

CITY OF NORTHVILLE
Planning Commission
December 15, 2015
Northville City Hall – Council Chambers

1. CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Wendt called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL:

Present: Steve Kirk
Carol Maise
Dave Mielock
Mark Russell
Jeff Snyder
Jay Wendt

Absent: Matthew Mowers (excused)
Christopher Miller (excused)
Anne Smith (excused)

Also present: Ken Roth, Mayor
Jim Allen, Mayor Pro Tem
Patrick Sullivan, City Manager
Sally Elmiger, Planning Consultant
Craig Strong, Chief Building Official
Lori Ward, Downtown Development Authority Director

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

MOTION by Kirk, support Maise, to amend the agenda by placing *Grade Plane Calculation Example first and Arbors, Trellises and Pergolas last. Motion carried unanimously.*

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: November 17, 2015

Commissioner Kirk pointed out a correction that needed to be made on page 7 of the November 17 minutes (reflected in the motion below).

Commissioner Kirk followed up on some items called out in the November 17 minutes, noting that he didn't want these things to get overlooked:

- Confirm with the Assessor that they did not use the zoning ordinances to define stories, floor spaces, etc., but had their own rules and definitions.
- Communicate with the Chief Building Inspector regarding the proposed language in Section 18.21.3 as to when a certified copy of a grading plan must be submitted by a registered civil engineer or land surveyor.
- Conflicting provisions in the Ordinance regarding driveways should be addressed and perhaps modified.

Motion by Mielock, support Snyder, to amend the November 17, 2015 meeting minutes as follows:

Page 7, paragraph 5: Commissioner Kirk said ~~that~~ the more that was put into an article or amendment . . .

Motion carried unanimously.

5. AUDIENCE COMMENTS: None.

6. REPORTS:

A. CITY ADMINISTRATION:

City Manager Sullivan said that in November the City Council had first readings for the amendments for arbors and pergolas and also for garden ornaments. After that reading there was discussion regarding definitions of front yard and front yard setback, and whether or not those terms and definitions were consistent throughout the Zoning Ordinance. City Council had asked Planning Consultant Elmiger to look at this and bring some proposed language to the Planning Commission that would clarify the definition of front yard. This process would require another Planning Commission public hearing and another first reading by City Council. The Council had not yet acted on the amendment on garden ornaments, since the two amendments were related.

B. CITY COUNCIL: None.

C. PLANNING COMMISSION: None.

D. OTHER COMMUNITY/GOVERNMENTAL LIAISONS: None

7. DISCUSSION:

Grade Plane Calculation Example

Referring to drawings labeled *EXAMPLE GRADE PLANE ELEVATION CALCULATION* and *BASEMENT AND STORY*, Chief Building Inspector Strong explained how grade plane elevation was calculated according to the Building Code. To calculate average grade plane the elevation at each building corner or elevation 6'0" from the building corner must be used, whichever was less. Chief Building Inspector Strong walked the Commission through an example that included a sloped elevation. Once the finish floor elevation on the first floor was known, it could be determined whether the story was below grade (a basement) or above grade (a story). Further schematics showing a flat grade plane and sloped grade plane were provided. In many instances, a walkout basement would be considered a story.

Chief Building Inspector Strong explained that when he received a grading plan, both existing and proposed grades were shown. This was necessary in order to see the drainage on the site.

A round table discussion followed, with questions and answers regarding the illustrations provided. Planning Consultant Elmiger explained that the provided drawings were for the benefit of tonight's discussion, so that the Commission could better understand how the average grade plane was calculated using the proposed language that would be discussed at the public hearing already scheduled in January.

Commissioner Kirk noted that a walkout basement would be considered a basement and not a first floor for real estate appraisals.

Cady Street Overlay – First Floor Parking

Commissioner Mielock disclosed that he was currently working on a project on South Cady Street.

It was the consensus of the Commission that tonight's discussion was general in nature, no vote would be taken, and Commissioner Mielock could therefore participate in the discussion.

Referring to the Carlisle/Wortman memorandum of December 9, 2015, regarding Cady Street Overlay District – Parking on the First Floor, and a handout showing proposed changes to the Cady Street Overlay (CSO) District, Planning Consultant Elmiger led the discussion of this agenda item. She explained that they had been requested to review the Cady Street Overlay District to determine ways of allowing parking on the first floor of a building while preserving the pedestrian orientation of the District. They researched other ordinances in order to collect various options that would help to ensure active ground floor uses along the street. They had prepared draft language regarding this and outlined some things for the Commission to consider:

1. Allow a certain portion of the first floor to be used for parking, but limit its location to the rear of the building so that active first floor uses could occupy the front (or street-side) of the building.
 - Properties with the underlying CBD or RTD zoning were not given the option to place parking on the first floor of a building (as was done for properties with underlying PR-1 zoning). Proposed language allowed up to 50% of the first/ground floor to be used as a parking garage. However, this percentage might need adjusting for smaller lots, and a table and map were provided in the memorandum showing smaller lots that were currently not developed within the Cady Street Overlay District. To address smaller lots, Carlisle/Wortman had added language that provided for some flexibility for any lot 10,000 square feet or less.
 - In order to preserve active first floor uses, and to limit first floor parking to the rear of the building, first floor parking could be required to be a minimum distance from the front façade of the building. The proposed language used 20 feet, and a schematic was provided showing how this would work. Also, active uses could be required, such as a storefront or residential building lobby/common area.
2. Add clarification for parking lot location and garage doors. Proposed language clarified that surface parking lots were only allowed in the rear yard, or within or underneath the building. The language also clarified that parking lots were not allowed at the corner of a corner lot.

Carlisle/Wortman also suggested adding either requirements or recommendations for the location of a garage door. In the proposed text, they suggested prohibiting garage doors to face Cady, Center or Main Streets, but also to allow the Planning Commission flexibility if necessary.

3. Add "Transparency" language to require a certain amount of windows/door on the street facing façade. This idea was to ensure that the building façade near the sidewalk had windows and doors, assisting in locating active pedestrian uses along the street. Dimensions in this section needed to be determined.

Planning Consultant Elmiger noted that Downtown Development Authority (DDA) Director Ward also had some things she wanted to discuss regarding the Cady Street Overlay District.

DDA Director Ward said that they had been meeting with the architect for the Corner House project to look at the streetscape designs that would be required there. While it was easy to list the elements required in a typical streetscape such as street furnishings, concrete finish, trees, etc., it was more difficult to show where these things would be placed on a typical streetscape.

DDA Director Ward noted that she and Mayor Pro Tem Allen had met with the Corner House architect regarding streetlights, bump-outs, and tree spacing. The ordinance requirement for tree spacing 20 feet on center was difficult. She suggested that some flexibility with this requirement might be helpful. For instance the sidewalk at the Corner house was only 5 feet. Tree grates themselves were 5 feet.

Downtown at the Main and Center area, typically every 4 or 5 spaces provided a bump-out. Along Cady Street perhaps there were some opportunities to have bump-outs and place trees or other landscaping there.

Mayor Pro Tem Allen noted that the CSO District: Streetscape (p. 10) required 1 canopy tree for each 40 lineal feet. Downtown there was roughly 1 tree for every 65 lineal feet. Perhaps the sentence requiring 1 canopy tree for each 40 lineal feet could be removed, and in its place a reference could be added to a DDA document regarding streetscape.

DDA Director Ward said that they would like to provide a typical graphic with the streetscape document. When the document was finalized she could bring it back to the Commission, in order for it to be revised and then adopted by the Commission.

In response to a question from Commissioner Kirk, Mayor Pro Tem Allen said that no further landscaping was proposed for the rear or south of the Corner House, but standards were already in a place for parking lot screening, etc.

City Manager summarized that DDA Director Ward and Mayor Pro Tem Allen were suggesting that the plans for the Corner House be modified, in terms of tree plantings on site. If the standards for the CSO District were revised, who would produce that document and how long would it take?

Mayor Pro Tem Allen asked if this possible change would trigger a new plan submission for review. Planning Consultant Elmiger said it would.

In response to a question from City Manager Sullivan, DDA Director Ward said that she had most of the narrative for the streetscape document, but still needed an illustration/schematic.

Commissioner Maise asked if this would be an ordinance change. Mayor Pro Tem Allen said the only landscaping contained within the CSO District ordinance was 1 tree per 40 lineal feet. There were no other guidelines or requirements. He felt it was critical to get bump-outs, as these broke up the street visually. Commissioner Maise said if there were a booklet showing guidelines for the area, this would provide more flexibility than currently provided in the ordinance. The ordinance could reference the booklet.

City Manager Sullivan said that he thought the standards discussed this evening might be an improvement over what was currently included in the ordinance. This discussion and any resultant changes had some priority, as there was already developmental movement in the CSO District.

Commissioner Russell suggested a second option of giving the Planning Commission the ability to modify the requirement of one tree for every 40 lineal feet. The Commission did not know what the streetscape guidelines would look like or where any future bump-outs would be located. The Commission needed some flexibility along Cady Street in order to work with merchants, etc., who would be located there.

Mayor Pro Tem Allen spoke to the practical difficulty of the Corner House placing the trees where currently required by ordinance. There simply was not room for the trees in a sidewalk that measured 5 feet, or in one area, only 4 feet.

Commissioner Maise asked about process. City Manager Sullivan reiterated that the Corner House would have to return to the Planning Commission for any changes in the approved plans.

Commissioner Russell wondered how the Commission would review plans if the entire requirement for tree placement were deleted. He preferred that the ordinance include the tree spacing requirement, with additional language that gave the Commission flexibility to require something else. To do otherwise would require the Commission to agree to an unknown. They did not know how many trees the streetscape would require, for instance.

Planning Consultant Elmiger said the ordinance, as now written, provided no flexibility. Any variation would need to seek Board of Zoning Appeals approval.

City Manager Sullivan asked if the ordinance couldn't refer to DDA designed guidelines.

Commissioner Russell was concerned that the Commission had teeth as a governing body to require certain landscaping as a part of the approval process. Commissioner Maise said process could include the ability to grant a waiver.

Mayor Pro Tem Allen suggested revisiting the requirement of 1 tree per 40 lineal feet. Again, downtown had 1 tree per approximately 60 lineal feet. Trees needed enough width to thrive, and the CSO District did not always provide this.

Commissioner Russell said that the idea was for Cady Street to be different than Main Street. DDA Director Ward said their discussion had focused on how to result in the Cady Street area being compatible and complementary with the Main Street area. She said the guidelines talked about typical spacing, giving a range for this without a specific hard requirement. They also looked at things like benches, but did not give hard requirements for spacing of these either, again giving a range of spacing that would be appropriate.

Mayor Pro Tem Allen said that on North Center the tree spacing was every 74 feet. On West Main the spacing was 50 – 60 feet, East Main 52-56 feet. Traffic flow requirements also limited the ability to plant trees.

Commissioner Maise asked where the 40-foot requirement had originated in the CSO District.

Commissioner Russell said that he had put forth this requirement originally. Because this did not work on

the Corner House project did not mean this was not a good dimension. That the Corner House now could not meet this requirement was not actually the Commission's problem. The developers could have designed the site differently and still met this requirement.

Commissioner Maise asked if there was a way to waive replacement requirements. Planning Consultant Elmiger said that a developer could replace trees with shrubs, in the ratio of 6 shrubs per tree. They could also place funds into the tree fund.

Mayor Roth asked what the next steps were for the property owner of the Corner House. Mayor Pro Tem Allen said the CSO District Ordinance needed to be amended, including following process that would require a Planning Commission public hearing and two readings by City Council. If this were done successfully, the developers would then have to return to the Planning Commission for approval for their amended plan.

Mayor Roth wanted to make sure the developer and the planning Commission knew what the steps were going forward.

In response to a question from Commissioner Maise, DDA Director Ward said she supported removing the last line from Streetscape: *At least one (1) canopy tree shall be provided for each forty (40) lineal feet* and replacing it with a reference to the DDA's Secondary Street Streetscape Guidelines. These would provide a typical streetscape for secondary streets.

Commissioner Mielock wondered about the procedure for adopting DDA guidelines. Planning Consultant Elmiger said that guidelines were not ordinances. If the ordinance required an applicant to look at the secondary street guidelines, they were still guidelines and nothing bound an applicant to a certain design structure.

Commissioner Russell said that if a developer said, "none of this works," what could the Planning Commission do? Planning Consultant Elmiger said that perhaps some language could be included in the ordinance that defined the ideal streetscape and provided standards for the same. If the standard could not be met the developer would have to work out other landscape/tree planting arrangements with the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Maise said this would have the benefit of having all landscape plans being reviewed by the consultants. Planning Consultant Elmiger said the ordinance could state the intent of the standard, which was to provide shade and a positive pedestrian environment, etc.

Commissioner Kirk noted that this was coming before the Commission because of the limited sidewalk width. He continued to be concerned about the canyon type effect of the tall buildings in this area. Trees were the only way the City had to buffer the effect of the buildings' heights.

Commissioner Russell spoke to the need to give the Planning Commission some flexibility to waive or modify the tree requirement, thus giving the Commission the tools to work with developers without forcing them to seek a variance. Also, the City needed to create the components of the ideal streetscape in order to give the Commission something to work toward, especially since they were not for the most part working with existing buildings. He felt the 40-foot spacing for trees was practical and doable for the most part. Again, the Commission should have some flexibility but a standard did need to exist. Guidelines were not binding and did not give the Commission enough governing authority to review and approve drawings.

City Manager Sullivan said he thought the guidelines could give the Planning Commission needed flexibility.

Commissioner Snyder noted that the downtown landscape had been installed around existing buildings. For the CSO District the Commission did not have that luxury. Commissioner Russell added that whatever resulted needed to be cohesive.

Mayor Pro Tem Allen said that landscaping and tree planting would be driven by parking and the cadence of the bump-outs. Trees would not thrive in a tight planting area. The goal was to enlarge some of the areas and get the trees planted in those areas, so that they could grow. However, he was not sure how guidelines could be binding on a developer.

Commissioner Maise said that they would need a mechanism for enforcement. For instance, an ordinance could put forth a standard, and deviation from that could require a waiver, subject to site conditions. If the ordinance referred to a set of guidelines, there needed to be strong language that the guidelines were binding.

Commissioner Snyder wondered if new developments along Cady Street could be required to place funds in a common fund to be used for a unified landscaping on the street.

City Manager Sullivan said the guidelines could be the document that was used during site plan review, and the review needed to document whether or not the guidelines had been met.

Chair Wendt wondered if the Commission could make the guidelines part of the Ordinance. Mayor Pro Tem Allen was unsure how the Commission could apply the specifics of a guidelines section to an unknown development.

City Manager Sullivan said it was important that when a new building went in, a developer used the same style streetlights, tree grates, etc., as were used throughout the District. However, making guidelines part of the ordinance added to the difficulty of changing out suppliers or changing out styles of design.

Commissioner Russell referred to the work done on the Master Plan, including discussions of form-based zoning. Why couldn't the guidelines for the CSO District be folded into the language already in place in the Master plan? Again, the Master Plan and the ordinance had teeth; DDA guidelines did not.

Planning Consultant Elmiger suggested that DDA Director Ward draft the guidelines. Then the Planning Commission could look at them, and appropriately draft language that either referred to the guidelines or incorporated them into the ordinance.

Mayor Pro Tem Allen supported a site-specific review process, which provided greater flexibility for all concerned.

Commissioner Russell wondered why new development along Cady Street could not be treated like a subdivision, where each lot had to have a set number of trees. The standard needed to be tangible and reasonably specific, especially regarding expectations for site plan submissions.

Chair Wendt asked Planning Consultant Elmiger to bring to the Commission similar ordinance language from other similar-sized communities regarding how they implemented design guidelines.

Commissioner Mielock asked how a developer could be required to put a bump-out on the street as a part of site development. Was there a way to require monies be put in a fund so that the City could develop these later as part of a unified streetscape development?

Commissioner Maise pointed out section T on page 11 which allowed the Planning Commission to waive or modify the design standards and landscape requirements set forth in Sections h through q where one or more of four factors were demonstrated.

Regarding front bump-out areas, Mayor Pro Tem Allen said that it was important for developers to know where these were planned so that they had an expectation of this happening in front of their development.

DDA Director Ward said that she thought the guidelines would refer to a typical section. The guidelines would not apply just to Cady Street.

City Manager Sullivan said the ordinance only applied to the Cady Street Overlay District.

Commissioner Russell said that the guidelines could anticipate a bump-out approximately every 3rd or 4th space.

Commissioner Maise said these should be grounded in the Master Plan, so as not to appear arbitrary.

Planning Consultant Elmiger said she would research ordinance language in other communities regarding areas set for redevelopment.

Planning Consultant Elmiger directed the attention of the Commission to the *first floor parking* portion of this discussion item.

Commissioner Kirk said he thought that developers had to have access off Cady Street since there was a zero foot lot line. Narrow lots had to have the ability to have garage doors right off of Cady Street.

City Manager Sullivan said there were competing interests. The buildings should be self-parked if at all possible, but they also didn't want a building that was four stories of residential with a parking deck on the first floor. Other than the Foundry Flask area, they really hadn't defined what was parking, residential, non-residential, what had to be store front, or how first floor residential should be treated. There was no clear language regarding first floor parking. There were no standards that addressed appearance, in terms of looking like a first floor parking deck, or where garage doors could be placed, or if windows would be required. There was not much guidance as to how to handle parking and other uses on the first floor.

Referring to page 1 of the Carlisle/Wortman memorandum, City Manager Sullivan addressed the proposed language regarding first floor parking which said that first floor parking may not occupy more than 50% of the first floor area. This was probably chosen because that was the percentage picked for the PR-1 area. The City Council in particular was concerned that development in the PR-1 area would not be all residential. They thought the Foundry Flask area was an area where there should be some commercial development on the first floor, and the 50% limit was set for non-residential use. However, was 50% the right percentage for Cady Street? Was it possible to self-park a three or four story building if only 50% of the ground floor was used for parking? City Manager Sullivan thought the drawing on page 2 of the memorandum that showed a 20-foot minimum screening zone along the front face of the building was a good starting point.

Chair Wendt asked about extending the Cady Street Parking Deck toward Church Street, which would solve some of the current parking problems. Developments along Cady Street would only make the parking situation worse, especially as guests visited some of the residential developments.

Planning Consultant Elmiger said that the Ordinance did allow flexibility in the number of spaces required. While the CSO District said that a certain number of parking spaces must be provided per the parking ordinance, it allowed developers along Cady Street the option of asking Council for parking credits.

Mayor Pro Tem Allen said that parking credits were allowed only in one small area – CBD. The rest had to be self-parked.

Chair Wendt said that regardless of what was done, there were going to be parking issues in the Cady Street area.

City Manager Sullivan said that it made more sense for a developer to put in parking by building a smaller building or by purchasing adjacent land than for the City to extend the Cady Street Parking Deck.

In response to a comment from Commissioner Russell, Planning Consultant Elmiger said the memorandum attempted to provide options that might work. The illustrated 20-foot screening area at the front of the building did not include the setback. If used, the sketch would need to be modified to show this.

In response to a question from Commissioner Mielock, Chief Building Official Strong said the first floor was the first story above grade. Regarding properties that had grade changes, this definition was not always simple. Anything 50% above grade level would be considered a first floor.

Planning Consultant Elmiger directed the Commission's attention to a Note at the end of subparagraph 3, which discussed a sloped lot having a building with a stepped foundation or split level, and how the average grade plane was to be determined. The CSO language did give some flexibility, in that it said: A non-occupied basement used for parking or tenant storage shall not count as a story with regards to the building height overlay. Theoretically a developer could get a basement plus five stories.

Commissioner Mielock said the entire ordinance should be clear and consistent as to how a first floor was defined. Planning Consultant Elmiger pointed out that the ordinance did define first floor and basement.

Commissioner Kirk wondered if some uses would need every bit of the first floor for parking, if they had the full elevation allowed.

City Manager Sullivan noted that parking was allowed on the first floor with a 5-story building under the CSO District regulations. Did the Commission want to permit just a parking deck on the first floor, which would look similar to the parking deck on Cady Street, or did the Commission want to have some other occupied space, or want to limit how many garage doors were permitted? How much of the front of the building could be access to the parking lot or was this not a priority?

The Master Plan did not require the first floor to be commercial. The 10 foot setback for first floor residential only applied to the PR-1 District (the Foundry Flask area).

Planning Consultant Elmiger asked the Commission to discuss whether they wanted a percentage of the first floor to be other than parking.

Commissioner Russell said that a “Cady deck” look should be discouraged. The 20-foot buffer at the front of the building seemed narrow to him. If a developer was required to provide self-parking, the onus was on the developer to come up with creative solutions regarding how to do this. The proposed 20-foot use buffer at the front of the building would prohibit the “Cady deck” look.

City Manager Sullivan said that perhaps the garage doors facing Cady Street could be limited to a percentage of the frontage.

Commissioner Russell said it was difficult to discuss garage doors because as of yet they represented a hypothetical.

Discussion followed regarding how the ordinance could be worded to limit garage doors on the front of a building.

Commissioner Mielock suggested limiting the number of curb cuts. This would probably provide a natural limitation to the number of garage doors on a front façade.

Planning Consultant Elmiger said that curb cuts were limited in the Access Driveway Section. This required a single means of direct access for each separately owned parcel. However, this did not mean there could only be one. Where possible, access should be shared.

Commissioner Russell questioned how section k. 4) would work: *Garage doors that access first floor parking shall not face Cady Street, Center Street or Main Street, unless no other option is available as determined by the Planning Commission.* He thought this might be too restrictive in some cases.

Planning Consultant Elmiger suggested that the ordinance might provide transparency requirements, requiring a certain number of pedestrian doors and transparency via windows.

Commissioner Russell spoke to land-locked properties. City Manager Sullivan said that a developer was permitted to develop with a zero setback, however this was not required.

Mayor Pro Tem Allen suggested adding language that encouraged rear lot drive connections. City Manager Sullivan said that shared parking lots and access management could create the ability for the Planning Commission to reduce required parking spaces.

Commissioner Mielock thought the CBD District required a 40-foot setback in the rear yard.

Commissioner Russell suggested adding language to the sub-area plan within the Master Plan encouraging shared parking lots and access management in this area.

Commissioner Mielock said that he thought the proposed modifications to the CSO District were good and he liked the direction this was going. The changes were keeping businesses or residential on the first floor on the south side of Cady Street. The proposed language provided the Commission some flexibility if there were extenuating circumstances. There were however some things he felt needed further discussion. For instance, the terminology *garage door* might carry a negative connotation. Perhaps these could be called access doors or even just refer to driveways.

Seeing that there were no more comments, Planning Consultant Elmiger said that this discussion would continue at a future meeting.

Arbors, Trellises and Pergolas

Referring to the document AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF NORTHVILLE TO DEFINE ARBORS, PERGOLAS AND TRELISES AS ACCESSORY STRUCTURES, AND TO PERMIT THEM WITHIN A CERTAIN SIZE IN THE REQUIRED FRONT YARD OF A LOT, and to the Carlisle Wortman memorandum dated December 7, 2015, Planning Consultant Elmiger said that after the first reading of the proposed ordinance amendment, City Council had wanted some clarification on *required front yards*. Two technical changes resulted that did not change any meaning and did not require a public hearing:

- Modify the preamble to use the terminology “required front yard” instead of “setback.”
- Clarify that the front yard area allowing arbors, pergolas and trellises is the “required” front yard.

Other changes added new language to the ordinance. New definitions of “required” and “unrequired” yards and illustrations for these terms were added, and were shown in red in the text document. These changes – on pages 4 and 5 – would require that the Planning Commission review the new language and schedule a public hearing before it returned to City Council.

In response to a comment from Commissioner Maise, Planning Consultant Elmiger said she would confirm that the ordinance language would be uniform, so that all language would refer to *unrequired yards* or alternatively *nonrequired yards* consistently.

Commissioner Kirk was concerned that the illustrations – with their smaller building footprints – gave the false idea that most homes had unrequired front yard space available. However, many homes were built right to the required front yard limit. This could be confusing for residents. Commissioner Maise said that graphically the illustration was clear, but it did not represent the typical Northville home in terms of actual configuration.

MOTION by Mielock, support by Russell, to set for public hearing at the next available meeting the proposed new language and illustrations for ARTICLE 26 – CONSTRUCTION OF LANGUAGE AND DEFINITIONS and SECTION 18.04 ACCESSORY BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES.

Chair Wendt asked for a roll call vote.

| | |
|----------------|------------|
| Russell | yes |
| Snyder | yes |
| Kirk | yes |
| Mielock | yes |
| Mowers | yes |
| Wendt | yes |

Therefore, the motion carried unanimously.

Other discussion

Chair Wendt initiated a discussion regarding communication between City Council and the Planning Commission. In the past, significant changes had been made to text amendments recommended to the Council without the changes returning to the Planning Commission, and without discussion with the Planning Commission. He was dismayed when major changes were made by the Council regarding the Master Plan, without seeming regard for the long process and many meetings spent on developing the changes to the Master Plan, especially regarding heights in the Cady Street Overlay District. Commissioner Snyder pointed out that this had involved not only the Planning Commission, but also the entire community who came to public hearings.

Mayor Roth said that going forward, he was committed to listening and respecting stakeholder input. He agreed with the comments made.

Commissioner Kirk asked that Planning Consultant Elmiger be prepared to answer questions and offer clarification regarding front yard setbacks at the public hearing.

8. ADJOURN

As there was no further discussion, Chair Wendt asked for a motion to adjourn.

MOTION Maise, support Mielock, to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 9:22 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,
Cheryl McGuire
Recording Secretary

Approved as published 1/19/16