



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

CITY OF NOVI

Regular Meeting

October 30, 2019 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, Member Ferrell, Member Gronachan, Member Lynch, Member Maday, Chair Pehrson

Absent: Member Anthony

Also Present: Barbara McBeth, City Planner; Lindsay Bell, Planner, Sri Komaragiri, Planner; Thomas Schultz, City Attorney; Madeleine Kopko, Planning Assistant

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved by Member Gronachan and seconded by Member Ferrell.

VOICE VOTE TO APPROVE THE OCTOBER 30, 2019 PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA MADE BY MEMBER GRONACHAN AND SECONDED BY MEMBER FERRELL.

Motion to approve the October 30, 2019 Planning Commission Agenda. Motion carried 6-0.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Nobody in the audience wished to speak.

CORRESPONDENCE

Member Lynch said yes. There is one letter from John Kuenzel, 23819 Heartwood. Everyone on the Commission has copies available to read.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

There were no Committee Reports.

CITY PLANNER REPORT

Planner McBeth said the first item on the agenda is Keford Collision and Towing. Staff is asking that this matter be postponed until the next meeting, which is November 13, in order for the City to notify the property owners surrounding the development. There is a motion in your packet that follows that recommendation. The second matter is the Golling Maserati and Alfa Romeo Zoning Request that we anticipated would be back in front of the Planning Commission for this meeting. We learned from the applicant last Friday that they wished that the matter be removed from the agenda and we expect that the rezoning signs are going to come down on the property. The applicant may or may not come back at a later point. If they do, we will have another Public Hearing.

CONSENT AGENDA - REMOVALS AND APPROVALS

1. SLI MEDICAL

Approval at the request SLI Medical for Planning Commission's approval of minor changes to the revised site plan and the landscape plan to accommodate truck maneuvering. The applicant previously received Planning Commission approval for site plan and storm water management plan.

Motion made by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Gronachan.

ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE THE REVISED PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN AND LANDSCAPE PLAN MOTION MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER GRONACHAN.

In the matter of request of SLI Medical for JSP18-74 SLI Medical Office Building, motion to approve the Revised Preliminary Site Plan based on and subject to the findings of compliance with the Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters and the remaining items listed in those letters being addressed on the electronic stamping set submittal. *Motion carried 6-0.*

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. KEFORD COLLISION AND TOWING JSP 18-31

Public hearing at the request of Keford Collision & Towing for Planning Commission's approval of the Preliminary site plan, Wetland permit, and Storm water management plan. The subject property is currently zoned I-2 (general industrial) with an associated planned rezoning overlay (PRO) agreement. The subject property is approximately 7.61 acres and is located on the south side of Grand River Avenue between Taft Road and Novi Road (Section 15). The applicant proposes to use the existing larger building for an auto body collision repair shop and related offices, along with an accessory use of car rental services. No particular subtenants for the second existing building have been identified yet. The plan proposes an enclosed yard of up to 160 spaces in the rear yard for storage of towed vehicles.

Motion made by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Gronachan.

ROLL CALL VOTE TO POSTPONE THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN, WETLAND PERMIT, AND STORM WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN MOTION MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER GRONACHAN.

In the matter of Keford Collision and Towing JSP18-31, motion to postpone the Preliminary Site Plan, Wetland Permit and Storm water Management Plan to give staff additional time to properly advertise for the public hearing. *Motion carried 6-0.*

2. TEXT AMENDMENT 18.290- UPDATES TO STANDARDS FOR HOTEL DEVELOPMENTS

Public Hearing for Planning Commission's recommendation to the City Council for an ordinance to amend the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance at various sections, in order to bring ordinance language up to date, and update standards for minimum parking, open space and loading requirements for Hotel developments.

Planner Komaragiri said we introduced an Amendment to reduce minimum parking requirements for hotel use at our August 28, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting. At the time, we were proposing a reduction subject to additional conditions such as a parking study and the development to be a part of a mixed use. However, we have gathered from that discussion that night that the Commission was in favor of having the reduction result in more

open space as opposed to a bigger building footprint. In response, we have revised the proposed Draft Amendment to address two items: the reduction in parking and additional open space. As part of our parking demand research, we looked at three things. First, we reviewed the parking requirements for the surrounding communities. Wixom, Farmington, Rochester Hills, and Southfield did not specify any minimum requirement for number of employees. It is most likely due to access to public transportation. Parking based on room count in other communities is similar to Novi. Second, we reviewed the parking requirements in the Institute of Transportation Engineers parking manual. The ITE Manual provided parking demand values for various types of hotels with an estimated 72% occupancy. Parking demand as per the manual ranges from 0.43 to 0.86 spaces for each room depending on the type of the hotel. Then we reviewed available data on the effect of ride sharing on hotel parking demand: a couple of articles and a published journal. In particular, we focused on a study completed by the University of Colorado published in the journal of Transportation and Land Use. This study provides a better insight to the directional relationship between parking and ride sharing services. The study also noted that if the ride sharing services did not exist, 26.4% of the Uber or Lyft riders would have driven and needed a parking space. Based on this research we believe that a 15% reduction in our minimum parking requirements is justified. If there are any accessory uses such as banquet halls or restaurants, parking will be calculated for individual uses as we have it right now. However, in such cases, we anticipate that the applicant will choose the option for shared parking.

To address the open space discussion, which was brought up at the last meeting, we've considered the option of land bank parking along with the parking reduction. However, after looking at a couple of scenarios, we've realized that it comes with the possibility of losing the green space if the applicant ever decides to install the parking in the future. We looked into open space requirements for hotels in other communities. Our surrounding communities currently do not have any standards, but a quick search revealed a few comparable requirements in other cities, especially with extended stay hotels where a majority of users are families with kids. Having that extra space for active or passive recreation would be useful. We realized that a requirement for minimum open space in terms of a fixed percentage like 15% of total site might be excessive if the hotel is part of a mixed use as part of a larger site.

We have come up with a formula which uses a minimum square footage per each room. We used a hotel, for example, that contains 200 rooms. Per our current Ordinance, they would be required to have 200 parking spaces. Based on the proposed Ordinance, we would require 170 spaces by which we saved about 30 spaces. If we apply that same rule using 250 spaces for each parking lot, that's a reduction of 7,500 square feet in impervious area which would have been parking. The number we came up with is 30 square feet for each room. For 200 rooms the number would give us around 6,000 square feet. It's not the exact same number but it's comparable. We said that the useable open space doesn't have to be an open green space, but something the hotel users can use, maybe an extended patio or a landscaped plaza. We looked at a couple of hotels that were approved in the last couple of years.

Planner Komaragiri showed a map of a hotel development in the area that displayed what the final development could have looked like with the new proposed Ordinance Amendment in place with a green space added in place of some parking spaces.

Planner Komaragiri continued to say that's about 30 square feet per each parking space reduced at 15%. In summary, what we're proposing with this Amendment is that there is no change for the employee parking, for the guest parking we are proposing a 15% reduction, and we added 1 space for pick-up for Uber and Lyft. There is no change to what we require for accessory uses, they still have to go through the section requirements for each use or do a shared parking agreement. For useable open space we are proposing a requirement of 30

square feet for each room for all districts where hotels are currently allowed except for Town Center and Town Center- 1 because they have their own 15% open space requirements. Just so we don't end up with undefined pieces spread around sporadically throughout the site, we set a requirement saying the open space should be a minimum of 10 feet in any direction, it cannot be counted towards any existing landscaping or buffer requirements and it has to be designed for active or passive recreation. We suggested it should be located at an accessible location and well designed.

In the past, we have noticed that consistently hotel developments have said they do not need a loading zone as the Ordinance requires. We have been sending those applicants to the Zoning Board of Appeals so we thought we would allow the Planning Commission to allow a reduction in loading space. That would avoid a step in having to go the ZBA Meetings for the applicants because the loading space requirement is based on the largest truck load that would access the site and it also depends on the type of hotel. Some hotels do not have restaurants or banquet rooms and would not need a larger loading space. Right now we are asking for 10 square feet for each front foot and if the hotel is longer they will have an excessive loading zone they will not need.

We just put in some findings that the Planning Commission needs to make before they can approve the reduction. These are the primary points in the Draft Amendment, but in addition to those we are also proposing some minor clean ups. Right now we have four categories that define what a hotel is: a hotel, a business hotel, a motel, and a transient residential use. It kind of gets cluttered and confusing sometimes so we are narrowing the definitions down to 2: either a hotel or a motel. We redefined it so that the business hotel and the transient residential uses are covered in those two categories and we cleaned up wherever those references are made.

Planner Komaragiri showed a map where the hotels and motels are currently allowed in Novi because the proposed text amendment would affect those sites if anyone is planning to develop a hotel or motel in those areas. Most hotels in Novi were between 12 Mile Road and the Grand River Avenue Corridor.

Planner Komaragiri said the Planning Commission is asked tonight to hold the Public Hearing, consider the proposed Draft Amendment, and make a recommendation to City Council.

Chair Pehrson said this is a Public Hearing. If anyone would like to address the Planning Commission at this time please step forward. Seeing no one, Chair Pehrson asked Member Lynch if there is any correspondence, and with none provided, Chair Pehrson closed the public hearing. Chair Pehrson turned it over to the Planning Commission for their consideration.

Member Lynch said I know we have been talking about this for a long time. You took this concept where the City wanted to see more green space while trying to be reasonable with developers over parking spaces. I think a 15% reduction is very conservative based on the data that I read. This is a good first step. I really appreciate the detail that you went through putting the formula together. I think this accomplishes the objective that we had, which was how do we get rid of these unnecessary asphalt jungles and replace it with green space without putting too much of a burden on a developer. This gives us some opportunity in the future as we try out this prototype. We can make further modifications as we go. Staff did a great job on this and I appreciate it.

Member Avdoulos said I agree and I think the visuals really help, especially if there are residences or businesses that want to see what that looks like and get a frame of reference. I think I'd like to see the open space contiguous to the hotel so people don't have to cross a

large area of parking to get to that open space.

Planner Komaragiri said we looked into that and then we realized that most of the hotels that were designed always have a loop around it and people want to have parking closer to the roads, but yes I agree.

Member Avdoulos said a lot of the hotels that offer breakfast have an outdoor seating area adjacent to the structure. I do think that this is going in the right direction to manage the amount of paved surfaces we have. There may be hotels that come in and based on their business model might want to go back to the other Ordinance and I think that is a case by case basis. I am going through that right now with a project where the City says that we only need 200 spaces but the medical facility were working with says they need 400 spaces and that's just based on what they know. So I think we may get that in the future, but I think that this is going where we want it to go.

Planner Komaragiri said we can definitely look into adding the contiguous part of it and see how we can make it flexible.

Member Avdoulos said I was just on a business trip and we called an Uber and they dropped us off. We see this more and more. Again, this is a living document so if it is not working we can always come back and change it. So I would like to make a motion.

Motion made by Member Avdoulos and seconded by Member Lynch.

ROLL CALL VOTE TO RECOMMEND TO CITY COUNCIL TO AMEND THIS ORDINANCE, BRING THE ORDINANCE LANGUAGE UP TO DATE, AND UPDATE THE STANDARDS FOR THE MINIMUM PARKING, OPEN SPACE, AND LOADING REQUIREMENTS FOR HOTEL DEVELOPMENTS MOTION MADE BY MEMBER AVDUOLOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH.

Motion to amend the Ordinance, bring the language up to date, and update the standards for the minimum parking, open space, and loading requirements for hotel developments. Motion carried 6-0.

3. TEXT AMENDMENT 18.288 – UPDATES TO THE B-2 AND B-3 ZONING DISTRICTS

Public Hearing for Planning Commission's recommendation to the City Council for an ordinance to amend the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance at various sections, in order to update the uses permitted as of right and the uses permitted as special land uses in the B-2, Community Business District and B-3, General Business District, and various other modifications.

Planner Bell said on August 28, 2019 we presented a Draft Text Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance as proposed by staff. City Council's Ordinance Review Committee requested that staff review land uses which may be more suited to be considered for Special Land Use Permits. In that review, we have come up with the Amendment suggested before you. Primarily they are in the B-2 Community Business District and B-3 General Business District. We have also incorporated some additional clean up items in our continued attempt to clarify things as we find them.

In summary, the changes include amending the definitions of the retail business service uses and retail business uses and adding a definition for smoke shops in the definition section. The list of uses provided in the retail business service uses has been updated to include some modern establishments including technology repair such as cell phone and electronic device repair. Minor modifications are proposed into the wording in the definitions to improve clarity as well. Another change is reclassifying theaters and other places of assembly as Special

Land Uses in the B-2 and B-3 districts. This addition is intended to allow the Planning Commission an opportunity to review future theaters and places of assembly under the criteria provided in the Ordinance for Special Land Use consideration offering additional discretion for approval and allowing for Public Hearing on such requests.

Another change would be clarifying the types of retail business uses allowed in the B-3 District. The language proposes reclassifying tattoo parlors as a Special Land Use - they were previously principal permitted - and adding smoke shops to the list of Special Land Uses in the B-3 District. Again, this would allow the Planning Commission to review those uses under Special Land Use criteria. We would also add massage establishments as a Special Land Use only in the B-3 District. The Zoning Ordinance does not currently provide clear guidance for the permitted location for these uses, but we have generally interpreted them to fall under the personal service establishment uses. This Amendment will allow the Planning Commission to hold a Public Hearing and consider the request for new massage establishments under the Special Land Use criteria prior to City Council's consideration of granting a license for such uses. The Planning Commission may want to discuss if there are other districts where they would also be permitted as a Special Land Use.

Planner Bell showed a chart with a list of existing businesses that have been issued City licenses for massage establishments and what zoning districts they are located in. Planner Bell said as you can see there are several districts represented including RC, TC, TC-1, B-1, B-2, B-3, OS-1, and even I-1 Districts where we currently have licensed massage establishments.

Another change proposed in this Text Amendment would amend the use standards for places of worship, Section 4.10, to clarify where the districts where such uses consider principal permitted and where it is Special Land Use, that's just kind of clarifying that part of the Ordinance. We would also change the section to allow the Planning Commission to modify the outdoor recreation requirements for daycares in the commercial districts. Previously, we have incorporated that ability for the residential districts but it didn't make it into commercial districts so we are proposing that at this time.

The Planning Commission is asked to hold the Public Hearing and make a recommendation to City Council for reading and adoption.

Chair Pehrson said this is a Public Hearing. If anyone wishes to address the Planning Commission on this matter please step forward. No one from the audience wished to speak. Chair Pehrson asked Member Lynch if there is any correspondence, and with none provided, Chair Pehrson closed the public hearing. Chair Pehrson turned it over to the Planning Commission for their consideration.

Member Maday said any time you can give the community and the Planning Commission a little bit more say in what's going on, I really like that, and I think the community would appreciate that, especially given some of that past issues that have arose. I have nothing to argue about with this.

Member Avdoulos said I have a question related to massages. There are a lot of businesses that are hair salons and massages are probably one of the amenities that are offered, so will they have to indicate that that's being provided in order to meet the Zoning Ordinance? Can they open up a hair salon and then add massage later as part of their business without going through the City?

Thomas Schultz, City Attorney, said this proposed ordinance amendment comes from an Ordinance Review Committee conversation which in turn resulted from an enforcement issue that the City had with a particular massage establishment. There was a denial of a license

which was under the City Code, not the Zoning Ordinance. We amended the massage licensing Ordinance to make it a little more clear when the City could say "no," but the Ordinance Review Committee also raised the question that it might be a little too easy to just open up a massage establishment. Planning staff was asked to look at making this a Special Land Use and decide where it might be appropriate. So as you point out, there are hair salons and other places that often include some massage service as a personal service that aren't in the B-3 District.

Mr. Schultz said, what this Ordinance that's in front of you does is, it says we're creating a new category, massage establishment, in the Zoning Ordinance for the first time. Before it was considered a personal service and allowed in the districts where that use is allowed. One of the things I think you have to do tonight, as a Commission, is decide where all those other districts you might find those broader uses. Applicants do have to get massage licenses from the City Clerk separate from the Zoning Ordinance. Those that have already been granted would not necessarily be permitted anymore, probably just become nonconforming uses that couldn't expand. So I think you have a couple things you might want to think about. Number one, do you think that only allowing them in the B-3 District is too narrow, or should this use be permitted in TC or B-2 or wherever else?

One of the other questions would be to think back to when the City required any bar or restaurant that serves alcohol to be considered a Special Land Use. The bar or restaurant will come to a Committee of department heads, and go through a Special Land Use process. Essentially what we did is, in that Ordinance, we said all the existing bars and restaurants serving alcohol can stay and they're permitted to remain unless they need some sort of Site Plan, then they have to come in and get a Special Land Use approval. So that's an option for this instance, if the Commission wants to require that for massage establishments. I just want to make sure that you have an opportunity to discuss and recognize that at least the Ordinance Review Committee wanted to pull back a little bit. But is just B-3 too far? Then how do you want to treat these businesses?

Member Avdoulos said I think that's where my questioning was coming from. Some of these businesses provide massages as a smaller portion of their business and I don't want to discount that and not allow them to have that opportunity to continue that service. So I don't know if it needs to be that zeroed in or if it can be an ancillary service to another business.

Chair Pehrson said going down the path and looking at the list, I think of Twelve Oaks Mall and Town Center. Visions Spa Salon and places of that nature where massage is a service provided to the customer. I think there's the connotation that we're fighting, that we now call an establishment as opposed to a parlor, which might have some other connotation to it that we don't want in the City. I kind of like the idea of allowing for those that already have a license to be grandfathered in. I wouldn't want to penalize them for having that service, which is legitimate for their clientele after they're getting their hair done, or manicure or pedicure. In such that they then had to come back for any kind of site improvement, they have to come back through the process of then obtaining that massage license or certificate. I think that makes a little more sense because right now you would have half of that list running in to the City for approvals. I don't think that's the intent or the spirit of what we're trying to propose here.

Member Gronachan said out of this list of existing businesses, how many of them only do massages? Looking at most of these, they look like they do massage as an option of many services. I concur with the two previous speakers about the grandfathering in, but is there something that could be added that if it is going to be strictly a massage establishment, then it would go into B-3, but if massage is an additional service, then that could fit into those other areas. Would that clarify it a little bit more? Then that way, in light of what happened in the

past, that would narrow it down by having it in the B-3 District, which there is certainly nothing wrong with that. We can always come back and change it if something else happens, but maybe that would be the way to go. If it is strictly just a massage establishment, it would go into the B-3 District, and if it is going to be an additional service to a business that is allowed in another district, then it could be allowed. Will that make it too complicated?

Chair Pehrson said is that an enforcement issue that would be any kind of burden on the City?

Attorney Schultz said I don't think so. I think if we write the language carefully enough, it should work. I get the idea that if it's part of a hair salon, it would be allowed in those districts where hair salons are allowed. But it might still pick up some of those others and make them non-conforming so if there is a broader list of districts, like the B-1 District or the TC District, that you want to also consider; that's open for discussion.

Member Ferrell said can you explain more about the Special Land Use Permit, does that allow this use anywhere?

Attorney Schultz said right now we don't have a massage establishment section of the Zoning Ordinance. We license them under the City Code and they pay a fee and we inspect them. In the Zoning Ordinance, they have been treated as part of a personal service type activity which is allowed in those other districts for the most part. There would be no need to come to Planning Commission if you have a proper building and you just want to occupy with that use and you meet all other requirements, they don't come to you. If they want to build a building to do that, then they're just coming in front of the Planning Commission to build a building, and you would not be approving their use.

With the Special Land Use, if you create a category and say we're going to treat them as massage establishments, they need a license from the city clerk. Then we will call the massage establishment a Special Land Use, and we will have to add a bunch of requirements that they have to meet before they are allowed to occupy. So now they do have to come to you as the Planning Commission and have to meet a list of 7 or 8 standards that are in the Ordinance; such as, they have to be harmonious with the neighbors, and they have to not affect traffic. You will get to approve whether or not they go in. This is adding that section and making it that kind of use - a much more highly regulated use than it is now. Again, the Ordinance Review Committee looked at some past enforcement actions and say maybe this is a category of uses for just a massage establishment that we want to be more careful about. So the proposed ordinance amendment does that and it also picks your most commercial district, the B-3 District, as the one place we would allow it. All those other ones that are existing would become non-conforming. Unless we do as we discussed for places that serve alcohol, and we include some sort of special language saying those that if they are currently operating can stay.

Member Ferrell said I have a question for the board. Do we want to limit it to just the B-3 District?

Chair Pehrson said I think that's what we're looking at right now. On one hand we're saying what is existing stands, right? Again, not penalizing anything in the TC or OS District, or wherever else and going forward making it such that B-3 is the only district where a massage establishment will be allowed. Or is it anyone's will and desire to just bypass B-3 and go through TC or OS and just add those in as part of the language?

Member Maday said why are we just limiting it to B-3? I feel like there are so many places in the community that it would be viable and I'd hate to lose business over it. I understand the sensitivity over it, but I feel like we're really limiting it with just B-3.

Attorney Schultz said I did sit through most of the Ordinance Review Committee discussion and it wasn't so much focused when we were talking about that. It wasn't a long discussion, but there were a couple of meetings where this came up. It focused less on the district than on the fact that making it a Special Land Use. It came up in the context of we were doing the B-2 and B-3 Ordinance that is in front of you, so there was no discussion that I am aware of at that level saying only the B-3 District. I think that is the idea, that the massage establishment use is not supposed to go everywhere. Basically it was put to you as a Planning Commission to think about where massage establishments might go. B-3 is our most obvious district.

Chair Pehrson said I'm okay with B-3 if it's just for massage establishments, nothing else. Then you're regulating direction for that particular establishment. But I think the language of the ancillary personal service definition for the rest of these, if that, can be applied to any of the districts. Given that it's a Special Land Use, it has to come in front of us anyway so we have some discretion. That way we're not penalizing these folks that already exist. Is that a viable solution to the verbiage?

There was general agreement with that concept.

Chair Pehrson said so can we ask staff to go through and kind of recreate that language and maybe send it back to us.

Attorney Schultz said yes, we will bring this one back.

Member Avdoulos said I have another question. So the businesses that already have that as part of their service, let's say they decide to sell it to somebody, just the business, and the business stays the same and they have massage as part of it, does the approval run with the business?

Attorney Schultz said I think so. I believe that's how we would enforce that. They would have to come and get their own City Clerk license, but we don't typically require a new owner to come in and update their land use approval.

Motion made by Member Avdoulos and seconded by Gronachan.

ROLL CALL VOTE TO BRING THE RECOMMENDATION OF TEXT AMENDMENT 18.288 BACK TO PLANNING COMMISSION FOR REVIEW AND FOR STAFF TO LOOK AT THE DISCUSSION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND INCORPORATE THOSE COMMENTS INTO THE DOCUMENT.

Motion to bring Text Amendment 18.288 back to the Planning Commission for review and for staff to look at the discussion and incorporate those comments into the discussion. *Motion carried 6-0.*

MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

1. APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 25, 2019 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Motion made by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Gronachan.

ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 25, 2019 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES MOTION MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER GRONACHAN.

Motion to approve the September 25, 2019 Planning Commission Minutes. *Motion carried 6-0.*

2. APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 16, 2019 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Motion made by Member Gronachan and seconded by Member Lynch.

**ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE THE OCTOBER 16, 2019 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
MOTION MADE BY MEMBER GRONACHAN AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH.**

Motion to approve the October 16, 2019 Planning Commission Minutes. *Motion carried 6-0.*

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Chair Pehrson asked if anyone wanted to address the Planning Commission.

Seeing no one, Chair Pehrson closed the last audience participation.

ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Gronachan.

**VOICE VOTE ON THE MOTION TO ADJOURN MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY
MEMBER GRONACHAN.**

Motion to adjourn the October 16, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting. *Motion carried 6-0.*

The meeting was adjourned at 7:42 PM.