



12803 S. Wacousta Rd., Grand Ledge, MI 48837  
517-626-6593  
517-626-6405 (Fax)  
www.WatertownTownship.com

**PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**  
**Wednesday, January 8, 2020 | 7:00 pm**

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm by Chair Joe Davis with the Pledge of Allegiance.

**PLANNING COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** Chair Joe Davis, Vice-Chair Rick Adams, Secretary John Wiesner, Zoning Board of Appeals Representative Charles Openlander, Beth Ball, Ron Overton, Andy Powers, Jessie Stipcak, and Dan Zay.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Planning Director Andrea Polverento.

**COMMUNICATIONS RECEIVED:** Polverento noted correspondence from EGLE that was received after packets were completed related to the Deer Creek agenda item, conflict of interest forms from the Clerk's department, and a flyer describing spring educational opportunities from the Michigan Association of Planning.

**AGENDA APPROVAL:**

Motion by Adams, seconded by Overton, to approve the January 8, 2020, regular meeting agenda as presented. Motion carried.

**PUBLIC COMMENT, NON-AGENDA ITEMS:** None.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

**1. November 6, 2019 Regular Meeting**

Motion by Powers, seconded by Zay, to approve the regular meeting minutes of November 6, 2019, as presented. Motion carried.

**2. November 6, 2019 Ordinance Review Committee Meeting**

Motion by Adams, seconded by Ball, to approve the Ordinance Review Committee meeting minutes of November 6, 2019, as presented. Motion carried.

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

**Case No. 19-04 SLU – Deer Creek Phase 3**

Davis opened the public hearing at 7:05 pm and the public hearing procedure was summarized.

Polverento described the facts of the case. She stated that these plans were previously approved in September 2018, under SLUP No. 18-18. The previous applicant had not taken any steps to complete the project, and

did not request an extension before the approval expired in September 2019. The contractor who has constructed most homes in this development has applied to complete the project using the original plans from 2018. The applicant is requesting final site plan approval and a special land use permit to construct the Thunder Lane cul-de-sac and the seven remaining site condominiums which will complete the Deer Creek subdivision. Phase 3 is directly east of the existing phases. In Phases 1 and 2, there are 28 homes constructed, with one under construction and no available lots.

Polverento said that lots in Phase 3 are proposed to vary in size from .5 acres to 3.25 acres. The one large lot is an outlier in size versus the rest of the development, because it includes a low area that was essentially left behind once the developer decided to eliminate a northern stub road in Phase 2, and now is proposed to accommodate storm water infrastructure. Three of the lots in this proposed phase are around 1.5 acres, also a little larger than most, due to the cul-de-sac orientation. Polverento stated that most of the reviewing agencies had agreed to stand by their earlier comments and requirements, and that those comments had been provided to the Commission for review.

Polverento stated that the Commissioners had been provided written comments that would become part of the official public hearing record. Written comments were received from a representative of Pure Green, the commercial landscaping facility directly east of the proposed project, and correspondence between Polverento and one of the existing Deer Creek landowners was also included. Polverento also noted that she had phone conversations with many of the Deer Creek residents, and that some had also stopped by to review the plans and ask questions in advance of the hearing.

At the conclusion of Polverento's staff report, Davis asked the Commissioners if they had any questions for staff.

Davis referenced the Board of Water and Light (BWL) agreement and noted the issues discussed previously with the BWL for water service and fire prevention, but noted that as the BWL had approved the project, he accepted their approval and had no further comments.

Wiesner asked if there were any changes from the plans which were approved in 2018. Polverento said they were the same plans, and noted the unit numbers for the record.

There being no further comments or questions from the Commissioners, Davis invited the applicant to speak on behalf of the project. Polverento introduced Mr. Richard Blasey of Bergmann Associates, the engineer of record on the project, and Mr. Mike Tooman, representing Dirtwerx Excavating and CVE Homes, the applicant.

Blasey stated that the reason for this hearing was that the original developer did not have the funding available to complete to project, and it had been sold to Dirtwerx to complete the development, after the approval had expired. He indicated that both he and Mr. Tooman were present to answer any questions the Commissioners or the public had.

Davis asked the Commissioners if they had any questions for the applicant or engineer. There being none, Davis said that he was most interested in hearing the concerns of the current residents. He opened the floor for the public to speak on the matter, asking them to state their name and address for the record and to direct any comments to him.

Mike Damico, 6660 Thunder Lane, said that most people in the audience were owners of the lots to the south that abutted the strip of land and were within 300 feet of the project. He stated that none of them knew that land would be available for development in the future. He said that he didn't think anyone was there to be mean, or to cause any trouble, but they just wanted to know what was going on. He stated that they had all bought their lots with the assumption that nothing was going to be developed behind their houses. They wanted that land for privacy behind their homes. He understands there are wetlands and that there may have been reasons that land wasn't divided up and made part of their lots. He questioned why they were not told that there was some type of development plan in place, with sewer that would be behind them. He said they were not told thoroughly enough what was possible. It's causing concern and questions because they don't know what's going on, and frustrating to a homeowner who just spent \$275,000 building a new house. They had left some small trees for privacy in the backyard, but now there may be bulldozing going on behind them. He would have liked to have purchased that extra 200 feet behind his property, and wanted to know why that hadn't been an option, and stated that the whole situation was mind-numbing. There was not a good explanation during the land purchasing process to help them understand what could be happening on the land behind them. He said he understood some of the land was wet, and asked if they would be looking at a drainage system like the one at the Lansing Mall where they had catch basins for drainage. He said he just would have liked to have known that. He would have liked to have known that someone could possibly have a big garden or something behind his property.

Davis said that he appreciated Mr. Damico's comments. He said that the Planning Commissioners had discussed this in length during the previous discussion on this matter. Davis said that they had questioned the applicant on this very situation, and that they had talked about how the usable portion of this lot would be much smaller than the 3-plus acres it encompassed. Davis said they had questioned the applicant previously on why someone would even want to buy a 3-acre lot when they might only be able to use an acre or less of their land. Davis said that the Commission understood their concerns.

Damico said that they were just looking for a definitive answer on what that land would be able to be used for. He said that they realized they had to accept whatever the answer was, but they just wanted to know for the record what they could expect. He wanted to know what he was going to be looking at for the next 30 years out his back door. He had assumed it would be forest and wildlife, and he was concerned that might now be gone.

Davis also noted that additional property to the north was owned by the township, and that currently it was planned to stay in passive recreation use, but that he understood the questions were related to the parcel with the flag portion that was concerning to the residents.

Overton referenced the handout which had been provided on the table from Mr. Clampitt with the Department of Environment, Great Lakes and Energy (EGLE) that showed a substantial portion of the development had wetlands. Overton referenced the area on the parcel in question that had an outline of a conservation easement. He asked Polverento what that meant.

Polverento stated that a conservation easement means that no development is permitted in that area, and that it must remain in its natural wetland state. Overton said that didn't encompass the whole lot, but it is a portion of the land the residents were questioning, and that part would not be allowed to have any development. Overton said that when also taking into account the storm water improvements, there would not be much land left for any type of development, besides maybe a small shed or something similar. Overton said that he understood it was heartburn for the residents.

Polverento stated that both she and Mr. Blasey were prepared to go into detail about what the stormwater improvements would look like on that parcel. Polverento asked if there were other questions or concerns before that was done, so all the factors could be addressed at once.

Carol McVicker, 6650 Thunder Lane, said that she and her husband were also concerned because this was the lot just next door to them to the east. She said they were concerned that someone was going to own the land right behind them. She wanted to know why they hadn't just given that land to the township, if it was going to have sewer and drains and that kind of thing on it, that should not be part of that lot. She doesn't want to look out her lot and see trailers or whatever that person might be able to store out there.

Polverento clarified for the record that the proposed improvements were for storm sewer only, not sanitary sewer.

McVicker said that she would have been much more comfortable with the township owning that property behind her, and not some other person.

Polverento said that the infrastructure improvements which were proposed on that lot were for the purposes of storm drainage within the subdivision, and that it was important for that land to remain as part of the development. She also said that the township had not been formally approached at any point by this developer or the previous developer to take over that property.

Mike McVicker, 6650 Thunder Lane, asked if they would be digging that land up and putting tile in there. Polverento responded yes. Ms. McVicker asked if they would be losing all the trees that are back there. Davis responded that the only area that would be excavated would be for the improvements shown on the plans, and that all the trees would not be removed. Davis said that the drainage improvements would mainly be for the benefit of the lots to the north of the centerline of Thunder Lane, given the topography of the overall area and that everything falls to the north. Overton added that the improvements would help keep the basements of those houses dry. Ms. McVicker said that they already had a dry basement. Overton said that this would help keep it that way.

Polverento referred to the plans for the development, and provided a short background on the previous plans for the development, which included a stub road which went north from Thunder Lane. The lots which now back up to the flag lot were originally intended to be oriented the opposite direction along that stub road. However, after Phase 1 was developed, it was determined during the engineering for Phase 2 that the topography in the area now in question was such that gravity sanitary sewer would not be possible as the land was too low and there was not enough fall to bring that to the main along Thunder Lane. The lots were developed instead to mirror the basic size and shape of the existing lots in Phase 1, and the land behind those lots was set aside for the storm sewer infrastructure to be addressed in the final phase.

Polverento referenced the inquiries as to why the adjacent residents hadn't been offered the opportunity to purchase parts of that property. She explained that the lots were laid out as they are now during the Phase 2 site plan review and special land use permit process. To adjust those lots to a different orientation now would not be simple. It would require a re-opening of the Phase 2 site plan and special land use permit, updates to the master deed for Phase 2 for which all lot owners would have to agree, and potential issues due to the lots being too deep to meet state law requirements. This would also only be possible if all lot owners who abutted this land had the financial ability to purchase the land, as you couldn't leave landlocked areas in the center. Further, when the lots were sold to the current owners by CVE Homes, CVE would have had

no opportunity to provide residents that option, as they did not own the land which is in question. Polverento also added that the storm water infrastructure as proposed would also render the far north areas inaccessible to the residents and would have required access easements, among other concerns. Selling that land to the current residents now would be complicated.

Damico asked what the stormwater infrastructure would look like once it was installed. Blasey responded that it would basically look like a pond, and over several years it will turn into a wetland.

Ms. McVicker asked if that land could be designated as common area. Polverento said that was previously considered, but it would have been landlocked, and that would have created access issues. Ms. McVicker asked why access couldn't be from the township property. Polverento explained that as it served the subdivision, access was required to be from within the development.

Antwan Joseph, 6670 Thunder Lane, said that they understood why it was not possible to add the land to their lots. He thinks the issue is the uncertainty.

Damico asked that the contactor take care when doing the construction not to take down more trees than was necessary. Blasey pointed out that the outline of the proposed stormwater area shown on the plans were the limits of land that could be excavated without amending the plans and holding another hearing.

Polverento pointed out all the areas on the lot in question on the plans which could not be developed, and also noted that while much of the area was not "technically" wetlands, it was very low ground which could and would likely hold water during some points during the year.

Damico agreed the land was low and noted that his property drained back to that area.

Polverento pointed out the building envelope for the lot and explained that the house for this lot could not be constructed in that area, it would have to be built near the road. Ms. McVicker asked if a shed could be built back there, or if trailers could be stored back there.

Polverento responded that she could not rule that out, unless the master deed or declaration of restrictions limited that option. The zoning ordinance would permit storage of recreation equipment and possibly an outbuilding if other permitting requirements could be met.

Mike Gonser, 6655 Thunder Lane, asked if a restriction could be placed on that lot to rule that out. Polverento said that the restrictions could be developed to accommodate that, but that was up to the developer to address.

Ms. McVicker explained that she previously lived in Lakeside Preserve and they had all kinds of restrictions. She proposed that restrictions be developed that said no one could store anything back there.

Joseph said that if this area is being used for drainage, great, but it will still be privately owned. What they are trying to say is that it needs to be secured, that there are limits to what can be done back there, and limit it to drainage. What if someone puts a dirt track back there, or something else which might decrease their property values? He wants reassurances that whatever goes back there will be for the good of the neighborhood. He said he would have bought that land to keep that from happening.

Ms. McVicker said they were told that nothing was going to go back there when they purchased their lot. She said their salesperson told them that at most only one house would be built at the end of the road. She said she specifically asked their realtor, Tracy Snyder, and that she told them at most only one house could be built at the end of the cul-de-sac.

Overton said that with all the storm drainage structure, tile, and conservation easement, he noted that there is only a very small acreage back there for anyone to do anything. He said that the residents could develop homeowner's association restrictions, but that if they were restricting that lot, they were also restricting themselves, and to keep that in mind.

Joseph asked why that land couldn't be cut off from that lot to provide reassurances that development would not occur. Blasey said that the land could not be sectioned off because the area had to have access from Thunder Lane, and the lot it was attached to is the only one that provides access to the road.

Joe Warner, 6775 Thunder Lane, said he lives in Phase 1 and had attended all the previous hearings on this development. He asked if there was a homeowner's association in place for any of the phases, and if so, who is the authority of that HOA?

Davis said that if one was not in place, that the residents could meet with the developer to talk about that, but that the Planning Commission could not weigh in on any HOA restrictions. Overton added that the residents could work together to establish whatever reasonable rules they wanted. Damico said that this situation was not typical, that the layout was so strange, and that this is not a normal situation for a new homeowner to walk into, and he feels it is an embarrassment.

Polverento noted that it was not that uncommon for oddly-shaped pieces of land to occur in subdivisions. There is often land leftover after parcels are allotted road frontage. She pointed out a similar circumstance in Lakeside Preserve. Ms. McVicker said that different streets in Lakeside Preserve had different bylaws, for example, some required trees between the sidewalk and the street and some didn't, so it's possible to establish different rules for Phase 3. Davis said that the township could not establish those rules through this process.

Ball stated that it was a \$60 per year investment to establish an HOA. She lives in a development with an HOA, and while it's not active, the landowners take turns paying the HOA fee to keep it active in the event it is ever needed. She agreed with Overton's earlier comments that it was important to remember if they wanted to restrict one lot from not being allowed to store trailers somewhere, they would be restricting all the lots, and to be careful in making the rules. It was also noted that once all the lots are sold, the 36 lot owners could all work together to establish rules, but that the township could not play a role in that.

Warner said that he agreed with that statement, but that no one knew what the proper procedure to do that would be, or who they could go to for advice on that. Davis and Polverento both stated that the township and Planning Commission could not and would not provide advice on that. Warner said that the way he reads the master deed, the HOA should have been turned over to the residents already, because the subdivision is 99% occupied. Ms. McVicker said that when they lived in Lakeside Preserve, they had a company called Capital Area Management that managed their HOA, but they had fairly expensive fees. Warner asked again who they could talk to about this. Davis suggested that this could not be addressed by the Planning Commission, and that some internet research might point them in the right direction. He suggested the residents talk amongst themselves and the developer after the meeting. He urged them to

be cautious that they not restrict anything so much that they rendered that lot unable to be sold. Davis said it would take a special buyer to be interested in that lot in the first place.

Damico said they weren't looking to be overly restrictive, just that they didn't want anything to be put on that one part of the lot behind them.

Davis noted that the property owner would have some restrictions already, due to the drainage that would be on the property, and to allow access to the infrastructure, so it will be difficult for anyone to buy that parcel in the first place. The developer can't subdivide that from the rest of the parcels, and since there was not a conversation when the stub road was discontinued, the applicant was left to purchase this property as it is now.

Polverento asked the public to consider that this parcel will be owned as private property, just like everyone is a private property owner. Everyone has the right to do what's best for them within the confines of the zoning ordinance and any other site condominium restrictions within their four corners of property. She recognizes that many of the people here tonight did not understand, or it was not made clear to them, what the circumstances of this particular strip of property in question were. She also noted that while the township owns the land that surrounds the remainder of the Deer Creek subdivision on the north, residents should understand that there is no guarantee that nothing will ever happen on that property either. While currently, the township has no stated plans to use that property for anything other than passive recreation, and has engaged with a number of local, state and federal partners on wetland and wildlife habitat restoration, but as property owners within Watertown Township, it should be understood that elections have consequences. While the current township board has generally maintained that their goal is to maintain that property as parkland, in four, or eight, or twelve years, a different township board could have a very different vision for that property. There is no way for anyone can look in a crystal ball and tell you what's going to happen in the future on land you don't own. Polverento said that she understands that everyone here wants to keep their view as it is, and that it's believed this view increases or maintains adjacent property values, but to remember that your right to your view extends only to your property line.

Warner asked that since there is so little usable area in that parcel, why isn't the whole area made into a wetland. Blasey stated that this plan is what has been approved by the various agencies with regulatory control over wetlands and storm sewer.

Mr. McVicker said that if the access is only 25 feet across, how would bulldozers and other equipment access the area for the infrastructure, would they cut through his property to access it?

Polverento stated that they are only authorized to use the area available to them on that lot for access.

Mr. McVicker asked that if someone built a house there, would they always have to maintain that access, without a fence or planting trees in that area? Multiple commissioners responded "yes."

Chris Queen, 6680 Thunder Lane, wanted to know why the 15mph speed limit sign was taken down. Polverento stated that speed limit signs can only be placed by the road commission on a public road. That was an illegal traffic signal which could not be enforced. The speed limit is posted by the road commission and no other signs may be installed. Polverento said she believed the legal speed limit on that street was 25mph. Chris asked how that could be, given that many residents had young children. Polverento re-

stated that the minimum speed limit is 25mph, and the residents could not place their own speed limit signs.

Gonser said that he lived on the south side of the road and asked about how the Phase 3 drainage would improve or affect his property. Blasey explained that a drain would be going in on the lot adjacent to his, and that should help move water from his property into the storm drain system.

Damico thanked the commissioners for their time, and for listening to their concerns. Davis thanked the residents for their questions. He said that it had been a long road getting here, with this being at least the third developer the Commission had worked with on this project. He said that he understood the residents had concerns, and that he remembered many Bunker Hill residents being very concerned about privacy when the Deer Creek development was proposed. Overton recalled that many Bunker Hill residents attended many previous hearings and were very outspoken about many of the same types of concerns that were brought up tonight, so the fact they weren't here was a testament to Deer Creek being good neighbors.

Damico said that they would remain cautiously optimistic, put their best foot forward, and hope for the best.

There being no further public comment, Davis closed the public hearing at 7:56 pm.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS:** None.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**1. Case No. 19-04 SLU/SPR – Deer Creek Phase 3**

The following standards are taken from Article 6 of the Zoning Ordinance, and are the basis for review by both Township staff and the Planning Commission and Township Board. Staff and the Planning Commission have reviewed each standard, and suggest the following conclusions:

*General Review Standards.* Each application shall be reviewed for the purpose of determining that the proposed special land use meets all of the general standards. Each special land use will:

(A) Be designed, constructed, operated and maintained so as to be harmonious and appropriate in appearance, with the existing or intended character of the general vicinity and that such a use will not change the essential character of the area in which it is proposed;

<b>Complies</b>	Does not Comply	Condition of Approval	Not Applicable
-----------------	-----------------	-----------------------	----------------

**Comments:** The proposed use meets this standard.

(B) Be served adequately by essential public facilities and services such as highways, streets, police, fire protection, drainage structures, refuse disposal, water and sewage facilities;

Complies	Does not Comply	<b>Condition of Approval</b>	Not Applicable
----------	-----------------	------------------------------	----------------



**Comments:** Road and utility extension will be conducted by the developer. The proposed use will be adequately served by police and fire protection. The applicant must meet the requirements of the Clinton County Drain Commission, Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control Administrator, and Road Commission; EGLE; Board of Water and Light; and Southern Clinton County Municipal Utilities Authority.

(C) Not create excessive additional requirements at public cost for public facilities and services;

**Complies**                      Does not Comply                      Condition of Approval                      Not Applicable

**Comments:** Public facilities including road and utility extension are at the developer's cost and are not expected to create excessive additional requirements at public cost.

(D) Not involve uses, activities, processes, materials, and equipment or conditions of operation that will be detrimental to any persons, property or the general welfare by reason of excessive effects of traffic, noise, smoke, fumes, glare, or odors affecting adjacent properties, streets, or uses;

**Complies**                      Does not Comply                      Condition of Approval                      Not Applicable

**Comments:** The proposed use is expected to comply with this requirement.

(E) The proposed use is so designed, located, planned and to be operated that the public health, safety and welfare will not be adversely impacted; and

**Complies**                      Does not Comply                      Condition of Approval                      Not Applicable

**Comments:** The proposed use complies with this requirement.

(F) The proposed use shall not be detrimental to existing and/or other permitted land uses in the zoning district.

**Complies**                      Does not Comply                      Condition of Approval                      Not Applicable

**Comments:** The proposed use complies with this requirement.

Motion by Overton, seconded by Zay, that the Planning Commission recommends to the Board of Trustees approval of Case No. 19-04 SLU for Dirtwerx Excavating, for a Special Land Use Permit for Phase 3 of the site condominium subdivision known as Deer Creek, provided that conformance to the conditions 1-8 as noted, are achieved to the satisfaction of the Township Zoning Administrator as being in accordance with the requirements of the Watertown Charter Township Zoning Ordinance.

Conditions of **Special Land Use Permit:**

1. Applicant must receive approval for and meet all requirements for final site plan review.
2. The Special Land Use Permit is for Phase 3 of the Deer Creek site condominium subdivision, for 7 total lots, lots numbering 30-36. No changes in the lot numbers are permitted without prior approval of the Planning Commission and Township Board.

3. The applicant shall comply with the requirements of the Clinton County Drain Commissioner, Michigan EGLE (if applicable), and the township engineer pertaining to storm sewer and overall site drainage. Copies of any necessary MDEQ/EGLE permits shall be provided to the township.
4. The applicant must comply with requirements of Clinton County Road Commission and submit written approval.
5. The applicant shall comply with the requirements of the Southern Clinton County Municipal Utilities Authority, Keys Consulting, and the township engineer pertaining to sanitary sewer.
6. The applicant shall comply with the requirements of the Lansing Board of Water and Light and submit written approval.
7. The applicant must submit a copy of the recorded Master Deed, Bylaws, and Rules & Regulations.
8. The applicant must comply with all applicable State, Federal and Township laws.

Motion carried.

Motion by Overton, seconded by Zay, to waive the reading of and to concur with the Planning Director's recommended comments regarding the site plan review specific requirements, Sec. 28-6.1.B.4, for Case No. 19-04 SPR, as provided in the staff report. Motion carried.

Motion by Overton, seconded by Zay, that the Planning Commission approve Case No. 19-04 SPR for Dirtwerx Excavating, for final site plan review for Phase 3 of the site condominium subdivision known as Deer Creek, in Section 27 of Watertown Charter Township, provided that conformance to conditions 1-11, as noted below, are achieved to the satisfaction of the Township Zoning Administrator as being in accordance with the requirements of the Watertown Charter Township Zoning Ordinance.

Conditions of **Final Site Plan Approval:**

1. Applicant shall receive approval for a Special Land Use permit and meet all applicable requirements.
2. Final Site Plan approval is for Phase 3 of the site condominium subdivision known as Deer Creek, for 7 total units, units numbering 30-36. No changes in the unit numbers are permitted without prior approval of the Planning Commission and Township Board.
3. The applicant shall comply with requirements of the Clinton County Drain Commissioner, EGLE, and the township engineer regarding overall drainage and storm sewer.
4. The applicant shall comply with all requirements of the Soil Erosion Administrator.
5. The applicant shall comply with the requirements of the Southern Clinton County Municipal Utilities Authority, Keys Consulting and the township engineer regarding sanitary sewer.
6. The applicant shall comply with the requirements of the Clinton County Road Commission.
7. The applicant shall comply with the requirements of the Lansing Board of Water and Light and Consumers Energy.
8. Streetlights shall comply with Section 28-5.18 of the Watertown Charter Township Zoning Ordinance.
9. Applicant shall provide a copy of recorded master deed to the Township.
10. Any future signage shall comply with the requirements of Sec. 28-5.21.
11. Applicant must comply with all applicable State, Federal and Township laws.

Motion carried.

## **2. 2019 Annual Report of the Planning Commission**

Motion by Adams, seconded by Stipcak, to accept the 2019 Annual Report of the Planning Commission as presented, and to forward the document to the Board of Trustees for further actions. Motion carried.

**3. Ordinance No. 55 – Solar Energy Systems**

Polverento presented the draft language for solar energy systems that was developed by the Ordinance Review Committee. The Planning Commission directed Polverento to submit the language to the township’s legal counsel for further review and comment. Polverento will place this item on the agenda for the next regular meeting.

**COMMITTEE AND STAFF REPORTS:**

1. Executive Committee Report – None.
2. Ordinance Review Committee Report – None.
3. Site Plan Review Committee Report – None.
4. Board of Trustees Report – Overton provided the Board of Trustees report.
5. Zoning Board of Appeals Report – None.
6. Capital Improvements Committee Report – None.
7. Staff Reports: Assistant & Director’s Reports – Polverento provided November and December 2019 staff reports.

**COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM AUDIENCE, STAFF, AND COMMISSIONERS:** None.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Motion by Overton, seconded by Adams, to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 pm.

Date approved: Feb. 5, 2020

\_\_\_\_\_  
Joe Davis, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
John Wiesner, Secretary