

VILLAGE OF YELLOW SPRINGS
PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING

Council Chambers

Tuesday, March 10, 2026 @ 6PM.

lague of Yellow Springs Planning Commission will meet in regular session on Tuesday, March 10, 2026 @ 6PM.

The meeting will be broadcast live via Channel 5 Community Access cable station, which is simultaneously shown on the Village's "Community Access Yellow Springs" YouTube station. For any questions, contact the Council Clerk at clerk@yso.com or at 937-767-9126.

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

NOMINATIONS AND VOTE FOR CHAIR

NOMINATIONS AND VOTE FOR VICE-CHAIR

REVIEW OF AGENDA

REVIEW OF MINUTES

1. [Minutes of November 11, 2025 Regular Meeting](#)

COMMUNICATIONS

The Clerk will receive and file:

[Sue Pfeiffer re: Purchase of Lot](#)

COUNCIL AND COMMITTEE REPORTS

Active Transportation Committee
Council

CITIZEN COMMENTS

PUBLIC HEARINGS

[Replat](#) – Kim Baldwin on behalf of the Robert Baldwin Family Trust, property owner of 126-138 Dayton Street, Yellow Springs, has submitted an [application](#) for a replat. Zoning district B-1, Central Business District. Greene County Parcel IDs: #F19000100110022800, -22900, -23300, -23400, -23500, -30600

OLD BUSINESS

NEW BUSINESS

AGENDA PLANNING

ADJOURNMENT

Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes

In Council Chambers @ 6:00pm

Tuesday, November 11, 2025

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:01 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Planning Commission members present were Susan Stiles, Chair, Stephen Green, Gary Zaremsky, Gavin DeVore Leonard and Scott Osterholm. Also present were Meg Leatherman, Planning and Economic Development Director, and Village Solicitor Amy Blankenship.

REVIEW OF AGENDA

There were no changes made.

REVIEW OF MINUTES

1. Minutes of September 9, 2025 Regular Meeting

Stiles MOVED TO APPROVE the Minutes of the September 9, 2025 Regular Planning Commission meeting. Osterholm SECONDED, and the MOTION PASSED 5-0 ON A VOICE VOTE.

COMMUNICATIONS

Guy Glass re: Objection to Expansion of Spring Meadows
Andrea and Mark Paulos re: Objection to Expansion of Spring Meadows
Eric Clark re: Separate HOA for Phases III and IV
Greco-Castronovas re: Separate HOA for Phases III and IV
Alison Szkody re: Separate HOA for Phases III and IV
Jeff Szkody re: Separate HOA for Phases III and IV
Pamela Nelson re: Separate HOA for Phases III and IV
Heather Hughes re: Separate HOA for Phases III and IV
Keith and Theresa Mefford re: Separate HOA for Phases III and IV
Jackie and Scott Skiples re: Separate HOA for Phases III and IV
Rick and Kathy Sanders re: Specific Objections to Spring Meadows Expansion
Lacey Fox re: Specific Objections to Spring Meadows Expansion
Kami Berkey re: Specific Objections to Spring Meadows Expansion
John Search re: AirBNB Regulation
Matthew Raska re: Reduce Zoning Regulation
Chris Bongorno re: Active Transportation Committee Recommendations for Spring Meadows Expansion

Stiles reviewed communications.

COUNCIL AND COMMITTEE REPORTS

Active Transportation Committee. Zaremsky referenced a letter from the Active Transportation Committee, noting that the recommendations they had made regarding the Spring Meadows expansion had been included in the Staff Recommendations.

Zaremsky commented that sidewalk clearing efforts have been successful and that only five areas of the village remain to be addressed.

Council. DeVore Leonard presented Council information as follows:

On 9/15/25, Council heard a first reading of an ordinance accepting annexation of 28.3 acres—the property on which the preliminary plat you will hear tonight is to be located. The annexation was passed on 10/6. 10/6/2025: Council passed annexation of 28.3 acres. First reads of the text amendments recommended to Council were also heard.

On 10/20/2025: Council passed all but one of the proposed text amendments. The amendment that did not pass was regarding changing the method of measuring distance between TGLs. At that meeting Anthony Salmonson was nominated and voted in as Planning Commission alternate.

CITIZEN COMMENTS

There were no comments made.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Stiles swore in those present intending to comment or provide testimony during the hearings.

Right-of-Way Vacation: John Hudson, property owner of 212 West Whiteman Street, Lot 182 of Yellow Springs Original subdivision, has submitted an application for a vacation of unused alley located along the east property line. Medium Density Residential (R-B). Greene County Parcel #F19000100090006800.

After noting compliance with a noticing requirements, Leatherman introduced the hearing as follows:

Jon Hudson, the applicant and property owner, has submitted a Right-of-Way Vacation request seeking to vacate an existing public alley located along the west portion of his property. The alley has not functioned as a public right-of-way for several decades; today, a portion is encumbered by a permanent structure, while the remainder serves as a private driveway for the residence.

Historical research indicates that a vacation of this alley was attempted between the 1950s and 1960s, as reflected in multiple legally recorded deeds. However, after review by Village staff, the Clerk of Council, and a licensed professional surveyor, there is no record of formal Village Council action approving the vacation. As such, the alley remains officially dedicated public right-of-way. The property owner intends to pursue a replat of his property to correct boundary lines and legal descriptions; however, that process cannot proceed until the alley is formally vacated by Village Council action.

There are three property owners adjoining the alley and they have all authorized submittal of the application, as provided for with the signed petition included with the application.

The Village Public Works Director has reviewed the request and has no objections, noting that the alley cannot function as a public access corridor due to the existing structure within the right-of-way and has effectively been treated as private property for many years. The proposed vacation would resolve longstanding title ambiguities and align the legal condition with existing physical and functional use.

Green received confirmation regarding the location of the alley, and that an existing shed is constructed into the alley.

Jon Hudson remarked that he wants to leave the property to his sister in good standing. He stated that he has had the property surveyed, and that is when the fact that the alley is not vacated came about.

Leatherman noted that a petition signed by neighboring property owners indicates that none have a problem with vacation of the alley.

Stiles OPENED THE PUBLIC HEARING. There being no comment, Stiles CLOSED THE PUBLIC HEARING.

Osterholm MOVED TO APPROVE THE ALLEY VACATION REQUEST. Zaremsky SECONDED, and the MOTION PASSED 5-0 ON A ROLL CALL VOTE.

Preliminary Plat, Major Subdivision: DDC Management LLC, on behalf of CF Land Holdings LLC, has submitted a Major Subdivision-Preliminary Plat application at 4359 East Enon Road on 28.30 acres for a total of 190 dwelling units and 2.80 acres of open space, to be built in multiple phases. Chapter 1226 Subdivision Regulations, Chapter 1248 Residential Districts. High Density Residential (R-C). Greene County Parcel #F16000100060001000.

After noting compliance with a noticing requirements, Leatherman introduced the hearing as follows:

DDC Management LLC, on behalf of CF Land Holdings LLC, has submitted a Major Subdivision – Preliminary Plat application for the development of Spring Meadows Extension, located at 4359 E. Enon Road. The petitioned subdivision encompasses 28.30 acres within the High Density Residential District (R-C) and proposes a total of 190 dwelling units to be constructed in two phases. Although phased development is anticipated, the entire Preliminary Plat is under Planning Commission consideration at this time. The project yields an overall density of 6.7 dwelling units per acre, consistent with the R-C District standards.

A total of 120 of the proposed dwelling units are in the attached single-family product type — consisting of twelve (12) structures with ten (10) units each — while the remaining 70 units are detached single-family homes on individual lots.

Leatherman noted that the Preliminary Plat provides 5.384 acres of public open space, exceeding the minimum requirement of 2.85.

Leatherman addressed a question from Stiles, stating that the area inside of the parking area shown was included in the open space calculation.

Leatherman noted that Miami Township Fire Rescue has reviewed the plan and has requested that there be no on-street parking in the figure-eight private drive area which will serve the attached single-family units.

Responding to a question from Stiles, Leatherman stated that she has requested that the entirety of the private drive be a no parking zone.

Leatherman stated that Choice One has reviewed the submitted traffic study and had some requests for adjustments. The traffic study indicates that, based upon a projected additional 1,675 trips per day, there will be “minimal impact” on the adjacent roadway (East Enon) since the road will continue to operate within acceptable LOS-A-C performance standards.

Choice One reviewed the stormwater plans and overall design, Leatherman said.

Leatherman corrected an error in the staff report, clarifying that the required number of parking spaces is 240, and the number shown in the preliminary plat plan is 222.

Leatherman stated that the majority of letters received regarding the plat plan requested a separate Homeowners Association Agreement (HOA) for this phase of the Spring Meadows project.

Leatherman added a subdivider's agreement to the conditions of approval, to be added prior to approval of the Final Plat.

Leatherman explained that pursuant to approval of the Preliminary Plat and associated public improvement plans, the applicant will be authorized to commence construction of required public infrastructure, including but not limited to curb and gutter, sidewalks, utilities, internal public streets, dedicated open space areas, and mailbox kiosks. Upon substantial completion of public improvements, and after final inspection and acceptance by the Village Public Works Department and the Village's civil engineering consultant (Choice One), a Final Plat will be submitted to the Planning Commission and Village Council for review and approval in accordance with VC Chapter 1226.

John Bills, President of DDC Management, addressed the project, stating that the plan is for Fischer Homes to build Phases III and IV.

Bills addressed the requests made for a separate HOA. He indicated openness to a separate HOA, explaining that this would be a "master HOA" which would take care of the common space, ponds, etc., and there would be a second entity or sub-association for the condos, which will include more service provision. Condo residents would be required to participate in both the HOA and the sub-association.

Bills stated that a second Master Association could be formed if that is the desire of current residents of Phases I and II.

Responding to a question from Zaremsky, Bills opined that if in the future the entities wished to combine into a single HOA this could legally be done, but would require 75% approval, making it unlikely.

Stiles asked that DDC conduct a survey to determine whether separate HOAs are truly a majority desire. Her suggestion received a nod from Bills.

Bills stated that Fischer Homes will construct the condos, which will be two-story townhomes with ten units per townhome.

Bills acknowledged Active Transportation Committee's request for an intermodal path along East Enon, but suggested that perhaps DDC could make a donation to such a path, since if it is constructed by DDC it will end just north of the development.

Bills addressed the "no parking on the private drive" issue, stating that he understood the request from MTRF to apply only to the "pinch point". He commented that he would like to be able to have parking along one side of the drive 200 feet out from the intersection.

Bills responded to a Green's request for additional parking spots, stating that he will work with the engineer to increase parking.

Responding to a question from Stiles, Bills stated that none of the units are designated as "affordable," but will be market-rate.

Bills could not assign a projected cost to the units. He said that DDC does not sell the units; that is done by the builder. He explained that more amenities drive up cost.

Stiles continued to press for affordable units. Bills suggested public/private partnerships and tax abatements as possibilities.

Leatherman commented that the condos do add a lower price point option to the housing market.

Stiles asked whether a second entrance off of East Enon could be added.

Bills responded that there is a second access through Phases I and II, adding that a second entrance off of East Enon would not improve traffic flow unless it connected internally to the condos. That, he said, is counter to the desire to limit traffic flow to the condos as a safety feature.

Stiles inquired about a second playground, and was informed that Phases III and IV would feature a garden area as more responsive to the target demographic.

Bills responded to Green, stating that the floorplan for the condos has been determined.

Bills responded positively to Osterholm, who asked that Fischer Homes endeavor to hire local contractors.

DeVore Leonard received confirmation that a final decision regarding separation of Phases I-II from Phases III-IV in terms of their HOA agreements could be done at a later point.

The Active Transportation Committee has requested the installation of a 10' multi-modal path along the E. Enon Rd property frontage and Village Code 1226.06(a)(3) requires sidewalks along all public roads. Therefore, a condition of approval is suggested for the Planning Commission to consider.

Bills expressed willingness to separate the HOAs if a majority of residents indicated this as their desire.

DeVore Leonard spoke to the expressed desire for affordable housing, stating that Council has not amended the zoning code to respond to this desire, but that he anticipates this happening once the new Council is seated.

Blankenship explained the nature of a TIF and its potential benefit to the community.

DeVore Leonard explained further how tools such as TIF could be used to assist or encourage affordable units.

Leatherman stressed that the Zoning Code will have to be updated to use some of these tools.

Zaremsky noted suggestions made by Active Transportation as follows:

- Widen the sidewalk between lots 63/63 and 78/80 to 10 feet; and
- Provide a 10 foot wide path in the south-west corner of the development, south of lot 81, connecting the private drive within the development to the E. Enon Road sidewalk

Brad Warnock with Choice One stated that Choice One had reviewed the Traffic Impact Study. He referenced the earlier request for a second entrance on East Enon Road, stating that Choice One had concluded that a second entrance/egress point is not warranted and might indeed reduce the level of service if added.

Green asserted that the traffic study “had been done in one day”, asking if that was normal.

Warnock explained that it is normal in a projected scenario such as this one, in which the development is not built.

DeVore Leonard pressed Warnock to explain Choice One’s position in more detail.

Warnock stated that the development should be viewed as a whole, which then provides three access points. He explained that trip generation was then created for each access point. The test is then to determine whether the trip generation shows any of the access points dropping a minimal standard of “C”.

Warnock affirmed for DeVore Leonard that Choice One sees no need for additional access points, determining that, as it is currently conceived, the subdivision should not negatively impact traffic flow.

Warnock noted a website maintained by ODOT is readily available, which generates information regarding daily traffic flow in any given area.

Stiles noted concern regarding stormwater drainage.

Warnock stated that Choice One does not address groundwater and that their purview is the proper management of runoff.

Bills addressed the groundwater question, stating that groundwater has to be managed by property owners, normally through use of sump pumps.

Stiles OPENED THE PUBLIC HEARING.

All speakers affirmed having been sworn in.

Eric Clark spoke in favor of an additional access point on East Enon and in favor of a multi modal path.

Guy Glass stated that Kenneth Hamilton “is terrible”. He complained of water problems in his yard, stating that “nothing is ever done about it.”

Mike Reynolds asked for a separate HOA and for a separate name for Phases III and IV.

Tammy Fox agreed with Reynolds and asked for a crosswalk across Dayton Street to the multi-modal path.

Maddie Fitch supported the priority of affordable housing. Regarding traffic, she stated that vehicles travel very fast on East Enon and asked whether the multi modal path could be extended to East Enon.

Rick Sanders addressed the number of units being considered, stating that it was “not plausible” that there will not be a negative traffic impact. He spoke disparagingly of DDC and stated that the development is not in line with the Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

Stiles CLOSED THE PUBLIC HEARING.

Stiles asked whether there was any way to negotiate with the developer to increase the number of affordable units, expressing frustration that what the developer is doing is permissible per the current zoning code.

Stiles asked that conditions be added to approval that, based upon a survey showing the desire for same, that a second HOA be created for Phases III and IV.

Bills stated willingness to do this if a survey warrants.

Leatherman modified condition eight, and PC members walked through the conditions of approval resulting in the eleven conditions listed below:

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

- 1- Prior to approval of the first building permit, obtain approval from the Zoning Administrator of a landscape plan for the entire development per the subdivision code section 1226.06(9). Include screening and landscaping for the garbage enclosure, mail kiosk areas, bicycle racks, and open space lots.
- 2- Include 60 bicycle parking spaces within the multi-family area, depict the location of these on the landscape plan.
- 3- Incorporate a 10 ft wide sidewalk along E. Enon Road for the entirety of the development frontage.
- 4- Incorporate a 10 ft wide sidewalk in the south-west corner of the development, south of lot 81, connecting the private drive within the development with E. Enon Road.
- 5- Prior to approval of the first building permit, obtain approval from the Zoning Administrator for the location of a temporary dumpster location for phase 1.
- 6- Parking lot construction to be approved by the Zoning Administrator before a certificate of occupancy is issued and the parking lot is used (VC 1264.03).
- 7- Obtain final approval from Village Public Works and Choice One Engineering of the Stormwater Management Plan, Traffic Impact Study, and Construction Plans prior to commencing construction.
- 8- Provide signage along Private Drive to restrict on-street parking at the pinch point and 200 feet in each direction.
- 9- Prior to approval of final plat execute Subdivider's Agreement.
- 10- DDC engage with current Phase I and II residents to determine need for separate HOA agreements.
- 11- Ensure as close to 240 off-street parking spaces as possible for multi-family parking area.

Stiles CLOSED THE PUBLIC HEARING.

Osterholm MOVED to APPROVE THE PRELIMINARY PLAT PLAN AS SUBMITTED WITH THE CONDITIONS AS OUTLINED (above). Green SECONDED, and the MOTION PASSED 5-0 ON A ROLL CALL VOTE.

OLD BUSINESS

There was no Old Business.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no New Business.

AGENDA PLANNING

Stiles and Osterholm thanked Leatherman for her work with Planning Commission.

Leatherman noted no items currently.

Stiles expressed a desire to revisit the Zoning Code to increase affordable housing.

ADJOURNMENT

At 7:51pm, Osterholm MOVED and Green SECONDED a MOTION TO ADJOURN. The MOTION PASSED 5-0 ON A VOICE VOTE.

Susan Stiles, Chair

Attest: Judy Kintner, Clerk

Please note: These minutes are not verbatim. A DVD copy of the meeting is available at the Yellow Springs Library during regular Library hours, and in the Clerk of Council's office between 9 and 3 Monday through Friday.

From: [Susan Pfeiffer](#)
To: [Judy Kintner, Clerk of Council](#)
Subject: Possible Green Space Property
Date: Monday, November 10, 2025 11:57:05 AM

You don't often get email from gretakee@hotmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

I am requesting the review by Planning Commission or Village Council the following:
Property on corner of Livermore and E. North College is currently for sale thru Dunphy Realty. Antioch College is owner, I believe.

Consider Village purchasing this property as Green Space. It has a small parking lot on one end which could be expanded for overflow parking for new Senior Center or for pending apartment complex. The remainder could remain green space.

The lot has several mature trees and would make an excellent small park in the neighborhood.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sue Pfeiffer

Yellow Springs resident

Sent from my Galaxy

— Public Notice —
**PUBLIC HEARING
PLANNING COMMISSION**

VILLAGE OF YELLOW SPRINGS, OHIO

Notice is hereby given that:



Replat — Kim Baldwin on behalf of the Robert Baldwin Family Trust, property owner of 126-138 Dayton St of Yellow Springs, has submitted an application for a replat — R-1, Central Business District. Greene County Parcel IDs: #F19000100110022800, -22900, -23300, -23400, -23500, -30600

**A PUBLIC HEARING WILL BE HELD ON THIS PETITION BY THE
VILLAGE OF YELLOW SPRINGS PLANNING COMMISSION ON:**

DATE: Tuesday, March 10, 2026 **TIME:** 6 p.m.
LOCATION: John Bryan Center, Second Floor
Council Chambers, 100 Dayton St.

This notice provides you and every other interested party the opportunity to have input at the hearing. You may express your views in writing for inclusion in the record of the hearing by providing a copy to the Clerk of Council at clerk@yellowsprings.gov, or by calling 937-767-9126. Please submit your letter by no later than Thursday, March 5th, 2026 for inclusion in the Commission packet; however, all letters received any time prior to the hearing will be provided to the Commission members and the Zoning Administrator. The applications, as prepared by the petitioners, may be examined at the office of the Zoning Administrator on the 2nd floor of the Bryan Community Center, 100 Dayton Street, Yellow Springs, Ohio 45387 or on the Village website at www.yellowsprings.gov after Friday, March 6, 2026. Questions regarding the applications, zoning code or procedures may be directed to the Zoning Administrator Aaron Arcellano, phone (937) 767-3401 or by email aaron.arcellano@yellowsprings.gov.



The Village of

YELLOW SPRINGS

— PLANNING & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT —

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Liz Fields, AICP – Planning & Zoning Contractor

REPORT DATE: March 5, 2026

MEETING DATE: March 10, 2026


RE: PC02-2026 – Re-Plat – 126,128,132,134,136,138 Dayton St. – Robert F. Baldwin Jr

SUMMARY

The applicant, Choice One Engineering, submitted a Re-Plat Application (Exhibit A) to consolidate six existing lots to three new lots. The properties involved are zoned Central Business (B-1). The parcel numbers are as follows:

Parcel IDs: F19000100110022800, -22900, -23300, -23400, - 23500, -30600

Section 1226.12(b)(3) allows for the approval of a re-plat by the Zoning Administrator with formal action by the Planning Commission for proposed replats which create an uncommon lot configuration upon review of additional criteria specified in Section 1226.06(a)(6).



Submitted Plat

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

ZONING DISTRICT: Central Business (B-1)

APPLICANT: Choice One Engineering

PROPERTY OWNER: Robert Baldwin Jr Inter Vivos Trust

REQUESTED ACTION: PC02-2026 – Re-Plat – 126,128,132,134,136,138 Dayton St. – Robert F. Baldwin Jr

PARCEL IDS: F19000100110022800, -22900, -23300, -23400, - 23500, -30600

PUBLIC NOTICE: Adjoining property owners were mailed a notice on February 23, 2026 (Exhibit C), and a notice was published in the YS News on February 27, 2026 (Exhibit D).

APPLICABLE CODE & STAFF FINDINGS

1226.06 DESIGN STANDARDS

(6) **Lots.** Every lot shall abut on a street and double frontage lots shall be avoided except where such lots will reduce curb cuts on heavily traveled thoroughfares. Area, dimensions, and layout of lots shall be in conformity with the Village of Yellow Springs Zoning Code. Uncommon lot configurations may be incorporated into a development where such division poses no apparent nuisance, and the Commission deems it appropriate. Approval of such lots shall be granted upon review of the following additional criteria:

- A. Adequate access to such lots is provided and poses no nuisance to adjoining lots. Adequate access shall accommodate emergency needs, parking and any other requirements specific to the location.

Findings: The replat is proposed to rectify an existing uncommon lot configuration to create three lots, each of which have access to Dayton Street and provide adequate access. It is not anticipated that the replat will pose a nuisance to adjoining lots.

- B. The relation to the adjoining lots is acceptable in that required setbacks can be maintained, adequate privacy is preserved and apparent nuisances (light, noise) are avoided.

Findings: The replat will result in the creation of lots that are further in line with the configuration of adjoining lots without having an impact on the privacy of adjoining lots or creating a nuisance.

- C. A minimum frontage of twenty feet shall be required for all lots

Findings: The lots all provide a minimum frontage of twenty feet.

- D. Uncommon lot configurations must be approved by the Planning Commission.

Findings: Staff believes the criteria listed above in Section 1226.06(a)(6) are met.

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Commission should consider the replat with the conditions outlined in Section 1226.06(a)(6). Staff recommends APPROVAL of the proposed replat.

Sincerely,

Liz Fields, AICP

Planning & Zoning Contractor

Village of Yellow Springs

EXHIBIT LIST:

Exhibit A – Application

Exhibit B – Submitted Plat

Exhibit C – Neighbor Notice

Exhibit D – YS News Public Notice



Permit Application: Re-plat

Planning & Zoning Department
100 Dayton St, 2nd Floor
Yellow Springs, OH 45387
(937) 767-1702

[FOR OFFICE USE ONLY]

Permit #: 2026-20

Application Received: 2-5-26

Applicant and Owner Information

Property Address:	126, 128, <u>132, 134, 136 & 138 Dayton St</u>		
Applicant Name:	Choice One Engineering	Phone:	937-497-0200
Applicant Address:	2633 Campbell Rd, Sidney, Ohio 45363		
Owner Name:	<u>Robert F Baldwin Jr Inter Vivos Trust</u>	Phone:	<u>937-631-1447</u>
Owner Address:	<u>PO Box 848 Yellow Springs, Ohio 45387</u>	Email:	<u>Kim Baldwin 9598@yahoo.com</u> <u>Kim Baldwin Co Trustee</u>

Property Information

Parcel ID(s):	F19000100110022800, -22900, -23300, -23400, -23500, -30600,		
Zoning District:	B-1, Central Business	Number of Lots:	6 existing lots to 3 new lots

Procedural Information

- "Re-plat" means the recombining of land parcels or lots that result in the same or fewer number of total parcels or lots that conform to current minimum size requirements.
- Approval Process varies per Village Code 1226.12 (*see page 2 for details*).
 - Approval of a re-plat by the *Zoning Administrator*, without formal action by the Commission, may be granted if a submitted record plan meets all of the conditions in Chapter 1226.12 (a);
OR
 - Approval of a re-plat by the *Zoning Administrator*, with formal action by the *Planning Commission*, may be granted if a submitted record plan meets all of the conditions in Chapter 1226.12 (a) (1)-(2) and (b).
- After approval, the re-plat *shall be submitted by the applicant* to the Greene County Recorder for incorporation into the Official Tax Map records within ninety days.

I hereby certify, under penalty of perjury, that all the information provided on this application is true and correct.

Applicant Signature: Wendy D. [Signature] Date: 2/3/2026

Owner Signature: Kim Baldwin Co Successor Trustee Date: 2/4/2026

Owner Signature: _____ Date: _____

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

Date filed: <u>2-5-26</u>	Fee * \$ _____	Fee ** \$ <u>125</u> Paid 2/5
<u>AS</u>	* Fee Paid at \$25 if, under 1226.12(a)(1)-(2), no action is required by Planning Commission	** Fee Paid at \$25 + \$100.00 if, under 1226.12(a)(1)-(2), action is required by Planning Commission
Approved by Zoning Administrator? ☐ Yes	PC Hearing Date: <u>Mar 10 26</u>	Case #: <u>PC02-2026</u>
PC Action Taken	Approved ☐ Denied ☐ Modification ☐ None ☐	
Total \$	Zoning Official Name and Title	Date