

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF COMMERCE
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL MEETING**

Thursday, January 25, 2018

2009 Township Drive

Commerce Township, Michigan 48390

A. CALL TO ORDER: Rusty Rosman, Chairperson called the special education discussion meeting to order at 5:30pm, and explained that the focus of the meeting would be on signs.

ROLL CALL: Present:

Rusty Rosman, Chairperson

Jorge Pacheco, Secretary

Rick Sovel

Bill McKeever

Clarence Mills

Robert Mistele, Alternate ZBA Member

Also Present:

Hans Rentrop, Township Attorney

David Scott, Township Supervisor

Deborah Watson, Recording Secretary

Jay James, Engineer/Building Official

Dave Campbell, Planning Director

Paula Lankford, Assistant to the Planning Director

George Weber, Township Board Trustee

B. APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA

MOTION by Mills, supported by Pacheco, to approve the Zoning Board of Appeals Special Education & Discussion Meeting Agenda for January 25, 2018, with one change, to switch items G1 and G2, allowing the Township Attorney to begin the meeting and discussion; therefore, *G1 became Discussion with the Township Attorney, and G2 became Signs and Sign Exceptions.* **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

C. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES: None.

D. PUBLIC DISCUSSION OF MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA:

Chairperson Rosman welcomed George Weber, the new Township Trustee, and explained the purpose and benefits of tonight's educational meeting.

E. UPDATE OF ACTIVITIES IN COMMERCE TOWNSHIP: None. (*To be discussed at the Regular ZBA Meeting to follow at 7:00pm*)

F. OLD BUSINESS: None.

G. NEW BUSINESS:

ITEM G1: DISCUSSION WITH TOWNSHIP ATTORNEY

Dave Campbell asked that Attorney Hans Rentrop lead the discussion and then have the sign discussion follow his information.

Attorney Rentrop – We are going to address two issues tonight, sign exceptions as requested by Rusty. Rick also asked at the last Township Board meeting to discuss land division reviews. The majority of time will be focused on signs.

As Rusty mentioned, she likes these training sessions to avoid problems, as an ounce of prevention equals a ton of cure. A couple of years ago, we had a case with a variance issue. The ZBA reached a decision on the variance, however the circuit court remanded the decision back to the ZBA for additional details and a second hearing was held. Through education, the idea is to hopefully avoid the costs of having cases remanded.

Open discussions took place regarding the case above, which involved a pool, and the final resolution of the matter, which resulted in a reduction of the pool size.

Attorney Rentrop segued into the following sign related topics:

- *What are the standards for sign variances?*
- *How should they be applied?*
- *When is it appropriate to deny a sign exception?*
- *Does the ZBA have to approve a sign just because the Zoning Ordinance allows it?*
- *How does the ZBA review an appeal from this section of the code of ordinances with respect to land divisions?*

He first provided background on signs. Signs are extremely tricky in terms of regulation, as it's a First Amendment Free Speech right. The courts have taken a very careful look at sign regulation to ensure constitutional rights are not being violated. If you have to read the sign, it's subject to what they call strict scrutiny, a very high level of review, and then you have to show a compelling governmental interest. Therefore, if you have look at the content of the sign to determine where it belongs, odds are that the regulation is probably not lawful. If the regulation is content neutral, and instead determines where the sign will be located, what size it will be and things of that nature, this is generally permitted as a low level of review, but they do have to serve significant governmental interest. So, there is still regulation but it's much easier to do this.

For commercial speech, the situation gets very delicate when looking at the sign content, and you can't restrict it. It must be supported by substantial regulatory interest. The regulation must directly advance the governmental interest, and be no more extensive than necessary to serve that governmental interest. This is looking at the public safety aspects, in terms of whether or not there is a reason for governmental commercial speech regulation.

The U.S. Supreme Court has appointed a committee of attorneys to review this topic and advise accordingly. Although they have not yet reached a verdict, there was one specific case reviewed in which an off-premise billboard type sign for a mobile church

was prohibited. The prohibition was found to be unconstitutional as they had looked at the content, it was subject to strict scrutiny, but that was their only available way to communicate as their church moved around.

McKeever – What if it was a brick and mortar church?

Attorney Rentrop – It gets a lot easier. Good point, and every case is very fact specific. My feeling is that if you approach a situation where there is a constitutional issue, and you think there is a gray area, my advice is to lean toward a favorable decision. You have to be very careful, and speak to our office any time for guidance.

Sovel – Are you suggesting that sign requests have only a diagram without wording?

Attorney Rentrop – That's not necessary. You just need to base your decision, to grant or deny a variance or appeal, based upon the criteria.

Discussion continued regarding considering sign requirements carefully, and understanding that the content is not the issue.

Attorney Rentrop – I wanted to bring up the M-5 electronic billboard, which is being relocated. It was the only freestanding billboard sign in Commerce Township. The reason why is because our office had a very careful approach in this to make sure that we allowed some signs, to accommodate that.

McKeever – How could we restrict this to just one?

Sovel – We have identified that billboards can only be put on an M-5 type of road, and they have to be a specific distance apart. In looking at the Township, there is no other location that meets the criteria.

Discussion continued regarding subtle nuances in signs and regulations.

Attorney Rentrop directed the group's attention to the sources of authority for the Zoning Board of Appeals. The primary source is Article 41 of the Zoning Ordinance, and the second is another section of the Zoning Ordinance which is specifically called Rights of the ZBA to Review, and also, the Code of Ordinances, such as the Land Division Act. In addition, State law indicates that the Township Board can delegate appropriate responsibilities to the ZBA, such as interpretation of ordinances, et cetera.

Article 41 sets forth five duties of the ZBA, which are administrative appeals, interpretation of the zoning district boundaries, interpretation of the zoning ordinance provisions, variances and exceptions. These are the primary functions of the ZBA. For administrative appeals, the ZBA should hear and decide appeals where it is alleged there is an error by the Planning Department or Building Department. The Building Enforcement Officials are charged with zoning enforcement and making administrative decisions. If someone disagrees with that decision, they would file an appeal with the Planning Department. They would review the appeal to make sure it complies with the

requirements of the appeal process in Article 41, and if it does, it then goes before the ZBA.

The second is exceptions; the ZBA is to hear requests for exceptions and other matters. For example, Article 30, Signs; any exception shall be subject to the conditions the ZBA may require to preserve and promote the purpose of this ordinance and the character of the zoning district in question.

Additionally, it is noted, the ZBA must have a public hearing and the decision must include a written record of the specific findings of fact in the determination. It is crucial to provide specific criteria and descriptions as to why the decision was made for approval or denial.

There are two ways that the ZBA reviews signs. One is through administrative appeal, if it was denied by Dave or Jay as it did not meet the requirements of the sign ordinance. The applicant files an appeal. If they get denied a permit, or they know they will get denied, then there is an exception sign review. The applicant the files their request for an exception which also goes to the ZBA.

Attorney Rentrop gave a detailed review with a PowerPoint on the overhead. He discussed sign procedures and the process of review, including permitting, noncompliance and denials, administrative review and exception applications. He also provided a handout of the chart as presented, along with additional information on the appeals process reviews and motions, and exception reviews and motions.

Sovel – The word abuse in here seems harsh.

Attorney Rentrop – That's what's in the ordinance, and it's part of the legal language.

Chairperson Rosman – Basically, these are the four things we want to look at if the request was denied by Jay or Dave.

Dave Campbell suggested discussion of a real-world example, where an applicant built up the earth beneath their sign, then stated that it was only 6' tall, but because they built up the mound underneath to raise the sign 4', that would not be allowable. They might not agree with the measurement from the base of the mound, and therefore, they would go to the ZBA to appeal the decision.

McKeever – That criteria is spelled out.

Attorney Rentrop – Yes, and in theory, there shouldn't be a lot of appeals as most situations have criteria set forth in the ordinance. That applies in land division also; it's the same situation where there are very specific criteria set forth in the ordinance.

Chairperson Rosman – It has been our experience that when we receive the reports, all of these things are answered. I'd like to advance further in our discussion, because we don't get an awful lot of appeals as a result of administration not being logical about what they're doing.

Attorney Rentrop – Okay, I just wanted to clarify the criteria.

Attorney Rentrop continued his review, discussing Zoning Ordinance interpretations, and moving forward to sign exceptions, including the 7 criteria to be considered when granting or denying a request for an exception.

Chairperson Rosman – When we make a motion for a dimensional variance, we are asked to make three or four points in our motion describing our decision. In the sign variance, it says that one reason is enough. Is it really?

Attorney Rentrop – It can be, yes.

Chairperson Rosman – So we need to check this list of seven items when reviewing an exception, but we only need to refer to one of them as the reason for approval or denial?

Attorney Rentrop – Potentially, but the more points made, the better. If you can address each one of those, it is beneficial.

Chairperson Rosman – So we want to make sure that when we deny a sign variance request, that we absolutely have one specific reason, but having two or three more is better.

Sovel – Unlike the previous discussion, all versus many.

Chairperson Rosman – Remember that.

Attorney Rentrop – Dave and I talked about this earlier today, and I'm trying to make sure this goes as smoothly and as clearly as possible.

Chairperson Rosman – That was a tough one.

Attorney Rentrop – The same thing is true here. The actual ordinance language doesn't say that you have to have one or more, it doesn't say you have to have one or many. These are the factors to consider in determining whether to grant an exception.

Dave Campbell – Some of these might not even be applicable, such as #4 has to do with height and area. If what you're asking is for the setback, then height and area are not applicable criteria.

Chairperson Rosman – Right. Most of the time, when we make a motion, 1, or 2 or 3 are it, but #5 is another one we always throw in.

Attorney Rentrop – I would suggest #7 would be one you always throw in too, which is, *the exception is not significantly impairing the intent and the purpose of the Article*. Obviously, you have an ordinance that has a purpose, and although that purpose might

be lengthy and difficult to understand at times, this is definitely a catch-all provision that can apply to approval or denial. I encourage you to look at the first two sections of Article 30, which are lengthy. It talks about the intent of the sign article. In reading the purpose section, 30.01, there are basically three main issues; safety, aesthetics and maintaining roadside open spaces.

Sovel – We have a conflict in my opinion. This discusses distracted driving, but yet we are allowing animated signs. How is that not considered an issue?

Attorney Rentrop – That is getting into the details of what is and is not legal.

Chairperson Rosman – We're not allowed to have graphics on the signs.

Attorney Rentrop – Regulations are in place for how fast you can flash the graphics, et cetera.

Pacheco – So you only require one of the seven criteria to be able to deny or affirm a request?

Attorney Rentrop – If someone comes in for an exception, and they meet one or more of the requirements, you can grant it. If they don't ...

Pacheco – The last one is insurance because it is vague.

Attorney Rentrop – Yes, and that's exactly why I strongly encourage you to explain why you've reached a decision, because there is a lot of discretion in all of these, such as aesthetics. These are pretty broad terms, and when you're being asked to make the discretion as a Board, you really need to articulate what it is you're basing the discretion on so that the court can review it and see that it makes sense.

Attorney Rentrop continued his detailed review of the seven criteria, including obstructions, visibility, site features, scale, aesthetics, minimal exception necessary, and intent of the article. He provided examples for consideration with regard to discretion. Again, the Ordinance requires that the ZBA state specific grounds for their decision, specific facts, and of course, conditions may be attached. He also referenced Section 30.02, which has 23 general standards.

Open discussions took place regarding specific examples of sign issues throughout the Township, potential exceptions and denials.

Attorney Rentrop moved forward to answering the question; When is it appropriate to deny a sign exception? The short answer is, when the Zoning Ordinance prohibits the sign and there's not a reasonable basis for an exception. The ZBA shouldn't be hearing anything on a sign theoretically, unless it's already precluded. Obviously, if an administrative decision was clearly arbitrary, which is highly unlikely, but certainly if the Board is hearing an exception, that presupposes that it is already prohibited.

The next question is; Does the ZBA have to approve a sign just because the Zoning Ordinance allows it? Yes, but the ZBA shouldn't be hearing it unless it's not allowed. The short answer, in theory, is that most sign exceptions could be denied unless there is a clearly legitimate reason within the criteria for granting it.

The ZBA must consider the exceptions for signs and other factors deemed relevant in determining whether to grant an exception to a particular requirement. The sign exception provision gives the seven criteria, but it also says in the section above that, 30.09.A., *Following a public hearing, the ZBA shall consider the standards, the seven standards of this Section, and any other factors deemed relevant.*

Attorney Rentrop advised avoiding this, as "any other factors deemed relevant" sounds too controversial. Unless it is something that is so clearly relevant that it is appropriate to consider, avoid using this as part of the decision-making process.

The final question was; How does the ZBA review an appeal from a decision of the code of ordinances in land divisions? This would be done the same way that the ZBA reviews an appeal from anybody. If it is a land division appeal, it would be an administrative review as well; holding a public hearing, considering the reasons that the request was denied, making a decision, and putting the findings in writing.

Attorney Rentrop – Before we move on to the land division section of the discussion, does anyone have questions on what we've discussed regarding signs?

Watson – Hans, if a sign is proposed and it just so happens that all the neighbors have signs that happen to be too large, is it better to approve their request for a variance?

Attorney Rentrop – The Board would have to look at the specifics and the facts of the situation. Obviously, the Zoning Ordinance is intended to bring something that is nonconforming into conformance. Just because something is nonconforming, it doesn't mean that we want it to go on forever.

That being said, there are certain rights. If you have 10 commercial lots, and 9 of them have nonconforming signs, and the 10th one wants to put in one that will match the other signs, it seems logical, if it's in place with the surroundings and they've applied for the exception. If they meet the other criteria, it seems like it's probably appropriate. If you can do something less than that, something that would serve the purposes of the advertising, then you can probably justify that as well. It is a bit of a gray area, but as long as the Board articulates the decisions, I think you'll be okay.

Chairperson Rosman discussed the shopping center at Commerce and Union Lake Road, on the southwest corner. Open discussion ensued regarding recent reviews of the sizes of signs at this location, and the potential for preliminary reviews by the Building Official before signs are installed. Bill McKeever stated that if a sign is put up that was not approved, then a violation can be written and it has to be removed. All information should be contained in the permit. Jay James stated that all information is in the permit. He also indicated that in recent reviews of signage at this shopping center, the signs were found to be in compliance with the original permits and they were conforming with the ordinance. Dave Campbell elaborated on the process for measuring signs, which involves drawing a rectangle around the farthest extent of the entire sign

including any logo. Jay James also discussed rent pricing for properties, which varies based upon accessibility and visibility, so people don't want to pay high rent along a main road. Instead, they choose a building that sits farther back because it's cheaper, then they come in to the Township to complain that people can't find their business and claim that their sign is too small. He also elaborated on how people find destinations today, which is based more upon Google and GPS as opposed to seeing signage.

Supervisor Scott – Hans, for education sake, can you use the idea that if a large number of storefronts have a sign that is nonconforming, and a new business comes in and says I want to have a sign like theirs, do we run into problems if a conforming sign would not be dramatically different than the nonconforming ones?

Attorney Rentrop – There's two issues. One, is that a lawful nonconforming sign, or is it an illegal nonconforming sign? If it's illegal, then absolutely not and you abide by the ordinance. If it is a lawful, pre-existing, nonconforming sign, then you have a different issue. My recommendation there is that you need to provide the amount of signage to reasonably accomplish the purpose.

Discussion continued regarding the Village Overlay, which prohibits internally illuminated wall signs; however, other types of illumination are permissible. There are alternatives. It was also noted that counsel had once advised, even if you make a mistake previously, you should not continue to make that same mistake again.

McKeever – Don't we have a caveat somewhere in the ordinance that addresses this? Just because we've approved a design, it doesn't mean that you have the ability to do what's not permitted by the ordinance?

Attorney Rentrop – That's correct. No one can approve a violation of the ordinance.

McKeever – Even if we inadvertently issue a building permit, or a sign permit, and it doesn't meet the ordinance, they're still in the wrong.

Attorney Rentrop – Correct.

Attorney Rentrop proceeded to discuss land divisions and the appeal process. The ZBA gets authority from the Code of Ordinances. Interestingly, the ZBA is not delegated authority to review land division appeals under the Land Division Act. That act does not say who would review these appeals of administrative decisions; it is just silent.

Therefore, the Code of Ordinances says that the ZBA will do this.

The Ordinance states, in relevant part, that *the Township has to review a land division application within 45 days, and shall promptly notify the applicant of the decision, and if denied, the reasons for the denial.* That's also so that the ZBA knows why it was denied and what the basis of the decision to deny was. The controlling section is Section C, which states, *any person or entity aggrieved by this decision may appeal the decision to the Board of Appeals, which the code defines as the ZBA.* It also says in there that; *the Board of Appeals shall review the decision using the same standards and procedures*

found in the Township Zoning Ordinance regarding variance applications. That is believed to be a typo because if the variance provisions were applied to a land division appeal, it wouldn't make a whole lot of sense. Attorney Rentrop believed that what they meant to say here was, *using the procedures of the variance process, or otherwise in the administrative review process.*

Practically speaking, the process is that the applicant submits their application to the Planning Department. The Planning Department reviews the application to ensure it is complete, the ZBA holds a public hearing and issues a written decision, using criteria from 41.06 which is the administrative part. If an applicant is dissatisfied with the decision of the ZBA, of course, they can appeal to the circuit court. If the court finds that the record is insufficient, or the factors were not satisfied, then they will remand it back for further findings.

Discussions took place regarding appeals that have gone to circuit court, which have been very few over the years.

Attorney Rentrop wrapped up his discussion. In conclusion, he stated that the ZBA is on the front line and has the best interpretation of the Zoning Ordinance. Although by statute, the ZBA does not have the authority to amend the Zoning Ordinance, the Board members should be giving their input to the Planning Department and making suggestions for change.

ITEM G2: SIGNS AND SIGN EXCEPTIONS

Chairperson Rosman – We're going to talking about wall signs, freestanding signs, the criteria for sign exceptions, and administrative approval of sign exceptions.

A. Wall Signs

1. Wall sign area
2. Signs only allowed on the side of the building adjacent to a road

B. Freestanding Signs

1. Setback from planned right of way (usually 75 feet from centerline)

C. Criteria for Sign Exceptions (Sec. 30.09.B)

D. Administrative approval of Sign Exceptions

Chairperson Rosman – Is there anything you would like to see, questions you have, or something you would like clarified?

Pacheco – I think it is a very difficult ordinance to follow. The explanations here have been well presented, however, this is very technical and difficult.

Chairperson Rosman – That is why it's so helpful when Hans gave us the criteria for reviews of dimensional variance requests. That was tremendous help in making motions. We have a separate sheet for dimensional variances, and another for signs.

Sovel – I would ask that we also get one for land divisions.

Attorney Rentrop – There are a few things in municipal government which are nearly impossible; those are signs and sidewalks. Sidewalks are wonderful, but the liabilities associated are horrendous.

Mistele – I think this presentation was very good. Dave has had some ideas, discussing changes to the sign ordinance, and I'm interested to talk more about those.

Mills – I would like to know that when we grant a sign variance, that what's there currently must be removed. Any nonconforming signs, such as portable signs, need to be removed.

Discussion ensued regarding adding the condition to remove any and all nonconforming signs in conjunction with any sign exception being granted.

McKeever – I'm in agreement with Clarence. The one thing that does stick out is just painting the name of your business on the side of a box truck and parking it by the street.

Dave Campbell – That is not allowed. They're literally a moving target.

Jay James – It's not allowed; however, proving that it's a violation is difficult. If they're actually using the truck and then just parking it, it's hard to call it a sign.

Examples of vehicles as signs were discussed at length. It was noted that these vehicles have to be operable and licensed.

Sovel – My concern is the "after-hours" and "weekend" signs.

Enforcement was addressed. Jay James explained that these do get removed if they are in the right-of-way. It's more difficult if they are placed close to the building. They are informed it is against the ordinance.

Chairperson Rosman – Paula, you meet people at the counter all day long. Do you have any comments?

Lankford – I'm in agreement with the comments made here this evening. Hans put it very well in explaining what staff needs to do, and how the ZBA must be diligent, and provide reasons for their decisions when making determinations.

Chairperson Rosman – My concern is when you have a center that is further back from the road, should there be a different sign allowance for these when compared to those that are closer to the road. I would suggest that the Planning Department look into this.

Dave Campbell – We did want to brainstorm issues in the Zoning Ordinance that cause people to come to you as a ZBA on a somewhat regular basis to ask for an exception. When something comes up as an exception, or a variance repeatedly, it should give us reason to say, “Let’s look at the rule.” Maybe the problem is not the folks asking for an exception to the rule, maybe the problem is the rule. In one of the appeals we have had from an applicant, one of their claims was that they were so far from the road that you wouldn’t be able to see their sign if they made it fit within our regulations. We do have a threshold now that says, a sign that is X number of feet from the road can be this big, and a sign that is more than 600’ from the road can be this size. One of the things Jay thinks might make sense, and it would be worth hearing from the ZBA, should there be more than a threshold just between 0 and 600’? Should there be a 200’ or 400’ threshold? If a building is 400’ from the road, then maybe they get something in between what we have now.

Sovel discussed Home Depot’s signage. He asked that if something got built in front of them, would they be allowed to come back and ask for a variance because their signage would be obstructed?

Jay James – No, not according to the Ordinance. Actually, Home Depot and Meijer are over 600’ from the road, but in addition, their buildings are over X amount of square feet. That’s what enables them.

Discussions continued regarding retailers changing their signage to fit within the Township’s guidelines, allowances for larger signs based upon the distance from the road, the potential for a sliding scale in this regard, and reviewing these options.

McKeever – Our traffic consultants could offer some information and insight on an acceptable formula might be when determining the sliding scale and size of signage at certain distances.

Dave Campbell – We can consult with them, and we are also going to look at how other communities handle this. Paula and Ann have started compiling other ordinances in this regard.

Chairperson Rosman – I would like to ask that Administrative Staff and the Planning Commission take a look at those alternatives. We can also provide our input. I like the idea that a traffic consultant could help determine what those numbers should be.

Dave Campbell – Applicants might argue that the area of the façade where the sign can be located is this large, but you’re only allowing us to have a sign of this size and it looks out of scale. There is something that other communities do, and I know Jay doesn’t like this idea, and I think he has convinced me that I don’t either, but I’ll still bring it up; should we base the size of the sign on the area of the façade? For example, a sign can only be 10% of the façade area for your tenant space. I think where we don’t like that idea is that it might encourage commercial building owners to raise their

parapet or otherwise do some tricks to their building to make a bigger façade. I think we will veto that one.

Chairperson Rosman discussed issues with sign colors and designs chosen by landlords and/or tenants. When they make a poor choice, it should not be the ZBA's concern.

Dave Campbell – That is seemingly between the landlord and the tenant. However, that doesn't mean they can't come to the ZBA with their request, and staff makes it clear to them that it's something they should take up with their landlord.

Discussions continued regarding allowing wall signs on a building other than on the front side, signage on corner buildings, signage issues with multi-tenant buildings, and alternatives for businesses that are so close to the road that there is no space for a monument sign. Other topics reviewed were updating the ordinance to address some of these issues, and also allowing administrative review of certain requests. Jay James discussed percentages allowable for signage, and potentially splitting those percentages for a business that requests signage on the front and side. This would not be allowable if it were facing a residence. Chairperson Rosman felt this might lead to sign pollution and offered examples. Dave Campbell stated that if a monument sign is not feasible, it might make sense to allow a sign on the side of the building in lieu of a monument sign, because effectively in this case, the building is the sign. There may be a minimum distance built into the Zoning Ordinance, that if the building is X # of feet to the road, then they cannot have a freestanding sign. Staff would bring this suggestion back for further review. Attorney Rentrop and Chairperson Rosman felt this was very sensible. Alternative signage, such as projection signs and awnings, were discussed which could increase visibility.

Dave Campbell reviewed freestanding signs in relation to the 120' planned right-of-way as deemed by the RCOC. This is a 60' half right-of-way, and the Township requires that the sign be 15' off that line, or 75' from the centerline of the road. For a lot of businesses, especially older businesses, many cannot meet that setback requirement so they come to the ZBA asking for an exception. This might be another item that needs to be reevaluated. Attorney Rentrop discussed a similar issue with fences. Paula Lankford stated that the fences were allowed on the right-of-way line. Attorney Rentrop was unsure if there was a parallel here. Sovel suggested that these could be handled administratively. Discussion continued regarding basing this on averaging of adjacent signage. Paula Lankford noted that there have been 15 of these requests since 2013. Dave Campbell added that if this would be an administrative sign exception to be too close to the road, then he would want to build in that all the other nonconforming and temporary signs must first be removed. That is a method to clean up other issues.

H. OTHER MATTERS: None.

I. CORRESPONDENCE: None.

J. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT: None.

K. ADJOURNMENT:

- **NEXT REGULAR MEETING DATE: THURSDAY, MARCH 22, 2018**

MOTION by Mills, supported by McKeever, to adjourn the meeting at 6:53pm.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Jorge Pacheco, Secretary