

**MINUTES
CITY OF FARMINGTON HILLS
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
VIA TELECONFERENCE
JULY 16, 2020, 7:30 P.M.**

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the July 16, 2020 City of Farmington Hills Planning Commission meeting was held via teleconference in compliance with Executive Orders issued by Governor Whitmer, for the temporary authorization of remote participation in public meetings and hearings. Members of the public body and members of the public participating electronically were considered present at the meeting and could participate as if physically present, as outlined on the City website and posted per Open Meetings requirements.

Chair Stimson called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:30 pm on July 16, 2020.

Commissioners Present: Brickner, Countegan, Mantey, McRae, Orr, Schwartz, Stimson, Trafelet, Turner

Commissioners Absent: None

Others Present: City Planner Stec, City Attorney Schultz, Planning Consultant Arroyo, Staff Engineer Kennedy

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION by Orr, support by Trafelet, to amend and approve the agenda as follows:

- At the applicant's request, postpone Item A. Lot Split 3, 2020 (Preliminary) to a later date.
- At the applicant's request, postpone Item B. Site Plan 54-6-2020 to a later date.

Roll call vote:

Yeas: Brickner, Countegan, Mantey, McRae, Orr, Schwartz, Stimson, Trafelet, Turner
Nays: None
Absent: None
Abstentions: None

MOTION carried 9-0.

REGULAR MEETING

A. LOT SPLIT 3, 2020 (Preliminary)

LOCATION: 21050 Goldsmith
PARCEL I.D.: 23-32-326-043
PROPOSAL: Split one parcel into two parcels in RA-1, One-Family Residential District
ACTION REQUESTED: Preliminary lot split approval
APPLICANT: Richard Bringardner
OWNER: Bringardner Living Trust

As noted above, this item was postponed at the request of the applicant.

B. SITE PLAN 54-6-2020

LOCATION: 30790 & 30836 Eight Mile Rd.
PARCEL I.D.: 23-35-352-015, 017, 018 & 23-35-376-017
PROPOSAL: Office & garage for contractor equipment in LI-1, Light Industrial
ACTION REQUESTED: Approval of site plan
APPLICANT: Casey Leach, P.E., Sidock Group, Inc.
OWNER: D'An-Co Properties II, LLC / RD.MJ Investments, L.L.C.

As noted above, this item was postponed at the request of the applicant.

C. SITE PLAN 55-6-2020

LOCATION: 31066 Twelve Mile Road
PARCEL I.D.: 23-11-351-049
PROPOSAL: Reuse of existing building for a gas station with a convenience store and carry-out restaurant, and a retail store in a B-3, General Business District
ACTION REQUESTED: Approval of site plan
APPLICANT: The Barbat Organization
OWNER: Orchard Ridge Plaza, LLC

Utilizing a PowerPoint presentation shown on the Zoom screen, and referencing his June 29, 2020 memorandum, Planning Consultant Arroyo gave the review for this proposal to reuse and subdivide the existing building at 31066 Twelve Mile Road for multiple tenants. One tenant would be a convenience store, and the other was to be determined, although the parking calculations projected this space as fast food. The building had a footprint of 5,653 square feet. A gas station canopy with 6 pump islands – 12 fueling stations – was also proposed. Gas service stations were a principally permitted use in the B-3 district, subject to the standards in the ordinance and outlined in the review memorandum.

Outstanding issues were as follows:

- The existing north side setback was nonconforming at 4.3 feet; the proposal would not make that nonconformity worse.
- The plan noted that the building would be less than 50 feet in height, and while this appeared to be correct, the actual height should be given.
- While the parking requirements were met, the parking calculations assigned more of the space to the fast food establishment than shown on the plan and should be made to match as a condition of final approval.
- The new proposed light fixtures met the cut-off standards of the ordinance. The applicant was proposing to keep the old, box-style fixtures already present, as well as the existing, pendant-style pedestrian lights near the building. Information was not given regarding the existing fixtures, and a site inspection showed that the box-style pole-mounted fixtures were not all mounted at a cut-off angle, and the pedestrian lamps were not cut-off fixtures, though it was possible that their light output would be low enough that they were not noncompliant—information was required to determine this. The photometric plan did not provide a uniformity ratio to confirm compliance, and there were three locations where light levels exceeded 0.3 footcandles at the property line.

The Planning Commission may choose to require, as a condition of site plan approval, that all lighting on the site be brought into conformity with Section 34-5.16.

- The applicant had provided a truck turning study on Sheet C-6, and while it showed that a truck can make the entrance from 12 Mile eastbound, it was extremely tight, and Planning Consultant Arroyo was concerned about conflicts between fuel trucks turning left and the westbound left turn lane, which extended past the driveway. Potential steps to mitigate those concerns included consideration of using the Orchard Lake driveway, which would require the truck to maneuver in reverse but would avoid the left turn in, or of mandating that fuel delivery occur only during off hours, if possible. This should be coordinated with the engineering review.
- The applicant should confirm that there would be no parking of motor vehicles or storage of trailers, campers, or other such conveyances on the gasoline service station property as this was prohibited, except for those necessary to the operation of a gas service station.
- The square footage of pavement was not provided but also was not changing. The number of parking lot trees required for the site and the degree of existing nonconformity was not clear. This information should be provided for review.

City Planner Stec pointed out that:

- The existing lamp posts in the northeast parking lot were significantly taller than what would be permitted today. House side shields were required for any lighting fixtures abutting residential property.
- A superimposed tree survey needed to be provided.

Mr. Schwartz said that the 12 Mile Road/Orchard Lake Road intersection was often listed #1 for accidents in the County. He was concerned that trucks would find it very difficult to exit the site by turning left and going eastbound on 12 Mile Road in order to access I-696.

In response to comments from Commissioner Turner, Chair Stimson said that any trucks exiting on Orchard Lake Road would have to turn right because of the median in the road. Effectively, Orchard Lake Road was a right-in, right-out access.

Commissioner Trafelet asked if the access from the Orchard Lake Road had a radius big enough to accommodate a tanker truck entering the site. Planning Consultant Arroyo said the plans showed tanker trucks entering the site from 12 Mile Road. Whether or not the access from Orchard Lake Road had enough room for a trucker to use would be checked at final engineering review.

Chair Stimson invited the applicants to make their presentation.

Development team members present this evening included:

- Eric Williams, Stonefield Engineering and Design, 607 Sheldon Street, Detroit
- Scott Barbat, Barbat Organization, 33477 Woodward Avenue, Birmingham
- John Abro, Project Architect, Farmington MI

Mr. Williams made the following points:

- The light fixtures already mentioned were dated; the applicants were willing to work with staff to bring the fixtures into compliance using LED fixtures with full cut-offs and house-side shielding.
- Regarding truck access to the site, while the site plan showed tankers entering the site off of 12 Mile Road, there were concerns about cars forming a queue on 12 Mile Road.

- As another option for accessing the site, a truck could enter going northbound on Orchard Lake Road, pull along the northern access drive, and then head back south into position, and when leaving the site travel north again to Orchard Lake Road.
- Fuel drops occurred twice a week. They were open to restricting deliveries to off-peak hours.
- Regarding the parking lot trees, an aerial overlay would be provided. There were approximately 16 trees within the property boundaries; those were a combination of deciduous and evergreen trees. The applicants would like to request a waiver so that the larger evergreen trees could count toward the overall parking lot tree requirement. There was a significant stand of evergreen trees along the new loading zone; they would like to maintain those if possible. The current landscape plan did show three additional trees, which would result in 19 trees in the parking lot; they could find a place for three additional deciduous trees. In the northeast parking lot, trees along the northern boundary were not on the property but hung over into the parking lot, making it difficult to find additional space for trees there.

Commissioner McRae asked if the applicants were willing to address light pole height issues in the northeastern parking area. Mr. Williams said they would be willing to cut the height of the poles in that area.

City Planner Stec said that the Ordinance did not require lighting in the northeast parking area and some lights could be eliminated. Also, there were two landscape islands in the northeast area where two trees could be planted, as well as on the southeast property line, south of the northeast parking area.

Commissioner McRae thought the northeast parking area should be lit, due to its proximity to Arby's.

Commissioner Orr asked if off-peak fueling including filling the gas tanks during the day. Mr. Barbat said gas would be delivered approximately twice a week. The Barbat organization was a Shell retailer and wholesaler, and they could control delivery times. Most deliveries occurred overnight. Any daytime delivery would use the 12 Mile access, and would exit onto Orchard Lake Road.

Commissioner Orr asked if pre-morning and post-evening deliveries could be part of an approving motion. Mr. Barbat said they could accept that, except for the once or twice a month when gas might be delivered during the day to take advantages of fluctuating prices.

Commissioner Trafelet asked the location of the tanks. Mr. Barbat said the fuel storage location would be on the southwest corner of the site. Most likely one split tank would be used.

Commissioner Trafelet pointed out that the southwest parking lot was the current detention area and had a history of flooding. How would this be addressed? Mr. Williams said they would meet with the City Engineering Department in order to understand the best practice for water detention and fuel storage on the site. City Planner Stec added that Paragraph #4 of the July 7, 2020 engineering report also addressed this concern.

MOTION by ORR, support by Trafelet, that Site Plan 55-6-2020, dated June 23, 2020, submitted by The Barbat Organization, be approved because it appears to meet all applicable requirements of the Zoning Chapter, subject to the condition that a revised site plan addressing the following items be submitted for administrative review:

- a. Two additional parking lot trees be added to the plan
- b. The lighting plan be revised to show:
 - Existing light poles reduced to the height permitted in the B-3 zoning district.
 - The overall number of light poles may be reduced to bring the site into compliance with maximum footcandle levels at the property line.

- House side shields added to any poles within 50 feet of a residential district.
- All fixtures be full shielded cut-off fixtures.
- c. A superimposed tree survey be provided.
- d. Outstanding issues in the June 29, 2020 Giffels Webster review report.
- e. Fuel deliveries be limited to pre-morning and post-evening off peak traffic hours.

And with the finding that the existing evergreen trees along the northern property line behind the Barron's menswear store may remain.

Roll call vote:

Yeas: Brickner, Countegan, Mantey, McRae, Orr, Schwartz, Stimson, Trafelet, Turner
Nays: None
Absent: None
Abstentions: None

MOTION carried 9-0.

D. PUD PLAN 1, 2020, INCLUDING SITE AND LANDSCAPE PLAN 56-6-2020

LOCATION: 29000 Eleven Mile Road
PARCEL I.D.: 23-13-351-005
PROPOSAL: Assisted Senior Living facility in SP-5, Special Purpose District
ACTION REQUESTED: Set for Public Hearing
APPLICANT: Edward Rose & Sons, Mark Perkoski
OWNER: Sisters of Mercy Regional Community

Utilizing a PowerPoint presentation shown on the Zoom screen, and referencing his July 8, 2020 memorandum, Planning Consultant Arroyo gave the review for this proposal to set PUD Plan 1, 2020, including site and landscape plan 56-6-2020, for public hearing. Preliminary qualification was granted by the Planning Commission at its meeting on April 16, 2020.

Planning Consultant Arroyo described the location of this request, which was adjacent to the Costick Center. The site was 53.66 acres, 34.18 acres of which constituted a dedicated conservation easement. The applicant was proposing to develop the remaining 19.48 acres. It was currently developed with the Sisters of Mercy facilities including Mercy Court, a chapel, Catherine's Place (skilled nursing) and McAuley Center. There was also a wireless communication tower on the site, maintained by others.

The PUD application included only the north 15.57 acres to accommodate the development of the Rose Senior Living building. The south 3.91-acre parcel is to be included with the City's plans for a future detached age restricted residential community. The site plan and zoning applications related to the south parcel will be submitted separately as those plans further evolve under the City's guidance.

Seven buildings currently existed on the 15.57-acre parcel and one building existed on the 3.91-acre (south) parcel. The construction of the new Rose Senior Living building would require removal of six obsolete structures. The plans also included preservation and repurposing of the large 500-seat chapel and Catherine's Place, the skilled nursing facility. Due to the proximity of the structures to unique property lines, the need to reconfigure shared utilities and mechanical systems, and the opportunity to design the Senior Living building into a significant part of the City's senior living campus concept, the applicant believed the PUD planning process would give the most flexibility.

Regarding site plan and use:

- The applicant was proposing a 207-apartment assisted and independent living building and a future 27-apartment memory care facility. The overall facility would also include common amenities and a guest suite for visitors.
- The Master Plan's future land use map assigned a quasi-public designation to this site. The site was the subject of specific study as well:
 - Sisters of Mercy Campus (No. 4). The present SP-5 zoning of this area was originally established to permit development of an extensive senior citizen community. The SP-5, Special Purpose District permits elderly care and services as a special land use. Residential uses were also permitted under the standards of the RA-2 District. In the meantime a large portion of the site had been acquired by the City, resulting in the creation of the Costick Center. Mercy High School had extended its outdoor athletic facilities as far north as the freeway, and a conservation easement has been granted to the Six Rivers Regional Land Conservancy, consisting of almost thirty-five acres of the property. Since there was no longer a need for the SP-5 District, it could be removed from the zoning ordinance and the zoning could be returned to the original RA-2 District. If the opportunity ever presented itself, the site would also be ideal for an expanded municipal center or "community center" as suggested in the City's Sustainability Study. However, that was now unlikely with the repurposing of Harrison High School.
- Goals.
 - Recognize continued use of the area for public and/or quasi-public purposes
 - With opportunity, expand municipal use of the site
 - Review the current zoning of the area in light of the change in ownership and its impact on the potential use as SP-5
- Policy
 - Change the zoning from SP-5 to RA-2 and remove the SP-5 section from the zoning ordinance

Regarding dimensional requirements.

The applicant was seeking relief from the height standards of the SP5 district. Maximum height in the district was 30 feet; the applicants were requesting a building height of 41 feet, 7 inches. No setbacks were listed on the plan, though it appeared that all setbacks exceeded 35 feet.

Building Materials.

The façade of the new building was primarily brick veneer and cement fiber siding in two colors. It was designed in a way that reflected the interior division of the building by floors and was generally comprised of durable materials.

Parking.

The units were proposed as follows:

1. Independent Living (117 units – 71 1BR & 46 2BR).
2. Assisted Living (90 units – 78 1BR & 12 2BR).
3. Memory Care (27). 6 spaces required

Parking was required as follows: 1.25 spaces for each 1-bedroom unit and 1.5 spaces for each 2- bedroom unit. 273 spaces would typically be required for the new building, with additional spaces (34) required for the memory care facility when it is completed.

The plan provided 219 parking spaces (32 in garages), with an additional area land banked on the eastern portion of the site for potential future parking, if needed. However the plan did not show how many

spaces this area could accommodate. This parking count would require relief from the standards of Section 34-5.2.

The applicant should bring the specific land banking request to the public hearing.

Overall Circulation.

The site was proposed to be accessed from a driveway on 11 Mile Road. The existing access easement needed to be adjusted to follow the actual path of the road. There was two-way circulation around the proposed building. The applicant and City had discussed relocation of the primary access road. Straightening this road and bringing it into the property further east would provide future room for growth of the Costick Center. When setting this application for public hearing, the Planning Commission was requested to set the public hearing for the next month or the next available date, in order to give the City and the applicant time to finish their discussions regarding the access road.

Trash Enclosure.

A detail of the proposed dumpster enclosure was not provided and is required.

Rooftop Appurtenances.

Rooftop appurtenances are not addressed on the plans.

Signs.

The plan included several signs, some of which were located on the adjacent property. On the site itself, a wall sign of 80.6 square feet was proposed on the northern elevation, facing I-696. On the adjacent site to the south, all signs included both the subject project and signage for the Costick Center. The monument signs at the two 11 Mile Road driveways for the Costick Center were each 62.9 square feet with a height of 7.75 feet, while the two directional signs proposed for the interior of the Costick Center site were each 33.48 square feet, with a height of 8.5 feet. Section 5.5 did not address sign standards for the SP-5 district. For the wall sign, there was no standard in the zoning ordinance regulating the size of a wall sign in the SP-5 district. The City Council, following a recommendation by the Planning Commission, may approve the sign package as part of the PUD if it feels the scale and location are appropriate.

Lighting.

A photometric plan had been provided, and the lighting plan appeared to meet the standards of Section 34-5.16.

Pedestrian Connections.

A pedestrian connection to 11 Mile was provided.

Section 34-4.20.3.

All centers for elderly care and services in the SP-5 district shall be subject to the conditions of Section 34-4.20.3. While the Planning Commission and City Council may provide relief from zoning ordinance standards under a planned unit development agreement, it should be noted that these are the underlying standards that apply to this use in the underlying district, and any that are not met will require specific reference in any final PUD agreement.

- No impact assessment had been submitted.
- The principal, service and accessory uses proposed for the residents were all permitted as part of a larger project in the SP-5 district.
- The section established a maximum floor area ratio of 0.16 for the entire zoning lot. No floor area ratio was provided on the plans; this should be added.

- Per Section 34-4.20.3.iv.a(5), internal setbacks are regulated as follows: the minimum distance between buildings used for the purpose of elderly housing shall be greater than the length of the façade times twice the height of the building, divided by 6. Buildings with corner-to-corner relationships shall have a minimum separation of 15 feet. In general, the new building had a corner-to-façade relationship with both existing buildings that will remain rather than a corner-to-corner relationship, so it appeared that this calculation should be completed to determine whether the standard was met or required relief.
- The total number of units or beds permitted within the EH use areas shall not be more than the square footage of the use area divided by the following:
 - (a) Four thousand (4,000) square feet for each independent elderly dwelling unit;
 - (b) Two thousand five hundred (2,500) square feet for each dependent elderly housing unit;
 - (c) One thousand five hundred (1,500) square feet for each convalescent home bed.16.8 acres was required, and this standard was met with 53 total acres on the site, including the conservation easement.
- The maximum building height of 30 feet may increase to 40 feet when a building is greater than 300 feet from the nearest abutting RA district. It appeared that the 300-foot distance was met although this should be confirmed. However, the tallest point of the building is 41.58 feet, and relief from this standard is required.
- A 200-foot buffer yard is required adjacent to any abutting RA district. This standard appeared to be met; the measurement should be added to the plan.
- A five-foot berm is required between a parking lot and property line, unless existing vegetation can be preserved. It appeared that existing vegetation proposed to be preserved served this function on the eastern portion of the lot. Also, the landscape plan showed additional plantings along the easternmost parking area. A buffer yard was not required adjacent to a freeway or adjacent to the SP-5 property to the south. The Planning Commission should review and make a determination whether or not this preserved buffer met the screening requirement.
- Approval of these facilities was conditioned upon the availability of adequate public services and any necessary improvements for vehicular access.
- Typically, this use would require a public hearing on the functional land use plan. However, the applicant has applied for a planned unit development, and the public hearing for the PUD served the same purpose for this plan.

Tree Preservation:

1. The inventory listed 302 trees, including 39 landmark trees on the site. All numbers on the tree removal schedule appeared to be correct and consistent.
2. 21 landmark trees with a total dbh of 338 inches were proposed to be removed. 25% of landmark trees dbh must be replaced, or 85 inches must be replaced. 29 trees with a caliper at planting of 3 inches was required.
3. 90 other regulated trees were proposed to be removed, requiring 90 replacements.
4. 119 total replacement trees were required, and 119 replacement trees were provided.
5. The landscaping table on Sheet L-1 incorrectly listed “81 standard replacements” rather than 90. However, the correct number of replacement trees was provided.

Landscape Plan

1. Parking Lot Trees. 102,723 square feet of pavement was proposed on the site. At one tree per 2,800 square feet, 37 trees were required, and 37 were provided.

2. Typically, parking lots along a right-of-way were required to have a hedge screen. However, the configuration of the site was such that the parking lot was effectively hidden from I-696 by changes in topography and retained existing vegetation.

In summary, this PUD request would include relief from ordinance standards as follows:

- Building height: 30/40 feet required; 41 feet, 7 inches proposed
- Parking: Permit 219 spaces instead of 273

The applicant should specifically identify other standards requested to be varied, if any, as well as the degree of relief sought based on additional comments in the review letter.

City Planner Stec said that a superimposed tree survey was also required as part of this application.

Commissioner Schwartz asked staff for a short written report for the public hearing of the number of senior housing projects had been approved and how many of those were developed in the last 3 years.

Commissioner Brickner asked about providing an easement for the back property to access 11 Mile Road. Planning Consultant Arroyo said there was an existing partial easement in place; the issue would be further addressed during the PUD process.

Commissioner Orr was concerned that the City not approve a height deviation next to the residential areas. Planning Consultant Arroyo said that once the PUD agreement was in place, the only buildings that could be higher than the normal limitation would be spelled out in the agreement. In this case, the tallest building would be the one located the furthest from single family residential.

Chair Stimson invited the applicants to make their presentation.

Several development team members were present on behalf of this application, including:

- Mark Perkoski, Edward Rose & Sons, 38525 Woodward Avenue, Bloomfield Hills.
- Zac Rosenow and Dan Neudecker, Pope architects

Noting that a more formal presentation would be made at the public hearing, Mr. Perkoski gave the following information:

- They would identify the landbanked parking.
- The only times they might have a parking issue would be during the holidays. They were hopeful they could work out holiday parking via a shared parking agreement with the Costick Center, which was not open during holiday times.
- The applicants were meeting with City staff regarding the access easement location.
- Regarding building height, the requested 4 stories would be on the west-most part of their building. This would create the greatest buffer distance – approximately 800 feet – between the east property line and the single family residences. Existing trees to the east would be maintained as much as possible and more could be planted. The three-story building would be at least 300 feet from the east property line.

Chair Stimson said the flat-roofed garages looked like storage units more than garages, detracted significantly from the site, and because of their appearance might actually be turned into storage units.

Mr. Rosenow said that they felt the garage structures were complementary to the other buildings on the site, with low sight lines and a horizontal one-story emphasis.

Mr. Perkoski said they were only offering 22 closed parking units, and even that number would probably not get used much. Most of the time people didn't store things in the garage – the facility already offered larger units with generous closets. Additionally there were storage units in the buildings. The flat roof was reminiscent of the 1960's style architecture as shown in the Costick Center and other surrounding buildings. However, they would try to enhance the garage structures for the public hearing.

Chair Stimson said he would be interested in what the applicants did with those garage units, including what materials would be used; he did not want them looking like storage units.

Commissioner Orr asked the location of HVAC units. Mr. Neudecker said that the majority of the mechanical equipment would be in a mechanical room in the basement under the center portion of the building. There would be some rooftop equipment in the back above the dining room. That equipment would be screened.

In response to a further question from Commissioner Orr, Mr. Neudecker said the individual apartments would have individual control over heat. They were offering an internal compressor; there would be nothing outside the walls of the building for the residential units. There might be outside equipment for other areas, and that equipment would be screened.

Commissioner Turner asked about elevators. Mr. Neudecker said that there would be four elevators, one of which would be a service/freight elevator.

Commissioner Turner asked that interior floor plans, including plans for the one and two-bedroom units, be provided at the public hearing.

In response to a question from Commissioner Orr, Planning Consultant Arroyo said the 4-acre parcel by 11 Mile Road was not part of this PUD application.

MOTION by Schwartz, support by Trafelet, that P.U.D. Plan 1, 2020, including Site Plan 56-6-2020, submitted by Mark Perkoski of Edward Rose & Sons, dated June 18, 2020, be set for Public Hearing by the Planning Commission on August 20, 2020, or at the next available meeting if needed in order to allow the applicant time to meet with City staff to resolve the reconfiguration of the Eleven Mile Road access, to address items identified in the June 29, 2020 Giffels Webster review report, and to address items brought out during tonight's meeting, including possible enhancement of the resident garage architecture.

Roll call vote:

Yeas:	Brickner, Countegan, Mantey, McRae, Orr, Schwartz, Stimson, Trafelet, Turner
Nays:	None
Absent:	None
Abstentions:	None

MOTION carried 9-0.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES May 21, 2020

MOTION by Orr, support by Brickner, to approve the May 21, 2020 meeting minutes with the following correction:

- Page 1, 2nd paragraph: Chair ~~Schwartz~~ Stimson . . .

Roll call vote:

Yeas:	Brickner, Countegan, Mantey, McRae, Orr, Schwartz, Stimson, Trafelet, Turner
Nays:	None
Absent:	None
Abstentions:	None

MOTION carried 9-0.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public indicated that they wanted to speak.

COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS

Commissioner Orr commented that the Florence Cement Company's temporary cement plant at Drake and Grand River was doing a good job of keeping the access road open to the businesses on Grand River, and the site was cleaner than previous similar users of the property.

Commissioner Schwartz commended the new subdivision west of Farmington Road and south of 13 Mile Road, which was substantially developed, fit in with the surrounding neighborhoods, and was a nice development.

The next meeting was scheduled for August 20, 2020.

ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION by Orr, support by Brickner, to adjourn the meeting at 8:43 pm.

Roll call vote:

Yeas:	Brickner, Countegan, Mantey, McRae, Orr, Schwartz, Stimson, Trafelet, Turner
Nays:	None
Absent:	None
Abstentions:	None

MOTION carried 9-0.

Respectfully Submitted,
Dale Countegan
Planning Commission Secretary

/cem