

**CITY OF NEWARK
DELAWARE**

**PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING**

September 6, 2016

7:00 p.m.

Present at the 7:00 p.m. meeting were:

Chairman: Alan Silverman

Commissioners Present: Bob Cronin
Jeremy Firestone
Willard Hurd
Frank McIntosh

Commissioners Absent: Robert Stozek
District 3 (Vacant)

Staff Present: Mike Fortner, Development Manager
Tom Fruehstorfer, Planner
Bruce Herron, City Solicitor

Staff Absent: Maureen Feeney Roser, Planning and Development Director

Mr. Alan Silverman called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:08 p.m.

1. THE MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 2, 2016 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING.

Mr. Silverman: I would like to call the September 6, 2016 meeting of the City of Newark Planning Commission to order. The first item on our agenda is approval of the minutes [of the August 2, 2016 Planning Commission meeting]. The minutes have been mailed to the Commissioners. They have been posted on the website for approximately the last six days. Are there any additions or corrections to the minutes? Hearing none, the minutes stand approved as posted.

2. REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION OF A MINOR SUBDIVISION FOR 357 PAPER MILL ROAD (CURRENTLY CHURCH OF THE NAZARENE) TO INSERT A LOT LINE BETWEEN THE EXISTING ASSMEBLY HALL BUILDING AND THE EXISTING CHURCH BUILDING.

Mr. Silverman: The second item on our agenda tonight is the review and consideration of a minor subdivision plan for 357 Paper Mill Road, currently Church of the Nazarene, to insert a lot line between the existing assembly hall building and the existing church building. Michael, if you will read the report.

Mr. Mike Fortner: Thank you, Alan. For the benefit of the public, I'm going to summarize the report.

[Secretary's note: Mr. Fortner proceeded to summarize the Planning and Development Department report on the proposed minor subdivision for 357 Paper Mill Road, which reads as follows:]

On May 26, 2016, the Planning and Development Department received an application from CDA Engineering, Inc. on behalf of Grace Evangelical Free Church of America, Inc. for the 6.94+/- acres at 357 Paper Mill Road. The property is zoned RD (one-family, semi-detached residential)

and owned by the Church of the Nazarene. The applicant is requesting minor subdivision to insert a lot line between the existing assembly hall building (proposed Lot 1) and the existing church building (proposed Lot 2), thereby creating two lots of 5.57+/- acres and 1.37+/- acres respectively. The subdivision will allow the Church of the Nazarene to sell Lot 2 to the Grace Evangelical Free Church of America, Inc., while retaining Lot 1 for Church of the Nazarene purposes. No alterations to the properties or buildings are proposed at this time.

Please see the attached CDA Engineering, Inc. minor subdivision plan and supporting letter.

The Planning and Development Department report follows:

Property Description and Related Data

1. Location:

The parcel is located on the west side of Paper Mill Road south of Coverdale Park and south of the entrance to Pine Brook Apartments on the east side of the road. A pie-shaped New Castle County parcel without street frontage lies between the property and Coverdale Park to the north.

2. Size:

The existing parcel is 6.94+/- acres. If subdivision is approved, Lot 1 (assembly hall) will be 5.57+/- acres and Lot 2 (church) will be 1.37+/- acres.

3. Existing Land Use:

Currently the site is the home of the Church of the Nazarene, which has a T-shaped church building fronting on Paper Mill Road, with an assembly hall, access drive and ancillary parking areas. The remainder of the site is grass with special flood hazard area (SFHA) lands along the western boundary.

4. Physical Condition of the Site:

In terms of topography, the site is relatively level but slopes consistently from high points along Paper Mill Road in the east to the flood plain area in the west. An accessway on the northern end of the parcel serves the current church and assembly hall. Should the subdivision be approved, the access drive will be part of Lot 1.

Regarding soils, according to the plan and to the United States Department of Agricultural Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), the site consists of Delanco Silt Loam (DoB) and Hatboro-Codorus Complex. Both are wet soils, but should not impact the proposed minor subdivision.

5. Planning and Zoning:

The 357 Paper Mill Road site is zoned RD. RD is a detached and semi-detached residential zone which permits the following:

- A. A one-family, semidetached dwelling.
- B. Reserved.
- C. Accessory buildings or structures, no impact, and accessory uses, no impact, including a private garage as defined and limited [in] Article II and subject to the special regulations of Article XV of this chapter, excluding semi-trailers and similar vehicles for storage of property.
- D. Cluster or neo-traditional types of developments, including uses that may not be permitted in this district, as provided in Article XXVII, Site Plan Approval.

- E. A one-family detached dwelling.
- F. The taking of nontransient boarders or roomers in a one-family dwelling by an owner-occupant family resident of the premises, but not including student homes, provided there is no display or advertising on the premises in connection with such use and provided there are not more than three boarders or roomers in any one-family dwelling except that an owner occupant family resident shall mean that the individual taking in nontransient boarders or roomers has a minimum of 50% ownership by deed of the property; and further provided that if more than two boarders or roomers are taken in, rental permits are required to be applied for and issued as provided in Chapter 17, Housing and Property Maintenance, of this code. In those instances in which there is more than one individual owner of a property on the deed pertaining to that property, and in which those multiple owners are not spouses owning as tenants by the entireties, said multiple owners, upon proper request, may be required to provide affidavits through the rental permit process, as provided in Chapter 17, that establish to the satisfaction of the city that minority ownership has not been created to circumvent any provision of this code.
- G. The taking of nontransient boarders or roomers in a one-family dwelling by a nonowner-occupant family resident on the premises, but not including student homes, is not a use as a matter of right, but is a conditional use, provided there is no display or advertising on the premises in connection with such use, provided there are not more than two boarders or roomers in any one-family dwelling, and with special requirements.
- H. Church or other place of worship, seminary or convent, parish house, or Sunday school building, and provided, however, that no lot less than 12,500 square feet shall be used for such purposes.
- I. Public and private elementary, junior, and senior high schools.
- J. Municipal park, playground, athletic field, recreation building, and community center operated on a noncommercial basis for recreation purposes.
- K. Municipal tower, water storage tank, water reservoir, water pumping station, and water treatment plant.
- L. Municipal sewage pumping station, and sewers.
- M. Right-of-way, street.
- N. Swimming pool, private; swimming pool, public.
- O. Temporary building, temporary real estate or construction office, and temporary storage of materials provided that such use is located on the lot where construction is taking place or on a lot adjacent or part of the development site thereto, and that such temporary use is to be terminated upon completion of construction.
- P. Utility transmission and distribution lines.
- Q. Public transportation bus or transit stops for the loading and unloading of passengers.
- R. Student home, with special requirements.
- S. No impact home businesses in a residential dwelling shall be permitted subject to special provisions.

RD zoning also permits, with a Council-granted special use permit, the following:

- A. Nursing home, rest home, or home for the aged, subject to special requirements.
- B. If approved by the council, property in a residential zone adjacent to an area zoned "business" or "industrial" may be used for parking space as an accessory use to a business use, whether said business use be a nonconforming use in the residential zone or a business use in said adjacent area zoned "business" or "industrial".
- C. Police and fire station, library, museum, and art gallery.
- D. Country club, regulation golf course, including customary accessory uses subject to special requirements.
- E. Professional office in a residential dwelling permitted subject to special provisions.
- F. Customary home occupations subject to special requirements in addition to all other applicable requirements.
- G. Substation, electric, and gas facilities, subject to special requirements.

- H. Day care centers, kindergartens, preschools, day nursery schools, and orphanages, subject to special requirements.
- I. Public transportation bus or transit shelters may be permitted subject to review by the planning department as to design and location.
- J. Public transportation bus or transit off-street parking facilities may be permitted for users of a public transportation service subject to review by the planning department.
- K. Swimming club, private (nonprofit).
- L. Accessory buildings or structures, with impact, and accessory uses, with impact, including a private garage as defined and limited in article II and subject to the special regulations of article XV of this chapter, excluding semi-trailers and similar vehicles for storage of property.

Regarding area regulations, a summary of RD requirements are as follows:

- (1) *Minimum lot area.* 6,250 square feet
- (2) *Lot coverage.* 50%; 25% for building
- (3) *Minimum lot width.* 50 feet
- (4) *Height of buildings.* Max three stories or 35 feet
- (5) *Building setback lines.* 15 feet
- (6) *Rear yards.* 20 feet
- (7) *Side yards.* 8 feet minimum/20 feet aggregate

Regarding RD zoning area specifications, on July 21, 2016, the Board of Adjustment granted variances for minimum lot width and maximum lot coverage for this project. Specifically, the Board approved a 6 foot variance for Lot 1 from Section 32-10(c)(3), which requires a minimum lot width of the lot be 50 feet. (Note: Since the Board of Adjustment meeting, the plan was revised regarding the width of Lot 1, making the variance unnecessary.) In addition, for Lot 2, regarding Section 32-10(c)(2), the Code requires that the total maximum lot coverage, including any buildings, accessory buildings and man-made improvements on the ground surface which are more impervious than the natural surface and which are used for parking and driveways, with some exceptions, shall be 50%. The current plan shows Lot 2 with a total lot coverage of 55%, which requires the granted 5% variance. With the plan revision and this variance, the 357 Paper Mill Road minor subdivision plan meets all applicable area requirements for RD zoning.

Regarding adjacent and nearby properties, the land immediately to the north of the site, as previously noted, is zoned SR (Suburban Reserve) in New Castle County and is, from a land use point of view, vacant. Beyond that is the City-owned Coleman Park, which is zoned Parkland (PL). To the east across Paper Mill Road are RM zoned single family homes and the Pine Brook Apartment complex, which is also zoned RM. Adjacent to the south of the site are RD zoned single family homes, some of which are rentals.

Regarding comprehensive planning, the Comprehensive Development Plan IV recommends single family residential (low density) uses for the site. The plan suggests densities of 1-3 dwelling units per acre for this category, which also would allow church uses proposed. Likewise, the yet-to-be-adopted Comprehensive Development Plan V land use recommendations are compatible with the uses proposed.

Subdivision Advisory Committee

The Electric, Parks and Recreation and Police Departments have no comments concerning this minor subdivision.

Planning and Development Department

Code Enforcement Division

1. The Division's comments are based on the 2012 IBC.

2. The Division notes that no changes to the buildings or property are anticipated at this time, but for informational purposes, any future buildings must meet all applicable Building and Fire Code requirements. In addition, any future buildings or structures will require complete architectural, structural, plumbing, HVAC, electric and fire protection drawings for review prior to any permits.
3. The cross-access and shared parking agreement between the parcels and memorialized in plan note 21, will need to be executed as part of the development approval.

Land Use Division

1. The Department notes that the pie-shaped New Castle County parcel could be annexed to the City to eliminate an island of County surrounded by the City lands and to afford the sensitive environmental features of the County property some protection. Having said that, the lack of street frontage makes it highly unlikely that the property can be developed in New Castle County anyway, and the applicant is not interested in annexation at this time.

Public Works and Water Resources Department

1. The Department will need to review the cross-access agreement before it is recorded to ensure stormwater management maintenance is delegated appropriately.

Recommendation

Because the 357 Paper Mill Road minor subdivision plan does not conflict with the land use recommendations in the Newark Comprehensive Development Plan IV or V; because no new buildings or development are proposed for the site and the existing buildings correspond to the development pattern in the community; and because with the variance granted by the Board of Adjustment the minor subdivision plan conforms to all applicable Zoning Code requirements, the Planning and Development Department suggests that **the Planning Commission recommend that City Council approve the 357 Paper Mill Road minor subdivision, as shown on the CDA Engineering, Inc. plan dated May 26, 2016, with revisions through August 12, 2016, with Subdivision Advisory Committee conditions.**

Mr. Fortner: That concludes my report.

Mr. Silverman: Thank you very much. Do the Commissioners have any questions about the report? There is no indication of any questions. Before I begin I see some new faces in the audience who have not been here before. What we would like to do is our procedure is to have the applicant make a presentation with respect to the application and then open the floor up for comments. Comments from the floor will be directed to the Commissioners, mainly to the Chair, and once the comments have been made by the citizens who are here, then the applicant will have the opportunity to respond to those comments. So I'd like to open up the floor to the applicant.

Ms. Sophia Tarabicos: Thank you, Commissioner. Good evening members of the Planning Commission. My name is Sophia Tarabicos. I am a land use professional at the law firm of Tarabicos Grosso. With me tonight is Colm DeAscanis of CDA Engineering, he is the project engineer, and several members, the property owners of the Church of Nazarene and Grace Church are here tonight. And I'll ask if you wouldn't mind raising your hands. Tonight we have Mr. Don Muzzey and Pastor Jonathan Mills from the Church of Nazarene. And from Grace Church we have Mr. Roger Todd, Mr. Lou Coxe and Pastor Greg Barrier. I don't want to repeat too much of what Mr. Fortner said. We do have a brief visual presentation that I think might illuminate some of the locations and the layout of the property as it currently is. So I'll just run through that very briefly.

[Secretary's note: During the course of her presentation, Ms. Tarabicos referred to a presentation that was being displayed on the screen for the benefit of the Planning Commission, Development Manager and public.]

As you can see, the property here, the Church of Nazarene property and the Grace Church, they share 357 Paper Mill Road. Currently there is a worship hall at the front of the property and there is an assembly hall in the back. At this time the Church of Nazarene operates in the worship hall along the front of the property and Grace Church operates in the rear of the property.

This is actually a zoning overlay to give you another sense of what the zoning in the area looks like. As was mentioned, this is an RD zoned property.

And just a little aerial here. Coverdale Park to the north, Pinebrook Apartments and the Newark Reservoir over to the east.

These are the two buildings as they are today. And, again, as Mr. Fortner mentioned, there is no change proposed to the physical conditions of the site. If this plan is approved, everything will remain as it is today. Nothing physical will change.

And this is actually a street view of the church. You can see the worship hall there on the left and you can see the assembly hall in the rear.

And then, again, this is actually an illustrated site plan. I thought it would be a little easier to see than a black and white plan. The proposal is to divide this property into two lots. Lot 1 will be retained by the Church of Nazarene, which is the current property owner. Lot 2, in the front, will be purchased by the Grace Evangelical Free Church.

The lot has adequate parking. We did receive a variance for 5% lot coverage above the 50%. But otherwise the plan is fully compliant. The appropriate open space is provided for each lot with this variance. And the appropriate parking is provided with each lot line.

Beyond that, I really don't have a whole lot to add to what Mr. Fortner provided. It was a lot of information that I probably would have mentioned myself but I'm glad he mentioned it as well. I'm happy to accept any questions that the Commission might have, or any members of the public. But, just to reiterate, this is a plan to facilitate a sale. It is not a plan for development. It's solely to facilitate the sale of Lot 2 from the Church of Nazarene to Grace Evangelical Free Church.

Mr. Silverman: Is there any member of the public who has questions? Seeing no members of the public who would like to speak, I'll open it up to the Commissioners.

Mr. Jeremy Firestone: I've got just one brief question.

Ms. Tarabicos: Sure.

Mr. Firestone: Do you anticipate any change in the signage?

Ms. Tarabicos: I don't believe so. If any of the property owners wish to correct me if I'm wrong, I believe everything is going to stay as it is.

Mr. Firestone: Thank you.

Mr. Silverman: I do have one concern I would like to go over. Because there is a common driveway shared by two uses, you say you're going to be preparing a comprehensive cross-access agreement?

Ms. Tarabicos: Yes, there will be a cross-access easement. There will also be a utilities agreement and a stormwater management agreement. They will all be prepared and reviewed by the City before the plan is recorded.

Mr. Silverman: And that will become part of the official City record?

Ms. Tarabicos: I believe so.

Mr. Silverman: Any other questions? Again, one more time, do any citizens present have questions? Let's move directly to the question, then. The Chair entertains a motion that the Planning Commission recommend that City Council approve the 357 Paper Mill Road minor subdivision plan, as shown on the CDA Engineering, Inc. plan dated May 26, 2016, with revisions through August 12, 2016, along with the Subdivision Advisory Committee conditions.

Mr. Firestone: So moved.

Mr. Silverman: Is there a second?

Mr. Will Hurd: Second.

Mr. Silverman: Okay, it's been moved and seconded. Are there any questions? Hearing no questions, we will move directly to the vote. All those in favor, signify by saying Aye. All those opposed, signify by saying Nay. The motion carries.

MOTION BY FIRESTONE, SECONDED BY HURD, THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION MAKE THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL:

RECOMMEND THAT CITY COUNCIL APPROVE THE 357 PAPER MILL ROAD MINOR SUBDIVISION, AS SHOWN ON THE CDA ENGINEERING, INC. PLAN DATED MAY 26, 2016, WITH REVISIONS THROUGH AUGUST 12, 2016, WITH SUBDIVISION ADVISORY COMMITTEE CONDITIONS.

VOTE: 5-0

AYE: CRONIN, FIRESTONE, HURD, MCINTOSH, SILVERMAN

NAY: NONE

ABSENT: STOZEK

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

Mr. Silverman: Okay, we are preparing the technical side of the next part of our meeting. While Mike is setting up, I'd like to remind the Commissioners that we have another project coming up with respect to the annual work program for the upcoming calendar year. So you should give some thought to the items that have been of interest or troublesome or you're aware of that we should bring to the attention of the Planning and Development Department and ultimately to City Council. We will be discussing that in the near future. Don't hesitate to put those in writing and send them to the Director. As we did last year, we'll put together a compendium and we'll whittle it down to something that could be reasonably done within time and resources. And that's my segue into upcoming special meetings of the Planning Commission.

3. DISCUSSION REGARDING UPCOMING SPECIAL MEETINGS OF PLANNING COMMISSION – MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 2016, 6:00 P.M. – ZONING MANDATED PARKING REQUIREMENTS AND PARKING WAIVER STUDY WORKSHOP.

Mr. Silverman: On September 19th we have the workshop that will begin at 6:00 p.m. dealing with the Zoning Mandated Parking Requirements and Parking Waiver Study. It will be a workshop. As you recall, parking waivers were a topic of discussion, along with parking

requirements, over the last year. We put it on our work program and this is the point at which we will hold the public workshop and gather information and continue working on the issues that were raised. Mike has put together a working outline of how we should approach this. It will be public workshop. I prefer if we conduct a public workshop on a less formal basis than our hearings. Depending on the crowd and the nature of the comments and discussion, it can be very formal or it can be very informal. This is an opportunity for the Commissioners to discuss how we're going to approach the issue and maybe some ideas of how we might circumscribe things, for example, like a parking waiver study, with respect to the scope of what we're going to hear and what we're going to include. Mike?

Mr. Fortner: Okay. Again, this is a draft agenda for the meeting on September 19th. It's going to start off with an overview presentation and an introduction to parking in Newark. And I'll talk a little bit more about that later, but I picture that taking about 20 minutes. That's my target. Assuming I'm not interrupted and I do the complete presentation and we don't have discussion during it, then we will have Q & A, and then the questions that we have, that'll take 10 minutes. Then we go into open discussion about action items and solutions. We'll have a public comment period and then discussion about what our next steps are going to be. What should we study and how should we move forward? And so it's just going to be about 90 minutes but, of course, it could go longer.

So then in the overview presentation, the thing that's going to take about 20 minutes . . . and this is a lot get into 20 minutes, I think, and I might have to scale this back . . . but I'm basically going to do a background of how the City got into parking. We're going to have a location inventory of all our parking. I'll be able to show the public lots, the private lots and the on-street. We're going to talk about the residential parking permit program and how that works, and some of the changes that are being planned for that, or at least being considered. We're going to talk about UD impact on the parking supply downtown. We're going to talk about the parking garage status. Where we are with that. We're going to talk about the parking waiver program. Explain that and the parking validation program, and the parking standards in the City Code. The idea is just to kind of give you an overview of everything that has to do with parking in downtown, so you have the general information for the discussion.

And then when we get to the discussion part, here are a few of the bullets that we're talking about. On parking standards, we're going to review the Kirsten [Jones] report. It covers uses, different kind of parking ratios, limitation of parking requirements, creating parking districts, the parking benefits district where the money that's raised through parking goes back into the downtown district, parking requirements for apartments based on bedrooms, and dynamic pricing. That's where the price of parking, particularly on-street parking, fluctuates for demand. And then electric parking signs that will show capacity in different lots and different ways to inform the public about where the parking is. And then valet parking or remote parking are some of the action items. There's some more too, and we're working on reviewing that.

And that concludes my overview. As Alan was saying, we could do it the way where the Commissioners sit up at the dais or we could do kind of a roundhouse thing, in the round, which is how I normally do workshops. But however you prefer it.

Mr. Frank McIntosh: I recommend in the round.

Mr. Fortner: In the round? Yes, I like that.

Mr. Hurd: So I guess I'll jump in here. So I'm working my way through, it's not Shoup's book, it's his student's book, I can't remember the name, but it's about how to analyze and develop parking standards. And the thing that I'm noting so far that I'm getting to the part where this is the steps you go through to develop an appropriate parking policy and parking standards process. The thing that you have to know first is what your current utilization rate is at different times of day. Find out what your peak is, where your dips are. That's something I think we need to get a handle on before we go jumping into parking districts, dynamic pricing,

etc. Because those things are all to help maintain a utilization rate that you have decided, through policy, to set. So if you said we want an 85% utilization rate in our parking lots and they're currently at capacity, then we don't want to add more spaces. Then we have to change the pricing. We have to do something to bring the number of cars in there down. But we don't have, that's a step beyond, I mean that's the policy decision that may not come from us but needs to be thought about. We also need to be thinking about, if we're at capacity, what's the effect of adding more spaces? What are the effects and what are the adjustments we can make and what are [inaudible]? It may be, I think, premature to get into revising the parking ratios or the parking standards with having that conversation in this workshop.

Mr. Fortner: I think we can give you some numbers on the parking utilization about how full our lots are. We've stated that numerous times and I can even go out and do some parking counts. We also have, especially on parking meters, better data now that knows exactly when parking meters are being used and not used, and we can see what we can pull of that. And also, of course, occupancy. We have some general ideas. We know it's full in the lunchtime periods. It's not full in the mornings. Lunchtime periods it gets full. Then it goes down and maybe fills up more in the dinnertime periods. But I don't know if they're necessarily always full. Weekends sometimes they can be full. So we can get you pretty good numbers on that.

Mr. Hurd: I think that data is crucial.

Mr. Fortner: Okay.

Mr. Hurd: Because it helps us, I think we have to sort of step back and ask what is the problem that we're seeking to address through adjusting the minimum parking requirements through the zoning process? Because that's sort of what we can do. If it's an issue of we don't think the developers are building enough parking spaces, we need to see if there's data that supports that, or whether the question is there's parking in the wrong places, or is there parking being used by other people? You know, trying to get a handle on what's the problem besides just there's not enough parking.

Mr. Fortner: Okay.

Mr. Silverman: Will, would that include work by Dr. Morgan? I know it's anecdotal and it's a snapshot but . . .

Mr. Hurd: Yes, I think all of that data is useful. I think that and the Haahs Study. Certainly the real-time data would be very useful to say what's the input/output? There should be some way to kind of say they come in the lot here and then they're going out. Because clearly, anecdotally, we can say as soon as the students come back to school, the parking lots are jammed. But is that because they're parking there instead of someplace else because it's cheaper? Is it because we give them monthly parking spaces? Is it because . . . who knows. We need to try to get a handle on that. Sort of understanding the data behind it.

Mr. Silverman: Anyone else? One of the things, when it comes to circumscribing the issue, this room could fill up very easily with people who are unhappy about parking in the big picture. And I think we need to make it clear in our own minds, and in the public's mind, that the purpose of the workshop is not a discussion of downtown parking problems, real or perceived. It's not a discussion of City traffic problems or congestion. It's not a not a discussion of vehicle/pedestrian/cyclist conflicts, with pedestrian crossings and bicycle lanes. And it's not a discussion of vehicle-related impact with redevelopment or development activity . . . are we bringing more cars into center city because we're redeveloping the properties?

I'd like to see the group, all of us, focus on an understanding of current City parking programs and proposals. And one of the two items that was bulleted was parking waivers. The Commissioners aware of my belief that waiver is totally misinterpreted by the general public. Meaning a developer doesn't have to do anything about automobile generation or lack of

automobile generation. There is just a waiver from the parking requirements. You aren't required to have parking. And I think that's a misnomer. And on that, I've spoken with Tom, who did a reading of the Code for me. Another set of eyes. And all of you have a copy of what's involved in the City parking waiver program. The word parking waiver is not used within the context of the Code. It's just the possible wording. And if you go back through the paper that I asked to be provided, you'll find that there are a lot of subtleties that are written into the specifications that an applicant has to meet. It appears to me that the purpose behind the waiver is to allow a re-use or continued use of an existing structure or a structure appropriate for the size parcel that's available. As we know, Main Street was originally a trail. It was a marketplace in Colonial times. It kind of evolved. It was a Victorian town with residential along the streets. Those residential units turned into taverns, storefronts . . . converted, extended, modified . . . but the lot size never changed. What had been an original house with maybe a septic system in the back yard or a cesspool . . . that's why the yard was so big . . . or a carriage house, is trying to accommodate 2016 kinds of uses. And I believe the parking waiver is a way of working with that. The specifications for the waiver are fairly precise. And maybe the issue is not with the notion of a parking waiver . . . I wish we could find another word . . . but the application of . . .

Mr. Firestone: Can I jump in just for a second just to seek clarification? From what we have here it says the off-street parking standards may be reduced . . . and there's a spelling problem . . . but it says reduced or waived. Which seems to suggest that the word or term waiver comes right out of the Code, along with reduction. I'm just reading from what you gave us.

Mr. Silverman: I agree, but there's no definition of waiver.

Mr. Firestone: Right, I just meant it's not an improper use. I mean it does have a Code base use whether it's defined or not. And so we can either reduce them or we can waive them.

Mr. Silverman: Agreed. Depending on circumstance.

Mr. Firestone: Depending on circumstance.

Mr. Silverman: But it's more than just a blanket waiver to the parking requirements.

Mr. Firestone: Yes.

Mr. Silverman: I'd also like to see the discussion focus on the standards that were adopted, so we all have an understanding of how we got here. You've heard Director Feeney Roser talk from time-to-time about suburban shopping center standards. Again, we've got a downtown district that was never designed for suburban style standards. Even our parking bays are suburban style, which generally deals with a blank slate of a piece of property and the uses fit the property. We don't have that option. Some of the literature we've mentioned talks of creating parking districts. That may be another focus. There are areas of the City, unlike the County and other jurisdictions, which have different parking standards for different geographic areas based on the intent and density of the uses.

So that's kind of the way I see this workshop shaping up. Kind of part education where we learn about how parking is handled and possibly providing information to the public so they have an idea how things are handled. I agree with Will that it's kind of premature, with maybe the exception of residential, deciding how many parking places are appropriate for a drive-up restaurant versus a walk-in restaurant versus a take-out restaurant. But there is some merit in looking at the impact of parking in our downtown area. Again, looking at literature, as much as 30% of downtown areas are taken up by surface parking. Oftentimes that parking is vacant. When I say vacant, the parking that is associated with a particular parcel or use may be sitting vacant at times but there may not be parking available in other spots. So maybe it's time to take a look at parking from an overall point of view.

The issues that get involved in parking are cross-access agreements, shared parking. There was a mention of valet parking. Some areas, particularly the commercial and restaurant areas, use valet parking, where parking is not an issue within [inaudible] available in front of the restaurant but you can stop there and your car is parked remotely for you and is brought back. I don't know if those things have been explored.

In doing some of my research, I found that the University of Delaware manages 9,200 parking spaces. The City controls about 600. And when I say controls, the City does not own a lot of the land on which it manages automobile parking. There are all kinds of agreements in place. So there's another factor out there. There are a lot of parking resources that could potentially be brought into the discussion. I know that the City, from time to time when there are public events, will work out arrangements with the University of Delaware to use university parking spaces for public events as off-street available parking. So these are just some of the things I'd like to see us consider when we're looking at the ideas and recommendations from this workshop. So there's just some of my thoughts. Will, do you have anything else?

Mr. Hurd: I guess a couple things. This goes back to data from Michael. I guess what it seems to me is that the City's lots and the spaces on Main Street are basically providing parking spaces for businesses that have not provided it in their lots through the vagary of development. For whatever reason, not every business on the street is providing parking behind it for its total number of customers.

Mr. Silverman: You mean on their own parcels?

Mr. Hurd: On their own parcels. So to maybe get a handle on what it is that we need to be supporting or providing would be some rough idea of . . . it seems like the Department is sort of saying you want to kind of call the Main Street a mall to determine parking. If we could have a sense of how many square feet of commercial space we're talking about and therefore how many parking spaces that would nominally require and how many spaces are in that sort of downtown Newark area. Both City and private. The unknown to layer on top of that is then, of course, how many apartments are in that boundary and how many cars and spaces would be attached to that. Just as a way to figure out is there already so many square feet of commercial space that there's no way to put enough parking to support it. You're already short. Or are we actually there but we just need to do better at moving it around. Try to get a handle on where we stand.

Mr. Fortner: That was actually my analytical paper from my grad school, where I first looked at getting a calculation of all the square feet of the downtown buildings and then just did it like individual where I did square feet. And when you do it that way, you come up considerably short on parking spaces. But when you look at it as a mall and then you factor out the apartment units and factoring other kinds of things like commercial and restaurants and all that, it came out basically about even at that time. And the numbers considerably shrank. And because downtown is kind of a shopping center type of thing, you generally try to park and then walk to your different stores, it's the same theory as a shopping center. But I can try to do some sort of rough update of that. I mean we have the basic framework but things have changed a lot since then. We could try to at least get you a ballpark of that.

Mr. Hurd: Okay.

Mr. Silverman: Frank, do you have any comments?

Mr. McIntosh: My only concern would be how far flung this discussion could get and that scares me a lot.

Mr. Silverman: That's why I'm looking for guidance from the group here.

Mr. McIntosh: Well anything that will shrink that would be favorable in my opinion. You have to be careful about how much you're adding. You added a whole bunch here. And Will is adding, and so on. You can only chunk out so much effectively. You would be better off having a second meeting. [Secretary's note: Mr. McIntosh adjusted the microphone to allow his comments to be better heard by the public.] You would be better off having a second meeting. I'll learn. My term is up in a year. You would be better off having another meeting so that you can get into the things that need to be done without having a lot of distraction. And I'm not sure how you do that, which is why you're Chairman and I'm not. But I think that it would behoove us to keep the meeting in a timeframe in which we can have intelligent discussion that is meaningful. And, if need be, I'd be willing to come back a second time. But it is an important subject and it should be treated that way. And we should just not be meandering through a lot of different areas. So I think you've talked to that, frankly, in your opening comments, that you wanted to get a handle on what it is that the public can expect and what it is that we as commissioners can expect. And I think we should do that. And I look at Mike's overall presentation there, the introduction to parking in Newark, and then I looked at what you were putting in there and I'd say that we're incompatible with 20 minutes. Even if you talk really fast. So what amongst those things are most critical for us to know and you should talk to those. The other stuff can be background material that you mail to us in advance of the 19th. So that's another way of handling some of the material. I just think it's important because we have, from time to time, gone on and on. And if you notice, when the meetings drag to, 9:00 p.m. is fine, 9:30 p.m. is less fine, 10:00 p.m. is really kind of getting obnoxious and by 11:00 p.m. no one is paying attention. All they're looking for is to get out the door. So if this is as important as we say it is, then we should do this in a way that we can have our best minds put onto it and put onto it effectively. And that's just my comments in general.

Mr. Fortner: Just to add on a little bit about what Frank was saying that may be helpful, you know there's a Parking Committee, as well. They haven't met in a while but Marvin Howard, the Parking Manager, is working on getting them back together. But some of this stuff, as you review it, you might want to take on some things as part of this project and then ask the Parking Committee to look at some of the other things and then even give a report back to you. That way you're not meeting to solve all of these. You have other groups that are very vested in parking. And so there's a lot of programs that they do like, for example, wayfinding, the signs posting how many parking spaces are there, working on the apps management of parking, which they may more effectively deal with. And you can focus on maybe what you might think of as land use. Big picture items. And so I think the meeting on the 19th can help focus that. You take the things we don't need to focus on and let's get the Parking Committee to focus on those. Let's focus on the parking waivers and what we're going to do about that, and parking requirements and the standards that we set for development.

Mr. Silverman: So do we want to allow the meeting to be the genesis of some of those bullet points?

Mr. Fortner: Yes, this meeting can weed some out too, but we're giving an overview to help you kind of decide. So after that meeting on the 19th you certainly would have even more clarity on that. It sounds like you have some clarity on that right now that will streamline this out.

Mr. Hurd: I think the thing that we can, where we're really involved in this is the parking standards in the City Code? That's kind of really what we're talking about. Do we have the right numbers?

Mr. Fortner: Do you want to focus on downtown or do you want it all?

Mr. Hurd: That's where the problem is, I would say. I think everywhere else you usually have the issue of a tight parcel that you have to squeeze it in. Even the Newark Shopping Center, for the most part, seems to have enough parking spaces at the moment. It's starting to get a little snug at times and so there's an issue there maybe whether they're using the right numbers too.

But I think specifically in the downtown area, the City has ended up in the business of parking to support businesses that couldn't provide parking for themselves. We need to have a sense of what's the right number. Because if we're at 100% capacity at times and they're not peak days, and for the square footage that we have, then we don't have the right number. Or we're giving away too many waivers. Or there's something. So then when we have the right numbers and someone comes to us and says I want to redevelop or develop this parcel and make it commercial, you can go okay, do you know what the number needs to be because we've looked at it and we've said this many square feet, this many parking spaces, and that's not enough, so we need to bump the number up or change it. That, I think, is the focus I'm thinking of. It's the focus on making sure that we're using the right standards or adjusting the standards to support when we're trying to dole out parking. I think to that end, looking at your list there, I would say I don't think we need to talk about the residential parking permit program if that's mostly in the surrounding areas. Or the parking validation program, I don't think maybe has as much . . .

Mr. Fortner: Well it's a downtown thing and it could be a key thing on parking supply because it impacts pricing because if you want pricing higher, you may not discourage people from going downtown if businesses are validating more effectively. That could help alleviate it for the customers, which we want, and keep out students, who we don't necessarily want parking downtown.

Mr. Firestone: I wouldn't throw out residential permit parking. I mean there are a lot of municipalities that allow an hour or two for non-residential . . .

Mr. Fortner: Especially with neighborhoods and how neighborhoods . . .

Mr. Firestone: Right, we may have a fair bit of extra capacity right up against the downtown business area that's not being really used by the residents. It would be good to have a better sense of how much that's being used and you can restrict those to certain hours. So you could make it so you couldn't do that in the evening but you could allow it during lunch time, for example. And that may allow some greater flexibility without the need to increase parking.

Mr. Silverman: And along that same line, the proverbial water balloon that if you start restricting parking in certain areas, it distorts the balloon when it doesn't have someplace else. And the residential parking permit controls how that [inaudible] particularly in residential areas.

Mr. Hurd: Okay.

Mr. Silverman: And then the parking validation program I think is important because that gets back to a cost-sharing between the operator of the automobile and the downtown business person who has some skin in it. As I understand the validation, there is a 50% cost sharing. If the City were to make a judgment to equalize its parking rates with the University parking rates, assuming that City parking rates are cheaper, people are going to gravitate to the cheaper area, but if they could equalize the cost, the validation, the cost to the merchant's consumer, would be subsidized by both the City and the merchant directly.

Mr. Hurd: I guess I saw that more of a discussion when we were talking about solutions and ways to affect parking capacity. Not so much a question of where we are now in terms of capacity and spaces. Unless there's data in there that says we use a lot of waivers which tells us that we have a lot of people using businesses or we're not using a lot waivers that tells us [inaudible]. I don't know, but there may be data attached to that that provides a better picture into how that program is being used or not used.

Mr. Fortner: We're [inaudible] the parking waiver program and we'll be able to present you information on that.

Mr. Firestone: I think we need to not get too deeply involved in this tonight. I mean we have this specific workshop that we're inviting the public to and, while it was on our agenda today, it

seems to me that the focal point of our discussion should really be in the informal workshop where the public is there and we've got the public comment period and we get the full presentation. I would agree that it would be good, maybe we don't limit it strictly to 90 minutes, but I wouldn't object to say in two hours we're out of there. And if we need a subsequent meeting, then we'll decide it. But I have no objection to putting an end time, which gives us a real confined time to make what progress we can make on that night and then see where we are and where we need to go rather than . . . because we could be there all night.

Mr. Hurd: I think a second meeting makes sense. It would give us some time to digest the data and get people thinking about things, questions back to the department. That way we can come back and sort of have an understanding of where we are and what we're trying to achieve and discuss solutions as a separate thing.

Mr. Fortner: I'm anticipating a second meeting. I mean at the discussion path forward 10 minutes is sort of like this is what we've heard. Let's get more research on this and we'll come back next month or something.

Mr. Silverman: What do you think about sharing some of this responsibility with the Parking Committee who can literally budget and implement the nuts and bolts of some of the ideas?

Mr. Hurd: Well I think once we have a sense of some solutions that are maybe not our purview but that have come out of the conversation, I think that's something we could send back to them. I think I kind of do agree with Frank. What we can do, what we should be getting out of this is an understanding of how are we going to adjust the parking requirements as defined in the Code.

Mr. Silverman: If we consider parking waivers a subset of parking requirements, then what should we work on for the parking requirements? Because you're saying the parking requirements should be this, but maybe we need [inaudible] for older properties.

Mr. Hurd: Right, I guess my sense is that we're reaching the point where there isn't capacity elsewhere for those parking spaces that aren't being provided [inaudible]. So now whether that's a question of whether we're asking for more spaces than they need . . . if our standards are too high . . . then people are asking for reductions to get down to the real number and it's not a problem because those cars aren't really [inaudible]. But if our numbers are right, and people are asking for a reduction on top of that, those cars that really can't park have to go someplace. And the sense I'm getting at times is that there isn't capacity for those cars that can't park there because of [inaudible]. But I don't have the data to support that. But I think with some data we might also be able to say we need to have some sort of limitation on the parking reduction program because there's no capacity elsewhere.

Mr. Silverman: On that notion of going someplace else, I have this idea that maybe some of those 9,200 parking spaces that are controlled by the University that are sitting empty on Saturday and Sunday and after 6:00 p.m. may be available to contract with the City where if somebody wants to run a private parking or the University wants to consider the revenue stream, it could make additional spaces available.

Mr. Hurd: So maybe the parking reduction process includes, you know, have they considered contracting for those spaces in additional lots or something. I don't know, I'm feeling very short on data to make any kind of . . .

Mr. McIntosh: I would concur with that. If you don't know what the problem is, you will not solve it, for sure.

Mr. Silverman: Yes.

Mr. McIntosh: And I think there's nothing more important than having the appropriate information for which to discuss and come to conclusions. There's nothing more important than that. And if people are forced to go out on edges of the parking area, I don't think they're going to go to that. I think they'll go someplace else and eat. And I don't think our merchants would like that very much. But for the time being, I don't know that we have the data, or if we do, it needs to be in front of us in an understandable way and then we can apply our good resources to attend to that in a way that makes sense. And before I forget, I've run many public meetings in which I always have an end time. I used to be president of the State PTA and I would say to them that this meeting ends at 9:00 p.m. and I don't care if you're in the middle of a sentence, I'm leaving, and that will end the meeting. So what happened was that people, as long as you enforce it . . . and I did cut somebody off in the middle of a sentence once, early . . . it didn't happen again . . . but they will adjust because they don't want to be embarrassed or whatever. And so you get rid of the riffraff comments and the comment that is outside of the discussion that should be taking place, and what you end up with is good discussion, solid discussion, within the timeframe that's there. And if it's appropriate, if you say well because of the nature of this meeting, we're going to go to 9:30, you make that decision in advance. But you stick to it. And people will confine their comments, in my experience anyway, which is somewhat extensive. And that has worked very successfully.

Mr. Silverman: Do we want to do that then? Arbitrarily I was asked when should we start this and I said 6:00 p.m., assuming there would be a lot of comments. Do we run the [inaudible] for two hours?

Mr. Hurd: I think after two hours it stops being productive.

Mr. McIntosh: And you don't have to go two hours, either. It doesn't have to end at two hours. So if you end it at 7:00 p.m., and the other principle of meeting management is ending early, because people love you for that.

Mr. Hurd: Yes.

Mr. Silverman: Bob Cronin, you have a glint in your eye.

Mr. Bob Cronin: Well if it's going to be for two hours, maybe we start at 7:00 p.m. and go to 9:00 p.m.?

Mr. Silverman: Unfortunately I've been told it's already been advertised.

Mr. Fortner: Yes, I think we had it at 6:00 p.m. I don't know what advertising has been done. Michelle, do you know?

Ms. Michelle Vispi: It's just been posted on the website, is all.

Mr. Fortner: So . . .

Ms. Vispi: I don't believe it gets advertised in the paper.

[Secretary's note: The Zoning Mandated Parking Requirements and Parking Waiver Study Workshop was advertised in the News Journal in print and online on August 23, 2016.]

Mr. Fortner: It won't be advertised in the paper so posting it, do we have to do, what, 10 days? It's about 12 or 13 days until the meeting. So if we can do it at 7:00 p.m., you prefer it at 7:00? If it's already stuck . . .

Mr. Silverman: Counsellor, do we have any problems with the fact that it's been discussed on the website as 6:00 p.m., if we change it to 7:00 p.m.?

Mr. Bruce Herron: No. As long as you do it within 7 days. And you're within 7 days.

Mr. Silverman: Seven o'clock then? Okay? Maximum of two hours?

Mr. McIntosh: Amen.

Mr. Silverman: Mr. Firestone, any thoughts on just the mechanics of what we're doing? Should we narrow our topics to just dealing with parking standards and waivers? And anything else is kind of out of bounds?

Mr. Firestone: I mean I'm fine with what was presented here and we'll figure it out as we go as to which topics we want to tackle next. And we'll hear from the public on what they think are the important topics. And then we'll make a decision.

Mr. Silverman: Michael, help me out here. The parking waiver is one of those administrative functions where we administer approval. It doesn't have to go to the Board of Adjustment. It doesn't have to go to City Council. We're the ones who approve waivers.

Mr. Fortner: Only in BB zoning, yes. Other times it goes to a variance. And so, yes, you get approval and then it can be challenged. Someone can challenge it.

Mr. Silverman: Any other comments? Okay, hearing none, we'll conclude that agenda item and move on to our next item.

Dr. John Morgan: Mr. Silverman, are you allowing public comment on this?

Mr. Silverman: I see no reason why not.

Dr. Morgan: Thank you. John Morgan, District 1. I would like to suggest possibly adding one item to the list on parking waivers, which I only recently became aware of. And that is whether the conditions under which parking waivers are granted are actually being enforced. For example, there is one restaurant on Main Street which got an extensive parking waiver about 20 years ago on conditions that its private lot would be patrolled/controlled 24 hours a day to keep out people who aren't customers. And that actually has not been done in the last several years and that leads to an aggravation of the parking problem downtown. There may be other examples.

Mr. Silverman: That's a point to bring up and probably refer back to the Parking Committee and the Parking Management for the City.

Mr. Fortner: We can look at the conditions on each of the parking waivers when they're applied.

Dr. Morgan: Right. I mean so if conditions have been applied but then they've been neglected in some cases, and I think there also has been, and I'd say I've thought about this a bit, and you could have a situation where a business opens saying it's going to be primarily catering to the lunchtime crowd, mainly people who work at the University and other downtown businesses, and they will already have parked their cars in University parking garages or elsewhere, and they'll be walking to lunch, 5 maybe 10 minutes, at most. And that business may be successful for several years. And then that business may decide that it wants to expand its clientele and it wants to bring in more people in the evening who will be driving here from a couple miles away. And the conditions under which a parking waiver was granted originally may no longer apply 5 or 10 years later. And I think that leads to a messy situation because the parking waivers are grandfathered forever, even though the business use may change on the premises. And, indeed, those parking waivers can be passed on from one business to another. And I think those are also issues that you may need to consider.

Mr. Silverman: I think you brought up another enforcement issue and there is an avenue to deal with that any time there is a tenant fit-out for architectural plans for substantially changing the interior of the building.

Mr. Fortner: Yes, it's in the plan review phase.

Mr. Silverman: We need to make sure that link happens.

Mr. Fortner: Well it's common and Planning Commission should never have granted a variance on certain terms that are specific to that business. But the main terms are they have to participate in the parking validation program. And businesses do, but they don't advertise it as much as sometimes they should.

Dr. Morgan: I guess I would also say on the issue of parking in City lots by people who aren't customers of Main Street businesses, a citizen of Newark who shall remain nameless once thought that that should be illegal. But, of course, it isn't. They're public lots. And, as a matter of fact, if a University student is parking in a City lot and paying \$1.00 an hour, the City is actually making more money than would be the case if a patron of a restaurant is parking there with validated parking. Because I believe the businesses are only paying \$0.50 on the dollar for the parking validation program. Is that correct?

Mr. Fortner: Something to that effect.

Dr. Morgan: So my point is that you shouldn't think about the students parking in City lots as an unmitigated problem. They're actually paying twice as much money toward the City as the customers of the businesses on Main Street. And I do think that this does help bring out the fact that any solution to the parking problems we have downtown must involve the active cooperation of the University of Delaware. And I would hope that there would be at least one high level representative of the University's parking operations present at any workshop you have.

Mr. Silverman: Mike, is it possible to extend that invitation?

Mr. Fortner: I'll ask Rich Rind if he can come.

Mr. Silverman: Okay, because part of your effort is to review what the City does with parking.

Mr. Fortner: I don't think Rich Rind has anything to do with the students choosing City parking lots. It's just students doing what's most convenient for them. They'll go to the most convenient place. I did a study on students parking there and so I can present some of that data. But sure, we'll get Rich Rind there.

Dr. Morgan: And it's not just students. The full professor who shares my office complex regularly parks in Lot 1 because it's much less expensive than \$800 . . .

Mr. Fortner: There's other services and visitors to the University. There's a physical therapy clinic there. I think a lot of people park in the Galleria lot for that.

Dr. Morgan: It's much less expensive than buying a University parking permit if you're only on campus 10 hours a week.

Ms. Carol McKelvey: My name is Carol McKelvey. I really want to applaud Mr. Hurd. We need data. Data comes first. I'd like to see a chart of where the parking is. A real chart that shows you the number of spaces and how often they're available to the public. We talk about parking all the time with no information. It's like, kind of, circular. And you've really got to get that data. And if you don't have that data before the 19th, you're just going to do it all over again.

Mr. Jim McKelvey: This is Jim McKelvey. The other quarter of the member of the public that's here . . . 25% right here. When I read the title of the workshop that's been advertised, I thought one thing. And when Mr. Silverman explained what was not going to be covered, I thought if I had come based on what I see as the title, I'm going to be very disappointed when he starts the meeting off saying this is the stuff that's not going to be covered. My recommendation is if you want to get a crowd here that's appropriate to the topic, you'll write your title differently, not just the hour of the start of the meeting. If you can do this legally, Bruce will tell us, in the time we have left. Because if you get this room full of people who all just want to come up here and say, "we don't have enough parking, I know I just drive around and around, I don't have enough parking," maybe 30 or 40 of those. It's not what you're looking for if I understand it. I'm thinking of an advertising angle that will get you the right people ready to have the right discussion. Thank you.

Mr. Silverman: Sir, if you would come up to the microphone and please identify yourself.

Mr. Albert Porach: My name is Albert Porach and I live in District 2. Could I see the next slide, Mike? The next slide please?

Mr. Fortner: Do you want the third one that has the discussion topics?

Mr. Porach: Yeah, one more. Dynamic pricing. Dynamic pricing. I think that's one of the most important things you probably should be discussing. What the dynamic pricing will do will guarantee that there will be on-street parking spots available anytime. In other words if somebody wants to go to the Iron Hill Brewery and they're willing to pay that price, they'll have a spot, you see. So I think that's very important, to talk about that and see whether that can be implemented and whether it can be effective. I've looked at the data revenue for Lot 1 and Lot 4. And the Lot 1 revenue follows the academic calendar at the University. Lot 4 is pretty regular over the whole year. So I don't know if putting more parking spaces in Lot 1 is really an effective solution for that particular problem. But I would look forward to this workshop and I hope we can address some of these problems. Thank you.

Mr. Silverman: Thank you. We've heard from all persons present. One hundred percent participation is a little unusual. Any other discussion on the parking workshop? Okay, hearing none, we'll move on to our other bullet point item on agenda item 3, the Capital Improvement Program.

**3. DISCUSSION REGARDING UPCOMING SPECIAL MEETINGS OF PLANNING COMMISSION
– TUESDAY, OCTOBER 18, 2016, 7:00 P.M. – 2017 2021 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT
PROGRAM.**

Mr. Silverman: Mike, do you have any comments on that item?

Mr. Fortner: No, this is just on the agenda to let you know it's upcoming. I don't have anything to report on it, just the date.

Mr. Silverman: Okay and we will be getting our packets beforehand so we can review them?

Mr. Fortner: Yes.

Mr. Silverman: And just a reminder this is part of our legal mandated responsibilities as Planning Commission, to review and comment on those Capital Projects that are directly related to the Comprehensive Plan.

Okay, is there any other business to be brought up before the group? If I hear no objections, we stand adjourned.

There being no further business, the Planning Commission adjourned at 8:18 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Michelle Vispi
Planning Commission Secretary