



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

CITY OF NOVI

Regular Meeting

December 7, 2022 7:00 PM

Council Chambers | Novi Civic Center
45175 W. Ten Mile (248) 347-0475

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 PM.

ROLL CALL

Present: Member Avdoulos (Acting Chair), Member Becker, Member Dismondy, Member Roney

Absent Excused: Member Lynch, Chair Pehrson, Member Verma

Staff: Barbara McBeth, City Planner; Beth Saarela, City Attorney; Lindsay Bell, Senior Planner; Christian Carroll, Planner; Rick Meader, Landscape Architect, Douglas Repen, Environmental Consultant

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Member Becker led the meeting attendees in the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion made by Member Dismondy and seconded by Member Roney.

VOICE VOTE TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 7, 2022 PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA MOVED BY MEMBER DISMONDY AND SECONDED BY MEMBER RONEY.

Motion to approve the December 7, 2022 Planning Commission Agenda. Motion carried 4-0.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Acting Chair Avdoulos invited members of the audience who wished to address the Planning Commission during the first audience participation to come forward. Seeing that nobody wished to participate, Acting Chair Avdoulos closed the first public participation

CORRESPONDENCE

There was not any correspondence.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

There were not any Committee reports.

CITY PLANNER REPORT

City Planner McBeth had nothing to report.

CONSENT AGENDA - REMOVALS AND APPROVALS

1. **123.NET FIBER HUT JSP22-49**

Approval at the request of Moiseev/Gordon Associates, Inc., for Preliminary Site Plan approval for a new 200 square foot telecommunication shelter. The subject property is 5.98 acres and is located at 48735 Grand River Avenue in Section 17, south of Grand River Avenue and east of Wixom Road. The southern portion of the property is zoned I-1, Light Industrial and the northern portion is zoned B-3, General Business.

Motion made by Acting Chair Avdoulos and seconded by Member Becker.

In the matter of 123.Net Fiber Hut, JSP22-49, motion to approve the Preliminary Site Plan based on and subject to the following:

- a. **Zoning Board of Appeals Variance from Section 3.1.19.D for a front yard building setback of 30 feet (40 feet required) as recommended by staff because the building is minimal in size and is screened;**
- b. **Zoning Board of Appeals Variance from Section 4.19.1.B for the placement of an accessory building in the front yard as recommended by staff because the building will have a minimal impact on the overall design and intent of the site;**
- c. **Landscape Waiver for a placement of building foundation landscaping in a location other than around the base of the proposed building due to the site layout, which is hereby granted; and**
- d. **The findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters and the conditions and the items listed in those letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan.**

ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE THE PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN FOR JSP22-49 123.NET FIBER HUT MADE BY ACTING CHAIR AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER BECKER.

Motion to approve the Preliminary Site Plan for JSP22-49 123.Net Fiber Hut. Motion carried 4-0.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **MOE'S ON TEN JZ22-27 WITH REZONING 18.738**

Public hearing at the request of David B. Landry for Planning Commission's recommendation to City Council for a Zoning Map amendment from Local Business (B-1) to General Business (B-3). The subject site is approximately 0.9 acres and is located on the south side of Ten Mile Road and west of Haggerty Road (Section 25). The applicant is not proposing any changes to the site and plans on continuing operating the site as a sit-down restaurant.

Planner Carroll said the 0.9-acre property is located west of Haggerty Road and on the south side of Ten Mile Road. It is currently zoned B-1 Local Business, and the applicant is proposing to rezone to B-3 General Business. The surrounding area is zoned R-4 to the south, B-1 to the east, B-3 to the north, and OS-1 to the west. The Future Land Use map indicates Community Commercial (which corresponds to the B-2/B-3 Zoning District) for the property and the surrounding Future Land Use consists of single family to the south, community commercial to the east and north, and community office to the west. The surrounding existing uses in the area consist of commercial and office uses. The subject property does not contain regulated wetlands or woodlands.

The applicant is proposing to rezone the site to bring it into compliance with current standards. No changes are proposed to the site, and it has been used as a sit-down restaurant for the past thirty-nine years.

When compared to the B-1 Zoning District, the B-3 Zoning District allows for more intense uses such as fueling stations, oil change establishments, and car sales showrooms. The B-3 zoning district would allow for an addition 5 feet in building height (from 25 feet to 30 feet) and has an additional 10 feet in building setback requirements for the front yard (20 foot minimum to 30 foot minimum). The B-1 Zoning District only allows for Restaurants (sit-down) and Restaurants (Fast Food Carryout), within a

Planning Commercial Center of at least 15,000 square feet of gross floor area. The rezoning to the B-3 Zoning District would allow for a sit-down restaurant.

The proposed rezoning from B-1 to B-3 meets the intent of the 2016 Master Plan for Land Use as the site is identified as Community Commercial on the future land use map, which is consistent with the B-2 and B-3 zoning districts.

The proposed rezoning would meet the Master Plan for Land Use objectives to support existing businesses and maintain quality design because it would allow an existing business to continue its use as a long-term, identifiable business in Novi.

The proposed rezoning would have no negative impact on public utilities.

The Planning Commission is asked to hold the public hearing and make a recommendation to City Council for approval or denial of the rezoning request. Representing the project is David Landry, the applicant's attorney. Staff is available to answer any questions.

David Landry, attorney representing Moe's on Ten, is requesting on behalf of the applicant to rezone the property from B-1 to B-3, not with the intent of making any changes to the premises, not inside nor outside, nor the use. The applicant would like to bring the site from legal non-conforming to conforming use. Moe's on Ten has operated at this site since 1983, for thirty-nine years. Prior to Moe's there was a sit-down restaurant on this site. Currently B-1 zoning does not allow for sit-down restaurants. Moe and Debbie Leon have proven their commitment to the city. They have employed Novi residents for generations, upgraded the facility, they personally both work on the site with their children, they have made a significant investment in the city and have been active in every possible way. They would like to be a conforming use, if for example the restaurant burned down and they are a non-conforming use, they would not be able to rebuild. Their lives are in this restaurant, and they want to pass the business down to their children. Again, no physical changes would be made. They are requesting a waiver of the rezoning traffic study, which is supported by the traffic consultant due to no changes to the site. A positive recommendation has been given by the Planning, Engineering, Fire and Traffic and it is consistent with the Master Plan. The applicant is asking for a positive recommendation from the Planning Commission. We would be happy to answer any questions.

Acting Chair Avdoulos invited members of the audience who wished to participate in the public hearing to approach the podium. As there were none, and seeing that there were no written responses for the Public Hearing, Acting Chair Avdoulos closed the Public Hearing and turned it over to the Planning Commission for consideration.

Member Becker disclosed that he is a frequent patron of Moe's on Ten and when he first moved to Village Oaks in 1976 patronized the previous restaurant on the site. Member Becker asked Planner Carroll for distinction between B-1 and B-3 for a restaurant. In reading the comparison page 4 of the planning review, it indicates in a B-3 zoned area as a Special Land Use what is permissible is a fast food carry out, drive-in, fast food drive thru, or a fast food sit-down restaurant. Member Becker inquired how B-3 will get Moe's on Ten to conforming. Planner Carroll said if you click at the actual land use description in Section 4, it describes sit-down restaurants, the labelling is a bit misleading.

Member Dismondy had no questions but indicated he is in support of the request.

Member Roney is in full support of bringing the site into conforming standards.

Acting Chair Avdoulos thanked Planner Carroll for the clarification of section 4 since on the comparison it wasn't indicated, but in looking at planning review chart it is there.

Motion made by Member Becker and seconded by Member Dismondy.

In the matter of Moe's on Ten, JZ22-27, with Zoning Map Amendment 18.738 motion to recommend approval to City Council to rezone the subject property from Local Business (B-1) to General Business (B-3) for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposed General Business (B-3) Zoning District meets the intent of the 2016 Master Plan for the Community Commercial future land use, and if approved will allow the use to be a legal conforming use as a sit-down restaurant in the General Business zoning district;**
- 2. The Master Plan for Land Use objective to support and strengthen existing businesses is fulfilled by allowing an existing business to continue its use;**
- 3. The Master Plan for Land Use objective to maintain quality architecture and design throughout the City is fulfilled because Moe's on Ten is a long-term, identifiable and unique business in Novi;**
- 4. There will be no negative impact on public utilities as a result of the rezoning request as stated in the Engineering memo, and no anticipated changes to the traffic to the traffic patterns as a result of the rezoning request;**
- 5. A waiver of the Rezoning Traffic Study as the proposed rezoning is not expected to result in additional trips.**

ROLL CALL VOTE TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF REZONING 18.738 FOR JZ22-27 MOE'S ON TEN TO CITY COUNCIL MADE BY MEMBER BECKER AND SECONDED BY MEMBER DISMONDY.

**Motion to recommend approval of Rezoning 18.738 for JZ22-27 Moe's on Ten to City Council.
Motion carried 4-0.**

2. ELM CREEK PRO JZ22-28 WITH REZONING 18.737

Public hearing at the request of Toll Brothers, Inc. for initial submittal and eligibility discussion for a Zoning Map amendment from Office Service Technology (OST) and Low-Rise Multiple Family (RM-1) to Low-Rise Multiple Family (RM-1) with a Planned Rezoning Overlay. The subject site is approximately 23.7 acres of a larger 37-acre parcel and is located south of Twelve Mile Road, west of Meadowbrook Road (Section 14). The applicant is proposing to develop a 68-unit multiple-family residential development.

Senior Planner Bell said the applicant is proposing to rezone 23.7 acres south of Twelve Mile Road, on the west side of Meadowbrook Road, utilizing the Planned Rezoning Overlay option. The existing development to the north and east is largely office, with some vacant parcels. The Waltonwood senior living facility is to the west, along with Twelve Oaks Lake.

The current zoning of the property is mostly OST – Office Service Technology, and a portion on the west side is RM-1. The properties to the north, east and south are also zoned OST. The area to the west is RM-1 low rise multiple family.

The Future Land Use Map identifies this property and those around it in blue as Office, R&D and Technology, which is consistent with the current zoning. The area to the west is designated Planned Development 1, which allows for multi-family development.

The natural features map shows there are significant wetland and woodland areas on this property as well as to the north and south. The tree and wetland surveys provided by the applicant confirm these features.

The applicant is proposing to utilize the Planned Rezoning Overlay to rezone the property to RM-1 Low Density Multiple Family. The initial concept plan shows 68 attached townhome units clustered in the northern and eastern areas of the site. All units are two stories tall at average grade. The development is accessed by a private street network with one entrance off Meadowbrook Road.

Rezoning to the RM-1 category requested by the applicant would permit the use proposed. Some of the conditions proposed include:

1. Preservation of 8.75 acres of City regulated woodlands

2. Preservation of 2.8 acres of City regulated wetlands
3. Density shall not exceed 3.6 dwelling units per acre (More limiting than the 5.7 dwelling units per acre allowed in the RM-1 District)
4. Providing a 60-foot-wide access easement to the remaining 14-acre parcel to the south
5. Providing the community amenities shown in the PRO Concept Plan, which includes a walking trail and scenic overlook point

Staff and consultants have identified some significant issues with the proposed rezoning and Concept Plan. First, as discussed in the planning review letter the area proposed to be rezoned is actually a portion of a larger parcel. The remaining 13.6-acre area is "owned" by another entity. But because there was never a formal split of this overall parcel; as far as the City records are concerned this is one roughly 37.11-acre parcel and this separate area doesn't even yet exist. The development is on an area that cannot legally be created as proposed because the remaining piece would not meet the requirements of the zoning ordinance since it is land locked. So clearly there are some legal hurdles that need to be ironed out before a PRO could be approved by Council.

Some other issues identified include questions of compatibility and buffering from the adjacent uses that will remain OST. The applicant has requested a deviation to provide a lesser setback from these developments than would be permitted under the RM-1 standards, which is typically 75 feet, and the applicant is requesting 50 feet. Being adjacent to a residential development can require additional setbacks or other restrictions, which can be an added burden to surrounding non-residential landowners.

Another concern is the wetland impact, which would require wetland mitigation under the City's code. The applicant is not proposing to provide that mitigation, but instead requests a deviation to allow a larger area of existing wetland to be permanently protected by conservation easement. A large number of woodland trees are also proposed for removal, and only a limited number of replacements could fit on-site which means the rest of the credits would be paid into the tree fund.

The façade review notes that the elevations provided have an underage of brick, about 15 percent and the minimum required is 30 percent, and overages of cement fiber siding. As PRO projects are supposed to be an overall benefit we would recommend meeting or exceeding the façade ordinance standards.

The Fire review notes that a secondary emergency access drive is required since there is only one entrance to the site from Meadowbrook Road.

Some of the more positive comments for the proposal are as follows. A residential development may result in smaller wetland and woodland impacts compared to an OST development due to the typical size of buildings and parking needs. The Traffic study notes that the number of residential units proposed would likely result in fewer vehicle trips compared to an OST development. The applicant has also proposed to construct off-site sidewalk segments on properties to the north and south along Meadowbrook Road, which would fill gaps in the City's sidewalk network.

The adopted revisions to the Planned Rezoning Overlay ordinance, regarding the updated process and requirements were reviewed. Under the terms of the new ordinance, the Planning Commission will not make a formal recommendation to City Council at this meeting. Instead, the first public hearing is an opportunity for the members of the Planning Commission to hear public comment, and to review and comment on whether the project meets the requirements of eligibility for Planned Rezoning Overlay proposal.

In summary, in order to be eligible, the applicant must propose clearly identified site-specific conditions relating to the proposed improvements that:

- (1) are more strict or limiting than the regulations that would apply under the proposed new zoning district (in this case the RM-1 District regulations), and
- (2) constitute an overall benefit to the public that outweighs any material detriments or that could not otherwise be accomplished without the proposed rezoning.

Following the Planning Commission public hearing, the project would then go to City Council for its review and comment on the eligibility.

After this initial round of comments by the public bodies, the applicant may choose to make any changes, additions or deletions to the proposal based on the feedback received. The subsequent submittal would then be reviewed by City staff and consultants, and then the project would be scheduled for a 2nd public hearing before the Planning Commission. Following this 2nd public hearing the Planning Commission would make a recommendation for approval or denial to City Council.

To summarize, tonight the Planning Commission is asked to hold the public hearing, and to review and comment on the proposed rezoning. Planning Commission members may offer feedback for the applicant to consider that would be an enhancement to the project and surrounding area, including suggesting site-specific conditions, revisions to the plans or the deviations requested, and other impressions.

The applicant Scott Hansen from Toll Brothers, as well as engineer Jason Emerine from Sieber Keast Lehner are present representing the project. Staff and our Wetland consultant are available to answer any questions.

Acting Chair Avdoulos invited the applicant to address the Planning Commission.

Scott Hansen, Senior Land Development Manager from Toll Brothers, made a brief presentation on Elm Creek and welcomed feedback. After we received Staff's written comments, some changes have been made to the plan. Mr. Hansen requested actionable feedback to incorporate into the revised plans for the next meeting. The revised site plan, due to the property having two owners, proposes all roads on site be public and they would provide public road access to the southern parcel. That would bring compliance with the land division requirement. A looping walking path was added in response to Staff's comments on open space. A wetland mitigation deviation was initially proposed, which came down to the fact the site is predominantly woodlands. The applicant did not want to cut down city woodlands to put in wetland mitigation but looking back they identified an area on the site where there is space, and the soils are good to where they can support a wetland mitigation basin and plan to incorporate that in their future submittal. The front and side architecture were revised to meet or exceed city ordinance and the applicant would now only ask for one deviation on the rear of the units. In regard to the concern with buffering, units were clustered to avoid the woodlands as much as possible. Along the south property line, the applicant is proposing to add 41 evergreen trees to increase screening, as well as a fence along a portion of the eastern property line. The applicant is willing to waive their requirement on adjacent parcels if that is possible with their PRO agreement so there is no negative impact to any existing commercial or future commercial uses next door. In regard to Staff comments on sustainable design, all homes include EV charging station ready garages, 2x6 framing with higher efficiency insulation, and energy star rated appliances. The woodland and wetland preservation totals just under 10 acres on this site, which the applicant feels is a major benefit to the city and ultimately to the residents. As other uses on this site would have different impact, the applicant feels they have done a good job at trying to maintain as much of the natural features as possible. In addition, regarding the proposed extension of the road to the south, the applicant is proposing to add 11 units so the density would increase slightly with unit count going from 68 to 79. Mr. Hansen concluded by saying he looks forward to any feedback and their goal is to get actionable feedback that can be incorporated into the plan.

Acting Chair Avdoulos invited members of the audience who wished to participate in the public hearing to approach the podium.

Paul Hatcher, 27333 Meadowbrook Road, stated he is about 4 parcels south of the entrance for the proposed development. Mr. Hatcher sent an email to City Planner McBeth earlier in the week with his viewpoint and relayed his concern with putting residential into what was clearly planned to be office, service, technology type uses specifically the part that goes out to Meadowbrook Road and the three buildings on that entry drive. Mr. Hatcher does not have an issue with residential being

behind or to the west of the parcels that front on Meadowbrook Road, but is not in favor of putting residential between the OST zoning and the uses already there. Mr. Hatcher purchased his property 16-17 years ago with the intention that he would be surrounded by other businesses like his, offices or business service technology businesses. Mr. Hatcher reiterated he is not in favor of what he sees in terms of the portion of the proposal that heads out to Meadowbrook.

Steve Carey, who was representing the National Truck Equipment Association, which is a trade organization currently headquartered in Farmington Hills stated that he is the parcel owner at 27421 Meadowbrook Road. The parcel is a five-acre undeveloped parcel that sits at the southeastern corner of the proposed development. They purchased this land approximately two years ago, with the intention of relocating their headquarters to this site. One concern about the proposed project is on the southeastern corner where there are multiple designated wetlands across multiple parcel boundaries at that point. A second concern would be any type of change to setback requirements which may limit their development plans for the site.

Seeing that nobody else wished to speak, Acting Chair Avdoulos asked Member Becker to note the correspondence received for this public hearing.

Member Becker noted that two letters were received, one from Paul Hatcher and one from Steve Carey, who we just heard from, restating what they had sent in.

Acting Chair Avdoulos closed the public hearing and turned it over to the Planning Commission.

Member Becker asked Staff for clarification on the number of off-street parking spaces that are in the plan as high density residences need a plan for parking for guests and gatherings. Senior Planner Bell relayed on the initial plan reviewed, three parking spaces were shown near the bank of mailboxes, another three spaces near the entrance off Meadowbrook and three on the southern road. It looked like the applicant added a few more into what they may bring as a revised plan.

Member Becker expressed concern that there is no second access, or emergency vehicle access, for the 18 units with 79 residences. Another concern is it creates a land locked parcel to the south. Even if they allow for both employees and trucks to service the development to the south, which will probably still be OST or ORDT, it is not a great idea to have that much supplemental traffic through a residential area.

Member Becker noted that the applicant stated in their November 30th letter that this residential development inside an OST zone is justified because their residential units are validated by serving an underserved market. However no factual information was provided to indicate that the potential residents of this development are underserved with other types of residences available. The applicants provided a narrative that the subject property is difficult to develop using the existing zoning and notes that some market challenges may restrict office development of the property as master planned. There is no evidence provided that the land use would be hampered to develop as outlined in our Master Plan and Future Land Use. The city's Master Plan, including the Future Land Use plan is meant to be a thoughtful guide as to how the City is developed, any significant changes to this plan represent a precedent to future developers to also ask that our Master Plan be set aside for a reason that is temporary and likely limited in time, such as current market challenges. There are certainly times when the City must thoughtfully decide to amend or reconfigure the Master Plan and Future Land Use Plan based on important and relevant changes in the needs of the city, it's residents and commercial businesses. Member Becker's opinion is that this request falls far short of being important, relevant, and justified to set it as a precedent.

Member Dismondy stated that he disagrees with his colleague in the fact that it is a very challenging parcel due to the wetlands and that the adjacent properties around the lake are residential, it makes sense because a bigger footprint industrial or office building would work there, but it would be less intrusive to have these smaller footprint dwellings here, if done properly. There is a lot to iron out there, buffering, ingress and egress. Member Dismondy inquired if there has been any conversation to tie into the adjacent property for ingress or egress off Twelve Mile Road. Senior Planner Bell responded

she is not aware if the applicant has approached the parcel owner for that.

Mr. Hansen indicated there is an existing easement in that area to allow for access, but did not think it was clear by the fire review that a secondary access was necessary. The International Fire Code says only a single entrance is needed if there are less than 99 attached units, so they feel they meet the fire code, but are willing to have that conversation with the Fire Marshall to determine what is required. If an emergency access out to the west is required by the Fire Department, the applicant will comply with that requirement.

Member Dismondy also relayed he can understand how existing OST users along Meadowbrook would be disappointed to see residential units in between office buildings. He thinks the ingress off of Meadowbrook should be along the lines of the development off of Wixom Road, across from Catholic Central, where it's not apparent it is a residential area apart from the signage. Member Dismondy concluded that he thinks the applicant is trying to make a nice development out of a challenging piece of property.

Member Roney looked at the Future Land Use and it does look like a place where you could put an office park. It seems laid out the right way for it with the entrance off of Meadowbrook, but as he read in the packet, we have not seen any proposals for anything like that in the past decade. Certainly the landowners have a right to develop their property, what makes it feasible is that there is residential to the west. It could work if it is done right, but Member Roney has concerns with buffering and setback. The setback of 50 feet for office is acceptable, but for residential it's 75 feet. A homeowner may have concerns with the absence of 25 feet. Concerns about the wetlands could be mitigated by having the setback further back. Member Roney is very appreciative of the new proposal concept presented tonight because it addressed a lot of issues in the packet, it could be made to work but still has more work to get there.

Acting Chair Avdoulos can see where the concept is coming from with the existing residential developments to the west. This proposal continues with the residential use that heads east, but doesn't feel like a compatible use with the way this is zoned as OST. It's not acting as any kind of transitional area that we typically see when we have residential adjacent to business. The fact that it's not zoned residential would make it one flag of residential along that strip that is zoned as OST. Another concern is that if we do this, and with the residential along Twelve Oaks Lake, there may be the desire to create residential all the way around the lake with other properties coming up, then we've got a mix of residential with OST. This could mean those who purchase property to develop it as OST could have hardships with residences there first. Member Avdoulos can appreciate the applicant in trying to utilize a difficult piece of property geometrically, but feels it is out of place or if it is going to be developed, the front section should be just an entrance without any residences there in order to make it work for future OST project applicants. Member Avdoulos asked Senior Planner Bell and City Planner McBeth if they were aware if the properties to the south are developable. Senior Planner Bell replied that we haven't seen any recent surveys but there are a lot of wet areas that go through there, so she is not certain.

Mr. Hansen added that the parcels to the south are also extremely challenging. As background, this property was previously used mainly as a dump site for the mall excavation, so the property has really poor soils. The applicant does not feel that it will ever be developed as office or industrial due to the poor soil, referring to the bigger footprint needed that requires extreme foundation conditions or extreme excavation. Residential uses are easier to do in those types of conditions, which is also why the applicant has everything clustered towards the north and east due to the soil there being less impacted by the historical fills. Moving further south there is a ravine, a small wetland with a creek that runs between, just south of the applicant's property line. The ravine has about a 20-foot drop, so getting across that ravine is going to be extremely challenging for the southern parcel. They actually have access through an easement from Oliver Hatcher as well. While not impossible to improve the property to the south, the applicant looked at it as part of this project and from a cost perspective any development on that southern parcel will be challenging. The applicant feels residential is doable, but commercial use will be tough from a woodland and access perspective.

Acting Chair Avdoulos expressed the concern that going down Meadowbrook, which is set up as an office type corridor, then having a wedge of residential there doesn't make sense.

Mr. Hansen inquired if Acting Chair Avdoulos sees an avenue forward for residential that he would support. Acting Chair Avdoulos replied looking at an entrance off Meadowbrook but not having development there would make better sense as he can see it being in harmony with the residential around the lake. Mr. Hansen said he appreciates the feedback and will go back to the drawing board to try to address the comments given.

This agenda item was discussed, but a motion on the item was not required.

MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

1. APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 9, 2022 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Motion made by Member Dismondy and seconded by Member Becker.

ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 9, 2022 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES WAS MADE BY MEMBER DISMONDY AND SECONDED BY MEMBER BECKER.

Motion to approve the November 9, 2022 Planning Commission minutes. Motion carried 4-0.

CONSENT AGENDA REMOVALS FOR COMMISSION ACTION

There were no consent agenda items.

SUPPLEMENTAL ISSUES/TRAINING UPDATES

There were no supplemental issues/training updates.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Acting Chair Avdoulos invited members of the audience who wished to address the Planning Commission during the final audience participation to come forward. Seeing that nobody wished to participate, Acting Chair Avdoulos closed the final public participation.

Acting Chair Avdoulos noted this is the last Planning Commission meeting of the year. He would like to thank all the Planning Commissioners for everything they've done. This has been a transitional year, going from a Zoom format to a live format. He appreciates the City and the Staff and all that they have done to keep things moving and making sure our developers and applicants, who have put a lot of time and effort in to make this a great city, are able to do that. Thank you to City Planner McBeth and her staff and to City Attorney Saarela.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn made by Member Becker.

VOICE VOTE ON THE MOTION TO ADJOURN MADE BY MEMBER BECKER.

Motion to adjourn the December 7, 2022 Planning Commission meeting. Motion carried 4-0.

The meeting adjourned at 7:52 PM.