

CITY OF NORTHVILLE
Planning Commission
May 2, 2017
Northville City Hall – Council Chambers

1. CALL TO ORDER:

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

2. ROLL CALL:

Present: Steve Kirk
Dave Mielock
Christopher Miller
Mark Russell
Anne Smith
Jeff Snyder
Jay Wendt

Absent: Carol Maise (excused)
Matthew Mowers (excused)

Also present: Ken Roth, Mayor
James Allen, Mayor Pro Tem
Patrick Sullivan, City Manager
James Gallogly, Director Department of Public Works
Sally Elmiger, Planning Consultant

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Chair Wendt suggested hearing item 9, Corner House – Site Plan Extension Request before Item 7.

**MOTION by Mielock, support Russell, to approve the agenda as amended.
Motion carried unanimously.**

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: April 18, 2017

Commissioner Kirk noted the following corrections:

- Page 4, next to last paragraph: City Manager Sullivan *stated* that
- Page 11, 7th paragraph from the bottom: . . . some downlights ~~downlights~~ . . .
- Page 15, 5th paragraph from the bottom: . . . one reason to ~~then~~ give that . . .

**Motion by Kirk, support Mielock, to approve the March 21, 2017 minutes as corrected.
Motion carried unanimously.**

5. AUDIENCE COMMENTS: None.

6. REPORTS:

- A. CITY ADMINISTRATION:** None.
- B. CITY COUNCIL:** None.
- C. PLANNING COMMISSION:** None.
- D. OTHER COMMUNITY/GOVERNMENTAL LIAISONS:** None.

**9. CORNER HOUSE – SITE PLAN EXTENSION REQUEST
335 CADY STREET**

As noted above, the agenda was amended to hear Item 9 before Item 7.

Planning Consultant Elmiger said the site plan for 335 Cady Street was approved on November 3, 2015, and from that date the applicant had a year to commence construction and to obtain building permits. This had not yet happened and therefore the applicant was requesting an extension of their final site plan approval. The Planning Commission could approve an extension for up to a year.

Roger Berent, 6435 Apple Orchard Lane, Rochester Hills MI, was present on behalf of this application, which was to formally request a one-year extension to the site plan approval for Corner House, 335 Cady Street. Referring to his April 8, 2017 letter, Mr. Berent said they fully intended to move forward, and were working toward construction beginning in the next couple of months. They had developed a set of construction drawings, and had submitted these drawings to the Building Department. The Building Department had only one comment, which the applicants would be able to address.

The homes were essentially custom homes and they had been dealing with the buyers who wanted custom designs, and this took time. Also, their preliminary budgets weren't quite where they needed to be, so they had to re-price once the drawings were complete. Most issues were now resolved, and they would be resubmitting drawings for the building permit within the next month or so, with a goal to break ground in the middle of the summer. Nothing had changed in terms of the site plans approved in November 2015.

Commissioner Miller asked if a 6-month extension would be sufficient. Mr. Berent said that 6 months would be better than zero, but they were requesting a year's extension.

Commissioner Kirk said he thought the project as presented was an excellent one, and he offered the following motion:

MOTION by Kirk that the Planning Commission grant a one-year extension to Final Site Plan Approval for Corner House, 335 E. Cady.

Commissioner Snyder said he supported a 6-month extension.

Chair Wendt asked the benefit of granting only a 6-month extension. Commissioner Snyder said since the approval was originally in November 2015, granting a 12-month extension at this point lengthened the project to close to 3 years. Ordinances could change during this long period.

City Manager Sullivan said he shared those concerns. Did the ordinance require that the request for an extension be made within one year of the original approval? Planning Consultant Elmiger said this was not a requirement. The final site plan approval was good for one year, and while the ordinance was silent as to when an extension must be requested, the extension – if granted – would be from the date of the last expiration, or November 3, 2016, which was one year from the original approval.

Commissioner Miller said he would support a one-year extension, since that would have a start date of November 2016, as this was a project that the Commission had looked favorably upon in the past.

Chair Wendt said this action would assume that no changes had been made from the original approval. Mr. Berent said that was correct. They had submitted full drawings, but had never responded to the single comment from the Building Department and picked up their permit. They were trying not to put the Building Department through numerous reviews based on customizing the homes. A one-year timeline was not that long for a project of this nature. The applicants had been working hard throughout this time to get everything lined up.

Commissioner Mielock asked if anything had changed in terms of number of bedrooms or any other significant design changes. Mr. Berent said “no.”

Commissioner Kirk remembered that one buyer was going to combine 2 units. Mr. Berent said this was still the case.

Commissioner Miller said he would support the motion on the floor, as long as the motion would indicate the ending date of November 3, 2017. The motion now read:

MOTION by Kirk, support Miller, that the Planning Commission grant a one-year extension, dated from November 3, 2016 and ending November 3, 2017, to Final Site Plan Approval for Corner House, 335 E. Cady.

Chair Wendt asked for a roll call vote:

Russell	yes
Kirk	yes
Wendt	yes
Mielock	yes
Smith	yes
Snyder	yes
Miller	yes

Therefore the motion carried unanimously.

7. PUBLIC HEARING: SPECIAL LAND USE – 129 N. WING STREET

Referring to the Carlisle/Wortman April 10, 2017 review letter, Planning Consultant Elmiger gave the background for this review. The parcel was on the southwest corner of Wing and Dunlap Streets and was currently occupied by a historic single-family residential structure that was converted into a four-plex sometime after World War II. The building had been vacant for 5-6 years. The new property owner would like to renovate the building back into a single-family home.

The current zoning was General Commercial District (GCD), which did not allow a single-family residential use. However, a “use of the same nature or class as those listed as either a Principal Use or Special Land Use in this district, which, as determined by the Planning Commission, are not more obnoxious or detrimental to the surrounding area than those listed” could be permitted as a Special Land Use.

Planning Consultant Elmiger said she had reviewed the request against the Special Land Use standards, including:

- *The proposed special land use shall be compatible with and in accordance with the general principles and objects of the City of Northville’s Master Plan.*

Currently the Master Plan designated this property and the others just south of it as office uses. Therefore the GCD Zoning was not consistent with the Master Plan. Those properties should be zoned for Professional and Business Office (PBO). The PBO would allow a residential dwelling unit as a special land use.

Planning Consultant Elmiger recommended that rather than considering a single family use under the GCD Zoning as *less obnoxious or detrimental*, a more appropriate course of action would be to rezone the parcel to PBO as the Master Plan called for, and then consider a single family dwelling unit under the Special Land Use standards of PBO.

- *The proposed special land use shall be designated, constructed, operated, and maintained to meet the stated intent of the zoning district as well as compliance with standards for preliminary site plan review.*

The current zoning of General Commercial District was intended for more intense business types that were accessed via a high-traffic corridor or a collector road. A single family residential home was not consistent with the GCD.

- *The proposed special land use shall be designed, constructed, operated and maintained to be compatible with existing or planned uses on surrounding land. In determining whether a special land use will be compatible and not create a significant detrimental impact, as compared to the impacts of permitted uses, consideration shall be given to the degree of impact the special land use may have on adjacent property, as compared with the expected value to the community.*

This standard was met.

- *The location and design of the proposed special land use shall minimize the negative impacts on the street system in consideration of items such as vehicle trip generation (i.e., volumes), types of traffic, access location and design, location of off-street parking, street capacity, traffic operations at proposed access points and traffic operations at nearby intersections.*

This standard was met.

- *The proposed special land use shall not have an adverse effect on the quality of the natural environment in comparison to the impacts associated with typical permitted uses.*

This standard was met.

- *The proposed special land use shall be located where it can be adequately served by essential public facilities and services, such as streets, pedestrian or bicycle facilities, police and fire protection, drainage systems, water and sewage facilities and schools.*

This standard was met.

In summary, Planning Consultant Elmiger considered the proposed project to return the structure to a single-family home as a positive for the neighborhood, and she supported the change. However, she recommended a different process, which would be to first rezone the parcel to PBO, and then consider the single-family use under that zoning district.

Commissioner Kirk asked if there would be more properties that should be rezoned to PBO. Planning Consultant Elmiger said a public hearing for rezoning all the businesses along Wing Street from Dunlap to Main Street might be appropriate.

Chair Wendt invited the applicant to make his presentation.

Greg Presley, Presley Architecture LLC, 108 N. Center, Suite 205, Northville, MI was present on behalf of this application, along with owners Janie Hickman and Dean Fliotsos, who currently lived across the street at 206 West Dunlap, Northville. They had purchased the subject property, which had been vacant for 5 years.

Mr. Presley had been hired four years ago by the previous owner to try to find out the highest and best use for this property, which was a four-plex. At that time the previous owner had proposed to convert the building into a duplex comprised of stacked condominiums. They received HDC approval for that project and completed construction documents. However, the owner never pulled the trigger on the project. At that time the opinion was that residential use met the zoning requirements of the GCD district, or was a grandfathered residential use.

Mr. Presley continued that the building was a vacant property in the GCD, and under the allowed by right uses there were hotels, motels, bed and breakfasts and inns (11.02.o.). The current use was not far from that as a form of lodging. Even though the four-plex would be more long-term rentals, he argued that this was an allowed use by right in the GCD. They were proposing a less intense use under GCD zoning, which the Planning Commission was allowed to grant under the *Special Land Uses Permitted After Review*, as Planning Consultant Elmiger already referenced: uses as determined by the Planning Commission as *no more obnoxious or detrimental to the surrounding area than those listed*.

Mr. Presley reiterated that he believed the GCD did allow for a form of residential use as a right. To allow the proposed single-family use as a Special Land Use was therefore a permitted use by right, by taking a more intense residential use and converting it to a less intense residential use.

Mr. Presley pointed out that office uses were also allowed in GCD, as well as PBO. He argued that the proposed use was not much different than a use allowed by right, and could be granted a Special Land Use in the GCD District, and was certainly *less obnoxious* than other uses allowed by right.

Mr. Presley speculated that the area was zoned GCD years ago in expectation that there would be spin-off businesses from the Northville Mall. However, that never materialized.

Mr. Presley explained that the problem with rezoning to PBO was that there were other properties that had the same issue: they were historic homes that would not be permitted to be torn down, and yet had no place to park cars. That was also the problem with the subject site, and was the reason it had never been developed with a GCD use before. GCD uses and PBO office uses required multiple parking spaces.

Also, the process of rezoning to PBO would take at least 2 more months, and he believed that GCD zoning did allow as a special land use the proposed use as a single-family home, which was the highest and best use for the property.

Mr. Presley asked that the Planning Commission grant a Special Land Use for a single-family home on this property. He noted that the project approved 4 years ago by the Historic District Commission was larger than this proposed use, which represented about 15% less volume than the previous approval. This was a better project than the earlier one.

Chair Wendt opened the public hearing at 7:30 p.m.

Carole Jean Stockhausen, 218 W. Dunlap Street, noted that she had sent a letter in support of the proposal. The building had been an eyesore for the neighborhood for a long time, and she supported bringing the structure back to single-family use.

Seeing that no one else came forward to speak, Chair Wendt closed the public hearing at 7:32 p.m.

Commissioner Miller said he had walked by this home for over 30 years. He agreed that it had never been in good repair, and was certainly a misfit under its current use on that corner. Especially with the proposed use oriented toward Dunlap Street, which conformed with the other residences there, and because it had always been a residential structure in one form or another, he supported the effort to change the use of the property to single family.

Commissioner Kirk said it was clear that the present state of the building was not its highest and best use, demonstrated by the fact that it had not been leased for 5 years. The Commission could leave the property the way it was, as a commercial use that was not the highest and best use, or could approve this change. The building's Victorian character allowed it to act as a buffer while relating it to the residential homes on Dunlap.

Commissioner Russell said he thought the present use was obnoxious and detrimental to the betterment of the neighborhood. He agreed with the applicant that the Commission should consider this proposed use as a special land use in the GCD District. However, going forward he felt the Commission should consider rezoning that whole side of Wing Street from Center to Dunlap as PBO in order to provide office use as was envisioned in the Master Plan, and also providing residential use should that need arise.

Commissioner Russell continued that what he didn't want to do was rezone this particular piece as PBO, leaving the adjacent residential properties as GCD. He supported going forward with the Special Land Use application.

Mr. Presley said that what they were proposing met the requirements of both the GCD and the PBO Districts. If the Commission allowed this proposal to go forward under GCD, and if later the whole block was rezoned to PBO, the use would still fit.

Commissioner Smith said the parcel was currently zoned GCD but was in the Master Plan as PBO. If the zoning along Wing Street changed to PBO generally, it would downzone the properties there, and some of their potential would be reduced.

Commissioner Miller said the main issue was whether or not to grant a Special Land Use this evening. The second issue of rezoning this or other properties to PBO was a side issue of how the zoning would be treated in the future. It made sense to set that issue aside in order to address the Special Land Use application.

Commissioner Russell said the Commission could grant the applicant's request because the new use was not any more obnoxious to the surrounding area, and neighbors were here in support.

In response to a question from Commissioner Mielock, Planning Consultant Elmiger said the Commission would make a recommendation to City Council regarding this request.

In response to a further question from Commissioner Mielock, Planning Consultant Elmiger said the approval would go with the land and not this specific applicant.

Commissioner Mielock asked what if someone wanted to come in and put in an interior design studio, for instance? Planning Consultant Elmiger said this could be done – a special land use would not restrict the property to only single family. All the other uses in the district would still be allowed. Granting a special land use added another permitted use to what was already allowed.

Commissioner Mielock said he was in favor of allowing a down-zoning, especially if it meant moving to a less intense use. If someone wanted to live in this building, he supported that.

Commissioner Kirk said he felt changing the use to a single family use on this parcel seemed to flow into the natural progression of what was desired for this area.

Planning Consultant Elmiger said that the next step was to make a motion in support of the applicant's request.

Mayor Roth noted that the review letter referenced “the use of the same nature or class as those listed as either a Principal Use or Special Land Use in this district . . .” Didn't the use have to be of the same nature or class before the “obnoxious” standard was applied?

Planning Consultant Elmiger said the applicant was arguing that a single-family residential use was similar or the same nature or class as hotel/motel/bed and breakfast in GCD.

Mayor Roth said this finding, if used, should be part of the record.

Commissioner Snyder said that he was having a hard time seeing hotel/motel/bed and breakfast use being similar to single family residential.

Mr. Presley said it was a form a lodging.

Commissioner Snyder asked what would keep someone from opening up a hotel/motel/bed and breakfast on other residential streets, using this same argument.

Mr. Presley said a property would need to be in the GCD District in order to have that opportunity.

Commissioner Snyder said he was still unsure if this argument was plausible.

Commissioner Smith said they were discussing the difference between commercial applications for living spaces and private residential spaces.

Commissioner Kirk indicated he was ready to offer a motion.

MOTION by Kirk, support Miller, that the Planning Commission is in support of the applicant’s request to use 129 North Wing Street as a single family home as a Special Land Use, based on the fact that this is a use of the same nature or class as those listed in Section 11.02, including hotels, motels, or bed and breakfast units, which are permitted uses in the GCD District, and the Planning Commission determines that the single family use is not more obnoxious or detrimental to the surrounding area than those listed and is recommending to City Council for approval as a Special Land Use.

Chair Wendt asked for a roll call vote:

Russell	yes
Kirk	yes
Wendt	yes
Mielock	yes
Smith	yes
Snyder	yes
Miller	yes

Therefore the motion carried unanimously.

Note: This motion was re-opened for consideration and amended during the discussion of Item 8, below.

8. SITE PLAN REVIEW: 129 N. WING STREET

Mr. Presley asked if the City Council agreed and approved this request, would the applicants need to return to the Planning Commission for a plan review?

Planning Consultant Elmiger said the Special Land Use process required that the Special Land Use application be heard at the same time as the site plan review. She had reviewed the site plan and this was on the agenda this evening.

Mr. Presley said he was very interested in getting comments this evening regarding the site plan and was ready to make his presentation, even though he had not brought elevations because he didn’t know there would be site plan review this evening.

Responding to a comment in the review letter, Mr. Presley said the height of the building was the existing height, which was probably 22-24 feet to the ridge. This was not a tall building by allowed standards. They were proposing the main structure to be “the structure,” and were actually taking some of the building away. They were, however, proposing to lift the building in order to get a working basement. Right now the only access to the basement was from the outside. They wanted to raise the grade and lift the building up in order to get positive drainage away from the building, something it did not have right now, resulting in water in the basement.

Mr. Presley said that they also proposed to take about 6 feet out of the original structure, thus gaining the space to construct a garage, which would be at least 25 feet away from the property line on the west side. They would have a side access driveway, with a turn into the drive, giving the ability to back up with a 1-point turn and nose out onto the street.

Mr. Presley continued that they were changing the orientation of the house from Wing Street to Dunlap Street, and would most likely change the address to a Dunlap address, so that it would relate to the single-family homes on Dunlap, not to the businesses on Wing Street. The HDC agreed to change the orientation 4 years ago and he thought they would again.

The porch and main access would be on the north side of the house. The current front east entrance would no longer be needed. The second floor would be substantially new, except they were saving the exterior walls. They were bumping out to the south and going over the garage with additional living space.

Commissioner Mielock asked if a special land use were approved, would it retain GCD standards, including setback requirements. Planning Consultant Elmiger said the Commission could condition any approval on the site meeting R-1B standards, for instance, or the standards of whatever residential district was thought appropriate.

Mr. Presley said the garage and other renovations would meet the GCD standards.

Chair Wendt asked about HDC approval of orienting the house toward Dunlap. Mr. Presley said they had allowed that 4 years ago. At that time they had allowed two front access garages as a duplex. He did not think allowing a side access garage would be an issue for them.

Commissioner Miller said he thought it was a good plan and supported the main orientation toward Dunlap, de-emphasizing the orientation toward Wing Street.

At this time Planning Consultant Elmiger explained that she had made a procedural error, and the previous motion making a recommendation to City Council would need to be revisited. The Northville ordinance stated: *Upon conclusion of the public hearing procedures, and after consideration of the Basis of Determination and the standards of preliminary site plan review, the Planning Commission may deny, approve, approve with conditions, or refer back to the applicant a request for special land use approval. The decision on a special land use shall be incorporated in a statement of findings and conclusions relative to the special land use which specifies the basis for the decision and any conditions imposed.* (Article 16.01.c.3)

Mr. Presley said that if the Planning Commission did approve the special land use this evening, the HDC would review the architecture. The HDC would be the arbiter of what the shell looked like.

Planning Consultant Elmiger said the motion could be amended to include R-1B standards and HDC approval.

City Manager Sullivan asked if the site plan had to be approved concurrently with the special land use approval. Planning Consultant Elmiger said this was the case. However, the site plan had been submitted and reviewed. The only thing they didn't have was the elevations.

Commissioner Russell said the request was for final site plan review, but the Commission did not have enough information to grant that. They did have enough information to grant preliminary site plan review.

Based on this new information, it was decided to re-consider the previous motion.

MOTION by Kirk, support Miller, to re-open the motion for re-consideration regarding Special Land Use – 129 N. Wing Street.

Motion carried unanimously.

MOTION by Kirk, support Miller, to amend the motion regarding Special Land Use – 129 N. Wing Street, as follows:

MOTION by Kirk, support Miller, that the Planning Commission is ~~in support of the~~ grant the applicant’s request to use 129 North Wing Street as a single family home as a Special Land Use, based on the fact that this is a use of the same nature or class as those listed in Section 11.02, including hotels, motels, or bed and breakfast units, which are permitted uses in the GCD District, and that the Planning Commission determines that the single family use is not more obnoxious or detrimental to the surrounding area than those listed, ~~and is recommending to City Council for approval as a Special Land Use.~~, and also grant approval of the Preliminary Site Plan with the following condition:

- **Approval of the Historic District Commission.**

Chair Wendt asked for a roll call vote.

Russell	yes
Kirk	yes
Wendt	yes
Mielock	yes
Smith	yes
Snyder	yes
Miller	yes

Therefore the motion carried unanimously.

9. CORNER HOUSE – SITE PLAN EXTENSION REQUEST, 335 E. CADY STREET

This item was heard earlier in the evening, before Item 7, as noted.

10. DISCUSSION

PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS TO MINOR SITE PLAN REVIEW PROCESS

Planning Consultant Elmiger said that these amendments were for revisions to ordinance language for the site plan review process. This had been discussed at the last Planning Commission meeting and she had made changes based on comments at that meeting, including:

1. The phrase “site development plan” had been replaced by “site plan.”

2. Clarifications were made regarding what required review by the Planning Commission and what required minor site plan approval, and what were exempted from either of those review processes.
3. For both Planning Commission and Minor Site Plan reviews, a “2,500 square foot building increase” standard had been added as a dividing line between each type of review.
4. For Minor Site Plan review, language was added to send the project to the Planning Commission, as a new application, if the applicant was not satisfied with the results of the administrative process.
5. Minor Site Plan approvals were also added to the section that described extending a final site plan approval. The applicant must come to the Planning Commission for an extension.

The changes were shown in blue, with the bulk of the new language shown on pages 2 and 3 of the draft document entitled *An ordinance to amend the zoning ordinance of the City of Northville to clarify when Planning Commission review or minor site plan review is required, and the site plan review process.*

The following discussion included:

- Buildings that increased the size of the area by more than 5%, or at least 2,500 square feet (whichever was smaller), would come before the Planning Commission. Less than these amounts would be considered a minor site plan review, and those would not come before the Commission.
- Under Section 19.03.c. *Minor Site Plan Administrative Review*, even if an application complied with the qualifiers listed, the committee (made up of the Planning Commission Chair, City Planner and City Manager) had the discretion to still require review by the Planning Commission, as stated: *based on the intensity of the proposed use and anticipated impacts on adjacent land uses*. However, this could be made clearer by additional clarifying language.
- Regarding the 2,500 square foot addition being a minor site plan review, other Planning Commissions in some other communities would also not review something that small. However, some communities did have full time planning staff that had the ability and time to look at smaller projects. Often smaller projects would go to the Planning Commission if the parking requirement were increased or the parking was modified in some way, or if the use was intensified.
- Paragraph c had a typo – “quality” should be changed to “qualify.” Also, the second sentence in that paragraph should perhaps read: . . . shall determine if a project qualifies for Minor Site Plan review *or Planning Commission review* . . .
- Similar language in Section 19.04.b and 19.05 1st paragraph should be consistent, and should probably both read: . . . *approve with conditions, refer back for modifications, or disapprove* . . . In any event, the language needed to be the same.

Commissioner Miller thought the proposed language balanced providing meaningful guidance while offering some flexibility and discretion as to what constituted a minor site plan review.

Commissioner Mielock thought the changes discussed this evening did not require another public hearing, and therefore offered the following motion:

MOTION by Mielock, support Russell, to recommend to City Council approval of the revisions to Article 19 of the Northville Zoning Ordinance.

Chair Wendt asked for a roll call vote.

Russell	yes
Kirk	yes

Wendt	yes
Mielock	yes
Smith	yes
Snyder	yes
Miller	yes

Therefore the motion carried unanimously.

FRONT YARD OPEN SPACE

Planning Consultant Elmiger gave the background to this item, referencing the document entitled *An ordinance to amend the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Northville to require front open space on a residential lot, prohibit parking on an unpaved surface in the front yard of a residential district or across a public sidewalk, and clarify that the driveway width requirement in Section 19.05 doesn't apply to single-family or two-family residential lots.* Proposed changes were shown in blue.

65% front yard open space was required for:

- All lots that met the minimum lot width requirement,
- All lots that did not meet the minimum lot width requirement but had vehicular access to an alley abutting the lot.

For existing lots whose lot width was less than the minimum requirement and did not have vehicular access to an alley, the front open space could be used exclusively for a driveway up to 16 feet wide, regardless if this resulted in less than 65% front open space.

Also, the definition of pavement was changed so that handicap access ramps were excluded from the definition. This information had already been in the ordinance, but was now moved to this location.

The following discussion included:

- The non-required yard should be labeled on the graphics (currently shown by dashed lines).
- The minimum front yard required front yard averaging. The minimum front yard was defined as whatever that average was.
- The word “minimum” could be eliminated, and the graphics amended to say: *front yard setback or front yard average, if required.*
- Should footnote 25.A change “free of pavement” to “landscaped area”? It was noted that the schedule of regulations already included a minimum landscaped area for a lot of 35%. What did “free of pavement” mean? Would this be landscaping or just dirt? The paragraph was entitled *Paved Surface Provisions* and therefore did not apply to landscaping. Planning Consultant Elmiger recommended leaving the language as it was, but if it did cause problems the language could be brought back to the Commission for further revision.

Commissioner Russell indicated he was ready to make a motion.

MOTION by Russell, support Kirk, to recommend approval of the Zoning Ordinance Amendments to Article 26 to the City Council.

Chair Wendt asked for a roll call vote.

Russell	yes
----------------	------------

Kirk	yes
Wendt	yes
Mielock	yes
Smith	yes
Snyder	yes
Miller	yes

Therefore the motion carried unanimously.

11. ADJOURN

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

MOTION by Russell, support Smith, to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 8:37 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,
Cheryl McGuire
Recording Secretary

Approved as published 5/16/2017