

APPROVED

PC mtg. 1/09/16

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF THE
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
HELD AT THE ROBERT J. HOMOLA
MUNICIPAL BUILDING, DUPAGE COUNTY
201 SOUTH BLOOMINGDALE, ILLINOIS 60108 ON
JANUARY 5, 2016 AT 7:00 P.M.

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Planning and Zoning Commission meeting was called to order by Vice Chairman King at 7:03 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Upon roll call by the recording secretary, the following Commissioners were:

Present: Commissioners Jaster, King, Coleman, Shannon and Smith

Absent: Commissioners Fangusaro and Chairman Brice

Quorum Present

Also Present: Mr. S. Gascoigne – Village Development & Planning
Mr. B. Prohaska – Engineer
Mr. M. Castaldo – Village Attorney

Moved by Commissioner Smith, seconded by Commissioner Shannon to appoint Commissioner King as temporary Chairman to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Ayes: All Commissioners Present

Nays: None

Absent: Commissioners Fangusaro and Chairman Brice

Motion Declared Carried

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – SEPTEMBER 1, 2015 AND OCTOBER 20, 2015

Moved by Commissioner Jaster, seconded by Commissioner Smith to approve the September 1, 2015 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting minutes.

Ayes: All Commissioners Present

Nays: None

Absent: Commissioners Fangusaro and Chairman Brice

Motion Declared Carried

Moved by Commissioner Coleman, seconded by Commissioner Shannon to approve the October 20, 2015 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting minutes.

Ayes: All Commissioners Present

Nays: None

Absent: Commissioners Fangusaro and Chairman Brice

Motion Declared Carried

5. DMG REAL ESTATES, LLC – 220 SPRINGFIELD DRIVE – SPECIAL USE, EXCEPTIONS, FINAL SITE PLAN REVIEW – (FIRST HEARING) – 2016-101

The following people were sworn in for the record.

Mr. Marty Burke - Location Finders International, Developer for DuPage Medical Group, 9400 Enterprise, Mokena, Illinois

Mr. Anthony Bonavolonta - Represents Grove LLC, the developer of the property to the south, 845 Butternut Court, Roselle, Illinois

Mr. Phil Loftus - Engineer, Spaceco, Inc., 9575 W. Higgins Road, #700, Rosemont, Illinois

The following exhibits were entered into the record.

Exhibit # 1 - Application for Hearing, dated December 14, 2015

Exhibit # 2 - Notice of Public Hearing, dated January 5, 2016

Exhibit # 3 - Affidavit of Compliance, dated January 5, 2016

Exhibit # 4 - Application Agreement, dated December 14, 2015

Exhibit # 5 - Affidavit of Disclosure, dated November 30, 2015

Exhibit # 6 - Notices to Surrounding Property Owners
(8) Notices Received, (16) Notices Not Received
Affidavit of Mailing, dated December 4, 2015

Exhibit # 7 - Certification Fee Agreements, dated December 9, 2015

Exhibit # 8 - Affidavit of Legal Notification, dated January 5, 2016

Exhibit # 9 - Masonry Bricks

Exhibit # 10 - Precast Concrete

Exhibit # 11 - Concrete Banding Material Around Windows

Exhibit # 12 - Vision Glass

Exhibit # 13 - Spandrel Glass

Exhibit # 14 - Aluminum for Windows and Canopy

Exhibit # 15 - Roof Screening Material

Exhibit # 16 - Metal & Glass Components for Two Monument Signs at
Entrance

Exhibit # 17 - Metal & Glass Components for Two Monument Signs at
Entrance

Exhibit # 18 - Metal & Glass Components for Two Monument Signs at
Entrance

Mr. Marty Burke introduced himself to the Planning & Zoning Commission. He is with Location Finders International and the Developer for DuPage Medical Group, with offices at 9400 Enterprise, Mokena, Illinois.

Exhibit # 1 was entered into the record, which is the Application for Hearing, dated December 14, 2015.

Exhibit # 2 was entered into the record, which is the Notice of Public Hearing, dated January 5, 2016.

Exhibit # 3 was entered into the record, which is the Affidavit of Compliance, dated January 5, 2016.

Exhibit # 4 was entered into the record, which is the Application Agreement, dated December 14, 2015.

Exhibit # 5 is entered into the record, which is the Affidavit of Disclosure, dated November 30, 2015.

Exhibit # 6 is entered into the record, which are the Notices to Surrounding Property Owners; (8) Notices Received, (16) Notices Not Received and Affidavit of Mailing, dated December 4, 2015.

Exhibit # 7 is introduced into the record, which is the Certification Fee Agreements, dated December 9, 2015.

Exhibit # 8 is introduced into the record, which is the Affidavit of Legal Notification, dated January 5, 2016.

Exhibit # 9 is introduced into the record, which are the Masonry Bricks.

Exhibit # 10 is introduced into the record, which is the Precast Concrete.

Exhibit # 11 is introduced into the record, which is the Concrete Banding Material Around Windows.

Exhibit # 12 is introduced into the record, which is the Vision Glass.

Exhibit #13 is introduced into the record, which is the Spandrel Glass.

Exhibit # 14 is introduced into the record, which is the Aluminum Sample for Windows and Canopy.

Exhibit # 15 is introduced into the record, which is the Roof Screening Material.

Exhibit #'s 16, 17 and 18 are introduced into the record, which are the Metal & Glass Components for Two Monument Signs at Entrance.

Mr. Burke stated that DuPage Medical Group has been a long time resident of Bloomingdale. They are looking to build a brand new facility. Their existing facility is not large enough and not up to their standards. They are looking to build a 55,000 square foot, three story state of the art medical office building at 220 Springfield. They are looking for final approval of the planned development tonight. They are scheduled to break ground in April or May 2016 weather permitting. The three-story brick, concrete, aluminum and glass building with several canopies will have the main entrance on the southwest corner of the building. It is an extremely attractive building very similar to the building in downtown Wheaton. This is a much bigger building.

Mr. Burke referred to Exhibit # 9, which is the Masonry Brick. He referred to Exhibit # 10, which is the precast, which will be along the base of the building. He referred to Exhibit # 11, which is the concrete banding material that will be around the windows and some of the other features. He referred to Exhibit # 12, which is the Vision Glass, which is a green color that will be used for all of the glass on the building. He referred to Exhibit # 13, which is the Spandrel glass and will be used in court areas that you do not see out of from the inside or outside of glass. He referred to Exhibit # 14, which is the Aluminum Sample for Windows and Canopies. He referred to Exhibit #15, which is the Roofing Material (Bronze). The roof-top equipment is fully screened.

Mr. Burke stated that they are asking for two monument signs. He referred to Exhibits 16, 17 and 18.

He stated that they have overlaid their development showing both the existing DuPage Medical Group Building to the north and they overlaid the LTT Development to the south and to the west. The LTT Development was approved with a driveway on the south side end of the property, an entrance off of Springfield on the south end of the property. They are required by the Fire Department and Engineering Department to have two entrances to their site for emergency purposes. He stated that both of them cannot be off of Stratford Drive. They do need a drive off of Springfield. They went to LTT and are trying to work out an arrangement so they can jointly have access to both sites. It would become a public road and tie into the design road that LTT has been approved to put in.

He referred to a blow up of their project and shows the Commission how the drive comes off the south side.

He stated at the very near future they will be providing a dedicated right-of-way for the building that will only extend from Springfield West to the two

driveways. The reason for that is because the current landowner does not need to have that road extend any further. Once the transaction between the planned owner and the contract purchaser happens then they will dedicate the rest of that property to the Village for public road to continue on. Right now they are looking for approval for all of that. The original dedication would just be for the 204 feet to just get them past those driveways. If the contract purchase does not close, then it will serve as a drive to both sides to be determined at a later date as to what the development on the site to the south looks like.

Vice Chairman King confirmed that the Fire Department has no problem with that entrance there.

Mr. Burke stated that they are looking for the required relief of two wall signs, two monument signs, a couple of setback variances, easement between the two DMG owned properties for maintenance and for trash, as well as going out to Stratford a cross access easement for both properties to have access to use the common drive.

Mr. Burke goes over the floor plans with the Commission.

Mr. Burke referred to the elevations. A sign will be on both corners of the east end of the building facing Springfield. They do think it is justifiable because a lot of the traffic will continue to come from Stratford and will need to be able to see that sign.

Mr. Burke showed them a slide of what the monument signs will look like.

Mr. Burke stated that they did a joint traffic study with LTT. The traffic study said that the improvement from the intersection of the new road down south of Springfield should be a 260 foot taper and turn lane, and there were no improvements required north of there. The Village has asked for a great deal of improvements on top of that. The petitioner would like the ability to work that out with staff if they move forward. They think some of the improvements are excessive including the resurfacing of Springfield. They would be more than willing to repair that road through a maintenance program, but the traffic that they are going to generate does not justify that kind of improvement.

Mr. Burke said that they would like to work together with engineering in regard to stormwater management.

Mr. Burke stated that there are some questions brought up in the staff report in regard to pavement repair on Stonington Road. He said Stonington Road is

a road that goes around close to the lake and is proposed to be moved except for one section that will stay. He stated that their site is much higher. He said they are raising that site and raising that road a little bit.

He stated that they also want to work out some details on the bike trail.

He showed the Commission the Plat of Dedication and what it would look like in the future.

Mr. Burke shows the Commission the landscape plan. They have met the requirement of the landscape plan and ordinance. There are a couple of items that they need to work out with staff with regard to removal of Ash trees and additional parkway trees.

Mr. Burke stated that they also received a report from the Fire Department with their comments. There is one recommendation for a water main move, and they do not agree with it, but they can work this out with staff.

Mr. Gascoigne referred to his memorandum, dated December 10, 2015. He stated that the subject property is located at 220 Springfield Drive. The site is currently a vacant piece of property located immediately south of the existing DuPage Medical facility and immediately north of the two parcels currently being developed by DB Walnut Grove, LLC. known as the Atriums on Springfield. To the north is the existing DuPage Medical Group facility and to the east, across Springfield Drive is multi-family and apartments.

The applicant is seeking approval for an approximately 55,000 square foot medical office building, with a surface parking lot containing 261 spaces. He stated that he did know in the report that they indicated 262 spaces, but the applicant actually used one of those parking spaces for something else. They are far in excess of the required parking. Medical Office Buildings are a permitted use by the Planned Development District of 250 Acres or More. The proposed building would replace the existing DMG facility that is out there to the north. According to the applicant in their previous conversations, they will either vacate that existing facility once they are complete with the new one, and either repurpose or demolish the old building.

Mr. Gascoigne stated that there are a number of waivers that are listed in the report, but he is not going to go through all of them, but they are outlined and highlighted in red. Most of them related to the parking lot setback; however there are a couple of things he will go through briefly.

In terms of access, two access points are proposed. The applicant should confirm that this is still their intention to provide cross easement access for their other site in the event that those get built out so that they would still have that second need for access.

Mr. Gascoigne said as the applicant indicated, they have been working with DB Walnut Grove regarding the single access along Springfield Drive to minimize the number of curb cuts along Springfield, based upon the discussions they have had and the applicant's presentation. The full property would be dedicated, but the north half belonging to DuPage Medical Group in the lower half ultimately belonging to the Atriums on Springfield, and if and when that is approved, the Plat of Dedication would be prepared and executed by both parties and also an agreement as to how the maintenance for the roads would be addressed. He said Atriums on Springfield are going to have their Homeowner's Association maintain snow removal on everything else so there should be some type of agreement reached to determine how they plan to work with LTT or with the other developer over there in terms of snow removal and so forth on the new access road.

Mr. Gascoigne stated that there is a requirement for one loading space, and they are not providing that so an exception would be needed for this.

Mr. Gascoigne stated that downspouts are not permitted on the exterior of the building. It did not appear to have them on the exterior so they assume that they are internal, but they are looking for confirmation, which they just confirmed.

Mr. Gascoigne stated as discussed, they are using a precast and then going to use a thinner veneer brick and stone for the outside. However, they are using trim around the windows, which is going to be aluminum and while the veneer and trim that they are using for the brick would meet the intent of the code, the aluminum is not a permitted material and would need an exception so the Commission would need to consider whether or not the aluminum around the windows would be an appropriate material.

Mr. Gascoigne said that they are proposing nine accent lights around the building. They just need to confirm how tall these are and how high they are on the building.

The Commission should establish if the proposed landscaping is both appropriate and sufficient, given its proximity to Springfield Drive and residential development to both the east and the south of the subject property.

He stated as the applicant deluded to previously, there is one Ash tree and they recommend that this tree be removed.

The Commission should consider if the proposed landscape screening is both appropriate and adequate for the enclosure. The applicant should confirm that the proposed aluminum doors are solid and that the dumpsters will not be visible in any way.

In regard to signage, the applicant is requesting variations for both of their signs, the monument signs, the number of signs, and the size of the signs. He stated that one monument sign would typically be allowed per code. They are requesting a second sign for the Stratford Drive entrance. Both of those are going to be the same size, black aluminum, white lettering, LED, and the signs themselves will be 41.25 square feet in lieu of the 35 square feet allowed. The appropriateness of a second sign, as well as the size, should be considered.

The petitioner is also proposing two wall signs on the building. They are permitted to have a second wall sign so the number of signs is not in question as much as the size. Each one is permitted to be 100 square feet, and they have each one at 146.25 square feet, internally illuminated channel letters with LED and both exceeding the size requirement.

Vice Chairman King inquired to the facility hours.

The facility will be open 8:00 A.M. to 6:00 p.m.

Vice Chairman King was just wondering if lighting would be a problem for the neighbors across the street, but if the facility closes at 6:00 p.m. he does not see a problem.

Commissioner Smith inquired about repurposing or demolishing the existing building, and if one or the other would affect the Village differently.

Mr. Prohaska stated that if they demolish it, there would temporarily be less traffic generated, and if there was a new facility they would have more traffic.

Commissioner Smith asked if the petitioner was leaning one way or another on what to do with the existing building.

The petitioner stated that they have a long time before this development happens. They will be marketing the existing building to a secondary use. If they cannot market it, they will probably demolish it.

Commissioner Jaster inquired if there is a lower level proposed for the new building. The petitioner stated that there is no level below grade proposed for the new building.

Mr. Prohaska referred to his memorandum, dated December 18, 2015. He stated that there has been a lot of planning activities recently in this neighborhood. He said a few months ago they were considering the LTT project with a new access to Springfield Drive. The Village has had a position for many years to minimize the direct access to Springfield Drive as it is such an important route to the various other properties in the neighborhood. The first thing that needs to be discussed and considered by everyone in the room is the appropriateness of moving the new access road. The new road is proposed to be located between this project and the LTT project. It is about 450 to 500 feet away from the existing signal at the Mall Entrance Road. They do not think that it can be moved any further to the north without potentially impacting the traffic associated with that intersection so this is about as far north as they can put it, and it really needs to be a shared access in order to minimize the number of accesses to Springfield Drive. This is an issue that needs some discussion.

The next item has to do with the improvements needed to the road. He said they heard the testimony earlier, but the staff position is that the lane configurations of the Springfield Drive and the new intersection should be similar to the existing lane configurations at the Mall Entrance with one exception and that is that the left turn bay for northbound to westbound traffic for the new road can be about 25 feet shorter at this road than at Mall Entrance 3. The reason for that is obviously there is going to be less traffic that goes into this road than at the signalized entrance trying to get to the mall. He said about 175 feet of storage is about the minimum that you would want to do. As far as the length of the taper on the exhibits they will see that in his report there was a drawing calling for a 350-foot taper for the southbound lanes. Basically, that is a 30 to 1 ratio of length to transverse lane change so if the lane is 11 feet wide and the taper ratio is 30 to 1, that is about 330 to 340 feet of length in order to move over the 11 feet as you transition from five lanes to four. He said it is the exact same configuration as the existing southbound traffic on Springfield Drive to the south of Mall Entrance 3. He said if they shorten the taper lane, what will happen at the speeds of traffic on the road is that motorists might have difficulty maneuvering the lanes because of the abruptness of the change of lanes. He said at the minimum of what they want to do is 30 to 1 and that is what is out there right now at Springfield Drive just to the north. They would like to maintain this at the new entrance road out to Springfield Drive.

Mr. Prohaska said there was a letter that was handed to them today that they would like to discuss with staff. He is not sure if it is up to the staff. This is in regard to the improvements on Springfield Drive. There should be discussion about this from the Commission.

He said at the same intersection, they talked about adding storm inlets to the northwest corner of the new intersecting road of Springfield Drive. He said what they are trying to do with that is to eliminate having a gutter that runs north and south across the new entrance road and just have a regular intersection where the asphalt for the new road meets the asphalt from the old road, and there is no gutter or drainage across that new road from the north to the south. In order to do that, they need to drop an inlet in some storm sewer at the northwest corner of that intersection. He thinks this is a better way to drain the area.

For internal traffic, they were looking at the handicapped stall locations. They need to be nearest to the main entrance door. There is one handicap stall that has been placed not nearest to the front door so it needs to be relocated.

Also, in the interior of the site, the existing pavement that runs to the trash enclosure for the existing building is at a slightly skewed angle to the new road that would access both buildings, and it gets to be a little peculiar in design because you have two pavements that are kind of intersecting at a skewed angle, and there will be a widening effect of the pavement. They are thinking that maybe the trash enclosure can be removed and shared between the two buildings since they are under common ownership, or perhaps the skewed angle can be reconfigured so that it is not such a large area of pavement at that angle.

Mr. Prohaska referred to the Bloomingdale Fire Protection memorandum, dated January 4, 2016. He stated that they have heard on many projects the standard for the Bloomingdale Fire Protection District to require two hydrants within 300 feet of the building and one of those hydrants within 100 feet of the building. He said the exhibits that we have received show the new hydrant within 100 feet of the fire sprinkler connection, but it did not show a second hydrant. Gary Kostal from the Fire District wrote his report and requested requiring another hydrant to meet the 300 feet spacing to every part of the perimeter of the building, and he is suggesting that the hydrant be located near the northwest corner of the building but not on a dead-end line. In order to eliminate the dead-end line, they are going to need to somehow reconfigure their service into the building or provide a loop. There are a couple of options on looping the water main. One of the options is to just tie into the water main with the fire hydrant that serves the other,

which is just to the north of the trash enclosure for the existing building. He said this can probably be worked out at a staff level but he does want to go over it.

Mr. Prohaska stated that he does not know if he saw in the drawings the monument sign setbacks. The code requires monument signs to be set back 15 feet from the right-of-way and 20 feet away from the adjacent curbs of the road. This should be detailed on the drawings.

He stated that they have some parking lot lighting that appears to be mounted to the building, and it was not clear what the height of that lighting was or what its impact is in terms of passing light onto the building and how that complies with the code requirement of the vertical foot candles illuminating the wall of that building. They need another plan that addresses that part of the code.

The drawings that came in on the street dedication need to be carefully coordinated between the two projects. There probably should be language in our Ordinance and Site Plan Approval Ordinance that requires that a roadway dedication occur and work out a date when LTT has their final approval or when the road is built, but some kind of coordination with this.

In regard to Ash trees, Mr. Prohaska said these in the past have had tree-for-tree replacement. They also have a requirement in the code for parkway trees so in between the sidewalk and curb of a public street is usually a row of parkway trees that are planted. On Springfield Drive, if there has been enough landscaping on the berm side of the sidewalk there has not been a requirement for parkway trees so they should probably consider and think about whether parkway trees should be required or not required for this project.

Mr. Prohaska stated that on the last page of his report there is a short list of the deviations from the Subdivision Code that are being requested, such as right-of-way width, sidewalk on one side of street only, and termination of a street or possibly just a private driveway for an aisle without a cul-de-sac.

Mr. Burke stated that in regard to Mr. Prohaska's comments on tapering, they kind of agree to do all of those improvements in the length, but now they have in their comments to repave the entire section of Springfield, which they think is asking a lot. They would be willing to participate in the maintenance of it, but do not think it is appropriate for them to repave the entire section.

Mr. Anthony Bonavolonta, introduced himself to the Planning and Zoning Commission. He represents Walnut Grove LLC, the developer of the property to the south. His business address is 845 Butternut Court, Roselle, Illinois. He stated that they are working closely with the developer of the medical center. The common drive will be a dedicated street.

Mr. Phil Loftus introduced himself to the Planning and Zoning Commission. He is with Spaceco, Inc. and the engineer for the project. His business address is 9575 W. Higgins Road, #700, Rosemont, Illinois. He stated that he drafted the letter that Mr. Prohaska is referring to and what Mr. Burke referred to. He stated that they are basically in agreement with the engineering report. They have not taken exception to any of Mr. Prohaska's engineering stances on these issues. He said in regard to the inlets that are being requested, as Mr. Prohaska described in his statement earlier, those inlets are required, and the only question that they have is at this time came as a little bit of a surprise was the intention of the engineering department to run that drainage to the east across Springfield Drive to the existing storm sewer or will he need to run a new storm sewer to the west some 500 to 600 feet to the existing detention facility. These are just issues because of the timing of the staff comments and the holidays; they did not get a chance to sit down and discuss this. They agree that inlets are required for all reasons as previously stated, but they just need to sit down with Mr. Prohaska and understand where that drainage is ultimately going to be connected.

Mr. Loftus discussed the safe tapers with the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Commissioner Jaster is comfortable with the project.

The petitioner will satisfy the Fire Department issue with the fire hydrant issue.

The Commission is fine with allowing two monument signs for the DuPage Medical Group. The Commission is fine with the size of the wall signs.

The Commission is fine with aluminum accent panels.

Mr. Prohaska stated that they need to have something in the Ordinance about the street dedication between the two properties.

THE PLAN COMMISSION TAKES A SHORT RECESS AT 8:20 P.M.

THE PLAN COMMISSION RESUMES THE MEETING AT 8:29 P.M.

Upon roll call by the recording secretary, Commissioners Coleman, Jaster, Shannon, Smith and Vice Chairman King.

The Planning and Zoning Commission discussed the dedicated street further.

Moved by Commissioner Smith, seconded by Commissioner Jaster to open up the floor to the public.

Ayes: All Commissioners Present

Nays: None

Absent: Commissioners Fangusaro and Chairman Brice

Motion Declared Carried

No one came forward to address this hearing.

Moved by Commissioner Smith, seconded by Commissioner Jaster to close the floor to the public.

Ayes: All Commissioners Present

Nays: None

Absent: Commissioners Fangusaro and Chairman Brice

Motion Declared Carried

Moved by Commissioner Jaster, seconded by Commissioner Smith to recommend approval of the following requests and relief relative to the request for the development and construction of a new medical office building, at the property commonly referred to as 220 Springfield Drive and to allow for: (1) a special use permit to allow the establishment of a Planned Development at the Subject Property; (2) Exceptions from the Zoning Ordinance related to: (a) signage; (b) tree preservation, landscaping and screening; (c) an exception to not provide a loading space; (d) maximum building height; (e) reductions in minimum required pavement setbacks; (f) reductions in the required landscaping setbacks; (3) deviations from Engineering Design Standards, including: (a) right-of-way width of less than 66 feet; (b) sidewalk location; (c) street termination without a cul-de-sac; and (4) final site plan review. The recommendation of approval made thereby shall be, and is hereby, made subject to the following conditions: (1) the applicant shall revise all plans and plats to reflect the newly proposed dedicated right-of-way, subject to the review and approval of the Village Engineer and the Village Attorney. Unless otherwise

authorized or required by the Board of Trustees, approval of final site plan shall be subject to and contingent on, the revised access to Springfield Drive, as identified tonight; (2) the petitioner shall comply with the requirements set forth in the memo of the Bloomingdale Fire Protection District dated January 4, 2016; (3) the petitioner shall comply with the requirements set forth in the memo provided by the Engineering Department, dated December 18, 2015; and (4) the applicant shall enter into a maintenance agreement, to be executed by the applicant subject to the review and approval by the Village Engineer and the Village Attorney.

Ayes: All Commissioners Present

Nays: None

Absent: Commissioners Fangusaro and Chairman Brice

Motion Carried

6. OLD BUSINESS – None

7. NEW BUSINESS

There will be a Plat of Consolidation for a building that already exists for the January 19th Planning & Zoning agenda. Commissioner King will be out of town and will not be attending this meeting. Since it will be a short meeting, the time will be changed to 6:00 p.m., and a reminder will be sent out to the members.

8. CITIZENS TO BE HEARD – None

9. ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Commissioner Coleman, seconded by Commissioner Shannon to adjourn the October 20, 2015 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting at 8:50 p.m.

Ayes: All Commissioners Present

Nays: None

Absent: Commissioners Fangusaro and Chairman Brice

Motion Declared Carried

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Sandra Aronson". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above a horizontal line.

Sandra Aronson, Recording Secretary
of the Planning and Zoning Commission