



## Allen Township Planning Commission

### Meeting Minutes November 20<sup>th</sup>, 2023 6:00 P.M.

A **General Meeting** of the Allen Township Planning Commission was held on Monday, November 20<sup>th</sup>, 2023, at 6:00 P.M. at the Allen Township Fire Company Building, located at 3530 Howertown Road, Northampton, PA. Chairman Gary Krill led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

#### **Roll Call:**

**Present:** Gary Behler; Gary Krill; David Austin; Paul Link; Felipe Resendez; Ilene M. Eckhart, Manager; B. Lincoln Treadwell, Jr. Esq. Solicitor; and Stan Wojciechowski, PE, CME, Engineer (Barry Isett & Associates, Inc.).

**Absent:** Andrea Martin, EIT (Barry Isett & Associates, Inc)

**Minutes:** Mr. Link made a motion to approve the minutes from October 16<sup>th</sup>, 2023 meeting, seconded by Mr. Austin. On the motion, by roll call vote, all Commissioners present voted yes.

**Public to be Heard:** There was no public to be heard.

#### **Business Items:**

**A. Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan – Stone Ridge Commercial:** Mr. Joseph Zator, Esq. introduced himself and Mr. Livengood, the applicant/developer for Stone Ridge. Mr. Zator indicated that at the September 2023's Planning Commission Meeting there were sixty-seven comments from the Barry Isett Letter dated September 16<sup>th</sup>, 2023, and that the comments needed to be addressed. He explained that most of the comments are addressed with will comply and he felt that there was nothing to discuss therefore he felt hopeful that Stone Ridge Commercial Plan would be ready for a recommendation. Mr. Wojciechowski indicated that there are some concerns regarding stormwater management. He explained that one area of concern is the stormwater management with the existing rain garden on Savage Road becoming displaced by Wawa. He further explained that the basin that is being built is going on the lot that will become a retail store. Mr. Wojciechowski explained that this application requires about 5,500 cubic feet to capture stormwater, which will be captured by Wawa until the retail store is built and the 5,500 cubic feet will be mitigated to a basin that currently exists on the former Prologis lot, currently owned by the Century Commerce Center. Mr. Wojciechowski indicated that the basins are not identified on the plans. He explained that there is an ancillary report where the water basin situation is explained, however, there is no documentation that the Century Commerce Center finds the utilization of their basin acceptable. Mr. Wojciechowski also explained that the Township has an easement over the Century Commerce Center basin so the Township will also need to agree with Stone Ridge Commercial Development utilizing the basin. Mr. Wojciechowski questioned if the Conservation District would approve. Due to the stormwater concerns, Mr. Wojciechowski explained that is why it is not recommended for preliminary and final to be granted together. Mr. Zator explained that currently there is not any documentation regarding the basin at the Prologis' lot, however, there has been communication

with the local representative of Prologis, Mr. Justin Fanslau, and it was indicated that Prologis will change the orifice that was requested by the Stone Ridge Commercial developer.

Mr. Krill questioned how the water will be directed to the Prologis water basin. Mr. Scott Pasterski of Keystone Consulting explained that there will not be a change in the way the water flows to the basin. He indicated that the Prologis basin will have the same amount of water flow as it does currently even with the commercial buildings being built. He explained that the only difference is that the Stone Ridge Commercial Development would be taken credit for raising the orifice in the basin to impound an additional four feet of water. He explained that once they receive the maintenance agreement along with other documentation, then the stormwater plan can be finalized. Mr. Wojciechowski indicated that the Township has not received anything from DEP that documents that they have accepted this methodology. Mr. Austin questioned if it would alleviate any of the issues associated with the stormwater issues. Mr. Wojciechowski explained that they are capturing more water and infiltrating more water, they will receive credit, however, the Township has not seen a technical review from DEP. Mr. Pasterski indicated that they have spoken with the Conservation District and have applied for MPDS permitting. He explained that they are waiting for review comments and if there are any issues, the comments would be a condition of approval for the MPDS permit.

Mr. Krill questioned how they would pipe water from the south side to the north side of the road. Mr. Treadwell explained that it's not so much a question of water runoff but rather how much water is being infiltrated with the project. He explained that if they infiltrate in a different location then they could get credit for it, therefore, they are receiving credit for infiltrating water despite the location being off the building site. Mr. Zator explained that they are raising the water level in the basin across the street, therefore, there will be more water physically there that can be irrigated onto the grassy area. He concluded that the water in the Prologis' basin has nothing to do with the water at Mr. Livengood's site as it is just a credit for DEP's requirement of infiltrating so much water. Mr. Austin questioned if they had written approval for the use of Prologis' basin. Mr. Zator indicated that they have an email from the current basin owner and that Prologis have tasked their in-house council to prepare documentation.

Mr. Wojciechowski explained that another area of concern is that Mr. Livengood is asking for a waiver to require a calculation methodology for infiltration area loading rates. Mr. Wojciechowski indicated that the Township's ordinance is consistent with DEP Standards. He explained that Mr. Livengood's team is claiming to follow DEP standards, however, they have not provided supporting evidence. He concluded that he felt that he felt that there was not any reason to grant that waiver unless they provide a preliminary geotechnical investigation to support that request. Mr. Pasterski discussed more about the loading ratio issue. He explained that they were infiltrating more water than DEP typically allows, however, if they obtained a geotechnical sign off, DEP would allow a more intensive ratio.

Mr. Wojciechowski questioned if the sidewalk on Savage Road was resolved. Ms. Eckhart indicated that it was resolved on the subdivision plan. Mr. Behler indicated that they called in the deferral for the sidewalks. Mr. Behler explained that the sidewalk discussion related more to Wawa and the Supervisors asked them to remove the path from the sidewalk on Rt. 329 as per a comment from an audience member.

Mr. Wojciechowski indicated that he was concerned about the large water basin that the developer is planning to install off of Horwith Drive. He explained that ostensibly they will need to do widening on Rt. 329 and at Horwith Drive. He explained that the basin is there to mitigate the improvements that they are planning to do on Rt. 329 and that the basin is sized based on the entire site being constructed. He explained that they gave the drainage calculations for the existing conditions and the future conditions of when everything is built, however, they do not show the calculations for what will happen when the development to the west side of

Stone Gate Drive is completed. Mr. Wojciechowski indicated he would like to see those calculations before the preliminary approval. Mr. Pasterski indicated that he will provide those calculations.

Mr. Pasterski indicated that he wishes to meet with Mr. Wojciechowski again in order to go over a few items and to make sure they are understanding everything correctly. Mr. Treadwell questioned what the status was for PennDOT approval. Mr. Pasterski indicated that he believed that they are on cycle three for the Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP) application and the traffic study was down to three comments, which were addressed in the previous submission. Mr. Treadwell questioned if the PennDOT application is broken up for what is necessary for Wawa. He indicated that previously it was one big application. Mr. Pasterski indicated that the most recent application was just for the Wawa and that the application was broken up into Phase I and Phase II. Mr. Treadwell questioned if Phase I was for the necessary changes for Rt. 329 with the Wawa and if Phase II was the remainder of the project. Mr. Pasterski indicated that was correct. Mr. Treadwell questioned if Horwith Lane would be included in Phase II. Mr. Pasterski indicated that was correct. Mr. Treadwell questioned Ms. Eckhart if the Township's engineer commented on whether a traffic signal was warranted for Horwith Lane. Ms. Eckhart indicated that the Langan, the Township Traffic Engineering firm in their memo of April 2023, strongly suggested that a signal analysis was warranted. She indicated that these comments were shared with PennDOT representatives. Mr. Pasterski indicated that the project is following what PennDOT requires and that PennDOT does not typically want to put signals on their roads unless they are necessary and if you meet conditions without a signal, PennDOT would prefer that. He concluded that PennDOT will have final say if there will be a traffic signal or not. Mr. Treadwell questioned if the Horwith Lane and Rt. 329 three-way intersection would be controlled by a stop sign. Mr. Pasterski indicated that was correct. Mr. Wojciechowski questioned if they were separating the left turn and right turn traffic into two separate lanes. Mr. Pasterski indicated that was correct. Mr. Wojciechowski expressed concern about the possibility of traffic turning right onto Rt. 329 from Horwith Lane, not being able to see if it is safe to turn right if cars are stacked from making a left turn onto Rt. 329. Mr. Pasterski indicated that PennDOT would not approve the plan if the sight distance did not work. Mr. Wojciechowski questioned how much land would be needed from the southwest corner to make the lanes happen and what would happen if the land could not be obtained. Mr. Pasterski did not have the amount of land needed available however, he indicated that if they could not obtain the land then what would most likely happen is the right run lane would be eliminated and the widening would still occur however, the right turns would happen from the through lane. Mr. Behler questioned if they were required to have the right turn lane. Mr. Wojciechowski indicated that the traffic study stated that there should be a right turn lane. Mr. Pasterski explained that if they could not get the right-of-way then PennDOT will decide the next course of action and that there is an indemnification that would occur. Mr. Krill questioned if they were talking to the landowner. Mr. Livengood indicated no, not until he hears back from PennDOT.

Mr. Austin indicated that he felt that there were still significant things that needed to be completed before the Commissioners gave a recommendation for preliminary. Mr. Link agreed. Mr. Zator stated that the comments that needed to be addressed boil down to outside agencies and that they were waiting for those approvals. Mr. Behler recommended that they clean up the comments on the review letter and if the plan and comments get fine-tuned, then he would be comfortable with a waiver on the preliminary-final. Mr. Krill questioned if they received confirmation from the Allen Township Fire Chief. Mr. Pasterski indicated that he reached out via e-mail and that the Fire Chief indicated that he was okay with the hydrant locations.

Mr. Behler questioned that since the PennDOT applications are broken into two phases, Phase I being the Wawa and Phase II everything else that would be west of the main road meaning that the main road will need to be placed before Wawa is operational. Mr. Wojciechowski indicated that Stonegate Drive would need to be in place as it is part of the Wawa application and then Phase II would be everything to the west of Stonegate drive. Mr. Krill questioned if they had room for everything else off of Horwith Lane. Mr. Pasterski indicated that they would need to take some of their own right-of-way and obtain a temporary grading easement from

Horwith Trucks. Mr. Treadwell questioned if Horwith Lane became the main entrance for the residential portion. Mr. Pasterski indicated that was correct. Mr. Treadwell stated that there are going to be drivers on Rt. 329 trying to make a left on Horwith Lane that would have to wait for a gap as it is a busy road. Mr. Link indicated that he was surprised that there is not a traffic light. Mr. Austin felt that PennDOT could put a traffic light at the intersection of Horwith Lane and Rt. 329 and possibly remove the light at Liberty Drive and Rt. 329 intersection. Mr. Krill indicated that there will be a lot of traffic in the area and he does not see a way to eliminate that. Mr. Wojciechowski indicated that the question is whether or not a traffic signal is needed at the Horwith Lane intersection and if it is needed then that is a discussion with PennDOT. Mr. Pasterski indicated that he will do an analysis and reach out to PennDOT.

Ms. Eckhart indicated that the Planning Commission needs to give a recommendation for January 15<sup>th</sup>, 2024, so that the Board of Supervisors can have an action on February 13<sup>th</sup>, 2024. Mr. Austin indicated that the Planning Commission meeting will most likely be moved as January 15<sup>th</sup>, 2024 is Martin Luther King Day. Mr. Krill indicated that the Commissioners will be tabling their recommendations.

**B. Preliminary/Final Stone Ridge Major Subdivision Residential Phase III:** Mr. Joseph Zator, counsel on behalf of the developer referenced the Barry Isett Review Letter dated November 18<sup>th</sup>, 2023, and indicated that many of the comments are will comply. Mr. Pasterski first read the waivers requested, item number four, which read as follows:

*“4. SALDO §22-410.1 which requires block lengths to not exceed 1,600 feet in length. We defer to the Planning Commission to review this request.”*

Mr. Pasterski indicated that the proposed lot layout has not changed since the sketch plan submission in 2021, so it would be late to make the changes now. He also indicated that the overall block length would approximately be 1,700 feet. Mr. Wojciechowski explained that typically, 1,600 feet or whatever length the municipality decides is to keep there from being excessively long blocks to avoid the situation where people must walk through someone else’s property and to allow emergency service vehicles quicker access. Mr. Behler questioned if this was something that the Township should get the Fire Department’s comment on. Ms. Eckhart expressed concern about a fire blocking off the rest of the development. Mr. Zator indicated that due to the road being a loop road the idea of getting closer approximate access to fire vehicles does not really apply because emergency vehicles can go in two directions. Mr. Wojciechowski explained that there are three additional accesses as well with Horwith Drive, Pine Street, and Joseph Drive. Mr. Pasterski indicated that he will officially request the waiver at the next Planning Commission meeting.

From the Barry Isett Review Letter dated November 18<sup>th</sup>, 2023, Mr. Pasterski read item number five, which read as follows:

*“5. SALDO §22-411.4 which requires 10-foot-wide planting screen and associated easement. We defer to the Planning Commission to review this request.”*

Mr. Pasterski indicated that there is existing vegetation that starts from the Northampton Borough and Allen Township line. He explained that they are proposing to build the lots and to cut back to the line but leave the existing vegetation in place and provide additional vegetation in accordance with the ordinance. Mr. Treadwell questioned if he had any photographs of the current vegetation. Mr. Austin indicated that he was looking at an aerial view and it appears to be medium to fully grown trees. Mr. Krill questioned if they would remove any invasive plants. Mr. Pasterski indicated that they could remove any invasive plants and add new landscaping as needed. He also stated that he will come back with photographs and if there are any dead trees and invasive plants.

From the Barry Isett Review Letter dated November 18<sup>th</sup>, 2023, Mr. Pasterski read item number eight, which read as follows:

*“8. SALDO §22-424 which requires subdrains if it is determined by the Board of Supervisors that such drains are necessary. Based on concerns with the Phase 1 and 2 constructions, we recommend subdrains be provided. Note: the waiver request letter and plans incorrectly identify this SALDO section.”*

Mr. Pasterski indicated that they could put sub grade in on the low spots where the roads are flat, however, he felt that it was not necessary on roads that have sufficient grades. Mr. Wojciechowski indicated that the Township is having drainage issues with the top of the hill in Stone Ridge therefore the Township would like to see the subdural sub drains placed. Mr. Livengood indicated that there has been issues with sink holes and base drains. He expressed concern that if there is a low point and stone is being placed in it could form a sink hole. Mr. Wojciechowski explained that the idea of the pipe is that the stone and everything drains into the perforated pipe and gets carried off and into the inlets downstream and not allow the infiltration underneath the roadway. Mr. Austin and Mr. Link both expressed that they did not have enough background on the topic to have an answer.

From the Barry Isett Review Letter dated November 18<sup>th</sup>, 2023, Mr. Pasterski read item number eight, which read as follows:

*“7. SALDO §22-411.7.D(1) which requires driveway centerlines not be located closer to a street intersection than 75 feet. Lots 31 through 36 are consistent with the Phase 1 and 2 intersections of the Graystone/Joseph and Graystone/Pine intersections.”*

Mr. Pasterski discusses that he has never seen a development where a T-lot was not developed. Mr. Behler indicated that he brought the topic up previously out of concern of cars parking in the intersection. Mr. Behler explained that after discussion, it makes sense to have a driveway there as it alleviates the possibility of cars parking in the intersection. Mr. Wojciechowski explained that they would lose maybe four units because of how small the lots are if they cannot have houses within 75 feet or less of an intersection. Mr. Behler expressed concern that if it is just curbing someone may park there causing issues with traveling cars to make turns. Mr. Krill indicated that the Commissioners are generally agreeable with this waiver.

From the Barry Isett Review Letter dated November 18<sup>th</sup>, 2023, Mr. Pasterski read item number ten, which read as follows:

*“10. SMO §8-232.2 which requires a maximum velocity of 15 feet per second in storm drains. We do not recommend this request.”*

Mr. Pasterski explained that there is an existing berm in the area that is currently shown on the plans. He indicated that the proposal will most likely be revised as they wish to change the pipe to a steel pipe as well as there to be a jack and board through the berm. He concluded that will be addressed in the next submission. He explained that with the current proposal the stormwater calculation showed that the velocity exceeds the ordinance required maximum of fifteen feet per second and presently the pipe is sloped at 11.74%. He explained that with this pipe, if it flattened to a lesser slope, there are concerns that there would be a major need for excavation. He questioned why there is an ordinance for such a velocity requirement. He explained that if there is a riprap apron then the water will carve a small canyon and eventually cause erosion. Mr. Pasterski indicated that they are planning on discharging the water into a walled structure which would act as an energy

dissipator. He also indicated that in his career, he's done some research on pipes, water that is going very fast can cause cavitation on concrete pipes meaning that the concrete and cement are pulled off the walls. He explained that would not be an issue with HDPE or steel pipe. He indicated that from an engineering standpoint, he does not see the harm in the velocity being fast. Mr. Pasterski indicated that excavation could lead to difficulties due to contour lines with various grades. He explained that if the pipe is flattened to 2% there would be an additional 20-foot excavation. Mr. Wojciechowski indicated that his concern lies where with the direction that the pipe is being discharged at Horwith Drive, however, this is all within Northampton Borough and the entity who would make the final decision are the people who own Horwith Drive. Mr. Pasterski indicated that they did receive copies of the plans and stormwater calculations. Mr. Treadwell questioned if they discussed the plans and issue with Northampton Borough. Mr. Pasterski indicated that he gave the stormwater calculations to Mr. David Lear from Lehigh Engineering (the Borough of Northampton's Engineer). Mr. Wojciechowski stated that he is interested to know if Mr. Lear would be okay with it. Mr. Treadwell expressed concern about the Township approving a plan that causes water to shoot out to a Northampton Borough Road. Mr. Wojciechowski indicated that he felt that there would be a pressure situation in the pipes. Mr. Pasterski indicated that he will discuss the plan further with Northampton Borough.

From the Barry Isett Review Letter dated November 18<sup>th</sup>, 2023, Mr. Behler referenced item two, which reads as follows:

*"2. SALDO §22-407.18 and §22-422 which require street lighting to be shown on the plans and provided by the developer. We note the plan shows streetlights, but does not have a detail for the street lights. We recommend that street lighting details be provided on the Final Plans."*

Mr. Pasterski indicated that from prior experience, PPL typically provides those details. Mr. Wojciechowski indicated that as long as the plans show the location of the streetlights and it is agreed that they are being put in. He indicated that if the locations change then it can be examined during the submittal stage. Mr. Pasterski indicated that they would provide something as a placeholder and indicate that it is subject to PPL. Mr. Pasterski indicated that there were two comments he wishes to discuss from the Barry Isett Review Letter dated November 18<sup>th</sup>, 2023, which read as follows:

*"10. A note should be added to the plans indicating that the base course shall be brought up to the elevation of the final wearing course upon installation, and then 1-1/2" of the base course shall be milled and overlaid with the final 1-1/2" wearing course."*

*19. We remain concerned with the potential for excessive speeds along Road A/Graystone Circle and Road B/Graystone Circle. Traffic calming measures should be reviewed for these streets."*

*49. Calculations should be provided, and plant schedule and landscape plans should clearly identify, plantings that are being counted to meet the requirements of ZO §27-1410 A."*

Mr. Pasterski referenced comment ten and indicated that he believed that Mr. Wojciechowski was concerned that during the construction phase the water would be able to be captured in the inlets. Mr. Pasterski explained that he discussed this with his client, Mr. Livengood, and they acknowledged that comment is not a requirement of the ordinance. He explained that the concern with the drainage with an inch and a half wearing with a seat top, the standard set top being 8-1/2" from the curb is going to collect water. He also indicated that there is a provision on the plan to put eyebrows, macadam berms around the inlets to capture the water. Mr. Pasterski indicated that Mr. Livengood stated that was a huge expense and something that is not an ordinary requirement therefore it is not a necessary expense. Mr. Wojciechowski indicated that he did not see the eyebrow detail and indicated that would address the comment.

Mr. Wojciehowski referenced comment nineteen and explained that there have been complaints about speeding on Graystone Circle and that is why he made the comment as he is worried that a longer road would encourage speeding. Mr. Livengood indicated that if the road is narrowed then the homeowners would lose their parking spaces and if there are speed bumps then the residents would complain about the noise of trucks and the garbage truck going over them. Mr. Krill indicated that he felt that speedbumps only work temporarily. Mr. Behler indicated that he was not in favor of narrowing the street because of safety concerns regarding the fire trucks driving on the road. Mr. Austin indicated that the real issue is the enforcement of speed limits. Mr. Wojciehowski questioned if chicanes could be incorporated to discourage speeding. Mr. Pasterski indicated that he would look into it.

Mr. Pasterski referenced comment forty-nine and questioned if the ordinance was under land development plan and not subdivision plan. Mr. Treadwell questioned Mr. Pasterski if he was asking if the ordinance was for commercial projects and not residential projects. Mr. Treadwell indicated that he will look into that.

Mr. Behler questioned how the Homeowner's Association would work as Phase I of the development does not currently have a Homeowner's Association. Mr. Wojciehowski indicated that he lived in a development where the first phase of the development did not have an HOA but the second phase of the development did. He explained that the HOA fell apart because people would choose to live in the homes that were not part of the HOA. Mr. Behler questioned how the HOA would affect the Township. Mr. Treadwell stated that the HOA would be there to take care of the basin. Mr. Wojciehowski added that it would also take care of the spray irrigation system. Mr. Treadwell indicated that the other option would be for the Township to own and maintain the basin and irrigation system. Mr. Behler questioned if the HOA fees were just for the maintenance of the common areas. Mr. Zator explained that Mr. Livengood decided to use the same name for the project and called it a different phase, however in reality it is a new subdivision that is being connected to adjoining properties. Mr. Behler indicated that he is for the HOA taking care of the basin and irrigation system.

Mr. Behler questioned if there was anything else. Mr. Wojciehowski indicated that he would like to see how they calculated their density calculations. He explained that they showed the area of twenty-two acres for dentistry but not how they arrived to the calculations. Mr. Pasterski indicated that he would give him a simple map of the residential lots.

Mr. Wojciehowski indicated that another concern is reworking the stormwater system because he did not see any information regarding the two existing rain gardens being removed and that volume getting relocated. He explained that the one rain garden is in the middle of the loop and one on the outside of the loop. Mr. Pasterski indicated that was addressed in the NPDES. Mr. Wojciehowski indicated that he did not receive that report. Mr. Pasterski indicated that he would get him that report.

Mr. Krill questioned if the fire hydrant plans were sent over to the Fire Chief. Mr. Pasterski indicated that they sent him the summary plan, and then possibly the whole plan set or just relevant plan sheets, followed by an additional summary plan.

Mr. Krill questioned the existing sidewalk conditions on Horwith Drive. He indicated that residents have stated that the sidewalks have not been taken care of. He questioned if they were putting sidewalks on Horwith Drive. Mr. Pasterski indicated that they are putting sidewalks on Horwith Drive and there are some existing sidewalk that will be kept and will end at the Allen Township and Northampton Borough line. Mr. Krill questioned if Northampton Borough wanted the sidewalk to continue in their Borough. Mr. Pasterski indicated that he was not at that particular meeting, however, he believes that Northampton Borough indicated that the sidewalk would create a conflict with the concrete channel. Mr. Behler indicated that if there are any damaged

sidewalks they should be replaced. Mr. Krill questioned who would be responsible for the sidewalk maintenance. Mr. Zator indicated that it would be the homeowners' responsibility to maintain the sidewalks unless the HOA decides to take over the sidewalk maintenance. Mr. Behler felt that the HOA should take care of the sidewalk maintenance to begin with. Mr. Treadwell indicated that those purchasing a home from Phase II can see that they have purchased a lot with a sidewalk. Mr. Treadwell and Mr. Austin both questioned the purpose of having a sidewalk on Horwith Drive. Mr. Behler indicated the sidewalks would be for future development. Mr. Link questioned who would take over the sidewalk if the HOA agrees to maintain the sidewalks but then collapses. Mr. Behler stated that it would have to go back to the property owner. Mr. Treadwell indicated that modern HOA documents have provisions in them and if the HOA does not perform the tasks assigned to them then the Township could do those tasks and assess everyone living in the HOA community. He indicated that an HOA can only collapse if none is living there. Mr. Zator indicated that the basin is predominantly in Northampton Borough, and it was discussed that if the HOA does not maintain the basin, then they have the right to take care of it and assess the people. Mr. Behler questioned why they would not just put all the sidewalk maintenance in the HOA fee and just say that the sidewalks are covered. Mr. Zator indicated that they will look into it and will come back with additional information.

**Public to be Heard:** No public comment.

**Announcements:** Mr. Krill announced that the next Planning Commission meeting will take place on Monday, December 18<sup>th</sup>, 2023, at 6:00 PM. He noted that in 2024, the Planning Commission meetings will be held at the Allen Township Municipal Building located at 4714 Indian Trail Road.

Mr. Behler made a motion to change the January 2024 Planning Commission meeting from January 15<sup>th</sup>, 2024, to January 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2024, and February 19<sup>th</sup>, 2024 meeting to February 26<sup>th</sup>, 2024 meeting; seconded by Mr. Resendez. On motion, by roll call, all present Commissioners voted yes.

**Adjournment:** There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:30 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Amber Aeverbeck