

**MINUTES OF PLAN COMMISSION
FOR THE CITY OF CUDAHY, WI HELD AT THE MUNICIPAL BUILDING ON
July 11, 2017**

CALL TO ORDER

1. Meeting was called to order by Mayor John Hohenfeldt at 7:00 pm.

OPENING STATEMENT

Prior to the meeting, notice was given to the community and posted in the appropriate places. Notice was also given to the news media that requested it, namely the Milwaukee Journal-Sentinel and MyCommunityNow.com.

ROLL CALL

The following members of the Plan Commission were present for roll call: Commissioner Mike Nelson, Alderman Justin Moralez, Commissioner Nick Gates, Commissioner Harry Savagian, and Alderwoman Michele St. Marie-Boelkow. Commissioner Jim Zsebe was absent and excused. Also present was Economic Development/Inspections & Zoning Director Brian Biernat.

2. Review and take appropriate action on the meeting minutes of June 13, 2017. **Motion made by St. Marie-Boelkow, seconded by Savagian**, to approve the minutes. All in favor.

OLD BUSINESS

3. None

NEW BUSINESS

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING

4. Public hearing to review an application for a conditional use permit to allow a commercial office space at 3772 E. Pulaski Avenue, submitted Justin Shurr (Air Masters HVAC). The proposed use may be allowed as a conditional use within the PUD Overlay per:

DIVISION 23. – Planned Unit Development Overlay District Sec. 44-752. – Permitted uses.
(2)(d) The permitted and conditional uses in the B-1 Neighborhood Business District as listed in division 10 of this article may be permitted where, in the opinion of the plan commission, the size, placement, and character of the uses as proposed would be compatible with the residential character of the development. Under no circumstances may the area occupied by the business uses, including parking, total more than 15 percent of the total area of the residential planned unit development. Such proposed business uses shall comply with the requirements of sections 44-335—44-338, except that the minimum lot area for such use may be reduced to one acre and the minimum lot width may be reduced to 125 feet.

STAFF COMMENTS: Economic Development Director Brian Biernat spoke about the historic character of the Pulaski Ave neighborhood as containing several storefronts for small businesses. The applicant would like to open an HVAC business at the address necessitating a conditional use permit per code. There will be no fabricating or assembly on premises. The building will be office and storage uses.

PRESENTATION BY APPLICANT: Justin Shurr presented his plan to have his office on the lower level of the address. He has no plans to have signage, but agrees to return to the Design

Review Board for signage approval should he decide signage is appropriate. The only business related parking on-site is Shurr's truck.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: There were no public comments.

CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING closed at 7:09 PM.

5. Appropriate action regarding an application for a conditional use permit to allow a commercial office space at 3772 E. Pulaski Avenue, submitted Justin Shurr (Air Masters HVAC). **MOTION MADE BY NELSON, SECONDED BY GATES**, to approve the proposal as presented. All in favor.

CONVENE JOINT MEETING OF THE PLAN COMMISSION AND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

The following members of the Design Review Board were present: Peter Dombrowski, Joan Houlehen, Eloise Williamson, Nick Gates, and Mike Nelson.

OLD BUSINESS

6. Review and take appropriate action regarding an application for a conditional use permit to allow a government structure at 5133 S. Whitnall Avenue & 5200 S. Barland Avenue, submitted by the City of Cudahy Department of Public Works. Government structures are a conditional use within the M-1 Limited Manufacturing District. The proposal is to build a DPW facility. The site, architectural, and landscaping plans are preliminary. The item was tabled at the June 13, 2017 joint meeting of the Plan Commission and Design Review Board.

Mayor Hohenfeldt delivered the following written statement which was provided to the Plan Commission and Design Review Board as a submittal for tonight's meeting:

Dear Commissioners:

During a Public Hearing held before the Plan Commission held on June 13, 2017, there appeared to be questions that were brought forth during the public hearing. The purpose of a public hearing is to allow staff and the applicant to make presentations regarding the proposed project, then allow the public to speak regarding the project. The item at hand was a conditional use for the property, not how the City was going to pay for the project. While questions arise during a public hearing, those questions are usually more pertaining to the use, and not other factors. However, as the Chairman of the Plan Commission and Mayor, I feel compelled to answer many if not all of the questions that were presented.

History of current Public Works Facility:

The original Public Works facility and the floor plan was drawn up in January of 1946, based on documents contained within the city property files. Construction of the facility began in July of 1946. We cannot find records on when work planning originally began on the facility, but presume that planning was in the works for several years. (See attached graph paper building plans approved by the city)

The original (east building) containing now not only storage space for DPW trucks, but it also contained offices for the Engineering Department, Garage Office, Water Utility Office, Tool Rooms, Boiler Room, and indoor storage for fuels and chemicals. (See attached floor plan)

In 1954, the current Water Tower located next to the DPW garage was constructed. At the same time, the City Water Utility was established also in 1954 and builds a filtration plant, which is at its current location on Lake Drive.

In 1963, a 60 x 100 metal storage building was added to the property, and the western addition to the facility (mechanics bays) were added on 10-29-1985 at a cost of \$200,000. This addition added 67,000 cubic feet of space, and they also added two 500,000 BTU heaters in the garage at a cost of \$10,698.

In 1985 and later, there were also additional expansion plans for the current public works facility that were found in various engineering and public works files. Those plans at that time were scrapped for unknown reasons.

1. Was the meeting properly noticed with correct detail? What are the powers of the city's Plan Commission?

Per Cudahy Municipal Code and Wisconsin State Statutes, the procedure for Public Hearings is extremely spelled out within our Municipal Code and Wisconsin State Statutes. An excerpt from our municipal code section 44-1259 is listed below. I have verified with the City Clerk's Office that all of the requirements of our Municipal Code and Wisconsin State Statutes were met. (Meeting notices and public hearing notices attached). In addition, as a courtesy, the City of Cudahy also puts public hearing notices on our city website.

Sec. 44-1259. - Notice of public hearings.

(a) Notice of any public hearing which the common council, plan commission, or zoning board of appeals is required to hold under the terms of this chapter shall specify the date, time and place of hearing, and the matter to be presented at the hearing. Pursuant to Wis. Stats. ch. 985 the notice shall be published as a Class 2 notice in a newspaper of general circulation in the city at least once each week for two consecutive weeks, the last publication of which shall be at least one week before the public hearing.

(b) Notice of the public hearing shall be mailed to all parties-in-interest at least 10 days before the hearing. Parties-in-interest shall be defined as the petitioner, the clerk of any municipality whose boundaries are within 1,000 feet of any lands included in the petition, and the owners of all lands included in the petition and all lands lying within 300 feet of lands included in the petition. The failure to give any notice to any property owner shall not invalidate the action taken by one of the aforementioned bodies.

(Code 2004, § 17.1301)

2. What is the authority of the Plan Commission, per municipal code and Wisconsin State Statutes?

Sec. 2-256. - Plan commission.

(a) The plan commission shall at all times consist of seven members. All members of the commission shall be appointed by the mayor. The mayor shall also choose the presiding officer. All member appointments by the mayor shall be subject to confirmation by the council.

(b) The mayor may appoint city elected or appointed officials to the commission, except that the commission shall always have at least three citizen members who are not city officials.

(c) Citizen members shall be persons of recognized experience and qualifications and will not receive compensation for commission service.

(d) The mayor will appoint members during the month of April for terms that expire in April. Citizen members shall be appointed by the mayor for three-year terms in such manner so as to effect the appointment of one of their number every year.

(e) The director of economic development, inspections and zoning shall attend all commission meetings for advisory purposes only.

(f) The plan commission shall have such powers and duties as are provided by state law and by chapter 44.

(Code 2004, § 1.34; Ord. No. 2321, 2-3-2009)

Sec. 44-1261. - Plan commission.

The city plan commission shall have the duties of making reports and recommendations related to the planning and development of the city to public officials, agencies, public utility companies, civic, educational, professional and other organizations, and citizens. The plan commission may employ staff and shall oversee the operation of the office of the zoning administrator. The commission, its members and employees, in the performance of its functions, may enter upon any land and make examinations and surveys. In general, the plan commission shall have such powers as may be necessary to enable it to perform its function and promote municipal planning.

(Code 2004, § 17.1001)

Sec. 44-790. - Powers and duties of the building inspector, design review board, and plan commission.

All applications within are subject to one of the following two processes, as determined by the building inspector:

- (1) *Design review* . Those applications involving only a change in the appearance of a property, such as painting, roofing, siding, substitution of architectural components, fencing, paving, or signage are subject to review by the building inspector and the design review board. The building inspector shall serve as the liaison between the applicant and the design review board, in facilitating the thorough and expedient review of an application, and shall ensure that the technical and procedural requirements of this chapter are met. The design review board shall serve as the final review and determining body in these matters, and shall focus its review on whether the application complies with sound aesthetic, urban design, historic, and architectural practices pursuant to the procedures outlined in section 44-792. This effort shall be guided, in part, by the city's comprehensive plan and the city design guidelines manual.
- (2) *Project review* . Those applications involving modification to the physical configuration of a property, such as grading, erection of a new building, demolition of an existing building, or the addition or removal of bulk to an existing building, are subject to review by the building inspector, the design review board, and the city plan commission. The building inspector shall serve as the liaison between the applicant, the design review board, and the plan commission in facilitating the thorough and expedient review of an application, and shall ensure that the technical and procedural requirements of this chapter are met. The plan commission shall serve as the initial and final discretionary review body on site design, and shall focus its review on the application's compliance with sound land use, site design, and economic revitalization practices. The design review board shall serve as the initial and final review and determining body on aesthetics, and shall focus its review on the application's compliance with sound aesthetic, urban design, historic, and architectural practices pursuant to the procedures outlined in section 44-793. The efforts of both the plan commission and the design review board shall be guided, in part, by the city's comprehensive plan and the design guidelines manual.

(Code 2004, § 17.0345(E); Ord. No. 2356, 1-4-2011)

3. Were the plans open for inspection by the Department of Economic Development/Zoning & Inspection as listed in the legal notice?

As published in the legal notice, the scope and extent of the conditional use was open for public inspection in the office of the Economic Development Director and available for public viewing during

ordinary office hours. In addition, the Director of Public Works/Engineering met with one resident, and the Mayor met with different residents who came with questions or concerns. Both of these residents also attended the Public Hearing before the Plan Commission and were afforded the opportunity to provide their input and answer any additional questions.

4. What are other uses within the M-1 current zoning for the property?

While the item before the Plan Commission is a conditional use, items currently under the M-1 zoning which are legally zoned for the property are listed below. While the Plan Commission is afforded some latitude on a proposal of M-1 Manufacturing, I have listed below the M-1 Principal uses per Municipal Code Section 44.

Sec. 44-500. - Intent.

The M-1 Limited Manufacturing District is intended to provide for manufacturing, industrial, and related uses of a limited nature and size, which on the basis of actual physical and operational characteristics would not be detrimental to the surrounding area or to the city as a whole by reason of smoke, noise, dust, odor, traffic, physical appearance, or other similar factors.

(Code 2004, § 17.0325(intro.); Ord. No. 2053, 2-4-2003; Ord. No. 2074, 8-19-2003; Ord. No. 2340, 3-2-2010)

Sec. 44-501. - Principal uses.

The following principal uses shall be permitted in the M-1 Limited Manufacturing District:

- (1) Assembly, processing, manufacturing and/or storage of the following:
 - a. Automotive upholstery and automotive accessories.
 - b. Apparel and findings, and related products.
 - c. Automatic temperature controls.
 - d. Book, newspaper, and magazine publishing, printing, and binding and binding devices.
 - e. Brooms and brushes.
 - f. Candy and confectionery products.
 - g. Cereal and pasta preparations.
 - h. Cleaning, dressing and dyeing.
 - i. Electrical appliances
 - j. Electronic devices.
 - k. Electrotyping and stereotyping.
 - l. Engineering, laboratory, scientific and research instruments and related equipment.
 - m. Fabric and felt, knit and lace goods.
 - n. Flavor extracts and flavor syrups.
 - o. Floor coverings limited to rugs and carpeting.
 - p. Footwear.
 - q. Fresh or frozen fruits, fruit juices, vegetables and specialties.
 - r. Fur products packaging and assembly, but not including tanning.
 - s. Glass and glass container manufacturing.

- t. Greeting cards.
 - u. Handbags, luggage and other personal leather goods.
 - v. Hats, caps and millinery.
 - w. Household furniture and furnishings.
 - x. Ice.
 - y. Ice cream and frozen desserts.
 - z. Jewelry, buttons and miscellaneous notions.
 - aa. Leather fabrication, not including tanning.
 - bb. Mechanical measuring and controlling instruments.
 - cc. Medical equipment and supplies, including dental equipment, ophthalmic goods, optical instruments and lenses, orthopedic, prosthetic, surgical appliances and supplies, pharmaceuticals and surgical instruments.
 - dd. Morticians' goods.
 - ee. Musical instruments and parts.
 - ff. Office supplies, artist materials and photographic equipment and supplies.
 - gg. Paper coating and glazing, and manufacture of products from paper, but not the manufacture of paper or pulp.
 - hh. Partitions, shelving, lockers, and office and store furniture and fixtures.
 - ii. Photoengraving instruments and apparatus.
 - jj. Pressed and molded pulp goods.
 - kk. Sanitary paper products.
 - ll. Sign and other advertising display manufacturing.
 - mm. Textile dyeing and finishing.
 - nn. Tire cord and fabric.
 - oo. Toys, amusement, sporting and athletic goods.
 - pp. Umbrellas.
 - qq. Wallpaper and window coverings.
 - rr. Watches, clocks, clockwork-operated devices and parts.
 - ss. Wool scouring and combing.
 - tt. Yarns and threads.
- (2) Commercial bakery.
 - (3) Commercial greenhouses.
 - (4) Food locker plants.
 - (5) Laboratories.
 - (6) Machine shops.
 - (7) Pleating, decorative and novelty stitching and tucking for the trade.
 - (8) Rice milling.

- (9) Typesetting.
- (10) Warehousing.
- (11) Welding shops.
- (12) Wholesaling.

(Code 2004, § 17.0325(A); Ord. No. 2053, 2-4-2003; Ord. No. 2074, 8-19-2003; Ord. No. 2340, 3-2-2010)

5. Did the City of Cudahy borrow the appropriate funds for construction of a salt dome and when was this accomplished?

The sources of funds for municipal projects and improvements are funds which are acquired from the Bond or Note market. The City of Cudahy has held a long standing relationship with Ehlers & Associates, the city's financial advisor who has been involved in all of the cities financing, and refinancing efforts since the early 1990s.

As a part of the process, the Office of Mayor, along with the Department Managers, identify specific needs of the city which can include but are not limited to municipal road, sewer, water, infrastructure projects, capitol purchases including such items as City Hall roof replacement, Department of Public Works, Police, and Fire Vehicles, Emergency Services Radio and Dispatch Equipment, and other major purchases of the city. Each time, working collectively with the governing bodies of the Finance Committee and Common Council, these needs of the city are vetted in open public meetings, before going to the market place.

The project of the acquisition of additional available necessary land with the area of 5133 S. Whitnall Avenue, construction of a new public works facility, and construction of a salt dome, have been a project that has been the works that began prior to me returning to the Office of the Mayor in 2013. The customary practice of the Common Council and Finance Committee since around 2008, has been to go to the market and borrow every two years, with a combination of financing for new items, as well as any refinancing efforts to save the citizens money (debt service on borrowing is covered under the General Tax Levy through the Debt Levy).

Refinancing efforts were conducted in 2013 and 2015 on previously bond and note issues to save the citizens money. A financing effort for new money (borrowing for capitol) was conducted in 2014. Due to tight financial constraints, the borrowing of \$350,000 for the new Department of Public Works Salt Dome was not able to be accomplished until a General Obligation Note Series 2016B in the amount of \$350,000 which was vetted as part of an open public meeting and approval process before the Common Council March and April of 2016.

6. Has a truck from the Department of Public Works ever started on fire, within the facility or in the public?

Attached to this report is a picture of a truck which exploded on a city street on the corners of New York and Henry Avenues in May of 2013. Other than the truck being destroyed, no employee or resident was injured in this incident. Had this vehicle been in an unprotected garage, this could have led to millions of dollars in equipment and facility being destroyed. (See attached picture)

7. Has the building ever inspected by the Building Inspection Department or Fire Department?

Reviewing the records from the Inspection Department which include Building Inspection, Electrical Inspection, and Plumbing Inspection, there appear to be a complete set of records in some cases going back to the original building, and more complete records from around the period of 1985 to present whenever work was done on the facility. In addition to the Inspection Department Records, I checked with the Fire Department who also inspects the facility (same as other city owned facilities) two times per year. If major improvements or expansion were to occur on the current site, those major improvements or expansion were to occur on the current site, those major improvements would need to be built up to today's current building and fire codes.

8. Have other Boards, Commissions, Committees and the Common Council provide authorization regarding the salt dome, acquisition of adjacent property, and plan moving forward?

The process of moving a new public works facility and salt dome is a long, multi-year process which has been in the works for several years. Currently, the City is working with Barrientos, a recognized firm that has worked on the design of various public works and other municipal facilities. The land at 5133 S. Whitnall (currently called water Annex), has been owned by the City and its entities for over 15 years, and has long been considered a possible site for a new public works facility. As mentioned above, this process moves through various different board, commissions, committees, and the Common Council. Most recently, the Board of Public Works received an informational update on the progress of the project at their May 22, 2017 meeting. Additionally, the Water Utility Commission reviewed and the City of Cudahy Storm Water Utility for the construction of a combined Utility and Department of Public Works Facility. On the evening of June 6, 2017, the Common Council received an update on the Department of Public Works space needs and planning study related to a new public works facility, as "Resolution for the sale of the Water Utility property at 5133 S. Whitnall Avenue and the purchase of the property by the City's Storm Water Utility." Each of these items considered on agendas were posted as required under Wisconsin State Law, and were discussed in open public session, as have all discussions regarding these matters.

9. A referendum should be held on the building of a salt dome and public works facility. How are we going to pay for it?

The citizens of the City of Cudahy have always been very generous in reviewing and approving referendums for items such as a new library facility as well as three referenda for projects within the School District of Cudahy facilities. When the City of Cudahy borrows money for capital projects, open public meetings have been and will continue to be held regarding all items that the city borrows money for.

In looking at other communities and their past practices regarding municipal facilities, I find no such referendum when the City of South Milwaukee moved their City, Police and Fire Departments from Chicago Road to the current sites. I also find no such referendum for the most recent construction of the city of St. Francis Civic Center and municipal building. The City of Greenfield during the week of June 26, 2017, moved into a new Fire Station with no referendum regarding the building of the new facility.

Respectfully submitted and reported to the Plan Commission,

John R. Hohenfeldt

Mayor

Chairman of the Plan Commission

7/11/2017

At this time a citizen attempted to speak and was not allowed because the meeting was not listed as a public hearing. It would be in violation of Wisconsin State Law to allow public comment at a non-public hearing.

Alderman Morales suggested to allow Director Mary Jo Lange to repeat her presentation of the plans from last month's meeting in order to properly inform the citizens at this night's meeting who were not present at the previous meeting.

Director Biernat stated that the conditional use permit application deals strictly with the proposed use of the property and does not deal with anything involving the building itself nor with funding of the project. Government structures are listed a conditional use under the M-1 zoning, as stated on the published public hearing notice. The proposal for the specific development is a separate issue because it is still in planning stages. Those plans, including funding, would be items at future meetings. The Mayor stated the power of the Plan Commission is to decide if the use is appropriate for the property. The City has yet to work with their financial advisors on the specific cost. Financing is not a prerogative of the Plan Commission.

The public was denied repeated attempts to speak per fact this was a non-public hearing.

Director Mary Jo Lange presented the plans per request of the Plan Commission. As the presentation also occurred at the June 13, 2017 meeting, details can be found in the June 13, 2017 minutes of the Plan Commission.

The current salt shed can hold 600 tons. The City typically gets 2,000 tons of salt each year. The City purchases salt annually, a year ahead of time, per State BID contract. If it is a year with low salt usage there is excess that must be taken. If the City does not take the excess the fine is \$125 per ton. This year that cost would be \$72,000. If the City does not purchase enough salt ahead of time it will run out of salt and be unable to purchase salt in the middle of the season. The salt at Jones Island is distributed across Southeastern Wisconsin. For many years the Department of Public Works has faced the issue of either not having enough salt storage space or a lack of salt from not purchasing enough. Director Lange developed the plan to build a salt storage facility large enough to hold the City's annual allotment. The process began to site the salt dome and was reviewed by the Board of Public Works, Common Council, Finance Committee, and put on the Capital Improvement Plan. Lange conducted a cost-benefit analysis to show that if the facility is built and salt is stockpiled then the return on investment of the salt dome can be achieved in three to four years. In addition, she addressed the deterioration of the current public works facility on Pabst Avenue and that eventually a new building must be built.

The proposal is to approve the concept of the plans and use of the site. It is not to approve a DPW facility. The DPW facility would require approval at future board meetings.

The current salt dome is not in compliance with DNR regulations. It would take a minimum of \$20,000 to get the current structure up to code and storage would still be limited to 600 tons. Updating the structure would be environmentally responsible because it would help reduce sodium chloride in fresh water supply. Director Lange stated that the Common Council allowed the Department to add salt to its budget, allowing the Department to use salt more effectively than in the past.

Morales asked if the City should expect to see a pay-off if the salt dome is approved and was affirmed. He then asked Director Lange to break down the conceptual process of the DPW facility and why it is potentially necessary. Lange stated the current facility on Pabst has many expenses and the site itself has limited space for future needs. The proposed site is about twice as large. The current facility is not conducive to a downtown setting, lacks storm water pollution control, has a deteriorating roof with a cost estimate of \$425,000 to fix, and the lack of fire protection could result in the loss of \$6.5 million in

equipment. Improvements needed to the current facility total close to \$8 million. The existing facility will cost \$157,700 per square foot to improve while the new facility will cost \$153,014 per square foot.

Moralez re-iterated that this meeting does not guarantee a new DPW facility will be built and will require multiple reviews to assess the costs of alternatives. He requested a 10 to 15 minute break to field questions from the public regarding the item. The Commissioners agreed to the request. Mayor Hohenfeldt recessed the meeting at this time.

Meeting called back in to order at 8:10 PM.

Moralez asked Director Lange why it is more valuable to invest money into the DPW facility as opposed to other services of the DPW like road reconstruction, tree trimming, and sewers. She stated that the cost recovery is cheaper to build a new facility that will last 50 or more years rather than repair the existing facility. She addressed the Departments conduct in the other services. Discussion ensued about City services.

Moralez asked Lange more questions which he received from citizens during the recess. The salt structure is sized for 200 tons. If salt is bought during a year when the commodity is cheap you can stockpile the salt for future years. The architect gave a rough cost estimate which determined the estimated costs stated previously by Lange.

St. Marie-Boelkow asked if the cost analysis was vetted by a third party. It was not. The Mayor stated the City's financial advisors, Ehlers & Associates, would be the third party to vet a cost analysis as the proposal for the DPW facility moved forward to the Finance Committee and Common Council.

A lengthy discussion about city services ensued.

Peter Dombrowski addressed the citizens about the purpose of the Design Review Board. The Design Review Board are volunteer community members, not City employees, and they do not concern themselves with financing or public projects. Mike Nelson stated he would like to see further illustrations and material samples of the salt shed. Dombrowski stated conceptual plans were received at the June meeting and then asked for a motion to approve the conceptual design for the salt storage shed.

Motion made by Williamson, seconded by Houlehen, to approve the conceptual design of the salt dome. All in favor.

St. Marie-Boelkow stated the needs analysis for the salt shed was presented to the Common Council and previously approved in the budget. She introduced a motion

Motion made by St. Marie-Boelkow, seconded by Savagian, to limit the conditional use approve to acceptance of the salt storage shed only and take no further action on other structures at 5133 S. Whitnall Avenue & 5200 S. Barland Avenue. All in favor.

For the record, Biernat stated that if the Plan Commission is going to limit the conditional use approval to the salt shed then the process for approval of any other future structure at the site would be an Amendment to the Conditional Use, and there for require another public hearing.

For the record, Mayor Hohenfeldt stated the item will not be on the upcoming Common Council agenda.

Motion made by Nelson, seconded by Gates, to adjourn the Design Review Board from the joint meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

10. Review and take appropriate action regarding a request by Ewald's Venus Ford (2727 E. Layton Avenue) to allow temporary parking at Blast Fitness (2525 E. Layton Avenue) during construction of Ewald's building addition. **Motion made by Nelson, seconded by St. Marie-Boelkow**, to approve the proposal as presented. All in favor.
11. Review and take appropriate action regarding a Certified Survey Map for a combination of lots at 3915 E. Edgerton Ave, submitted by Tracy & Mike Gulock (owner). **Motion made by Nelson, seconded by St. Marie-Boelkow**, to approve the CSM as presented. All in favor.
12. Review and take appropriate action regarding a Certified Survey Map for a combination of lots at 3933 E. Plankinton Ave, submitted by Daniel Parker (owner). **Motion made by Moralez, seconded by Gates**, to approve the CSM as presented. All in favor.
13. Review and take appropriate action regarding a Certified Survey Map for a combination of lots at 3726 E. Allerton Ave, submitted by Christopher & Meredith Berry (owner). **Motion made by Moralez, seconded by Savagian**, to approve the CSM as presented. All in favor.
14. Review and take appropriate action regarding a Certified Survey Map for a combination of lots at 4819 S. Lake Dr, submitted by Dennis Jenders (owner). **Motion made by Moralez, seconded by Savagian**, to approve the CSM as presented. All in favor. Mr. Jenders added a comment that the Department should consider costs involved with requiring certified survey maps.

ADJOURN

15. **Motion made by Gates, seconded by Nelson**, to adjourn. All in favor.