

**Village of Indian Head Park
201 Acacia Drive
Indian Head Park, IL 60525**

**MINUTES
VILLAGE OF INDIAN HEAD PARK
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
CONTINUATION OF A PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING PETITION #172**

“Pursuant to 5 ILCS 120/2.06 (3) minutes of public meetings shall include, but need not be limited to: a general description of all matters proposed, discussed, or decided, and a record of votes taken.”

Tuesday, July 7, 2009

7:30 P.M.

I. CALL TO ORDER - CHAIRMAN DENNIS SCHERMERHORN

A continuation of a public hearing was hosted by the Village of Indian Head Park Planning and Zoning Commission on Tuesday, July 7, 2009, at the Municipal Facility, 201 Acacia Drive to consider Petition #172 regarding a request from Mr. & Mrs. Jim Nix for an amendment to the Ashbrook Development P.U.D. to allow for an in-ground swimming pool at 11145 Ashbrook Lane. The meeting was convened and called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Chairman Dennis Schermerhorn. Kathy Leach, Zoning Commission Secretary, called the roll as follows:

II. ROLL CALL: PRESENT (AND CONSTITUTING A QUORUM):

Chairman Dennis Schermerhorn
Commissioner Diane Andrews
Commissioner Denise Ingram
Commissioner Mike Lopez
Commissioner Earl O'Malley

ALSO PRESENT:

Debbie Anselmo, Zoning Trustee
Trustee Carol Coleman, Zoning Trustee

NOT PRESENT:

Commissioner Noreen Costelloe
Commissioner Jack Yelnick

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG

Chairman Schermerhorn and the Planning and Zoning Commission members led the audience in reciting the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag as follows: *“I Pledge Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God indivisible with liberty and justice for all”*.

QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS FROM INDIAN HEAD PARK RESIDENTS/PROPERTY OWNERS IN ATTENDANCE REGARDING ZONING AGENDA ITEMS

For the record, Chairman Schermerhorn stated that each person who would like to make a statement to address the Commission with regard to Petition #172 must state their name, address and individual sworn testimony will be received by the Commission at the public hearing this evening.

IV. CONTINUATION OF A PUBLIC HEARING HELD BEFORE THE VILLAGE OF INDIAN HEAD PARK PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION (PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED AFTER DISCUSSIONS BY THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS AND PRIOR TO VOTES)

ZONING AGENDA ITEMS:

- 1. Petition #172 – A zoning petition to consider an amendment and variation to the Ashbrook Development Planned Unit Development for a special use to allow for the construction of an in-ground swimming pool with safety fence and landscape enhancements in the rear yard of the property at 11145 Ashbrook Lane.**

Chairman Schermerhorn convened a continuation of a public hearing regarding Petition #172 pursuant to a request for an amendment to the Ashbrook Development P.U.D. with regard to an in-ground swimming pool at 11145 Ashbrook Lane. He noted the following exhibits were received by the Commission marked: (RH1) a plan review report dated July 1, 2009 prepared by Tim Halik, the Village's Plan Review Consultant, regarding the most recently submitted plans from Barrington Pools submitted to the Village for review; (RH2) a letter from Christopher Burke Engineering dated June 25, 2009 regarding a review of the most recent grading plans for the subject property prepared by W.C. Doland Engineering; (RH3) a letter from Barrington Pools dated June 18, 2009 stating items that have been addressed to resolve issues with the proposed pool project including computer generated landscape photographs; (RH4) a site plan showing the pool location last updated June 23, 2009 and; (RH5) an updated grading plan dated June 17, 2009 prepared by W. C. Doland Engineering.

Chairman Schermerhorn summarized the following: (1) the Planning and Zoning Commission is conducting the meeting this evening to address issues that were posed when the Village Board heard this matter at their last meeting and; (2) a suggestion was made by the Village Board to remand this zoning matter back to the Zoning Commission to review this matter based on new information and adjustments to the plans that were presented by the petitioner. Chairman Schermerhorn asked Mr. Nix, the property owner of 11145 Ashbrook Lane, to provide a response to items that were discussed at the last Village Board meeting and changes that have been made relative to the proposed pool project since the last Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.

Mr. Jim Nix stated that since the last meeting the pool area was shortened by a few feet, more solid evergreens were added to the landscaping plan, a new grading plan was provided and the pool is smaller. Chairman Schermerhorn stated that one of the issues raised previously was the proposed retaining wall. He asked Mr. Nix how that matter has been addressed. Mr. Nix stated that the retaining wall is part of the back of the pool area and additional landscaping and evergreens will be planted to screen the area so it is not visible. Chairman Schermerhorn asked if the retaining wall is depicted on the plan entitled re-submit drawing dated June 23, 2009. Steve Hopkins, of Barrington Pools, stated that the boxed section on the plan dated June 23, 2009 shows a section of the pool wall area. Chairman Schermerhorn asked Mr. Hopkins if the cross-section wall reference on the plan that will be exposed from the pool area above grade constitutes a retaining wall. Mr. Hopkins responded, yes. Chairman Schermerhorn pointed out that the wall section reference on the plan has no dimensions. Mr. Hopkins stated that there is a dimension of the wall section that is twenty-two inches (22") below existing grade and he presented a larger scale drawing to the Commission for reference.

Chairman Schermerhorn asked Mr. Hopkins the height of the retaining wall. Mr. Hopkins stated that the height of the retaining wall varies from the highest point at 3.3' and the wall is stepped down to grade. He added that the grading and drainage plan prepared by W.C. Doland Engineering dated June 17, 2009 reflects the elevations. Chairman Schermerhorn noted that the previous recommendation to the Village Board was to accept the pool proposal without a retaining wall. He further noted that the recommendation to the Village Board was specifically conditioned that no retaining wall would be constructed. Commissioner Andrews stated that there is a reference in the letter from Barrington Pools dated June 18, 2009 that the pool fence will be located on the pool deck for three sides only. Steve Hopkins stated that the pool fence will be installed on the back side of the property and two sides. Commissioner Andrews inquired if there will be two steps down from the back of the residence down to the pool deck area. Mr. Hopkins responded, yes. Commissioner Andrews stated that the landscaping plan does not reflect Arbor Vitae all the way around on the east side of the property and the pool structure may be visible during the winter months. Mr. Hopkins stated that there is an existing pine tree in that area as well as a Birch tree and more screening can be added, if necessary.

Chairman Schermerhorn asked if there is a reason why there are two steps down at the back of the house to the pool deck and he inquired if two additional stairs could be added down to grade to bring the pool area to a lower level. Mr. Hopkins stated that if additional stairs are added and the pool is lower a retainer wall would need to be installed between the house and pool. Chairman Schermerhorn noted that a retainer wall between the back of the house and pool would be within the buildable area and would not require a variation. Mr. Hopkins stated that the concept was considered at the beginning of the initial design planning process and due to elevations and changes in grade a modified plan was presented. Chairman Schermerhorn stated that a retaining wall is defined in the zoning code as a structure. He noted that structures need to be placed within the buildable area of the property or a variance must be obtained.

Mr. Hopkins asked if a variation is part of the zoning process that is included in an amendment to a Planned Unit Development. Chairman Schermerhorn stated that a variation was not initially requested by the petitioner for a retaining wall.

Jim Stortzum, counsel for the Ashbrook Townhome Association, stated that Mauro Crestani, from L.C.T. Design Group, is present on behalf of the Ashbrook Townhome Association as an expert witness in land planning. Jim Stortzum asked Mr. Crestani based on his review of the grading plan documents provided, how much of the pool and deck area is above ground. Mr. Crestani stated that the pool and decking at the highest point is about 3.3' above ground at the lower corner of the pool area to about one-foot (1') above grade at the back of the property. He noted that the entire pool area is above ground at various heights with an average above ground at 2.5' across the back of the property. Mr. Stortzum asked Mr. Crestani if it would be fair to say that a substantial amount of the pool is out of the ground and it could be considered an above ground pool. Mr. Crestani responded, yes. Mr. Stortzum stated that the Village code allows in-ground pools as a permitted obstruction in the rear yard setback but above ground pools are not allowed. Mr. Stortzum asked Mr. Crestani if he had an opportunity to walk the property to inspect the area prior to the public hearing. Mr. Crestani responded, yes. Mr. Stortzum asked Mr. Crestani based on the elevations and slope of the property, what is the drop-off from the rear steps down to the pool wall area. Mr. Crestani responded, about nine-feet (9'). Mr. Stortzum presented photographs taken from the back of a townhome unit that reflects the visual effect townhome owners will have as it relates to various grade changes and elevations.

Mr. Stortzum asked Mr. Crestani if Arbor Vitae evergreens stop sound and noises from leaving the property. Mr. Crestani responded that Arbor will provide a buffer but the evergreens will not stop noises from leaving the property. Mr. Stortzum asked Mr. Crestani how long he has been a land planner and architect. Mr. Crestani stated that he has been a professional land planner and architect for about thirty-three years and he has worked for several firms over the years working in the area of land planning. Mr. Stortzum asked Mr. Crestani in his experience as a land planner will the proposed swimming pool as currently designed adversely impact the adjoining property owners with noise and light. Mr. Crestani stated that noise and light will adversely impact adjacent property owners. Commissioner Lopez asked Mr. Crestani how he defines adverse impact on adjacent property owners. Mr. Crestani stated that there will be blighting of the property coming from the site and noise from pool parties and gatherings. Chairman Schermerhorn stated that people enjoy their yards, decks and patios for social gatherings and there will be no more noise from a pool than there would be from someone enjoying their yard for other purposes.

Commissioner Ingram stated that the proposed pool is in ground and she asked Mr. Crestani what he based his definition on for the pool to be defined as an above ground pool. Mr. Crestani stated that typically an in-ground pool is in the ground and the proposed pool is both in the ground and parts of the pool structure are out of the ground. Steve Hopkins stated that pool depth is about eight-feet (8') in the ground at the deepest point and six inches down from the top of foundation of the house.

Commissioner Andrews asked Mr. Crestani the percentage of the pool that is out of the ground. Mr. Crestani stated that approximately thirty-five percent (35%) of the pool is above grade. Mr. Stortzum stated that an in-ground pool is typically at grade level in the ground.

Mr. Nix stated that the pool decking area may be above grade but the proposed pool is in the ground with an excavation of eight-feet (8') deep. Mr. Stortzum stated that there is no indication on the elevation plans showing the water levels and it is difficult to determine if the pool is above ground or in the ground. Chairman Schermerhorn referenced **Chapter 15.21.030 (b), Swimming Pools**, of the Municipal Code which states in part: *“only in-ground outdoor swimming pools shall be permitted in single family residential zoned lots and under no circumstances shall the normal water level in such pools be higher than one-foot above the lowest natural grade level immediately adjacent to the pool”*. Mr. Stortzum stated that it cannot be determined based on the information shown on the plans if the pool is above ground or in the ground because no specifications were provided. Mr. Stortzum presented a portion of the Ashbrook Estate Homes Single Family Association declaration of covenants and restrictions which states in part: *“plans must be approved by the association and there are certain standards that must be met”*. Mr. Stortzum stated that he did not find a reference in any of the prior meetings that the property owner received approval of the current plans from the association and the association process is to review location of the pool and lighting. Commission Lopez stated that the property owner sought the proper approval for the proposed pool during the initial process when the original plans were presented. Mr. Stortzum stated that the Ashbrook Townhome Association has title to all of the easements in Ashbrook and maintenance of the pond areas. He noted that the association owns the access easement areas and due to the wet conditions of the association access area, heavy equipment cannot be brought into that area.

Mr. Stortzum asked Donna Smith, the owner of 6211 Edgebrook Lane West, if she has an opinion on the proposed pool plans and how the pool might affect her property values. Donna Smith stated that she believes the swimming pool will have an affect on her property values as well as the property values of other townhome owners because there will be additional lighting, additional noise and the presence of a large structure that presently does not exist in the area. Mr. Stortzum asked Donna Smith if she believes the pool will have a negative impact on her property values. Donna Smith responded, yes. Chairman Schermerhorn asked Donna Smith if she has particular qualifications, experience or training in real estate appraisals. Donna Smith responded, no. She added that she served previously on the Zoning Board of Appeals in Hinsdale and is familiar with the zoning process. Mr. Stortzum asked Donna Smith if she dealt with property values and similar issues while serving on the Hinsdale Zoning Board of Appeals. Donna Smith responded, yes. Mr. Stortzum noted for the record that the photographs presented by Barrington Pools are computer generated color pictures and not actual proposed landscape plans.

Mr. Stortzum stated that the Ashbrook Townhome Association opposes the pool in its present form including the proposed retaining wall design that is above grade on at least three sides.

He noted that there is no indication on the plans how much of the structure is actually above ground, the petitioner and the pool contractor have not incorporated some of the recommendations when the Board remanded this matter back to the Planning and Zoning Commission. Mr. Stortzum stated that the Ashbrook Association is opposed to the current plan and requests that the Zoning Commission carry a recommendation to the Board to not approve the request as presented.

Mr. Stortzum stated that the Ashbrook Townhome Association will be open to comment on revised plans that incorporate more of the Board's recommendations including possible adding more stairs to step the pool down to grade and other suggestions. He noted that the Ashbrook Townhome Association is also concerned about the unified drainage in the development and how that pool might have an impact on drainage. Mr. Stortzum stated that the Plat of Subdivision for the Ashbrook Planned Unit Development including the common easement areas were approved at the same time so unified drainage is an issue and the scope of the development was set forth in the annexation agreement. Mr. Stortzum stated that granting an amendment to the Ashbrook Development to allow for a pool will create a precedent and other problems including future requests for pools, how much lot area can be used for pools, how much of the pool can be out of the ground, how much green space will be removed and will there be an adverse affect on unified drainage.

Mayor Andrews, as a member of the audience, asked Mr. Stortzum if there is a pool design plan that is presented to satisfy all open issues would there be objections to the pool by the Ashbrook Townhome Association members. Mr. Stortzum stated that some adjustments need to be made to the plans and some of the objections primarily were to the size of the pool, an above grade pool structure and the retaining wall. He noted that the Ashbrook Townhome Association is open to comment on a plan that incorporates all recommendations from the Board and the Ashbrook Townhome members are aware that a pool at some point might be approved. Mayor Andrews asked Mr. Stortzum if Mr. Crestani is aware that the swimming pool section of the code incorporates landscape requirements for screening purposes and the evergreens are not intended to serve as a sound wall barrier. He noted that noise will be generated from a property whether there is a backyard barbecue, a graduation party or other social gathering. Mr. Stortzum stated that he is aware that Arbor Vitae will not create a sound barrier although the location of the evergreens to be planted around the pool and fence areas will provide a buffer for adjacent property owners.

Floyd Harris, of 6243 Edgebrook Lane West, stated that adequate landscape coverage around the pool, fence and deck areas may not be able to be installed to provide screening from the view from the back of some of the townhome units down to the pool area. Chairman Schermerhorn asked Mr. Floyd if his question was that someone would be able to see down to the pool area from a second floor balcony or deck on the back of a townhome unit. Mr. Floyd responded, yes. Mr. Nix stated that he is trying to work with various grade levels to incorporate the pool, pool decking, safety fence and landscaping. Commissioner Andrews stated there is a retaining wall proposed at the back of the pool area and she asked how the sides of the pool that are sloping to the retaining wall will be supported as the grade changes.

Mr. Hopkins from Barrington Pools stated that the pool will be constructed of concrete and earth will surround all sides of the pool. Donna Smith, of 6211 Edgebrook Lane West, stated that she is concerned that the openness of the entire area will be changed if multiple pools are installed in the development which will change the character of the Planned Unit Development.

Chairman Schermerhorn stated that public commentary was received from the audience and the Commission at this time will review the details of the proposed plans.

He noted that the current design plan presented was generated based on recommendations from the Village Board. Chairman Schermerhorn stated the following items were discussed:(1) that the size of the pool be reduced to insure adequate space for planting of landscaping according to the code requirements (*this item was addressed by the petitioner*); (2) the recommendation to the Board was conditioned that there would be no retaining wall (*the current proposal reflects a retaining wall structure with portions of the pool that are above ground*); (3) noise was mentioned as a concern and;(4) Mr. Stortzum mentioned that Ashbrook Estate Homes Association approval was not received regarding the current design plan. Commissioner Lopez stated that the swimming pool code reference with regard to the definition of above ground pools may refer to water level. Mr. Hopkins stated that the water level is down seven inches from the top of the deck area and the deck area is about two-feet above grade. Chairman Schermerhorn stated that it is not the function of the Planning and Zoning Commission to make a determination or interpretation of building code requirements and those items are reviewed for code compliance by the Village's plan review consultant.

Chairman Schermerhorn noted that the current design plan reflects that a rear yard variation would be required to allow for a retaining wall structure that encroaches into the rear yard setback and landscape screening was addressed in the current plan to provide screening around the fence areas according to Village codes. Commissioner O'Malley stated in the most recent plan review report prepared by the Village's plan review consultant a notation was made that a proper retaining wall design plan be provided by an Illinois Licensed Structural Engineer for additional review. He noted that the requested information was not provided to the Village for review. Chairman Schermerhorn stated that building code compliance is reviewed separately and the design of the retaining wall would be reviewed prior to the issuance of a building permit. Commissioner Ingram noted for the record that the Village's plan review consultant noted throughout his report that the structure is an in-ground swimming pool. Commissioner Andrews stated that in-ground pools in a Planned Unit Development with a retaining wall outside of the buildable area have not been approved previously. She noted that some in-ground pools in P.U.D. areas are on much larger lots, there are concerns with establishing a precedent on what could happen in the entire Ashbrook community with swimming pools on small interior lots and overall drainage to adjacent properties may be an issue.

Chairman Schermerhorn noted that the subject property is located within a Planned Unit Development and it may be deemed that a swimming pool is a special use. He noted that the swimming pool should be designed and located so that the public health and safety is protected and that it would not cause substantial injury to the other property values in the neighborhood.

Commissioner Andrews stated that a precedent would be established if the pool is approved as proposed based on the percentage of the lot that would be utilized for the pool in a Planned Unit Development on an interior lot and overall drainage might be affected. Commissioner Lopez stated that he lives in the Ashbrook Subdivision, this is the first time a pool has been proposed and he is not concerned that the pool would have an adverse impact in the neighborhood. Commissioner Andrews stated that she lives on a block with in-ground swimming pools and once there is one pool there are more to follow.

Chairman Schermerhorn asked the Commission members if the proposed pool design will be located so that the public health, safety and welfare is protected. The following responses were noted: (Commissioner O'Malley (no), Commissioner Andrews (yes). She added that the public health, safety and welfare would be protected if the project is done properly. Commissioner Lopez (yes) and Commissioner Ingram (yes). Commissioner Andrews stated that she has concerns with drainage issues and water run-off relative to the pool and water going into the pond. Chairman Schermerhorn stated that there would not be more water running into the pond if a pool is constructed. Chairman Schermerhorn noted that one public comment was received that the project would impact the property values and he added that the Commission members do not have specific qualifications in real estate appraisals. He noted that in-ground pools are allowed in every residential district in the Village and there is nothing to support the argument presented that a pool in any other part of the Village has negatively impacted property values.

There were no further public comments stated regarding the zoning petition before the Commission. Chairman Schermerhorn stated that the Commission is required to conduct a Findings of Fact prior to voting on a recommendation to be made to the Village Board regarding zoning matters. The Commission members reviewed the following Findings of Fact with regard to the residential property at 11145 Ashbrook Lane and a proposed retaining wall for an in-ground swimming pool based on evidence presented in response to the following criteria before recommending a variation, as required by the Village's Zoning Ordinance, ***Title 17 Zoning, Section 17.23.060E***: (1) that the property in question cannot yield a reasonable return if permitted to be used only under the conditions allowed by the regulations governing the district in which it is located (not applicable -- this reference pertains only to commercial properties); (2) the plight of the owner is due to unusual circumstances (all commissioners agree); (3) the variation, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality (3 commissioners agree - 2 commissioners disagree); (4) the particular physical surroundings, shape or topographical conditions of the specific property involved would bring a particular hardship upon the owner as distinguished from a mere inconvenience if the strict letter of the regulation were to be carried out (5 commissioner agree -Chairman Schermerhorn disagreed). He noted that the retaining wall could have been placed within the buildable area of the lot close to the house; (5) the conditions upon which the petition for variation is based would not be applicable generally to other property within the same zoning classification (all commissioners disagree). The Commission members noted that the property is within a Planned Unit Development; (6) the purpose of the variation is not based upon a desire to make money out of the property (all commissioners agree); (7) the alleged difficulty or hardship has not been created by any person presently having an interest in the property (all commissioners agree);

(8) the granting of the variation will not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to other property or improvements in the neighborhood in which the property is located (1 commissioner disagreed and 4 members agreed); (9) the proposed variation will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property, or substantially increase the danger of fire, or otherwise endanger the public safety, or substantially diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood (all commissioners agree). Commissioner Lopez moved, seconded by Commissioner Ingram, to accept the findings of fact with regard to a special use within a Planned Unit Development. Carried by unanimous voice vote (5/0/2).

Chairman Schermerhorn entertained a motion to present a recommendation to the Village Board regarding Petition #172. Commissioner O'Malley moved, seconded by Ingram, to accept and approve the revised plans as presented by Mr. Nix with regard to Petition #172, relative to an in-ground swimming pool at 11145 Ashbrook Lane, as discussed this evening. The motion did not carry by roll call vote. (2/3/2).

Aye: Commissioners: Ingram, Lopez

Nay: Andrews, O'Malley and Chairman Schermerhorn

Absent: Costelloe, Yelnick

Chairman Schermerhorn stated that the petitioner has spent a great deal of time and effort with various design plans and possibly all suggestions from the Board and Commission could be incorporated to make the plans work. Mr. Nix stated that he revised the plans several times, more landscaping was added, he has done everything to try to address the issues to make the plan work and he would like to build a safe pool for his family. Mr. Nix stated that this topic has been discussed since April and now the Ashbrook Townhome Association is asking for more changes to the plans. Chairman Schermerhorn stated that the Commission previously voted to make a recommendation to the Village Board with no retaining wall. He noted that the current plans reflect a retaining wall and that issue was not addressed by the pool contractor. Commissioner Andrews stated that there may be drainage issues with a higher pool elevation and stepping down the pool to grade might be a better design plan. Mr. Nix stated that for the safety of his children a higher pool elevation was designed to avoid a steep drop down to grade level. He noted that a higher elevation with the safety fence will be more difficult for someone to try to climb the fence to access the pool than a fence that is two-feet lower at grade. Commissioner Andrews stated that it is the responsibility of the property owner to insure that the pool is safe.

Commissioner O'Malley stated that he has concerns with the size and location of the interior lots in Ashbrook and how the pool and fence area is laid out as it relates to safety of children possibly accessing the pool area in a location where the fence may be lower due to grade changes.

Chairman Schermerhorn entertained a motion setting forth the following conditions relative to Petition #172 for an in-ground swimming pool. Commissioner Lopez moved, seconded by Commissioner Andrews, to vote its recommendation to the Village Board to accept the petition as presented with the following conditions:

(1) the Village ordinance regarding fence screening must be observed; (2) that no retaining wall outside the buildable area should be proposed. The motion carried with a roll call vote as follows: (4/0/2).

Aye: Commissioners: Andrews, Ingram, Lopez, O'Malley

Nay: None

Absent: Costelloe, Yelnick

Chairman Schermerhorn stated that a report and recommendation will be presented to the Village Board as discussed this evening.

**REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF PLANNING AND ZONING
COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
(DISCUSSION AND A POSSIBLE VOTE MAY TAKE PLACE)**

★ *Minutes of the Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting held June 2, 2009*

Upon review of the minutes presented from the meeting held on Tuesday, June 2, 2009, Commissioner Andrews moved, seconded by Commissioner Ingram, to approve the June 2, 2009, meeting minutes, as amended. Carried by unanimous voice vote (4/0/2).

VI. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss before the Commission, Chairman Schermerhorn entertained a motion to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Andrews moved, seconded by Commissioner O'Malley, to adjourn the meeting at 9:15 p.m. Carried by unanimous voice vote (4/0/2).

Respectfully Submitted,
Kathy Leach, Recording Secretary
Planning and Zoning Commission