

**CITY OF CEDARBURG
PLAN COMMISSION**

**PLN20071105-1
UNAPPROVED MINUTES**

November 5, 2007

A regular meeting of the Plan Commission of the City of Cedarburg was held on Monday, November 5, 2007 at Cedarburg City Hall, W63 N645 Washington Avenue, in the Council Chambers. The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Mayor Gregory Myers.

Roll Call: Present - Mayor Gregory Myers, Council Member Sandra Beck, Mark Burgoyne, Brook Brown, Keith Kaiman, Joe Emmerich

Excused - Park & Forestry Chairperson James Schara

Also Present - City Attorney Kaye Vance; City Planner Jon Censky; Administrative Secretary Darla Drumel; interested citizens

STATEMENT OF PUBLIC NOTICE

Administrative Secretary Drumel confirmed that the agenda for the meeting had been posted and distributed in compliance with the Wisconsin Open Meetings Law.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Council Member Beck, seconded by Commissioner Brown, to approve the minutes of October 1, 2007 as presented. The motion carried without a negative vote, with Commissioner Schara excused.

COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS FROM CITIZENS

No comments or suggestions were offered at this time.

PUBLIC HEARING FOR PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT AMENDMENT REQUEST TO CONVERT RECREATIONAL AREA OF THE WOODMERE DEVELOPMENT AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF MCKINLEY BOULEVARD AND GARFIELD STREET TO HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY AND CONDITIONAL USE REQUEST FOR PROPOSED 20-UNIT/TWO-STORY CONDOMINIUM STRUCTURE – DUEY STROEBEL

Mayor Myers declared the public hearing open at 7:04 p.m.

According to Planner Censky's report, Mr. Duane Stroebel Jr. submitted revised plans to convert the tennis court and basketball area of the Woodmere complex from recreational to senior housing condominiums. He noted that Mr. Stroebel purchased this complex in 2005 and has since been working to upgrade its appearance through improved site maintenance and as part of that project he proposes this conversion. Mr. Stroebel felt that senior housing would better fit the character of the neighborhood and would benefit the community as a whole through added tax revenues.

Planner Censky advised that the site is zoned RM-2 (PUD). The RM-2 base Zoning District permits multi-family housing as a conditional use and the PUD Overlay Zoning District provides flexibility in design and serves to tie the plan directly to zoning. Any significant change to the plan requires a public hearing before the Plan Commission and approval by the Common Council. A public hearing

is also required because housing for the elderly is classified as a Conditional Use in the RM-2 District. Since both public hearings must be held before the Plan Commission, they were again combined into one notice on the agenda. The public comment received for the PUD plan amendment will be passed on to the Common Council for them to consider before taking action and the elderly housing conditional use request will return for consideration at a future Plan Commission meeting. This meeting served as the public participation/hearing and recommendation portion.

Planner Censky continued that the Woodmere project was originally approved as a Planned Unit Development (PUD) in the 1970s. It resulted in a total of 128 two-bedroom apartment units, which is below the maximum number allowed by Code (i.e. 187 units possible). The recreational area had been designated during the PUD zoning process and the conversion of that area to housing for the elderly is a significant change to the overall plan, which necessitates this approval process.

Planner Censky noted that the plan was revised based on the comments the applicant received at the August 6, 2007 Plan Commission public hearing. Mr. Stroebel currently proposes a plan for 20 units, which are down from the previously-proposed 27 units, and the number of floors was reduced from 3 to 2. By eliminating the third floor, this structure will measure 28 feet high, which is down from the 38'-high structure previously proposed and under the 48'-height maximum allowed for senior housing with underground parking. The proposed structure is in full compliance with the setback and offset requirements.

With respect to parking, the Code requires ½ stall per unit for elderly housing. The new plans far exceed that requirement but better reflect the anticipated demand for independent living elderly housing with 41 underground stalls and 8 surface stalls. Due to the irregular shape of the McKinley Boulevard right-of-way along the frontage of this site, the surface stalls are shown partially within that right-of-way. To address this issue, the applicant will need to petition to vacate that right-of-way as this project moves forward.

Planner Censky reported that City staff continued to have an issue with the location of the driveway access. Because the site has frontage on both McKinley Boulevard and Garfield Street, staff preferred that driveway be relocated to the lesser traveled Garfield Street. McKinley Boulevard is an arterial street with substantially higher traffic volumes and with access being proposed at a bend in the road we feel safety is sacrificed.

Planner Censky explained that since the proposal is a change to an existing PUD project, it is viewed as an integral part of that project even though it is separated by a property line. Accordingly, while it meets the density requirements for elderly housing (i.e. 24 units/acre max.) as a standalone site within the RM-2 District, the maximum number of units within this project (i.e. 187 units possible), FAR and open space standards apply across the entire project.

Planner Censky pointed out that the research conducted for the Smart Growth Plan revealed that the City's population is growing old as a result of the baby-boom generation reaching retirement age. This statistic indicates that projects of this nature will be needed to house that growing segment of the City's population. In fact, the Visioning Report completed several years ago recommended promoting independent living senior housing and that recommendation is also reflected in the draft Smart Growth Plan.

Planner Censky noted that the proposal complied with the dimensional standards of the RM-2 District and he suggested some conditions for consideration if the PUD amendment was recommended to the Council.

Mr. Duane Stroebel, Jr. presented the revised plan that reflected the feedback received at the August 6 Plan Commission meeting. The building design was reduced from three stories to two, which neighbors previously expressed was acceptable. He advised that the new building would be four feet shorter and close to equal in length to the existing adjacent Woodmere apartment buildings. Because of the reduced height, the units were reduced from 27 units to 20 units. He stated that he could not promise that the project would be financially feasible with only two stories, but would know when a development agreement was signed. The underground parking would accommodate 41 cars, which is well over the Code-required half-space for each unit. The building would be set back the same distance from the roadway as the existing units on the south side of Garfield Street, but there would be sidewalk on the north side. All snow would be contained on the site and the rubbish collection would be contained inside the building. The design would allow auto traffic to enter and exit the underground parking while the rubbish was being collected. Mr. Stroebel continued that the previous owners had advised him that the use of the tennis courts and basketball court had stopped years ago, but when they were utilized, McKinley Commons residents complained. He pointed out that a City park with tennis courts was already established adjacent to the north of the Woodmere site. The previous owner also informed him that the original developer was not required to install these recreational courts, but added them as a tool to market the complex.

Mr. Stroebel advised that the unit prices would be in the range of \$200,000 to \$300,000 and would represent \$5 million in value to the City's tax base. The project would also provide housing diversity, accommodate the needs of senior citizens who wish to remain in the community, meet the recommendations of the Visioning Committee and comply with the concepts of Smart Growth planning by not promoting sprawl. He added that there are no other central locations suitable for senior housing in the City. Mr. Stroebel urged Commissioners to avoid making their decision based on the emotional response of a small group of people.

In response to a question from Vice Chairperson Burgoyne, Mr. Stroebel advised that the outdoor spaces would be landscaped, patios would be constructed with grilling areas and basically geared towards the desires of the residents.

Richard Dassow, N16 W5391 Garfield Court, stated he was not for or against the project but asked the Commission to consider certain points. He was led to believe that changes to PUD projects were not permitted and he bought his home believing the recreational facilities would always be there. He believed that the original Woodmere developer was required to put in the tennis courts and basketball court. It was not fair to make an amendment when the only reason the facilities are not being used is because they were allowed to deteriorate. The senior housing condominiums are a radical change to the PUD. The Plan Commission is charged with assuring that development adheres to good planning principals and it is not good planning to amend a PUD just to add to the City's tax base.

Gordon DeLaunais, N17 W5382 Garfield Street, thought the two-story project was good as shown.

Asked if a PUD could be changed, Planner Censky responded that the PUD ties the plan to the zoning and any significant change to the plan must go through a prescribed approval process. The three steps required for this project includes a public hearing at the Plan Commission for a recommendation on the amended plan, which is then forwarded for final action at the Common Council. The RM-2 zoning district classifies senior housing as a conditional use and a public hearing is also required at the Plan Commission, where final details such as landscaping,

architecture, lighting, etc. are approved.

Harold Stefan, N17 W5419 Garfield Court, emphasized that he and his wife, Romelle, are not against senior housing. When they bought their property, the previous owner told them that a City official said nothing could be built on the site. They would not be opposed to buildings similar to the McKinley Commons structures. He said their biggest concerns were related to traffic safety. The turn to exit the site to go northbound on McKinley Boulevard is too sharp, it would be difficult to go northbound on McKinley from the south entrance, people would be parking on Garfield Street, the curve on McKinley would be problematic. There are many pedestrians in the area and the increased traffic would be a threat to their safety. Mr. Stefan did not believe the rubbish issue could be addressed fully. He said they had been trapped to say that a two-story building was acceptable because Mr. Stroebel had said a two-story structure was not economically feasible, so the neighbors supported it thinking it could not be built.

Richard Hensch, N17 W5441 Garfield Court, asked if the access to the development would be located on Garfield Street. Planner Censky responded that the access point had not yet been determined, and could be decided upon by both the Plan Commission and Common Council. He also asked if the surface parking would be relocated if the entrance was changed to Garfield Street. Mr. Stroebel responded that the parking would remain in the same area. The address of the building would be on McKinley Boulevard with the main entrance facing McKinley and the underground parking accessed at that point. Mr. Hensch then announced that he was against the project because of the loss of green space which, once given away, you never get it back.

Ellen Haynes, W54 N114 McKinley Court, spoke in support of the project, opined that the upscale development would produce a rise of property value. In response to the suggestion that the site remain green space, she advised that the City was offered an opportunity to buy the site for park purposes in the early 1990s. She suggested that purchasing the site from the developer could be an option, although it would take the property off from the tax roll. The only way she knew that someone could control open space is to take ownership of it. As it is now, it is an eyesore and many children from outside the area come there.

Randy Miller, W52 N246 Pierce Avenue, advised that when he was a member of the Plan Commission, he understood that a PUD provided development control to the City, but did not prohibit any future changes. He agreed with Ms. Haynes that the site is often occupied by children out of the neighborhood and pointed out that a City park is located nearby. Mr. Miller also concurred that the development would be an asset to the area. He walks along Garfield Street and noted that it is very dark at night. The new development would provide more eyes to improve safety, more ownership to maintain properties and an increase in property values.

Mr. Stefan stated that Angela Rester Samse, N17 W5461 Garfield Court, who was unable to attend the meeting, is very concerned about the number of people the development would generate.

Mr. Miller noted that if it were not for changes, he would not have his home. He built on an infill lot created by a land division. What was appropriate in the 1970s does not necessarily mean the City cannot end up making a change for a benefit to the community in 2007.

Mr. DeLaunais stated that the tennis courts were padlocked and the nets were taken down on the basketball court. In addition, a load of gravel was dumped on the basketball court. No one could utilize the facilities and that is why they are an eyesore.

Action to Close Public Hearing

Being that no other comments were being offered, Council Member Beck moved to close the public hearing at 7:50 p.m. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairperson Burgoyne and carried without a negative vote, with Commissioner Schara excused.

Continued Discussion:

In response to a question from Council Member Beck, Planner Censky advised that the overall density of the project was under the maximum allowed for the district. Commissioner Brown asked about the need to vacate road right-of-way to accommodate the project and Planner Censky noted that it appeared initially that McKinley Boulevard was to be constructed straight to the north. At this time, the right-of-way is way beyond the standard.

Commissioner Brown maintained that a PUD had never been changed in the City's past and asked if any example could be drawn upon.

Vice Chairperson Burgoyne noted that most of the City's PUDs are subdivision and that there is little likelihood of making a significant change to a subdivision. There is nothing technically wrong with making a change to a PUD, but there are procedures in place that must be adhered to. He added that developments such as senior housing are relatively new.

Commissioner Kaiman believed that the Plan Commission had a long history of protecting neighborhoods and he could not imagine any change being more drastic as changing green space to a 20-unit residential development. In his opinion, the recreational facilities were an integral part of the original PUD and nothing necessitates making a change.

Commissioner Emmerich agreed with Commissioner Kaiman, stating that it was contradictory to the goal of preserving green space in a PUD to stuff a large building in that corner. There is a need to accommodate the recreation needs of the Woodmere tenants, and the aesthetic needs of the residents and the neighbors. He expressed concerns of Woodmere preschoolers walking alone to access the City park north of Woodmere. Leaving it as green space would improve property values in the area and attract more residents to the Woodmere development.

Mr. Stroebel countered that marketing studies have shown that such facilities do not add value to tenants. The majority of the Woodmere tenants are adults. He assured that, as owner of the complex, he was not going to do anything that would be detrimental to Woodmere.

Mayor Myers advised that when he ran for election, one of most prevalent issue he was approached with was the lack of housing for senior citizens in Cedarburg. People who had lived in the community for most of their lives, wanting to stay in the community, no longer wanting to maintain single-family homes, were having to move out of the area because there was no place to go. The City has changed considerably since the Woodmere PUD was adopted. The City is much denser and projects like these are the housing choices people in a city expect. The opportunities for growth are diminishing and there are not many places to build a facility as proposed by Mr. Stroebel. Mayor Myers felt that the proposed facility fits into the neighborhood perfectly, between the existing high-density apartments and the condominiums. A great deal of green space would be preserved around the entire project. He agreed the site is now an eyesore but pointed out it was an eyesore long before Mr. Stroebel bought the property. He agreed that the proposed development would raise everyone's property values. All he heard at the last meeting from the neighbors was that three stories was too big and that two stories would be fine, and Mr. Stroebel amended his plans to address the neighbors' concerns. Mayor Myers noted that decisions have to be made for the good

of the greater community and believed that Mr. Stroebel's project met that goal. He urged the Commissioners to give a positive recommendation to the Common Council.

Commissioner Brown pointed out that he served on the Visioning Committee and the recommendation to provide senior housing has been met by the approval of four different developments. PUDs are meant to remain unchanged and the recreation facilities were an integral part of the approved plan. He had concerns related to pedestrian and vehicular traffic. The neighbors agreed with a two-story structure only because they thought they did not have any other option. A 32,000 square foot building is gigantic and too significant of a change to the PUD.

Action:

A motion was made by Vice Chairperson Burgoyne to recommend approval of the requested amendment to the Planned Unit Development (PUD) to convert the recreational area (tennis and basketball courts) of the Woodmere Development at the northeast corner of McKinley Boulevard and Garfield Street to housing for the elderly with the following conditions:

- Access drive to McKinley Boulevard as proposed.
- The applicant shall pay user fees prior to the issuance of a building permit.
- Engineering department review and approval of the grading, drainage, stormwater management and erosion control plans prior to building permit.
- The building shall be with a proper fire/smoke detection and sprinkler system.
- The applicant petitioning and the City vacating the adjacent McKinley Boulevard right-of-way.

The motion was seconded by Mayor Myers and failed with Mayor Myers and Vice Chairperson Burgoyne voting in favor, and Council Member Beck and Commissioners Brown, Emmerich and Kaiman opposed, with Commissioner Schara excused.

REQUEST TO DIVIDE 44,056 SQUARE FOOT PARCEL LOCATED AT N49 W7103 WESTERN ROAD INTO TWO PARCELS OF 23,189 SQUARE FEET AND 15,957 SQUARE FEET – WILMER AND ROSA JERSCHEFSKE

Planner Censky explained that Mr. and Mrs. Jerschefske were requesting land division approval to split their existing 1.01-acre parcel located at N49 W7103 Western Road into two separate parcels of 23,189 square feet and 15,957 square feet. The existing double-frontage lot is sandwiched between Western Road and Windwood Drive, with the existing homestead fronting on Western Road and the proposed on Windwood Drive. The proposed lot will gain access to sewer and water service from Windwood Drive.

Planner Censky noted that City staff's review indicated full compliance with the minimum dimensional requirements of the RS-3 District and recommended conditions for consideration if approval was granted.

Action:

Commissioner Brown moved to approve the request to divide the 44,056 square foot parcel located at N49 W7103 Western Road into two parcels of 23,189 square feet and 15,957 square feet with the following conditions:

- Payment of the necessary user fees prior to the recording of the Certified Survey Map.

- The newly created lot shall be viewed as an infill and therefore future home construction plans must be approved by the Plan Commission.

The motion was seconded by Council Member Beck and carried without a negative vote, with Commissioner Schara excused.

CONSIDER RESOLUTION NO. 2007-01 RECOMMENDING ADOPTION OF THE CITY OF CEDARBURG "SMART GROWTH COMPREHENSIVE LAND USE PLAN – 2025"

Planner Censky explained that the first step in the Comprehensive Plan adoption process is for the Plan Commission to pass a resolution recommending Common Council approval of the Smart Growth Plan. The Plan will then be presented to the Common Council who will hold a public hearing following a Class 1 notice before considering an ordinance to adopt. The following is the specified process as set forth in State Statutes 66.1001:

Comprehensive Planning

(4) **PROCEDURES FOR ADOPTING COMPREHENSIVE PLANS.** A local governmental unit shall comply with all of the following before its comprehensive plan may take effect:

(a) The governing body of a local governmental unit shall adopt written procedures that are designed to foster public participation, including open discussion, communication programs, information services and public meetings for which advanced notice has been provided, in every stage of the preparation of a comprehensive plan. The written procedures shall provide for wide distribution of proposed, alternative or amended elements of a comprehensive plan and shall provide an opportunity for written comments on the plan to be submitted by members of the public to the governing body and for the governing body to respond to such written comments.

(b) The plan commission or other body of a local governmental unit that is authorized to prepare or amend a comprehensive plan may recommend the adoption or amendment of a comprehensive plan only by adopting a resolution by a majority vote of the entire commission. The vote shall be recorded in the official minutes of the plan commission or other body. The resolution shall refer to maps and other descriptive materials that relate to one or more elements of a comprehensive plan. One copy of an adopted comprehensive plan, or of an amendment to such a plan, shall be sent to the following:

1. Every governmental body that is located in whole or in part within the boundaries of the local governmental unit.
2. The clerk of every local governmental unit that is adjacent to the local governmental unit that is the subject of the plan that is adopted or amended as described in par. (b) (intro.).
3. The Wisconsin Land Council.
4. After September 1, 2003, the department of administration.
5. The regional planning commission in which the local governmental unit is located.

6. The public library that serves the area in which the local governmental unit is located.

(c) No comprehensive plan that is recommended for adoption or amendment under par. (b) may take effect until the political subdivision enacts an ordinance or the regional planning commission adopts a resolution that adopts the plan or amendment. The political subdivision may not enact an ordinance or the regional planning commission may not adopt a resolution under this paragraph unless the comprehensive plan contains all of the elements specified in sub. (2). An ordinance may be enacted or a resolution may be adopted under this paragraph only by a majority vote of the members-elect, as defined in s. 59.001 (2m), of the governing body. An ordinance that is enacted or a resolution that is adopted under this paragraph, and the plan to which it relates, shall be filed with at least all of the entities specified under par. (b).

(d) No local governmental unit may enact an ordinance under par. (c) unless the local governmental unit holds at least one public hearing at which the proposed ordinance is discussed. That hearing must be preceded by a class 1 notice under ch 985 that is published at least 30 days before the hearing is held. The local governmental unit may also provide notice of the hearing by any other means it considers appropriate. The class 1 notice shall contain at least the following information:

1. The date, time and place of the hearing.
2. A summary, which may include a map, of the proposed comprehensive plan or amendment to such a plan.
3. The name of the individual employed by the local governmental unit who may provide additional information regarding the proposed ordinance.
4. Information relating to where and when the proposed comprehensive plan or amendment to such a plan may be inspected before the hearing, and how a copy of the plan or amendment may be obtained.

Planner Censky pointed out that the Plan contained the necessary goals, objectives and policies which will guide the City's growth through the year 2025. This is the result of a strategic planning process that began in 2000 with the creation of the Cedarburg Blue Ribbon Visioning Committee who conducted several focus group sessions and also surveyed the community to determine how the City of Cedarburg should monitor and control its growth over the next 20 years. It continued with the inventory and analysis of background information, which resulted in the establishment of the guiding goals, objectives and policies that this Commission has been working on over the last year and a half. This document contains all nine elements required by the Smart Growth law. All elements have been added as they were drafted to the City's website for public review and comment.

Planner Censky noted that the Land Use Map on page 8-13 would be revised to clarify the extraterritorial residential land uses. He will also be adding a page to the beginning of the document identifying the Plan Commissioners and Council Members involved in the adoption of the Plan. An extension has been granted for adoption and the new deadline is May 1, 2007. A public hearing would need to be held before the Common Council in January or February of 2008.

Council Member Beck agreed, noting that the adoption should occur before there is a change in the

Common Council membership to avoid trying to get new members familiar with the document before the May 1 approval deadline.

Commissioner Brown suggested that the language be stronger regarding the relationship with the Town of Cedarburg. He also questioned whether the inclusion of "Morals," as noted on the table on page 10-5, was appropriate.

Commissioners directed that action to refer to the Common Council be deferred to the December 3, 2007 meeting to allow more time to review the document. Planner Censky advised that the new 2025 Land Use Map would be forwarded to the Plan Commissioner prior to that meeting.

RECOMMENDATION REGARDING ADOPTION OF FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY'S (FEMA) FLOOD INSURANCE STUDY (FIS) AND FLOOD INSURANCE RATE MAP (FIRM) PANELS 55089C0159F, 0167F, 0178F, 0186F, 0187F AND 0188F DATED DECEMBER 4, 2007 AND REVIEW AND POSSIBLE RECOMMENDATION TO ADOPT THE WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES (WDNR) CEDAR CREEK/MILWAUKEE RIVER DAMBREAK HAZARD MAP, THE FLOODWAY DATA/TABLES AND THE DAMBREAK HAZARD PROFILES DATED OCTOBER 4, 2007

Planner Censky advised that the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) had recently completed a re-evaluation of flood hazards in the City of Cedarburg, and the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources conducted a dam failure analysis for the Woolen Mills Dam, the Ruck Dam, the Columbia Mills Dam and the Wire and Nail Factory Dam on Cedar Creek. They have provided us with copies of the final Flood Insurance Rate Maps and the Cedar Creek/Milwaukee River Dambreak Hazard Map and require that this material be formally adopted by December 4, 2007. Cedarburg's existing floodplain maps are based on a study that was completed in the 1980s and this study is intended to upgrade those maps. Last December the City of Cedarburg adopted a new revised floodplain ordinance which was based on the FEMA model ordinance. That revision was necessary to incorporate recent changes the Administrative Code in NR 116, Wisconsin Supreme Court cases, and minimum standards of the National Flood Insurance Program regulations found in 44CFR, Part 60. The creation of these new FEMA maps is part of the ordinance change process and therefore these maps must be referenced in the recently- adopted floodplain ordinance.

Planner Censky noted that, for the most part, the FEMA study results in few changes to the previous floodplain location throughout the City except for portions of the downtown. The existing maps show all property along the east side and certain areas on the west side of Washington Avenue between Columbia Road and Bridge Street within the floodplain, where the new maps have adjusted the floodplain to remove some of those properties on the east side. Accordingly, those who own buildings that have been removed from the floodplain will no longer be subject to the floodplain regulations and will not be required to purchase flood insurance. We have been advised that failure to adopt this ordinance would result in suspension from the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). If a community is suspended from NFIP, it is subject to the provisions of Section 202(a) of Public Law 93-234, which prohibits federal officers or agencies from approving any form of loan, grant, guaranty, insurance payment, rebate, subsidy or disaster assistance loan or grant, for acquisition or construction purposes within the floodplain areas.

This ordinance revision will be schedule for public hearing before the Common Council later this month.

Action:

PLAN COMMISSION
November 5, 2007

PLN20071105-10
UNAPPROVED MINUTES

A motion was made by Commissioner Brown, seconded by Council Member Beck, to recommend the adoption of the Federal Emergency Management Agency's Flood Insurance Study and Flood Insurance Rate Map panels 55089C0159F, 0167F, 0178F, 0186F, 0187F and 0188F dated December 4, 2007 and recommend adopting the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources Cedar Creek/Milwaukee River Dambreak Hazard Map, the Floodway Data/Tables and the Dambreak Hazard Profiles dated October 4, 2007. The motion was seconded by Council Member Beck and carried without a negative vote, with Commissioner Schara excused.

Commissioner Kaiman suggested that the new information be passed on to the effected property owners.

REPORT FROM THE JETZCO MEMBERS AND DISCUSSION OF THE DIRECTION AND STATUS OF ONGOING DISCUSSIONS

The Plan Commission was advised that there was no JETZCO meeting this evening.

MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no announcements.

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Brown moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:43 p.m. The motion was seconded by Council Member Beck and carried without a negative vote.

Darla Drumel,
Administrative Secretary