



MINUTES

MEETING OF VILLAGE OF FRANKFORT PLAN COMMISSION / ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

November 10, 2022–VILLAGE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

432 W. NEBRASKA STREET

- Call to Order:** Chair Rigoni called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM
- Commissioners Present:** Chair Maura Rigoni, Brian James, Nichole Schaeffer, Dan Knieriem, Will Markunas
- Commissioners Absent:** Jessica Jakubowski, David Hogan
- Staff Present:** Director of Community and Economic Development Mike Schwarz, Senior Planner Chris Gruba, Planner Drew Duffin
- Elected Officials Present:** None

A. Approval of the Minutes from October 27th, 2022

Motion (#1): To approve the minutes from October 27th, 2022.

Motion by: Knieriem

Seconded by: Schaeffer

Approved: (4-0, Commissioner Markunas Abstained)

B. Workshop: Drive Through Coffee Shop – Hickory Creek Marketplace Subdivision

Chris Gruba gave the staff report.

The applicant and the architect approached the stand. The architect explained that their civil engineer could not make it to the meeting. Neither person had anything more to add.

Chair Rigoni asked for comments on the proposed use.

Commissioner Knieriem asked if the proposed restaurant was part of a larger chain or an independent restaurant.

The applicant our responded that the proposed building would be their first location, but that their short-term goal was to open ten locations in total.

Commissioner Knieriem asked if the applicant was in the restaurant business.

The applicant stated that restaurants were a family business.

Commissioner Knieriem asked if the applicant was from the Frankfort area.

The applicant stated she was from the area.

Commissioner Knieriem said he thought the location was a good spot for this use, especially given the other coffee uses nearby were always busy. It was a good location. He asked how their concept differed from other coffee shops.

The applicant explained that they would utilize a double drive-through lane, which would help to manage throughput. There would also be runners delivering orders to car windows, similar to Chick-fil-A or Portillo's.

Commissioner Knieriem asked if there would be an app for preordering from the restaurant, since there were no proposed order boards.

The applicant said that there might be in the future.

Commissioner Knieriem asked whether the proposed basement would be used for storage.

The applicant responded that it would.

Commissioner Knieriem thanked the applicant for their work to align color scheme of the proposed building with the surrounding buildings in the PUD. He believed it looked good.

Commissioner Schaeffer agreed with Commissioner Knieriem. She asked if there would be any indoor seating.

The applicant said there would not be, and that the inside would be employees only.

Commissioner Schaeffer asked where the applicant would source the business' coffee from.

The app explained they were looking at different roasters at the moment. Ideally, they would pick someone local, but no decision had been made yet.

Commissioner Markunas asked how runners would take orders.

The applicant responded that runners would use tablets.

Commissioner Markunas asked if those same runners would deliver orders to cars.

The applicant said they would.

Commissioner Markunas asked the applicant if they were looking to eliminate the drive-through chokepoint by allowing people to pull out of the line one they received their orders.

The applicant said that was the case.

Commissioner James expressed his concern for the safety of people moving through the site, both pedestrians and drivers, based on the proposed layout.

The applicant noted that it was a priority for her as well.

The architect noted that there was striping on the site plan to alert drivers to areas which would be frequented by pedestrians.

Commissioner James noted that the proposed building was a relatively niche design. He thought the Plan Commission should consider how the proposed structure could be used by a future occupant. It was a good location, and the Plan Commission should consider that when deciding on their recommendation.

Chair Rigoni noted that the uses seemed appropriate. She also said that she was struggling to understand how the drive-through would work, since it was an uncommon approach to handling drive-through traffic. She asked for comments on the list of exceptions developed by staff which might be requested at a future public hearing.

Commissioner Markunas asked why the applicant did not redesign the northern entrance to be a two-way entrance, rather than an exit-only driveway.

The applicant explained that they wanted all cars entering the site to enter the drive through line. Having an entrance on the north side of the property could result in people cutting into line.

Commissioner Markunas asked if the applicant would consider changing the north driveway into a two-way driveway. From a safety perspective, he believed that some people would turn in through there anyway.

The applicant said she was open to making that change.

The architect stated that they could change the design to make it clear that driveway was not an entrance.

Commissioner Markunas explained that people could still use it as an entrance anyway.

Commissioner Knieriem agreed. Widening north entrance would make the property friendlier to patrons. He could see the applicant's concern, but believed it would be better to make it a two-way entrance.

Chair Rigoni noted that, given parking was proposed along the south property line, there ought to be a way to access that parking without needing to drive all the way around the building. She thought the building should be reoriented, and be laid out similar to the Steak n' Shake to the south. Most drive-throughs in Frankfort were not build so close to La Grange Road, and flipping the proposed design so the drive-through was on the east side of the property would be consistent with other development, and would eliminate the need for the exception to reduce the required building setback from the centerline of La Grange Road.

Commissioner James added that it could also provide the applicant an opportunity to better utilize their proposed signage.

Chair Rigoni made clear that she was not trying to change the applicant's design, but asked the applicant to consider what the Plan Commission was suggesting.

The architect noted that the proposed drive-through was oriented a certain way, and changing it would be inconvenient to drivers.

Chair Rigoni clarified that she was asking the applicant to consider reorienting the site plan so that a drive-through would work as normal. She noted that the proposed canopy was larger than normal for a restaurant, and that the proposed canopy appeared more like a bank drive-through.

Commissioner Markunas added that reorienting the building would help with parking too, since a patron would not need to drive all the way around the drive through line to access parking.

The architect asked for the Plan Commission for clarity on their suggested reorientation. He noted that reorienting the building the way they suggested would push the building back further from La Grange Road.

Chair Rigoni noted that the building would be a fixed point. She asked staff to make sure the setbacks of the proposed building were aligned with nearby buildings rather than focus on following the letter of the Zoning Ordinance.

Commissioner Knieriem asked if the Plan Commission's suggestion was clear to the applicant.

The applicant said it was, and that they had considered a similar design before. They wanted to be closer to the road, however.

Chair Rigoni said she understood that desire, but that they would still have to meet setback requirements. She suggested the applicant look at how Steak n' Shake laid out their building so the drive-through was away from La Grange Road.

Commissioner Schaeffer asked if the exceptions related to the setback from La Grange Road would be unneeded if the building was reoriented.

Chair Rigoni said it was possible.

An aerial view of the nearby Steak n' Shake was displayed on the screen.

The architect stated that the Steak n' Shake layout was a potential option. He thought the Plan Commission was suggesting relocating the proposed parking on the east side of the property to the west side, close to La Grange Road.

Commissioner Schaeffer said that they applicant should also keep in mind that there would be landscaping between their building and La Grange Road. People drove fast along that road, and may not clearly see your building when passing. She understood their desire to get as close to La Grange Road as possible, but it might not be as advantageous as they were thinking.

Commissioner Markunas noted that reorienting the building would also mean the large proposed sign on the east façade would face La Grange Road.

The architect agreed.

Chair Rigoni asked for comments relating to the proposed building and building materials.

Commissioner Markunas stated he thought they were good. He was glad the applicant had worked with staff. The current proposal gave the building an individual character but still tried to match surrounding area.

Commissioner James agreed, but expressed his concern with the proposed thin brick veneer. He noted that the Plan Commission preferred structural brick.

Commissioner Schaeffer agreed. She stated that she liked the lighter stone accents. She added that while structural brick may cost more, but was standard in the Village.

Commissioner Knieriem added that if a car hit the thin brick around the canopy column, it would be an issue for the business. It would be an issue for the driver if the applicant instead used full structural brick.

Chair Rigoni noted that there was uniformity in the surrounding shopping center, and that the applicant was the last one to develop their property. The proposal did not incorporate an arch element into their design, which was present in other buildings in the PUD. To her, the biggest sticking point was architecture. On its own, the proposed design was great, and would appear so at another location. Her issue was how it related to the other buildings around it. The proposed building was not cohesive, especially with the red coloring.

Commissioner Knieriem asked Chair Rigoni which arches she was referring to.

Chair Rigoni explained that the arch element was incorporated differently with each building, but was present regardless. Building designs became flatter as they approached the intersection of St. Francis Road and La Grange Road.

The applicant asked if the building to the north of their property had arch elements.

Chair Rigoni said there was an arch in the stone detailing above the entryway. She turned the conversation toward landscaping. She asked if staff was looking for direction on the potential tradeoff between connecting to the sidewalk along La Grange Road and removing a large evergreen tree.

Chris Gruba explained that connecting to the sidewalk along La Grange Road was required per code, and the applicant was looking to install it, but the Plan Commission could consider waiving that requirement at the request of the applicant.

Commissioner Knieriem noted that if the building was reoriented, it might not be an issue.

Chair Rigoni asked if any other buildings had a connection to that sidewalk.

Chris Gruba noted that Steak n' Shake had one.

Commissioner Knieriem noted that there was not a lot of pedestrian traffic on La Grange Road, and asked the applicant if they wanted the sidewalk connection.

The applicant said they had no preference either way.

Commissioner Markunas noted that not installing the sidewalk could be cheaper.

Commissioner Schaeffer stated that it was a different story near the high school, but that in the area near the applicant, there were very few pedestrians. She then asked if the landscaping in the north west corner would screen headlights on the turn radius.

Chris Gruba said that some plants would, but not all. Staff asked for taller landscaping to screen headlights, but none had been proposed yet.

Chair Rigoni noted that since the site might be laid out differently at the next meeting, the applicant had a chance to address concerns about headlights. She asked the Plan Commission if they had any comments on the proposed signage.

Commissioner Markunas noted that two different sign sets were given to staff, and asked which ones the applicant was going to use.

The applicant stated they would use the signage details found on the proposed elevations.

Chair Rigoni asked if the proposed signage met the Village regulations.

Chris Gruba stated that the proposed signage currently exceeded regulations.

Commissioner Knieriem asked the applicant if they were looking to paint a sign on the wall.

The applicant explained that their intent was to install a box sign

Commissioner Schaeffer asked if it would be illuminated.

The applicant said it would.

Chris Gruba stated that, as proposed, the development did not comply with the PUD sign regulations.

Commissioner Markunas said that staff could work with the applicant to meet the requirements.

The architect asked if they would be allowed to paint the wall.

Chair Rigoni said she did not think it would be.

Chris Gruba said it was not allowed, according to the PUD Ordinance for Hickory Creek Marketplace.

Chair Rigoni noted they proposed more than two signs, which was not allowed per Code.

The architect noted that they should remove the proposed canopy signs, which would address the number of signs. That would leave only the size regulations to comply with.

Commissioner Markunas agreed, and said that they could work with staff to meet code.

The applicant asked if unilluminated signs were still considered signs per code.

Chair Rigoni said they were.

There was some discussion on the regulation which required a landscape barrier between bypass lanes and drive-through lanes. The Plan Commission expressed that they were generally alright with the applicant not meeting that code requirement.

Chris Gruba asked if the Plan Commission had any comments on the outdoor seating area.

Commissioner Knieriem noted that the building was located along La Grange Road, which had high traffic volumes. He suggested the applicant consider installing extra landscaping to help reduce noise.

Chris Gruba asked if the Plan Commission thought the proposal was ready to come to a Public Hearing.

Chair Rigoni said she was, unless there were any major changes. She asked what time the restaurant would close.

The applicant said that they would close at 8:00.

Commissioner Schaeffer asked if they would sell food.

The applicant stated that they would sell pre-prepared foods such as pastries, but nothing else.

C. Workshop: 15 Ash Street – Old Frankfort Mall

Chris Gruba gave the staff report.

The applicants, Mike and Chris, approached the stand. They were joined by Chris Tokarz, their architect. They brought an additional presentation for the PC as well, which was not able to be displayed on screen due to technical issues.

The architect explained that they had originally proposed parking along White Street. The Public Works Department and Village staff recommended against adding on-street parking within the right-of-way of White Street but were amenable to adding a 12'x50 loading space within the right-of-way. The architect had done a lot of reorganization of tenant spaces on the interior of the building, so that all would have street access. Other changes were made to accommodate the transformer, but their options were limited since the building was so close to the lot lines. He created an alcove that would allow for an on-site interior transformer, the design of which had yet to be finalized. All tenants would have access to a street and an interior area for back-of-house needs. The landscape plan showed that trees would be provided within the rights-of-way of Ash, White and Kansas streets. The current plan did not include two trees which were proposed on Ash Street and Kansas Street, but they would be added to comply with code. The building was in a unique situation, since there were streets on three sides and no rear property line, which resulted in certain variances. The proposed building would fill out the property. The applicant stated that the project would not be feasible unless the building were expanded to nearly all property lines. One other major change was to the second-floor residential hall. They took some space out of the bowling alley, so now the proposed dwelling units were larger. The tradeoff they made was in losing event space within the bowling alley, but the existing bowling alley lanes would remain. A proposed roof deck and observation deck would be located above the bowling alley and above the 3rd floor of the addition, respectively. On the third floor, there was a proposed roof deck and observation deck. In regard to comments on the building height, Kansas Street slopes up from White Street to Oak Street. The proposed 45-foot building height was measured at White Street, but 42 feet on Ash Street. 28 Kansas Street was currently the highest building along Kansas

Street, standing at about 38 feet, meaning that due to the change in grade, the actual height difference was about five or six feet. The proposed three-story building addition would not appear as tall as a result. The submitted renderings were new to this workshop. The applicants were looking to have high quality architecture, stone and masonry, similar to the other buildings in the downtown area. The renderings showed how balconies and front entries interact with the sidewalk. Given the amount of space and foot traffic on and around the site over the course of a year, adding landscaping to the development was a challenge. There were no plans to remove any public landscaping, just what was on the subject property. They had also added detail to the façades to improve the look of the building and match the other facades on the block, including more detail and larger windows. The size of the proposed roof deck could be variable. All rooftop mechanical units would be screened by parapets or other screening devices, and would only be visible from the south.

Chair Rigoni asked if there were any comments on the site plan or related variations.

Commissioner Markunas noted that, based on the property, there was a need for variances for setbacks and landscaping. He asked what the intent was for the proposed landscape planters.

The architect explained that they were freestanding planters. They would keep the plants healthy and out of the way of traffic. They were proposed in order to meet the intent of the Landscape Ordinance.

Commissioner James thanked staff for their detailed report and for showing how the proposed building related to the Comprehensive Plan. Knowing it was identified in the plan and was consistent with what was laid out there was good. He had no concerns with the site plan.

Chair Rigoni asked for comments about the proposed height, which was increasing from 35 feet to 45 feet. For clarity, she asked if the non-retail spaces on the second and third floor would be residential uses or office uses.

The architect stated that there would be residential dwelling units only on the second and third floor of the building addition.

Grant Currier, President of Linden Group Architects, spoke up. He noted that the Plan Commission had asked for a cross-section of the proposed development at the last workshop which would show that the floors of the addition would line up with the existing floors.

The architect also noted that they were providing parapet walls, while other tall downtown buildings do not. He added that the parapets were necessary to screen roof-mounted mechanical units.

Commissioner Knieriem stated that design made sense, and understood that the applicants were looking to make the most of the property.

Chair Rigoni noted that the Plan Commission often talked about adding density to the downtown area, and that the proposed residential units added that desired density.

Commissioner Knieriem asked if the units would be owned or rented.

The applicant noted they were uncertain at the moment, but that they were leaning towards selling them as owner-occupied units.

The architect asked if they would need to complete some additional paperwork depending on whether the units were rented or owned.

There was some discussion on how condominium units would be created, sold, and regulated.

Chair Rigoni asked if there were any comments about parking.

Commissioner Knieriem noted that there were ten proposed units. If they assumed that half of the units would have one car and the other half would have two, fifteen parking spots would be required. He asked if the applicant had given any thought to getting agreements signed for dedicated resident parking.

The applicant responded that he had been looking at options and may get some parking agreements, or may instead purchase property for space. He noted that it would be easier to sell condos if they had parking.

Chair Rigoni noted that they ought to future-proof resident's needs against time-restricted parking in the downtown, too.

The applicant noted that about fifteen cars currently parked downtown overnight.

Commissioner Schaeffer asked if there were any parking spaces near the building.

The applicant responded that there were.

Commissioner Schaeffer asked if residents would be able to use loading zone.

Chair Rigoni said they would, since it would be located within the public right-of-way.

Commissioner Knieriem asked if the applicants were looking to build so densely so as to maximize their own income. He noted that some of the proposed units were less than 500 square feet.

The applicant noted that they were beginning to see more smaller units being built in more urban settings. There was a growing number of people with no cars who were utilizing less space, and that they wanted to meet that perceived demand.

Commissioner Schaeffer asked if the applicants had any concern about noise being an issue for residents, given the proximity to the bowling alley and commercial uses below the residences.

The architect noted that the wall separating the existing building and the proposed addition was about a foot thick, with more soundproofing beyond that. They were planning to build adjacent to the existing exterior wall, rather than connect to it, which would also reduce noise. Looking at the cross section, there was a lounge, then a wall, then a hall, then another wall. In all, there is a lot of space which might help to dissipate the noise of the bowling alley, and they were doing what they could to address that.

Commissioner Schaeffer asked if the applicants were displacing any tenants as a result of the reorientation of the first floor.

The applicant said that some tenant leases were coming to term. To the best of his knowledge, no current tenant wanted to leave. The ground floor layout wasn't set in stone just yet.

Chair Rigoni asked if the Plan Commission had any density concerns relating to the dwelling units proposed.

Commissioner Knieriem asked if there were any studio-type units in the Village.

Chair Rigoni said she was unsure, but that she wanted to know to better gauge the demand for the types of dwellings proposed.

The architect stated that he could look into it. Typically, people expected smaller living spaces in downtown area and that anyone who wanted more space would locate farther from downtown. He knew that there were people who were looking to downsize, which had resulted in a boom in townhouse construction.

Chair Rigoni noted that Frankfort was unique since there was no Metra station near the downtown, which may result in less demand for commuter-style units. She was trying to understand if there was demand for that small a space despite the lack of nearby transit.

The architect clarified that the size of one of the proposed studio spaces was determined by a transformer needing to be located inside the building. He had tried to maximize number and size of each unit. He had experience with multifamily units in other communities. Units were typically studio, one, or two-bedroom units. Not many had three or more units, but there were some examples in Mokena, Frankfort Square, and Orland

Park. There were many such residential units built as part of transit-oriented development, but that the concept overall was relatively new to the suburbs.

Commissioner James stated that he had no issue with the size of the proposed units, but had a concern that there was not adequate storage for each unit. He wanted to avoid balconies being used for additional storage space.

The architect agreed, saying that it was common to have off-site storage lockers in multifamily developments.

Commissioner James noted that many residents might have bicycles, since the building was so close to the Old Plan Road Trail. He wanted to make sure they had spaces to store those bicycles.

Commissioner Schaeffer asked if the observation deck was intended for residents only.

The applicant stated it would be for tenants only.

Commissioner Schaeffer asked if there would be patrons from the bowling alley or members of the public that had access to the observation deck.

The applicant said that the deck would be for residential tenants only, though he was not 100% certain. That was the idea at the moment, since only residential tenants would have access based on the current layout of building. However, one restaurant had expressed interest in using the observation deck.

Chair Rigoni said that the applicant would need to be clear on who would be able to use the roof decks.

Commissioner Schaeffer expressed her concern about making the roof deck accessible to nonresidents. In regard to the restaurant using the space, having alcohol and food on the deck would require a Special Use Permit and would raise liability concerns.

The architect stated they were not currently seeking any Special Use Permits. He asked if a use were to come forward, whether that would require Plan Commission approval or not.

Chair Rigoni stated she was unsure, but that regardless the Plan Commission should anticipate that future request. She reiterated that the applicants should be clear on what they were requesting from the Plan Commission. Approving a plan with an observation deck for residents would be different than approving rooftop dining.

The architect stated they could have those details clarified prior to the next meeting.

Chair Rigoni asked if her fellow Commissioners' concerns were related to the deck itself or rather allowing commercial tenants use the space.

Commissioner Schaeffer stated she was fine with the deck, but was worried with how it was used.

The applicant stated he did not wish to limit his options if possible.

Chair Rigoni responded that there does need to be a limit on how it would be used, since it could be seen from the south of the building.

The architect clarified they needed to know who would be using the proposed deck, not so much how it would be used.

Commissioner Markunas noted he had experience with other rooftop amenities in other places. He recalled that people tend to be very protective of those spaces.

The architect noted that the proposed deck wouldn't be open for use at any time, but would be regulated based on the tenants of the building.

Commissioner Markunas stated that often people considered those amenities as part of their home.

Chair Rigoni said that her only concern was with the timing of the use. If the proposed deck was only for residents, there would be certain times the deck was used. Commercial tenants would use such a deck more consistently. Plus, they would require alterations to the space, such as umbrellas or pergolas. She told the applicants to make sure they understand what the space would be used for.

Commissioner Schaeffer said when she first saw deck, she was concerned with safety issues, particularly if the use of the deck was tied to an alcohol-related use such as a restaurant. She would want that space's use regulated to avoid safety issues.

The architect stated he was of the same mind, that if this proposed deck would be used as an event space, it would need to be regulated. He noted that having this kind of space available to rent could be popular, especially because it provided a good view. He was planning to have some separate way to access the deck in the event it would not just be used by residents.

Mr. Currier claimed that nothing proposed by the applicant didn't respond to the Comprehensive Plan.

Chair Rigoni responded, saying that the Plan Commission was trying to understand how this observation deck would be used.

Mike Schwarz noted that, per the Zoning Ordinance, all business must be conducted indoors. Anything else would require a Special Use Permit, on which conditions could be set by the Plan Commission.

Chair Rigoni stated the Plan Commission wanted to be clear how the applicant wanted that space to be used, so they could address their concerns.

The applicant asked if the Plan Commission would be alright with the deck if it was intended for residential, and whether commercial use of the space would require a Special Use Permit.

Commissioner Markunas said that was the case.

Commissioner Knieriem explained that there was a need to regulate the observation deck in some way. If that use changed over time, those changes could be addressed at the appropriate time.

There was some discussion on what materials would be used to construct the proposed deck. Materials would include glass, metal, and EIFS, among others.

Commissioner Schaeffer noted that the elevations called out two different kinds of brick which appeared to be similar colors. She asked if they were intended to be different colors or the same.

The architect stated they were meant to be different, it was just that renderings were not always the best at showing the differences between the two types. He stated that they would have samples for the Historic Preservation Commission when they met. They were also working on photometrics, and would have them ready prior to a Public Hearing for staff comments.

Commissioner Schaeffer asked the architect if he had considered adding some decoration to the entryway on the north west corner of the building, since it looked so plain on the rendering.

The architect clarified that there was a lot of detail already present on the facades. There were details there which were hard to see on the renderings, but were visible on the submitted elevations.

There was some discussion on how the building transformer would be screened.

Commissioner Schaeffer asked staff to send the architect's presentation to them, since it did not work on the projector.

Commissioner Knieriem asked the applicant what their timeline for the project was.

The applicant responded it would be about a year, and that he wanted everything done right around Fall Fest. He would break ground as soon as it was approved, around March or April.

Commissioner Knieriem noted that the building likely wouldn't be ready for Fall Fest.

The applicant clarified that they were looking to minimize the impact of their project on Fall Fest, to clean up the site for that event so as to minimize disruption.

Commissioner Knieriem thanked the applicant for their proposal.

Commissioner James asked the applicant incorporate bike racks into the project, as well as comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

The architect stated those changes would be in the renderings the Plan Commission would receive as part of the presentation slides. He would work with staff to determine where to place the bike racks.

Chair Rigoni noted that the proposed architecture was of the quality they looked for, and said it would be a great addition.

Chris Gruba noted that at a future public hearing, there would be nine variance requests and two Special Use Permit requests.

Chair Rigoni reminded the applicant to request all special uses and variances as soon as they could. The more requests they knew about ahead of time the better. She added that having draft covenants and restrictions would be good too. She encouraged the applicants to get answers to the questions the Plan Commission had raised, since the Village Board would have the same questions.

There was some discussion on which meeting would be held next. The applicant would be in contact with staff to schedule their next meeting with the Historic Preservation Commission.

D. Public Comments

There were none.

E. Village Board & Committee Updates

Mike Schwarz informed the Plan Commission that the all variances requested for the Plantz Residence were approved by the Village Board at their meeting on November 7th.

The Committee-of-the-Whole held a meeting on November 9th, where they discussed the annexation agreement for the Olde Stone First Addition development. The feedback received by the applicants was less than favorable, and staff was in contact with them about next steps. The Committee-of-the-Whole also discussed the proposed development at 7 N. White Street. The applicant had requested that the Village split the costs associated with relocating an existing transformer on the site. They also requested either signing a lease agreement with the Village, or that the Village sell more land in order to accommodate a trash enclosure.

F. Other Business

There was none.

G. Attendance Confirmation (December 8th, 2022)

Chair Rigoni asked the other members of the Plan Commission to notify staff if they were unable to attend the next meeting.

Motion (#3): Adjournment 9:17 P.M.

Unanimously approved by voice vote.

Approved December 8th, 2022

As Presented _____ As Amended _____

Maura A Rigoni /s/ Maura Rigoni, Chair

Drew Duff /s/ Secretary