

MINUTES

ANN ARBOR CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING

7:00 p.m. – July 20, 2010

Time: Chair Mahler called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Place: Guy C. Larcom, Jr. Municipal Building, 100 North Fifth Avenue, Second Floor, Council Chamber, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Bona, Carlberg, Giannola, Mahler, Pratt, Westphal, Woods

Members Absent: Briggs

Arriving Members: Derezinski

Staff Present: Kahan, Rampson

INTRODUCTIONS

Susan Pollay, DDA Executive Director, explained how they arrived at the recommendations for Payment in Lieu of Parking Policy. The DDA has been managing parking since 1992. The recommendations for the proposed policy came from early parking contracts with the City that have worked well. She noted, however, the DDA does not actively pursue parking contracts and has tried to stay away from contracted permit parking. The DDA's role has been to assist the City in framing how parking requirements could be met through a parking contract in specific developments. The City establishes parking minimums, through the site plan process, outlining terms and conditions for each project for as long as they deem necessary.

Pollay stated the DDA is recommending that the City Council follow allow the language to be flexible enough so that developers are tied to the Payment in Lieu of Parking only as long as the City policy requires them to be. She explained that across the country, these types of Payment in Lieu of Parking policies are set up in various ways; often the developer pays a contribution, much like a parks contribution. She said they have explored this contribution idea and it still leaves the unanswered requirement of how the DDA is going to meet the parking needs of the tenant, since the tenant now becomes faced with having to pay separate parking after the developer has already paid into the system.

Pollay explained that the DDA is recommending that City Council do what it has already done by portioning the contribution through smaller monthly payments instead of an upfront large payment, more like a monthly surcharge. She added that the monthly surcharge would escalate in accordance with inflation. She noted that the DDA views the parking surcharge as an investment in the system, whether for repairs to the existing system, potential future parking spaces or for the transportation system as a whole.

Pollay clarified that the DDA is recommending that the Council in the future do something that they haven't done previously; look at the *need* and *want* spaces. She explained that the *need* spaces are the parking spaces that are required under the site plan (through the City's zoning ordinance) and the *want* spaces are all

the other spaces that they would like to have associated with their project. The DDA is recommending that the two types of spaces be divided into two separate contracts which will allow more flexibility.

Pollay concluded by saying the DDA is recommending that the surcharge dollars come back to the DDA for a transportation-centered fund for upkeep of the existing parking system, as well as the transit system as a whole. She noted that the DDA Board approved these recommendations at their July meeting, and that she is looking for input from the Commission if you feel that we are moving in the direction that the A2D2 Committee had intended.

Bona expressed confusion that the DDA would come up with the recommendation of forced spaces. She didn't believe the Commission had interpreted these premium parking spaces as *need* spaces, and when we force the developers to buy permits for spaces in the system, they no longer have an incentive to look into alternatives. She thought that the Payment in Lieu policy would be a payment towards the system, and the inflexibility surprised her.

Pollay explained that she was attempting to show how the Parking in Lieu policy would only affect the required spaces as defined under the site plan.

Carlberg referred to the two developments that currently have this type of contract in place and asked for clarification on the difference in demand and use.

Pollay stated that the Cornerhouse Lofts is a residential use, and they see less frequency with the car usage in that project, while in the McKinley project there is much more of permit demand for commercial tenants and their customers.

Carlberg inquired where the tenants of the Cornerhouse Lofts are parking; if they are forced to find parking in their neighborhoods.

Pollay responded that anecdotally, yes, and since we are a small town people are forced to work with their neighbors or use Craig's List to try to find parking in someone's backyard or possibly even going without a car.

Carlberg questioned the DDA's comment that they believed the pilot program would work with a 20% surcharge. She asked for clarification if that makes financial sense.

Pollay explained that they currently have a \$ 30.00 monthly surcharge, but the Committee feels it would work better to use it as a percentage of the monthly costs that were adopted by City Council, rather than go back to the Council every year as the City does with its fees.

Carlberg asked if costs were still below the total costs of providing or building the parking space.

Pollay responded that the cost to build is more than what is being recommended but that most of the spaces are already paid for and this proposal is having them pay over market value for upkeep and maintenance of the existing facilities, as well as an investment into the overall system.

Westphal asked who had completed the research presented on best practices that was associated with the recommended policy.

Pollay noted that Planning had done the research from case studies and provided it to the DDA.

Westphal inquired if anyone required a lump sum payment instead of monthly permits.

Rampson indicated that in the few studies cases that did include lump sums, the contributions were very small.

Pollay cited recommendations from Nelson – Nygaard parking study that it would be most beneficial to pull as many resources as possible into a public system to make it more advantageous for downtown developers.

Westphal asked if it would be more attractive to developers to pay towards a parking system.

Pollay stated that she wasn't sure, but believed that for the developers who had larger parcels, it would be more attractive for them to build the parking themselves, but for the ones who had smaller parcels, this proposal might be more beneficial to them.

Westphal asked of any known restrictions or if the DDA would feel that their hands were tied with spending the 20% surcharge funds if it would go towards an overall transportation system that extends outside of the DDA boundaries.

Pollay remarked that the DDA had been managing parking, which extended outside of the DDA district, since 1992 and that they were committed to transit. She stated that there were no restrictions to the DDA, but the city attorney would need to further review if the Payment in Lieu of Parking could go toward the transportation system in general or if it needs to specifically go to parking.

Woods asked if there were disadvantages, that they had found in their studies, for residents who lived downtown and inquired how the recommendations would work for them.

Pollay explained that they would be guaranteed a space in a facility, but it wouldn't be assigned specifically to them. Most areas in the City don't have enough parking for their residents or tenants and they are then forced to find that necessary parking in public areas, whether on streets or in parking structures.

Woods asked if they had information on some residents taking advantage of U of M parking after hours.

Pollay said that finding free parking requires juggling and it's all a part of urban living.

Pratt asked if the DDA deals directly with the individual occupants or the building owners of the developments in collecting payments.

Pollay explained that they deal only with the accounts payable person, and the permit holders pay the DDA every month whether the permits are used or not. She mentioned that there was currently no incentive for the building owners to break from their permits, whereas if it was on an individual basis, there might be more willingness to use the Zip Car, with which the DDA has had great success.

Pratt supported getting as much parking into the public system as possible, understanding that the DDA is highly motivated to have no more space consumed than necessary. The challenge of reaching those individuals once they become tied into the system has its own mechanics. Outlining the unbundling becomes important; when people pay rent, they usually do not realize they are paying for parking.

Pollay suggested that since the A2D2 Committee is in the rearview mirror, it would be a good idea for the Planning Commission to start discussion on the next wave of parking maximums, unbundling and ordinances around that topic as well as other transit options that bring the City beyond the parking discussions. She offered to return for further discussion with them.

Pratt asked if it would be possible to look at various other options that would make it more affordable, i.e. including the Zip Car or Get Downtown Program into the Payment in Lieu of Parking Policy. He noted that the proposed policy is voluntary so it is intended as another available option to developers.

Westphal stated that he was in support of “cashing out” parking requirements. He inquired if there could be any analogy made with the affordable housing payment involving a PUD, where developers have the option of making a payment instead of providing on-site affordable units. He requested that any future discussion on cashing out would consider if the Commission would be creating a legal challenge to say that it wouldn't be fulfilling a parking desire or need.

Bona mentioned, since it could be expensive to make a full payment up front, she would like to know if there was a way for developers to pay a surcharge but not buy a permit as part of the requirement. They could always buy a permit if they wanted. The surcharge could be a payment plan towards the larger sum, similar to a mortgage.

Pollay thanked the Commission for the opportunity to come before them expressing how helpful the discussion had been.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved by Carlberg, seconded by Pratt, to approve the agenda.

A vote to approve the agenda showed:

YEAS: Bona, Carlberg, Derezinski, Giannola, Mahler, Pratt, Westphal, Woods
NAYS: None
ABSENT: Briggs

Motion carried.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

None

REPORTS FROM CITY ADMINISTRATION, CITY COUNCIL,
PLANNING MANAGER, PLANNING COMMISSION
OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES, WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS AND PETITIONS

a. City Administration

None

b. City Council

Derezinski reported that the City Council had unanimously approved the Zingerman's petition and there was great support for the project.

c. Planning Manager

Rampson reported on upcoming meetings;

July 22, 2010 at 5 pm ZORO (Zoning Ordinance Reorganization project) Technical Meeting, at Water Treatment Plant to discuss the Annotated Outline
August 5, 2010 City Planning Commission meeting has been cancelled.
August 10, 2010 City Planning Commission meeting is the working session; City's Energy Manager Andrew Brix will be speaker on the Solar Plan.
Mia Gale will be taking over as Administrative Assistant from Jill St. John who has retired.

d. Planning Commission Officers and Committees

Westphal reported that the Downtown Design Task Force has been meeting weekly, with its next meeting on August 28, 2010, 5:30 pm on the 6th floor of City Hall. Discussion has been that the design review process should be mandatory, however compliance will be voluntary and encouraged. They are working on making the guidelines user-friendly.

Derezinski reported that the Washtenaw Visioning Committee met last week at 7:30 am at Paesanos. The meeting was generously hosted by Mike Roddy, who scheduled the meeting during the morning to attract the merchants along the Washtenaw Avenue. The meeting was attended by approx 40 people; Anya Dale from Washtenaw County Planning and Terri Blackmore from Washtenaw Area Transportation gave presentations and spoke about information collaboration which affected the four jurisdictions along Washtenaw Avenue.

Derezinski apologized for being late due to attending a meeting with homeowners and City Officials to address sewer backups that occurred during the recent storm. He indicated how planning plays a vital role in this regard.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Jim Mogenson, 3780 Greenbrier spoke in regards to the Bylaws. He had a concern regarding any future change to the Bylaws of the Commission, and voiced his desire for them to continue to allow feedback on emerging non-development projects, noting that it was important for the City Planning Commission to hear about these broad based issues before they came before the Commission as a project. He stated that he has been able to utilize the audience participation forum to bring to the attention of the Commission emerging issues and even though they are broad based he felt they all affect the City and in this way tie into the Bylaws. He also commented that he realized that speaking too often in a public forum might result in tone deafness, and he didn't wish for that to be the case with his feedback.

PUBLIC HEARINGS SCHEDULED FOR NEXT MEETING

None

REGULAR BUSINESS

a. Public Hearing and Action on Amendments to Chapter 55 (Zoning Ordinance), Section 5:10.6(2)(c), R4A Multiple-Family Dwelling District, regarding the addition of "guest houses for relatives of hospital patients" as a permitted principal use in this zoning district – Staff Recommendation:

Kahan presented the staff report and explained the proposed amendments.

Noting no speakers, Mahler declared the public hearing closed.

Woods asked clarification on the 400 square foot limitation.

Kahan explained that the square footage referred to the lot size and was part of the current existing language.

Giannola questioned if there was any maximum time limitation stipulated for the stay.

Kahan noted that they had included language that specifically included relatives of hospital patients. He noted that the petitioners had envisioned relatives typically staying a week or two.

Giannola asked if the amendment was written so as to prevent someone from staying six months or a year if they would be a part of an ongoing rehabilitation program.

Kahan stated that they had not included specific limitations on the length of their stay other than to say that they would be relatives of hospital patients. He said the intent was that after the patient is no longer in the hospital they would need to find other accommodations.

Westphal asked for clarification that the language was not intended to apply to relatives of convalescent home residents.

Kahan said that was correct.

Woods asked why we would want to limit the type of stay to short term instead of including facilities like Glacier Hills, which offers more long term convalescent care.

Kahan said the proposal came out of a need for services that several organizations are beginning to provide while their patients undergo treatment at their facilities. He noted that this type of service would be the most cost effective to most relatives and was intended to address the short term need.

Mahler questioned how broadly were we defining relatives and is the definition codified anywhere, since the definition could be quite far reaching and broad or very narrow.

Kahan noted that the City defines a family as outlined in the zoning definitions as; An individual or group of individuals occupying a dwelling unit as a single housekeeping unit in accordance with the standards of Section 5:7.

Rampson explained that having gone through the family definition only a few years ago the courts have upheld that there are relationships that mimic blood relatives and therefore staff has tried to stay away from definitions of the family; rather staff has chosen the term "relatives of patients in the hospital". From a zoning standpoint she didn't believe there was a significant difference between an aunt or a sister but offered to look further into the matter if the Commission so requested.

Mahler felt that occupancy could become an issue in these guest houses.

Rampson stated that these guest houses would be regulated under the housing code and would have to meet the occupancy standards set for non-owner occupied dwellings, which she felt would be the counter balance for any possibility of over occupancy.

Woods asked if the amendment should read families of hospital patients rather than relatives or maybe there wasn't a significant difference.

Kahan noted that with further limitations to the code it might work against the intent of what they were trying to achieve and through proposed language he felt it would grant them greater flexibility through interpretation in the future.

Bona was in favor of leaving the broader proposed language of "relatives of hospital patients", pointing out that the ratio of the lot size to occupancy was more of an issue.

Westphal supported Bona and commented that it would be the owner of the facility who would define who would be a guest in their houses and his main concern was the limit on the number of occupants to deter possible complaints such as traffic or parking issues.

Moved by Bona, seconded by Derezinski, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the text Amendments to Chapter 55 (Zoning Ordinance), pertaining to principal uses in the R4A Multiple-Family Dwelling Zoning District Section 5:10.6(2)(c).

A vote on the motion showed:

YEAS: Bona, Carlberg, Derezinski, Giannola, Mahler, Pratt, Westphal, Woods
NAYS: None
ABSENT: Briggs

Motion carried unanimously.

b. Public Hearing and Action on Ann Arbor Guest House Zoning and Area Plan Waiver Request, 4.77 acres, 2000 Dhu Varren Road. A request to zone this site from TWP (Township District) to R4A (Multiple-Family Dwelling District) to allow a maximum of 12 adults (10 guests and 2 caretakers in 6 bedrooms), and to waive the area plan requirement because no new construction is proposed (Postponed from 5/4/10 meeting) – Staff Recommendation: Approval

Kahan presented the staff report.

Noting no speakers, Mahler declared the public hearing closed.

Mahler read the two motions together.

Westphal inquired if the maximum restriction of allowing twelve (12) adults at the proposed site was in addition to the R4A zoning restriction.

Kahan replied that R4A district allowed for a maximum of twelve adults.

Rampson explained that the Commission would be taking action on the zoning to R4A only and not limiting the occupants.

Westphal asked if the petitioners had a right to propose a facility at that location that didn't resemble what currently was at that site.

Rampson responded that they would have the right to propose that through the site plan process, and it would have to be consistent with the Northeast Area plan and the City's Master Plan.

Kahan noted that the Commission had already taken action on the annexation, and the current proposed motions included the Commissioners taking action on the area plan waiver as well.

Moved by Pratt, seconded by Giannola, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommend that the Mayor and City Council approve the Ann Arbor Guest House R4A (Multiple-Family Dwelling District) zoning.

and

The Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby waives the requirement for the area plan as allowed by Chapter 57 Subdivision and Land Use Control.

A vote on the motions showed:

YEAS: Bona, Carlberg, Derezinski, Giannola, Mahler, Pratt, Westphal, Woods
NAYS: None
ABSENT: Briggs

Motions carried unanimously.

c. Public Hearing and Action on Kroger Grocery Store Site Plan for Planning Commission Approval, 5.22 acres, 400 South Maple Road. A proposal to remove parking spaces on the south side of the existing building and add a drive-thru pharmacy window (Postponed at 7/8/2010 meeting) - Staff Recommendation: Approval

Rampson explained the proposal.

Jason Fochtman representing Jeffrey Scott Architects, Kroger Grocery Store and the petitioner spoke in support of the project explaining that they had made the modifications requested and suggested by the Planning Commission at their earlier meeting and he would be happy to answer any questions the Commission had.

Noting no further speakers, Mahler declared the public hearing closed.

Moved by Derezinski, seconded by Pratt, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby approves the Kroger Grocery Store Site Plan for Planning Commission Approval, subject to removal of construction material and equipment prior to finalization of building permits or certificate of occupancy as applicable.

Derezinski asked Fochtman what the current status was on the construction material at the back of the site that had been referenced.

Fochtman responded that it had been removed by the contractor.

A vote on the motion showed:

YEAS: Bona, Carlberg, Derezinski, Giannola, Mahler, Pratt, Westphal, Woods

NAYS: None
ABSENT: Briggs

Motion carried unanimously.

e. Resolution to Adopt Amended City Planning Commission Bylaws

Rampson gave the staff report.

Carlberg had a question from pg 4, section 6, relating to completion of an annual disclosure of planning affiliations, since they are the Planning Commission and it would seem unnecessary.

Rampson thought that it might be related to conflict of interest issues and she could verify with the attorney's office.

Carlberg also inquired about the requirement of an annual report and asked if the Commission would have to review and approve it. She would like to see it before it was submitted.

Rampson responded that that was a requirement for all City departments and it had been presented to them as informational in the past but they could change that to make it an item for them to take action on if they so requested.

Westphal asked for clarification on audience participation and how it related to the comments brought by the evening's public speaker who had referenced such.

Rampson answered that there was no change in regards to audience participation.

Bona referenced pg 8, Section 17, regarding electronic communications, requesting the language to read: *with or from members of the Commission, member of the public, or the petitioner...*

Rampson clarified for the Commission that the language should specifically read that members of the Commission should not be emailing or texting each other during the meeting about items that are on the agenda.

Mahler stated that he had hoped for the City Attorney, Kevin McDonald, to have been at the evening's meeting to give feedback on a few items that he had.

- Page 2, Article IV, Section 1; Membership; there are a couple of type errors. The word *Mayor* should be capitalized, on the fifth line down the word *City* should be capitalized.
- In the sentence beginning with *The membership shall be representatives of important segments of the community,...*; replace the word *shall* with *may, may be, should be* or *to the extent possible* since *shall* implies mandatory action. The sentence could read, *The membership may be, or should be, to the extent practicable, representatives of important segments of the community...* and the same change in the last sentence in Section 1, *The membership may be or should be to the extent practicable representative of ...* The language *the entire geography of the local unit of government* should be reviewed by the attorney, since it seems quite unclear
- Section 2, line 2 doesn't clarify what type of meetings the commission shall be reimbursed for attending. On line 3 it should read *City Planning* instead of *Ann Arbor planning*.
- There needs to be a space added between Section 3 and Section 4.

- Pg 3, in Section 9, there should be a due process cited for the benefit of the Commissioners and the public.
- Pg 5, Section 12 and 13 are repetitive, as stated by Bona.
- Pg 6, Section 7, second sentence, it would be good to add the following, ...*when more than one candidate for office is nominated*, and maybe language like, *voting by secret ballot is optional*.
- There needs to be a space between Section 9 and 10.
- Pg 8, Section 10, line 5, should have the word *in* added to read, *petitions described in Article IX of these bylaws*.
- Pg 13, Article XIII, Section 2. should be reviewed by the City Attorney, as it would seem in contrast to the adoption of the bylaws themselves and that wouldn't seem in line with the intent.

Carlberg stated that she thought Article XIII Parliamentary Authority, Section 2, referred specifically to Robert's Rules of Order.

Mahler felt that if that was the case then it should specifically state Robert's Rules of Order.

Westphal questioned the interpretation on Pg 10, Section 4, line 7, and if that might include even notes from the public that could be passed to them during the meeting.

Mahler felt that that would be an instance when the Chair would exercise their discretion on a case to case basis to allow or prohibit such communication using Robert's Rules of Order as a guide.

Giannola asked if Pg 8, Section 17 regarding communication should include the wording "hand written notes."

Mahler felt that the issues brought forth were valid concerns and needed to be reviewed by the Attorney.

Woods added that Pg 4, Section 7, also needed some clarification from the Attorney in regards to the intent to disclose communication at meetings, since in the past this hadn't been the practice.

Carlberg remarked that she felt that any communication should be available to all Commissioners. She also didn't want the public to think that they could lobby the Commissioners during a meeting but at the same time she recognized that there might be legitimate concerns that the public might have need to bring to the Commission's attention and there should be an obligation on behalf of the Commissioners to bring that communication to everybody. She would rather err on the side of disclosing communication and dealing with it on a case by case basis than the possibility of missing important input from the public.

Bona noted that under Article V, Section 7, it refers to direction on handling communications relating to Site Plans in that it states that if a member received such communications, the member shall make note of the communication and report it to the Commission at a public meeting or hearing.

Westphal expressed his concern with allowing such communication that it could possibly extend the public hearing throughout the meeting.

Westphal noted that on Pg 7, Section 3, he would like to see no delineation between the regular and business meetings and reference them all simply as meetings unless there was some compelling reason to differentiate between the two.

Rampson clarified that there would be a distinct difference between a regular meeting and a working session even with the delineation of a regular and business meeting.

Rampson requested that references to the title of The Planning and Development Services Manager, be changed throughout the Bylaws to read "*Planning Manager*".

Rampson indicated that she had not requested Kevin McDonald to be present at the evening's meeting since she thought that the Commission might be close to a final version, but after noting the input she stated that she would ask McDonald to be present at the next meeting in August.

Derezinski commented that it seemed that most of the issues dealt around the Open's Meeting Act, and he was confident that McDonald would be able to clarify concerns and questions the Commission has.

Woods questioned if the required meeting notice postings are also posted on the web as well as being posted at City Hall and if that should be added to the existing language.

Westphal stated that he would accept a new draft, showing track changes along with an attached written response to the questions and concerns the Commissioners had brought forth and if the Commission still felt that they had further concerns McDonald could come to a following meeting.

Noting no further speakers, Mahler declared the public hearing closed.

Moved by Pratt, seconded by Derezinski, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby adopts the amended Planning Commission Bylaws, subject to Council review and approval.

Moved by Pratt, seconded by Carlberg to postpone action on the motion to the next meeting that staff from the City Attorney's Office is able to attend.

Motion carried unanimously.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Brad Mikus of Stone School Road spoke regarding the Payment in Lieu of Parking Proposal asking if it will go before the City Planning Commission for a vote or just before City Council. He also stated that he was disappointed in the lack of public showing for the Area, Height and Placement Zoning amendment public hearing and that there were no major changes to the amendment. He suggested that the Commission could have made some amendments

Woods clarified that the Area, Height and Placement Zoning amendment was part of a long, on-going public process that had been discussed for almost two years and there had been a lot of public input during the review process. She also responded that in regards to the Payment in Lieu of Parking Proposal that the presentation was informative for the Commission and that it would be decided by the City Council.

COMMISSION PROPOSED BUSINESS

Bona informed the Commission that her employer would be hosting a special speaker, Pat Murphy, who is a leader in the field of planning, climate and sustainability. She noted that he would be in Ann Arbor on September 28 to speak at a workshop that she was sponsoring, and she was offering to share his availability if the Commission was interested to have him come and speak in the Council Chamber. She noted that his speaking fee was \$ 1,000 plus expenses for 24 hrs. and if the Commission was willing to split the cost of \$ 1,000 it would be a reasonable cost for an interesting topic. She suggested that the Commission vote on the matter.

Woods asked if there was an available budget for such special speakers.

Rampson responded that there was an available budget for training and special speakers as outlined.

Derezinski stated that while he appreciated the offer he would like more time to make a decision on the matter.

The Commission discussed if they needed a vote on the matter.

Rampson remarked that she would appreciate to know if the Commission could give her a show of support for the matter.

Carlberg asked how much was available in the budget for training.

Rampson responded that last year the Commission had spent a total of \$ 2,000 and there were funds to cover this matter.

Westphal supported the idea of having an expert speak to the Commission on sustainability, since the subject impacts them in their role as Planning Commission members.

Pratt supported the idea and suggested that if the speaker could gear his speech towards the role of City Planning Commissions as well as speaking in regards to communities that have undertaken a public process it would be valuable and helpful.

Bona expressed that Murphy had written several books; one recently on transportation, and that his main focus was on transportation, housing and food.

Woods commented that she was supportive of having Murphy come as a speaker and to have the speech televised for those who would not be available to attend.

Mahler extended the offer of invitation to Energy and Environmental Commissions as well.

Through a show of hands the Commissioners showed consensus for Pat Murphy to come and speak on Sept. 28, 2010 in Council Chamber.

Derezinski indicated that he was in favor of getting the word out to the general public in regards to the special speaker.

ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Giannola, seconded by Bona to adjourn the meeting at 9:10 p.m.

A vote on the motions showed:

YEAS: Bona, Carlberg, Derezinski, Giannola, Mahler, Pratt, Westphal, Woods
NAYS: None
ABSENT: Briggs

Motion carried unanimously.

Wendy L. Rampson, Planning Manager
Planning and Development Services

Diane Giannola, Secretary

Prepared by Mia Gale
Community Services Area