



Plan Commission Meeting Minutes January 24, 2023

3930 N. Murray Avenue, Village of Shorewood, WI 53211

1. Call to order.

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m.

Present: President Ann McKaig – Chair, Commissioners Kate Flynn Post, Barbara Kiely Miller, Dan Wycklendt, Josh Pollack

Excused: Trustee Couto, Therese Klein

Others present: Leslie Oberholtzer – Codametrics, Planning Director Bart Griepentrog, Planning Administrative Clerk Crystal Kopydlowski

2. Approval of December 6, 2022 meeting minutes.

Ms. Kiely Miller moved to approve the minutes, seconded by Ms. Flynn Post. Vote to approve 5-0.

3. Consideration of Conditional Use Permit application for the operation of a resale and consignment business at commercial property 2518 E. Capitol Drive.

Director Griepentrog provided an overview of the item per information provided in the meeting materials. Ms. Cynthia Jashinske applied to operate Posh Fashion and Consignment Boutique, a women's and men's fashion boutique with resale and consignment at 2518 E. Capitol Drive. The parcel is zoned B-3 Mixed Use Commercial District and resale shops are listed as a conditional use. No interior or exterior modifications are associated with this specific application but the building itself is going through renovations to split the space into three separate spaces. The business will sell men's and women's clothing and accessories and will require a secondhand dealer's license. The space is 815 square feet and would operate seven days a week from 10 a.m. to 9 p.m. with one to two employees on site at a time. Parking is not applicable to this application because it does not involve new development, substantial enlargement, or a change in use.

Ms. Kiely Miller asked if this was a second location or a new operation. Ms. Jashinske stated this was a new operation. Ms. Kiely Miller asked if this business was at all related to the other resale shop on Capitol Drive called Posh Collective. Ms. Jashinske stated the businesses were not related.

President McKaig opened the public hearing at 6:37 p.m. With no comments the public hearing was closed at 6:38 p.m.

Mr. Wycklendt moved to approve the Conditional Use Permit application for the operation of a resale and consignment business at commercial property 2518 E. Capitol Drive, based on meeting the conditions stipulated in 535-25C. Seconded by Ms. Flynn Post.

Attorney Bayer arrived at 6:39 p.m.

Ms. Kiely Miller expressed concern that there is a similar business operating on Capitol Drive with a similar name stating it could cause confusion for customers, deliveries, or promotions. She stated she was happy to consider the use in the space on the condition the name changed.

President McKaig said her interpretation was that the business name falls out of the scope of review for the Plan Commission and that the Commission is considering a use and a business plan. Mr. Griepentrog said that a business name does not match any of the seven conditions and would not be within the scope of review. He added that when Design Review Board reviews signage they cannot tell anyone what to put on their sign due to freedom of speech.

Ms. Flynn Post said it was great to have a business fill the space after being vacant and saw no reason to oppose it based on the criteria.

Vote to approve 4-1. Ms. Kiely Miller voted nay.

4. Consideration of Conditional Use Permit application to construct a chimney that will exceed the maximum building height on a new single-unit dwelling at residential property 3534 N. Lake Drive.

Director Griepentrog provided an overview of the item per information provided in the meeting materials. Before the Commission is a conditional use permit application for the construction of a chimney that will exceed the maximum building height at 3534 N. Lake Drive. Similarly, on September 24, 2019 the Plan Commission approved the construction of four chimneys at this same address that would've exceeded the max. Plans to construct that house did not commence, and the prior approval lapsed.

The parcel is zoned R-1, which per 535-19A has a height maximum of 30 feet. Building height is measured from the established grade of the frontage of the street to the mean height level between the eaves and ridges of the pitch roof. The proposed midpoint of the roof is 28' 4 1/2", which conforms to the allowable height regulations. The chimney, which would top out at 36' 6 3/8", requires a conditional use per 535-30A.

On December 1, 2022 the Design Review Board approved architectural plans for the construction of a new single-unit dwelling to be located at the 3534 N. Lake Drive. The plans included a chimney on the southern elevation that extends above the maximum building height and a second chimney on the northern wing that is below the maximum building height.

Building code requires a chimney to extend at least three feet above the highest point where it passes through the roof and be at least two feet higher than the house within ten feet of the chimney.

For reference, the chimney to the north at 3550 Lake Drive is 34 feet in height. The property to the south at 3510 Lake Drive, has a chimney on the garage that is 36 feet in height and a chimney on the house that is 49 feet in height.

Opposition was received from the property owners at 3562 Lake Drive and that was provided to the Commissioners.

Ms. Flynn Post asked if there was any concern of safety. Mr. Griepentrog stated that from a building perspective there are no concerns and that the building is setback a considerable amount from the south lot line. Applicant Katie Minn (Northworks Architects and Planners) stated that the setback distance from the closest part of the guest wing is 28 feet and to the building chimney itself is approximately 40 feet.

Mr. Wycklendt asked about the code requirement for the chimney. Mr. Griepentrog stated the code requires the chimney to be 2 feet higher than any portion of the house within 10 feet of the chimney. Mr. Wycklendt confirmed then that the chimney couldn't be 30 feet because it would violate code, be a safety issue and be the same height at the roof. Mr. Griepentrog stated this was correct.

Mr. Wycklendt moved to approve the conditional use permit application to construct a chimney that exceeds the maximum building height of a new single-unit dwelling at residential property 3534 N. Lake Drive, per the plans attached to this application, based on meeting the conditions stipulated in 535-25C.

Mr. Wycklendt withdrew his motion.

President McKaig opened the public hearing at 6:48 p.m. With no comments the public hearing was closed at 6:49 p.m.

Mr. Wycklendt moved to approve the conditional use permit application to construct a chimney that exceeds the maximum building height of a new single-unit dwelling at residential property 3534 N. Lake Drive, per the plans attached to this application, based on meeting the conditions stipulated in 535-25C. Seconded by Ms. Kiely Miller. Vote to approve 5-0.

5. Discussion and consideration of Resolution 2023-07 A Resolution Recommending the Adoption of Amendment #1 to the Village of Shorewood Comprehensive Plan 2040 in Relation to the Commercial Zoning Update.

President McKaig reminded Commissioners that this item has been discussed and recommended previously in relation to the Commercial Zoning Update due to a few minor changes. Director Griepentrog said the information in the packet matches this description and what is being sought is a recommendation via resolution so the Village Board can consider adoption of said amendment at their February 6 meeting prior to and in conjunction with deliberating the Commercial Zoning Update. In order to align the recommendations of the Commercial Zoning Update with the Comprehensive Plan's Central District Future Land Use Subcategories, the amendment seeks to remove requirements related to ground-floor uses from the narrative descriptions.

President McKaig asked if any commissioners needed further clarification on this item.

Mr. Pollack moved to approve Resolution 2023-07 A Resolution Recommending the Adoption of Amendment #1 to the Village of Shorewood Comprehensive Plan 2040 in Relation to the Commercial Zoning Update. Seconded by Mr. Wycklendt. A roll call vote was taken: Mr. Wycklendt – Aye, Mr. Pollack – Aye, Ms. Kiely Miller – Aye, Ms. Flynn Post – Aye and President McKaig – Aye. Vote to approve 5-0.

6. Discussion and recommendation of Ordinance Amendment implementing the Village's Commercial Zoning Update by repealing and replacing Chapter 535 Zoning, and associated changes in Section 225-12 Design Review Board, Chapter 319 Article 1 Food Service, Subsection 326-7 Minimum space, use and location requirements, Chapter 437 Article II Display of Merchandise in Outdoor Areas, and Subsection 455-2 Refuse and collection service.

President McKaig reminded the Commission that at the previous meeting they reviewed the final draft and provided their direction to the consultant. The draft before them has incorporated the changes from the previous meeting. She asked if any comments were received on this item prior to the meeting. Mr. Griepentrog stated he had not received any comments.

Leslie Oberholtzer, Codametrics, introduced and gave an overview/presentation of the Commercial Zoning Update. She displayed the membership of the working group, stated the update is supporting the Comprehensive Plan 2040 going forward and that the comprehensive plan is the basis for all the new zoning. The project scope was very clear and included form-based elements and updated use classifications with goals of more predictable redevelopment, compatibility with existing context and alignment with

community expectations. She stated the update addresses all the B Districts; the commercial corridors. This is now the final stage of the process/schedule for the project as the adoption process begins.

Ms. Oberholtzer detailed revisions that have been made since the presentation of the draft in December 2022. The revisions are as follows:

- The police department on Wilson Drive was removed from the GX-2 zone and rezoned to P-1 Civic and Institutional District to make it more consistent.
- With PDDs being a legacy overlay there needed to be base zones applied to those parcels outside of the commercial district. Those zones include P-1 Civic and Institutional District, R-7 Townhouse Residence District and R-10 Apartment House District 2.
- In the GX-3 District (intersection of Oakland and Capitol), the rear setback regulation was revised to include “min. 5 ft. setback may be approved through a planning exception when alley access exists along the side lot line”. This accounted for side alley scenarios that are rare. The ground-story height was increased to be 16 ft. max. for the GX-3 District. (535-22G)
- The Stepped-Back Top Story would only apply in the GX-1 and GX-2 Districts and not the GX-3 District. (535-22G)
- In terms of Bird-Friendly Design, this was revised to apply to all buildings, 5,000 square feet or larger. This would also apply to the replacement of 50% or more of all applicable windows on all facades. The fly-through conditions were increased to 30 feet. There was a Design Review Board trigger included also due to the window replacement regulation. (535-23F)
- In the GX Districts, some uses are permitted in limited portions of building footprints. These uses are limited to the total cumulative floor area not to exceed 25% of the ground-story building footprint. A planning adjustment was added for limited uses which states “A planning adjustment may be requested for up to an additional 10% of the footprint, maximum 35%”. (535-25)
- A new use category was added called indoor entertainment which would include businesses like bowling alleys, arcades, laser tag and escape rooms. These would be allowed in the upper stories of the MX Districts, anywhere in the CX and in the GX Districts. (535-25D(4))
- Due to a public comment regarding concerns about electric vehicle charging fleets the sentence that stated “Fleet vehicle fueling facilities are not allowed” was stricken. The sentence stating “Electric charging for fleet vehicles is allowed, accessory to the principal use” was added. Under Accessory Uses - Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment Regulations a sentence was added that reads “In the commercial and mixed use districts, EV supply equipment may be located anywhere on the lot where a parking space is allowed per the building type regulations”. (535-25D(14) and 535-26D)
- Updates to the R District Accessory Structures section. Included are size regulations (that had mistakenly been excluded) that read “Accessory structures must not exceed 15 feet in height and shall not occupy more than 10% of the lot unless otherwise stated”. Outbuildings and garages were added to all levels in the R and P zones. Their exclusion had been pointed out previously. Site Coverage was included for drive-through canopies to read “Drive-through canopies are limited to

no more than 50% of the building footprint". Size and Site Coverage for fuel pump canopies was updated to read "Fuel pump canopies may not exceed 18 feet in height and may not occupy more than 35% of the lot". (535-26D)

- Procedures were updated. Clear language was added that details a zoning review requirement for conditional uses. The line "and property values" was stricken from the Design Review Intent per previous discussions. Language regarding replacement of 50% or more of all windows was added to Design Review Applicability. (535-31)
- The Village Attorney had asked to add the language that reads "The Design Review Board does not have the authority to revise or amend zoning regulations". When this was being added it was determined that a Duties and Responsibilities section should be added for Design Review Board. The Design Review Board establishment, membership and organization was currently located in Chapter 225 Building Construction and was relocated to Chapter 16 Boards, Commissions and Committees Article VIII. Mr. Griepentrog stated that the suggested language addition from the Village Attorney does not appear in the public review draft and encouraged any questions or comments on it. President McKaig asked if it was too late to be added. Attorney Bayer said that it was not too late to add and that it is not a change to the Design Review Board's jurisdiction it just makes it more explicit and clearer.

President McKaig asked if any commissioners had any questions/comments or needed any further clarification on the changes just presented or that had been discussed prior to this meeting.

Ms. Kiely Miller questioned the definition of setback (page 57 materials) and asked if the definition is misleading when discussing rear lot lines and setbacks. President McKaig asked if this was an industry standard definition. Ms. Oberholtzer stated it was and she noted that each building type has defined building setbacks and parking setbacks. Ms. Kiely Miller withdrew this concern.

Ms. Kiely Miller referenced page 69 of the materials and a section that states "there is landscaping necessary to adequately screen it from street view that does not impair the vision triangle;" and she questioned if this referred to just commercial driveways or commercial residential. Mr. Griepentrog stated this applies to only residential. And the section this language is in (Section F) is being modified to state "Decks, patios, porches and driveways in R Districts". He also clarified that this requirement applies to circular driveways which most often exist on Lake Drive. The vegetation requirement also relates to circular driveways in the R Districts.

On page 76-77 zoning districts are listed. Ms. Kiely Miller suggested that since all the residential districts are listed (R-1 through R-10) that all the commercial districts in the MX, CX, GX and RX zones should be listed too. Mr. Griepentrog and Ms. Oberholtzer both agreed they should be listed for clarity.

Ms. Kiely Miller asked if the zoning code will be in a file format after its completion so that updates and changes can be made internally. Mr. Griepentrog stated that moving forward village staff will be able to make any changes without the need for a consultant.

On page 182, Ms. Kiely Miller referenced the new use group "entertainment, indoor" noting it was not discussed in the working group and that after reading the description these types of businesses would likely be businesses that, because of noise, parking and the number of patrons should be kept as requiring a conditional use and not a use by right. President McKaig clarified that this use was not discussed in the working group. Ms. Kiely Miller said

that is correct. Mr. Griepentrog stated that in December, he received an inquiry and application for a use like this. He consulted Ms. Oberholtzer asking what type of use this type of business would fit into. President McKaig verified that the application was received after the last Plan Commission meeting and prior to this meeting. Mr. Griepentrog said yes. Ms. Oberholtzer stated that this is a new use category and that the uses in the current code do not allow for these types of uses/businesses. They had originally left this use out of the code update after having early on discussed it as a use category that likely would not fitting anywhere in the village. After the application was received, it was decided that a use category separate from consumer services should be created. Mr. Griepentrog said the use category is limited in square footage. President McKaig asked if this was a standard use in other codes. Ms. Oberholtzer stated yes. Mr. Griepentrog clarified this would be allowed in the rear or upper levels of the MX district. Ms. Kiely Miller said it would be allowed by right though in the CX and GX districts and she proposes it be a conditional use.

Ms. Kiely Miller referred to page 183 commenting on veterinarians being grouped with other human medical and dental uses. She suggested they are different than a medical office even if they have more activity and asked to remove them from this restrictive usage where they are not allowed in storefronts. Mr. Griepentrog asked where they would be placed if removed from medical or dental office or clinics. She suggested that veterinarians should be placed in consumer services with pet grooming and pet stores. Mr. Griepentrog added that pet grooming is already a part of improvement service and pet stores would be retail use. The idea of this was that the veterinary services would be behind a more active use if it was in the MX districts and it is allowed in the CX and GX districts.

On page 192, Ms. Kiely Miller suggested rewording “no person other than members of the immediate household occupying such dwelling shall be employed in the home occupation” to say “non-household members cannot work out of the location”. Mr. Griepentrog said this is outside of the commercial district and has not been updated. This was not within Ms. Oberholtzer’s scope. This is a future item the Plan Commission will be reviewing.

President McKaig recommended that bird friendly design be held until current litigation is decided. Attorney Bayer researched the court case that challenged Madison, WI’s version of this regulation. There was a decision and order issued by the circuit court in August that upheld the regulation. An appeal brief was just filed last week and he does not anticipate a decision until this fall. He believes that if The Associated Builders of Wisconsin, who have brought this case, lose the appeal they will likely appeal to the Wisconsin Supreme Court. He does not see a quick resolution of this matter. The Associated Builders of Wisconsin argued that state law preempted this regulation and that ultimately it is a building code regulation not a zoning code regulation. He agreed with the circuit court’s decision. An appeal to the WI Supreme Court could be a couple year process and his guess is the circuit court decision will be upheld. Attorney Bayer said that if this is passed as a practical matter with limited areas this regulation would apply to it is possible no issues would manifest before a decision is made. He said a builder/developer would have to be adversely affected by the regulation in order to sue. He said the likelihood of a municipality being sued over this in the next year and a half is unlikely. He advised to make a decision based on policy and know that the circuit court in Dane County has upheld a regulation similar to this. President McKaig said another way to say this is that the Plan Commission can move ahead with this regulation and asked Attorney Bayer if he is not recommending that they defer it. He said there is nothing about the lawsuit that affects Shorewood directly and there is no statewide stay pending an outcome. He said it is reasonable to discuss and review the topic. Attorney Bayer does not recommend acting out of fear but rather make an informed policy decision. President McKaig supported this moving forward allowing the Village Board to review it further. Ms. Flynn Post asked if the Madison case was about the glass or

decals. Attorney Bayer said his understanding was that the case was more of a global challenge to the zoning regulation and the municipality's right to conduct any regulation in this area. They argue that any state law doesn't allow local regulation in this area and that state law follows international building code that preempts the local regulation. Ms. Flynn Post said this doesn't address her question of windows versus decals. Ms. Oberholtzer said the way that the visual marker section was written is to allow a variety of methods of marking the glass. This could be embedded fritted glass, etched glass, film or UV-coating (decals). She said it was written to be clear there are a variety of ways to meet the code. She did not believe the Madison code was as specific.

President McKaig withdrew her concern regarding bird-friendly design.

President McKaig, referencing the indoor entertainment use category, asked for further clarification as it is being added as permitted as-of-right in the CX and GX districts. Mr. Griepentrog said the inclusion was in response to an application and his initial response being to categorize the business as an event venue. He said he wanted this type of use to be more specific than even an event venue. He said it was not discussed in the working group but in terms of a zoning administrator he would've moved it along as an event venue and he wanted the code more clear so that it was not ambiguous or challenged to the Board of Appeals in the future. Ms. Oberholtzer said that if this is made a conditional use she asked what types of conditions would be applied and what is the reasoning for making it a conditional use. President McKaig asked if there was support for the changes as drafted. Mr. Wycklendt supports the inclusion of the use as written understanding Ms. Kiely Miller's concerns with noise. Ms. Kiely Miller said that there are seven criteria that are used to evaluate conditional use applications. She said that they have to consider if the use being proposed will interfere at all with surrounding neighbors. She said depending on how robust the business could be it could create traffic and parking concerns also. Mr. Pollack, Ms. Flynn Post and President McKaig had no concerns with how this was written.

Trustee Stokebrand asked if businesses offering axe throwing would fall into this use category. Ms. Oberholtzer said that would be up to Mr. Griepentrog to interpret. She said that it would probably fall into this category. These businesses are fully indoors and the safety concerns for the interior would be similar so you wouldn't treat it differently. President McKaig asked if there were any examples elsewhere such as the City of Milwaukee. Mr. Griepentrog said he knows the City of Milwaukee has axe throwing businesses but does not know the regulations surrounding them. He offered to research it more if wanted. The intent was to have a more generalized category to review applications. They are not trying to discriminate on types of businesses. He would interpret axe throwing in this category.

President McKaig asked if there were any proposed changes to the Entertainment, Indoor used category. Ms. Kiely Miller suggested at the end of the description on page 182 changing the language to read "Does not include adult-oriented businesses or axe throwing". Mr. Wycklendt cautioned getting too detailed on what types of businesses are detailed here.

Ms. Kiely Miller moved to change the Entertainment, Indoor use category description to read "Does not include adult-orientated businesses or businesses offering experiences like axe throwing". There was no second. The motion failed.

Mr. Wycklendt moved to approve 535-25D(4) Entertainment, Indoor as drafted which states "Establishments that provide commercial gathering places, primarily indoors, for participant or spectator entertainment that have no more than 20,000 square feet of total gross floor area. Typical general entertainment uses include cinemas, theaters, arcades, bowling alleys, and experience-based entertainment establishments, such as laser tag, escape rooms, and arts and crafts workshops. Does not include adult-orientated businesses." and

shown as a permitted as-of-right in the upper stories only of the MX Districts and a permitted as-of-right in the CX, GX, and P Districts. Seconded by Mr. Pollack. Vote to approve 4-1. Ms. Kiely Miller voted nay.

Referring back to page 183, (veterinary businesses) Section 535-25D(9), Ms. Kiely Miller stated that per the usage chart on page 180 these types of businesses are only allowed on the upper levels of the MX and CX Districts but permitted on all levels of the GX District. Ms. Oberholtzer clarified that in the MX and CX districts they can be on the first floor but in the rear of the level. Mr. Wycklendt asked if the intent is to not have surgery being done in the front window of the business. Ms. Oberholtzer said that is correct and to also not have storefront windows blocked by blinds which is often the case with medical type businesses.

Ms. Kiely Miller moved to remove veterinary clinics from the uses chart to not be included under Medical-Dental Clinics Office but be a stand alone use and allowed permitted as-of-right in the MX, CX and GX Districts. There was no second. The motion failed.

This concluded all the points of discussion.

President McKaig asked if anyone in the public wanted to be heard on the matter.

Trustee Stokebrand asked if there was any municipality within 100 miles that has adopted form-based zoning so we can see what this will look like in ten years. Any place to see how this zoning theory has manifested. Ms. Oberholtzer stated that yes many communities have adopted this. Some of the recent ones have been Hywood and Villa Park, Illinois and Allouez and De Pere, Wisconsin. Mr. Griepentrog said form-based code has been around for around 30 years and this is not new nationally. He said Milwaukee has areas of form-based code as well. Whitefish Bay has elements of form-based written into their code also.

Trustee Stokebrand said there is nervousness for the first five years and levels of vacancy. Mr. Griepentrog said that in terms of form-based code and uses those are two separate items. These got merged early on in the hybrid form-based code and vacancies based on uses are not related to form-based standards. He is happy to research this and get her more information.

Ms. Flynn Post commented that she sees a huge opportunity for a communication plan to help the community understand what form-based planning is all about. To show the design process as it stands and what it will look like after. She asked to figure a way to communicate this more effectively. President McKaig said there was a communication plan approved with this project. The draft before them is reflective of a diverse array of stakeholder input along with professional experience. Mr. Griepentrog said there will be a presentation at the Village Board meeting and if there is anything that one feels should be included they can contact him.

Ms. Kiely Miller said the process chart, use chart and map sum up pretty well what is in the 100 plus pages of the code.

Mr. Griepentrog said there have been village manager memos for the last two weeks. Next week the project will be a feature story. It has been advertised on social media. Invitations were sent to Village Trustees to attend this meeting. The communication plan has been followed throughout the process. Mailings are being sent to commercial property owners informing them of the project and the upcoming Village Board meeting/public hearing.

Mr. Wycklendt moved to recommend the changes associated with the Commercial Zoning Update as drafted, inclusive of changes requested by the Village Attorney in relation to Design Review Board and the request to list all the zoning districts in 535-17 Establishment, and direct staff to prepare an Ordinance Amendment implementing the Village's Commercial Zoning Update by repealing and replacing Chapter 535 Zoning, and associated

changes in Section 225-12 Design Review Board, Chapter 319 Article 1 Food Service, Subsection 326-7 Minimum space, use and location requirements, Chapter 437 Article II Display of Merchandise in Outdoor Areas, and Subsection 455-2 Refuse and collection service for Village Board consideration. Seconded by Mr. Pollack.

Ms. Kiely Miller said that after 13 meetings of the working group she feels some areas fell short and thinks some things will be regretted. She is voting to not recommend as drafted tonight.

Ms. Flynn Post said this is a direct output of the Comprehensive Planning process. She said it does a great job of articulating and capturing those priorities that were identified through a village wide process. A process that does not need to be reinvented now. This has been an exhaustive process with dozens of community members involved and hundreds of community member hours invested in this. She urges the Village Board to adopt these changes with the confidence that the issues have been thoroughly vetted by the working group, the Plan Commission and the public hearings. This is a huge opportunity for the Village to enact a new vision for building for the community and one that is following a lot of complaints and concerns about development in recent years. She thanked Director Griepentrog for his leadership and Ms. Oberholtzer for her patience.

Mr. Wycklendt said that through the process one may not agree with all that is being proposed but that as a whole this will work for the village.

Mr. Jesse Dercks, 4429 N. Maryland Avenue, asked if it is correct that the proposal for the indoor facility in the MX1 and MX2 would restrict to the basement or second floor. Mr. Griepentrog said that you could still operate on the first floor but the first 20 feet would have to be an active use or retail. There is no limit to the basement or second floor. A business can have multiple uses also.

Vote to approve 4-1. Ms. Kiely Miller voted nay.

7. Future agenda items.

Mr. Griepentrog stated that there may be pending applications submitted for the February meeting as well as discussion of the Commission's future initiatives as directed by the Village Manager.

8. Adjournment.

Mr. Wycklendt moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:23 p.m. Seconded by Mr. Pollack. Vote to adjourn 5-0.

Recorded by,



Crystal Kopydlowski
Planning Department Administrative Clerk