MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING OF VILLAGE OF FRANKFORT
PLAN COMMISSION / ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
APRIL 26, 2018 – VILLAGE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
432 W. NEBRASKA STREET

Call to Order Chair Don Schwarz called the meeting to order at 6:30 P.M.

Commissioners Present:	Margaret Farina, Lisa Hogan, Jessica Petrow, Gene Savaria, Don Schwarz, and Maura Rigoni
Commissioners Absent:	Alicia Hanlon
Staff Present:	Assistant Director of Development Services Zach Brown, and Utilities Administrative Assistant Marina Zambrano
Elected Officials Present:	Trustee Mike Stevens, Trustee John Clavio, and Trustee Bob Kennedy

Chairman Schwarz swore in all those wishing to give public testimony.

A. Approval of the Minutes from April 12, 2018.

Motion (#1): Approve the minutes from April 12, 2018 meeting.

Motion by: Farina Seconded by: Rigoni

Approved: (4 to 1)
Abstain: (1) Petrow

B. Request: Smithville Re-subdivision

Public Hearing Request: Final plat approval to consolidate Lots 56 & 57, within the Five Oaks Subdivision.

Assistant Director of Development Services Zach Brown presented the staff report and provided an overview of the request noting that there are no utilities between the two lots that would preclude the future construction of a home. Applicants, Howard and Janice Smith were present and further described the request noting their request to consolidate the lots will not infringe any easements but will allow them to build their dream home.

Motion (#2): Recommend the Village Board approve the final plat for the Smithville Re-subdivision in accordance with the reviewed plans.

Motion by: Petrow Seconded by: Rigoni
Approved: (5 to 0)

C. Public Hearing Request: AGA Properties Group, LLC Variance (Ref. #102) (Continued from April 12, 2018)

Public Hearing Request: Variance of Article 6, Section B, Part 4d of the Village of Frankfort Zoning Ordinance to permit the use of non-masonry building materials on the first and second floor, and a variance of maximum permitted garage height from 15 feet to 18 feet 8.25 inches to accommodate the construction of a new single-family home and detached garage on the property located at 320 95th Avenue.

Assistant Director of Development Services Zach Brown presented the staff report and provided an overview of the request. Project representative, Joe Aiello was present and further described the request. Mr. Aiello provided a map and photographs of homes in the surrounding area that received similar materials variances.

Resident in the Lawndale subdivision, Steve Lecas was present and expressed his satisfaction with the proposal. Mr. Lecas added that this is a great investment in the community that blends in well with the existing architecture. He made an attempt to be present at the meeting since he was unable at the prior meeting and will like direction for future construction since he owns 3 lots south of the proposal. Mr. Lecas presented a map and photographs of homes in the surrounding area approved with non-masonry materials.

Resident, Mark Baker expressed his satisfaction with the proposal. Mr. Baker noted that he owns a home similar to the proposed and feels it blends in well with the surrounding area.

- Commissioners discussed the unique location of the subject property noting that while not part of the old town area where building materials variances are somewhat common it was also not located in a traditional residential subdivision;

- Commissioner Petrow questioned if the applicant had considered constructing the entire first floor in masonry as a compromise. The applicant noted that they would like to proceed as proposed;

- Commissioners noted that the Village's Comprehensive Plan calls for the future construction of a road between White Street and 95th which if constructed would provide a direct link between the old town area and the subject property;

- Commissioner Rigoni questioned the front yard setback of the proposed home. Mr. Brown noted that the proposed home was setback ±130' from 95th Avenue which Commissioners discussed as a possible mitigating factor;

- Commissioners discussed the uniqueness of the area noting the large lots and a road with a rural cross section;

- Member Rigoni noted that the masonry portion of the ordinance was written to address construction in new residential subdivisions;

- Member Farina discussed the exhibit identifying the amount of masonry on the homes in the surrounding area noting that masonry materials were common in the Cambridge and Lawndale subdivisions to the south and that the new Folkers Townhome project would be constructed of masonry materials;

- Commissioners questioned the need for the detached garage which the applicant noted would be used for parking and storage;

- Commissioners expressed support for the increased garage height noting that it helps the garage better relate to the architecture of the proposed home as is required by ordinance.

Staff presented the following written findings of fact:

Accessory Structure Height

1. *That the property in question cannot yield a reasonable return if permitted to be used only under the conditions allowed by the regulations in that zone;*

   Modifying the height of the garage to comply with ordinance requirements would result in an architectural character that is at odds with that of the home to which it is associated and therefore compromise its resale value.

2. *That the plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances;*

   Village ordinance requires single-family homes constructed on properties platted after January1st, 2000 have a minimum roof pitch of 8/12. In addition the ordinance requires accessory structure be designed to relate to the architecture of the home to which they are associated. The increased roof height of the garage is necessary to meet the intent of the ordinance and better relate to the proposed home.

3. *That the variation, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality.*

   The proposed 3 foot 8.25 inch increase in roof height will be difficult to perceive from the public right-of-way as the proposed garage is located ±165' back from 95th Avenue and as such will not alter the essential character of the area.

Building Materials

1. *That the property in question cannot yield a reasonable return if permitted to be used only under the conditions allowed by the regulations in that zone;*

   The majority of the surrounding properties are non-conforming with respect to the Village's masonry requirements. Requiring compliance would result in a home whose design is inconsistent with that of the surrounding area and thereby compromise its resale value.

2. *That the plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances;*

   The property is subject to building regulations designed to address new development. As an infill project, the material requirements conflict with the development pattern in the area.

3. *That the variation, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality.*

   The surrounding homes are constructed of a variety of building materials the majority of which do not comply with the Village's masonry requirements and as such the proposed variance will not alter the essential character of the area.

Motion (#3): Recommend the Village Board approve a building materials variance to permit the use of non-masonry materials on the first and second floor of the home proposed at 320 S. 95th Avenue in accordance with the reviewed plans and public testimony.

Motion by: Rigoni Seconded by: Farina
Approved: (3 to 2)
Aye: (3) Petrow, Hogan, Rigoni
Nay: (2) Farina, Savaria

Motion (#4): Recommend the Village Board approve an accessory structure height variance from 15' to 18'-8.25" to accommodate the construction of a detached garage on the property located at 320 S. 95th Avenue in accordance with the reviewed plans and public testimony.

Motion by: Hogan Seconded by: Rigoni
Approved: (5 to 0)

D. Public Hearing Request: Szmurlo Variances (Ref. #103)
(Continued from April 12, 2018)

Public Hearing Request: Variances of maximum permitted garage height from 15 feet to 27 feet and accessory structure setback from 10 feet to 2.8 feet along the eastern property line to accommodate the construction of a detached garage in the rear yard of the property located at 258 W. Nebraska Street.

Assistant Director of Development Services Zach Brown presented the staff report and provided an overview of the request.

The Applicant, Chester Szmurlo was present and further described the request noting that the existing garage is in need of some repairs and that he is in need of additional space for storage as his home was not constructed with a basement. Mr. Szmurlo noted that in preparation for the meeting he re-evaluated his proposal and thought that 27' was too tall. Mr. Szmurlo presented revised plans for a garage with a maximum height of 24' stating that he felt it looked more appealing.

- Commissioners discussed the revised garage design and 24' height noting that it was an improvement over the original proposal and closer to the 21' height of the existing home;

- Commissioners questioned the need to encroach the setback by an additional foot noting that they prefer the garage maintain the same setback of 3.8'and not increase the degree of non-conformity. The applicant noted that the additional foot will provide more area for tool storage and a wider panel on each side of the overhead door;

- Members noted that at 2.8' the new garage would be extremely close to the garage on the property to the east which would look out of place;

- Commissioners discussed shifting the garage to the west so as to maintain the 3.8' setback however noted doing so could create issues with the building code requirements for separation between primary and accessory structures as well as impact an existing mature tree to the south of the proposed garage;

- After some discussion the applicant agreed to revise his requested setback variance from 2.8' to 3.8';

- Commissioner Farina noted that Nebraska Street is an entrance to the downtown area and that many of the historic homes on Nebraska are not constructed with two-story garages;

- Member Farina noted that the existing garage compliments the style of the home and its post WWII construction;

- Member Petrow questioned if the certified notices were mailed to the residents within 250'which Mr. Brown confirmed;

Staff presented the following written findings of fact:

Accessory Structure Height

1. *That the property in question cannot yield a reasonable return if permitted to be used only under the conditions allowed by the regulations in that zone;*

   Buyers of today's single-family homes expect them to have a reasonable amount of storage space. The subject home was constructed without a basement thereby limiting the applicant's storage area. To achieve a reasonable amount of storage the applicant proposes to construct a two-story garage. Constructing a larger single story garage to achieve the same amount of storage space as the proposed two-story structure would result in a rear yard of substandard size for a traditional single-family lot and require the removal of an existing mature tree therefore compromising its resale value.

2. *That the plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances;*

   An existing mature tree located immediately south of the proposed garage and required building code separation from the existing home preclude the applicant from building a one- story garage with a larger footprint in order to achieve the same amount of storage space as the proposed two-story structure.

3. *That the variation, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality.*

   Three properties on this block of Nebraska Street are improved with two-story garages including 102 Maple, 240 Nebraska, and 322 Nebraska. The second story of the proposed garage was designed with a steep roof pitch that extends to the first floor ceiling height in an effort to minimize the scale of the structure. As a result of these factors the proposed garage height will not alter the established character of the area.

Accessory Structure Setback

1. *That the property in question cannot yield a reasonable return if permitted to be used only under the conditions allowed by the regulations in that zone;*

   Relocating the garage to meet the required setback would result in a rear yard of substandard size for a traditional single-family lot and require the removal of an existing mature tree therefore compromising its resale value.

2. *That the plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances;*

   The existing garage maintains a reduced setback. The requested variance is intended to maintain the character of the area.

3. *That the variation, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality.*

   Several garages on this block of Nebraska Street appear to maintain reduced setbacks and as such the proposed garage will not alter the essential character of the area.

Motion (#5): Recommend the Village Board approve an accessory structure setback variance from 10' to 3.8' to accommodate the construction of a detached garage in the rear yard of the property located at 258 Nebraska Street in accordance with the reviewed plans and public testimony.

Motion by: Hogan Seconded by: Savaria
Approved: (5 to 0)

Motion (#6): Recommend the Village Board approve an accessory structure height variance from 15' to 24' to accommodate the construction of a detached garage in the rear yard of the property located at 258 Nebraska Street in accordance with the reviewed plan and public testimony and conditioned upon prohibiting the use of the garage as temporary or permanent dwelling.

Motion by: Rigoni Seconded by: Hogan
Approved: (4 to 1)

E. Public Hearing Request: Guild Variance (Ref.#104)

Public Hearing Request: Variance of side yard setback from 15 feet to 13 feet to permit the construction of an addition to the rear of the existing home located at 1014 N. Butternut Circle.

Assistant Director of Development Services Zach Brown presented the staff report and provided an overview of the request. Applicant, Gary Guild was present and further described the request noting that he received the neighbors' approval on the proposal and the addition will provide matching brick to blend in well with the home.

- Commissioner Hogan questioned whether the applicant was aware that the existing home was non-conforming with respect to the required 15' setback along the western property line. The applicant noted that he was not aware of the non-conformity until it was discovered as part of this project;

- Commissioners noted that the home was constructed at an angle with respect to the western lot line and that as such the 13' encroachment was limited to the southwest corner of the proposed addition;

- Member Rigoni questioned if the proposed addition would be flush with the existing western façade of the home which the applicant confirmed;

- Commissioners verified that the proposed addition had been reviewed and approved by the Butternut Creek Woods HOA;

- Staff presented letters of support from three surrounding property owners and noted that they spoke with another property owner who also supported the project;

Staff presented the following written findings of fact:

Side-yard Setback

1. *That the property in question cannot yield a reasonable return if permitted to be used only under the conditions allowed by the regulations in that zone;*

   Constructing the addition at the required 15' setback would result in an unusual offset in the western façade of the home which would be out of character with the surrounding area therefore compromise its resale value.

2. *That the plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances;*

   The existing home maintains a reduced setback and is constructed at an angle with respect to the western property line. Constructing the addition at the same façade plane as the existing home results in a slight increase in encroachment. Were the home constructed at the 15 foot setback and perpendicular to the western lot line the addition could be constructed without the need for variance approval

3. *That the variation, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality.*

   The proposed addition is located in the rear of the home and will not be visible from the public right-of-way. The addition is screened from the property to the west by existing mature vegetation. Because of these factors the proposed encroachment will not alter the essential character of the area.

Motion (#7): Recommend the Village Board approve a side-yard setback variance from 15' to 13' to permit the construction of an addition in the rear of the existing home located at 1014 N. Butternut Circle in accordance with the reviewed plans and public testimony.

Motion by: Hogan Seconded by: Petrow
Approved: (5 to 0)

F. Public Hearing Request: Equanimity Massage and Wellness Special Use (Ref. #105)

Public Hearing Request: Special use for a massage establishment to operate Equanimity Massage and Wellness, located at 20950 S. Frankfort Square Road, Unit A-4.

Assistant Director of Development Services Zach Brown presented the staff report and provided an overview of the request. Applicant, Valetta Byrd was present and further described the request.

- The applicant noted that she has since complied with the requests of the building department and has posted the list of her prices and provided a hamper for the dirty linens;

- Members questioned if the applicant's business shared a common waiting area with the rest of the tenants in the building which the applicant confirmed;

- Members discussed the hours of operation. The applicant noted that her hours will mainly be evenings and weekends by appointment only. Ms. Byrd added that the last appointment will be at 8 PM in order to close at 9 PM;

- Commissioners questioned if the outside door to the building would be locked when the other office tenants are closed. The applicant noted that in the evenings the outside doors would be locked and that her appointments are spaced appropriately to allow her time to let her next customer into the building;

- Ms. Byrd stated that the door to the massage room will remain unlocked while in session;

Staff presented the following written standards of special use:

<u>Special Use for a Massage Establishment</u>

1) *That the establishment, maintenance or operation of the special use will not be detrimental to, or endanger, the public health, safety, morals, comfort or general welfare.*

   The proposed use is licensed and regulated by the Illinois Department of Financial and Professional Regulation. A copy of the applicants massage therapy license is on file with the Village.

2) *That the special use will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted, nor substantially diminish and impair property values within the neighborhood.*

   The proposed use is by appointment only and is quiet in nature and as such will not negatively impact the surrounding office uses or property values.

3) *That the establishment of the special use will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of the surrounding property for uses permitted in the district.*

The proposed operation and its office based nature is consistent with the future development patterns anticipated for the surrounding properties in the Village's Future Land Use Plan and would not impede the development of the surrounding properties in a manner consistent with said plan.

4) *That the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of any proposed structure will not be so at variance with either the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of the structures already constructed, or in the course of construction in the immediate neighborhood or the character of the applicable district, as to cause a substantial depreciation in the property values within the neighborhood.*

No architectural modifications or new structures are proposed in association with the requested special use.

5) *That the adequate utilities, access roads, drainage and/or necessary facilities have been or are being provided.*

The subject property is located in an established office development which is serviced by public utilities, provides on-site storm water management, and has frontage on two public roads.

6) *That adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide ingress and egress so designed as to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets.*

The proposed use is by appointment only and will generate minimal traffic and as such will is not expected to impact traffic congestion in the public streets.

7) *That the special use shall, in all other respects, conform to the applicable regulations of the district in which it is located, except as such regulations may, in each instance, be modified by the Village Board, pursuant to the recommendations of the Plan Commission.*

The proposed use conforms to all other applicable regulations in the district in which it is proposed.

Motion (#8): Recommend the Village Board approve a special use for a massage establishment for Equanimity Massage and Wellness located at 20950 S. Frankfort Square Road, Suite A4 in accordance with the reviewed plans and public testimony and conditioned upon the door to Suite A4 remaining unlocked while in use.

Motion by: Hogan Seconded by: Rigoni
Approved: (5 to 0)

G. Public Hearing Request: Cube Training Center Special Use (Ref. #106)

Public Hearing Request: Special use for indoor recreation and entertainment to permit the operation of Cube Training Center, an indoor hockey training facility, located at 9216 Gulfstream Road, Unit A.

Assistant Director of Development Services Zach Brown presented the staff report and provided an overview of the request. Applicant, Thomas Creal was present and further described the request noting the hockey training facility will utilize synthetic ice surfaces that will provide little to no maintenance requirements. The facility will utilize rubber flooring for the safety of those wearing their skates.

- Commissioners noted that sports training facilities are becoming more common in industrial parks however stated that no hockey training facility exists in the area;

- Commissioners questioned how the classes / training programs work. The applicant noted that classes are staggered so as to avoid too many people being within the facility at one time, that memberships were available, and that the facility was also available for rent;

- Members discussed the hours of operation. The applicant noted the facility will be open Monday through Friday 5-9 PM and Saturday and Sunday will provide extended hours from 9-9 PM;

- Commissioners discussed parking requirements noting that the applicants heaviest hours of operation occur during the off hours of the surrounding uses, that parking was available on street if necessary, and that many of the people utilizing the facility are not of driving age and will be dropped off / picked up;

- Chair Schwarz questioned whether there is a special requirement with the facilities insurance company. The applicant noted that he had satisfied all his insurance company's requirements;

- Staff noted that building department review of the build-out plans was ongoing and recommended a condition of compliance with all applicable building codes;

Staff presented the following written standards of special use:

<u>Special Use for Indoor Recreation and Entertainment</u>

1) That the establishment, maintenance or operation of the special use will not be detrimental to, or endanger, the public health, safety, morals, comfort or general welfare.

The proposed use consistent with other similar uses that operate in the area without impact to the public health, safety, morals, comfort or general welfare.

2) *That the special use will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted, nor substantially diminish and impair property values within the neighborhood.*

   The proposed use will operate during the off hours of the surrounding uses and as such will not negatively impact the surrounding industrial businesses nor impair property values.

3) *That the establishment of the special use will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of the surrounding property for uses permitted in the district.*

   The surrounding properties are already developed and improved and as such the proposed use will not impact their ability to develop in a normal or orderly fashion.

4) *That the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of any proposed structure will not be so at variance with either the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of the structures already constructed, or in the course of construction in the immediate neighborhood or the character of the applicable district, as to cause a substantial depreciation in the property values within the neighborhood.*

   No architectural modifications or new structures are proposed in association with the requested special use.

5) *That the adequate utilities, access roads, drainage and/or necessary facilities have been or are being provided.*

   The subject property is located in an established industrial park which is serviced by public utilities, provides storm water management, and has frontage on a public road.

6) *That adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide ingress and egress so designed as to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets.*

   The proposed use will operate during the off hours of the surrounding uses and as such is not expected to impact traffic congestion in the public streets.

7) *That the special use shall, in all other respects, conform to the applicable regulations of the district in which it is located, except as such regulations may, in each instance, be modified by the Village Board, pursuant to the recommendations of the Plan Commission.*

   The proposed use conforms to all other applicable regulations in the district in which it is proposed.

Motion (#9): Recommend the Village Board approve a special use for indoor recreation and entertainment to permit the operation of The Cube Training Center

located at 9216 Gulfstream Road, Unit A in accordance with the reviewed plans and public testimony and conditioned upon compliance with all applicable building codes.

Motion by: Petrow Seconded by: Farina
Approved: (5 to 0)

H. Public Hearing Request: AGS, Inc. Rezoning & Variances (Ref. #107)
Public Hearing Request: Rezoning from I1 to I2, variances of required landscaped front yard from 25 feet to 20 feet, and variance to permit a loading area in the front yard, to accommodate the construction of a new 48,900 sq. ft. building within the East Point Industrial Park. Other Request: Final plat approval.

Assistant Director of Development Services Zach Brown presented the staff report and provided an overview of the request. Project architect, Grant W. Currier and property owner John C. Trainor were present and further described the request.

- Commissioners discussed the proposed rezoning noting its consistency with the zoning of the property immediately to the west;

- Members discussed the proposed plat of subdivision and vacation noting that similar lot consolidations were approved within the East Point Industrial Park;

- Commissioners discussed the proposed variance of the required landscape front yard from 25' to 20' noting that a similar variance was recently approved for Adhesive Systems;

- Members noted that the Village had previously discussed a modification to the required greenspace noting historical discrepancies in its application and numerous variance approvals;

- Member Farina suggested that if the green space is to be reduced in the code there should be an offsetting factor such as a green roof;

- Staff confirmed that the provided landscape plan exceeded ordinance requirements for parking lot screening;

- Commissioners discussed the revised loading dock area noting that while still within the required front yard the dock would no longer interfere with north / south traffic through the parking lot;

- Staff noted that review of engineering plans was ongoing and recommended final engineering as a condition of approval;

Staff presented the following written findings of fact:

Landscaped Front Yard

1. *That the property in question cannot yield a reasonable return if permitted to be used only under the conditions allowed by the regulations in that zone;*

   The majority of industrial development in the Village is constructed with a reduced landscaped front yard. Requiring compliance in this case would result in a reduced buildable area when compared to other similar industrial properties and therefore compromise its resale value.

2. *That the plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances;*

   The applicants manufacturing process necessitates a building footprint with a minimum depth of 180'. Reducing the building depth to achieve the required setback would compromise the utility of the floorplan and interfere with the applicants manufacturing process.

3. *That the variation, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality.*

   The East Point Industrial Park is largely undeveloped. The building most recently constructed in the park was permitted a reduced landscaped front yard of 20' and as such the proposed reduction will not alter the essential character of the area.

Loading Area within the Front Yard

1. *That the property in question cannot yield a reasonable return if permitted to be used only under the conditions allowed by the regulations in that zone;*

   Recessed loading docks are a common improvement in industrial buildings. A variance would not be required if the dock was constructed at grade however doing so would result in a building with no depressed dock area at all and thereby limit its resale value.

2. *That the plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances;*

   The applicants manufacturing process necessitates a building footprint with a minimum depth of 180'. Recessing the loading dock further into the building so as to meet the required setback would compromise the utility of the floorplan and interfere with the applicant's manufacturing process.

3. *That the variation, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality.*

The proposed encroachment into the front yard is limited to a 9' portion of the loading dock. The increased right-of-way width and parkway size combined with the proposed landscape screening will limit the visibility of the encroachment from the public road and as such will not alter the essential character of the area.

Motion (#10): Recommend the Village Board approve the rezoning of lots 26, 27, and 28 in the East Point Industrial Park from I-1 to I-2 in accordance with the reviewed plans and public testimony.

Motion by: Hogan Seconded by: Farina
Approved: (5 to 0)

Motion (#11): Recommend the Village Board approve a variance of the required landscape front yard from 25' to 20' for lots 26, 27, and 28 in the East Point Industrial Park in accordance with the reviewed plans and public testimony and conditioned upon modification of the grading plan to include the 2.5 landscape berm and final engineering approval.

Motion by: Rigoni Seconded by: Hogan
Approved: (4 to 1)

Motion (#12): Recommend the Village Board approve a variance to permit a loading area within the front yard for lots 26, 27, and 28 in the East Point Industrial Park in accordance with the reviewed plans and public testimony and conditioned upon final engineering approval.

Motion by: Farina Seconded by: Hogan
Approved: (5 to 0)

Motion (#13): Recommend the Village Board approve the final plat for the AGS Subdivision consolidating lots 26, 27, and 28 in the East Point Industrial Park in accordance with the reviewed plans and conditioned upon final engineering approval.

Motion by: Farina Seconded by: Savaria
Approved: (5 to 0)

Motion (#14): Recommend the Village Board approve a plat of vacation to vacate the 20' public utility and drainage easements between lots 26, 27, and 28 in the East Point Industrial Park in accordance with the reviewed plans and conditioned upon final engineering approval.

Motion by: Farina Seconded by: Rigoni
Approved: (5 to 0)

I. Public Comments
None

J. Village Update
None

K. Other Business
Staff presented a letter from the Village's legal counsel regarding the proper handling of written comments provided for a project that is before the Commission at a public hearing.

L. Attendance Update
Members confirmed their availability for the next Plan Commission Meeting to be held on May 10, 2018.

Motion (#15): Adjournment (8: 37 PM)

Motion by: Petrow Seconded by: Savaria
Unanimously approved by voice vote.

Approved May 10, 2018

As Presented _____

As Amended _____

_____ /s/Donnell Schwarz, Chairman

_____ /s/ Secretary