

Minutes of the Development Review Commission May 14, 2019

Minutes of the regular hearing of the Development Review Commission, of the City of Tempe, was held in Council Chambers 31 East Fifth Street, Tempe, Arizona

Present:

Chair David Lyon
Vice Chair Michael DiDomenico
Commissioner Scott Summers
Commissioner Thomas Brown
Commissioner Philip Amorosi
Commissioner Andrew Johnson
Alt Commissioner Barbara Lloyd

City Staff Present:

Ryan Levesque, Deputy Director, Community Development
Suparna Dasgupta, Principal Planner
Steve Abrahamson, Principal Planner
Diana Kaminski, Senior Planner
Karen Stovall, Senior Planner
Lee Jimenez, Senior Planner
Obenia Kingsby II, Planner II
Blake Schimke, Planner I
Dalton Guerra, Planner I
Joanna Barry, Administrative Assistant II

Absent:

Commissioner Don Cassano
Alt Commissioner Michelle Schwartz
Alt. Commissioner Angela Thornton

Hearing convened at 6:00 p.m. and was called to order by Chair Lyon

Consideration of Meeting Minutes:

- 1) Study Session and Regular Meeting – February 26, 2019

Motion: Motion made by Commissioner Amorosi to approve Study Session Minutes and Regular Meeting minutes for February 26, 2019 and seconded by Commissioner Johnson.

Ayes:

Nays:

Abstain: Commissioner Lloyd

Absent: Commissioner Cassano

Vote: Motion passes 6-0

The following items were considered for **Consent Agenda**:

3. Request a Development Plan Review for a 12,479 square-foot building addition for **BD B1 RENOVATION & ADDITION**, located at 1625 West 3rd Street. The applicant is Will Studio, PLC. (PL180295)
4. Request a Use Permit to allow a community garden for the **ERHARDT PARK COMMUNITY GARDEN**, located at 4003 South Evergreen Road. The applicant is Ryan Companies. (PL190012)
6. Request a Use Permit Standard to reduce the side yard building setback by 20% from twenty (20) feet to sixteen (16) feet for the **WULBRECHT-JOHNSON RESIDENCE**, located at 7918 South Juniper Street. The applicant is The Phactory. (PL190062)
7. Request a Use Permit to allow a second hand store for **ONCE UPON A CHILD STORE**, located at 1628 East

Southern Avenue, Suite No. 1. The applicant is Elea Capital Venture, LLC. (PL190073)

Motion: Motion made by Commissioner Sumners to approve Consent Agenda and seconded by Commissioner Lloyd.

Ayes: Chair Lyon, Vice Chair DiDomenico, Commissioners Sumners, Amorosi, Johnson, Brown and Lloyd

Nays:

Abstain: None

Absent: Commissioner Cassano

Vote: Motion passes 7-0

The following items were considered for **Public Hearing:**

2. Request a Development Plan Review for a new three-story multi-family residential development consisting of 11 units for **1436 S. TERRACE ROAD**, located at 1436 South Terrace Road. The applicant is Gammage & Burnham P.L.C. (PL190025)

PRESENTATION BY APPLICANT:

Ms. Manjula Vaz, Gammage & Burnham, gave a brief introduction then turned the presentation over to Brian Stark, architect with Local Studio, LLC. He went over the site layout and explained how they are buffering the project with trees. The doors on either side of the structure will support the patios. Vice Chair DiDomenico inquired about the white section at the top edge of the structure and was advised it was a door in a fixed position to block the glass from the sun exposure. Vice Chair DiDomenico also enquired how these structures are going to be livable (cooled and insulated) since it is basically a steel box in Arizona. Mr. Stark stated that they have foam on the walls for insulation. Chair Lyon said that in the drawings he could see the units had insulated floors but could not tell if the ceilings were insulated. He inquired about how that would allow the unit to cool. Mr. Stark advised that the entire inside of the container is insulated. Mr. Stark said their issues at the beginning were more of a condensation issue as the units were so tight. If an occupant took a shower the windows would bead up because there was no air exchange. They mitigated that by having an exhaust fan pull in outside air. This runs about every 20 minutes. Chair Lyon asked Mr. Stark to briefly explain why they chose to use shipping containers and what the recycling benefit was of that. Mr. Stark stated that there are thousands of shipping containers left at the ports in Long Beach, CA. The containers come to the ports but do not necessarily leave. It is costly to break the containers down and ship them back. When they purchase these containers, they always choose the ones that are cargo worthy but are about to be retired out of service. By reusing these containers instead of purchasing brand new ones they are able to reduce carbon footprint. Regarding the trees, Commissioner Amorosi felt that adding chaste trees would be better as it would add a contrast of color and asked why they were doing away with using them. Ms. Vaz stated that they were looking for more symmetry with the landscaping, so they stuck with a greenish palette. Commissioner Amorosi asked if the citrus trees were going to be edible, not just ornamental and Ms. Vaz indicated that they would be edible. Commissioner Sumners noted that he did not see any doors on the bedrooms in the plans. Mr. Stark stated that due to the size of the units they did not put doors on the bedrooms to help with the openness of the space. Also, since they can centralize the A/C unit and blow out in both directions they are able to air out the whole unit. Having the doors open on both sides also creates passive air to move through the unit. Since the units only have one bedroom that has not been an issue so far. Commissioner Brown asked if the teak wood on the building was recycled or was it reclaimed. Mr. Stark stated this teak was from Indonesia where they take used material and create engineered floors or pieces of wood with it. Commissioner Brown asked if the A/C units would be out of view. Mr. Stark confirmed that the A/C units as well as the sprinklers would be out of view. Commissioner Brown asked if the units were rentals or for sale and what is the price range. Mr. Stark clarified that they are rentals, but at this time did not know what the price will be as they do not know what market rate will be used. Commissioner Lloyd stated she liked the concept, the look, and the use of recycled materials but she was curious about the location as it does not tie into surrounding structures. Mr. Stark indicated that this location is by railroad tracks so trains with similar containers would pass by. Also, he feels the scale of the structure fits with the neighborhood. Ms. Vaz indicated this site is also right next to the planned Tempe Micro Estates project. Once both projects are completed it will look more compatible in scale and density. Commissioner Johnson stated he really liked this project and is happy Tempe is getting one of these

projects, however he is disappointed that because of the location not many people will get to see it. He would have preferred it be in a more prominent area like Apache and Mill.

PUBLIC COMMENT: NONE

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

Ms. Karen Stovall, Senior Planner, stated that the applicant went over the main items and she did not have much more to add. She did indicate that a neighborhood meeting was not required for this project and they did not receive any feedback from the public. She recommends the project for approval subject to the stipulations in the staff report.

COMMENTS AND DISCUSSION FROM THE COMMISSION: NONE

Motion: Motion made by Commissioner Lloyd to approve **PL190025** and seconded by Commissioner Johnson.

Ayes: Chair Lyon, Vice Chair DiDomenico, Commissioners Sumners, Amorosi, Johnson, Brown and Lloyd

Nays:

Abstain: None

Absent: Commissioner Cassano

Vote: Motion passes 7-0

5. Request two (2) Use Permits to allow restaurant uses and general retail and service uses for **CIRCA '78**, located at 1803 East Rio Salado Parkway. The applicant is DA-OB, LLC. (**PL190061**)

PRESENTATION BY APPLICANT:

Mr. Mark Davis introduced himself and gave an overview of the project. The area where the property is located is surrounded by retail and restaurants. The property was built 1978 and they want to bring it up to current standards by way of Tempe's Adaptive Reuse Ordinance. They are going to add more parking on the south side of the property and new site lighting around the property for safer conditions. They will activate the street front by adding store fronts and patios to the front. With regard to landscaping, the site currently has three palm trees. They will be adding a full landscape program. Mr. Davis stated that staff had requested modifications to the project as stated in Condition No. 6 and he requested that this condition be removed. Since the adjacent buildings surrounding the property are basically windowless, he does not feel this condition is necessary. Mr. Davis has worked with a couple of muralists to develop an art installation on the east portion of the north façade. By keeping the canopy off of that top area, it feels more welcoming for a mural to live on. Mr. Jack Leonard, architect with Creo Architects, introduced himself elaborated on the project details with regard to the canopy and front windows. They only want to extend the canopy over the area with the glass windows. Due to utility lines, their landscaping is confined to the northeast corner of the site and a canopy in that area would not be conducive to the structure. With regard to the rollup doors, the front of the property that will become a restaurant will have glass rollup doors installed. However, the tenants in the back of the property would prefer the metal doors for privacy and to block out the sun. Commissioner Amorosi asked Mr. Davis if the dirt alley on the west side of the property would be improved upon. Mr. Davis clarified that was the existing opening for access and they are leaving it as is. He also stated that the \$50,000 it would take to regrade the third alley would take \$50,000 away from improving the property. This alley is used by neighboring businesses. Commissioner Amorosi indicated that he noticed there were only eight bicycle spots designated, when the requirement is eighteen. Mr. Davis stated that the size of the restaurant would affect the number of bike spaces needed. Commissioner Amorosi asked Mr. Lee Jimenez, Senior Planner, if he was okay with this. Mr. Jimenez stated that there is a condition to provide that many parking spaces and the final number will be determined during the building plan check. Commissioner Brown noted that there appears to be a 10-foot wide enclosed backyard for all the tenants on the east side which is a dead end. He inquired if there would be a door or gate on the north end so that people could get out on both sides in case of an emergency. Mr. Davis stated that the architect would be writing that into the plans. There would be a pedestrian gate on the north side. Commissioner Brown asked if the three overgrown palm trees would be coming out and Mr. Davis indicated that they would. Vice Chair DiDomenico questioned the appropriateness of an Adaptive Reuse Program for a building that is too large for the program. Vice Chair DiDomenico asked applicant why he feels a building over 5,000 SF should be eligible for the Adaptive Reuse

Program. Mr. Davis feels that the Adaptive Reuse is very geographically specific, and he feels it applies in this area. Commissioner Sumners asked if the neighbors to the south have been asked if these restaurant affects them. Mr. Davis said that several neighbors support the reuse of the project and are in favor of the improvements to the property. Commissioner Sumners specifically asked how the neighbors to the south feel about a restaurant being there. Mr. Davis stated that property is owned by a physician and he has not reached out to him. He said it is being rented out to a tour bus company at this time. Chair Lyon asked how deep the canopy is on the north side. Mr. Jimenez confirmed that the posts for the canopy need to be behind the setback however the canopy itself can extend beyond that. Chair Lyon stated that he was not comfortable with the fact that the applicant does not have tenants set up for the property or know what type of services they would provide. He agrees with staff comment that the property is not compatible with the neighborhood and needs to be more developed architecturally. Mr. Davis stated this was more of a scaled down project and staff asked them to dress it up, which they did. They are bringing in some modern colors. If he upscaled the property too much it would not support the market rents in the area.

PUBLIC COMMENT: NONE

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

Ms. Suparna Dasgupta, Principal Planner, indicated that staff was unaware that the applicant disagreed with condition of approval No. 6. She stated that staff does understand this is going to be a phased improvement and that as Tenant Improvements (TIs) come in, the door types will be evaluated based on the type of tenant services that would be provided. Therefore, flexibility is built into the language of the condition. They also want the entire building to have a different type of roofline given the new use. Given the nature of the Use Permits being requested staff feels very strongly that those conditions remain. If the Commission accepts the applicant's request for removal of Condition No. 6, staff would still request another condition be added that a minor Design Plan Review be required for the proposed artwork. Mr. Lee Jimenez, Senior Planner, recapped the applicant's request for the property. Since the project was advertised, staff has received two letters of support. Mr. Jimenez also had a phone and email inquiry, but no formal comment was provided. Vice Chair DiDomenico asked Mr. Jimenez what benefit or incentive the applicant gets by going through the Adaptive Reuse process and what conditions do they not have to comply with for ordinance or code by going this route. Mr. Jimenez stated that there is parking relief from the standard code provision with the allowance of utilizing the Adaptive Reuse Program, if authorized by the Community Development Director. Vice Chair DiDomenico asked if the application fees are less with the Adaptive Reuse versus standard permits or other savings by going this route. Mr. Jimenez stated that there are no provisions for reduced fees but since the standards and requirements are less for an Adaptive Reuse the cost of the project is most likely less. Commissioner Brown noted that the A/C units were not screened, and one was visible in the photograph. He asked Mr. Jimenez if staff would catch and correct this during the administrative design review. Mr. Jimenez indicated that the screening would be worked out during the building permit application as all mechanical units are required to be screened. Commissioner Brown asked if the sign in front of the building would be modified or completely replaced. Mr. Jimenez stated that was under a different permit process, so he was not sure.

COMMENTS AND DISCUSSION FROM THE COMMISSION:

Commissioner Lloyd stated she appreciated the applicant going through the Adaptive Reuse process and keeping the building and feels this would be a benefit for the area. Commissioner Amorosi feels Condition No. 6 needs to stay in and he would like to see the canopy come out even further. He would like to see the mural artwork on the front even if it has the shade screen over it. Commissioner Johnson could go either way with Condition No. 6, item A, however item B needs to remain. Vice Chair DiDomenico does not believe the area of the project is in need of an Adaptive Reuse and the incentives it provides.

Motion: Motion made by Commissioner Amorosi to approve **PL190061** as written including Condition No. 6 with the added condition that if there is a mural piece it require a minor Design Plan Review application. Seconded by Commissioner Brown.

Ayes: Chair Lyon, Commissioners Amorosi, Johnson, Brown and Lloyd

Nays: Vice Chair DiDomenico and Commissioner Sumners

Abstain: None

Absent: Commissioner Cassano

Vote: Motion passes 5-2

6. Request a Use Permit Standard to increase building height by 10% from thirty (30) feet to thirty-three (33) feet and Development Plan Review consisting of an additional 19 new three-story attached single-family dwelling units to an existing development for **THE ROOSEVELT**, located at 225 South Roosevelt Street. The applicant is Synectic Design Inc. (**PL170380**)

PRESENTATION BY APPLICANT:

Mr. Lance Baker, Architect with Synectic Design, introduced himself and gave some history on the project. The Roosevelt project was brought before the Commission in December of 2017. This is now Phase 2 with the addition of 19 units to the existing 14 units for a total of 33 units. One of the issues that has come up is the SRP irrigation line. It is very old and needs to be replaced. Applicant is working with SRP on this and it will be replacing the pipe and two irrigation structures at the developer's expense. Four units along the north side will have an easement in their backyard landscape area. There will be access gates for SRP to maintain the lines. The structures have been set up to keep the views to the interior to assist with the privacy for surrounding properties. Elevations match phase I in material and style, just with slight variations. Applicant is asking for a Use Permit Standard for three feet of additional height, as they did with Phase I, to add more interior ceiling height. There are 66 parking spaces required, however applicant has plans for 79 spaces. There will be ten full guest spaces which should help reduce on-street parking. Commissioner Brown asked if the properties are for rent or sale, and the applicant advised they would be for sale. Commissioner Brown then asked about roof access and applicant indicated that since they would not have any mechanical equipment on the roof there would be no roof access. Commissioner Amorosi referenced a letter they received from a citizen indicating the ditch/irrigation line was a part of the Bureau of Land Management and not Salt River Project (SRP) so they did not have the authority to move it. In the letter it stated that the developer tried to move the line to the north, but the developer indicated this never occurred. Their intention is to replace the pipe in the exact location it currently is. Commissioner Amorosi inquired if any structures would be on this and applicant indicated only portions of four units would have fencing that goes across the pipe. Ms. Diana Kaminski, Senior Planner, wanted to clarify to the Commission that this application is for the Use Permit Standard for the height of the building and a Development Plan Review (DPR).

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Mr. Merrill Darcey, resident of Tempe, introduced himself and indicated since this application was for two items he should get six minutes to speak. Chair Lyon asked that he keep his comments to three minutes. Mr. Darcy lives within the Riverside neighborhood and is also an irrigation customer. He stated that in the information packet for this project it stated that the irrigation line to the east of the property is abandoned but he said it was not and actually serves an acre of up to eight or nine parcels. They also want to put sissou trees on the property, but they have highly invasive roots that could damage those lines, so he asks that they be changed to live oak or ash trees. With regard to the Use Permit, he has concern regarding the noise coming from all of these units. He also does not believe they will be owner occupied, but rather rentals.

Ms. Justine Yates, spoke on behalf of her husband Phillip Yates, who is out of town and is also the President of the Riverside community. They are a neighbor to southwest corner of the project and have a lot of concerns with the density. They have condos next door and not a single person parks in their garages, they just park in the front of the units or the neighbor's property. Roosevelt is basically a single lane road and she does not feel the parking garages will be used for parking but rather ping-pong, parties, etc. She stated there should be a homeowner's association for the property that requires owners to park in their garages. There needs to be better screening landscaping to provide privacy for single-story residential neighbors.

Mr. Todd Green, area resident, indicated he was the one who wrote the letter referenced earlier by Commissioner Amorosi. He obtained the information by calling SRP. He stated the surveyor had a hard time determining the boundaries of this project and asked the developer to reach out to the property owners to the north, which would be himself and Ms. Acosta but they never heard anything from them. He also has concerns about the trees and screening for privacy. He claims the developer was the one to initially damage the ditch, prompting SRP to reach out to them. Commissioner Brown asked Mr. Green if he lived immediately opposite the ditch location and he indicated that he has the property to the north and he was supposed to be reached out to for a boundary conflict.

Ms. Marta Den, resident who lives north of the proposed project, expressed the need for better screening from view of the proposed project. She is also concerned with traffic. She indicated that Wilson is always full of cars on both sides. She said they had approached the City once before to see if they could make it, so parking is only on one side but after a survey was conducted it did not pass.

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

Ms. Diana Kaminski, Senior Planner, clarified that this is not a phased development. The initial development was done by a different owner, architect, etc. When the property was sold a new owner and developer came on board for the project under review today. The biggest issue is determining the northern boundary property line which was originally a canal, then an underground irrigation line. This affects the landscape plan, the site plan and possibly the Use Permit Standard. A condition was made to require a ten-foot setback. There is also a step back requirement for the property based on the increased height request. A condition has been added to address those units affected by the step back. Another condition is for the developer to obtain a verified sealed survey and a letter of agreement between the property owners to the north. With regard to the irrigation line referenced by a resident that is located on the Wilson side of the property, surveyors have gone out to the site but have had trouble locating the line. A condition has been added to give them time to further research this line. Staff recommends approval of the requested entitlements subject to approval of all the conditions listed. Vice Chair DiDomenico asked Ms. Kaminski if staff feels comfortable with the 13 spaces for guest parking. Ms. Kaminski stated they used a similar ratio as what was used on the first development to calculate spaces. Commissioner Lloyd asked if the parking rules that would be required in the CC&R's with regard to garage utilization existed on the previous, original development. Ms. Kaminski indicated that the CC&R's for the homeowner's association would apply to all 33 units, so they would be included. Commissioner Johnson asked if a stipulation could be added to have the developer work with the property owners to the north to address screening, possibly having the property owners add the trees/screening to their side of property line. Commissioner Sumners shared Commissioner Johnson's concern with the need for a buffer to the north of the project and is not comfortable with the uncertainty of how it will be resolved.

APPLICANT RESPONSE:

Mr. Baker stated that the only property line that is really in question is the skewed line to the northwest portion of the project. They are working with SRP to establish the property line, not move it. With regard to the adjacency to the other properties, this project is single family and the property to the northeast is GID which would allow a 35-foot height. Commissioner Johnson asked applicant if he felt there was a need for additional screening from this development to the adjacent existing developments and he indicated they are trying to mitigate any feelings of intrusion by the way they orientated the buildings and plan to landscape in that easement as much as SRP will allow them.

COMMENTS AND DISCUSSION FROM THE COMMISSION:

Commissioner Amorosi sees too many issues right now. He has concerns with parking being too close to the easements or on top of them. He also does not see the extra space that would enable the tandem parking locations. Vice Chair DiDomenico wanted to address the Use Permit Standard first. He does not have any issue with the extra three feet or the 10% increase in height. Vice Chair DiDomenico moved for approval of the Use Permit Standard increase from 30 feet to 33 feet. Commissioners Sumners, Johnson and DiDomenico discussed continuing the DPR to a later date to address issues regarding landscape buffers and other items of concern. A vote was taken to approve DPR as is, however it failed with only Chair Lyon and Commissioner Johnson voting in its favor. Chair Lyon then asked the applicant how they felt about continuing the DPR to a later date. Mr. Baker stated he would be okay

with the continuance as long as they get specific details on what items need to be addressed. Vice Chair DiDomenico inquired how long applicant expects it to take before SRP determines where the exact property line is located. Mr. Adam Baker, Synectic Design, stated they already received information from SRP for the centerline of the irrigation ditch. As shown the property line is based on Alliance's survey. The applicant has less property on their side and it gives four feet to the northern property, so they would not encroach in any way onto that property. Commissioner Brown stated the design has areas of concern that need to be addressed. Ms. Dasgupta asked the Commissioners to provide some specific design concerns they have to help staff and applicant understand and address concerns. Commissioner Brown shared his concerns with the flat roof and stucco, no roof access, parking, 20-foot driveways with dead ends. Commissioner Sumners wants a 10-foot setback with mature trees to protect the residents from the views looking down on their backyards to the north. Commissioner Amorosi had concerns about the density and also wants applicant to reach out the neighbors regarding screening. Commissioner Sumners wanted to reference the long drive in the property and is concerned that someone will speed down it and cause accidents. Applicant indicated the Fire Department did not want any speed bumps through there. Ms. Kaminski asked the Commissioners if they had any thoughts or concerns on the color palette. Chair Lyon stated he did not have any concerns.

Motion: Motion made by Vice Chair DiDomenico to approve the Use Permit Standard for **PL170380** and seconded by Commissioner Sumners.

Ayes: Chair Lyon, Vice Chair DiDomenico, Commissioners Johnson, Sumners and Lloyd

Nays: Commissioners Amorosi and Brown

Abstain: None

Absent: Commissioner Cassano

Vote: Motion passes 5-2

Motion: Motion made by Vice Chair DiDomenico to continue the Design Plan Review to a date uncertain to be set by the applicant **PL170380** to address concerns regarding property lines and screening for the neighbors. Seconded by Commissioner Sumners.

Ayes: Chair Lyon, Vice Chair DiDomenico, Commissioners Sumners, Johnson, Brown and Lloyd

Nays: Amorosi

Abstain: None

Absent: Commissioners Cassano

Vote: Motion passes 6-1

-
5. Request a Zoning Map Amendment from R-4 to R1-PAD, Planned Area Development Overlay and Development Plan Review consisting of 13 new single-family residential units for **TEMPE MICRO ESTATES**, located at 1443 South Rita Lane. The applicant is Newtown CDC. (**PL190007**)

PRESENTATION BY APPLICANT:

Mr. David Crummey, Newtown CDC, gave an overview of the project. The project will consist of 13 homes at 1443 South Rita Lane. Mr. Matthew Salenger, with coLAB Studio, LLC., went over the site plan. He stated the houses are very small at 560 square feet, except for the ADA unit which is 600 square feet. They are predominantly detached except for two houses at the southwest corner that are attached, and the ADA unit attached to the community space. The buildings are all one-story tall. The color palette for each property alternates to allow definition of each unit. Mr. Crummey stated this project is also part of the community land trust to provide affordable housing. Commissioner Sumners asked applicant to clarify homes that are for sale and those held in trust. Applicant stated that when they purchase through their community land trust it is similar to most financing however it comes with a shared appreciation letter. This letter states that you pass on your good price on the home to the next owner. When selling the home, you will get what you paid originally with about 25% appreciation, but the other 75% will go on as savings to the next owner. Vice Chair DiDomenico asked who owned the community building and the applicant stated that it would be managed by the homeowner's association, which will be managed by the property owner, Newtown.

PUBLIC COMMENT: NONE

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

Mr. Ryan Levesque, Deputy Director, Community Development, briefly spoke on the project and is looking forward to it coming to fruition. Ms. Diana Kaminski, Senior Planner, listed the conditions of approval such as a requirement for a public access easement for the parking drive to be recorded on the subdivision plat to allow public use of the drive as part of the turnaround and circulation. The offsite refuse enclosure will service this property as well as the 1436 S. Terrace Road container project. The first property to get a Certificate of Occupancy is the one that will have to get the refuse enclosure built. Staff are requiring that the two street trees be the Arizona Ash along the west side to provide maximum shade at the end of Rita Lane. Staff recommends approval with all the conditions proposed.

COMMENTS AND DISCUSSION FROM THE COMMISSION:

Commissioner Amorosi expressed his approval of the project. Chair Lyon agreed with Commissioner Amorosi and likes Newtown's idea of creating a sense of community and appreciates the simplicity of the architectural gestures.

Motion: Motion made by Vice Chair DiDomenico to approve **PL190007** and seconded by Commissioner Lloyd.

Ayes: Chair Lyon, Vice Chair DiDomenico, Commissioners Sumners, Amorosi, Johnson, Brown and Lloyd

Nays:

Abstain: None

Absent: Commissioners Cassano

Vote: Motion passes 7-0

Staff Announcements: None

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 9:11 pm.

Prepared by: Joanna Barry

Reviewed by: Suparna Dasgupta



Suparna Dasgupta, Principal Planner, Community Development Planning