **plenty** [1] - 9:8 point [5] - 11:15, 12:5, 41:3, 41:5, 46:9 pointed [2] - 37:6, 45:21 points [4] - 9:14, 18:12, 55:22, 60:5 poisoned [2] - 10:25, 11:25

police [1] - 59:25

policies [1] - 78:22

posit [2] - 60:18, 62:11 position [2] - 23:12, 39:18 positions [1] - 8:24 possibility [1] - 46:4 possible [1] - 59:24 potential [2] - 16:6, 77:25 potentially [2] - 16:6, 68:20 powers [1] - 37:17 practice [2] - 34:3, 34:4 practicing [2] - 29:11, 29:13 precedent [1] - 39:17 precisely [2] - 44:11, 44:22 preface [2] - 75:1, 75:7 preferred [1] - 76:18 preliminary [1] - 8:16 prepare [1] - 51:7 presence [2] - 67:20, 73:8 present [6] - 7:21, 17:4, 27:8, 51:3, 67:1, 74:20 presentation [1] -37:8 presented [4] - 37:3, 37:7, 38:12, 49:10 **presenting** [1] - 26:4 preserve [3] - 17:6, 44:18, 78:23 pretty [2] - 22:8, 49:9 prevent [1] - 42:18 prevented [1] - 42:16 prevents [3] - 12:6, 26:3 previously [1] - 28:5 prey [1] - 62:1 principal [1] - 46:2 printed [1] - 63:18 private [1] - 66:11 probative [2] - 49:9, 50:5 problem [2] - 27:16, 44:23 **problems** [1] - 76:16 procedural [2] - 11:3, 25:19 procedure [2] - 15:3, 26:14 procedures [2] -14:18, 74:20 proceeded [3] - 11:19, 12:5, 28:16 proceeding [3] - 12:7,

73:20, 73:23 Proceedings [1] -1:10 proceedings [1] -61:23 PROCEEDINGS [1] -3.4 process [6] - 9:19, 9:20, 21:9, 25:23, 36:15, 61:22 professional [1] -74:13 Professional [2] -35:1, 35:7 professor [1] - 26:25 PROFFER [4] - 67:18, 70:1, 73:6, 79:18 proffer [19] - 26:23, 27:2, 27:8, 27:12, 27:17, 27:23, 36:23, 47:16, 47:17, 66:20, 66:25, 67:19, 67:23, 68:6, 69:8, 69:18, 72:16, 73:7, 74:8 program [2] - 40:7, 40:8 prohibited [1] - 6:9 project [2] - 5:3, 55:6 promise [1] - 65:17 proof [1] - 37:11 proper [8] - 11:4, 15:3, 29:20. 35:6. 38:19. 54:1. 55:3. 57:16 properly [2] - 29:5, 58:3 properties [3] - 20:3, 55:13, 57:3 property [24] - 4:21, 6:10, 6:19, 16:5, 16:22, 19:25, 20:6, 20:8, 20:10, 31:24, 32:1, 32:16, 43:22, 44:4, 44:6, 45:2, 45:18, 46:17, 50:9, 54:21, 55:2, 59:2, 59:17 proposed [2] - 5:19, 59:4 protect [1] - 25:20 protection [1] - 59:25 prove [3] - 36:25, 45:3, 48:17

provide [2] - 12:12,

provided [5] - 6:21,

provides [4] - 9:23,

77:18, 77:19, 78:20,

12:14, 14:24, 56:16

providing [1] - 54:20

76:17

79:2

provision [2] - 17:16, 56:15 provisions [1] - 57:19 proximity [1] - 41:25 Public [3] - 1:14, 80:4, 80:18 **public** [6] - 6:7, 23:2, 23:12, 30:8, 44:9, 61:19 **publicly** [2] - 53:3, 66:13 published [2] - 10:3, 74:23 puff [1] - 16:11 pump [1] - 75:9 pumps [3] - 38:25, 39:1, 78:5 purported [2] - 53:10, 59:21 **purposes** [1] - 28:2 **pursuant** [1] - 15:5 purview [1] - 20:3 pushed [1] - 52:10 put [4] - 9:3, 15:7, 20:22, 45:14 **puts** [1] - 68:23 **putting** [1] - 51:15

Q

qualifications [4] 69:10, 69:13, 69:21,
73:12
qualified [1] - 80:6
quasi [3] - 23:3, 36:13,
66:10
quasi-judicial [3] 23:3, 36:13, 66:10
questions [1] - 37:5
quick [3] - 9:10, 62:22,
63:11
quickly [4] - 16:19,
34:15, 69:20, 72:22
quite [2] - 21:25, 43:1

R

radius [1] - 32:2
rail [1] - 16:18
raised [7] - 8:12, 39:4,
39:6, 47:25, 52:14,
52:18, 52:24
rather [1] - 6:6
RDL [2] - 69:24, 73:14
re [1] - 70:2
reach [2] - 25:24,
58:11
reached [1] - 25:25
read [2] - 10:25, 60:12

ready [1] - 26:23 real [1] - 45:18 really [4] - 16:19, 29:18, 42:23, 62:1 reason [3] - 15:7, 19:21, 51:11 reasonable [9] - 37:1, 45:4, 48:2, 48:8, 48:11, 48:17, 48:22, 49:8, 61:14 reasons [8] - 8:23, 10:12, 15:8, 62:2, 62:3, 62:4, 66:1, 66:17 receive [1] - 3:15 received [7] - 7:5, 8:23, 20:4, 33:8, 36:9, 47:6, 53:18 receiving [2] - 9:24, 36:14 recent [1] - 7:4 recess [2] - 4:10, 67:16 recessed [1] - 59:6 recommendation [1] -58:2 recommended [3] -57:4, 57:5, 57:8 recommending [1] recommends [2] -68:18. 68:24 record [79] - 10:22, 12:3, 12:18, 12:25, 16:17, 17:24, 18:2. 21:7, 21:22, 23:2, 25:20, 26:19, 26:24, 27:2, 27:6, 27:14, 27:16, 27:18, 27:23, 28:3, 28:5, 28:18, 28:19, 29:3, 29:21, 30:4, 30:8, 30:17, 35:9, 35:16, 35:19, 35:20, 36:7, 38:14, 39:6, 39:7, 39:13, 40:11, 40:12, 40:13, 40:14, 41:5, 41:9, 41:12, 41:22, 43:6, 43:15, 43:17, 44:15, 45:14, 49:9, 49:16, 50:1, 52:1, 52:3, 52:6, 52:10, 53:3, 53:6, 53:9, 54:7, 54:13, 55:8, 56:8, 57:24, 59:12, 60:16, 60:21, 61:4, 62:3, 64:22, 65:21, 67:2, 68:1, 69:8, 69:17, 69:21, 74:11, 78:16 redevelopment [1] -

57:7 reference [4] - 30:1, 53:12, 53:13, 76:12 references [1] - 28:23 referred [2] - 19:2, 76:12 refuse [1] - 58:3 refused [2] - 47:14, regard [2] - 20:19, 21:3 regarding [1] - 38:12 regardless [1] - 48:12 regards [2] - 17:10, 21:14 regular [1] - 71:4 relationship [2] - 54:2, 58:19 relevance [1] - 78:19 reliability [2] - 69:12, 78:19 reliable [2] - 49:10, 50:5 relied [1] - 21:15 relies [1] - 29:2 rely [1] - 30:1 remand [1] - 65:12 remember [2] - 41:9, 48:3 reminder [1] - 66:20 removal [1] - 59:16 rendered [1] - 57:15 rendering [1] - 5:14 renderings [1] - 54:17 repeat [2] - 63:3, 73:12 repeated [1] - 33:18 repeatedly [3] - 39:4, 47:3, 79:8 report [13] - 27:1, 49:2, 57:1, 58:1, 58:2, 58:23, 59:3, 59:19, 60:2, 60:25, 67:25, 69:13, 79:1 report's [1] - 55:4 reported [1] - 59:11 reporter [3] - 27:7, 72:20, 73:1 REPORTERS [1] -1:23 represent [2] - 14:6, 32.14 representatives [2] -33:19, 48:24 representing [3] -6:18, 6:21, 13:13 request [8] - 27:11, 27:12, 32:19, 32:24, 47:2, 47:13, 60:5,

64:18

requesting [1] - 64:1 requests [1] - 32:21 require [3] - 39:2, 46:22, 78:2 required [11] - 5:15, 9:17, 12:9, 20:22, 31:24, 46:17, 74:25, 76:1, 76:24, 78:7, 78:8 requirement [1] - 37:2 requirements [1] requires [4] - 13:10, 45:25, 68:24, 68:25 requiring [1] - 31:25 reserve [3] - 13:6, 69:9. 78:17 resident [1] - 56:6 residential [1] - 43:2 respect [9] - 9:4, 18:15, 22:13, 24:16, 30:10, 36:1, 36:19, 63:14, 64:21 respond [9] - 18:12, 33:20, 33:25, 34:7, 34:10, 36:4, 40:21, 41:4, 63:6 responded [3] - 32:24, 33:12, 36:8 response [5] - 6:22, 34:23. 36:10. 36:17. 39:12 restrict [1] - 32:21 restricted [2] - 10:22, 77:21 resume [1] - 70:7 retail [1] - 38:24 return [1] - 4:6 reverse [3] - 7:10, 45:12, 65:11 reversed [1] - 45:11 Review [1] - 74:5 review [18] - 6:25, 17:10, 17:23, 21:4, 21:6, 21:14, 38:14, 48:4, 48:5, 48:7, 49:2, 49:3, 55:17, 60:7, 60:19, 61:2, 61:3. 71:3 reviewed [5] - 50:25, 56:11, 57:14, 57:19, 62:7 reviewing [1] - 51:25 revise [1] - 19:6 Revised [2] - 45:23, 79:6 revisions [1] - 19:6 rewards [2] - 40:6, 40:7

requested [1] - 6:2

rid [1] - 77:4 right-in [1] - 77:22 right-in/right-out [2] -77:15, 77:19 right-of-way [1] -54:23 right-out [1] - 77:23 rights [1] - 54:12 rights-of-way [1] -54:12 Road [12] - 4:15, 4:22, 4:23, 6:10, 16:18, 42:22, 43:6, 44:16, 56:23, 68:15, 68:21 **ROAD** [1] - 1:6 roads [3] - 46:3, 54:3, 69:1 roadway [1] - 75:21 Roetzel [1] - 2:7 **roll** [5] - 3:18, 24:2, 25:4, 31:6, 71:21 room [1] - 70:3 **ROSZAK** [9] - 3:17, 3:25, 23:25, 24:6, 25:6, 31:4, 31:16, 67:10, 72:3 Roszak [7] - 2:3, 3:24, 24:5, 25:5, 31:15, 67:9, 72:2 roughly [2] - 74:16, 75:12 rule [3] - 14:16, 75:2, 78:21 Rule [1] - 49:22 rules [2] - 64:14, 64:25 Rules [2] - 35:1, 35:6 run [1] - 53:15 rush (11 - 53:15 Russell [1] - 59:9 Russell's [1] - 41:15

S

safety [6] - 54:5, 54:25, 55:3, 61:20, 76:16. 77:6 sandwich [1] - 42:6 sandwiched [2] -43:25, 44:1 sarah [1] - 31:5 Sarah [4] - 2:6, 24:1, 25:4, 71:22 satisfaction [1] -57:25 **satisfied** [1] - 58:6 satisfies [1] - 55:6 **saw** [2] - 38:16, 63:22 scenario [1] - 77:25 scope [1] - 21:14

screening [1] - 56:15 seal [1] - 80:14 second [15] - 3:16, 3:17, 8:15, 18:1, 22:18, 23:24, 23:25, 25:2, 25:3, 31:3, 31:4, 66:18, 71:6, 71:11, 71:19 secondary [1] - 76:11 seconded [1] - 66:23 secondly [2] - 19:11, 33:14 seconds [3] - 20:17, 65:16, 65:17 section [2] - 9:21, 37:14 Section [10] - 7:8, 9:23, 53:24, 56:13, 57:17, 58:16, 59:13, 59:22, 60:9, 79:6 **Sections** [1] - 45:22 see [4] - 22:21, 49:6, 53:2, 53:4 seek [1] - 30:23 sees [1] - 32:11 segregate [1] - 54:10 semi [2] - 6:9, 38:25 semi-trucks [1] - 6:9 seminars [1] - 35:7 semis [5] - 42:12, 42:14, 42:16, 42:18, 43:1 sense [4] - 17:25, 38:16, 46:15, 51:25 sent [1] - 36:8 separately [1] - 13:7 **serve** [2] - 55:9, 58:25 served [3] - 11:7. 28:11. 28:12 service [5] - 5:18, 31:25, 46:2, 54:3, 56:16 **session** [5] - 3:10, 3:14, 4:11, 65:25, 67:17 set [5] - 53:24, 62:2, 62:3, 62:4, 80:13 setting [1] - 39:18 seven [1] - 37:23 seventy [1] - 75:15 seventy-three [1] -75:15 several [1] - 74:17

shall [7] - 4:6, 6:9,

7:10, 10:1, 10:3,

SHAMM [1] - 76:13

48:21, 59:23

shot [1] - 18:5

show [1] - 42:22

showed [6] - 20:4,

texture [1] - 58:20

THE [1] - 73:11

20:7, 20:11, 50:24, 51:5, 61:22 showing [2] - 54:17, 56:20 **shown** [3] - 5:3, 35:16, 46:6 shows [5] - 35:9, 38:14, 44:23, 54:1, 54:5 side [5] - 5:7, 5:8, 56:7, 67:1, 77:18 sidewalk [4] - 6:7, 54:19, 54:20, 55:2 sight [1] - 77:9 sign [2] - 15:1, 60:4 similar [2] - 41:20, 59:10 similarly [2] - 28:21, 57:11 simply [6] - 12:7, 16:3, 18:6, 42:7, 43:14, 46:21 single [2] - 16:21, 55:20 sit [3] - 13:18, 37:18, 37:21 site [43] - 5:1, 5:23, 14:7, 38:23, 39:9, 42:1, 42:5, 42:9, 42:13, 42:17, 42:18, 43:24, 45:24, 48:4, 48:6, 49:14, 49:17, 52:6, 52:15, 52:18, 52:23, 53:7, 54:1, 54:9, 54:17, 54:24, 56:12, 56:14, 57:2, 57:16, 58:1, 58:16, 58:23, 59:13, 59:19, 59:22, 59:23, 60:9, 61:7, 61:10, 61:14, 75:8, 76:10 sits [1] - 37:16 situation [3] - 18:7, 75:25, 76:6 situations [1] - 77:20 **sixty** [1] - 76:2 size [1] - 75:10 sized [1] - 57:11 slide [2] - 5:3, 6:6 Smith [5] - 16:18, 42:22, 43:6, 44:16, 68:15 snuff [1] - 57:21 Soltice [1] - 67:24 Soltis [6] - 26:24, 67:21, 69:11, 69:20, 73:9, 73:11 **SOLTIS** [7] - 68:10, 69:23, 73:13, 73:21, 73:24, 74:2, 74:4

sometimes [1] - 32:10 77:11 States [1] - 22:17 **sorry** [10] - 5:11, 9:12, 28:24, 40:20, 40:22, station [6] - 5:6, 5:7, 41:3, 62:24, 63:2, 5:10, 5:18, 68:18, 66:21, 75:15 sort [2] - 8:8, 28:1 sounds [1] - 14:22 south [1] - 5:6 Southwest [1] - 69:4 **spaces** [1] - 46:2 speaking [1] - 40:19 speaks [2] - 26:6, 45:9 special [3] - 15:24, 16:4, 71:1 specific [5] - 32:21, 38:1, 75:6, 75:10, 75:25 specific-size [1] -75:10 specifically [8] - 9:23, 20:9, 31:25, 33:1, 47:12, 64:6, 64:18, 74:21 specified [2] - 75:11, 80:11 specifies [5] - 18:16, 74:23, 75:12, 75:23, 76:17 specify [1] - 76:14 squeezed [1] - 49:18 ss [1] - 80:1 stacking [1] - 16:16 staff [17] - 7:5, 49:2, 55:4, 55:5, 56:22, 57:1, 57:6, 58:1, 58:2, 58:4, 58:23, 59:3, 59:19, 60:2, 60:25, 62:8 stamped [6] - 48:25, 54:16, 54:17, 56:19, 60:25, 64:10 standard [2] - 48:8, 48:9 standards [1] - 57:21 standing [3] - 15:10, 19:22, 62:13 started [2] - 22:4, 29:12 State [7] - 1:15, 26:25, 73:16, 74:21, 76:13, 80:5, 80:18 **STATE** [1] - 80:1 state [3] - 26:18, 50:2, 69:21 statements [9] - 16:9, 16:12, 49:22, 50:4, 50:13, 52:21, 55:21,

61:6. 61:7

states [5] - 7:10,

14:19, 14:21, 48:21,

75:9 station/fueling[1] -5.18 **stations** [1] - 78:4 Steven [1] - 2:4 still [1] - 62:11 stood [2] - 4:9, 67:15 store [7] - 5:4, 16:2, 16:15, 16:22, 50:17, 56:2, 75:10 stores [1] - 78:4 **stormwater** [1] - 58:10 **Street** [1] - 1:23 **street** [4] - 38:17, 41:19, 59:11, 77:18 **streets** [2] - 44:9, 54:18 stricken [2] - 28:19, 29:21 strictly [1] - 14:24 strike [8] - 13:7, 28:3, 28:21, 28:25, 29:10, 29:23, 30:14, 31:1 **strongly**[1] - 19:16 **structure** [1] - 59:18 **stucco** [1] - 59:5 **stucco-like** [1] - 59:5 studies [3] - 68:25, 74:17, 74:18 study [17] - 39:3, 39:21, 46:16, 46:22, 49:24, 55:19, 69:15, 74:20, 74:24, 76:1, 76:8, 76:9, 77:6, 78:2, 78:6, 78:9, 79:11 stuff [3] - 58:8, 59:20, 65:9 subject [3] - 15:13, 54:21, 58:13 **submit** [3] - 10:24, 19:19, 35:18 submitted [17] - 6:24, 8:10, 11:1, 16:15, 19:7, 19:13, 19:14, 19:20, 33:15, 34:1, 49:1, 53:2, 63:16, 63:20, 64:13, 67:25 **submitting** [1] - 71:2 substance [2] - 8:17, 16:24 substantial [6] -49:10. 50:6. 56:20. 56:22, 64:24, 65:4 sudden [1] - 18:1

sufficient [1] - 38:19

suggests [1] - 65:24 Suite [1] - 14:9 summarize [2] -53:21, 56:14 **summarized** [1] - 53:6 summary [3] - 12:2, 57:23, 69:6 support [7] - 16:7, 16:8, 22:16, 57:24, 59:12, 59:21, 71:2 supported [3] - 53:9, 56:1, 61:16 **supporting** [1] - 10:2 supports [1] - 49:6 supposed [4] - 17:23, 33:24, 49:17, 52:21 surface [1] - 57:18 surrounding [6] -44:9, 59:2, 74:19, 76:4, 76:6, 77:17 **survey** [1] - 56:19 surveyed [1] - 54:16 surveys [1] - 49:1 **sustained** [3] - 43:19, 44:20, 44:25 sworn [1] - 80:7

Т

table [7] - 7:22, 32:19, 47:4, 47:14, 51:9, 64:2. 76:17 tabling [1] - 64:4 taint [1] - 27:16 teach [1] - 73:16 technical [4] - 14:22, 15:7, 19:12, 57:22 ten [3] - 10:5, 29:13, 73:17 term [2] - 15:16, 57:22 terms [6] - 12:3, 19:22, 29:24, 42:1, 58:20, 64:1 testified [3] - 43:8, 44:7, 73:20 testify [6] - 3:2, 26:23, 43:12, 50:17, 64:17, 80:8 testifying [2] - 40:12, 55:12 testimony [27] - 17:5, 26:24, 38:10, 48:24, 50:23, 55:5, 55:8, 55:11, 55:16, 56:2, 57:6, 57:9, 58:5, 58:6, 59:1, 59:3, 59:7, 59:20, 60:3, 60:6, 60:24, 61:1, 67:24, 69:19, 74:8, 78:20, 80:7

themselves [1] - 76:4 thereafter [2] - 52:9, 52:14 therefore [2] - 16:25, 39.15 they've [2] - 11:1, 52:23 thirdly [1] - 12:10 thirty [3] - 9:24, 20:17, 29:14 Thoroughfare [1] -38:2 thoroughfares [1] -54:2 thoughts [1] - 70:8 threat [1] - 66:2 three [5] - 5:18, 42:3, 75:13, 75:14, 75:15 Three [1] - 66:9 throughout [1] - 75:4 Thursday [2] - 1:10, 71:11 thwart [1] - 18:7 timeline [1] - 11:13 timely [1] - 19:13 TIS [1] - 75:25 today [15] - 7:6, 12:2, 22:21, 25:25, 29:23, 31:23, 32:3, 33:14, 36:11, 53:19, 63:16, 63:17, 63:19, 63:21 Todd [1] - 2:8 Tome [1] - 2:6 **TOME** [39] - 3:20, 3:22, 3:24, 4:1, 4:3, 4:5, 24:3, 24:5, 24:7, 24:9. 24:11. 24:13. 25:5, 25:7, 25:9, 25:11, 25:13, 25:15, 31:7, 31:9, 31:11, 31:13, 31:15, 31:17, 67:3, 67:5, 67:7, 67:9, 67:11, 67:13, 68:3, 71:13, 71:15, 71:23, 71:25, 72:2, 72:4, 72:6, 72:8 tonight [1] - 13:11 tonight's [1] - 35:22 Tony [2] - 14:5, 14:8 took [1] - 62:7 totally [1] - 29:20 tractor [3] - 54:11, 54:14. 54:15 tractor-trailer [3] -54:11, 54:14, 54:15 traffic [60] - 16:6, 16:23, 26:21, 38:13,

38:23, 39:2, 39:3,

39:14, 39:16, 39:20, 39:21, 41:16, 41:18, 41:21, 43:22, 44:2, 44:9, 44:11, 44:15, 45:7, 45:8, 46:16, 46:21, 46:22, 47:7, 49:24, 50:3, 50:12, 50:18, 54:5, 54:10, 54:11, 55:9, 55:19, 55:23, 56:3, 56:9, 64:16, 68:16, 68:24, 69:2, 69:11, 69:15, 69:18, 74:15, 74:17, 74:24, 76:1, 76:3, 76:7, 76:9, 77:8, 78:2, 78:6, 78:8, 78:11, 78:21, 78:22, 79:11 trailer [3] - 54:11, 54:14, 54:15 transcribe [1] - 12:16 Transcript [1] - 1:10 transcript [9] - 12:11, 12:12, 12:14, 12:21, 12:22, 12:25, 16:20, 36:23, 65:10 transcripts [1] - 7:1 treat [1] - 14:19 treated [1] - 11:12 treats [1] - 10:10 trees [6] - 6:7, 56:24, 57:4, 57:7, 59:16, 59:19 tribunal [1] - 22:20 tried [1] - 50:19 triggered [2] - 11:8, 28:10 triggers [1] - 11:13 **Trip** [1] - 75:11 trips [5] - 39:8, 39:11, 75:8, 75:13, 75:24 truck [4] - 5:7, 16:22, 68:16, 69:2 trucks [5] - 5:20, 6:9, 16:16, 39:1, 60:4 true [1] - 39:24 truth [3] - 80:8, 80:9 try [4] - 9:10, 47:20, 63:10, 77:6 trying [3] - 18:7, 42:5, 77:4 Tucker [2] - 2:12, 14:8 turn [8] - 25:17, 34:10, 42:2, 42:12, 42:14, 76:25, 77:2, 77:13 turn-in [1] - 42:12 turning [2] - 6:10, 42:3 turns [1] - 77:24 twelve [1] - 75:9 twelve-pump [1] -

75:9 twenty [4] - 74:16, 75:13, 77:3, 78:3 twenty-four [1] - 75:13 twenty-nine [3] -74:16, 77:3, 78:3 two [30] - 5:17, 5:19, 6:5, 6:7, 8:15, 15:8, 16:17, 16:18, 18:13, 19:22, 21:3, 22:1, 26:20, 34:12, 36:11, 44:10, 46:17, 48:3, 48:14, 50:20, 53:5, 57:4, 57:7, 63:9, 64:1, 66:6, 75:15, 75:24, 76:2, 76:17 type [5] - 26:14, 32:22, 35:14, 75:8, 75:21 types [2] - 40:2, 56:17 typical [1] - 5:5 typically [2] - 76:8, 77:17

U

under [17] - 3:2, 15:10,

U.S [1] - 49:21

15:17, 16:9, 18:8, 20:1, 26:1, 34:25, 35:6, 37:2, 48:2, 48:6, 48:14, 52:19, 56:5, 61:24, 64:14 underground [1] -58:10 unforeseen [1] - 51:6 unfounded [1] - 16:14 unintentionally [1] -48:10 United [1] - 22:17 University [2] - 26:25, 73:17 unless [1] - 66:12 unsupported [1] -56.4 **unusual** [1] - 54:22 **up** [11] - 15:14, 16:16, 17:22, 20:4, 20:7, 20:11, 46:20, 50:12, 51:5, 57:21, 61:22 Urban [1] - 26:25 urban [1] - 73:16 uses [8] - 5:11, 18:20, 26:8, 42:25, 55:13, 58:24, 68:13, 68:14

V

VACANTI [35] - 13:15, 13:19, 13:22, 14:1, 14:4, 20:14, 20:17,

34:6, 34:13, 34:16, 34:24, 40:10, 43:3, 43:11, 43:16, 44:14, 47:20, 47:23, 53:20, 53:23, 60:17, 62:17, 65:15, 65:20, 68:2, 68:5, 69:7, 73:2, 78:15, 79:7, 79:13, 79:16 Vacanti [12] - 2:12, 6:21, 13:13, 14:5, 14:8, 32:12, 33:24, 44:10, 45:5, 64:3, 67:21, 73:9 vacanti [1] - 67:1 vacanti's [1] - 33:13 value [2] - 50:9, 50:12 values [1] - 44:4 variance [6] - 9:20, 23:7, 26:9, 30:9, 30:10, 33:5 variances [18] - 5:15, 6:1, 6:2, 12:4, 14:19, 17:12, 17:14, 17:15, 17:19, 23:1, 30:5. 51:10, 52:7, 52:12, 64:4, 64:21, 64:24, various [3] - 74:18, 74:23, 78:7 vehicle [1] - 5:6 vehicles [2] - 75:16, 75:22 vehicular [2] - 54:4, 54:18 vicinity [1] - 55:14 visibility [1] - 16:7 volume [1] - 75:22 **volumes** [1] - 45:9 vote [2] - 27:13, 65:6 vote's [1] - 27:18 voted [1] - 28:8

27:10, 27:21, 30:16,

W

wait [2] - 34:10, 64:24

21:25, 52:20, 52:23,

waived [6] - 21:15,

53:1, 65:8

walk [2] - 49:5, 53:11

walked [2] - 60:23,
61:15

walking [2] - 33:21,
63:22

watching [1] - 65:18

website [3] - 63:17,
63:18, 63:21

welcome [1] - 66:5

welfare [1] - 61:20

West [2] - 68:15 WHEREOF [1] - 80:13 whim [1] - 46:18 whole [1] - 80:8 width [3] - 5:21, 6:4, 42:7 Williams [7] - 2:2, 4:1, 24:7, 25:7, 31:7, 67:11, 72:4 WILLIAMS [17] - 3:13, 4:2, 23:19, 24:8, 25:2, 25:8, 30:25, 31:8, 66:16, 67:12, 70:9, 70:19, 70:22, 71:10, 71:14, 71:16, 72:5 willing [1] - 38:20 WITNESS [1] - 80:13 witnesses [3] - 16:11, 17:5, 26:20 workability [1] - 42:1 works [1] - 64:22 world [1] - 32:11 worried [1] - 40:6 writing [1] - 18:24 written [5] - 8:23, 11:5, 21:5, 28:9, 56:17

Υ

year [1] - 23:4 years [6] - 29:12, 29:13, 29:14, 73:18, 74:16, 78:3 years' [1] - 77:4 yourself [1] - 13:21 yourselves [1] - 34:22

Ζ

Z25-09 [3] - 1:5, 3:5, 4:14 **zero** [2] - 16:7, 46:15 **ZONING** [1] - 1:4 zoning [16] - 5:2, 5:8, 5:11, 5:12, 5:24, 7:11, 7:17, 21:21, 23:8, 26:11, 26:16, 31:2, 31:25, 48:15, 51:22, 73:22 **Zoning** [15] - 1:12, 2:8, 2:10, 6:2, 6:5, 6:17, 8:13, 9:16, 10:15, 19:3, 23:6, 23:21, 28:23, 29:1, 64:25