

MINUTES

**ANN ARBOR CITY PLANNING COMMISSION**

REGULAR MEETING

7:00 p.m. – April 7, 2009

Time: Chair Bona called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

Place: Council Chamber, Second Floor, 100 North Fifth Avenue, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

---

ROLL CALL

---

Members Present: Bona, Carlberg, Derezinski, Mahler, Potts, Westphal, Woods

Members Absent: None

Members Arriving: Borum, Pratt

Staff Present: Bartha, DiLeo, Pulcipher

---

INTRODUCTIONS

---

None.

---

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

---

a. Minutes of March 17, 2009.

**Moved by Carlberg, seconded by Potts, to approve the March 17, 2009 minutes.**

Bona noted two minor corrections to her comments on Page 5 of the minutes.

A vote on the minutes as amended showed:

YEAS: Bona, Carlberg, Derezinski, Mahler, Potts, Westphal, Woods  
NAYS: None  
ABSENT: Borum, Pratt

**Motion carried as amended.**

---

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

---

**Moved by Mahler, seconded by Woods, to approve the agenda.**

A vote on the motion showed:

YEAS: Bona, Carlberg, Derezenski, Mahler, Potts, Westphal, Woods  
NAYS: None  
ABSENT: Borum, Pratt

**Motion carried.**

Enter Borum.

Enter Pratt.

---

REPORTS FROM CITY ADMINISTRATION, CITY COUNCIL,  
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES, PLANNING COMMISSION  
OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES, WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS AND PETITIONS

---

Derezenski shared highlights from the April 6 City Council meeting, during which the A2D2 Zoning Ordinance was discussed. He said the Council made more changes to the Ordinance than he would have liked, noting that the main debate was on height limits. He said a motion was made to reduce the South University height limits from 170 feet to 120 feet. He offered an amendment, which passed by one vote, to that motion limiting the reduction from 170 feet to 150 feet, instead of 120 feet. He said another change was the creation of a D2 transition area in the South University area and on East Huron. He said there was an argument about buffers, noting that the setback on East Huron was changed to 30 feet, and the height limit on East Huron was changed to 150 feet, as in the South University area. He also noted that language on active uses was also struck from the Zoning Ordinance. He said the next public hearing was set for June 1, to give staff eight weeks to prepare the revised Ordinance and to share it with the public. He also told Council at the April 6 meeting that he believed the Planning Commission should have been given more deference in matters relating to height limits.

Westphal added that diagonals had been eliminated from the Zoning Ordinance when the height limits were reduced.

Derezenski said that there was also discussion at the meeting that the Draft Master Plan should return to the Planning Commission for further review, in light of the changes to the Zoning Ordinance. He finished by saying that during the public hearing, people asked for design guidelines, and that he and Councilmember Higgins assured them that they were to follow, hopefully by September 2009.

Pulcifer said that in addition to A2D2, the Planning staff was working on several other projects. First, she said staff was working on a revised version of the Master Plan Land Use Element, which was under review by the Master Plan Revisions Committee, and for which a public hearing had been set for the May 5 Commission meeting. Second, she said staff was working on community outreach for the Area, Height and Placement project. She noted that Council had initiated this effort, appointed an advisory committee

to talk to the five wards, and to bring proposed revisions to the wards for comments. She said the first meeting would be scheduled toward the end of April, and that the effort would last through the summer and into the fall. Third, she said staff was preparing to work on the R4C/R2A study, which would be a year long effort.

Bona asked whether the changes to the Master Plan Land Use Element being discussed were based on comments from adjoining jurisdictions.

Pulcifer replied yes, and that other revisions were based on Master Plan Revisions Committee comments.

Potts noted that the Ordinance Revisions Committee would meet at City Hall on April 28 at 3:30.

---

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

---

None.

---

PUBLIC HEARINGS SCHEDULED FOR NEXT MEETING

---

None.

---

REGULAR BUSINESS

---

(a) Public Hearing and Action on Amendments to Chapter 57 (Subdivision and Land Use Control Ordinance), Sections 5:121, 5:122, and 5:124, to amend timing requirements for City Planning Commission to make a report and recommendation to City Council, and for action by City Council, on area plans, site plans and plats – Staff Recommendation: Approval

DiLeo explained the proposed amendments and made a brief presentation.

Noting no speakers, Chair Bona closed the public hearing at 7:23 p.m.

**Moved by Mahler, seconded by Woods, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the amendments to Chapter 57 (Subdivision and Land use Control), Sections 5:121, 5:122, 5:124, and 5:130 related to timing of Planning Commission recommendations and City Council actions on area plans, site plans and plats.**

Derezinski commented that some petitioners might be critical of a move like this, feeling that their projects could be kicked down road. He also commented that the Commission and Council could face liability issues due to the deemed approved language in the current version of Chapter 57. He supported

removing inoperable sections of Chapter 57, but wanted to see a guarantee or phrase regarding reasonableness (of time) clause to protect petitioners in the event of a long process. He suggested that staff and the City Attorney's office could work on language that he would propose when the item reached Council.

Bona asked if staff would be comfortable with such an amendment.

Pulcipher replied yes.

Potts supported the motion, stating that these were outdated sections of the Code. She believed the record showed that items moved expeditiously through the process, and that the time requirements were unnecessary. She supported Commissioner Derezhinski's idea, if the City Attorney's office thought it was useful.

Carlberg commented that the Citizen Participation Ordinance and better technology should be credited in part for the reduction in complaints from petitioners. She did not support inserting legalese into the Code because it might allow petitioners to think there was a loophole for legal action. She said staff works as quickly as it can, and that the Commission is clear and fair in dealing with petitions. She supported removing artificial timelines, but was reluctant to add weasel words.

Woods agreed with Commissioner Carlberg. She believed the City's website, which posts filing, approval and permit dates, helped to dispel the misperception that projects move slowly through City Hall, because people can see exactly how long things take. She supported removing the time requirements, because she said the Commission was there to carefully consider petitions, not rubberstamp them.

Westphal supported the motion, but suggested that a history of the time limits language might be helpful for Council. He questioned whether the language was archaic, or in response to semi-recent projects. He also wondered how Ann Arbor stacked up against its peer cities in regard to time frames and average approval speed.

Bona asked staff if Kevin McDonald from the City Attorney's office had researched other cities in Michigan.

DiLeo replied that he had, but that she did not recall what he said regarding other communities and would follow up. She did offer a history of the amendments, noting that the 60-day and 30-day time requirements were at least 40 years old, and that the deemed-approved language was adopted sometime between 1972 and 1980. She noted that a petitioner had never challenged the language in the Code.

Bona recalled, from the Ordinance Revisions Committee meeting, that these types of time limits were rare.

Pratt said that there had been efforts to streamline the approval process, and that the process has been clear and worked well. He could not remember the last time an item had been tabled more than once. In that sense, he said, the Commission may not need to do anything in the ordinance. He supported the staff recommendation of establishing a policy describing the process that would be simple to share with petitioners.

**Moved by Pratt, seconded by Westphal, that the main motion be amended by adding the following language: "And with a recommendation from Planning and Development Services manager to establish a modern policy for the review, scheduling,**

**and action for petitions under consideration by the Planning Commission and City Council in the spirit of good customer service for those submitting petitions by June 1<sup>st</sup>.”**

Derezinski summarized his concern about a reasonableness clause as an issue of due process. As a lawyer, he believed that it was necessary that Chapter 57 contain due process or appeal process language. Without a way to appeal, he said it becomes a political process, and he wanted to see a way to offer relief in the event of petition dragging on. He said the law was filled with examples of deemed-approved clauses, and that he believed it was necessary for the public to have a path to force decision making.

Potts did not believe a due process clause was necessary. She believed it anticipated a problem that did not exist, and that it raised issues that were best left alone.

Mahler asked Commissioner Derezinski if the Commission exposed it self legally in the absence of a due process clause, and what the City's liability was.

Derezinski said that in the absence of a due process clause, a writ of mandamus could be filed with a court, causing the City legal expenses. He said a court would be torn without ordinance language to fall back on, and would have to make its own interpretation. He said he preferred to add reasonableness language as protection for petitioners, and he believed this was good public policy.

Mahler replied that by the time a petitioner filed a writ of mandamus, the odds of a petition not being acted on were slim to none. He supported Commissioner Derezinski's call for a reasonable timeline as a backstop, but he was not as interested in crafting grievance processes. He asked Commissioner Pratt to comment on his amendment.

Pratt replied that he proposed his amendment because there were good things being done in practice that were not necessarily documented in a policy. He believed his amendment aimed at Commissioner Derezinski's concerns about redress. He believed it helped to have a procedure or intent in writing, but he was not proposing to create a catchall. He felt such a policy would be useful to the City in informal settings.

Mahler was concerned that having an informal written policy could lead to manipulation by petitioners, if one felt he or she were being treated differently than another, and could point to a written intent statement. He believed the more language created, the more people could pick it apart. He was hesitant without seeing the language of the policy being proposed.

Bona agreed that system currently worked pretty well, and believed the Commission gave and followed a calendar with clear deadlines for Commission action. She was unsure whether a policy was needed, but believed that adding policy or intent language to the calendar currently used was a good idea. She was comfortable with the motion, and with Commissioner Pratt's proposed amendment.

Woods asked whether the motion, or Commissioner Pratt's amendment, was currently under discussion.

Pratt replied that the amendment was under discussion, and that his intent was to seek recommendation from the Planning and Development Services Manager to establish a modern policy for review action by June 1, 2009.

Woods asked why June 1<sup>st</sup> was chosen.

Pratt replied that it was far enough out to do, but close enough to remain a priority.

Bona asked staff if June 1<sup>st</sup> was a reasonable goal.

Pulcifer said June 1<sup>st</sup> was reasonable, but that she wanted the Commission to review whatever was drafted. She said that a draft for review could be ready by June 1<sup>st</sup>.

A vote on the amendment showed:

YEAS: Bona, Borum, Carlberg, Derezinski, Pratt, Westphal  
NAYS: Mahler, Potts, Woods

**Amendment carried.**

Bona asked if anyone wanted to send a message up or down to Council on whether Commissioner Derezinski's proposal for a reasonableness clause should be reviewed. She also asked if the Commission wished to see it before he proposed it to Council.

Pratt replied that he was comfortable with the City Attorney's office coming up with a few sentences, and he saw no need to review it.

Bona asked whether the Commission wanted to recommend that the reasonableness clause be added or not added.

Woods replied that she was comfortable with or without adding Commission direction, stating that Council would do what it felt was appropriate. She supported removing the archaic language.

Mahler suggested that the Commission recommend that Council add carefully worded language to assure petitioners that they have a backstop. He said he would like to see a recommendation from the City Attorney's office that Commissioner Derezinski could use to propose his amendment.

Bona asked if in the interest of not holding the item up, whether staff would be okay if the Commission took a straw vote.

Pulcifer believed it would be beneficial to pick a few Commissioners to work with the City Attorney's office to draft language.

Bona recommended Commissioners Derezinski and Mahler. (The Commission supported this.)

Westphal wanted to be sure Ann Arbor was not the only community undertaking an effort like this.

Derezinski believed that this was a good discussion, and that the minutes would reflect that. He felt his concerns and the counter concerns had been given justice in the discussion.

Bona asked staff to copy the Commission on language drafted by the City Attorney's office and Commissioners Derezinski and Mahler.

A vote on the main motion as amended showed:

YEAS: Bona, Borum, Carlberg, Derezinski, Mahler, Pratt, Potts, Westphal, Woods  
NAYS: None

**Motion carried unanimously, and reads as follows:**

**Moved by Mahler, seconded by Woods, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the amendments to Chapter 57 (Subdivision and Land use Control), Sections 5:121, 5:122, 5:124, and 5:130 related to timing of Planning Commission recommendations and City Council actions on area plans, site plans and plats, and with a recommendation from Planning and Development Services manager to establish a modern policy for the review, scheduling, and action for petitions under consideration by the Planning Commission and City Council in the spirit of good customer service for those submitting petitions by June 1<sup>st</sup>.**

(b) Public Hearing and Action on Foxfire Phase 2C Site Plan for Planning Commission Approval to revise the Wetland Mitigation Plan. A proposal requesting relief from wetland alternative mitigation regulations by increasing the amount of wetland alternative mitigation from 50 percent of the total mitigation required to 61 percent for this site north of Dhu Varren Road, east of the railroad – Staff Recommendation: Approval

DiLeo provided a brief presentation of the proposal.

Remesh Kusharala, Foxfire Neighborhood Association board member, spoke against the proposed revision, stating that the petitioner had for years failed to (1) address backyard flooding, (2) clear remaining construction debris, and (3) plant street trees.

Richard Thomas, 2270 Hickory Pointe Drive, spoke against proposed revision to natural features mitigation plan.

Noting no further speakers, Chair Bona closed the public hearing at 8:27 p.m.

**Moved by Derezhinski, seconded by Potts, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby approves the Foxfire Phase 2C Site Plan for Planning Commission Approval to revise the natural features mitigation plan, including alternative mitigation measures and relief.**

Bona noted that the Commission was the approving body for this item, and that five affirmative votes were needed to approve the proposal.

Potts commented that the motion does not explain what the Commission was approving, and clarification would be helpful. She believed this was a good proposal, and superior to the previous proposal, noting her approval of all the unpaved space on the site. She said this proposal used hardship analysis similar to what the Zoning Board of Appeals used, which she believed was appropriate.

Bona noted that the motion referred to the Foxfire Phase 2C Site Plan.

Carlberg agreed in general with Commissioner Potts. She noted that the concern for wetland mitigation in Code is the proper handling of water, and she believed that the site posed a hardship beyond their control, noting the wetlands on site would qualify as low quality wetlands. She believed the petitioner's situation met the conditions in Code for an exception to the wetland requirement, and that at times the

50% alternative mitigation cap seemed unreasonable. She noted that the proposal did not address the neighbors' concerns, which were important. She noted that the wetland mitigation was a separate issue, but the pictures shared by the neighborhood indicate that there are issues to be resolved between the builder and homeowners.

Mahler agreed with Commissioner Potts, but believed the motion was confusing, because it proposed both relief from the wetland requirement and alternative mitigation in excess of 50%. He questioned whether the Commission needed to bump the cap and offer relief, or whether it could just offer relief.

DiLeo replied that with regard to alternative mitigation, Code said that 50% alternative mitigation was the maximum, but that either the Commission or Council could make exceptions. She noted that the relief offered could be noted in square footage, if desired by the Commission. She said the proposal sought a revision to increase the alternative mitigation from 21% to 50%. Regarding the relief request, she noted that a generic relief request was made.

Pratt asked why the parkland had been dedicated as part of the original project.

DiLeo replied that Foxfire was a long time in development, and that when Phases 2A, B and C were approved, the park was included. She said that when Phase 2C came back, Code had changed and extra land was donated at that time to meet the overall wetland requirements.

Pratt asked if the land was donated because the petitioner simply did not need it.

DiLeo believed that was the case.

Pratt asked whether there were any other issues requiring extra dedication, and whether the original plan was a Planned Project or Planned Unit Development.

DiLeo replied no, that it was standard zoning and a standard site plan.

Pratt stated that the proposal offered relief to alternative mitigation, but he noted that without the City threatening to pull the bond on this project, many of the promised results might not have been met. He believed the solution as proposed was not a great one, and he questioned the value of additional land as opposed to street improvements. He was interested in seeing something that got to the idea of improving the area. He also questioned how well Guenther Building Company had restored some of the common areas, and believed that the City and homeowners had gotten back less than they expected in the project, while now being told that nothing else could be done. He was concerned that the neighbors and environment were getting nothing in return. He stated that he would like to see street trees.

Bona asked staff to explain when final site plan sign off would occur. She also asked when the final City inspections would take place, particularly with regard to neighbor concerns.

DiLeo said one home was left to be completed and inspected, and that was pending resolution of the outstanding site plan issues, only one of which was wetland mitigation. She noted that the other issues had been resolved between the homeowners and the builder, and she believed that Mr. Gorenflo could perhaps clarify those issues. She noted that the Foxfire West Park had been in the City's jurisdiction for five years, and that issues with that area were handled by Parks and Recreation Services. She believed other areas had been turned over to the homeowners association, and that they would be responsible for issues in those areas. She noted that Guenther Building Company was responsible for wetlands, not the open space.

Bona stated that the wetland would be under the jurisdiction of the City for three years, the state for five years, and then turned over to the homeowners after that. She asked staff if street trees had been planted.

DiLeo said yes.

Pratt said he was looking for compensation on the ground for failed wetlands, not compensation on paper, noting that parkland was nice, but not required. He reiterated that he was looking for equal exchange for the failed wetlands, and asked what the Commission's basis was for providing relief. He believed that adding natural features to replace a missing natural feature made more sense.

Bona noted that there were fewer wetland requirements when this project was approved than there were today. She recalled that the original site plan was in compliance with Code.

Pratt agreed, but noted that the petitioner had allowed the original site plan to expire.

DiLeo confirmed that the Code requirements had changed between the original and subsequent site plan approvals, meaning that after Phases 2A and 2B were completed, Phase 2C faced different wetland requirements. She noted that in 1998 and 2002, the City allowed wetland mitigation in detention ponds, which was disallowed after 2002.

Bona said that she supported the proposal, and that she also supported the previous one. She agreed with the approach to relief, but noted that she was sensitive to the street tree issue also.

Potts said that when a petitioner asks for relief, it is tempting to ask for them to give back elsewhere. She believed the petitioner did meet the standard for relief. She noted that the Foxfire development had been ongoing with problem after problem, with inspectors having to go out for many issues.

Carlberg asked whether installation of street trees could be proposed as alternative mitigation.

DiLeo replied yes, noting that only 21% of the maximum 50% alternative mitigation had been used. She stated that the part of the current alternative mitigation was parkland, and the other was money that was in the street escrow account. She said that even if the parkland remained and the street trees were planted, the project would still fail to meet the mitigation requirements.

Carlberg replied that the Commission could do what was best for the community. She stated that money had been deposited in the street tree escrow, and asked whether the trees had been planted and if the homeowners neglected to water them.

DiLeo replied yes, that money had been used to plant trees.

Carlberg asked whether every house had a tree at some point.

DiLeo replied that she would need to seek clarification, but the City Forester had confirmed that trees had been planted.

Carlberg asked again if trees had been planted by the City, and whether the homeowners knew they were supposed to water the trees.

DiLeo replied that she was unsure.

Carlberg commented that, based on comments from the homeowners, that there was clearly disagreement on the issue.

Pratt said he had made no proposal regarding street trees, and did not believe the developer should have to pay for more trees. He asked the petitioner to comment.

Natalie Ceccolini, of Guenther Building Company, stated that having her company water the trees in the neighborhood was unrealistic. She noted that Guenther did deposit \$20,000 into the street tree escrow for trees, but that the trees had never been planted. She stated that her company had met with Planning staff, the county, etc., at least five times, and that everyone had signed off on the idea of having the City plant the trees, including Roland Neynaber of Development Services. She believed that something had obviously gone wrong, and stated that her company would not have a problem planting trees, and recouping the \$20,000 from the street tree escrow. She stated that not one tree had been planted in Foxfire Phase 2C.

Woods asked when the \$20,000 was deposited.

Ceccolini replied that it was probably in 2001 or 2002.

Woods asked at what point in a project trees were typically planted.

Ceccolini replied that trees went in at the end, after sidewalks and driveways were installed.

Woods asked if this were the last house.

Ceccolini replied yes, and that it had been completed more than a year or two ago.

Woods asked if the City might have been waiting for the last house to be signed off before planting trees.

Ceccolini replied no, stating that the last house had passed its final building inspection. She said that once this final amendment was passed, the last home would receive its certificate of occupancy.

Bona asked for staff comment.

DiLeo stated that Ceccolini was correct in stating that Guenther Building Company could plant trees and recoup the escrow funds, but she noted that the alternative mitigation numbers would remain the same.

Bona clarified that the trees were a separate issue, but part of the same motion. She said the Commission would offer relief, and, in addition, Guenther Building Company would provide the street trees and recoup its escrow.

**Moved by Mahler, seconded by Pratt, that the main motion be amended to read as follows: “The Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby approves the Foxfire Phase 2C Site Plan request for relief from providing mitigation or alternative mitigation due to undue hardship pursuant to Section 5:127(5) of Chapter 57 of the City Code, with the condition that the petitioner will plant all street trees required by the 2C Site Plan on or before December 31, 2009 and in return will be reimbursed for any and all monies deposited by petitioner to the street escrow account.”**

Derezinski asked if staff would support these conditions.

Pulcipher replied yes.

Pratt asked if the homeowners association were willing to initiate a letter to homeowners explaining how to water the trees.

Kusharala replied yes, that that would be fine.

Potts said the City may have a pamphlet for homeowners explaining how to care for trees.

Woods believed this compromise sounded very good. She asked about a timeline for completion.

DiLeo replied that site plan compliance would be in effect immediately, and that the tree planting could be completed in spring or summer, followed by a refund of the escrow funds.

Westphal asked whether all of this simply brought the issue back to square one, noting that the original trees are being planted, and that the City was offering relief from wetland mitigation requirements. He was concerned that the City was offering relief for actions that were required in the first place, without any compensation for other outstanding issues.

Carlberg asked Commissioner Mahler to add a timeframe for the street tree plantings, such as during 2009.

Mahler asked staff what the site plan would have required.

DiLeo replied that the site plan would have required planting during the appropriate planting season.

Mahler suggested requiring that they be planted on or before December 31, 2009.

Pratt asked when the optimal time was to plant street trees.

Ceccolini replied that fall was the best time to plant, depending on the weather. She said November 1<sup>st</sup> was a realistic goal, and that December 31<sup>st</sup> would be fine, too.

Bona asked if there was any other discussion on the amendment.

A vote on the amendment showed:

YEAS:	Bona, Borum, Carlberg, Derezinski, Mahler, Pratt, Potts, Westphal, Woods
NAYS:	None

**Amendment carried unanimously.**

Pratt asked where the dead trees were that Forestry said were planted and died.

DiLeo said she would follow up on that.

Bona said that the Commission kept raising the bar, and that the City was getting more mitigation than was originally expected, because the project took a long time to complete. She said she was very comfortable with the amendment.

Woods replied to the concern raised by Commissioner Westphal, stating that she was adamant about requiring relief to be within City limits. She noted that upon further review, she believed that a lot had been done to try to mitigate on site, which is why she was comfortable with this solution. She was pleased that the petitioner and the homeowners met, and she believed that in the long run, everyone wanted the neighborhood to be a beautiful place to live.

A vote on the main motion, as amended, showed:

YEAS: Bona, Borum, Carlberg, Derezinski, Mahler, Pratt, Potts, Westphal, Woods  
NAYS: None

**Motion carried unanimously, and reads as follows:**

**Moved by Mahler, seconded by Woods, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby approves the Foxfire Phase 2C Site Plan request for relief from providing mitigation or alternative mitigation due to undue hardship pursuant to Section 5:127(5) of Chapter 57 of the City Code with the condition that the petitioner will plant all street trees required by the 2C Site Plan on or before December 31, 2009 and in return will be reimbursed for any and all monies deposited by petitioner to the street escrow account.**

(c) Resolution to Adopt City Planning Commission Meeting Schedule for FY 2009/2010.

**Moved by Mahler, seconded by Carlberg, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby adopts its meeting schedule for fiscal year 2009-10, with business meetings occurring on the first Tuesday, working sessions on the second Tuesday, regular meetings on the third Tuesday, and Commission committee meetings, as needed, on the fourth Tuesday.**

A vote on the motion showed:

YEAS: Bona, Borum, Carlberg, Derezinski, Mahler, Potts, Pratt, Westphal, Woods  
NAYS: None

**Motions carried unanimously.**

---

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

---

None.

---

COMMISSION PROPOSED BUSINESS

---

Pratt said the Floodplain Subcommittee was scheduled to meet on the 4<sup>th</sup> floor of City Hall on April 22 at 3:00 p.m., and that staff was reviewing feedback from the initial meeting. He said after the April 22 meeting, the goal was to circulate a draft among staff for comment.

Commissioners Carlberg and Potts asked if the Commission could see a draft before the April 22 meeting.

Bona noted that it was a working session, but asked Pratt if it might be possible to share the draft with the Commission prior to the meeting.

Pratt replied that the Commission had not yet seen the draft Floodplain Ordinance, and that he would provide them with it before the April 22 meeting.

---

ADJOURNMENT

---

Bona declared the meeting adjourned at 9:28 p.m.

---

Mark Lloyd, Manager  
Planning and Development Services

---

Kirk Westphal, Secretary

Prepared by Steve Bartha  
Management Assistant  
Planning and Development Services