

Approved

Village of Gurnee
Planning and Zoning Board Minutes
February 5, 2020

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m.

Planning and Zoning Board Members Present: Chairman James Sula, Brian Baugh, Tim Garrity, Edwin Paff, Josh Pejsach, and Laura Reilly

Planning and Zoning Members Absent: David Nordentoft

Other Officials Present: David Ziegler, Community Development Director; Tracy Velkover, Planning Manager; Clara Gable, Associate Planner; and Bryan Winter, Village Attorney

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Approval of PZB's December 18, 2019 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Paff motioned, seconded by Mr. Pejsach, to approve the December 18, 2019 meeting minutes.

Voice vote:

All "Ayes," no "Nays," none abstaining

Motion carried: 6-0-0

4. Minor Sign Exception for Olive Garden

The petitioner is seeking a minor sign exception to allow text on the face of the main shared ground sign along Grand Avenue to be less than the required 6" height for the main business name and 3" height for tag lines.

Ms. Gable stated that Haley Linville of Midwest Sign & Lighting is requesting, on behalf of the Olive Garden located at 5590 Northridge Drive, a Minor Sign Exception to allow the height for lowercase lettering in their main business name to be less than the 6" requirement and for lettering in the tagline "Italian Kitchen" to be less than the 3" requirement, specifically on the multi-tenant sign panel (on Grand Avenue). She noted that Olive Garden is planning to reface their existing multi-tenant sign panel, which is only 9.6 sq. ft. in size. The smallest of the proposed lowercase lettering in their main business name is 3.9" tall, while other lowercase letters are slightly larger (5" to 6"). The upper case lettering in the main business name meets code. The lettering in the tag line "Italian Kitchen" is .9" tall. She stated that trying to retrofit an existing sign with a new face that meets letter height standards adopted after the installation of the sign can be difficult, especially when working with existing, smaller multi-tenant sign panels. The Minor Sign Exception process allows for consideration of the above requested amendment. A Minor Sign Exception can be granted by the PZB if they find that the number, size, design, and

Approved

placement of all proposed signs within the development are consistent with the stated purpose of the sign regulations. The PZB has the final decision making authority in this matter.

Mr. Sula asked if there were any questions, and—if not, a motion would be in order.

Mr. Paff motioned, seconded by Mr. Pejsach, to approve the petition of Haley Linville of Midwest Sign & Lighting on behalf of the Olive Garden, located at 5590 Northridge Drive, for a Minor Sign Exception to allow the height of the lowercase lettering in their main business name to be less than the 6” requirement and for lettering in their tagline to be less than the 3” requirement, specifically on the multi-tenant ground sign along Grand Avenue.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Baugh, Garrity, Paff, Pejsach, Reilly, and Sula

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Motion Approved: 6-0-0

5. Informal Review for 32551-32655 IL Route 21

Feedback is requested on a proposal for a mixed-use development on 29.12 acres located north of the Serbian Monastery and south of Lake County Grading (generally south of the southeast corner of Rt. 120 and Rt. 21). The property is located in unincorporated Lake County. The proposal reflects 456-unit mixed use apartment project (3 and 4-story) and 15,000 sq. ft. of restaurant/retail on the first floor of one of the proposed buildings.

Ms. Gable stated that Thad Gleason, representing Sunrise Development, is seeking feedback on a mixed-use development for approximately 29 acres located on the east side of Rt. 21, north of the Serbian Monastery Church and south of Lake County Grading. The proposed development includes five buildings containing a total of 456 apartment units and 15,000 sq. ft. of restaurant and retail space. The subject property is not located in Gurnee, but is contiguous to the Village’s boundary. The property is surrounded by O-1 PUD and R-1 PUD property in the Village of Gurnee and Estate, Open Space, and Limited Industrial-zoned property in the County. The Village’s current Comprehensive Land Use Plan reflects Public/Quasi-Public for the subject property. The draft Comp Plan reflects Industrial Mixed-Use. The applicant is in attendance to present his proposal.

Kirk Rustman, with William A. Randolph, Inc., stated that he is part of the development team. He noted that the site is challenging, as it has about 50 feet of fill. He noted because of the fill that the foundations on this project will be more expensive than most, but that they feel that their plan is a great use for the property. He noted that they have met with the Monastery Regional Council and they would like to see this project go forward. He noted that they are here to get feedback on their concept plan for the site.

Thad Gleason, Gleason Architects, P.C., walked the PZB through the proposed development. He noted the following:

- The project has no official name, but they are referring to it as the Monastery Development.
- Site consists of approximately 30 acres and is located on the east side of Rt. 21, north of the Serbian Church and south of Lake County Grading. The Des Plaines River/Forest Preserve is located to the east.
- The Forest Preserve bike trail is to the east and it is their intention to make a connection to this trail.
- The site has a level portion before dropping off toward the river (floodplain property).
- Total of 5 buildings consisting of a total of 540,000 sq. ft. (456 apartment units and 15,000 sq. ft. of retail/restaurant area in the ground floor of building #1).
- Buildings and parking are setback from Rt. 21, which is probably where storm water detention will be provided.
- Phasing of the development is proposed, with Buildings #1 and #2 in the first phase and Buildings #3, #4, and #5 in the second phase.
- Two access points are proposed; one full access and one right-in/right-out.
- The site will also have access to the Serbian Monastery site and they are having discussions about potential parking on the Serbian site also.
- Total of 585 parking spaces; 350 spaces shy of meeting code
- The exteriors of the buildings will be a mix of brick, stone, and Hardiboard.
- 4-story buildings would be about 56 feet tall
- Proposing to use modular construction
- Units will be energy efficient
- Building #1 is the center building (mixed use)
 - 4-story building containing a total of 111,000 sq. ft.
 - 15,000 sq. ft. of retail/restaurant space in the first floor
 - Second, third and fourth floors each contain 27,118 sq. ft. for a total of 72 rental units (66 one-bedroom and 6 two-bedroom)
 - 1-BR units are 818 sq. ft. and 2-BR units are 1,360 sq. ft.
- Building #2
 - 3-story building
 - Contains a total of 134,723 sq. ft.
 - 100 rental units (82 one-bedroom and 18 two-bedroom)
 - 1-BR units are 759 sq. ft. and 2-BR units are 1,178 sq. ft.
 - Pool and patios proposed
- Building #3 & #4 (identical buildings)
 - 4-story buildings
 - Contains a total of 185,372 sq. ft.
 - 152 rental units (124 one-bedroom and 28 two-bedroom)
 - 1-BR units are 810 sq. ft. and 2-BR units are 1,200 sq. ft.
 - Fitness room, play area, bike storage provided as amenities.

Approved

- Building #5
 - 4-story building
 - Proposed for work-force housing with smaller units and a small kitchenette area only
 - A commercial kitchen and dining area is provided in the building
 - Available to all age groups
 - Tax credits used to make affordable
 - Contains a total of 94,033 sq. ft.
 - 132 rental units (64 studio/efficiency and 68 one-bedroom)
 - Studio units will be 308 sq. ft. and 1-BR units will be 480 sq. ft.

Mr. Garrity stated that this is a lot of units. He asked if the driving force for the density is to compensate for the expense of the foundations.

Mr. Rustman stated that part of the density is needed because they are proposing that 20% of the units qualify as affordable “work force” housing. The residents have to be income qualified. He also noted that they have to have a large number of renters to off-set the foundation costs.

Mr. Paff asked staff if the required number of parking included the retail/restaurant space.

Ms. Velkover stated that the parking number is calculated including the required parking for this commercial area.

Mr. Paff stated that they are still over 300 spaces shy of meeting code. He asked if the retail/restaurant space is primarily the reason for them not meeting code.

Ms. Velkover stated that the residential component also a factor in their inability to meet code.

Mr. Paff indicated that this is a concern.

Mr. Rustman stated that they have discussed parking with the Serbian Monastery Council and they are looking at trying to get the ability to obtain some parking on their site to the south.

Mr. Paff stated that this is a substantial distance away, especially from Building #5. He asked if there was any discussion about putting in a stop light.

Mr. Rustman stated that they hope not, as there is a signal at the Rt. 120 ramp which causes gaps in traffic. That would be a discussion for them with IDOT though.

Mr. Paff asked if there is a median in the middle of Rt. 21.

Mr. Sula stated that there is a cut in the median and he asked where it is at; if it aligns with one of their proposed access points.

Approved

Staff pointed on an aerial where the existing median cut is located. The location is the entrance into the Serbian Monastery site.

Mr. Garrity asked if there would be any garage parking.

Mr. Rustman stated that it would be all surface parking.

Mr. Winter noted that if the undevelopable acreage is removed from the site, they are proposing a density of over 21 DU/acre. He indicated that there is more to the density that the foundation cost.

Mr. Rustman agreed that there are other large costs to developing this property, including the fact that there is no sewer currently to the property. Over 3,000 feet of sewer needs to be run to the site.

Mr. Paff stated that without an ability to get into the site from the north, the development wouldn't be very successful.

Mr. Rustman clarified that there would be a median cut to provide full access to the site, so that it is accessible from both the north and south.

Mr. Pejsach stated that he feels the development is totally out of place. It is not compatible with existing land uses, nor the existing or proposed Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

Ms. Reilly stated that she agrees with Mr. Pejsach.

Mr. Sula stated that his concern is that the proposed use is not compatible with the Comprehensive Land Use Plan and he would need to see more about how this development would not throw off the goals and objectives of the Comp Plan. He also noted that the inability of the development to meet the parking requirement is a game stopper for him. He noted that the degree of departure from the parking code isn't 5%. It's upwards of 30%. Shared parking with the Monastery isn't practical given the site plan. The height of the buildings, giving the fact that the site is already substantially higher than Rt. 21 results in a development that is completely out of character with the area. Also, locating residential adjacent to an intense use like Lake County Grading is not appropriate. Finally, there are no services that residents can walk to.

Mr. Garrity noted that he also has an issue with the density. He liked the idea of affordable housing and asked, if they truly feel this is a good site, to investigate underground parking, lower density, and mixing in higher income rentals with the project.

Mr. Sula stated that it would take a lot for him to warm to this project. He noted that his primary concern is it's not consistent with the Comp Plan and incompatible with the adjacent uses.

6. Public Hearing: Text Amendments to the Gurnee Zoning Ordinance

a. Article 8.2.32 Vehicle Repair/Service – Minor and Major

Proposal to eliminate the screening requirements for vehicle repair/service (major and minor) along any lot line abutting all districts/uses except for office and residential

Ms. Gable stated that, currently, the Zoning Ordinance requires that vehicle repair/service establishments are screened along interior side and rear lot lines with a solid wall or fence, a minimum of five feet. This seems unnecessary when the vehicle repair/service establishment abuts an industrial or commercial use or district. The proposed amendment will ensure that vehicle repair/service establishments are properly screened when adjacent to less-intense residential or office districts, but will no longer require unnecessary screening. Staff is proposing to address these concerns by changing Article 8.2.32.c to say that “vehicle repair/service establishments must be screened along any interior side and rear lot lines abutting residential or office districts or uses with a solid wall or fence, a minimum of five feet in height.”

Mr. Sula opened the floor to the public for the public hearing items. As there was no one from the public in the Council Chambers, he closed the floor to the public for this matter and all subsequent public hearing matters, unless someone from the public joined the hearing.

Mr. Pejsach motioned, seconded by Mr. Garrity, to forward a favorable recommendation on the petition of the Village to amend the Article 8.2.32.c “Vehicle Repair/Service – Minor and Major” as follows “vehicle repair/service establishments must be screened along any interior side and rear lot lines abutting residential or office districts or uses with a solid wall or fence, a minimum of five feet in height.”

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Baugh, Garrity, Paff, Pejsach, Reilly, and Sula

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Motion Approved: 6-0-0

b. Article 10.2.12 Home Occupation

Proposal to prohibit the following as home occupations:

- i. Massage services*
- ii. Astrology, card and palm reading, or fortune-telling*
- iii. Landscape business where equipment, supplies, and plant material are stored on-site except when within a fully enclosed permitted dwelling unit or accessory structure*

Ms. Gable stated that the Village recently received an inquiry as to whether massage is allowed as a home occupation. Currently, only the “repair and service of vehicles or industrial machinery” is expressly prohibited as a home occupation. Staff surveyed nearby municipalities and found that two would allow massage as a home occupation (unincorporated Lake County and Grayslake- both of which would require a massage license) and four would not allow this (Libertyville, Vernon Hills, Mundelein, and Waukegan). Staff decided to propose an amendment to prohibit massage as a home occupation, which is consistent with the Village’s current regulations on Massage Service Establishments in business districts: including that Massage Service Establishments are only ever allowed as a Special Use in certain non-residential districts, that Massage Service Establishments are required to be located 1,000 feet from residential, and that Massage Service Establishments need Massage Establishment licenses through the Village of Gurnee to operate (which will not be issued if the locational requirements are not met).

Finally, Ms. Gable stated that staff is proposing to add “landscape business where equipment, supplies, or plant material is stored on-site except when within a fully-enclosed permitted dwelling unit or accessory structure”. This type of operation is already prohibited by the commercial vehicle parking ordinance and home occupation standards, which states that home occupations and all related activity, including storage, must be conducted completely within the dwelling unit or permitted accessory structure. However, staff continues to receive inquiries regarding landscaping businesses as home occupations, and adding this provision may help to provide clarity. Staff is proposing to clarify this matter by adding the following language to the list of prohibited home occupations: “Landscape business where equipment, supplies, and plant material are stored on-site except when within a fully enclosed permitted dwelling unit or accessory structure.”

Mr. Sula asked if Mr. Winter was comfortable with carving out uses as prohibited as home occupations.

Mr. Winter stated that the Village can restrict home occupations to protect residential areas. He noted that many communities have a list of uses that are prohibited as home occupations.

Mr. Paff asked why auto repair is prohibited, if it is conducted within a garage. He noted that the Village allows landscaping businesses as long as their operations are kept inside.

Ms. Velkover noted that auto repair facilities were prohibited as home occupations years ago (probably at least 15 years) because the activities couldn’t be contained entirely within a garage. Cars that were awaiting repair or were repaired a waiting to be picked up were being stored on the property. The number of cars parked on site was not something that was consistent with most residential properties. Also, in the summer time, repairs were being conducted with garage doors open resulting in noise complaints.

The PZB discussed the prohibition of massage establishments as home occupations. Some members questioned what negative impacts these establishments have on a neighborhood if

Approved

they operate in compliance with the home occupation regulations, comparing the use to someone cutting hair in their home.

Ms. Velkover noted that this amendment is proposed in order regulate these establishments more consistent with how the Village regulates them in business districts. She noted that principal massage establishments are not permitted uses in any commercial or office zoning districts. A special use permit is required. In addition, licensing of these establishment is required, which stipulates that they cannot be located within 1,000 feet of a residential zoning district or residential use. Staff believes allowing massage establishments in homes, by right, is in conflict with how these uses are regulated elsewhere in the community.

Mr. Sula asked if we aren't already covered since, if you can't have a massage establishment within 1000 feet of residential, you wouldn't be able to have it in a home.

Ms. Velkover stated that staff had this discussion and felt that, because home occupations aren't licensed businesses, there wouldn't be a specific massage establishment license requirement. This text amendment makes it clear, so there can be no interpretation in the future that it would be allowed because it's a home occupation and not a licensed business.

Mr. Garrity indicated that he supported the proposed text amendment.

Mr. Paff stated that we allow day care as a home occupation.

Ms. Velkover clarified that up to 6 children is the limit for a home occupation day care. Again, she noted that this was proposed to keep it more consistent with how the use if regulated in commercial districts.

Some commission members questioned why the Village requires this use to obtain a Special Use Permit in commercial districts.

Ms. Velkover noted that the Village Board supports the additional review that the Special Use Permit and licensing process provides for these businesses.

Ms. Gable stated that staff is also proposing to add "Astrology, card and palm reading, or fortune-telling" to the list of prohibited home occupations. She stated that staff's experience is that this use relies heavily on advertising to walk-in/drive-by traffic (i.e. location on major roads/intersections, use of illuminated signage and signage on vehicles, etc.). This is not consistent with our home occupation standards, which state that signs, displays, or activities that indicate from the exterior that the structure is being used, in part, for any purpose other than that of a residence are prohibited (with the exception of a non-illuminated 2 sq. ft. wall sign).

Mr. Garrity asked if this would impact any existing home occupation in Gurnee.

Approved

Ms. Velkover noted that this would not impact any home occupation currently in the Village. The psychic reading facilities that you've seen around the area in the last 5-7 years have all been in unincorporated Lake County. She noted that Gurnee did have a psychic reader in the past operating out of a home along Grand Avenue.

Mr. Pejsach stated that he doesn't have any issue with a psychic reader operating out of a home if they can meeting the home occupation standards, including no lighted signs, signs on vehicles, etc. He questioned why a psychic reader operating legally as a home occupation be punished because some violate existing codes and ordinances.

Ms. Velkover noted that, in staff's experience, these types of businesses rely upon pass-by traffic and thus why they are located in homes along business roadways (State and County highways) and install illuminated signs and park vehicles up along these State and County highways with signs on them. These are not true home occupations and thus, why staff is proposing to prohibit.

Mr. Sula also indicated that he has the same view as Mr. Pejsach. He doesn't see why this use should be prohibited since there are codes and ordinances in existence to reign in the offending actions.

Mr. Ziegler stated that the suggested prohibition would have the same endpoint as exists now (going through the code enforcement process), but it would make it clear upfront that the use is not allowed. Historically, the Village has seen these types of uses start with a small sign, and then increase it over time by maybe adding a neon sign in the window, and then a sign on a car.

Mr. Sula asked how other communities treat this type of use.

Ms. Gable stated that of the communities surveyed there were 2-3 that prohibited this use as a home occupation (Chicago, Carol Stream, and one other, possibly Lisle).

Mr. Sula clarified that the existing psychic reading establishment along Grand Avenue (opposite Burger King) is not in the Village.

Staff confirmed that this facility is not in the Village's limits.

Mr. Pejsach asked if there was a way to address the signage.

Ms. Velkover noted that there are already ordinances prohibiting lighted signs on home occupations and signs on cars that are purposely parked in a manner to display the signs. It's a matter of code enforcement, which can become problematic when a vehicle can be moved in quick fashion from compliance to violation. It is hard to enforce something that is movable and changeable like a vehicle sign.

Approved

Mr. Pejsach asked if his vehicle that he has with his magnetic sign on it is in violation of code.

Ms. Velkover noted that the type of signage that Mr. Pejsach is describing is legal. However, this is not the type of signs that staff has seen used with the psychic reader that was previously in town and the ones that have been located on the periphery of the Village. The signs they are using are painted on the sides or windows and parked up along the main road, nowhere near the house or garage, oftentimes parallel with the roadway so the signs have the maximum visibility.

Mr. Garrity indicated that he believes that the use, because it seems to rely on high traffic areas, is not appropriate as a home occupation.

Mr. Sula stated that difficulty enforcing a code does not justify a text amendment to prohibit an entire type of home occupation.

Mr. Winter stated that it is telling that the locations where the Board members have seen signage for these uses is along major roadways, which appreciates that the business model is reliant upon drive-by traffic and generally doesn't lend itself to a residential neighborhood, where is where home occupations are located.

Mr. Sula stated that, if a person's business model allows them to operate as a home occupation in compliance with the rules and regulations, then why shouldn't they be allowed to operate. He agreed that we don't want flashing signs. But if the business can operate legally, then there shouldn't be any issue.

Mr. Garrity noted that the facilities that he's seen around town would not be appropriate for a residential area.

Finally, Ms. Gable stated that staff is proposing to add "landscape business where equipment, supplies, or plant material is stored on-site except when within a fully-enclosed permitted dwelling unit or accessory structure". This type of operation is already prohibited by the commercial vehicle parking ordinance and home occupation standards, which states that home occupations and all related activity, including storage, must be conducted completely within the dwelling unit or permitted accessory structure. However, staff continues to receive inquiries regarding landscaping businesses as home occupations, and adding this provision may help to provide clarity. Staff is proposing to clarify this matter by adding the following language to the list of prohibited home occupations: "Landscape business where equipment, supplies, and plant material are stored on-site except when within a fully enclosed permitted dwelling unit or accessory structure."

Mr. Sula stated that his view on home occupations is that, if the business is doing something that changes the appearance or character of the area it shouldn't be allowed.

Approved

Ms. Gable stated that commercial vehicles, like tractors and such associated with these businesses couldn't be located on a residential lot (unless inside a permitted accessory structure), as this is a violation of the Village's commercial parking ordinance. However, we get inquiries often about these types of businesses and if someone doesn't call staff to inquire about the legality of parking/storing these vehicles outside, they may miss the fact that it is prohibited, as the commercial vehicle parking provisions are found in another area of the code. She noted that this is really a clarification of existing codes and doesn't change what is allowed.

Mr. Baugh motioned, seconded by Mr. Paff, to forward a favorable recommendation on the petition of the Village to amend the Article 10.2.12 "Home Occupation" to add "massage services" to the list of prohibited home occupations.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Baugh, Garrity, Paff, Reilly, and Sula

Nays: Pejsach

Abstain: None

Motion Approved: 5-1-0

Mr. Baugh motioned, seconded by Mr. Garrity, to forward a favorable recommendation on the petition of the Village to amend the Article 10.2.12 "Home Occupation" to add "astrology, card and palm reading, or fortune-telling" to the list of prohibited home occupations.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Baugh, Garrity, and Reilly

Nays: Paff, Pejsach, and Sula

Abstain: None

Motion Failed: 3-3-0

Mr. Pejsach motioned, seconded by Mr. Baugh, to forward a favorable recommendation on the petition of the Village to amend the Article 10.2.12 "Home Occupation" to add "landscape business where equipment, supplies, and plant material are stored on-site except when within a fully enclosed permitted dwelling unit or accessory structure" to the list of prohibited home occupations.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Baugh, Garrity, Paff, Pejsach, Reilly, and Sula

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Motion Approved: 6-0-0

c. Article 13.15.1 Signs Requiring Special Use Approval

Proposal to eliminate a confliction in the ordinance regarding the use of neon tubing or LED tubing and other similar lighting outside of a sign face

Approved

Ms. Gable stated that staff is propping to eliminate a conflict in the ordinance regarding the use of neon tubing or LED tubing and other similar lighting outside of a sign face. She stated that The Zoning Ordinance only allows neon tubing outside of the sign face with a Special Use Permit. However, an amendment is needed to clean up an existing contradiction in the Zoning Ordinance (Article 13.2.1 “Prohibited Signs and Sign Characteristics” and Article 13.15.1 “Signs Requiring Special Use Approval”), the first of which states that neon tubing outside of the sign face is prohibited and the latter of which currently states that in the C-3 district, neon tubing outside of the sign face is prohibited (requiring Special Use approval). Staff is proposing to remedy these conflicting sections by changing Article 13.15.1.c to say that “any installation of neon tubing or LED tubing and other similar lighting outside the sign face requires special use approval, even when such installation is part of an architectural element or feature of the building or structure. For the purposes of these regulations, each linear foot of such lighting or tubing is considered one square foot of sign area.”

Mr. Garrity asked for clarification on what is exactly proposed.

Ms. Velkover stated that the code has, for years, required a Special Use Permit anytime neon or LED is used outside of a sign area in commercial districts. An example of neon or LED being used outside of a sign area would be a building that lined the top of their building (parapet) with neon or LED. Or a business that lined their storefront windows with LED or neon. This practice is required, in commercial districts, to go through a Special Use Permit hearing because it is an “attention attracting device” which is our definition of a sign. One linear foot of LED or neon is counted as 1 sq. ft. of sign area. Unfortunately, when the sign code was overhauled, there is reference to the special use permit process only when in the C-3 district. However, in another area of the sign code it indicates that any application for LED or neon outside of a sign area requires a special use permit. The conflict in the code needs to be remedied and since the Village’s prior code has not limited this treatment to just the C-3 district, we are proposing to eliminate just the reference to the C-3 district.

Mr. Pejsach motioned, seconded by Mr. Baugh, to forward a favorable recommendation on the petition of the Village to amend Article 13.15.1.c to read “any installation of neon tubing or LED tubing and other similar lighting outside the sign face requires special use approval, even when such installation is part of an architectural element or feature of the building or structure. For the purposes of these regulations, each linear foot of such lighting or tubing is considered one square foot of sign area.”

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Baugh, Garrity, Pejsach, Paff, Reilly, and Sula

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Motion Passed: 6-0-0

Approved

7. Next Meeting Date: February 19, 2020

This meeting is proposed to review the first full draft of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

8. Public Comment

There were no public comments.

9. Adjournment

Mr. Pejsach motioned, seconded by Mr. Baugh, to adjourn the meeting.

Voice vote:

All "Ayes," no "Nays," None abstaining

Motion carried: 6-0-0

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Joann Metzger,
Recording Secretary, Planning and Zoning Board