

REPORT OF CITY PLAN COMMISSION

July 2, 2018 – 6:00 PM

Police Department – 933 Michigan Avenue, Stevens Point, WI 54481

PRESENT: Mayor Wiza, Alderperson Kneebone, Commissioner Arntsen, Commissioner Haines, Commissioner Hoppe, and Commissioner Cooper.

ALSO PRESENT: Director Ostrowski, Alderperson Jennings, Alderperson Nebel, Alderperson Dugan, Alderperson McComb, Alderperson Morrow, Brandi Makuski, Dan McKenzie, Eric Niffenegger, Larry Huber, and Trevor Roark.

INDEX:

1. Roll call.

Discussion and possible action on the following:

2. Report of the June 4, 2018 meeting.
3. Public Hearing and Action on a request from Dan McKenzie for a conditional use permit amendment to amend the site plan requiring screening along the northern property line at 3349 Whiting Avenue (Parcel ID 281230805440007).
4. Public Hearing and Action on a request from the City of Stevens Point to Amend Chapter 23, Zoning Code, of the Revised Municipal Code, specifically Section 23.02(2)(1)(a)(3), to modify performance standards relating to utility uses.
5. Public Hearing and Action on a request from ANR Pipeline Company for a conditional use permit amendment to relocate an accessory structure at 600 Wilshire Boulevard North (Parcel ID 281240821440002).
6. Public Hearing and Action on a request from the City of Stevens Point to Amend Chapter 23, Zoning Code, of the Revised Municipal Code, specifically Section 23.02(2)(f), to modify uses, performances standards, and design guidelines within the “B-TID5” overlay district.
7. Comprehensive Plan Update.
8. Zoning Code Rewrite.
9. Request from the Redevelopment Authority of the City of Stevens Point to purchase 1013 Second Street and 1016 Third Street (Parcel IDs 281240832200418 and 281240832200414).
10. Community Development Department Monthly Report for June 2018 (*to be supplied after the end of the month*).
11. Director’s Update.
12. Adjourn.

1. Roll call.

Present: Wiza, Kneebone, Arntsen, Haines, Hoppe, Cooper

Excused: Rice

Discussion and possible action on the following:

2. Report of the June 4, 2018 meeting.

Motion by Commissioner Cooper to approve the report of the June 4, 2018 Plan Commission meeting; seconded by Commissioner Haines.

Motion carried 6-0.

3. Public Hearing and Action on a request from Dan McKenzie for a conditional use permit amendment to amend the site plan requiring screening along the northern property line at 3349 Whiting Avenue (Parcel ID 281230805440007).

Director Ostrowski briefly explained 3349 Whiting Avenue had been granted a conditional use permit in 2006 for the construction and operation of an elderly housing project. One of the conditions, he added, had been for continuous evergreen screening on the north property line. The applicant had claimed that the landscaping shrubs had continued to die and had not been effective in screening, and therefore requested that the condition be removed or an alternative be sought. According to the neighbor's letter north of the property, a 6 foot tall fence would be preferable. However, staff found that a 6 foot tall fence may impact the existing natural vegetation as much of it seemed to overhang the property line. Staff recommended a 4 foot tall opaque fence stretching from the walkway on the west to the dumpster fencing on the east, in addition to carrying over other conditions from the previous conditional use permit.

Mayor Wiza declared the public hearing open.

Aldersperson Nebel (District Three) referred to the letter written by the applicant's northern neighbor where he had witnessed people cutting through his property and having noise be an issue. She asked whether the fence could be moved further into the property to accommodate the six foot tall fence without needing to trim vegetation. The additional height would also prevent people from climbing over it.

Dan McKenzie (3349 Whiting Ave), applicant, stated that they were open to any suggestions, whether it be a 4 or 6 foot tall fence. He did note that they needed to consider both the distance from the fence to the property line as well as the actual height of the fence. He explained that their snow was plowed to the north, and that the fence would need to be closer to the property line as to not cause damage to the fence. Maintenance could also prove difficult since they would need to deal with overhanging vegetation due to the potential height of the fence. They wanted the fence to work and be aesthetically pleasing for both parties involved.

Eric Niffenegger (3333 Whiting Ave), neighbor to the north of the applicant, stated that he would be agreeable to a 4 foot fence, but that it should be opaque as staff suggested. He would also be willing to perform the maintenance with the overhanging tree branches. In terms of snow removal, he stated that they should be pushing the snow straight down the driveway rather than to the north.

Dan McKenzie (3349 Whiting Ave) explained that they had to push the snow to the north as plowing snow down 260 feet of driveway with 2 dumpsters at the end could not happen.

Eric Niffenegger (3333 Whiting Ave) noted that a lot of garbage came with the plowed snow to the north.

Mayor Wiza declared the public hearing closed.

Aldersperson Nebel (District Three) stated that the neighbor's concerns within his letter, such as cutting through and noise disturbances, needed to be addressed. She noted an option to remove snow off-site.

Mayor Wiza asked Mr. Niffenegger for clarification if he would be agreeable to a 4 foot fence, to which Mr. Niffenegger confirmed that a 4 foot, opaque fence would be agreeable, adding that he would also be fine with maintaining a 6 foot tall fence.

Mayor Wiza noted his preference for the 4 foot tall fence in order to reduce the amount of vegetation that would need to be trimmed.

Commissioner Hoppe clarified that staff recommendations was for a 4 foot opaque tall fence stretching from the walkway to the west of the dumpster.

Dan McKenzie (3349 Whiting Ave) asked what opaque meant, to which Mayor Wiza stated that one could not see through it.

Aldersperson Kneebone hoped that the applicant would be able place the fence as close as possible to the property line for the sake of snow removal, especially since the neighbor was agreeable to trimming overhanging vegetation. Mayor Wiza confirmed that they could put the fencing up to the property line.

Dan McKenzie (3349 Whiting Ave) asked whether they needed to strictly adhere to a 4 foot fence, or if the neighbor and he could come to an agreement on distance and height, to which Mayor Wiza stated that a 4 foot fence would be the minimum that they would need to meet.

Motion by Commissioner Haines to approve the request from Dan McKenzie for a conditional use permit amendment to amend the site plan requiring screening along the northern property line at 3349 Whiting Avenue (Parcel ID 281230805440007), specifically to amend condition 8 as follows:

- 1. Installation of a minimum four foot tall opaque fence stretching from the walkway on the west to the dumpster fencing on the east, as indicated in the image below.**



Other conditions shall be carried forward from the November 2006 conditional use permit approval.

seconded by Commissioner Hoppe

Motion carried 6-0.

4. Public Hearing and Action on a request from the City of Stevens Point to Amend Chapter 23, Zoning Code, of the Revised Municipal Code, specifically Section 23.02(2)(1)(a)(3), to modify performance standards relating to utility uses.

Director Ostrowski stated that the current agenda item was connected to the following item, and explained that it had given staff an opportunity to look at some of the performance standards within certain zoning districts by utility companies and other similar uses. Often times they had utility equipment located within the Conservancy District, of which they could be on an easement or very small parcels, making it very difficult for needed structures to be placed upon them due to setback requirements within the district. The Conservancy District, he expanded, had a side yard setback of 30 feet, street setback of 50 feet, and a rear setback of 50 feet. These setbacks often times did not leave much property left, so staff wished to move forward with an ordinance amendment that would allow the Plan Commission and Common Council to

reduce those setback standards to no less than half of the current setback requirements for the Conservancy District. While the applicant had an opportunity to go before the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance, the rate at which staff saw similar requests made it more appropriate to allow the Plan Commission to approve the requests based off the lot in question. The requests would still come before the Plan Commission, and commissioners would see such a request in the next agenda item.

Commissioner Haines asked whether the amendment would apply to all possible utilities and utility infrastructure, to which Director Ostrowski confirmed correct, but added that it would not if it was in the right-of-way.

Commissioner Haines stated her disagreement in allowing all utility infrastructures to be granted reduced setbacks as it could include utilities such as a wind tower, a new pipeline, or a transmission pole. Were they to apply to limited size accessory structures only, she would agree with having the performance standard amended, to which Director Ostrowski stated that the requests would always come back before the Plan Commission for approval, but if the commission wanted to note it only for accessory structures, they could do that.

Commissioner Haines stated that they could look at limiting the size, especially when they started getting close to water or wetlands.

Director Ostrowski reiterated that the request would not grant an automatic approval, any change in reduced setbacks would need to be approved by the Plan Commission and Common Council. At the time of review of the request, if the body did not feel the request was appropriate, they could deny it and make it meet existing standards outlined for that district.

Aldersperson Kneebone noted similar thoughts to Commissioner Haines and expressed concern for companies placing their utilities where they want which could become a big safety concern.

Mayor Wiza declared the public hearing open.

Aldersperson McComb (District Nine), while noting understanding that requests would come before the Plan Commission for approval, still held concerns about the request, and asked whether structures would include items such as a cell phone towers.

Aldersperson Nebel (District Three) asked whether the amendment would apply to all zoning districts or just Conservancy, to which it was confirmed that the amendment would apply only to the Conservancy District.

Mayor Wiza declared the public hearing closed.

Mayor Wiza reiterated that each request would need to be reviewed by Plan Commission and subsequently Common Council.

Commissioner Haines stated that language should be added to clarify that only accessory structures may be approved for reduced setbacks, to which Director Ostrowski stated that the change would be agreeable to staff.

Aldersperson Kneebone asked whether building any structure would need to be directly related to operation of utilities, or if a company could just come in and build a garage to store items.

Commissioner Arntsen considered whether the initial setbacks helped to constrain buildings, and whether allowing reduced setbacks would result in over designing or building bigger than necessary.

Mayor Wiza stated that commissioners would have the opportunity to ask those questions at a time that a request was made to the Plan Commission for a Conditional Use Permit.

Commissioner Arntsen expressed concern over buildings potentially being constructed larger than needed if they were allowed more room to do so.

Motion by Commissioner Haines to approve the request from the City of Stevens Point to Amend Chapter 23, Zoning Code, of the Revised Municipal Code, specifically Section 23.02(2)(1)(a)(3), to modify performance standards relating to utility uses with the following:

23.02(1)(a)(5)

The City Plan Commission may recommend and the Common Council may approve reduced setbacks for accessory structures relating to a utility, pipeline, transmission line, substation, or generally similar use. The reduced setbacks shall be no less than half of the performance standard setbacks in the table above.

seconded by Commissioner Arntsen.

Motion carried 6-0

5. Public Hearing and Action on a request from ANR Pipeline Company for a conditional use permit amendment to relocate an accessory structure at 600 Wilshire Boulevard North (Parcel ID 281240821440002).

Director Ostrowski briefly explained that ANR Pipeline was looking to relocate a small 48 square foot shed further east and away from existing equipment on the small parcel. As mentioned previously, since pipelines were a conditional use, and the parcel was in a Conservancy district, the previous amendment that was just approved by Plan Commission would allow for the reduction in setbacks needed to move the shed. Staff recommend approval with conditions outlined in the staff report.

Mayor Wiza declared the public hearing open.

Aldersperson Morrow (District Eleven) stated that he had no concerns with the request, nor had he heard of any concerns from the area.

Mayor Wiza declared the public hearing closed.

Commissioner Arntsen asked whether Sentry Insurance had noted any concerns, to which Director Ostrowski stated that staff had not been contacted with concerns.

Commissioner Arntsen asked whether they had been notified, to which it was clarified that they had, with Aldersperson Morrow adding that residents in the area, as well as himself, had also received the notice.

Motion by Commissioner Cooper to approve the request from ANR Pipeline Company for a conditional use permit amendment to relocate an accessory structure at 600 Wilshire Boulevard North (Parcel ID 281240821440002) with the following conditions:

1. **Applicable building codes shall be met.**
2. **A building permit shall be obtained.**
3. **Minor changes may be approved by staff.**

seconded by Aldersperson Kneebone.

Motion carried 6-0.

6. Public Hearing and Action on a request from the City of Stevens Point to Amend Chapter 23, Zoning Code, of the Revised Municipal Code, specifically Section 23.02(2)(f), to modify uses, performances standards, and design guidelines within the "B-TID5" overlay district.

Director Ostrowski explained that the City had interviewed consultants to produce master plans for both the Downtown area and Division Street corridor. Recognizing that there may be potential changes in Division Street becoming more urban, they had created the B-TID5 overlay district shortly after the TIF District was created. The B-TID5 overlay district stretches approximately from Fourth Avenue all the way up to Sentry's property to the north, with the intent to allow some reduced setbacks to make buildings closer to the street which in turn would make a more urbanized street frontage along the corridor. However, those requirements came in through a conditional use request that was involuntary, not as a requirement. He explained that this resulted in an unharmonious look along the street frontage as some buildings were set back quite a bit, and some were along the street frontage. The proposed amendment to the Zoning Code would not only make the reduced setbacks a requirement in order to pull the buildings closer to the street, but it would also outline intent, eliminate some parking requirements, allow mixed uses, and increase density, all in an attempt to move forward with making the Division Street corridor a more urbanized area. Due to the uniqueness of the corridor, they would also require a site, building, and landscaping review by the Plan Commission and Common Council to make sure they were meeting the general guiding principles currently within the Zoning Code.

Commissioner Arntsen asked for clarification on whether the goal or idea was to get the entire parcel built up with a structure. If a 5 feet ring was left around the lot, it wouldn't leave much room for landscaping or other items.

Mayor Wiza stated that the goal was to move the buildings closer to the street. Several people, including alders, he added, had talked about that vision for the Division Street corridor, as moving them closer to the street would provide greater walkability and a neighborhood type feel rather than having expansive parking lots followed by buildings.

Director Ostrowski stated that often times the lots were not built up entirely, and the much larger lots could leave the appropriate setbacks under the current ordinance. However, the current 25 foot street yard setback pushed those buildings further to the back of the site which reduced walkability and pedestrian friendliness. The goal was to put an emphasis on pedestrian connection to the street which was a prominent approach throughout many communities.

Commissioner Arntsen stated that he could see where having a 5 foot setback for the front would be good, but was not clear on the benefits to reduced setbacks on the sides or rear.

Director Ostrowski stated for clarified that the performance standard they would use would be for the front street yard setback only, and if they wanted to reduce it or make it greater, the conditional use process would be triggered.

Mayor Wiza declared the public hearing open.

Aldersperson Dugan (District Eight) commended staff on moving forward with the request. She mirrored Commissioner Arntsen's concern about only having 5 feet to work with, adding that while the reasoning and idea was excellent, the area for landscaping seemed narrow.

Aldersperson Nebel (District Three) noted her appreciation on all the work that was done on moving forward with the request, and also expressed concern for the lack of front space that would be left for green areas.

Aldersperson Jennings (District One) thanked staff for their work on the request, adding that it would help establish a solid foundation for the area moving forward. In terms of the green space, she explained that while 5 feet seemed small, it did work as green spaces could also be elements between or behind buildings, or in medians with potential roadway changes. She also questioned whether the Common Council or Plan Commission should be the bodies to determine the lot width and area density, as a future commission and

council could end up back stepping if it wasn't anchored in the Zoning Code or Comprehensive Plan. She hoped that the Plan Commission would accept the request, noting that the time to move forward was now.

Aldersperson McComb (District Nine) recounted a personal story where she spent time in Italy, noting that the smaller towns were very walkable and enjoyable regardless of limited green space. A lot could be done with greenery in small spaces, she noted.

Trevor Roark (601 Washington Ave) stated his thanks to City staff and officials for their work on the request, adding that the ordinance amendment would help with transportation management, and assist in building equity. He questioned if the bike parking standards would be inclusive of the requirements, to which it was confirmed that they would be.

Mayor Wiza declared the public hearing closed.

Commissioner Hoppe stated that another way to break up the area and add greenspace would be to install trees along the sidewalk or street, similar to the existing Downtown area. Mayor Wiza added that they had a wide right-of-way to work with.

Commissioner Arntsen stated that having buildings closer to the roads could make it difficult to expand infrastructure and utilities in the future. He also noted that while landscaping was nice in the right-of-way, it would be an expense to the City to maintain it.

Director Ostrowski stated that landscaping requirements on the site would still apply with the standards.

Aldersperson Kneebone asked whether they should be more specific with Condition 6 of the proposed changes, rather than just stating that it should be appropriate and enhance the site.

Director Ostrowski explained that the conditions were general guiding principles, and that the overall zoning standards would still apply and would need to be met. As an example, if a parking lot was being constructed, there would need to be one tree for every 50 lineal feet.

Commissioner Arntsen asked for clarification on the wording of Condition 1 of the proposed changes.

Director Ostrowski briefly stated that it help define the boundary of where the street was, and they wouldn't want to potentially develop incorrectly where all the larger sites have already been developed.

Motion by Commissioner Haines to approve the request from the City of Stevens Point to Amend Chapter 23, Zoning Code, of the Revised Municipal Code, specifically Section 23.02(2)(f), to modify uses, performances standards, and design guidelines within the "B-TID5" overlay district with the following:

1. Changes to setbacks, lot size, and uses:

- Street front setback: 0 ft. ~~- 5 ft.~~, or 10 ft. if yard abuts residence district
- Side yard: 0 ft. ~~- 5 ft.~~, or 10 ft. if yard abuts residence district
- Rear yard: 0 ft. ~~- 5 ft.~~, or 10 ft. if yard abuts residence district plus an additional 3 ft. for each story or fraction above two stories
- Accessory building: 0 ft. ~~- 5ft.~~, or 10 ft. if yard abuts residence district



- Parking Ratios: ~~Per 21.03(14) Not required, but if installed, parking lots must meet the parking standards outlined in Section 21.03 (14), excluding parking ratios~~
- Lot width: ~~60-ft~~ As determined by the Plan Commission and Common Council
- Lot Area Density: ~~Per 23.02 (2) (d) 4. B-4 Commercial~~ As determined by the Plan Commission and Common Council
- Height: Per 23.02 (2) (d) 4. B-4 Commercial

- Permitted Uses: ~~none~~Permitted uses in the B-4 Commercial District, plus multiple-family residential.
- Conditional Uses: ~~permitted and e~~Conditional uses in the B-4 Commercial District, except that multiple-family residential shall be a permitted use.

2. Changes to general guiding principles:

1. Buildings are aligned and close to the street. Buildings form the space of the street.
2. Buildings oversee the street with active fronts as opposed to blank fronts. The first floor and upper floors should include windows as well as entrances. Wider entrances, door framing, canopies, and other techniques should be used to identify the entrance.
3. Property lines are physically defined by buildings or street walls.
4. Building facades facing the street shall exhibit a high level of architectural design. In no case shall the front facade of the building consist of a blank wall or a series of garage doors. Windows should play a prominent role in the facade design. All building materials to be used shall express their specific properties. For example, heavier more permanent materials (masonry) support lighter materials (wood).
5. Two or more story buildings are preferred over one story buildings.
- 5-6. Landscaping shall be of high quality and installed at a rate that is appropriate that enhances the proposed site and surrounding properties.
- 6-7. Vehicle storage, garbage, and mechanical equipment are kept away from the street and screened from public view.
- 7-8. Parking (not including on-street parking) should be away from the streets and screened from public view.
- 8-9. The building design is coordinated with the street space. The city may require the improvement of the streetscape adjacent to the property including installation of trees, paving, sidewalk, lighting, street furniture, etc. Street trees are limited to a list approved by the City Forester.
- 9-10. Safety: Buildings should be close to the street but should acknowledge their neighboring building setbacks. Safety of entrances as well as vision around corners should be addressed in the review process.

seconded by Commissioner Hoppe.

Motion carried 6-0.

7. Comprehensive Plan Update.

There was no further chapter to review.

8. Zoning Code Update

Director Ostrowski noted that they would be skipping Chapter 7 in the summary as the chapter itself would take one or two meetings to review in its entirety. He summarized the following four chapters within the Zoning Code and invited comment from the Commission throughout his summary:

1. Chapter 6: Adequate Public Facilities

- a. **Need to include specific and local Levels of Service in Table 6-1, Adopted Level of Service Standards.**

2. Chapter 8: Nonconforming Uses/Vested Rights

a. No comments were made.

3. Chapter 9: Administrative Agencies

a. No comments were made.

4. Chapter 10: Legal Status

a. No comments were made.

Director Ostrowski, in regards to Table 6-1, stated that an example for levels of service and standards could be items such as flow rates for water and sewer in certain areas.

Trevor Roark (601 Washington Ave) expressed concern for level of service standards being tied to only one mode of transportation or vehicle type, and asked whether they could expand the table to include different modes of transportation.

Director Ostrowski, in regards to other mode of transportations, stated that they would start looking at doing a complete streets approach for roadway reconstructions. When they looked at building new streets, he added, they would incorporate the different modes of transportation early on in the design stage.

Mayor Wiza reminded those in attendance that they were not taking approval on the agenda item, only comments. Approval for the document would be done for the whole document once all feedback was received for all chapters.

Commissioner Arntsen asked for clarification on level of services, to which Director Ostrowski explained that level of service was used to calculate roadway conditions based on a variety of factors. For example, if a developer was constructing a new subdivision with 20 new residential units, that developer would need to conduct a transportation analysis to see how the 20 new single family homes would impact the current roadway, if that roadway needed to be upgraded to handle the new subdivision, or what traits a new roadway would need to have in order to bring up the level of service.

Director Ostrowski briefly explained that Chapter 7 would be brought before the commission within the next couple of meetings. They could expect the entire document with discussed changes shortly after that, with another one or two meetings prior to potential adoption.

Commissioner Haines asked what Chapter 7 was titled, to which Director Ostrowski stated that Chapter 7 was titled Supplemental Use Regulations. Supplemental Use Regulations, he further explained, would allow them to add certain restrictions or requirements for different types of uses without needing to go through the lengthy conditional use permit process. For example, a car wash would be considered a conditional use. Rather than applying the same conditions for every car wash conditional use request, they could allow the use within the Zoning Code with the needed requirements which would allow them to move forward.

Mayor Wiza stated that they did something similar for the animal ordinance. Rather than consistently applying and approving the same conditions over and over, they adopted an ordinance that would allow the raising of chickens with minimum standards that needed to be met, but any additional standards would still require a conditional use.

9. Request from the Redevelopment Authority of the City of Stevens Point to purchase 1013 Second Street and 1016 Third Street (Parcel IDs 281240832200418 and 281240832200414).

Director Ostrowski briefly explained that the Redevelopment Authority wanted to purchase 2 properties in the downtown area to complete the acquisition of the majority of a block in order to perform site assembly. He further added that the Redevelopment Authority and City owned a number of properties within the block between Third Street, Second Street, Portage Street, and Centerpoint Drive, in addition to the former Lullabye site directly to the east. The Redevelopment Authority had reached an agreement with the Belke Estate to purchase the entire property consisting of the house, the storage shed, the lumber manufacturing facility, and they now had signed an option to purchase for the price of \$300,000.

Mayor Wiza noted that the Common Council had authorized the option to purchase the previous month.

Director Ostrowski further explained that the option to purchase would lock up the property and allow them to take the property through the process of legally acquiring it. Of which one of the steps would be for the Plan Commission to provide a recommendation to the Redevelopment Authority to approve the purchase. The Redevelopment Authority was currently looking at doing some site assembly to have a better block as they moved forward in redeveloping the downtown area.

Commissioner Hoppe asked for clarification if the area that wrapped around the block for 1013 Second Street was included in the purchase, to which Director Ostrowski confirmed that the properties from Third Street to Portage Street were included, minus 1001 Second Street and 1009 Second Street.

Commissioner Hoppe inquired about the strip of land between 1013 Second Street and 916 Centerpoint Drive, to which Director Ostrowski ascertained that the property seemed to be a former right-of-way of River Road where the railroad used to have a license over the property. If it was a right-of-way, he added, it would revert to the adjacent property owners which would be either the Redevelopment Authority or City.

Commissioner Haines asked how much acreage the City would acquire in total with the purchase, to which Director Ostrowski estimated approximately 3 acres, adding that the Lullabye site was slightly under 4 acres.

Commissioner Hoppe asked what the portion of land was west of 1105 Second Street and 0 Second Street, to which Director Ostrowski stated that it was right-of-way. He further added that the right-of-way, directions, and road connections were subject to change as they began looking at the master plan for the downtown area.

Motion by Commissioner Hoppe to recommend approval of the request from the Redevelopment Authority of the City of Stevens Point to purchase 1013 Second Street and 1016 Third Street (Parcel IDs 281240832200418 and 281240832200414); seconded by Commissioner Haines.

Motion carried 6-0.

10. Community Development Department Monthly Report for June 2018 (*to be supplied after the end of the month*).

Director Ostrowski briefly reviewed the monthly report and reported that the City was still trending about \$11 million more in value than the previous year with an increase in year to date fees as well. A majority of the code enforcement violations were due to grass or weeds, and improper storage of household items outside.

Mayor Wiza noted the steady increase in value and fees over the past several years.

11. Director's update.

Director Ostrowski stated that the end of the month Comprehensive Plan & Zoning Code Rewrite meeting would occur on July 23, 2018 at 7:00 PM in which they could most likely have Comprehensive Plan Chapters to review.

Commissioner Hoppe and Commissioner Haines stated that they would not be available to attend due to a prior commitment, to which Director Ostrowski stated that he would send out confirmations of availability to check for a quorum.

12. Adjourn.

Meeting adjourned at 7:12 PM