

**CITY OF BIRMINGHAM**  
**REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING BOARD**  
**WEDNESDAY, MAY 27, 2020**

Held Remotely Via Zoom And Telephone Access

Minutes of the regular meeting of the City of Birmingham Planning Board held on May 27, 2020. Chairman Scott Clein convened the meeting at 7:32 p.m.

**A. Roll Call**

**Present:** Chairman Scott Clein; Board Members Robin Boyle, Stuart Jeffares, Bert Koseck, Daniel Share, Janelle Whipple-Boyce, Bryan Williams; Alternate Board Member Nasseem Ramin; Student Representative June Lee

**Absent:** Alternate Board Member Jason Emerine; Student Representative Rachel Hester

**Administration:** Jana Ecker, Planning Director  
Eric Brunk, IT Manager  
Nicholas Dupuis, City Planner  
Laura Eichenhorn, Transcriptionist

**05-53-20**

**B. Approval Of The Minutes Of The Regular Planning Board Meeting of May 13, 2020**

Mr. Share noted a typographical error on page two of the minutes in the second full paragraph from the bottom of the page. He recommended that the capital 'D' before the word 'debris' in the first line of that paragraph be removed.

Mr. Share also said there was no need to specify that the meeting was virtual three times on the first page of the minutes since the fourth line of the minutes notes that the meeting was "Held Remotely Via Zoom And Telephone Access". He explained it was important to have the record clearly reflect that it was a regular Planning Board meeting like any other.

Mr. Jeffares noted a typographical error on page six, sixth paragraph down, sixth line. He stated that 'must' should be corrected to 'much'. He also noted that in the first full paragraph on page eight, third line, the word 'might' should be inserted between 'sun' and 'disappear'.

**Motion by Mr. Share**

**Seconded by Mr. Jeffares to approve the minutes of the Regular Planning Board Meeting of May 13, 2020 as amended.**

**Motion carried, 7-0.**

**ROLL CALL VOTE**

Yea: Share, Jeffares, Koseck, Whipple-Boyce, Williams, Boyle, Clein

Nay: None

---

**05-54-20**

**C. Chairperson's Comments**

Chairman Clein welcomed everyone to the meeting and reminded everyone that the meeting was being held under the guidance of the City Attorney and City administration to ensure compliance with Governor Whitmer's executive orders. He thanked City Staff for their contributions to the success of holding these meetings remotely. Chairman Clein then reviewed procedures for the meeting.

Planning Director Ecker reviewed for the public the 'raise hand' function within Zoom.

**05-55-20**

**D. Review Of The Agenda**

Chairman Clein explained Item F1 was to be postponed to the June 10, 2020 Board meeting as a result of the Board's May 13, 2020 decision to limit the agenda to no more than three substantive items due to the challenges of remote meetings.

**Motion by Ms. Whipple-Boyce**

**Seconded by Mr. Koseck to postpone the Final Site Plan Review for 770 S. Adams to the June 10, 2020 meeting of the Planning Board.**

**Motion carried, 7-0.**

**ROLL CALL VOTE**

Yea: Whipple-Boyce, Koseck, Share, Williams, Boyle, Clein, Jeffares

Nay: None

Chairman Clein then explained that the Community Impact Study (CIS) Review and the Preliminary Site Plan Review for 469-479 S. Old Woodward were to be postponed to the June 24, 2020 meeting of the Board upon the recommendation of the City Attorney. He explained that while there was a sign on the property providing proper notice for the rezoning hearing, there was not signage providing proper notice for the CIS and preliminary site plan review. City Attorney Currier determined that while the signage at 469-479 S. Old Woodward met the zoning ordinance requirements, the lack of signage specifying the CIS and Preliminary Site Plan reviews resulted in a deviation from the current practices of the City of Birmingham. As such, the Board was directed by the City Attorney to postpone the matter to a distant enough date certain so as to allow the applicant to follow the City's current practice of displaying the types of applications to be considered 15 days prior to the public hearing.

**Motion by Mr. Williams**

**Seconded by Mr. Share to postpone the CIS review for 469-479 S. Old Woodward to the June 24, 2020 meeting of the Planning Board to ensure that the applicant correctly posts notice on the site for at least 15 days in advance of the review in**

---

**accordance with City ordinances, current City practices, and the recommendation of the City Attorney.**

Rick Rattner, attorney for the owner of 469-479 S. Old Woodward, said he was expressing strenuous disagreement with the City Attorney's recommendation to postpone the CIS review. Mr. Rattner based his disagreement on the following:

- The signage posted in the window of 469-479 S. Old Woodward directs the viewer to the Planning Board meeting agenda for the current May 27, 2020 meeting on the City of Birmingham webpage. That May 27, 2020 agenda specified that there would be a rezoning hearing for 469-479 S. Old Woodward, a CIS review for the same property, and a Preliminary Site Plan Review for the same property. Rather than a lack of notice, Mr. Rattner asserted that would constitute full, fair and reasonable notice.
- The City sent out postcards to all lots within 300 feet of 469-479 S. Old Woodward to notify them of upcoming rezoning hearing, CIS review, and preliminary site plan review for 469-479 S. Old Woodward. He said that also constituted sufficient notice.
- Given the contentiousness of this project, Mr. Rattner opined that the issues with notice were being raised only as a ploy to further delay the project from moving forward. He stated this was not fair to the Planning Board, the City or the applicant.
- City ordinances do not require signs either for Preliminary Site Plan Reviews or for CIS reviews. As a result, Mr. Rattner stated that there was no basis for delaying the hearing of the Preliminary Site Plan Review and the CIS review by the Board.
- He stated that the applicant seeks to develop the property at 469-479 S. Old Woodward in a reasonable and lawful manner as permitted by the U.S. Constitution and the laws of the State of Michigan. Continued delay of the applicant's right to a review of the project by the Board was stemming from those who oppose the project, and not from any real lack of notice in Mr. Rattner's view.

Duraid Markus, owner of 469-479 S. Old Woodward, stated no one on his team had been advised by the City of the need to place additional noticing signage for the CIS and preliminary site plan reviews. He added that no one on his team was supplied with the required signage either, beyond the signage for the rezoning application.

Planning Director Ecker noted that in the application documents it states that it is the responsibility of the applicant to make sure all required signage is posted for the entire 15 day notice period. Ms. Ecker stated that the applicant had filled out the notice sign portion of the application and she personally gave Mr. Markus multiple notice signs. She explained that the City requires a public notice sign by ordinance, and that City practice has been to add a specification on the signage regarding the type of application. She said the City Attorney advised that the applicant should either hang another sign indicating that the property at 469-479 S. Old Woodward will be coming before the Board for CIS and preliminary site plan reviews, or should specify on the extant public notice signage that those reviews will be occurring by attaching the relevant stickers provided by the City.

Mr. Markus stressed that if he had been made aware of the City's practice of specifying the types of review on the signage he would have done so. He emphasized that he and his team had not received sufficient information from the City indicating those requirements. He stated that even his architect, Chris Longe, who has done multiple projects in the City was unaware of this

Birmingham Planning Board Proceedings  
May 27, 2020

---

additional City practice. Mr. Markus said it was unfair that his application was being penalized with a delay when the issue stemmed from a seeming miscommunication of City processes.

Chairman Clein said he fully understood and respected both Mr. Rattner's and Mr. Markus' concerns. He said he would have preferred not to further postpone the reviews both for the benefit of the applicant team and for the public who attended to comment on the reviews. Chairman Clein said he would be requesting that the City provide the City Attorney's recommendations in written form to the applicant team expeditiously so that the applicant team could understand the City Attorney's position. He said he would also be requesting that City staff supply the applicant team with clear instructions on exactly what is required to be posted. Chairman Clein clarified that neither he nor the Board are in the position to challenge the City Attorney's recommendation that these reviews be postponed.

Planning Director Ecker confirmed she would place additional signage with specification of the types of reviews down by the drop box in the police station for the applicant team to pick up. She confirmed for Mr. Markus that she would be supplying two additional signs, one for each building.

Mr. Williams said the simplest way to prevent further confusion would be to have all signage cleared with the City Attorney.

Mr. Share said the language in Article 7.02 and Article 7.02(9) in the ordinances regarding signage should be reviewed by the Board at a future meeting in order to try and make requirements more clear.

Mr. Jeffares expressed frustration with the postponement in light of the fact that he has advised City Manager Valentine multiple times that the City's current signage is unclear. Mr. Jeffares said the QR codes on the City's signs only work from a very close distance, and does not direct the viewer easily or efficiently to the information they are seeking. He said he had emailed clearer signage options to City Manager Valentine and specifically cited Savannah, Georgia as having a particularly good example. With those signs, Mr. Jeffares continued, the public is advised that something will be occurring regarding the signed property, and then there are two lines where the specific types of reviews or applications can be written out by staff by hand. He said this would alleviate the confusion that can result from trying to find the specific information on the City's website.

**Motion carried, 5-2.**

**ROLL CALL VOTE**

Yea: Williams, Share, Whipple-Boyce, Boyle, Clein

Nay: Jeffares, Koseck

Chairman Clein reiterated that it would be in everyone's best interest if representatives from the applicant team worked with City staff to determine the requisite next steps regarding signage.

**Motion by Mr. Williams**

**Seconded by Mr. Share to postpone the Preliminary Site Plan Review for 469-479 S. Old Woodward to the June 24, 2020 meeting of the Planning Board to ensure that the**

---

**applicant correctly posts notice on the site for at least 15 days in advance of the review in accordance with City ordinances, current City practices, and the recommendation of the City Attorney.**

Mr. Rattner said that his objections to the previous motion should be applied to the current motion as well. He added that if Article 7.02(9) is reviewed by the Board at a future time per Mr. Share's recommendation, any signage requirements beyond those for final site plan review should also be specified.

**Motion carried, 5-2.**

**ROLL CALL VOTE**

Yea: Williams, Share, Whipple-Boyce, Boyle, Clein  
Nay: Jeffares, Koseck

**05-56-20**

**E. Rezoning Request**

**1. 469 – 479 S. Old Woodward (Former Mountain King and Talmer Bank) – Request for rezoning from B3/D4 (up to 5 stories) to B3/D5 (over 5 stories).**

Planning Director Ecker reviewed the item. Mr. Rattner reviewed the PowerPoint presentation submitted by the applicant team and included in the meeting's agenda.

In reply to Mr. Koseck, Planning Director Ecker confirmed that the designs of 469-479 S. Old Woodward included in the PowerPoint presentation were only conceptual, and were not being voted on as part of this rezoning request.

Chairman Clein noted the Board received an email dated May 25, 2020 from Brad Coulter, 498 Wimbledon. Mr. Coulter wrote the rezoning should only be granted contingent on the City receiving significant community benefits from the rezoning. Chairman Clein stated that this email would be added to the record moving forward.

Patrick Howe, attorney for the Birmingham Place Commercial Condominium Association, reviewed his clients' objections to the proposed rezoning as laid out in the contents of his May 19, 2020 letter to the Board. He continued that DPZ stated that "all properties within the study area should be eligible for rezoning to D5." Mr. Howe asserted that the DPZ study arose out of questions regarding ordinance language, and not out of questions regarding whether a D5 rezoning is appropriate for 469-479 S. Old Woodward. He continued that the applicant failed to demonstrate "why the rezoning is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of the rights of usage commonly associated with property ownership" given the fact that the applicant has site plans prepared that would adhere to a D4 designation. While the applicant team asserted that a development adherent to D5 zoning on this lot would be of much higher quality than a development adherent to D4 zoning, Mr. Howe stated that subjective opinions of quality are not the standard for whether a property should be rezoned. Mr. Howe concluded that for these

Birmingham Planning Board Proceedings  
May 27, 2020

---

reasons, and the reasons set forth in his letter, the Board should deny the rezoning request for 469-479 S. Old Woodward.

Larry Rochkind, resident of Birmingham Place, stated that during the March 11, 2020 City Commission meeting Mr. Markus said he would build a D4 building if the City ultimately determines that would be most appropriate. Mr. Rochkind also stated that the applicant had the affirmative obligation to prove that the rezoning would have no detrimental effect on the surrounding properties, which Mr. Rochkind said the applicant failed to do. Citing Mr. Markus' previous statements to the Board that his financials were the main driver for the rezoning request, Mr. Rochkind reminded the Board that financial considerations were not one of the permitted reasons for which the City could grant a rezoning.

Brad Coulter reviewed the points from his aforementioned May 25, 2020 email to the Board.

Chairman Clein explained to Mr. Coulter that current City ordinances do not allow the Board to ask applicants for community benefits in exchange for project approval. He said that while under a Special Land Use Permit (SLUP) the Board is able to clarify certain requirements that fall within City ordinance, the City Commission has decided not to allow contract zoning.

Mr. Coulter said he did not think the Planning Board had the ability to do that, but wanted the point included in the record for the City Commission to see.

Mr. Markus shared his contention that it would better serve the interests of the condominium owners of Birmingham Place if 469-479 S. Old Woodward is rezoned to D5. He noted that if the lot remains zoned D4 he would be able to build lotline to lotline, which would block air and sunlight for a number of the Birmingham Place occupants. If rezoned to D5, in contrast, Mr. Markus said he would be better able to work with Birmingham Place owners, City staff, the Planning Board and the City Commission to design a building that would meet the needs of his business and the larger Birmingham community. He noted that the City's ability to influence his development would be particularly enhanced by the requirement that if the lot is rezoned to D5 it would be subject to a SLUP, through which the City could condition the project. If the lot remains D4, the City actually has less influence on the building that is built.

Chairman Clein then returned the conversation to the Board.

Mr. Share said he generally agreed with Planning Director Ecker's conclusions **findings of fact** regarding the rezoning request as set forth in her April 17, 2020 memorandum to the Board. He said he would add that the building height to the north of 469-479 S. Old Woodward is either 110 or 115 feet and the building height to the south of 469-479 S. Old Woodward is 77 feet. MU-5 is 66 feet with an additional twelve feet, and across the street to the west of 469-479 S. Old Woodward is 56 feet. He said he disagreed with the memorandum's conclusion that the 2016 Plan (Plan) favored mixed use. He said that rather he found the Plan to be neutral regarding mixed use, and that the Plan specified that traditional American cities like Birmingham rarely have buildings taller than five stories. Mr. Share expressed concern that efforts to make heights compatible with existing, adjacent heights could result in this block of S. Old Woodward eventually becoming 110 foot buildings, with the trend continuing north along the east side of Woodward.

Birmingham Planning Board Proceedings  
May 27, 2020

---

In reply to Mr. Koseck, Chairman Clein stated that the five findings of fact laid out in Article 7, Section 7.02 do not supply objective standards that must be met in order to grant a rezoning request; rather, they explain the five factors the Board must consider in making its decision.

Planning Director Ecker confirmed Chairman Clein's explanation.

Mr. Williams noted that Mr. Markus has previously stated to the Board that he could not possibly build an appropriate five-story, mixed-use building that would adhere to D4 at the 469-479 S. Old Woodward. Mr. Williams said he believes applicants make good faith representations to the Board, and that he had been in support of the rezoning to D5 on the basis of those representations. Mr. Williams said that it is a significant change in the applicant's position that for on the same agenda as this rezoning request the applicant had also submitted a Preliminary Site Plan for a five-story, mixed-use, D4 building which he had previously said would be impossible to build. Mr. Williams said that as a result he could no longer agree with the applicant's assertion that a D5 rezoning is a necessity for an appropriate development to take place on the lot.

Mr. Share drew attention to the fact that Article 7, Section 7.02 requires that the applicant demonstrate why rezoning is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of the rights of usage. He emphasized that there is a difference between preferential and necessary. With the rights of usage for D4 and D5 buildings being identical, Mr. Share said it strained credulity to argue that a change in height would be necessary to maintain the rights of usage, which would be the only remaining way of meeting that requirement. He said he saw no evidence that the existing zoning classification had become inappropriate. He said he did see evidence that the rezoning would be detrimental to at least part of one of the neighboring properties. He said based on these factors he remained unconvinced that the rezoning would be necessary, noting that there are other tools offered by the City to address some of the applicant's concerns.

Mr. Jeffares said the fact that 469-479 S. Old Woodward is zoned D4 while both the neighboring properties are D5 made little sense to him. He said he believed the study by DPZ of the area also hinted at the inappropriateness of that zoning pattern. Mr. Jeffares said he also agreed with Mr. Markus' assertion that the interests of the occupants of Birmingham Place and the City would be best served if a SLUP is applied to 469-479 S. Old Woodward, which could only happen with D5 zoning. While acknowledging his fellow Board members' concerns that the argument for rezoning was not perfect, Mr. Jeffares said the case for rezoning the property had been at least well-made. He concluded by saying that long term it would be the right thing for that area of Birmingham and for the City as a whole.

Mr. Boyle responded to Mr. Share's statement that adding height alone does not fundamentally change the rights of usage by stating that adding height would in fact allow for more residential units to be built. He said having more residential units aligns well with both the 2016 Plan and the current discussions of the draft master plan, both of which sought to add more residential density to the downtown area.

Mr. Koseck said that if the City were hypothetically being built from scratch, 469-479 S. Old Woodward would undoubtedly be zoned D5 to match its neighbors instead of being left as a D4 outlier. He said he believed that the applicant team adequately provided persuasive reasons for their rezoning case. Mr. Koseck said he could not think of a case in which an existing zoning

classification could no longer be appropriate, and said he was concerned that he was holding the applicant to a standard for which he could not think of a convincing argument. He said he did not think Whole Foods, for instance, as the Board's last rezoning request, could be accurately described as having met that standard. Mr. Koseck said his primary, guiding consideration in rezoning requests has been the question of whether the rezoning would be detrimental to the surrounding properties. He said that while he had previously been against the rezoning, he had seen changes in the applicant's proposals that demonstrate sensitivity to the surrounding properties which could be even more influenced by a SLUP. He said the possibility has emerged for a development that could work well for all parties involved if the rezoning goes through.

Mr. Williams said that what Mr. Koseck was suggesting amounted to contract zoning, which he noted the City Commission had previously rejected. He said that while it would be his personal preference to pursue contract zoning in this case, since he said it could provide the most benefit to all parties, it was not within the purview of the Board to offer unless the Commission were to find differently.

Ms. Whipple-Boyce said that without getting into contract zoning the Board does have real influence through a SLUP if 469-479 S. Old Woodward is rezoned to D5. She noted the Board had been able to make marked improvements to projects in the past through the use of a SLUP, even while the Board is appropriately conservative with the impositions it will make on a private developer's building. She said the use of a SLUP in D5 would allow the Board to help shape a project that would ultimately be better received by occupants of Birmingham Place.

Chairman Clein said he generally agreed with City staff's findings in the memorandum with exception of points a and d from Article 7, Section 7.02 of the Zoning Ordinance. He said for him the consideration came down to two matters. He said he agreed with previous comments that the rezoning of 469-479 S. Old Woodward would likely align with the intent of the 2016 Plan in terms of massing, height, and residential density. He said that in contrast, however, a number of the City's other operational and proposed plans which apply to this area propose no increase in building height. He said he has not seen any comments from those other plans that state that Birmingham needs to have buildings taller than five stories. While he acknowledged that a lack of necessity does not equal a lack of ability, he said that is a determination better made by official City Plans and not by looking at one particular property.

Chairman Clein continued by questioning Mr. Koseck's supposition that if the City were being built from scratch that 469-479 S. Old Woodward would be zoned to D5 like its neighboring properties. Chairman Clein suggested that, in such a hypothetical, it might be just as likely that the neighboring properties would be restricted in height to better match 469-479 S. Old Woodward instead. He said he did not have evidence to support the idea that if the City were starting from scratch in its zoning that it would want buildings that are over 100 feet tall. He said he agreed that contract zoning would be the best way to make sure this development could be beneficial to all parties involved, but echoed Mr. Williams' statements that such an option is not within the Board's purview. He said it might be within the City Commission's right to do for the property. Chairman Clein cautioned that a SLUP remains limited in its ability to influence a project.

He said his final concern regarded "the suitability of the property in question to the uses permitted under the existing zoning classification," from Article 7, Section 7.02(d). He said the question

came down to the definition of the word 'suitable'. He noted the applicant argued that it would be more suitable to rezone the property to D5 given the neighboring properties' zoning and the 2016 Plan. Chairman Clein countered that suitability could be based, instead, on a greater number of the City's Plans and discussions recommending that the City pursues buildings taller than five stories, which he said has not been the case. He said that since there was insufficient proof that the City's Plans intentionally seek buildings taller than five stories, or that a building taller than five stories would be more 'suitable' on the property, he would not be supporting the applicant's rezoning request for the property.

Mr. Share said he agreed that this would be an ideal situation for contract zoning, and suggested that it might behoove the City Commission to consider that option as they review the Board's rezoning recommendation. Mr. Share also noted that the master planning team told the City that the recommended residential density in the downtown area can be achieved without increasing any building heights.

While acknowledging Mr. Share's point that building heights need not necessarily be raised to increase residential density in the downtown area, Mr. Jeffares clarified that not doing so would require a number of property owners to perform costly renovations to their own buildings which he said was not a likelihood the City should depend on.

Mr. Boyle said he wanted to make a statement, then a motion. He recalled that in 2018 he made a recommendation for the rezoning of 469-479 S. Old Woodward to D5, and that at that time his motion did not carry. The Board then requested clarification regarding the definition of adjacent and abutting in the ordinance. He said he spent a lot of time over the last two years considering the matter, walking the property, reading the letters and listening to public comment, and said that his position remained the same. Mr. Boyle said he briefly wanted to explain why that was the case. He explained that each of the letters and comments from the occupants of Birmingham Place actually made the argument for D5 rezoning, rather than against. He said those statements were in support of density, compact living and working, and the ease of urban life. He said each person commenting from Birmingham Place wanted to preserve those qualities of life they bought into. Mr. Boyle noted that this rezoning application proves the developer believes he can sell that same lifestyle to future residents of his property.

Mr. Boyle stated that those living and working in the neighboring buildings, who spoke against this rezoning application, do not have the sole right to this lifestyle they value. He said, even more accurately, as downtown residents they have the responsibility to welcome new neighbors to the area, even if the new buildings might restrict their views. He said that is the cost of living downtown.

Mr. Boyle continued that based on the documents reviewed during the meeting, granting the rezoning request would affect the amenities of a very small number of residents of Birmingham Place. He noted that even with this very large development only the residents on the southern facade may be impacted with the loss of their view. He said if the rezoning request is granted, however, the City gains more than it loses with the addition of many more residents who will also enjoy the benefits, just like the area's current residents, of living downtown.

#### **Motion by Mr. Boyle**

---

**Seconded by Mr. Jeffares to, based on a review of the rezoning request and supporting documentation submitted by the applicant, a review of the applicable master plan documents and the development trends in the area, adopt the findings of fact contained in the staff report dated April 17, 2020 and recommend approval to the City Commission for the rezoning of 469 - 479 S. Old Woodward from D-4 to D-5 in the Downtown Overlay.**

Seeing no discussion of the motion at the Board level, Chairman Clein invited public comment.

Mr. Bloom said he did not believe the motion should be passed. He said that the master planning process is still ongoing, which could influence the most appropriate direction for this property. He continued that the applicant purchased a property that was zoned D4 and then decided he wanted it to be D5 instead. He said, finally, that the applicant said that if he could not get a D5 zoning that he would build a property that would negatively impact the neighbors in Birmingham Place and the City, which Mr. Bloom said is not the only alternative if the property is not rezoned. He said the applicant should find a way to reach agreement with the occupants of Birmingham Place who are already invested in Birmingham instead of pursuing this rezoning.

**Motion carried, 4-3.**

**ROLL CALL VOTE**

Yea: Boyle, Jeffares, Koseck, Whipple-Boyce

Nay: Share, Williams, Clein

Chairman Clein thanked all parties for their spirited participation, and stated this would be forwarded to the City Commission for their consideration and review.

**05-57-20**

**F. Miscellaneous Business and Communications:**

**a. Communications**

**b. Administrative Approval Correspondence**

**c. Draft Agenda for the next Regular Planning Board Meeting (June 10, 2020)**

- 219 Elm - preliminary site plan review
- 770 S. Adams - final site plan
- Master Plan Review Process Discussion

Chairman Clein said he would like the Master Plan Review Process Discussion to include some recommendations formulated by City staff and the master planning team for the Board to review and then to present to the Commission at the joint Board-Commission meeting.

Birmingham Planning Board Proceedings  
May 27, 2020

---

Mr. Williams commented that Mr. Share had offered a worthwhile process suggestion at the May 13, 2020 Board meeting, and asked Mr. Share if he could formalize the suggestion in writing for the Board to review at their June 10, 2020 meeting.

Mr. Share confirmed he would do so.

Chairman Clein recommended Mr. Share send his suggestion to Planning Director Ecker via email, and that any other Board members with suggestions do the same. He said those would then be aggregated into recommendations for the June 10, 2020 agenda packet written by the Board, City staff and the master planning team, which the Board would then review in advance of the joint meeting.

Planning Director Ecker requested that Board members get their suggestions to her by June 1, 2020.

**d. Other Business**

**05-58-20**

**G. Planning Division Action Items**

- a. Staff Report on Previous Requests**
- b. Additional Items from tonight's meeting**

**05-59-20**

**H. Adjournment**

No further business being evident, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 9:37 p.m.

Jana L. Ecker

Planning Director