

Committee members, please let Dick Meister know if you will attend the meeting so we can determine if a quorum is present so we can conduct business.

**General Code Committee  
Regular Meeting  
Monday, August 21, at 7:00 p.m. online via Zoom**

The zoom meeting will be held at the website: <https://depaul.zoom.us/j/97550510882>

or by phone: 312 626 6799 or +1 470 250 9358 or +1 720 928 9299

**Agenda:**

1. Approval of minutes of August meeting
2. Update on the progress of our recent recommendations
3. Old Business:

Review of recommendations on 'fines and penalties,' See questions and responses (in red below).

71.99 Ken raised the question of reference to a court conviction, should we not worry about that since it was not raised in the current working of the code?

**Not to Worry but see comments below**

In a number of sections throughout the code, where reference to penalties are listed as referring to the penalty at end of the section and this in turn makes reference to 10.99: for example - 72.01 (C)5 refers to penalty 70.99 and that in turns refers to 10.99. Should be directly reference all of these instead directly to 10.99. **YES** It also occurs dealing with penalties under 71.99. Also in Section 73, traffic schedules. In Section 74 Schedule III and IV have no penalty listed, no reference to 71.99 or 10.99. **To help simplify things, everything listed as a penalty in sections 71-74 should refer back to 10.99. It needs to be pointed out that these fines or the proposed changes are not currently being applied since our police department is currently using a State Dictated Traffic Fine Structure. Our Town Marshal, Jim Reader, wanted to leave this section in place just in case somewhere in the future the town and or Town Marshal wanted to go back to a Town Ordinance Related Fine Structure**

I can live with keeping those references to 70.99 and 71.99 etc., , realizing that this in turn refers to 10.99. It may make it difficult over the longer term, the double referencing.

**If there is an easier way of referring back to 10.99 I have no objections. Hopefully people will eventually understand that almost every fine listed in the ordinances refer back to the general fine 10.99**

See 91.99 It makes reference to Court and also to \$25, do we wish to change that to \$50.

**It should simply refer back to 10.99**

In section 92.99 are we simply replacing 10.99 for the current language (A) and (B)?

**YES**

Are we missing something if we drop the current wording?

**I don't believe so**

93.99. I think we should keep current language in that it involves other enforcers (planning, building etc). Also it includes (D) attorney fees and (E).

**This may require some additional discussion. While any related fine in this chapter can refer back to 10.99 if the current language is left in place it seems that who the enforcer(s) is (are) needs to be better defined. The way the ordinance is currently written anyone on any of the listed committees can go around and give out fines.**

94.99 again many references to penalties listed under 94.99 which in turn refers to 10.99.

**Yes it does**

96.99 Makes reference to employees and non employees. Are we missing something if we drop reference to employee?

**I would simply have it refer back to 10:99 where it would apply to ALL and not employee/non-employee**

Although beyond the scope of these code changes is 70.04 that lists the cost of car plates at \$10. Are we still selling O.D. car plates?

**I checked with Jean Manna Yes and they are still the same price**

#### 4. New Business –

1. Is there or should there be a limit on the number of pets, especially dogs, that can be housed in any one residence (When does a house become a kennel) ?
2. Is there or should there be an ordinance of hanging laundry regularly on a balcony or a clothes line in front of a home?
3. Another possible item for discussion is revisiting the issue of having Council Members elected by wards.

#### 5. Residents' remarks

#### 6. Next meeting scheduled for October 19, 2020.