



# PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

CITY OF NOVI

Regular Meeting

**March 12, 2014 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 or about 7:00 PM.

## ROLL CALL

**Present:** Member Anthony, Member Baratta, Member Giacometti, Member Greco, Member Lynch, Chair Pehrson

**Absent:** Member Zuchlewski (excused)

**Also Present:** Barbara McBeth, Deputy Director of Community Development; Sara Roediger, Planner; Kristen Kapelanski, Planner; Adam Wayne, Engineer; David Beschke, Landscape Architect; Gary Dovre, City Attorney; Doug Necci, City's Façade Consultant; Victor Cardenas, Interim City Manager; Brian Coburn, Engineering Manager.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

## APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved by Member Lynch, seconded by Member Baratta:

## VOICE VOTE ON THE AGENDA APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER BARATTA:

**Motion to approve the March 12, 2014 Planning Commission Agenda. *Motion carried 6-0.***

## AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

No one in the audience wished to speak.

## CORRESPONDENCE

There was no Correspondence.

## COMMITTEE REPORTS

There were no Committee Reports.

## COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPUTY DIRECTOR REPORT

Deputy Director McBeth had nothing to report.

## CONSENT AGENDA - REMOVALS AND APPROVAL

### 1. FOX RUN JSP13-64

Approval of the request of Erickson Living for Planning Commission's recommendation to the City Council of a Revised Preliminary Site Plan with a PD-1 Option and Revised Phasing Plan. The subject property is 102.8 acres in Section 1 of the City of Novi and located north of Thirteen Mile Road and west of M-5 in the RM-1, Low Density Low-Rise Multiple-Family District. The applicant has made minor adjustments to the phasing plan and landscape plan for the remaining buildings in Phase 2.

Moved by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Greco:

## VOICE VOTE ON THE CONSENT AGENDA APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER GRECO:

**Motion to approve the Consent Agenda. *Motion carried 6-0.***

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

### **1. 2014-2020 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

Victor Cardenas, Interim City Manager, said each year, the City of Novi, as part of the annual budget process prepares a Capital Improvement Plan or CIP. This document serves as a guidepost for major capital expenditures for the next six years. This is done in accordance with the provisions outlined in the Municipal Planning Commission Act, PA 285. A capital improvement is defined as any new equipment, construction, acquisition or improvement to public lands, buildings or structures in excess of \$25,000, with a minimum life expectancy of five years. Maintenance-oriented, operational or continuous expenditures are not considered to be capital improvements. The CIP is first a planning tool and may be quite useful as a planning primary guide in implementing the Master Plan. The City is required by statute to adopt a five-year capital improvement plan that outlines the planning capital needs of the City. The plan is broken down into the following categories: roads; sanitary sewer; intersections and signals; sidewalks and pathways; storm sewer and drainage; water distribution; equipment; parks; and buildings and property. This year's roads, intersections, sidewalks and construction expenditures equals out to about \$3.6 million dollars. This does not include the Eleven Mile Road construction which was moved up by City Council in the last February meeting. So the total expenditures for construction will be \$4.6 million dollars coming up in 2014. A previous incarnation of this document was presented before the joint committee of the CIP, which is Planning Commission and City Council members, at their February 24<sup>th</sup> meeting. Interim City Manager Cardenas said he welcomes any questions about the plan.

Member Lynch said he's part of the committee with Commissioner Giacometti. City staff has done a good job. You can't do everything all at once. Member Lynch likes the prioritization process using more quantitative instead of subjective data, specifically with the roads. Overall, there's only so much you can afford. Member Lynch said that you have to trust the staff on thoroughly analyzing the needs of the City. In his opinion, staff did a good job.

Member Baratta said he is part of the pathway and sidewalk committee. One of the things the committee had talked about in a prior meeting was with the development going on in Novi that the City needed to really look back at our priorities. For example if there's a subdivision being constructed and the City had proposed a sidewalk extension across the street, maybe we need to review and determine if our priorities remain correct. Member Baratta said, the CIP has taken that into consideration. Member Baratta thanked staff and said the CIP was really well done.

Member Giacometti said he has a question under the buildings and property category regarding the construction of a new fire station, Fire Station One. This is an item that was added since the sub-committee meeting. Is 3.1 million dollars the cost for full construction?

Interim City Manager Cardenas said the City is in the process of getting a needs assessment done by an architectural firm. The cost is not finalized yet, but that's one of the numbers they've been suggesting for full construction and engineering of that facility.

Member Giacometti said that doesn't seem like a whole lot of money for a fire station.

Interim City Manager Cardenas said it's also taking into consideration what the need of the new fire station will be. Fire Station One was mainly the headquarters and main operations for the fire department. However, a lot of that has been moved over to the Police station and Fire Station Four. This amount is taking that into consideration - it's a smaller and condensed building.

Member Giacometti said otherwise he agrees with the recommendations. This is an excellent job and a

really solid packet for review.

Chair Pehrson said given that we do this every year, the amount of hours that are spent and the planning and the different dots that are put on boards and ideas thrown out there this is something that Novi is very good at; spending wisely the money that is afforded to us by the citizens. So everything is prioritized. If you've never had the chance to look at something like this, it's well worth your time and investment because the amount of effort that goes into the CIP and the kinds of things that are thought about sometimes will take you back. You don't think of how much it takes to run a City and the kinds of infrastructure that a City like this really takes on. Chair Pehrson appreciates the work on this, it's well done.

Moved by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Greco:

**ROLL CALL VOTE ON THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER GRECO:**

**Motion to adopt the 2014-2020 Capital Improvement Program, as presented. *Motion carried 6-0.***

**2. PARK PLACE EAST, JSP13-35**

Public hearing at the request of Centennial Home Group, LLC for Preliminary Site Plan utilizing the Open Space Preservation Option with a Site Condominium, Wetland Permit, Woodland Permit and Stormwater Management Plan approval. The subject property is 10.66 acres in Section 31, located south of Nine Mile Road, between Beck and Napier Roads in the RA, Residential Acreage District. The applicant is proposing a seven unit single-family residential development using the Open Space Preservation Option.

Planner Sara Roediger said the applicant is proposing a seven unit single-family residential development using the open space preservation option. The property is surrounded by single family residential homes, most of which are located in the existing Park Place subdivision, with the exception of a vacant parcel located to its east. This property and all of the sounding area is zoned RA, Residential Acreage. Similarly, the Future Land Use map indicates primarily single-family uses for this area with some park and utility uses planned for the surrounding properties. There are regulated wetlands and woodlands on the property, primarily along the southern and western property lines along with an open-water wetland near the east property line. The vast majority of these are being preserved as part of the plan. The proposed development will result in seven single-family detached homes that would connect to the existing Park Place subdivision through Boardwalk Avenue to the west, with a future connection to the undeveloped parcel to the east. The open space preservation option which the applicant is using is intended to encourage the preservation of open space and natural features, and the applicant has designed the site to preserve nearly all of the existing wetlands and woodlands. All reviews are recommending approval of the proposed plan with items to be addressed on the final site plan. The Planning Commission is asked to hold a public hearing and make a determination that the parallel plan is acceptable and, based on that plan; determine that the maximum number of dwelling units that would be permitted under the open space preservation option is seven units. The Planning Commission is also asked to approve the Preliminary Site Plan, Wetland Permit, Woodland Permit and Stormwater Management Plan.

James Courtney, resident of Park Place Estates, said he's here to represent the Park Place Estates Homeowners Association. We have a couple of questions from residents that are affected by this that received public notice. He has six different points for the Planning Commission and the developer's consideration. This will help us understand how this is going to be developed. It includes our concerns and offers some solutions.

Mr. Courtney said, Park Place East will be a unique development in that the plans currently have access to the site via Park Place Estates. The resulting heavy equipment such as earth movers and graders could cause serious damage immediately or years down the road as well as large amounts of dirt and debris throughout that access road. We would like to know if traffic would be restricted only to the Nine Mile entrance as much as possible so that it doesn't go down Park Place Drive through Roberts. Also he wondered if there is a way to offset the cost of repairs to the roads that is caused as a result of constructing this development.

Number two, Mr. Cortney said, we're happy to hear that the tree line is going to be preserved. That's great news. What we'd like to also see is that there's a fence line on the western most boundary of the proposed site. We'd like to make sure that remains intact, not only for aesthetics but also it keeps a separation between the two subdivisions and also keeps debris from going back and forth, especially during the construction phase. The third point is concerning the deed restrictions and conformity to Park Place Estates. If you come in through Napier or Nine Mile, you're going to see our homes follow a very strict and rigid set of restrictions in how you can build. We want to understand the way Park Place East is going to be built, is it going to match the same style? Jack from Centennial Home Group had sent us an email in regards to this and alluding to the fact that it would look the same and be built the same as Park Place Estates. Of course, these lots are not the same size or the house will not be the same size, the concern is we want to follow the exact same construction rules. With this, we could help Centennial Home Group with creating their bylaws and restrictions because we have experience in it but also we will be able to point out some pit falls that we found.

The fourth point is on Park Place Estates general road layout. The parallel plan calls for a cul-de-sac that would push all the homes over to the right, therefore destroying the woodlands. We have a concern with the way the road is being proposed. First of all, it would be going straight through to the other end of the lot. There is no cul-de-sac, so drivers cannot turn around without backing up. We'd like to have a cul-de-sac put in there and for the signage purpose, instead of putting up a separate sign at the entrance that the actual name of Boardwalk would be changed to Park Place East, that was the residents of this future site could actually identify their homes as Park Place East and that way there doesn't have to be a separate sign. From that aspect, everyone would be able to differentiate the two.

The fifth point: the value. There are two things that we'd like to see as these future residents are going to receive two benefits from our existing subdivision. The first one would be the improvements that we did on our front entrances with electricity and landscaping. That provides a value to the builder also as his residents will be going through our subdivision. So as we had to put money into that, we'd like to have some kind of compensation for that real value that is being added. We've proposed a one-time fee from the builder for \$10,000 for the Nine Mile Entrance that his future residents would be using. This would go exclusively toward improving the entrance, as currently there is nothing there.

The second part would be for the homeowners association that would be going there in the future, there is ongoing maintenance throughout the entire Nine Mile and Napier entrance with mulch, sprinkler lines, repairs and grass cutting. What we would like to see is that the proposed development have some way to compensate Park Place Estates for this future cost, as they will also be benefiting from this. This would be something that would be ongoing and would only be assessed to the future residents. I thank the Planning Commission for their time.

Member Lynch read the correspondence.

Cinzia Miksitz objects the plan because of concerns with heavy construction equipment traveling through the subdivision streets on Park Place and Roberts Drive. Heavy earthmovers and grading equipment will likely damage the paved roads. Park Place Drive has already seen plenty of damage over the last 12-15 months due to heavy construction traffic volumes. Suggests an entrance off Nine Mile

Road only for heavy equipment.

Gorgi Serdenkovski supports the plan for several reasons but with some conditions. Number one, that the fence between Park Place East and Park Place remains in place. Two, construction access should enter through Nine Mile and Roberts Drive. Three, Homes in Park Place East should receive approval from Park Place community to maintain value and consistency. Finally, Park Place East should pave Nine Mile Road from entrance on Roberts going west and repair any damage to Roberts caused during construction.

Jack Carnihan, from Centennial Home Group, said we're currently building on two lots in Park Place and we're developing this land for our own use. We're planning to build houses that are exactly in line with what's there. The expectation is that this project will look just like part of the existing sub. Mr. Carnihan said he knows the square footages that are required in the restrictions for the existing Park Place subdivision. We will exceed those sizes in our master deed and bylaws. So there won't be a problem with values. We want this to look just the same.

As far as the fence on the west property line which was brought up on several instances - where we can leave that we will. But there's grading work that's required and there's construction of a large retention pond, and where the trees can be left we do not want to spend money to take them down. Mr. Carnihan said, we will do everything we can to leave them. We're talking about marketing some extremely valuable homes and not everybody wants to look at that fence. I realize it does provide some separation, but not everyone wants to look at that fence. That's an issue that we've considered as well, as to rather or not the fence is of value: to make this look separate or make this all look like all one nice continuous moving project.

As far as the streets, our current access is off of Broadway Drive and we have no other street frontage. We've designed the street to head to the east for potential future extension. At one time or another it was discussion of a cul-de-sac and they wanted that street to be able to be continued to the east. That's why you see that kind of configuration. As far as using the street for access, we would certainly be willing to only restrict coming in off of Nine Mile but at this point, I don't have any other point of access to get to the site with construction equipment. If the street can be identified as to the current condition and we cause damage or mud or there's erosion related issues that is our responsibility. Our erosion permit will require us to take care of that. If we cause damage, we will be more than willing to repair that or work with the city to get that corrected at any time. We're more than willing to work with the adjacent homeowners.

Mr. Carnihan said, I'm not prepared to agree to given amount of money at this point in time but if we're benefiting from improvements from their subdivision entry, then the easiest thing is for us to agree to participate on a pro-rata basis for the improvements. I think that is only fair. We have seven lots. We're not sure of the exact number of homes in the existing sub, but we'd be willing to do that. We'd like to move this ahead and would like your consideration of all the recommendations for approval. I'll answer any other questions you may have.

Member Lynch asked is this subdivision going to have a separate deed and bylaws?

Mr. Carnihan said yes. The existing Park Place is a platted subdivision. We're going to do this plan as a condominium. So it will have its own separate bylaws and master deed.

Member Lynch said so you'll be governed by Act 59, whereas the other one isn't.

Mr. Carnihan said that's correct. We will pattern our restrictions in a similar fashion to what the existing sub has. Mr. Carnihan said, I believe they have a 2,800 square foot minimum for a house; normally our houses are about 3,300 square foot minimum up to about 4,500. The existing sub is nice and that's why we want

to develop east of there.

Member Lynch said he looked at the package and it looks like these homes are going to range anywhere from 3,400 to 4000 square feet. And the homes will be priced in the mid-\$500 to mid-\$600's. From your presentation, you're going to work with the Park Place Estates to somehow develop a sharing of expenses for the entranceway, since it does benefit everybody.

Mr. Carnihan said he think that's only fair. This is the first time I've heard of this, but we're willing to do that, yes.

Member Lynch said the issue about the cul-de-sac, are you thinking of just putting a gravel down at the end of the street so that you have some sort of turnaround? You certainly will have construction traffic.

Mr. Carnihan said we could do that. They're called T-turnarounds at the end where it's done. Rather if it's a gravel or a temporary asphalt that meets the city standard, we'll be willing to do that to avoid the issue of being unable to turn.

Member Lynch said ok thank you. You've answered all my questions.

Member Baratta asked were these houses going to have any vinyl siding at all?

Mr. Carnihan said no they will not.

Member Baratta said no, just brick? And the issue came up on signage. Where you going to have a separate name for this subdivision or is it part of Park Place?

Mr. Carnihan said we were just planning to sell homes out of homes we're currently constructing. We are not planning any signage whatsoever.

Member Baratta said that was it. Thank you.

Member Anthony said so the straight street going through there is something that the city wants for ongoing development as we begin to build out our vacant spaces, is that correct?

Planner Roediger said correct.

Member Anthony asked during construction, what kind of oversight will the city be doing as far as dust, dirt, the condition of the road at the beginning of construction versus documenting the condition of the road after, will any of that be involved in this construction?

Engineer Wayne said yes the city would be overseeing the construction of this development and through the application process, as the applicant alluded to. The applicant will be required to pull a Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control Permit. Through that, the city has a code enforcement officer who monitors and enforces those permits as well as a private inspector that the city consults with to oversee that inspection as well. The inspectors go out and make sure that the developer is sweeping the street on a daily basis. They will have a construction mud mat at the entrance to the development just to make sure that there isn't any dirt or soil being tracked offsite onto the existing public streets.

Member Anthony said so it looks like that it's likely that Roberts Road would probably be a road used for trucks coming in and out. If that were the case, both on Roberts and Boardwalk, would the soil erosion permit prevent any type of cleanup of those roads during construction.

Engineer Wayne said yes the soil erosion permit would enforce the cleanup of those roads. The contractor that the applicant hires will most likely have to sweep those roads daily. There would also be measures for controlling dirt being washed into the storm sewers.

Member Anthony said so obviously they would need to take measures controlling any dirt runoff into the storm sewers as you said on Roberts and Boardwalk. They'd be required to do any cleanup or sweeping if dirt were to accumulate there. The restriction on the cleanup with the soil erosion permit is restricted to the area of the new construction.

Engineer Wayne said yes sir, both the area of construction and the construction access.

Member Anthony said the one thing I like about this site is the preservation of the wetlands, the open green space, and the preservation of the woodland. This is very well done. The developer is doing homes that are consistent with the others ones and he's willing to work in cooperation with the existing neighborhood on any shared benefits on a pro-rata basis. I certainly would support this.

Member Greco said before I make a motion, I'd like to make a few comments. I think most of the points that James Courtney made tonight have been addressed. It sounds like there's going to be a good relationship with the current homeowners with the developer of this new site in addressing all of the concerns.

Moved by Member Greco and seconded by Member Anthony:

**ROLL CALL VOTE ON THE PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER GRECO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER ANTHONY:**

**In the matter of Park Place East, JSP13-35, motion to approve the Preliminary Site Plan utilizing the Open Space Preservation Option with a Site Condominium based on and subject to the following:**

- a. The Planning Commission has made the determination that the parallel plan is acceptable and, based on that plan, has determined the maximum number of dwelling units that would be permitted under the OSP Option is seven units;
- b. The Planning Commission has made the determination that the Open Space Preservation Option Plan satisfies the intent of the Open Space Preservation Option;
- c. The conditions and items listed in the staff and consultant review letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan;
- d. To limit the construction equipment access to Nine Mile Road;
- e. The developer is prepared to work with the homeowner's association on a pro rata basis for improvements to the existing Park Place subdivision entrance;
- f. To clean and repair existing roads in Park Place Subdivision that are disrupted by construction.

The motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 3, Article 24 and Article 25 of the Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 6-0.*

Moved by Member Greco and seconded by Member Anthony:

**ROLL CALL VOTE ON THE WETLAND PERMIT APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER GRECO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER ANTHONY:**

**In the matter of Park Place East, JSP13-35, motion to approve the Wetland Permit based on and subject to the findings of compliance with ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters, and the conditions and items listed in the staff and consultant review letters being addressed**

on the Final Site Plan. The motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 12, Article V of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the ordinance. *Motion carried 6-0.*

Moved by Member Greco and seconded by Member Anthony:

**ROLL CALL VOTE ON THE WOODLAND PERMIT APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER GRECO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER ANTHONY:**

In the matter of Park Place East, JSP13-35, motion to approve the Woodland Permit based on and subject to the findings of compliance with ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters, and the conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan. This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 37 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the ordinance. *Motion carried 6-0.*

Moved by Member Greco and seconded by Member Anthony:

**ROLL CALL VOTE ON THE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER GRECO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER ANTHONY:**

In the matter of Park Place East, JSP13-35, motion to approve the Stormwater Management Plan based on and subject to 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. This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 11 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the ordinance. *Motion carried 6-0.*

**MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION**

**1. BECK NORTH LOT 53, JSP14-03**

Consideration of the request of Amson Dembs Development for Preliminary Site Plan and Stormwater Management Plan approval. The subject property is located in Section 4, at the northeast corner of Nadlan Court and Hudson Drive in the I-1, Light Industrial District. The subject property is 3.90 acres and the applicant is proposing to construct a 50,058 square foot speculative office and industrial building with associated parking and landscaping.

Planner Kapelanski said the applicant is proposing to construct a 50,058 square foot speculative industrial building at the northeast corner of Nadlan Court and Hudson Drive. The site is bordered by vacant land and various office and industrial uses in the Beck North Corporate Park. The subject property is zoned I-1, Light Industrial and is bordered by I-1 zoning in all directions. The Future Land Use map indicates Industrial, Research and Development and Technology uses for the subject property and all surrounding properties. There are no existing natural features on the site. The applicant is proposing a speculative building with associated parking and landscaping. All reviews recommend approval of the plan with the planning review noting that the applicant should revise the floor plan to demonstrate areas that can be deducted from the required parking calculations. Staff is confident the site can meet the parking standards once this is done. The applicant has also submitted the required material sample board.

Chris Miller, from Amson Dembs, said this is a single story building for research and development. It works with all the façade requirements of the City. Mr. Miller said they already have someone interested in the building.

Member Anthony said one of the things that staff had requested for the façade was that you bring in the sample board for the exterior. Which of the samples on that board will be on the exterior?

Mr. Miller said all of them.

Member Anthony asked if staff had been able to look at those samples beforehand and wondered if they are in compliance.

Planner Kapelanski said we haven't had a chance to review the samples, but our façade consultant Doug Necci is here this evening. He can take a quick look at that and make sure that's what he expects to see.

Mr. Necci confirmed that it is consistent with what we would expect.

Member Anthony said with the motion that we have, does that already account for our consultant to do a greater, in depth look at it?

Planner Kapelanski confirmed that it does.

Member Baratta asked what the clear elevation inside the building is. Is it 20 feet?

Mr. Miller said it will be 21 feet.

Member Baratta asked if a wet sprinkler system will be in the building.

Mr. Miller said yes. It's a speculative building so the design is assumed to be an ordinary hazard and a light duty hazard. If we get a tenant in the building that is going to require a SFR, we'll have to install that type of a system and we know we have the water pressure.

Moved by Member Anthony and seconded by Member Greco:

**ROLL CALL VOTE ON THE PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER ANTHONY AND SECONDED BY MEMBER GRECO:**

**In the matter of Beck North Lot 53, JSP14-03, motion to approve the Preliminary Site Plan based on and subject to the following:**

- a. Applicant revising the floor plan to more clearly show areas that can be deducted from required parking calculations as indicated in their response letter;**
- b. The findings of compliance with ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters and the conditions and items listed in those review letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan;**
- c. A finding that is hereby made that the parking is compatible with surrounding uses; and**
- d. A waiver of the same side driveway spacing requirement, that is hereby granted.**

**This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 19, Article 24 and Article 25 of the Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 6-0.***

Moved by Member Anthony and seconded by Member Greco:

**ROLL CALL VOTE ON THE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER ANTHONY AND SECONDED BY MEMBER GRECO:**

**In the matter of Beck North Lot 53, JSP14-03, motion to approve the Stormwater Management Plan, subject to the finding 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.**

This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 11 of the Code of Ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 6-0.*

1. **APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 12, 2014 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

Moved by Member Greco and seconded by Member Anthony:

**VOICE VOTE ON THE FEBRUARY 12, 2014 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER GRECO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER ANTHONY:**

**Motion to approve the February 12, 2014 Planning Commission Minutes. *Motion carried 6-0.***

**CONSENT AGENDA REMOVALS FOR COMMISSION ACTION**

There were no Consent Agenda Removals.

**MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION**

There were no Matters for Discussion.

**SUPPLEMENTAL ISSUES**

There were no Supplemental Issues.

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION**

No one in the audience wished to speak.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Moved by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Anthony:

**VOICE VOTE ON MOTION TO ADJOURN MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER ANTHONY:**

**Motion to adjourn the March 12, 2014 Planning Commission meeting. *Motion carried 6-0.***

The meeting was adjourned at 7:45 PM.

Transcribed by Valentina Nuculaj

March, 2014

Date Approved: March 26, 2014

---

Richelle Leskun, Planning Assistant  
Signature on File