



# City of Harrisonburg

City Hall  
409 South Main Street  
Harrisonburg, VA 22801

## Master

File Number: ID 20-325

File ID: ID 20-325      Type: PH-Special Use Permit      Status: Agenda Ready

Version: 1      Agenda Section:      In Control: City Council

File Created: 11/04/2020

Subject: SUP 729 Foley Road multi-family      Final Action:

Title: Consider a request from Waseem, Nadeem, and Sohail Alfridi for a special use permit to allow multiple family dwellings at 728 Foley Road

### Internal Notes:

Sponsors:

Enactment Date:

Attachments: CC Memorandum SUP (728 Foley Road), Site Maps, Application, applicant letter and supporting documents, Conceptual Site Layout, PC Memorandum

Enactment Number:

Contact:

Hearing Date:

Drafter: thanh.dang@harrisonburgva.gov

Effective Date:

Related Files:

### History of Legislative File

Version:	Acting Body:	Date:	Action:	Sent To:	Due Date:	Return Date:	Result:
----------	--------------	-------	---------	----------	-----------	--------------	---------

1	Planning Commission	11/11/2020	recommended to full council	City Council	12/08/2020		Pass
---	---------------------	------------	-----------------------------	--------------	------------	--	------

Action Text: A motion was made by Finnegan, seconded by Fitzgerald, that this PH-Special Use Permit be recommended to full council to the City Council, due back on 12/8/2020. The motion carried with a recorded roll call vote taken as follows:

Notes: Chair Colman read the request and asked staff to review.

Ms. Banks said that the Comprehensive Plan designates this site as Medium Density Residential. These areas have been developed or are planned for development of a variety of housing types such as single-family detached, single-family attached (duplexes and townhomes), and in special circumstances, multi-family dwellings (apartments). Depending on the specific site characteristics, densities in these areas should be around 15 dwelling units per acre. Non-residential uses may also be appropriate.

The following land uses are located on and adjacent to the property:

Site: Single-family detached dwelling; zoned R-3

- North: Across Foley Road, single-family detached and multiple family dwellings; zoned R-3
- East: Single-family detached dwelling; zoned R-3
- South: Single-family detached and duplex dwellings; zoned R-3
- West: Single-family detached dwelling; zoned R-3

The applicant is requesting a special use permit (SUP) to allow multiple family dwellings of up to 12 units per building on a +/- 22,380 square foot parcel addressed as 728 Foley Road. If approved, the applicant desires to convert the existing single family detached dwelling structure into a multi-family (apartment) building with four dwelling units. In the past nine years, there have been several SUP requests, of the same nature, approved along Foley Road; however, those requests have all been for the construction of new structures within new developments and not a change of use for an existing structure, such as this request.

With this request, the parcel has sufficient lot area for the property to contain seven dwelling units, but as described in the applicant's letter, only four dwelling units are planned.

When converting a single-family dwelling structure to a multi-family dwelling structure, the Zoning Ordinance (ZO) does not allow parking spaces to be located within the established front yard area between the front property line and the building. Parking regulations within the R-3, Medium Density Residential District also requires that when any parking lot containing five or more spaces is to be constructed within an established single-family or duplex neighborhood, such as this, such parking lots cannot be located between principal buildings and public streets. These parking requirements are being met, as illustrated on the conceptual site layout submitted with the request, where a new driveway is planned along the western boundary of the property with parking in the rear. Additionally, the ZO requires that parking lots in the R-3 district that abut single-family detached or duplex parcels, must be screened from such parcels by a minimum 5-foot buffer containing either a 6-foot high masonry wall, solid wood fence, or evergreen hedge. The submitted conceptual site layout illustrates a 5-foot wide buffer along the western boundary, which will need to contain the wall, fence or evergreen hedge.

Although not shown on the submitted conceptual site layout, staff has discussed with the applicant that the existing driveway entrance will need to be removed, because, if approved, the ZO would not allow parking in the front of the structure. The applicant is also aware that all parking lot landscaping requirements within Section 10-3-30.1 of the ZO must be met.

As part of the requirements for obtaining a SUP for multiple family development in the R-3, Medium Density Residential District, an applicant must substantiate that they have met several conditions to justify the development. Those conditions outlined in Section 10-3-48.6 (e) of the ZO consist of the following:

1. Existing multiple-family development, or land planned for multiple-family development according to the Land Use Guide, is located adjacent to, across the street from, or in close proximity to the proposed development;
2. The applicant has demonstrated that adequate vehicular, transit, pedestrian and bicycle facilities:
  - currently serve the site; or
  - are planned to serve the site according to a city or state plan with reasonable expectation of construction within the timeframe of the need created by the development; or
  - will be provided by the applicant at the time of development; or
  - are not needed because of the circumstances of the proposal.
3. The applicant has demonstrated that the proposed multiple-family development's design is compatible with adjacent existing and planned single-family, duplex and townhouse development. Compatibility may be achieved through architectural design, site planning, landscaping and/or other measures that ensure that views from adjacent single-family, duplex and townhouse development and public streets are not dominated by large buildings, mechanical/electrical and utility equipment, service/refuse functions and parking lots or garages.
4. The applicant has shown that the site is environmentally suitable for multiple-family development. There shall be adequate area within the site, or the development shall be designed, to accommodate buildings, roads and parking areas with minimal impact on steep slopes and floodplains.

The applicant has addressed each condition within the letter attached herein.

Specifically with regard to Section 10-3-48.6(e)'s condition #2 as stated above, staff would typically expect for the applicant to construct street frontage improvements of curb, gutter, sidewalk, and any other necessary improvements at the time of development to meet the condition of adequate pedestrian facilities. The conversion of the existing structure into multi-family units rather than demolishing the existing building and constructing a new multi-family structure, and thus disturbing more property, however, brings in to question whether the circumstances of the proposal negate the need for such improvements to be made as is allowed in the last bullet of condition #2. If the applicant demolished the existing structure and constructed a new multiple family dwelling structure, the scale of the project would likely require an engineered comprehensive site plan (ECSP), and therefore, frontage improvements would also be required. The current plan to convert the existing building would not necessitate an ECSP. If curb, gutter, and sidewalk were to be constructed, the existing fire hydrant in front of this property would likely need to be relocated, creating the need for more financial investments in design and construction. While staff contemplated whether the applicant must construct curb, gutter, and sidewalk along the frontage to meet the requirements of condition #2, and further debated whether a condition should be attached to the SUP to achieve the same, in this particular case, staff believes the

circumstances of the proposal do not warrant such improvements.

The character of this neighborhood, consisting of properties along Foley Road and Ridgeville Lane, has changed over the past two decades from a neighborhood consisting of only single-family detached dwellings to now include duplexes, townhomes, and multiple family dwelling units. As proposed, the units within this application are consistent with the surrounding parcels.

Staff recommends approval of the special use permit to allow multiple family dwellings on the subject parcel with the following conditions:

1. The SUP shall be limited to the existing structure and no more than four multiple family dwelling units. (Note: Small additions to the existing structure for housing improvements may be allowed at the discretion of the Zoning Administrator.)
2. The existing driveway and entrance shall be removed; however, portions of the paved area may remain and be repurposed.

Condition one is proposed because other ideas and scenarios for multiple family development on this parcel were not discussed and staff believed it was appropriate to limit the SUP as proposed in this application. This condition also allows for consistency in the understanding for the surrounding community to know what development could actually be allowed under the approved SUP. If in the future, the property owner wishes to add more dwelling units or to redevelop the site for other multi-family development, then a SUP will be required.

The second condition requires that the existing driveway and entrance between the structure and the public street be removed to comply with Section 10-3-25(3)a. and acknowledges that portions of the paved area may remain and be repurposed for things such as, but not limited to, a paved area for a walkway or a patio.

Chair Colman asked if there were any questions for staff.

Chair Colman asked if handicap parking and handicap accessibility to the units would be required.

Ms. Banks said that there will be the requirement of handicap accessibility.

Chair Colman said that it looks like a shed that is on the property line will have to be removed.

Ms. Banks said yes.

Vice Mayor Romero asked if there has been any concern within the community. There have been multiple applications in that area. We recently approved a larger housing development there. Is this close to that?

Ms. Banks said that we approved an R-5 development earlier this year, which is closer to the intersection of Foley Road and Reservoir Street. Slightly over two years ago, in August of 2018, this body reviewed an R-3 SUP like this one for a proposed development at 753 Foley Road. That is further up at 753 Foley Road, almost all the way to the end and across the street from this one. It is closer to the Angle development that you see up there. They have not started construction on that development. I did not check to see if their SUP has expired.

Vice Mayor Romero said that he wondered if there has been any sort of pushback from the community. When we approved that one project, there was the whole neighborhood that came out in strong opposition. That application was approved. That is why I wanted to have a sense of whether there was any pushback from the community and how close this was to that project.

Ms. Banks said I had a phone call with the directly adjacent neighbor to the west and with their family. They were asking about what the buffer would be between the driveway and their property. They understood that the driveway would be coming along their property. They were not opposed to the SUP, but they did have questions about the buffering. I also had an email from someone who was asking questions about the parking lot. I did not receive any in opposition.

Commissioner Finnegan said that this is different from that other application. They are using the existing structure. They are not knocking this house down and building something new and taller. It is different in that way, as well. They are repurposing the house that is there.

Chair Colman said that some of the things that we discussed when the large development was proposed, was traffic issues, increased number of cars coming through Foley Road and some people going around to Ridgeville Lane instead. This area has been changing for a while. It has been evolving from single-family homes and duplexes into multi-family structures. At least in this case, it is a repurposing of a single home into four units. It is nice that it is not so many, but hopefully that makes it more affordable for the property owner to do that and provide housing for more than just one family. I do not know that the traffic would be impacted significantly by this, but it is one more development in this area that is generating more traffic onto Reservoir Street, where it is difficult to turn on to. Those discussions were there when we talked about the large development. It just adds to the numbers. I am not opposed to it. To the contrary, I think it is a great idea, but I do want to bring up the fact that we had a significant discussion about how traffic was flowing there based on a lot of the people from both neighborhoods there that came out to speak about it.

Chair Colman asked if there were any more questions for staff. Hearing none, he opened the public hearing and invited the applicant or applicant's representative to speak to their request.

Waseem Alfridi, 1831 Jenny Lane, Rockingham called in support of the request. I am glad to be part of this. I was trying to see the video, but I am getting some error. I am waiting for a decision to be made with the committee. I have discussed most of my plans with staff and we are hoping everything goes well in the committee.

Chair Colman asked if there were any questions for the applicant. Hearing none, he asked for the next caller.

Seth Roderick, Monteverde Engineering and Design Studio, the applicant's engineer, called in support of the request. I am available to answer any questions related to any engineering items. I did hear the concern regarding the traffic. The Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) determination of needs showed only two additional trips in the morning peak hour and three additional trips in the evening peak hour.

Chair Colman asked if there were any questions for the applicant's representative. Hearing none, he asked for the next caller.

Frank Gordon, 3354 Lawyer Road, Rockingham, called on behalf of Foley Road, LLC, Ridgeville, LLC, and Devon Lane, LLC, which are adjoining properties. I am calling in favor of this application because it is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and because recent zoning actions by the Council, which include two R-5 rezonings, not one, on this street make clear that Foley Road is no longer a single-family neighborhood. In addition to the parcels zoned R-5, several others have already been granted the same SUP requested here, including the Angle property as previously mentioned. Allowance of increased density in proximity to public transportation has been demonstrated to improve housing affordability, which is a topic of great interest in our community and a stated goal of City Council.

I do have some concerns. First, this is proposed as four units, three three-bedroom and one two-bedroom. Are the units interconnected within the interior of the building? The significance is that some properties in other areas of the City, when the properties are laid out as duplexes, they will often have a perfunctory kitchen in one unit, so it becomes an eight-bedroom student rental. What I would like to see is improved housing affordability. I think this project has that potential, but I recognize that it also has the potential, if it has interior inter-unit connection, to become an eleven-bedroom student housing. That would not be as favorable from the perspective of property owners on this street.

The second concern is regarding the adjacent property that is one unit closer to Reservoir Street and is topographically downhill from this project, as you can see on the conceptual site plan that you have been provided. Water intrusion was occurring into the crawlspace under 722 Foley Road, which is the one I am referring to just down the hill. This was reviewed by Valley Engineering and as a part of their conclusions, they say that it was unequivocally clear that stormwater runoff from the house next door, which is the

applicant's proposed house, was contributing to this stormwater. One of the concerns that I have regarding the property of Devon Lane, LLC, which is downhill, is that we are increasing the impervious areas by installing parking areas, which will be uphill from 723 Foley Road. I am concerned that unless that parking area is curved or angled, which I think the topography would allow, for that stormwater to be directed towards the street, otherwise it will significantly exacerbate the already existing stormwater problem we are having on the property just down the hill from this. I am hopeful that the City Engineer can address that when he is reviewing this plan, which I think is provided for in the Code that the City Engineer can indicate what, if any, additional stormwater problems might occur. This is a chief concern of mine, as the owner of that property.

Lastly, I would say that while it makes sense to me while we are trying to propose affordable housing not to require development of the sidewalk and gutter, improvement of fire hydrant, which could all be very expensive actions, I would wonder if the Planning Commission would recommend to City Council that they ask for street frontage dedication of the property necessary to build that infrastructure in the future. Dedicating land to the City was done by 735 Foley Road, across the street, when the sidewalk was not built. It would at least facilitate the potential for development of sidewalks to go there in the future, should funding occur from some other mechanism. I would commend that to your consideration.

In summary, I want to emphasize that I am in favor of this project because I think it has the potential to develop additional affordable housing if not diverted into a large student house. This neighborhood, as has been alluded to by planning officials and members of the Planning Commission, is no longer a single-family neighborhood. As the owner of two adjacent single-family homes, I am eager to see what comes out of the zoning revisions. I am thoroughly convinced and supported by previous statements by the Urban Institute that increasing allowed density near public transportation will improve affordability. I can foresee that for my two properties, as well.

Commissioner Finnegan said that he agrees with Mr. Gordon's last statement about the connection between affordability and increasing density in the single-family neighborhoods.

Mr. Roderick called into the meeting to address some of the comments made by Mr. Gordon and stated that as shown in the preliminary drawings, the impervious area is only about 6,000 square feet. It would not significantly increase stormwater for any measure. It is a relatively small impact and it is under the 10,000 square foot threshold that requires erosion control and stormwater to be looked at. By that metric, it would not have a major impact. I am not aware of the issues that they were talking about; drainage going into the basement of the neighboring property. There is a large backyard on both properties and I would expect that grading of that site potentially could shift that downstream, but again, that is not something I have looked at.

Chair Colman asked Mr. Roderick to speak to the concerns regarding the

inner-connectivity of the building, if there were to be four units, are they going to be completely separated or are they going to be interconnected in such a way that they could be used for student housing?

Mr. Roderick replied the building plans have not been finalized. What I do know from my walkthrough with the applicant is that three of the units were going to be interior access. There would be a common hallway through the front door. The only unit that may have exterior access would be the unit that is being converted from the garage. That unit needs to have separate access for ADA purposes. The other three would have an interior corridor, common hallway, and they would branch off as separate units from there. They do have the potential of having their own, small kitchen area.

Chair Colman asked if there were any questions for the applicant's representative. Hearing none, he asked for the next caller. As there were no more callers, he closed the public hearing and opened the matter for discussion.

Ms. Banks said that the four units in the house will be required, by Building Code, to be completely separated. When Mr. Roderick mentioned a shared hallway, that is a common entry and then you would go into your apartment, which would be completely separate with no access into other apartments. You cannot go from apartment A into apartment B unless you physically leave apartment A, go into that hallway and then walk across to apartment B. They will not be allowed to have that internal access. Building Codes will not allow it.

Commissioner Finnegan said that there would not be a big shared kitchen.

Ms. Banks confirmed that there will not be a shared kitchen. Each unit will have customary kitchen facilities, they will have to have a sleeping area, bathroom and living area, as Building Code will require. It could be a requirement that they would have to be sprinkled, as well. It will not be one large communal house with a shared kitchen. The stormwater questions have been brought to the attention of the City engineer and he will be working to address Mr. Gordon's concerns and to discuss that with him.

Chair Colman said that there was a question about dedication of street frontage for a future sidewalk.

Ms. Banks said that when staff had the discussion of the improvements along the front, we also had the conversation of dedicating right-of-way only. We did not feel that the dedication of right-of-way was necessary at this time. We were not asking for street improvements to be put in, so we did not make that a condition of the request at this time. If you feel strongly about it, you have the right to make conditions as well.

Commissioner Whitten asked where is the school bus stop for Foley Road? Is it down at Reservoir Street?



Ms. Banks said that she did not know where the school bus stop was located.

Commissioner Whitten said that the more we add, the more opportunity for kids that are going to be walking and I do not think that a bus is going to pick them up door to door on that street. There must be a collection point or a bus stop. I think that makes sidewalks a concern for the future, for the near future.

Ms. Banks said that is something we can check on.

Vice Mayor Romero said that there are plenty of kids that go to our schools from that neighborhood, at least over the years that has been the case. I would anticipate that the bus does go in and does loop around to come back. We can look into that here. When I used to work at Stone Spring Elementary School, that was the case. The bus would go all the way. This is a pretty long way between Reservoir and the end of the street out there. We typically are at a block at most for kids to walk to the bus. I am pretty sure that it goes in there.

Chair Colman said regarding right-of-way, typically the City would require it if the property were to expand, they would have to submit a comprehensive site plan for review and go through that process. If they do not, then the City would not have the right-of-way to put a sidewalk on this property. I typically prefer an access easement, rather than a dedicated right-of-way because it allows for the setbacks to remain the same, compared to pushing the setbacks farther back. In this case, it may or may not apply. The other caveat here is that the setback can be the average front setback of all the units on that block. How do the other Commissioners feel about this issue?

Commissioner Byrd said that this whole area is medium density residential district. I am confused as to why people are referring to the neighborhood as single-family if it is zoned to be medium density for multi-family units. It sounds like, from the plan, that we are looking towards this area's population going up anyway. We might want to think about making sure that there is space for any future decisions on what will happen with Foley Road itself.

Ms. Banks said that the medium density residential district does allow by-right for single-family homes, duplexes and townhomes. The single-family homes are a smaller lot size than what you would find in the R-1 or R-2 residential districts. We refer to it still as a single-family or duplex neighborhood because of the definition within the R-3 medium density that says that if there is a single-family home next door or adjacent to the property we are looking at, then it is considered a single-family neighborhood or a duplex neighborhood. There are still scattered single-family homes throughout the area. They are allowed by-right. There have been R-3 neighborhoods that have developed utilizing the smaller lots for single-family homes.

Chair Colman said that Commissioner Byrd's point is valid. If we are going to be looking at this area to continue to develop into a medium density R-3 and some multi-family structures

realizing that this area is moving in that direction, we do need to consider the long-term impacts to the infrastructure there, mainly the streets and sidewalks and things like that. We should consider what may be coming in the future. Perhaps it will be something like this, a single-home that is repurposed. If someone were to propose something next door to this, then they will have to provide the right of way or at least the access easement for the sidewalk, but this property will not have to because we did not ask for it. I think that it could be a good idea to do it. Is there interest in adding conditions or recommendations?

Commissioner Finnegan said that he is not concerned. This is a repurposing of an existing structure. It is increasing density and as the traffic analysis indicated, adding a few cars, but I do not feel compelled to add conditions.

Commissioner Whitten said that when you do increase density that is part of the responsibility of development. It is like when we ask sidewalk to be built that does not connect, but we know that it will eventually connect. It is much harder to go back and ask for something after that possibility does not exist anymore. It is a much bigger problem. I think it is not a bad idea to ask for and it is not a lot to ask for. This is the time to ask.

Chair Colman said, to be clear, we are asking for an access easement for future sidewalk to be able to be built there. We are not asking them to build a sidewalk. We are not asking them to improve that. We are just asking them for an easement to have a sidewalk located there, when and if the properties adjacent to it develop. Is that what we are saying?

Commissioner Whitten said yes, that is what I would say, an easement, not for a sidewalk to be built.

Ms. Banks said which are you saying. You would want an easement or right-of-way dedication?

Chair Colman said easement.

Mr. Russ asked when does the Design and Construction Standards Manual allow for easements instead of dedication? I am looking at it now and it looks like we should be getting dedication not an easement.

Chair Colman said that it is not uncommon, in my experience, for Public Works to require an access easement instead of a right-of-way dedication for a sidewalk. The benefit of the easement, which we should look at when we revise the Zoning Ordinance, is that right-of-way dedication pushes the setback further back. It limits your property and your construction area. Your house needs to be 30 feet or whatever the setbacks may be. When you do the access easement, the sidewalk is within the property and without pushing the setback, the building, the constructability, farther back. As we are trying to bring buildings closer to the road or sidewalk, that moves things in that direction as well. Public Works has done that many times, Mr. Russ, but your opinion is highly valued.

Mr. Russ said I am worried that this will lead to applying different development standards to different properties without any rule for how we decide which property follows which standard. When we set the setbacks, it is with the presumption that the sidewalks are going to be on the public street.

Ms. Banks said that Public Works has said that they would rather have right-of-way dedicated instead of sidewalk constructed with this project.

Chair Colman said that, if that is the case, we should leave it alone because from the standpoint of property rights and what they can do with the property we are limiting even more if we say that we need to have right-of-way. If we are not asking anyone else to give right-of-way, then we should not ask it here either.

Mr. Fletcher said that along this stretch of Foley Road, right-of-way has been dedicated in piecemeal situations when development occurs. If you look at our GIS map and tax mapping, you will see indentations where right-of-way is dedicated. I agree with Mr. Russ that right-of-way dedication would be cleaner and generally more consistent with the expectations of how we apply those standards. There are times that the Department of Public Works will work with property owners and developers to do an easement if there is some type of special circumstance. In this case, if the Commission is going down the path of recommending that property be dedicated to the City, I would suggest wording it in a way that allows us to confirm with the Department of Public Works, the amount of space that would be needed for dedication. We would typically say from the centerline of the street, you would need to have at least 25 feet of right-of-way on both sides, which adds up to 50 feet of right-of-way. It could be of variable width depending on how the actual property line aligns with the public street. If the Planning Commission makes that recommendation, or that suggested condition, I suggest that flexibility in wording. It is probably going to be at least the amount of distance from the centerline of the public street, equivalent to 25 feet of right-of-way. What you will see on that street is that it is often times five or seven feet that is dedicated on that side and the same on the other side. I could not tell you how much right-of-way is within Foley Road. It could be anywhere between 35 and 40 feet of right-of-way. That is why we need that flexibility.

Chair Colman said that the question would be how many properties have dedicated right-of-way along Foley Road? Staff did not recommend that right-of-way be dedicated, but the intention was, or the interest would be that, if that street is developed, that there is sufficient space for that to be built. Now is the time for the City to ask for this and not later.

Mr. Fletcher said that typically what we are looking at is scale and threshold. When you look at the right-of-way dedications that have occurred in the past along Foley Road, you will see redevelopment or substantial development that had triggered the need for an engineered comprehensive site plan. In this case, we evaluated and determined that we are looking at the reuse of an existing building and they are not increasing their footprint

significantly, in fact they are removing some impervious area from the front and putting it in the back. There is some logic to the things you are talking about, but there is a threshold to consider. Had they proposed to demolish the existing structure and rebuild four or more units as permitted by density; they would likely have thresholds that require much more sophisticated evaluation into the overall development picture. It is one of those scenarios where you have to determine where you draw the line. We determined it is a small scale project and they did not trigger a big comprehensive site plan review; therefore, we did not add on those additional costs. There was a domino effect that would have been created.

Chair Colman said that he does not see the costs coming into play when it comes down to right-of-way dedication, unless you need a plat. That would be the main concern here. I am concerned more about setbacks in this case. I am fine with the way staff is proposing this.

Commissioner Byrd said that it is good that this was brought up now, so that if we approve this, and City Council looks at this, everyone will think about these things at that point as well.

Chair Colman said that when we think of development and expanding properties, taking right-of-way reduces the buildability of a property. That is what we need to be concerned with. There are pros and cons in each thing that we suggest. I want us to be conscious of that.

Commissioner Whitten said that she is glad we have had this discussion. I agree with Commissioner Byrd that we will leave this for City Council to think about. I do think that erring on the side of caution when it comes to future infrastructure is always well-advised.

Commissioner Finnegan moved to recommend approval of the SUP with conditions as presented.

Commissioner Fitzgerald seconded the motion.

Chair Colman called for a roll call vote.

Commissioner Whitten	Aye
Commissioner Fitzgerald	Aye
Commissioner Finnegan	Aye
Commissioner Byrd	Aye
Vice Mayor Romero	Aye
Commissioner Orndoff	Aye
Chair Colman	Aye

The motion to recommend approval of the SUP with conditions as presented passed (7-0).  
The recommendation will move forward to City Council on December 8, 2020.

Yes: 7 Colman, Finnegan, Whitten, Romero, Orndoff, Byrd and Fitzgerald