

MEETING RECORD

NAME OF GROUP: PLANNING COMMISSION

DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING: Wednesday, September 30, 2020, 1:00 p.m., Hearing Room 112, on the first floor of the County-City Building, 555 S. 10th Street, Lincoln, Nebraska

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Tom Beckius, Dick Campbell, Tracy Corr, Deane Finnegan, Cristy Joy, Cindy Ryman Yost; Tracy Edgerton and Dennis Scheer absent; 9th Seat Vacant; Steve Henrichsen, David Cary, Geri Rorabaugh, George Wesselhoft, Rachel Jones and Rhonda Haas (via broadcast) of the Planning Department; media and other interested citizens.

STATED PURPOSE OF MEETING: Regular Planning Commission Hearing

Chair Corr called the meeting to order and acknowledged the posting of the Open Meetings Act in the room.

Chair Corr requested a motion approving the minutes for the regular meeting held September 16, 2020.

Motion for approval of the minutes made by Campbell, seconded by Finnegan and carried 6-0: Campbell, Finnegan, Joy, Ryman Yost, Beckius and Corr voting 'yes'; Edgerton and Scheer absent.

CONSENT AGENDA

PUBLIC HEARING & ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION

BEFORE PLANNING COMMISSION:

SEPTEMBER 30, 2020

Members present: Campbell, Finnegan, Joy, Ryman Yost, Beckius and Corr; Edgerton and Scheer absent.

The Consent Agenda consisted of the following item: Comprehensive Plan Conformance 20013, Comprehensive Plan Conformance 20014, Change of Zone 20029, Preliminary Plat 20004, Special Permit 20035, Special Permit 20036, Use Permit 132D, Use Permit 19001A, Use Permit 20013 and Corrected Resolution.

There was no ex-parte communications disclosed.

There was no ex-parte communications disclosed relating to site visits.

Clerk noted that, although Commissioner Scheer is absent today, he had declared a conflict of interest on agenda Items 1.6, Use Permit 132D and 1.7, Use Permit 19001A.

The Clerk noted that the applicant has requested to defer on Item 1.1, Comprehensive Plan Conformance 20014, for two weeks to the regular Planning Commission hearing on October 14, 2020; and, therefore, this application was removed from the Consent Agenda.

The Clerk noted that the applicant has requested to defer on Items 1.3a and 1.3b, Change of Zone 20029 and Preliminary Plat 20004, for two weeks to the regular Planning Commission hearing on October 14, 2020; and, therefore, these applications were removed from the Consent Agenda.

Campbell moved approval of the remaining Consent Agenda items, seconded by Joy.

Beckius stated that he would be abstaining from voting on the consent agenda items, due to a perceived conflict of interest on Item 1.6, Use Permit 132D. He explained the State of Nebraska does not recognize a parent as being an immediate family member, but Commissioner Beckius stated that he does; and, therefore, will be abstaining from this vote.

Motion carried 5-0: Campbell, Finnegan, Joy, Ryman Yost and Corr voting 'yes'; Beckius abstained; Edgerton and Scheer absent.

Note: This is FINAL ACTION on Comprehensive Plan Conformance 20013, Preliminary Plat 20004, Special Permit 20035, Special Permit 20036 and Use Permit 19001A unless appealed by filing a letter in the Office of the City Clerk within 14 days.

Corr called for Requests for Deferral.

**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CONFORMANCE 20014
TO REVIEW AS TO CONFORMANCE WITH THE 2040 LINCOLN LANCASTER COUNTY
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, A PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE LINCOLN CENTER
REDEVELOPMENT PLAN, TO ADD THE "TERMINAL BUILDING REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT", ON
PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT 947 O STREET AND 139 SOUTH 10TH STREET.**

Members present: Campbell, Finnegan, Joy, Ryman Yost, Beckius and Corr; Edgerton and Scheer absent.

Staff Recommendation: Two-week deferral.

The Clerk noted that the applicant has requested to defer this item for two weeks to the regular Planning Commission hearing on October 14, 2020.

Beckius moved to grant the request for a 2-week deferral for public hearing and action on October 14, 2020, seconded by Joy and carried 6-0: Campbell, Finnegan, Joy, Ryman Yost, Beckius and Corr voting 'yes'; Edgerton and Scheer absent.

CHANGE OF ZONE 20029

FROM R-3 (RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT) TO H-3 (HIGHWAY COMMERCIAL DISTRICT), ON PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED WEST OF NORTH 33RD STREET AND SCHWORER DRIVE

AND

PRELIMINARY PLAT 20004

FOR A NEW PRELIMINARY PLAT CONSISTING OF TWO LOTS, ON PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED WEST OF NORTH 33RD STREET AND SCHWORER DRIVE

Members present: Campbell, Finnegan, Joy, Ryman Yost, Beckius and Corr; Edgerton and Scheer absent.

Staff Recommendation: Two-week deferral.

The Clerk noted that the applicant has requested to defer this item for two weeks to the regular Planning Commission hearing on October 14, 2020.

Campbell moved to grant the request for a 2-week deferral for public hearing and action on October 14, 2020, seconded by Finnegan and carried 6-0: Campbell, Finnegan, Joy, Ryman Yost, Beckius and Corr voting 'yes'; Edgerton and Scheer absent.

[Break at 1:15 P.M.

Resumed at 1:30 P.M.]

TEXT AMENDMENT 20006

AMENDING VARIOUS SECTIONS OF THE LINCOLN MUNICIPAL CODE AND 27.67.040 TO PROVIDE A DEFINITION AND CONDITIONAL ZONING REGULATIONS FOR TRANSITIONAL LIVING FACILITIES THAT WILL REPLACE THE REGULATIONS FOR ALTERNATIVE-TO- IMPRISONMENT FACILITIES; BY REPEALING SECTION 27.63.750 TO REMOVE SPECIAL PERMITS FOR ALTERNATIVE TO IMPRISONMENT FACILITIES; AND REPEALING SAID SECTIONS AS HITHERTO EXISTING

PUBLIC HEARING:

SEPTEMBER 30, 2020

Members present: Campbell, Finnegan, Joy, Ryman Yost, Beckius and Corr; Edgerton and Scheer absent.

Staff Recommendation: Approval

There was no ex-parte communications disclosed.

There was no ex-parte communications disclosed relating to site visits.

Staff Presentation: Steve Henrichsen, Planning Department, came forward and stated this is for the proposed Transitional Living Regulations that were discussed at the September 16, 2020, briefing. He shared that staff members from the Nebraska Office of Courts and Probation were also in attendance at the briefing to answer questions. Henrichsen stated this is a compromise proposal, which provides conditions to protect the adjacent neighborhood and still allows this use within Lincoln. He shared that individuals being released from the court system already reside in the City of Lincoln, and this type of setting will provide a better outcome for those individuals who are using a transitional living facility.

Corr stated a letter received wanted to know if an assisted living facility falls under a residential healthcare facility. Henrichsen said yes. Corr asked who would be maintaining the mapping for the required distance. Henrichsen stated the Planning Department would do the mapping and when City Council adopts the text amendment the Planning Department will update the map with the current locations and as uses are added and removed. Corr inquired if the map would include the facilities with three or more individuals. Henrichsen stated it would be for those with more than three, because three or less is considered a family, and a permitted use. Corr inquired if the operator did not keep their contact information updated as required, would this be enough to have the permit revoked. Henrichsen stated that is one of the conditions of the permit and failure to comply with the conditions does mean it could be revoked. Corr asked if the permit were revoked would the facility need to completely cease its operations or would it just need to go down to three or less. Henrichsen stated going down to three or less would be an option. Corr asked if there were other land uses that require an administrative permit. Henrichsen stated there are a couple of uses that are temporary and they would be for a concrete batch plant and a wireless cell tower.

Testimony:

1. **Roy Helm, 2750 South 13th Street,** came forward and stated he is in opposition to this text amendment. Helm stated he is in support of the name change and does recognize and support this type of facility. He shared an issue he has with this type of facility is that the Planning Department is only concerned with the zoning and land use, and not the inside living conditions. Helm stated public hearings need to be maintained as part of the permitting process and the City Council needs to have a voice in the process and the ability to make changes.
2. **Greg Newport, 1954 A Street,** came forward and inquired about the distance requirement between facilities of 1,000 square feet and where that number came from. He shared that the distance between facilities needs to be studied further on how it would impact development within the neighborhood. Newport stated the revocation process has been discussed some, but he would like to see a moratorium placed on the property if it goes into revocation, for at least a year.
3. **Shelly Stall, 1954 A Street,** came forward and stated she is in support of a transitional living facility and feels they would enrich a neighborhood. She shared that revocation is the last item listed in the new set of proposed changes, which could be expanded. Stall

stated there is nothing in the ordinance that gives the neighbors any indication of how a review process could be started to address problems. She asked if the permit should be issued for a certain length of time and it could be a requirement for the applicant to come back for a standard review.

4. **Daniel Cuba, 6016 Oakridge Drive**, came forward and stated he was just informed within the last 24 hours about this from several of his neighbors who had received a notice that an alternative-to-incarceration facility was being moved into the neighborhood, but he did not receive a notice. He stated several of his neighbors are working and were unable to attend today's meeting. Cuba shared there are several neighbors in Colonial Hills that have no idea this going on, and there needs to be more public information for this type of facility.
5. **Mariette Dykema, 6000 Fleetwood Drive**, came forward and stated that she just found within the last couple of days a transitional living facility could be put in their neighborhood, which is zoned for single-family housing. She shared that the house next to her is a rental now with a family but would be a potential place for this type of facility, which has no oversight or permits. She shared that kids walk to school in this area and this is a family owned area.
6. **Mark Leeker, 2732 South 13th Street**, came forward and stated he agrees with all the testimony given today regarding transitional living. He shared transitional living is important and can be successful, but there are gray areas that have not been addressed yet. Leeker stated he would like to see public hearings or neighborhood input considered as part of the permitting process. He shared there needs to be transparency with this process, because he has just heard that the neighboring house is going to be used for this type of facility. Leeker stated that he talked with the new owner of the neighboring property and welcomed her to the neighborhood and nothing was mentioned to him about the house being used for transitional living.
7. **Cathy Wilken, 1942 A Street**, came forward and stated there are 37 Neighborhood Associations in the City of Lincoln and it would benefit them all if notices were sent out regarding this type of facility, and they would also like to be informed on any item that involves changes to their neighborhood. This has a huge impact on the neighborhood, and they want to be informed on changes that directly affect them. She stated they support this type of facility but want to be informed and have a voice in the process.
8. **Monica Zinke, 6433 Havelock Avenue, Executive Director Fresh Start**, testified in support via Zoom teleconference, stating that "Fresh Start" is a transitional living facility and the Board of Directors are in support of this text amendment. She shared they want to encourage the Planning Commission and City Council to look at adopting some basic standards for the programming in these facilities. Zinke shared there should be basic guidelines in place to ensure the participants in these programs are getting the support they need, plus this will decrease the chance of profiteering. She explained that

letting supportive programs operate in the neighborhood is a better option than individuals having no programs to go to while trying to get reestablished in themselves in society.

Joy asked Ms. Zinke if she had a recommendation on what the basic standards should be based on her experience with this type of facility. Zinke explained having basic standards will be a challenge but it is needed. She shared there are several different quality programs that follow different models, require different staffing levels, and each program has different programming requirements. Zinke stated they do want some basic standards in place to ensure the residents are getting what is needed.

Ryman Yost acknowledging there is not a one-size-fits-all for programming and asked Ms. Zinke to briefly state the types of inspections required and their frequency. Zinke stated on the building permit side there are several inspections done yearly by fire, elevator company, and boiler company to list a few on the building. She stated that they are also inspected by Lincoln Housing Authority and the individuals staying at the facility have visits from community corrections, probation and parole.

- 9. Tina Arsiaga, 6111 Rolling Hills Blvd., testified in support via Zoom teleconference,** stating she owns the property at 420 South 28th Street, which is a transitional living facility and is attending today's meeting to listen and address concerns that they may have. She shared that she is unsure of what inspections would be needed on the building side but thinks the Fire Department may come for an inspection of the house. Arsiaga stated there would also be visits through drug court, community corrections and probation for the individuals living in the house with the entities would look at the living conditions to see if they are safe for the resident.

Corr asked Ms. Arsiaga how she feels about the conditions listed on the proposed text amendment and if they would you be able to follow them and if there was anything extraordinary listed. Arsiaga said her only concern is this would be going through the Planning Department. If someone wanted to do this and they were new to the process and went to the Planning Department first and started the process and then Building & Safety after, they would not know about everything that is required on the building side, which is what makes this type of permit expensive. She stated she also has concerns on the maximum of six individuals in a house and after that it would be a commercial permit with increased costs.

Staff Questions:

Beckius inquired what actions a neighborhood resident would need to take to initiate a review. Henrichsen stated that they could call Planning Department and report complaints if the provider is not following the conditions of approval. At this point, Building & Safety would be contacted to inspect the facility and send a letter to the property owner.

Corr asked if they could use the UPLNK online or the website application to submit a complaint and asked if this would trigger a review. Henrichsen said yes, the Planning Department does get comments and complaints from the public through the department's online webpage.

Joy asked for more information on a commercial permit through Building & Safety after an application is through the zoning portion. Henrichsen explained there are several applications where the applicant is encouraged to have discussions with both departments regarding the first steps for both, because sometimes it is determined by the applicant that the requirements of the building code make it too expensive. In this case, when they received an Administrative Permit from the Planning Department, they would still need to apply for an occupancy permit from Building & Safety.

Ryman Yost inquired if it is more than three in the group living facility, is there another threshold after that. Henrichsen stated he is unsure of what Building & Safety's range is and assumes that they would fall into the next category. Most of the inquiries received were between 3 and 16 and that would be a different category in the building code.

Campbell inquired if the building and fire inspections would need to be completed before they could get their final approval. Henrichsen said no, the permit can be approved if the site meets all the conditions prior to the building inspection, but they would not be able to move in before meeting Building & Safety requirements.

Finnegan asked about notifications not being sent to the neighborhood associations and if that would take a big effort to do or do they already getting notified. Henrichsen stated the Lincoln Municipal Code (LMC), under Section 27.81.050, discusses notices for public hearings and that is where the standard 200-foot notifications are listed. He stated that there is not an actual requirement on any of the applications to notify the neighborhood but the Planning Department does. The notifications for this type of permit would be done the same as other applications, and it is standard practice of the Planning Department to send out notifications to neighborhood associations.

Corr wanted to clarify if the notification would be sent out before, after or both. Henrichsen stated for all the other applications receive notification before, but in this case, it is being proposed that the notification be sent out after. Henrichsen explained this would indicate to the neighbors that the provider has met the conditions and the permit was granted on the site. Corr asked if the notification would be sent just to the neighborhood where the property is located or the entire neighborhood association. Henrichsen stated that typically it would be the neighborhood association that the property is within and, at times, they have needed to send out the information to additional neighborhood associations because of the property's location. Campbell stated that the notice would be sent to the neighborhood association and not each individual property. Henrichsen said that is correct and each of the neighborhood associations are asked to keep their information updated.

Joy inquired if the Planning Department had considered having a term limit on the permit or if there could be a renewal process after a certain length of time. Henrichsen stated they look at this as a land use application and, if all of the conditions have been met, there would be no reason for this type of permit to expire or be renewed because the land use and zoning would remain the same. If there were to be a complaint that the house is in disrepair or other complaints, they could contact Building & Safety and, if there were complaints on noise or parties, you would call the Police Department. Joy inquired if there was any land use that does have a time limit or review. Henrichsen stated there is one for soil extraction, which is often tied to a project and they would have a 3-year time limit and at the end they could reapply, if needed. He shared that there is an administrative permit and it is for a temporary concrete plant, which is often tied to a project also. He shared that for the transitional living facility they may have to spend several thousand dollars to meet all the requirements and conditions and, if there is a limit on the length of time for the permit, most would be hesitant to invest that amount of money when it is only good for a couple of years. Henrichsen stated this is not something that is done to other permits within the department, because if you had a permit for alcohol, childcare, or one of the many other permits where there is concerns on if the business is operated correctly, it would not be the Planning Department that would go and check on the operator, because there is a different process for the licensing requirements for the inside of the facility.

Corr inquired if the other special permits approved by the department stay with the land or go with the owner. Henrichsen stated that they stay with the land or the site regardless of who the property owner is and regardless of who the operator is.

Finnegan stated that Mr. Newport has asked how the 1,000 feet between facilities was decided and she asked if Mr. Henrichsen could explain. Henrichsen stated it is a subjective number they came up with by looking at other communities, this community, other uses and the spacing requirements in those communities and tried to find that balance and that is how they came up with the 1,000 feet.

Beckius inquired about a potential user in the Colonial Hills Neighborhood, which was talked about previously at the open house, and he asked if Mr. Henrichsen would discuss this. Henrichsen stated that was an allowed use, which was for a group home. Building & Safety had determined that it met the spacing requirements and the conditions, and they can now start their operation. Beckius asked what the differences are between a group home and a transitional living facility. Henrichsen stated that a group home could be a foster home or for individuals who are receiving some type of therapy or counseling on site or it could be someone in recovery for some type of addiction or they could also be on probation.

Finnegan inquired who would decide the type of programming that is required in a transitional living facility. **Abby Littrell, City Attorney's Office**, came forward and stated what the Planning Commission is considering now is a land use proposal in the zoning code, which addresses the activity and would describe generally what the activity is and whether it is appropriate for the land. The programs and definition being proposed requires that they be affiliated with an

alternative-to-incarceration or transitional living program, which could be at the federal, state, county or tribal level and they would set the programming requirements for their own programs. Littrell stated the programs will vary, and the definition does require that they are affiliated with one of the agencies, but the zoning code is not being used to dictate what the programming should be. Finnegan asked who would decide how much is being paid to the provider or if it would be along the same lines as the programming. Littrell stated the program the provider is in would address the fees paid, and that the commissioners need to look at this as a zoning use and what the provider is paid is not relevant. Littrell explained someone had mentioned a hair salon, which may be a permit associated with the hair salon, but part of the consideration as commissioners would not be what is charged for that service or what is being charged for the booths, but would be land use and zoning. Finnegan stated that they could live anywhere, in some cases, if they had the resources. Littrell said individual that would otherwise qualify for this program could live anywhere in the community or in the transitional living facility.

Corr stated that there have been several statements to extend the moratorium because they need more time, and asked Ms. Littrell to explain the timeline and why it cannot be extended. Littrell stated that the Planning Commission cannot extend the moratorium because it was set by ordinance and only City Council can pass ordinances. She explained that the Planning Commission is to advise the City Council on the text amendment that is before them and not the moratorium. Corr stated there has been mention of using a moratorium under different circumstances and asked if one of the conditions placed on this type of permit could require the operator to stop operations for a year if they lost their administrative permit. Littrell stated she had heard that proposed and that would be very unusual, and further stated that she could not think of another circumstance where the Planning Commission would impose that requirement. She shared that doing this could affect the condition of the site, because if a permit was pulled and a new provider moved in and wanted to start their operation they, too, would be bound by that moratorium because it would be attached to the land use and not the owner.

Campbell moved to close the public hearing on this item, seconded by Beckius and carried 6-0: Campbell, Finnegan, Joy, Ryman Yost, Beckius and Corr voting 'yes'; Edgerton and Scheer absent.

TEXT AMENDMENT 20006

ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION:

SEPTEMBER 30, 2020

Campbell moved approval, seconded by Beckius.

Campbell stated that he agrees with a lot of the ideas that have been mentioned, but it would be up to the City Council to set the conditions. Campbell stated the Planning Department has put together a good text amendment, which does answer many of the questions discussed on the previous application, and he further stated there could be more work done to this. He shared there should be wording added to this text amendment about sending notification to the neighborhood association because it is not required and should be.

Beckius said that he agrees with his fellow commissioner and much of what has been heard through the testimony is that this is a human issue. He shared that it is important to remember as individuals leave jail, they reenter society frequently and they integrate back into the community and take up residence in neighborhoods and most of the time it is not a problem. It is important to keep in mind that the transitional living facilities as proposed does not replace the services given to the individual by probation or parole, but they are in addition to those requirements. He stated the conditional permitting would be a way to ensure consistency and fairness in the community for this type of application. Beckius stated he does agree that this type of facility may impose additional burdens on a neighborhood as stated in the report due to an increase in density and parking, and he further stated he does feel the spacing between facilities is appropriate. Beckius stated there is one item he had mentioned previously and has not heard any testimony about the Neighborhood Design Standards outside of the 1950's city limits as part of this proposal and he has concerns with this requirement.

Beckius made a motion to amend and remove the requirement listed under 26.62.050 of the LMC, Section C3, and the portion of the proposal that should be removed states "construction of new principal residences in the R-1 through R-8 Zoning Districts, shall meet the neighborhood design standards regardless of the facility location", seconded by Campbell.

Corr stated she was not going to support the motion because she feels that individuals are more concerned with the topic at hand and they have not considered that portion. She shared that just because it has not been mentioned, that does not mean that it is not important.

Campbell shared that applying the design standards could be a stumbling block, and the house should blend in with the other houses of the neighborhood.

Corr stated that she could be wrong, but she thinks that is how they are written, and they need to blend in with the existing façade. Beckius stated that is correct, and that it does not serve anyone to require the applicant to go through that process when they are building in a new neighborhood that may have a covenant. Corr stated she thinks that it is important because they do not want someone building something new that looks like an institution instead of a home and, if it is decommissioned, it needs to look like a home. Beckius stated that most new facilities would be in a neighborhood with a restrictive covenant that would prevent something looking like an institution being built.

Finnegan inquired if they would need to follow the design standards of the neighborhoods. Corr stated there is a gap, because there are new development areas where they would have a covenant and there are neighborhoods that were developed previously and they no longer have a homeowner's association, and that is the problem.

Beckius stated that it is just another hoop for them to jump through. Corr stated that it is a protection for the neighborhoods that are in the middle. Beckius stated that this is an important item to note because this would be applying standards that have never been applied

outside the 1950's city limits, which has never been done before. Corr stated that is part of the reason that she is not in support of removing the condition. Discussion continued.

Motion to amend failed 3-3: Campbell, Finnegan and Beckius voting 'yes'; Joy, Ryman Yost and Corr voting 'no'; Edgerton and Scheer absent.

Joy stated she appreciates today's discussion and asked if what was mentioned earlier by Commissioner Campbell regarding neighborhood notification needed to be added. Finnegan stated Mr. Henrichsen said it is already listed.

Ryman Yost stated that clearly this has been a difficult issue with a lot of discussion and most of the testimony was not in opposition to the concept but was supportive and understanding. There is a need for quality services in transitional living to support successful reentry and help reduce the rates of recidivism, which are traditionally incredibly bad. She stated the concept is good, and she appreciates all the work that has been done putting together the guidelines for the land use, which is the specific purview of this board. She appreciates knowing why the 1,000-foot rule was in place and about the mailing of notifications. She stated that Ms. Zinke stated she has concerns of profiteering and there should be ongoing communication with State Senators, City Council or County Board members. Ryman Yost stated that they need to look having inspections with the Health Department and Building & Safety for contracting providers to ensure the safety and success of the participants in these types of programs. She shared that based on this she is in support of this text amendment.

Finnegan stated that she is in support and they need to discuss the programming further with the appropriate entity.

Joy stated everyone has done a great job discussing the issues before them and with the human side of this issue there are a lot of challenges. Joy stated from a land use and zoning standpoint, staff has done a great job and she is in support.

Corr stated that she agrees with many things her fellow commissioners have discussed. She shared that there has not been much discussion on the internal living environment, and during an investigating, if Building & Safety is unable to go inside, that can put everyone at a disadvantage, and they have had problems with this at times. When looking at this from a planning standpoint, this commission approves sororities and fraternities, which the Planning Commission does not regulate what goes on inside one of these facilities either. Corr stated that she understands this is a concern from the human perspective and that is why there needs to be oversight on this type of facility, but this does need to be approached from a land use and zoning application by this commission. Corr encouraged the public to keep the conversations going with the appropriate entities, and she further stated that she would support of the text amendment.

Motion carried 6-0: Campbell, Finnegan, Joy, Ryman Yost, Beckius and Corr voting 'yes'; Edgerton and Scheer absent.

Chair Corr stated that anyone wishing to speak on an item not on the agenda may come forward and do so; no one came forward.

Beckius moved to adjourn the Planning Commission Meeting of September 30, 2020, seconded by Joy and carried 6-0: Campbell, Finnegan, Joy, Ryman Yost, Beckius and Corr voting 'yes'; Edgerton and Scheer absent.

Meeting adjourned 2:57 p.m.

Note: The Planning Commission will not formally approve these minutes until their next regular meeting on Wednesday, October 14, 2020.

F:\Boards\PC\Minutes\2020\pcm093020.docx