

**BIRMINGHAM CITY COMMISSION /
PLANNING BOARD JOINT WORKSHOP SESSION
JUNE 15, 2020
HELD REMOTELY VIA ZOOM AND TELEPHONE ACCESS
7:30 P.M.**

I. CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mayor Pierre Boutros called the meeting to order at 7:31 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Commission

ROLL CALL:

Present:

Mayor Boutros
Mayor Pro Tem Longe
Commissioner Baller
Commissioner Host
Commissioner Hoff
Commissioner Nickita
Commissioner Sherman

Planning Board

ROLL CALL:

Present:

Chairman Scott Clein
Robin Boyle
Stuart Jeffares
Daniel Share
Janelle Whipple-Boyce
J. Bryan Williams
Nasseem Ramin, alternate

Absent:

Bert Koseck
Jason Emerine, alternate
Rachel Hester, student representative
June Lee, student representative

Master Planning Team:

Matt Lambert, DPZ
Sarah Traxler, McKenna

Administration: City Attorney Tim Currier, City Manager Valentine, Clerk Designee Alexandria Bingham, Planning Director Ecker, Building Official Johnson

III. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

Mayor Boutros explained the purpose of the joint workshop session and the meeting procedures that would be followed.

A. Master Plan Draft Review Process

Planning Director Ecker introduced the item, the reasons for holding the workshop session virtually, and Matt Lambert and Sarah Traxler, both members of the master planning team. She explained that Ms. Traxler would be providing an overview of where the City is in its master planning process.

Ms. Traxler reviewed the documents regarding the master planning process that were provided in the evening's agenda packet.

At Mayor Boutros' request, Planning Director Ecker reviewed the 11 master plan themes as outlined in the evening's agenda packet.

Mayor Boutros then invited comment from Chairman Clein and from the Planning Board (Board) members.

Chairman Clein explained that while the first public input session regarding the master plan draft went relatively smoothly, the second input session became more mired in the details than seemed to be useful. After some discussion between the Board and the master planning team, the master planning team came up with the proposed themes, review and adoption process that Ms. Traxler described. Chairman Clein continued that:

- The Board was seeking feedback from the Commission regarding the themes and the review and adoption process, with the end goal of having themes and a review process of which the Commission approves. He was respectfully requesting the Commission's public support for the public input process, and any Commission feedback that should arise regarding the public input process, or the master plan in general, along the way.
- Board meetings via Zoom have seen an increase in public engagement relative to in-person meetings. The largest Board meeting held via Zoom thus far had approximately 60 members of the public and there was ample public input during that meeting. Many of the individuals who joined that meeting were not obligated to be there in regards to another topic being heard and had not previously joined Board meetings. At least some of the public input increased as a result of the public's likely preference for being able to attend a meeting virtually. If Governor Whitmer allowed for the continuance of virtual meetings he was confident that the Board could effectively engage the public in these discussions via that medium.
- The themes laid out in the evening's agenda packet align with the original intent of the master planning process, which was a high-level focus on the neighborhoods. The process proposes many different means of reaching many different audiences within the City.
- The themes arose from the rather exhaustive process of public engagement that has occurred thus far regarding the plan. They were summarized by the master planning team and reviewed by Board members. The Board is ready to refine the themes further in tandem with public discussion. Not all of the themes may remain as the process continues.

Mr. Lambert stated that there would be no issues for DPZ if the City extends out its master planning process. He said they would be available to complete all aspects of the process as laid out in the first contract, and that if additional meetings need to be added that would be possible at whatever pace the City sees fit.

Commissioner Baller stated:

- His support for continued meetings via Zoom and expressed hope that Governor Whitmer would authorize them past June 30, 2020.
- The phrases 'broad support' and 'extensive interest' were used to describe different aspects of the plan's proposals. Commissioner Baller encouraged the master planning team and City staff to be sure the data proving those claims was made widely available for public review. He was confident in the existence of the data, but that it would benefit the entire master planning process for there to be transparency regarding how those conclusions were reached.
- A good plan both remains at a generally high level and goes into further detail when appropriate, such as the discussions included in the first draft regarding S. Woodward, the intersection of Woodward and Lincoln, the intersection of Woodward and Maple, recommendations for neighborhood parking, and some downtown considerations. He was perfectly happy seeing a mix of high level and detail, and hoped that the useful detail would not be entirely removed in the pursuit of too high level a plan.
- He appreciated the Board's work on the plan thus far and looked forward to seeing more.

In reply to Commissioner Baller, Chairman Clein stated that the review and adoption process laid out has broad support among Board members. He said that the process was discussed at the Board level and did undergo changes based on Board member comments. Two changes he described as examples were using Nextdoor as a tool for soliciting public feedback and avoiding relying too heavily on neighborhood associations for the spread of information about the process. He also said that since the Board members were present at the current meeting they were more than welcome to offer any comments or additional insight.

Mr. Williams said he thought it would be helpful for another Board member to comment on the process. He commended the consultants, staff, and his fellow Board members on collaboratively creating a plan that would take the City through to the end of the master plan process. Mr. Williams said the only topic that yielded any debate at the Board level was how best to reach out to the neighborhoods during the process. He said that in response to that discussion at the Board level the master planning team and staff came up with a plethora of options for reaching out to residents. Mr. Williams stated that if the City is to receive neighborhood buy-in for the plan the City and the master planning team must make every effort to reach out to the residents.

Mr. Williams stated that he personally felt that public input following draft two would be essential.

In reply to Commissioner Hoff, Mr. Lambert said the City's five subdistricts were central, northeast, northwest, southeast and southwest. He explained that the plan proposes 12 neighborhoods plus the mixed use districts.

Ms. Traxler further elaborated that the specific map for those divisions is available as part of the City's master plan documentation.

In reply to Commissioner Hoff, Mr. Lambert continued that the master planning team proposes to meet with residents from each of the five subdistricts, and to further solicit more

neighborhood-oriented feedback via all other available methods for communication with residents.

Mayor Pro Tem Longe expressed appreciation for the work done on the process thus far, and stated that she viewed the proposed process as appropriate. She said she watched the second public input meeting and understood the Board's concern that the conversation became too granular to be useful to the overall goals of the master planning process. She said she would support a venue for residents to express their more individualized concerns outside of the general public input discussions hosted by the Board. Mayor Pro Tem Longe endorsed both the proposed themes and the master planning team's willingness to state that the themes are not yet final and will be subject to updating.

Commissioner Host said he appreciated the slower timetable being proposed, stating that in light of the Covid-19 pandemic the master planning process was not likely currently at the forefront of many residents' minds. Commissioner Host also asked about the master plan discussion of affordable housing.

In reply to Commissioner Host, Chairman Clein emphasized that the Board is not seeking to increase affordable housing in its legal sense. He explained that, rather, the Board and master planning team are advising discussion of housing that is just a bit more economically attainable than the housing otherwise available in the City.

In reply to Commissioner Host, Mr. Lambert stated that the topic of attainable housing came up in every roundtable discussion with residents barring one. He said the one meeting in which it was not addressed directly was still concerned with schools and the need to retain families with school age children, which ties into the issue of the costs of living in Birmingham. Most of the conversations regarding attainable housing stemmed from older adults who would be looking to downsize in the future and wanted reasonably-priced housing available that would allow them to remain in Birmingham.

Commissioner Sherman stated that it had been the goal of the master plan from the outset to be a plan for future generations and not necessarily as much a plan for the 55+ age group. In light of that, he asked the master planning team about their success in getting input from younger residents.

In reply to Commissioner Sherman, Mr. Lambert confirmed that aside from the under-25 age bracket all other age brackets were relatively equally represented in the survey responses. He stated that the master planning team had its majority of face-to-face interaction with younger residents and families during their drop-in clinics. He said that there might be expanded opportunity to solicit feedback from younger residents in light of the expansion of virtual discussions.

Commissioner Nickita emphasized the importance of maintaining a clear implementation process for the plan with steps for the short-, medium- and long-term. He advised all present to keep that in mind as the master planning process moves forward, stating that implementation processes are the only way that previous City plans have had their goals realized.

Seeing no further Board or Commissioner comment, Mayor Boutros invited public comment.

In reply to Jim Arpin, Chairman Clein explained that, to his understanding, the D5 area study completed by DPZ was a sub-area study, commissioned separately by the City to gain insight into D5 zoning, and not part of the master plan.

Mr. Lambert confirmed Chairman Clein's statement that the D5 area study was performed separately from the master planning process. He added that some of the recommendations from the D5 area study do relate to some recommendations in the master plan draft regarding proposed efforts to reduce discrepancies in zoning ordinances in the City.

David Bloom said he appreciated the City's previous master plan for its strict delineation between the City center and the surrounding neighborhoods. He shared concern about the proposals in the current master plan draft that encourage the development of neighborhood seams with increased housing density and destinations. Mr. Bloom said that while he was supportive of more housing density, he thought the ideal location for it would be the Triangle District and not already established residential neighborhoods. He also expressed concern that denser housing adjacent to single family homes would destroy the single family home property values. Mr. Bloom asked if Birmingham residents in actuality were calling for these changes, or whether these changes were being pushed through at the behest of developers. Mr. Bloom said the area around Bates St. extension should also be considered as part of the master plan.

In reply to Mr. Bloom, Mr. Lambert stated that the master planning team has not been in dialogue with any developers regarding any aspect of the process. He explained there were two drivers for the proposals Mr. Bloom referenced. The first is the aforementioned desire on the part of many senior residents to have attainable housing available should they choose to downsize in the future and remain in Birmingham. The second is that planning in previous decades was concerned about potential blight brought on by multi-family homes because those buildings were often not well-regulated and maintained. Mr. Lambert explained that the thinking in the planning world has evolved in recent years to understand that smaller-scale, well-maintained multi-family homes, strategically placed, adds to the well-being of communities.

Paul Reagan said in his perspective that the master planning team came into the community with themes they wanted to advance rather than themes that arose organically from Birmingham residents. Mr. Reagan continued that Birmingham in the past has attracted its residents largely on the basis of safety and exclusivity, and not housing density or affordability. He opined that the safety and exclusivity Birmingham residents seek is mutually exclusive with the proposal to add more apartment living, whether in the Triangle District or along neighborhood seams. He warned the Commission and the Board that there would be a lot of resident pushback regarding those proposals.

Mr. Reagan said the master plan was also notably missing proposals for the integration of east and west Birmingham and any commentary on unimproved roads and sewers. For the east-west integration he recommended that could be done by installing elevated walkways over Woodward.

In reply to Mr. Reagan, Mr. Lambert said he very much appreciated the feedback that integrating the east and west sides of the City should be one of the themes of the master plan. He said the plan draft did pay some attention to topic, but that he looked forward to further

discussing whether more should be done. Mr. Lambert added that the planning ideas that initially would have influenced Birmingham's development are more similar to the ones being advanced today. He explained that in the intervening time some planning practices came into vogue that introduced policies which were actually destructive to aspects of what makes Birmingham so desirable and liveable. He noted that most Birmingham residents surveyed are very happy with the City, and that only small improvements need to be made. He said the proposals in the master plan draft move towards implementing those.

Mayor Boutros thanked the public for their comments and thanked the DPZ team for their work thus far on the project. He identified consensus among the Commissioners that the master planning process could move forward with the proposed themes, and could move forward with soliciting further public feedback through Zoom as long as it remains authorized by Governor Whitmer.

In reply to Commissioner Baller, Chairman Clein confirmed that the Board received the information and guidance it sought from the Commission. He thanked the Commission for their input and perspective.

B. Lot Combination Review Process

Mayor Boutros recused himself from the discussion at 8:53 p.m.

Mayor Pro Tem Longe initiated discussion of the item at 8:53 p.m.

Planning Director Ecker provided an overview of the item.

Commissioner Baller said that while he was supportive of this discussion occurring, he thought this was not the correct time to be having the discussion. He suggested it would have been more appropriate to complete review of the lot combination request that had already been submitted to the Commission, and then to proceed subsequently with the review of the process. He said it also would have been more appropriate to have allowed the Board time to convene, discuss the issue amongst themselves, and send along voted-on guidance to the Commission. He said he would also like it to be more clear in the lot combination review process that a number of parts of the review are up to the Commission's subjective understanding, specifically citing items one, four and six in Chapter 102, 83(6) as places where that subjective understanding is sought.

After Commission discussion, Chairman Clein addressed Commissioner comments, stating:

- Front setbacks would not change in a lot combination or split since those are already determined by the relationship to other homes on a street.
- Without policing specific design decisions, the Commission can still consider the rhythm, spacing, street wall and other aspects of a street or neighborhood that would be affected by potentially approving a lot combination or split. They can then consider whether those changes might be beneficial to the development of that street and neighborhood.
- Neighborhoods in Birmingham are too varied to be able to provide more specific criteria for lot combination or split appropriateness beyond the criteria already set forth. Acknowledging that, the Commission seems to be on the right path in regards to making

these determinations based on what they perceive to be the best interests of the community.

- Since site plans are not submitted as part of a proposed lot combination or split, the Commission should consider any building configurations that would be allowed under ordinances if the combination or split were approved, and should use that to help guide their decision.

In reply to a question from Commissioner Host, City Attorney Currier stated that lot combinations and splits are legal, and that it is up to the discretion of the Commission whether to allow them.

Mayor Pro Tem Longe asked if any other Board members wanted to weigh in on the discussion.

Mr. Williams said the Board could review the topic in the study session if that would be the desire of the Commission. He said that the matter could also be considered in conjunction with the master plan discussions as they move forward, since the issues are related. Mr. Williams said the Board had thought the room for Commissioner discretion provided in the process would be beneficial since there are so many conditions to consider during a review. He said that if that was not the Commission's consensus that the Board could further attempt to provide more objective criteria on which the Commission could base its decisions.

Mr. Share said that the key issue was a philosophical one, in that the Commission had decide whether they wanted their discretion to be further limited. He gave one example that providing more specific criteria could allow applicants to propose changes that are within the letter of the ordinance but not the spirit, and that the Commission would not be able to deny those changes in such a case. He said that while he agreed with Mr. Williams that the Board could study the issue, he suggested that the Commission consider the possible consequences of reducing their discretion given the variability present in these matters.

Ms. Whipple-Boyce said that in an effort to refresh her memory on the topic, she went back to find minutes of the discussions of this ordinance. She continued that:

- This item seemed to have been initially discussed at a joint PB-CC meeting on June 20, 2016. At the time there was consensus among both the Board members and the Commission that some restrictions should be added to the lot combination process.
- The next time this ordinance was discussed was July 18, 2016, where the Commission reviewed and approved language for the ordinance.
- While it was possible that she missed a meeting in which the issue was discussed, she tends to be at most Board meetings and found no record either on agendas or minutes that the Board ever reviewed the item. There was no indication that the language submitted to the Commission was vetted or voted on by the Board.
- The minutes of the July 18, 2016 Commission meeting indicated that the Commission intended the ordinance change to stop abuses of the lot combination process from continuing on the part of developers with the understanding that the ordinance would be reviewed again as part of the master planning process.
- Language set forth in item one contradict points in items two, three, and four. She would have raised that issue at the time if she had been present for a discussion of the language. Given the contradictions in the ordinance language, she could understand why it was proving confusing for the Commission to act on it.

- Themes four, five and six in the master plan all relate to lot combination considerations.
- The master planning process will provide the groundwork for the Board to later create a clearer ordinance regarding lot combinations.
- If the improvements to the ordinance are significant enough at a later date, it is possible that these reviews could return to being administratively approved instead of being performed by the Commission.
- She was fully supportive of re-looking at this ordinance, but did not think it would be appropriate to propose new language until the master plan is more fully developed.
- In the meantime, the Commission should review lot combination applications according to the ordinance language that is currently set forth.

Mr. Jeffares concurred with Ms. Whipple-Boyce that the current master planning process, with its neighborhood focus, will allow the Board to better formulate language for this ordinance in the future. He said he has seen lot combinations that benefit neighborhood character, citing the ability to replace a garage-front home with a home more in line with Birmingham's current zoning as an example.

Mr. Boyle said that if Commission consensus is that they would like more clarity from the Board then the item should be returned to the Board for study.

Commissioner Sherman said that Chairman Clein provided the most actionable guidance in terms of what the Commission's considerations should be for a lot combination request. He said that while he heard agreement among the Board members that the ordinance should be returned to them for further study, he said that in his mind the Commission was only seeking guidance as to how they should render decisions based on the current ordinance.

Commissioner Hoff said she was appreciative of the Board members' comments. She said she was heartened to know that this ordinance would tie into master planning considerations as well. She said that she was of the mind to request the Board to review the ordinance language per their offer.

In reply to Commissioner Hoff, City Attorney Currier stated that lot combination moratoriums are difficult to maintain, so it would be unlikely that the City could avoid lot combination requests until the ordinance language is sufficiently clarified. He stated that it is City policy to apply the rules in force on the date of a given application, so the current lot combination request before them should be reviewed under the current ordinance.

Seeing no further Board or Commission comments, Mayor Pro Tem Longe invited public comment.

Mr. Bloom said that while he has often spoken against lot combinations, one of the factors worth considering should be whether the requesting party is a current resident. He said he would be more amenable to current residents being granted these requests because of their investment in the community. He also suggested that if a resident owns two lots and proposes a lot combination, the lot without the combination could be split by the City at the time of its sale to re-balance the number of lots the City has.

Hany Boutros stated:

- That public comment should occur at the beginning of Commission meetings, explaining that it is prohibitive for members of the public to wait until the end of the sometimes very long meetings to voice their opinions.
- From his perspective, the discussion proved that for the most part the Commission should not be involved in determining lot combinations since many Commissioners said they were unsure what to base their decisions on.
- A lot of the criteria suggested ultimately amount to aesthetic opinions or preferences for sizes of houses. The City should be allowed to limit the size of houses built on lot combinations if it wants, but should not reply on vague descriptions such as character.
- He agreed with Ms. Whipple-Boyce that the Board should review the ordinance and come up with clear criteria and that then those applications should be administratively reviewed.
- The Commission should hold a public hearing for an application only if it does not meet the criteria, in order to give the applicant a chance to advocate for approval.
- He was unsure the City would continue to be attainable for families if they are expected to have homes on 40-foot lots.
- Birmingham has no consistent character among its houses from one street to the next, and describing it as if it does is misleading.

Seeing no further comment from the public or Commission, Mayor Pro Tem Longe concluded discussion of the item.

C. Economic Stimulus Program

Mayor Boutros resumed leadership of the meeting at 9:49 p.m.

City Manager Valentine introduced the item and Planning Director Ecker provided an overview of the item.

In reply to Commissioner Baller, Planning Director Ecker said:

- A slight reduction in site plan applications occurred, but that had likely owed to the temporary construction stoppage across the state.
- Owing to the Covid-19 pandemic, the City believes it possible that site plan applications could drop off in the future.
- The goal in offering these incentives was to both buffer the City against potential economic fallout in the coming months and to make the City competitive in terms of attracting new investments.
- These proposals were being recommended by the City administration and not the Board.
- The cost to the City for offering these incentives depends on the types of incentives. Some of the incentives would result in no costs to the City, such as offering parking passes at public decks or allowing for economic development licenses for investments of over \$10 million.
- The costs for a commercial rehabilitation district would depend on the size of the development, the according increase in taxes as a result of the new construction, and for how long the Commission would be willing to abate those taxes.

Mr. Boyle said that he applauded the effort on the part of the City administration. Acknowledging that there will be an economic recession, the extent of which is not yet known,

he said it made sense for the City to position itself to mitigate the effects of the recession as much as possible in the short-, medium- and long-term. He cited the City's granting of extra outdoor seating to restaurants as one short-term response that is already being implemented. He said a medium-term response could be in-line with many of the administration's proposals for incentivizing and maintaining development in the City. As part of that medium-term response he recommended making the data available that demonstrate the wisdom and necessity of those actions. Finally, the long-term plans could be the possible commercial rehabilitation district, similar to the Corridor Improvement Authority.

Mr. Boyle said discussion of the situation and its potential remedies would be prudent in the very near future. He said he was less convinced that given the late hour, and the fact that no decisions are made at joint meetings, that the conversation should be continued presently. He said the Board could review the matter first or that it could go directly to the Commission.

Mayor Pro Tem Longe said:

- She would be concerned about implementation of the Commercial Rehabilitation Act (Act) from an equity standpoint.
- There would likely be many areas in the City that would benefit from the investment and that choosing one area could seem unfair.
- She did not know where the 50,000 sq. ft. minimum came from since it is not mentioned in the text of the Act.
- This proposal could end up favoring new businesses over Birmingham's current ones in terms of benefits, especially if the new businesses are competitive with the already extant ones.
- Economic incentives are often very useful to bring investment to areas in more dire economic conditions than the ones Birmingham finds itself in.

In reply to Mayor Pro Tem Longe, Planning Director Ecker stated that to her knowledge no businesses have submitted applications for the Act thus far.

Commissioner Host said he was unpersuaded that these proposals would not cost the taxpayers of Birmingham. He said that he would not want to consider their implementation until the City is facing more dire straits. Commissioner Host said that if the City wanted to provide an economic stimulus, it should lower the residents' taxes before considering anything else.

Commissioner Nickita said it should be clarified that the City already offers incentive programs, for instance through its bistro and economic development licenses. He explained that those do not fund developers, but rather encourage the kind of development the City wants long-term. He cited Triple Nickel restaurant as one example that came about through these incentives, which both gave residents another restaurant to enjoy and expanded the City's tax base. He encouraged the exploration of these ideas to maintain a healthy amount tax revenue, to provide jobs, to provide anchors for other future developments, and to help the City reach its development goals.

Chairman Clein said he was hearing a lot of discussion about implementation strategies for encouraging business and development in Birmingham. He said that the first and most fundamental question should be whether Birmingham residents have an interest in incentivizing business and development.

Commissioner Baller said first that he was perplexed by the joint meeting structure, since ostensibly no action is taken but the Board and administration still come away with what they perceive to be the Commission's recommendation. He said the purposes of the Commission would be better served if there were official votes on these directions so that it is more clear what is being requested. He continued that he would be supportive of the City understanding how it could implement any of these strategies, while being less sure that they needed immediate implementation. He said the question of when to use the strategies would be a worthwhile one.

Commissioner Sherman stated that over the last number of years Birmingham has chosen not to offer financial incentives to bring new business into the community. He said that, absent a compelling reason, he was unclear as to why Birmingham would change that practice now. He noted that when offering tax abatements for some new properties those tax dollars will still need to be made up by the City in other places. He said he would approach these kinds of strategies very cautiously before moving forward.

Mayor Pro Tem Longe said Chairman Clein was correct that the City must determine whether offering these incentives would be supported by the residents. She said it was also difficult to discuss whether any of these strategies might be appropriate without having a clearer sense of where the administration proposes to implement them. She said she could see some of them being useful in the Rail District, for instance, but that she did not see them as being necessary for the downtown.

City Manager Valentine responded to Commissioner Baller's comments. He explained that after the joint workshops the Board's action list is brought to the Commission for review. He said that the Commission then has the ability to amend the Board's action list according to the priorities determined at the workshop discussion.

Mr. Jeffares agreed with Chairman Clein and Mayor Pro Tem Longe, saying that the City must first determine whether these more advanced incentives are necessary given the City's current economic conditions before deciding how to implement them.

Mr. Williams agreed with previous comments, saying he would be supportive of the Board studying the incentives. He explained that better understanding the options does not obligate the City to implement them. He said the Board would need more data for its consideration, and recommendations from the Commission and the administration regarding where in the City these solutions might be implemented. Mr. Williams said he was unswayed by the supposition that because the City has not used these particular strategies before they should not be considered for the future. He noted that there were some Commissioners against bistros when they were proposed about 12 years ago because they had not been used before, and that the bistro program has turned out to be very successful.

Commissioner Hoff shared support for the topic being studied with the understanding that study does not obligate any particular actions.

Commissioner Host thanked the Board for their efforts to interpret and understand the Commission's direction during the meeting.

Seeing no further Board or Commission comment, Mayor Boutros invited public comment.

Mr. Reagan implored the Commission and the Board to not implement any commercial financial incentives at the cost of the residents of Birmingham. He said there was a letter included in the March 22, 2020 Commission agenda packet written to RH, a commercial entity, trying to entice them to create a location in the City through the use of financial incentives. Mr. Reagan said he found no evidence that the Commission as a whole had reviewed or endorsed that letter. He ventured that Birmingham residents had strongly voted against exorbitant commercial incentives when they voted down the proposed Bates St. project in 2019. He continued that at the Commission's first meeting in June 2020, Commissioner Host had requested City Manager Valentine to find a way to increase funding to the senior center. Mr. Reagan recalled that Commissioner Host brought his request for funding down to \$1, and Mr. Reagan said that City Manager Valentine demurred regarding the request. Mr. Reagan said that residents will remain unhappy with City administration and the Commission as long as commercial projects are favored financially over the residents' needs.

Mr. Bloom largely concurred with Mr. Reagan. He said he agreed with the statements that it would be prudent to study and better understand the proposed strategies. He continued, though, that the City administration and the Commission lost a lot of trust on the part of the residents in 2019 as a result of attempting to use some of these tools in ways the residents did not support. He said he would proceed with these discussions with the utmost caution in terms of the likely ramifications for residents. Mr. Bloom noted that, for instance, while giving away parking passes to developers might not immediately cost the City money, it would increase the strain on an already-strained parking system. In turn, that would necessitate raising funds from residents to create other parking options sooner than might have otherwise been necessary.

Mayor Boutros thanked the public for their comments. He said he understood the general consensus from the Commission to be that they would like more information on how these various incentives would work, and would like the Board to study it, without any obligation to implement the incentives.

Mayor Boutros thanked the Board, Commission, Staff, and public for their participation.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT

Occurred during the discussion of each item.

V. ADJOURN

Seeing no further comment, Mayor Boutros adjourned the meeting at 10:44 p.m.

NOTICE: Individuals requiring accommodations, such as mobility, visual, hearing, interpreter or other assistance, for effective participation in this meeting should contact the City Clerk's Office at (248) 530-1880 (voice), or (248) 644-5115 (TDD) at least one day in advance to request mobility, visual, hearing or other assistance.

Las personas que requieren alojamiento, tales como servicios de interpretación, la participación efectiva en esta reunión deben ponerse en contacto con la Oficina del Secretario Municipal al [\(248\) 530-1880](tel:(248)530-1880) por lo menos el día antes de la reunión pública. (Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964).