

CITY OF PONTIAC
PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 6, 2017
6:30 P.M.

Meeting before the Planning Commission, at
47450 Woodward Avenue, 2nd Floor, Council Chambers,
Pontiac, Michigan 48342.

BOARD COMMISSIONERS:

Dayne Thomas, Chairman
Ashley Fegley, Vice Chair
Mayor Deirdre Waterman, Commissioner
Mona Parlove, Commissioner
Christopher Northcross, Commissioner
Lucy Payne, Commissioner
Hazel Cadd, Commissioner

CITY OFFICIALS PRESENT:

Nicholas Lomako, City Planner
Jane Bais-DiSessa, Deputy Mayor

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ADDRESSING THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Reverend Douglas P. Jones
Craig Cavarick (ph)

MINUTES RECORDED BY:

Quentina R. Snowden, (CSR-5519)
Certified Shorthand Reporter

1. CALL TO ORDER: Chair Thomas called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL:

PRESENT: Dayne Thomas, Chairman
Mona Parlove, Commissioner
Christopher Northcross, Commissioner
Lucy Payne, Commissioner

LATE: Mayor Deirdre Waterman, Commissioner

EXCUSED: Hazel Cadd, Commissioner
Ashley Fegley, Vice Chair

Mr. Lomako reported a quorum is present.

3. COMMUNICATIONS: (None.)

(Mayor Deirdre Waterman entered the Council Chambers.)

4. MINUTES FOR REVIEW: November 8, 2017.

Motion to approve by Commissioner Parlove;
Seconded by Commissioner Northcross.

(All eyes to approve the minutes.)

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

5.1 PF 17-24 Zoning Map Amendment
PARCEL NO: 64-14-31-235-019
APPLICANT: Reverend Douglas Jones
CURRENT ZONING: R-1 One Family Dwelling
PROPOSED ZONING: P-1 Parking

(Presentation of facts provided by Mr. Lomako.)

(Chair Thomas invited the petitioner to address the Commission.)

Reverend Douglas Jones, 162 Seminole, Pontiac, Michigan approached. He stated he believes that Mr. Lomako has done a great job of explaining exactly what they want to do. He stated based on the activities going on at the church, the extension of activities means they need more parking, and rather than have that parking on the street, which could create a hazard for kids going back and forth, they want to make sure it's a safe environment. He

indicated the idea is to consolidate the lots all together now and make it a paved lot. He stated he believes it increases safety; number two, helps them with the number of activities that they have at the church, since the church is in a growing mode; and then thirdly, just cosmetically for that area, he believes it will be a definite benefit to the community.

Commissioner Northcross had no questions, just commented that he has been through Welcome Missionary Baptist Church and at times it can get very congested, and parking is a premium.

Mayor Waterman stated she agrees with Commissioner Northcross. She believes this is a good position and shows certainly in keeping with the other things going on there.

Commissioner Parlove inquired how many additional parking spaces does the paving allow the church.

Reverend Jones stated 50 parking spaces. The total parking spaces that are going to be allocated will be close to 427, if he's not mistaken.

Commissioner Parlove asked if it incorporates lot D parking as well.

Reverend Jones stated affirmatively.

Commissioner Payne commented that the church is a beautiful building and she believes the additional parking and pavement will actually really enhance the entire community within that area, and beautify the church even more than what it is now. So thanked the applicant for coming up with the idea. She agrees with the safety and all of the things the petitioner put forth added to this.

Reverend Jones stated that there are a lot more people who are engaged in walking around the community, again the lighting on the church facilitates that and he just believes that being able to pave the parking lot extend the availability of parking is going to be a great asset to the community, as well as the activities that they have.

Chair Thomas stated he has no questions, but

commented that the church is doing great work, God's work, and so he believes this is taking care of de facto parking area that's not so attractive today and making it a good addition to enhance the work that they are trying to do. He stated he's in favor of the petition and proposal.

(Public hearing was opened and closed; no one approached.)

Motion made by Commissioner Parlove to recommend to City Council that the request of Reverend Douglas P. Jones to rezone Parcel No. 64-14-31-235-019 (more commonly known as 162 Seminole Street) From R-1 District to P-1 District be approved for the following reasons:

1. P-1 District zoning would support the logical extension of, and improvement to, existing accessory off-street parking spaces serving Welcome Missionary Baptist Church.
2. Off-street parking is compatible with adjacent development. Off-street parking currently exists to the north, east and west of the subject site.
3. P-1 District zoning is consistent with the aims of the City's Master Plan - that is, the conversion of a vacant lot for off-street parking contributes to the development objectives of one of the neighborhood's key assets - Welcome Missionary Baptist Church.

Mayor Waterman questioned the shared lot on the diagram B3 and B.

Reverend Jones stated he stated that's the shared lot by the hospital off of Seminole, to the northeast of the shared lot because they do share parking with the hospital. They have had that shared agreement under the former owner's North Oakland Medical Center Doctor's Hospital and so it is still open under OIHN. He stated that's the shared parking. He stated once they pave their lot it's going to establish them to have even more parking which means they will be using the hospital at a lesser amount of time than they do today.

Mr. Lomako had a point of clarification to the motion made and being supported. He stated the motion was made based upon the planning analysis and finding of facts presented.

He asked if the record could be clarified to indicate that.

Commissioner Parlove indicated the motion is made for the reasons stated in the staff letter dated November 17th.

Seconded by Commissioner Northcross.

AYES: Thomas, Parlove, Northcross, Waterman, Payne.

NAYS: (None.)

ABSTAIN: (None.)

MOTION CARRIES 5-0-0

5.2 PF-17-25 Zoning Map Amendment

PROPERTY ADDRESS: 1023 E. Walton

PARCEL NO. 64-14-10-378-012

APPLICANT: Bloomfield Alliance LLC

CURRENT ZONING: R-1 One-Family Dwelling District

PROPOSED ZONING: C-1 Local Business

(Presentation of facts provided by Mr. Lomako.)

(Chair Thomas invited the petitioner to address the Commission.)

Chair Thomas questioned whether this petitioner was before the Commission previously for a similar issue.

Mr. Craig Cavarick (ph) stated he is representing Bloomfield Alliance. He stated the property was rezoned twice to commercial in 2006 approximately and also in 2014. He stated they never came forward with the site plans after 2014 so those approvals had expired. He stated they then picked up the property. He stated they did not own the property prior, that they are under agreement to purchase the property at this time.

Chair Thomas questioned whether they're a builder.

Mr. Cavarick stated they are a builder/developer, and two of the majority of the partners of Bloomfield Alliance are acting medical doctors in McLaren Hospital and DMC Hospitals. He indicated the purpose of it, the intent for need and for use; and then Centennial

Home Group, they have done homes in commercial developments throughout southeast Michigan for more than 25 years.

Chair Thomas asked the applicant if there was anything additional he needed to add to the presentation by Mr. Lomako.

Mr. Cavarick stated there are a couple of things he would like to clarify. He indicated the red outline is one parcel of four that are included in this 2.89 acres, so initially the two parcels had been rezoned twice prior and then they have acquired the home adjacent to that and then there's also a large vacant parcel just immediately west of that also. He stated it would be the four parcels. He indicated the wetland that -- or the wet area, is approximate to the rear corner of the parcel. He stated it's adjacent to a storm drain or culvert that has been blocked and it's been many, many years that it's been vacant, has developed into a wet area.

He stated to address the wetland he did do a study by King and MacGregor. And their recommendation was that it is not regulated wetland based upon the statutes of Michigan. He indicated so they have had meetings with the DEQ and submitted an application for a finalized meeting to get a firm, in writing, definition of what the requirements will be, whether they determine it not to be a wetland, then it's up to the City for them to instruct the petitioner how they would like to deal with that or proceed.

He indicated as far as trees, they have done a tree study also and he indicated, as Mr. Lomako mentioned, they proposed a conceptual site plan of what they would like to do there and the details of the landscaping they will be providing more of tree resource allocation. He stated they also have acquired a couple of properties inside the loop that are vacant and open and there may be some landscaping opportunities to enhance the community as well through cross-utilization.

He questioned Mr. Lomako whether the site plan

was is in the packet.

Mr. Lomako stated they are not reviewing the site plan at this point, it is preliminary in nature, and that they found some flaws in it, so to avoid confusion, they kept it off the agenda.

The applicant stated they have had some active dialogue with the engineering too that they revised the access points where they would like those to be, some utility corridor, identified some challenges. He stated that may be part of what he addressed.

But he stated as they look at the area there it is a very high traffic boulevard. He stated it doesn't seem conducive as single family, as presently zoned. He stated he thinks it's conducive to a higher use. He says they have researched the area as a group from a medical standpoint, the people in that field are confident and want to have an owned and operated facility there that is medical nature. They have proposed a possible drive-through. That drive-through would be more oriented to a pharmacy type approach, not a mainstream but just a boutique that will service the community, not Rite-Aid, not CVS, nothing of that nature.

They have internally in the group discussed food options and those foods would be non-fast food, more of health food-oriented approach. He stated that summarizes it. He would like to clarify how they see the site going forward.

Commissioner Northcross stated Walton Boulevard is a lively street, a lot of traffic going by. He stated it seems like it's a good area for retail. He stated he believes when there was a public hearing there were some issues raised by the community at that time. He stated he doesn't remember exactly what all of the issues were, but he stated he does remember they had a very good turnout and some good dialogue about some things that they should be aware of.

He questioned whether they have had a chance to talk with anyone in the community about the proposed development plans.

The applicant stated they have not entirely to the neighborhood there. They have been waiting

for this quorum to see if there are any concerns. And he stated there was a lot of involvement last time, he stated that he recalled the site plan before was a pharmacy with active drive-through and fast food kind of approach, and he stated that's not what the intent is. He stated they have done a lot of development with those similar kind of projects and he stated they do tend to attract a lot more attention than some other lower impact commercial offices than have been proposed here. He stated they were not party to any of that back in 2014. He said they have only acquired the property recently.

Commissioner Northcross stated in his mind the approval of C-1 designation for the property would -- is beginning to be highly dependent upon what it is going to be used for, the special exception permit. And he stated he was hoping to see a little more description of what it is going to be used for. He stated it's kind of like saying "Okay, we think it's okay" without having the additional site plans. So he'd like to have more of the site plan to say exactly what's going to go on. He asked why they are looking at the redesignation, the rezoning separate from the site plan itself. He questioned why they aren't looking at them both together.

The applicant stated when they met with Mr. Chip Smith, they did have that conversation and they did present a site plan and he stated they do have copies of the most recent conceptual site plan that he would share if they would welcome that, but they were advised to proceed in the manner they're doing now by going for the zoning and when they come back with the site plan review, which would be the next step, that that is where they would have the opportunity to really direct them in how they would like to see that site plan.

Chair Thomas clarified that the site plan was submitted, but there was a flaw. He questioned whether it would it be fair to say they have zeroed in with specifically the type of use; it's just that the site plan has to be tweaked; in other words, as the Commission proceeds forward to try to make the determination as Commissioner Northcross talked about, are they specifically looking at a medical use/pharmacy drive-through, that type of thing?

The applicant answered affirmatively.

Chair Thomas stated so technically they could make a conditional approval, tying it to if the Commission so desires to approve it, it could be approved conditionally as long as the use was medical, whatever it happened to be, drive-through pharmacy.

Mr. Lomako stated they don't have to condition it. He stated they have the applicant's testimony on record.

He did address Commissioner Northcross's comments as to why there isn't a site plan. He indicated when they compared the application for the zoning amendment and the descriptions provided therein, it did not match what the site plan showed. He stated there was a disconnect, they were inconsistent.

He stated in the site plan he mentioned the sizes were different, the uses were different than were being proposed, and some of the requirements that the Zoning Ordinance required weren't reflected in the drawing. He indicated so they thought it would confuse people if you were to look at what was being requested and what was being drawn, there would be a disconnect, and further muddy the waters.

He stated should they be inclined to approve it with the understanding that the applicant wants to truly develop it in a medical way, then they would be glad to meet with the applicant, provide some guidance on how that plan should be drawn and developed in a way so there is a consistency throughout.

He stated the other thing normally what they like communities to do is to approve the rezoning before they get into the details of site plan review as well. He stated why should the developer go through the expense of site plan and analysis on the if-come that the rezoning might not be approved.

He stated oftentimes they ask a developer to just submit a concept plan without the sheets of the building floor plans and preliminary engineering and all of that just so they have a

clear idea. He stated but it is their call, that the inconsistencies were too severe to bring them all together today.

Commissioner Northcross stated it sounds reasonable. He stated there is some cost with the plans, and if we can't get past step one, no need to go to step two.

Mr. Lomako stated he agreed.

Mayor Waterman stated she does understand the reasoning and she believes it is reasonable that this land, this parcel, is not conducive toward residential and she stated it makes sense to change the zoning of it. She stated she does agree with Mr. Chair that she would think the zoning should be conditional. She stated as she recalls they did have that discussion before when they were asked to re-zone at that time and she had asked that that record be part and parcel to this evening so they could go back through the discussion that they had. She stated at that time what was proposed was a strip mall for that parcel, and one of the reasons the Commission felt it wasn't appropriate is because this corner also already has quite a density and traffic issues such that they have had to do some widening and some other improvements just to accommodate the traffic that is there. She stated also it was the subject of some discomfort and inconvenience for the residents in the area who have spoken about what should be on that corner. She stated she agrees in terms of conditional rezoning, particularly since having very specifically stated that concept is a medical office pharmacy drive-through.

Commissioner Parlove inquired as to the type of medical facility, whether it is more of an urgent care facility.

The applicant stated they have explored that. He stated there's a good need for personal physician as well in that area. He stated the urgent care is certainly something kind of see a void, especially with the high-density of residential in the area.

Commissioner Parlove inquired if it could be doctors' offices as an alternative?

The applicant stated even if it was urgent care, he doesn't believe it would occupy the entire area, there would be some other medical offices, perhaps dental. He stated also the pharmacy aspect of it would be a minor

component and then perhaps some food.

Commissioner Parlove questioned the outline of the red on the presentation.

Mr. Lomako stated that's a drafting error.

Commissioner Parlove questioned whether the whole thing is three acres.

The applicant stated it is 2.89.

Commissioner Parlove questioned whether that would be able to support several doctors in practice there.

The applicant answered affirmatively.

Commissioner Parlove inquired as to whether they have built other projects along the same lines of this type of facility.

The applicant answered affirmatively. He stated they have re-done some stuff in Rochester Hills and similar buildings constructed in southeast Detroit.

Commissioner Parlove stated based on the information that's presented about the trees, if there is any way to incorporate what's still on the lot within the plan maybe to make an atrium or something that allows some of the trees to remain.

The applicant stated they will try to maintain whatever they can. He stated although there's 70 inches that were subject to the ordinance over 60 inches, there are no landmark trees.

Commissioner Parlove commented that the health food aspect and coming back to what Mr. Northcross had said about the zoning, reading through what some of options are for the C-1 and seeing words like pawn shop makes her a little nervous to just give this a blanket approval as C-1. She stated she would not want to exclude something that would have healthful food as opposed to fast food.

Commissioner Payne stated that the petitioner had mentioned this was C-1 some time ago and it had expired.

She questioned whether this was a C-1.

Mr. Lomako he stated this is the first he's heard of it.

The applicant stated they were conditional. He has a couple of letters from James Sabo, December 7, 2006, November 30th, 2006, that the Pontiac City Council approved request to rezone the property.

Commissioner Payne stated she doesn't remember this being discussed as a C-1. She stated she does have concerns in regards to the area because the last time there were a number of residents that expressed their concerns that basically the business would actually be in their backyard when you finish, and all the trees that were serving as a buffer from the traffic and everything, and kind of dividing their neighborhood from all of the things that were going on, all of that would be gone, and they would be in the backyard. She stated that one of the things that she remembers it was going to be was a strip mall with a drive-through service.

She stated she doesn't remember if it was a fast food, but it was a drive-through, and one of her concerns was that there wasn't enough room on the property, that it would be a very short drive-through and the traffic coming through there and the way that the traffic would actually be blocked if they did have a number of people that are trying to go through a drive-through blocking that area of the traffic that's actually flowing through.

She stated she understands that a C-1 would probably be better because of the businesses going through there. But she stated she doesn't see a service. She stated she doesn't know why she's thinking it, but she really feels that the intent is to have a service there where things are being sold as opposed to urgent care or physician offices. She stated she needs to know what's going on there for sure.

The applicant stated he's open to those conditions. He stated they would like to have some ancillary services through the medical aspect, but that certainly their

intent has been vast majority of every square foot is going to be medical purpose.

Commissioner Payne stated she also is concerned in changing it to C-1 that the petitioner comes back and then they want to do something totally different than what the Commission wanted; And then all of a sudden the land is still stuck there because this wasn't the intent.

The applicant stated they're open to a condition on the rezoning approval.

Chair Thomas stated he believes that they have clarified that this is not a pawn shop or drive-through hamburger joint, that it is specifically tied to medical. And that as it relates to the drive-through area, they have a chance to look at that to make sure that there aren't issues. He stated in the past the residents were concerned about it being a strip center and there was pushback because they didn't know what was going to be in the strip center, but it was clearly not going to be medical.

(Public hearing was opened.)

Mr. Paul Sanchez, 1001 East Walton Boulevard stated his property is just west of the red line. He stated he would be a neighbor to this parking lot or whatever is there. He stated the wetland covers half of the vacant lot next to him. He stated he thought that stuff was protected years ago. He stated he's been there since 1977 and it's kind of his dream home. He stated he's 70 years old now. He stated he wanted another 10 or 15 years as is, but that may not be the case. He stated it was kind of deceiving where he sees the red line. He stated he's concerned about it being a methadone facility. He stated he thought Chair Thomas refer to there being a bar there.

Chair Thomas clarified that it would be tied exclusively to medical, away from any of those types of businesses.

Mr. Sanchez indicated he thought it was too close to the high school and middle school.

(Public hearing was closed.)

The architect approached to clarify the wetland

issue. He stated they did talk to the DEQ about the wetland area. He stated it's not in the database for FEMA at all, that it doesn't exist. He stated he spoke with the city engineer, about it. He stated the issue is because the area is low, water was sitting and that's why they requested the wetland to come and do the inspection. He stated also they are trying to minimize anything to do with the wetland. He did indicate that they did actually meet with someone from the DEQ, and put an application for preliminary discussion and review. He stated the wetland is very small. He stated this is why they are having a meeting with them so they can see what they have to do with the wetland issue; it's not regulated, it doesn't exist, it's just something that happened because it's a low area. So he stated they will of course will keep informing the City about the issue after the meeting.

Commissioner Northcross stated he see potential for the area to be developed. He stated he sympathizes with Mr. Sanchez. He stated he's starting to see the City starting to develop in some very positive ways, and looking for good development, but at the same time, looking in his own area and surrounding neighbors, there's a good quality of life with that development. He stated this might be a good time to actually have some dialogue with the developers about exactly what that's going to look like, the development, what it will ultimately look like once it's completed.

He stated he's very inclined to say okay conditionally yes go to step two, which would be to develop the site plan; that yes they will look at a conditional approval of the rezoning of the property from R-1 to C-1 with the understanding that if the site plan is rejected, then the conditional rezoning is rejected. He stated that would be his approach that he would like to see taken.

He stated he believes that would allow them to better understand exactly what the development will look like. He stated he would also encourage the residents in that area to look at this development.

Chair Thomas stated that assuming that this passes, and when it comes back, really truly look at being creative to create a proper buffer for Mr. Sanchez so he's not looking at a parking

lot.

Mayor Waterman reiterated what was said before and also remember from the discussion that they had when it came up before in a different guise to respect the development and particularly long-term citizens. She stated it certainly is something that is an appropriate consideration as they look toward what comes next.

She did ask Mr. Lomako if they were to consider that conditional rezoning, what verbiage would they put in there, can they make it to just this particular concept, or do they have to make it broader for concepts of this sort.

Mr. Lomako stated the Commission can accept the offer of the applicant that they will limit the development to medical-related uses and complimentary uses.

The applicant stated the majority will be medical, simply because they did propose a food kind of facility which would not necessarily be medical in prescription.

Mr. Lomako stated perhaps medical and supporting uses to healthy living.

The applicant stated that was fair enough.

Mr. Lomako stated the reason he thinks the Commission should accept the offer of what the applicant wants to do as far as a development is because that's what they have indicated in the rezoning application form. He stated that was not what was shown in the preliminary site plan that was provided in companion with this application. What was provided in the application was different. The site plan was a strip shopping center no medical uses related on that plan.

The applicant stated that in an effort to conserve expense, they did do some cut and paste from some projects of the same nature, so they were looking for a structure of the size of the building to be able to replace it. He stated they did name the project Walton Medical, so the intent is apparent.

Mr. Lomako stated they have the offer of conditions tonight they can accept and accept those conditions as part of the motion. He

stated they have that commitment on the rezoning application form, and that should give the Commission security to move forward.

He stated that should the pharmacy continue to be part of this, that would trigger the use to be a special exception use. He explained that means that when the site plan is submitted, they hold another public hearing and invite the public to look at the plan to make sure it's appropriate. He also said the Commission can attach conditions to the site plan at that point to make it suitable. He addressed Mr. Sanchez, letting him know there are a number of hurdles to his benefit that the applicant has to go through. He stated the City's Zoning Ordinance as constructed right now is a pretty good ordinance in terms of imposing those sorts of buffering techniques, lighting restrictions, sign restrictions, proximity of parking to residential that helps protect residential property owners.

The applicant mentioned also that when in the proposed site plan, they did continue to retain some of the wetland or whatever it is that exists there presently, so there is a significant buffer between the structure and Mr. Sanchez's home. He stated they will have some conversations and be neighborly.

Commissioner Payne stated she still has a concern in regards to the size of the property and the trees that are there.

The applicant stated some of the trees are in the center, the horizontal line on the north of the red line, there is basically a power line corridor that some of the thick trees are truncated. He stated although there is vegetation and there's a lot of vegetation, it's not healthy or beautiful vegetation, not high quality. He stated they would hope to retain what they can and have shown in the diagram around where the wetlands are as best they can to retain those.

Commissioner Parlove stated she would like the proposal to tie the request to the petitioner rather than to the site, so if something happens in the next phase that it doesn't move forward, that it goes back to or remains R-1 zoning.

Mr. Lomako requested clarification. He stated the applicant has chosen not to pursue rezoning under the conditional rezoning process like they did for the urban agricultural facility a while ago. They're going straightforward with a traditional zoning. If the rezoning were to be approved absent any stipulation tonight, he stated any C-1 use could go in there. He stated they can't extract or demand from the applicant tonight that this property be used for medical purposes. He stated that's called Contract Zoning and that's illegal in the State of Michigan. He stated they can accept the offer as a condition of getting this approved tonight that it will be used for medical facilities primarily and supporting uses to that. He stated that's why they suggested should anybody want to frame a motion that it lead with language such as that in consideration of the findings of fact contained in staff's letter, and in recognition that we accept the applicant's offer that he will develop this exclusively for medical and related uses, that we recommend approval to the rezoning, something to that effect. He stated other than that they would be in legal trouble.

Commissioner Parlove made a motion to recommend to the City Council that the request of Bloomfield Alliance LLC to rezone approximately 2.89 acres of land (more generally described as Parcel Numbers 64-14-10-378-012/013/018/019 being that land area petitioned under Pontiac Case No. 17-25) from R-1, One-Family Residential District to C-1, Local Business District be approved for the following reasons:

1. The subject site's corner location with frontage along a major thoroughfare make it better suited to C-1 District development than detached single-family homes.
2. C-1 District development is compatible with the area development pattern. A shopping center is located to its east. Higher density housing is nearby. An institutional use (the Notre Dame Marist Academy - Lower Division) is located to its south.
3. The applicant has not provided any market data evidence that concludes additional retail facilities can be supported at this location without negatively affecting surrounding businesses. However, the apparent success and full occupancy status of neighboring Carnival Market Plaza strongly suggests there is market

demand for additional neighborhood-oriented retail, office and/or personal service uses here.

4. C-1 District zoning at this location is consistent with the City's overriding development objective contained in the Master Plan - to attract new office, retail, commercial and mixed-use development/redevelopment to the City.

Commissioner Parlove added to the motion to include Mr. Lomako's statement, specifically "In consideration of the findings of fact contained in staff's letter, and in recognition that we accept the applicant's offer that he will develop this exclusively for medical and related uses, that we recommend approval to the rezoning."

(Seconded by Commissioner Northcross.)

AYES: Thomas, Northcross, Parlove, Waterman.
NAYS: Payne
ABSTAIN: (None.)

MOTION CARRIES 4-1-0

6. SITE PLAN REVIEWS: (None.)

7. LOT SPLITS: (None.)

8. NEW BUSINESS: Proposed 2018 Calendar of Meetings; There was discussion to move the January 3, 2018 meeting to January 10, 2018. Motion made by Commissioner Parlove to accept the calendar; Seconded by Commissioner Northcross.

9. UNFINISHED BUSINESS: (None.)

10. OTHER ITEMS: (None.)

11. PUBLIC COMMENTS: Mayor Waterman discussed upcoming projects.

12. ADJOURNMENT:

Commissioner Parlove made a motion to adjourn; Commissioner Waterman seconded.

(All ayes.)

Adjourned at 8:03 p.m.

Minutes certified by:

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Quentina R. Snowden", enclosed in a thin rectangular border.

/s/ Quentina Rochelle Snowden, CSR-5519
QRS Court Reporting, LLC
800.308.0068