

**MINUTES
CITY OF FARMINGTON HILLS
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
FARMINGTON HILLS CITY HALL – COUNCIL CHAMBERS
JUNE 15, 2017, 7:30 P.M.**

Vice Chair Schwartz called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. on June 15, 2017.

Commissioners Present: Brickner, Countegan, Fleischhacker, Mantey, Orr, McRae, Schwartz, Stimson

Commissioners Absent: Rae-O'Donnell

Others Present: City Planner Stec, Staff Engineer Darnall, City Attorney Schultz, Planning Consultants Arroyo and Tangari

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

City Planner Stec noted that Item B. Site and Landscape Plan 72-12-2016, 29141 Twelve Mile Road, had been postponed per the applicant's request.

MOTION by Mantey, support by Brickner, to approve the agenda as amended, with Item B. Site and Landscape Plan 72-12-2016, 29141 Twelve Mile Road, postponed.

MOTION carried unanimously.

REGULAR MEETING:

A. REZONING REQUEST 2-5-2017

LOCATION:	37000 Grand River Ave.
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-20-300-030
PROPOSAL:	Rezone part of a parcel currently zoned B-4, Planned General Business District to B-3, General Business District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Set for Public Hearing
APPLICANT:	Thomas Duke
OWNER:	Duke & Duke LLP

Commissioner Mantey disclosed that he had a conflict of interest with this agenda item, in that Thomas Duke was the landlord for his business.

MOTION by McRae, support by Fleischhacker, that Commissioner Mantey be recused from discussion of Agenda Item A.

MOTION carried unanimously.

Commissioner Mantey left the meeting.

Utilizing overhead slides and referring to the June 9, 2017/revised June 13, 2017 Giffels Webster review letter, Planning Consultant Arroyo gave the background for this application, which was a request to set

for public hearing a rezoning of 0.98 acres at 37000 Grand River from B-4 to B-3 in order to construct a drive-through coffee shop.

Planning Consultant Arroyo reviewed the zoning and use of adjacent properties, with B-3 Office to the west on the same site, C3 General Commercial (gas station in Farmington) to the south, B-4 retail to the east, and RC-3 Multi-family to the north.

The parcel was designated Large Office on the Future Land Use Map. The Master Plan noted that the large office category was intended to be implemented using the OS-4 district, which was not the current zoning. The lot was not part of any special study area.

The current use was an office building. The rezoning was requested for part of the parking lot.

The applicant would also be seeking a lot split if the zoning request was granted; the lot split would match the boundary of the newly zoned section.

The listed uses for the B-3 and B-4 Districts were in the Commissioners' packets. The letter reviewed the *Items to be considered for a Zoning Map Amendment*. Planning Consultant Arroyo would not go over those items in detail this evening, but he did note that the parking issue in item #7 had been resolved.

Chair Schwartz said that at the public hearing he would like to see more data regarding the occupancy of the office building. If the building were under-occupied, how would parking requirements be impacted should they move to full occupancy?

Commissioner Orr referred to #5 on page 3 of the review letter: *Will the proposed zoning place a burden on nearby thoroughfares? If so, how would this burden compare with the existing zoning district?* The review letter stated that this change would not have a significant impact. How was this conclusion reached?

Planning Consultant Arroyo said the information was based on a comparison of listed uses in the B-3 and B-4 Zoning Districts.

Commissioner Orr said that the intersection was jammed during peak hours. Drivers often used the access road to bypass both Grand River and Halsted Roads. The exit as shown on the site plan seemed unacceptable and rejection of the site plan seemed likely.

Commissioner Orr asked if all three sub-criteria listed in item #10 regarding spot zoning had to receive a negative answer in order for this request to go forward. Planning Consultant Arroyo explained that the criteria were considered guidelines, offering questions generally asked when spot zoning became part of the overall consideration. It was up to the Commission and ultimately the City Council to decide whether this request constituted spot zoning.

Commissioner Brickner asked if easements would be required if the rezoning request were granted. Planning Consultant Arroyo said that would be part of site plan review.

Commissioner Brickner agreed with Commissioner Orr in terms of traffic difficulties at that corner. In the mornings drivers who were trying to get on the expressway experienced intense slowdowns there.

Vice Chair Schwartz invited the applicant to speak.

Lonny Zimmerman, Siegal/Tuomaala Associates, 29200 Northwestern Highway Ste 160, Southfield MI, architect, was present on behalf of this application. Thomas Duke, owner, was also present.

Mr. Zimmerman explained that they were seeking to optimize the use of the parcel. They were the original architects for the office building, which had been built in 1978. They built the parking to meet the zoning ordinance requirements at that time. The occupancy rate had been high for the entire life of the building, so they had a good picture as to what parking was needed. Even at optimum periods the parking lot was never more than half to two-thirds full. The B-3 designation gave options for use at that corner; they would still exceed the parking requirements for most of the uses that could go there. The B-3 designation would allow them to optimize the use of the parcel by putting in another use that would provide community benefit as well as benefit the property owner.

Vice Chair Schwartz said that at the public hearing the applicants should be prepared to explain why this rezoning along with the proposed use would not have an impact on traffic congestion.

Commissioner Orr asked what would happen if the zoning change were approved, the parcel was split, and then the eventual site plan was denied.

Mr. Zimmerman said that worst case scenario meant the site would stay as it was. However, there were other options for use other than the iteration shown this evening.

Commissioner McRae asked why the requested parcel was not squared off.

Mr. Zimmerman explained that the rezoned section was shaped to accommodate a coffee shop or similar type use, complete with drive-through, parking, etc. The configuration shown generated the number of required parking spaces while still leaving the required number of parking spaces for the office building.

Mr. Zimmerman continued that there would be cross easements to share parking. During the times of heavy coffee shop use, the offices in the building would likely not be open.

Commissioner McRae noted that a gas station was a B-3 use. The configuration requested would likely prohibit a gas station as well as other potential uses at that location. Maybe that was not a bad thing.

Commissioner Fleischhacker said that if the rezoning request were granted, the applicants would likely present something that met all zoning requirements. At that point the Commission would have no choice but to accept what was submitted.

Commissioner Brickner had concerns about the engineering of the property because of the drop off there. Nevertheless, he was ready to make a motion.

MOTION by Brickner, support by Countegan, that Rezoning Request 2-5-2017, petitioned by Thomas Duke, be set for Public Hearing on July 20, 2017.

MOTION carried 7-0-1 (Mantey recused).

Commissioner Mantey rejoined the meeting.

B. SITE AND LANDSCAPE PLAN 72-12-2016

LOCATION: 29141 Twelve Mile Rd.
PARCEL I.D.: 22-23-13-126-002
PROPOSAL: Banquet hall for existing place of worship in RA-2,
One Family Residential District
ACTION REQUESTED: Approval of Site and Landscape Plan
APPLICANT: Lubin Ivanovski
OWNER: Great Martyr St George of Kratovo

As noted above, this item was postponed per the applicant's request.

C. PUD PLAN 1, 2017

SITE / LANDSCAPE PLAN 57-5-2017

LOCATION: 22000 Haggerty Rd.
PARCEL I.D.: 22-23-31-101-020
PROPOSAL: Planned Unit Development Plan & Site and Landscape
Plan for new hotel on historic property in OS-4,
Office Research District
ACTION REQUESTED: Set for Planning Commission Public Hearing
APPLICANT: M2B2, LLC
OWNER: Estate of Vickie White

Utilizing overhead slides and referring to the June 9, 2017 Giffels Webster review letter, Planning Consultant Tangari gave the background for this application, which was to set for public hearing a final determination for Planned Unit Development Plan 1, 2017, and Site and Landscape Plan for a new hotel on a historic property in the OS-4 District at 22000 Haggerty Road.

Planning Consultant Tangari noted that the Planning Commission had seen this before; the site was rezoned from RA-1 to OS-4 in 2016 and in May 2017 was granted preliminary PUD qualification. The applicant had requested that the final determination for the PUD and site and landscape plan review be concurrent with each other. Given the size of the site and the relatively limited scope of the PUD this seemed like something that could be accomplished.

Giffels Webster had reviewed the submitted site plan in their June 9, 2017 letter. However, Planning Consultant Tangari was not going to present a detailed site plan review tonight because the site plan was likely to change. Also, some information had not yet been submitted.

Commissioner Schwartz asked what things still had to be submitted.

Planning Consultant Tangari explained that MDOT was attempting to work out a pedestrian connection from the right of way back to the trailhead, so that was not yet on the plan. It was possible the location of the trailhead would change. There were also a few dimensional standards that were not listed on the plan, and the square footage of the hotel had not been included. Details for certain things like the trash enclosure, the curbs, etc., were missing. There were no photometrics.

The tree survey was also incomplete. However, if the trailhead moved, the number and placement of trees on the landscape plan could change significantly.

Commissioner McRae asked how people would get to the trailhead. Planning Consultant Tangari said that was still being worked out, not only with the pedestrian connection, but also in terms of signage.

Commissioner McRae noted that the trailhead and the saving of the historic home were the key reasons to have this PUD.

In response to a question from Commissioner Orr, City Planner Stec said signs could be part of a PUD plans.

Commissioner Orr addressed the details for parking lot trees. It seemed that dirt was piled up in the islands, but rain would wash that dirt away and the trees would fail. Could more level islands be required as part of the PUD process?

Planning Consultant Tangari said that they had noted in the review that Farmington Hills details needed to be shown on the landscape plan; that was not what was currently shown. City Planner Stec said the City could review its landscape details for parking lot trees.

City Planner Stec noted that the applicant was present for this proposal, as was Bryan Farmer, Deputy Director of Public Services. Mr. Farmer had been the catalyst for moving ahead with a trailhead on this property. He was the person working with MDOT and helping to make things happen.

Vice Chair Schwartz asked if Mr. Farmer could project how long it would take MDOT to finalize trailhead plans.

Mr. Farmer gave some history of the process so far, and said that it had actually been quite speedy. They had met with MDOT in October 2016. They determined it was best to create a separate office space for the historic home and to create the trailhead in the rear. Having this trailhead would offer something the City didn't currently have in terms of non-motorized connectivity. MDOT's nontransportation coordinator Julie Edwards was really excited about this project. She had written some policy language and had met with the Real Estate Division of the Federal Highway Administration. The City had received requirements from the FHA in April that specifically laid out what was needed to make this work; there were not a lot of hoops to go through. They had met with the City Attorney and things appeared to be moving smoothly.

Commissioner Mantey said he felt parking for the trailhead would not be a problem because trailhead users would park during the day and hotel users would park at night. Hopefully there would be shared parking.

Mr. Farmer said MDOT required ADA accessibility to the pathway from Haggerty to the trailhead. He referred to a plan that showed how they could accommodate that without taking out trees at the north end. MDOT also required dedicated parking spaces, though they didn't suggest a distinct number. The applicants were proposing 4 dedicated spaces.

Mr. Farmer spoke to his vision for other private/public partnerships to create more trailheads,

Vice Chair Schwartz said that when this came back for public hearing, the applicants should have an agreement that spelled out who would maintain the trailhead, including trash cleanup and portajohn use.

Mr. Farmer said they had a verbal understanding already that trash and other maintenance would be the responsibility of the hotel. The City would place and maintain portajohns during the busy season.

Vice Chair Schwartz referred the applicants to the West Bloomfield trailhead, which was very busy on weekend mornings.

Referring to previous discussion regarding landscape trees, Planning Consultant Arroyo said that he also would like to revisit standards, to require landscape islands to be somewhat larger in order to help trees survive there.

Mike Huszti, 555 Hill Street, Milford MI, real estate broker representing M2B2, was present on behalf of this application. Mr. Huszti distributed copies of the revised concept plan, showing a site plan and a proposal for the park.

Vice Chair Schwartz asked about the timetable for submitting documents for the public hearing in July. Planning Consultant Tangari said the applicants would need to submit at least 2 weeks before the meeting.

Vice Chair Schwartz asked Mr. Huszti if he felt they could be ready for the July meeting. Mr. Huszti said they could be absolutely be ready. The items in the review letter could be easily resolved. The big issue was with MDOT and providing a pedestrian connection from the sidewalk on Haggerty to the trailhead. They were ready to present two options to MDOT. The first preferred option utilized existing sidewalks as well as adding more, but also contained some jogs. To make that work the park had to be flipped to the south side of the site. The second was a straight path that would require the removal of some landscaping and open up the neighboring office building to the north with its large parking lot and bright lights.

Also, they were dedicating 4 parking spaces to the trailhead, and they would share parking with the hotel during the day.

Mr. Huszti said that by the time they submitted their final site plan the access to the trailhead should be resolved.

Commissioner Fleischhacker asked staff to make sure that any proposed signs met zoning regulations.

Vice Chair Schwartz asked for data regarding the percentage of walks vs. bikers on the path. He thought that most people would drive to the trailhead rather than walk up via Haggerty Road.

Commissioner McRae asked that any missing items be ready for review before the July meeting, including dimensions, photometrics, calculations for parking, etc.

Planning Consultant Arroyo said the new materials should be in by June 29th.

Commissioner Fleischhacker asked that a material board be brought to the public hearing.

MOTION by McRae, support by Stimson, that P.U.D. Plan No. 1, 2017, including site and Landscape Plan 37-5-2017, submitted on May 18, 2017 by M2B2 LLC, be set for Public Hearing on July 20, 2017.

Planning Consultant Arroyo pointed out that splitting the historic home from the rest of the property would likely create some setback deficiencies. The new parcel should be shown and dimensioned, with a comparison to the district requirements, so any waivers could be requested as part of the PUD process.

City Planner Stec noted that the applicants should prepare a written narrative as required, especially emphasizing regarding the preservation and use of the historic home.

Vice Chair Schwartz called the motion.

MOTION carried unanimously.

D. SITE AND LANDSCAPE PLAN 58-5-2017

LOCATION:	30800 Orchard Lake Rd.
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-02-151-018
PROPOSAL:	Parking lot improvements and facade change to existing building in a B-2, Community Business District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Approval of Site and Landscape Plan
APPLICANT:	Mark Drane of Rogvoy Architects, PC
OWNER:	ATMF VI, LLC

Utilizing overhead slides and referring to the June 8, 2017 Giffels Webster review letter, Planning Consultant Tangari gave the background for this application, which was to request approval of a Site and Landscape Plan in order to complete parking lot improvements and a façade change to the vacant K-Mart building, located in a B-2, Community Business District.

Planning Consultant Tangari reviewed adjacent zoning and land uses, with B-2 to the north, RC-2 to the south, RC-2/RA-4 to the east, and B-2 to the west. A paper street was directly east of the parcel.

The retail use would remain as the former K-mart space would be converted from a single tenant space to three smaller tenant spaces. It appeared that Aldi and Burlington Coat Factory were prospective tenants for two of the spaces.

The project would include small additions to the building and some reconfiguration of the parking lot. Total leasable square footage of the center would be 79,503 square feet after completion.

The building appeared to meet the setback and height requirements of the B-2 district, except for the minimum setback from a residential district at the rear. The applicant was proposing to remove portions of the rear of the building to add loading docks and trash compactors in the newly created space. This would significantly reduce the existing nonconformity, and all but two small portions of the rear façade would now meet rear setback standards of 75 feet. As the applicants were reducing a legal nonconformity, they would not need to seek a variance.

Outstanding issues included:

- Regarding rooftop screening, the applicant should clarify whether the cornice on the front façade and masonry parapet on the rear façade served this purpose or whether additional screening would be necessary. It was not clear whether rooftop equipment would be screened to the south; the elevations did not appear to show a new parapet on that façade.

- While the dumpster enclosure met standards, it could be moved farther away from the eastern residential property line.
- There was adequate parking on the site to meet ordinance requirements. However, one sheet showed land banked parking at the south. Those did not meet the 10-foot parking setback so those spaces could not actually be put in. There was plenty of parking without those spaces.
- Currently the front yard parking spaces did not meet setback requirements. Under the new plan they did.
- The photometric plan only addressed the rear of the building. Lighting elsewhere on the site was proposed to remain as is. For the new lighting, the illuminance levels at the pavement appeared to meet standards. However, no average to minimum ratio was provided for the new lighting, and no information on mounting heights was provided. The Planning Commission should determine whether the information provided was satisfactory for a modification to an existing site.
- A pedestrian connection to Orchard Lake Road was not provided.
- Regarding the landscape plan, the main issue was that the zoning ordinance required a wall or berm along the rear property line abutting residential. A wall was not shown on the plan, and there was currently a 3-foot tall chain link fence along that boundary. In this case, the rear property line abutted an RA District but not RA property, as Greening Avenue, a paper street that had not been constructed, ran between the property and the nearest residential lot. The area was heavily wooded. The Planning Commission could waive the requirement for a wall and screening trees if it determined that the required screening would serve no good purpose in light of conditions in the area. Images had been provided that showed conditions there.

Vice Chair Schwartz asked if an approving motion could be conditioned on the rear screening being revisited if someone wanted to build a home to the east, or if the current screening failed.

City Attorney Schultz said this was a waiver, which was an exercise of discretion on the Commission's part. It would be appropriate to have a condition that the waiver was granted so long as the screening was there. If the screening failed, the requirement for a wall or berm could then be handled administratively.

Planning Consultant Tangari noted the City owned the paper street; it was unlikely a home would be built there.

Commissioner Orr pointed out that the paper street appeared to be zoned B-2. Did the subject property actually abut a residential property? City Planner Stec said this had been discussed with Planning and Community Development Director Gardiner, and it was the City's opinion that the requirement for a wall would apply.

Commissioner McRae asked if the Best Buy and the Kmart were all one property. City Planner Stec said this was a separate property from Best Buy. Commissioner McRae noted that there was a pedestrian connection right over the line on the Best Buy side.

Vice Chair Schwartz was concerned that the required trees, when mature, would render the individual retail signs invisible. Planning Consultant Arroyo said this was a question of species selection.

Commissioner Brickner asked about future MDOT plans to construct a small round-about at the Best Buy entrance, and to install a boulevard on Orchard Lake Road. How would this impact the proposed landscaping?

Planning Consultant Arroyo said based on what they had seen, there could potentially be a small round about at the Best Buy entrance. The type of median proposed for Orchard Lake Road was a narrow one, so the right of way acquisition would be minimal. He didn't anticipate based on what they'd seen so far that those future improvements would significantly impact the site.

Planning Consultant Tangari added that the round about would take a very small corner of the parcel; the bigger impact would be on the Best Buy parcel. But all plans were conceptual at this point.

Vice Chair Schwartz invited the applicants to make their presentation.

Mark Drane, Rogvov Architects, 32500 Telegraph Road, Suite 250, Bingham Farms, was present on behalf of this application. He explained that they wanted to re-tenant the building and modernize it. He had no objections to the review comments. They were tearing down the back of the building; this would then become less nonconforming. Greenbelt would be added to the front. They would lose the parking spaces they had planned to land bank along Whitewood Street.

A large storm sewer ran next to the dumpster, making it difficult to move the enclosure further to the west. The dumpster enclosure did meet requirements.

Mr. Drane noted that they had developed the Best Buy site and they had all reciprocal rights for parking, delivery truck, and pedestrian access. The pedestrian access was perfect where it was, at the crosswalk with the signalized intersection, and they had the reciprocal right to use it.

The lighting in back would be 18-feet high with appropriate light cutoff. There were some light fixtures that were over doors at 8.5 feet high. They would be happy to provide the average to minimum ratio.

Commissioner Fleischhacker said that he understood that the Commission would not be approving signage. Still, he hoped the nonconforming lollipop sign would be removed, as tall trees would eventually block that sign. A monument sign could be very effective on that site.

Commissioner McRae agreed it made sense to use the Best Buy pedestrian access.

Commissioner McRae addressed the excess parking on the site. There were 25-50 more parking spaces than necessary. Could that number be reduced in order to increase the greenbelt along the south end? If they were going to land bank parking that would be the area to do it.

Mr. Drane pointed out that they were losing their 16 land banked spaces. He would not guarantee that they could lose significantly more spaces than that, but they could make an attempt to reduce parking on the south side.

Commissioner Orr asked about rooftop equipment. Mr. Drane said all rooftop equipment would be screened per ordinance. They would use rooftop screens behind the parapet if necessary.

Commissioner Brickner complimented Mr. Drane on his work, and expressed pleasure at having this blighted property updated and filled with good tenants.

In response to a question from Commissioner Orr, Mr. Drane said they would not be making provision for charging cars.

Commissioner Fleischhacker asked City Attorney Schultz if the applicants were required to have an additional pedestrian access, or could they use the pedestrian access to Best Buy.

City Attorney Schultz said this was a redevelopment. The Commission could bring the site to conformity to the extent they thought reasonable. If they felt something was unreasonable, they were not obligated to require it.

Mr. Drane pointed out that part of the Best Buy pedestrian access was on their property. He also reiterated that they had reciprocal easement agreements with Best Buy, including pedestrian access.

Vice Chair Schwartz indicated he was ready to entertain a motion.

MOTION by Fleischhacker, support by McRae, that Site Plan 58-5-2017, dated May 18, 2017, submitted by Mark Drane of Rogvoy Architects, be approved because it appears to meet all applicable requirements of the Zoning Chapter, subject to the following conditions and findings:

- **A revised site plan addressing the following items be submitted for administrative review:**
 - **The area of the landscape island abutting the Whitewood Street right of way be increased, and this area can include banked parking spaces for future use if needed as long as minimum road right of way buffering requirements are met**
 - **Items identified in June 8, 2017 Fire Marshal's review report be addressed**
 - **Screening for roof-top units be provided**
- **Findings on the following items were made:**
 - **The requirement of a 6 foot screen wall or berm along the eastern property line is waived. If the existing trees in the Greening Road right of way are ever removed the necessity for the wall or berm will be re-evaluated**
 - **The existing rear-yard setback deficiency can remain as a legal-nonconforming situation because the majority of the rear of the building will be brought into compliance with the setback requirements**
 - **The existing Best Buy pedestrian connection from the Orchard Lake right of way meets the intent of the ordinance and no additional connection is required**
 - **The proposed dumpster enclosure is acceptable**

MOTION carried unanimously.

MOTION by Fleischhacker, support by Orr, that Landscape Plan 58-5-2017, dated May 18, 2017, submitted by Mark Drane of Rogvoy Architects, be approved because it appears to meet all applicable Zoning Chapter requirements, and applicable Design Principles as adopted by the Planning Commission, subject to the following conditions and findings:

- **A revised site plan addressing the items identified in the June 8, 2017 Giffels/Webster review report be submitted for administrative review**
- **Findings on the following items were made:**

- **The requirement of a 6 foot screen wall or berm along the eastern property line is waived. If the existing trees in the Greening Road right of way are ever removed the necessity for the wall or berm will be re-evaluated**
- **The proposed shape of the storm-water detention pond is acceptable**

MOTION carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: May 18, 2017

MOTION by Fleischhacker, support by Brickner, to approve the meeting minutes of May 18, 2017 as published.

MOTION carried unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

There was no public comment.

COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS:

Commissioner Mantey said he hoped the ordinance requirement for a pedestrian connection allowed the use of a pedestrian connection on an adjacent property when there was reciprocal agreement to allow cars to enter. Vice Chair Schwartz suggested that staff take a look at that ordinance and if it needed tweaking they could bring it back to the Commission.

Commissioner Fleischhacker noted that the nonconforming sign at Westbrook shopping center was down and the business owners were considering constructing a monument sign there.

Commissioner Stimson asked when new sidewalks were installed, when was a decision made to put in a nonmotorized path vs. a regular sidewalk. Staff Engineer Darnall explained that often the decision was land-dependent, and how much right-of-way was available.

Commissioner Stimson asked if there was a preference to put in a non-motorized path. Planning Consultant Arroyo said the City had been considering development of a non-motorized plan to evaluate that and to document those roads that would be able to have the wider path.

Commissioner Stimson said in the meantime, as sidewalks were being put in was there an attempt being made to make them non-motorized, especially if they were on major roads.

City Planner Stec said he would research this and report back.

Commissioner McRae said as tomorrow was the last day of school, it might be a good idea to talk to the school about educating the public regarding school bus laws. There appeared to be a lack of understanding about when to stop for school buses.

City Attorney Schultz explained that if the red light was on motorists could not pass. Any other time they could.

Commissioner Orr asked about the trees that were removed in order to install a monument sign at

Muirwood Shopping Center. It appeared those trees were not being replaced, as grass was now planted in that area. Was this a landscape plan violation? City Planner Stec said he would follow up with this issue.

Commissioner Orr said his recent experience with properties being developed next to highways led him to be more certain than ever that it was appropriate and good to require businesses to landscape so as to improve the view from the highway.

Discussion was had regarding use of bicycle lanes in the City. Several commissioners gave their experience biking in the City, both on sidewalks and in the provided bike lanes.

The next meeting was scheduled for July 20, 2017. Commissioner Stimson noted that he would be absent.

ADJOURNMENT:

Seeing that there was no further discussion, Vice Chair Schultz adjourned the meeting at 8:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Steven J. Stimson
Planning Commission Secretary

/cem