

**LIVINGSTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES**

June 19, 2019

6:30 p.m.

304 E. Grand River Ave., Howell, Michigan

PLANNING COMMISSION		
COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:	BRIAN PROKUDA JEANNE CLUM MATT IKLE	LAURA ABRAMSON BILL ANDERSON
COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:	CLAIRE STEVENS	
STAFF PRESENT:	KATHLEEN KLINE-HUDSON ROB STANFORD SCOTT BARB	
OTHERS PRESENT:	SEE SIGN IN SHEET FROM MEETING	

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Meeting was called to order by Commissioner Prokuda at 6:30 PM.

2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG**

3. **ROLL AND INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS:** None.

4. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Commissioner Action: IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER IKLE TO APPROVE THE AGENDA DATED JUNE 19, 2019, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ANDERSON.

All in favor, motion passed.

5. **APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES**

Commissioner Action: IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER ANDERSON TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING DATED MAY 15, 2019, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER CLUM.

All in favor, motion passed.

6. **CALL TO THE PUBLIC:** None.

7. ZONING REVIEWS:

A. Z-18-19: BRIGHTON CHARTER TOWNSHIP – REZONING

Current Zoning: NR: Natural Resources

Proposed Zoning: I-1: Industrial

Section / Proponents: Section 24 / Ashley Land Redevelopment Co., Inc.

Township Master Plan:

The Future Land Use plan and map of Brighton Charter Township designates the site as Planned Unit Development (PCI). The Township Master Plan describes this area in the following manner (p. 28):

Planned Unit Developments are a type of land use that allows some regulatory flexibility in favor for higher quality development. This tool allows a developer to work with the site to develop the most reasonable plan, given existing conditions, surrounding contexts and community goals. Planned Unit Developments can be used to cluster development in a certain area of the site in order to create shared open space or protect natural features. A PUD can help accomplish the following:

- *Provide flexible design to respond to the unique characteristics of a site.*
- *Coordinate development on larger sites within the designated lands.*
- *Preserve significant natural features in a more coordinated and comprehensive manner.*
- *Provide alternatives for developing plans on land that may exhibit difficult physical constraints, and where an improved design can provide the developer and the community with benefits.*
- *Allow for clustered development in order to create common space for use by future residents or users of the development. Ensure public infrastructure and road improvements are made as practical, concurrent with the development.*
- *Provide the opportunity to mix compatible land uses.*

The gravel pits located on several sites near the east side of the Township provide an area for future development. Extraction of gravel has extended below the water table, creating several small lakes that can be used as an attractive feature in future development plans proposed on some of these sites. The gravel pits would be most effectively developed as planned unit developments (PUD) which include a mixture of uses.

County Comprehensive Plan:

The 2018 Livingston County Master Plan does not direct future land use patterns, or development within Livingston County. Alternatively, it offers a county-wide land use perspective when reviewing potential rezoning amendments. The Land Use & Growth Management chapter of the plan includes decision-making recommendations regarding potential land use conflicts and promoting good land governance.

Township Planning Commission Recommendation: Disapproval. The Brighton Charter Township Planning Commission recommended **Disapproval** of this rezoning at its May 10, 2019 Public Hearing. There were several (nearly 100) public comments noted in the meeting minutes against this proposed rezoning request. There were only two (2) public comments noted in favor of the rezoning.

Staff Recommendation: Disapproval. Staff recommends **Disapproval** of the rezoning request. The rezoning request does not follow the Master Plan for the area. It is somewhat presumptive with relation to the still valid life-cycle of the gravel pit operation.

According to the Township, the Ashley gravel pit operation still has five (5) to seven (7) years of extraction capacity remaining, with the other surrounding gravel pit operations having 15-20 plus years remaining. In addition, it appears that the petitioner acted outside of their established Township mining permits in a unilateral manner to acquire and begin concrete crushing operations, essentially created a non-conforming use of their own volition. The request is neither a reasonable nor appropriate remedy for this situation.

Commission Discussion: Commissioner Prokuda disclosed that he does some work for the General Motors Proving Grounds. Commissioner Abramson asked if the newly proposed plans for the site still included an end-use restoration plan. Commissioner Anderson stated that he knows of other concrete crushing establishments within Livingston County and that Monroe County is not the closest destination for this product.

Public Comment:

Attorney Paul Burns introduced himself, the petitioner Lew Hayes, and Paul LeBlanc, planner for the applicant. Mr. LeBlanc responded that there would be a restoration plan and then asked to give a brief presentation on the proposed rezoning.

Mr. LeBlanc gave a presentation that included the criteria for rezoning as outlined in the Brighton Township Zoning Ordinance. He stated that the necessity of industrial rezoning is because NR zoning does not allow bringing in concrete materials to be crushed; concrete crushing is only allowed in the I-1 zone. He explained that there is an end use of the property at which time the restoration plan will be implemented. He said that the Brighton Township Master Plan says that zoning should be based on a plan, yet the Township needs to reevaluate the future land use for this site because it is no longer feasible nor valid. He stated that there is a demonstrated need for this concrete product and the next closest facility providing this product is in Macomb County.

Various residents then spoke and addressed the Planning Commission regarding issues with the proposed rezoning.

Marilyn Carr, Brighton Township - expressed concerns about silica dust and further contamination, and referred to EPA standards.

Douglas Carr, Brighton Township - stated concern about loaded trucks coming in with concrete and trucks going out with gravel. He stated that these trucks present dangerous traffic concerns.

Roxanne Cutchins, Milford Township - requested that a petition be entered into the record of names of those attending the meeting and said there were many who could not be there tonight that also shared many of the concerns the residents are expressing. County Planning Staff received the petition to place on file.

Mark Watson, Milford Township - stated that water contamination is a primary concern. He is concerned about gravel crushing.

Sandy Jordan-Olger, Labadie Road - expressed concern about truck traffic. She said that the business bought a concrete crushing machine ahead of the rezoning. She is concerned about her neighborhood and the persons in her community.

Susan Long, Milford Township - read a prepared statement. She stated that the petitioner is trying to maximize financial benefit, and the current use is not consistent with the permit. She also stated that there are issues with the roads, health, and safety and an environmental impact statement is needed.

Diahann Pearson, Milford Township - said that she called GM Proving Grounds and their chief environmental engineer told her that Mr. Hayes was crushing old test track. She also spoke about environmental and health concerns, and future land use.

Dr. Taire Thie, Kierstan Dr. – stated that when concrete is crushed, the chemicals that leach out change the PH of soil. She is concerned about trucks and truck pollution, as well as environmental concerns. She mentioned that the Brighton Township hall was packed with residents at the Planning Commission meeting.

Roy Hunsinger, Grondinwood Ct. – expressed concern about silica, that Ashley Development operated illegally and that there are other sources of crushed concrete in Livingston County.

Phil Klimkewicz, Brighton Township - expressed concern about the potential rezoning.

Commission Discussion: Commissioner Prokuda asked if there are 300-500 gravel trucks traveling this area on a daily basis and whether or not the traffic volume would be comparable with the proposed concrete crushing use. He asked if Brighton Township had required a traffic study and asked about the end use plan. Mr. LeBlanc explained that not all of the truck traffic is a result of Ashley Land Development since there are other extractive operations in the immediate area.

Commission Action:

Commissioner Action: IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON TO RECOMMEND DISAPPROVAL. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER CLUM.

Motion passed: 4-1 (NAY IKLE)

B. Z-19-19: BRIGHTON CHARTER TOWNSHIP – CONDITIONAL REZONING

Current Zoning: R-3: Residential Single Family

Proposed Zoning: OS: Office Service (Conditional)

Section / Proponents: Section 16 / David LeClair

Township Master Plan:

The Future Land Use plan and map of Brighton Charter Township designates the site as Medium Density Residential. The Township Master Plan describes this area in the following manner (p. 27):

This designation primarily refers to moderate-density single-family uses, including single-family homes on existing small lots and some two-family attached condominiums. Areas designated as Medium Density Residential were selected where historic patterns of development near commercial nodes and around many of the lakes in the southern and western portions of the Township have resulted in medium density areas. Other areas of existing moderate density development were also categorized as Medium Density, as well as areas where a transition is needed between lower density areas and multiple-family or neighborhood commercial areas. These areas are expected to be developed at densities of two to three dwelling units per acre, and are generally located within close proximity to major thoroughfares and commercial areas, and where the existence of larger parcels of land that can accommodate this type of development. The majority of the Medium Density Residential areas are found within areas that are served, or may be served by public water and sewer.

County Comprehensive Plan:

The 2018 Livingston County Master Plan does not direct future land use patterns, or development within Livingston County. Alternatively, it offers a county-wide land use perspective when reviewing potential rezoning amendments. The Land Use & Growth Management chapter of the plan includes decision-making recommendations regarding potential land use conflicts and promoting good land governance.

Township Planning Commission Recommendation: Approval. The Brighton Charter Township Planning Commission recommended **Approval** of this Conditional Rezoning at its May 10, 2019 Public Hearing. There were several agreed upon Conditions tied to this rezoning.

There were several public comments noted in the meeting minutes both for and against this proposed rezoning request from R-3 to Conditional OS for his property for the following reasons: it has less impact than what could be developed under the R-3 zoning district; benefits traffic and the environment; and will comply with all items required by the Township Planner, Township Engineer, and outside agencies:

Livingston County Drain Commissioner, Livingston County Road Commissioner, and Brighton Area Fire Authority.

Staff Recommendation: Approval with Conditions. Staff recommends **Approval with Conditions**, Conditions being that the township reevaluate and consider implementing Staff's final recommendations as provided in this case regarding the proposed "Conditions for Rezoning".

Staff would also highly recommend that the Township use this case and many of its elements as an impetus in the pursuit and development of a set of stand-alone zoning ordinance regulations and provisions specifically addressing for Event/Wedding Barn uses in the township going forward in the future, rather than addressing each case in piece meal fashion or with numerous conditions tied to it. This will provide future prospective developers interested in pursuing this type of development or venture a solid set of regulations by which they can develop a plan or idea prior to bringing a plan before the township for further consideration at the Commission/Board level. It also would give the Township a solid regulatory basis with which to work from when approached by perspective developers interested in pursuing this type of development or venture in the future.

Commission Discussion: Commissioner Abramson asked if single family residential is tied to the event center and why it should be restricted. Principal Planner Stanford stated that single-family residential is not allowed in the OS District. Commissioner Prokuda asked for clarification about whether there would be any other uses with the event. Commissioner Clum noted that at many of these types of establishments noise can become a concern. Commissioner Ikle noted that there is a strong need for this type of use in the county since many have to travel to Oakland County or the Lansing area to experience these types of events. He also stated that the conditions of this rezoning, including the insulated construction of the event barn should do a good job of enforcing nuisances such as noise. Commissioner Prokuda asked how this OS rezoning is not considered spot zoning and if there are any other more appropriate zoning districts.

Public Comment:

The applicant and property owner, Davis LeClair, responded that the event barn will be insulated with very little noise coming from the use and there is a vegetated buffer around the perimeter of the site. He stated that wedding barns throughout Michigan tend to be in residential areas. Mr. LeClair said that he really wanted this project to happen and that all of the adjacent and nearby neighbors are supportive of the proposed use and conditional rezoning. He stated that much of the site will remain open space with little impervious surface. He said that he will homestead the residence on-site. Mr. LeClair said that Old US-23 is under the jurisdiction of the Livingston County Road Commission and they require him to have a deceleration lane into his property.

Ken Younkins, Brighton Township - expressed his concerns about the barn and the potential for undue expansion and if there were any restoration plans for the site if it ever reverted back to the original zoning.

Kelly Mathews, Brighton Township Planner – Stated that the Township could have gone many different routes with this use and that a conditional rezoning is the best option for now. She said that there was no good way to carve out the residential use without ordinance language.

Commission Action:

Commissioner Action: IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER ANDERSON TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS; conditions being those stated in the recommendation of the staff review and the Revised Conditional Zoning Agreement filed with Brighton Township.

SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER IKLE.

Motion passed: 4-1 (NAY PROKUDA)

C. Z-20-19: TYRONE TOWNSHIP, ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS - ARTICLE 2 DEFINITIONS, ARTICLE 4 FR FARMING RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT, ARTICLE 12A PCS PLANNED COMMERCIAL SERVICES DISTRICT, ARTICLE 16A PIRO PLANNED INDUSTRIAL, RESEARCH, AND OFFICE DISTRICT, ARTICLE 22 SPECIAL LAND USES.

The Tyrone Township Planning Commission is proposing to amend the Township Zoning Ordinance by amending several sections of the Ordinance to allow for utility scale solar energy facilities.

Township Planning Commission Recommendation: Approval. The Tyrone Township Planning Commission recommended **Approval** of the text amendments at their May 14, 2019 meeting. There were no comments at the public hearing on the proposed text amendments.

Staff Recommendation: Approval. The proposed text amendments are appropriate for the Tyrone Township Zoning Ordinance.

Commission Discussion: None.

Public Comment: Mark Meisel, Chair of the Tyrone Township Planning Commission reported that there is no solar energy facility planned at this point in time; the Township just wants to put language in place in anticipation of future use.

Commissioner Action:

Commissioner Action: IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER CLUM TO RECOMMEND **APPROVAL**. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER IKLE.

Motion passed: 5-0

D. Z-21-19: TYRONE TOWNSHIP, ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS - ARTICLE 21 SUPPLEMENTAL DISTRICT REGULATIONS, SECTION 21.59 RECREATIONAL MARIJUANA USES.

The Tyrone Township Planning Commission proposes a new amendment regarding recreational marijuana uses. This amendment proposes Tyrone Township opt out of recreational marijuana facilities using zoning restrictions as permitted by Initiated Law 1 of 2018, consistent with regulatory ordinance #48 adopted by the Township Board in January 2019. This dual opt out strategy was recommended by the township attorney.

Township Planning Commission Recommendation: Approval. The Tyrone Township Planning Commission recommended **Approval** of the text amendments at their May 14, 2019 meeting.

Staff Recommendation: Approval. The proposed amendments appear to be reasonable and appropriate and consistent with Initiated Law 1 of 2018.

Commission Discussion: None.

Public Comment: None.

Commissioner Action:

Commissioner Action: IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER IKLE TO RECOMMEND **APPROVAL**. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ANDERSON.

Motion passed: 5-0

E. Z-22-19: TYRONE TOWNSHIP, ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS - ARTICLE 2 DEFINITIONS, ARTICLE 20, SECTION 20.02 FOOTNOTES TO SCHEDULE OF REGULATIONS.

The Tyrone Township Planning Commission proposes a new amendment regarding submerged lands(s) and lot area calculations. This amendment proposes to add a new definition for “submerged land” and modify Section 20.02.W to clarify the lot/parcel area for the purpose of creating a conforming lot/parcel does not include submerged land as defined. The township attorney believes that the township’s current ordinance language reasonably states this requirement, and is further supported by language in the Land Division Act, however the Township Planning Commission all agreed that some clarification would be beneficial. This clarification is the result of a requested land division which attempted to include a significant portion of the required lot/parcel area using a portion of the submerged bottom land of an inland lake (Marl Lake) that was included in the parent parcel legal description.

Township Planning Commission Recommendation: Approval. The Tyrone Township Planning Commission recommended **Approval** of the text amendments at their May 14, 2019 meeting

Staff Recommendation: Approval. The proposed amendments appear to be reasonable and appropriate. The new definition better clarifies the Township’s intent with regard to submerged lands and their relation with lot area calculations.

Commission Discussion: None.

Public Comment: None.

Commissioner Action:

Commissioner Action: IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER CLUM TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON.

Motion passed: 5-0

F. Z-23-19: HOWELL TOWNSHIP – REZONING

Current Zoning: MFR: Multiple Family Residential

Proposed Zoning: RSC: Regional Service Commercial

Section / Proponents: Section 27 / Brockway/Lucy Road Resources, LLC

Township Master Plan:

The 2016 Howell Township Master Plan designates the subject parcel as **Medium Density Residential**. The Future Land Use Map and Strategy recognizes and encourages the continued development of residential property of varying styles and density based on intended character and function within the Township.

Based upon the Township’s Future Land Use Map, it is clear the intent is to provide a broader range of housing opportunities in those areas where medium density residential currently exists. Pineview Village is east of the proposed rezoning site with the Township Master Plan designating properties to the west as medium density residential along M-59. A rezoning to a more intense land use such as regional service commercial would not be compatible with either the Township Master Plan or current land use patterns in the area.

County Comprehensive Plan:

The 2018 Livingston County Master Plan does not direct future land use patterns or dictate development within the Township or surrounding area. A wider approach is evaluated when consideration is given to a

potential rezoning and how it will affect land use from a county perspective based on current planning trends and best management practices.

Due to the location of the parcel along M-59 and other residentially zoned property in the immediate area, the proposed request to rezone to RSC is not compatible with the 2018 Livingston County Master Plan. The county plan considers a carefully balanced approach with best land use management strategies that reflect an orderly transition between land uses of varying intensities. The current request to rezone to RSC does not reflect an appropriate transition between these differing land uses and is not compatible with the Howell Township Master Plan.

Township Planning Commission Recommendation: Disapproval. The Howell Township Planning Commission recommended **Disapproval** of the proposed rezoning from MFR 'Multiple Family Residential' to RSC 'Regional Service Commercial' at the May 28, 2019 public hearing. The minutes reflect that there were no conflicts or issues from the general public on the proposed rezoning.

Staff Recommendation: Disapproval. The request to rezone from Multiple Family Residential to Regional Service Commercial is not compatible with the Howell Township Master Plan or the 2018 Livingston County Master Plan

Commission Discussion: Commission Ikle stated that transitional zoning would be good for this site since it is located between residential land use and Lucy's Landscaping. Commissioner Prokuda asked for clarification on the Innovation zone. Principal Planner Barb stated that many commercial uses are included in the Innovation zones. He said that RSC allows more intensive commercial uses and NSC allows more neighborhood commercial uses. Commissioner Prokuda stated that RSC does not allow mini-storage and he does not like all of the uses that RSC zoning allows. Commissioner Clum disclosed that her in-law's property is adjacent to Lucy's Landscaping and their quality of life and property value has gone down since the business ceased to be Kelsey Hayes.

Public Comment: David Bittner, Attorney for petitioner, said that there was no real opposition for this rezoning at the Township Planning Commission meeting; the vote was 2-3.

Commission Action:

Commissioner Action: IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER CLUM TO RECOMMEND **DISAPPROVAL**. THERE WAS NO SECOND AND THE MOTION WAS NOT CONSIDERED.

Commissioner Action: IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON TO RECOMMEND **NO ACTION - ENCOURAGE FURTHER REVIEW**. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER IKLE.

Motion passed: 4-1 (NAY CLUM)

G. Z-24-19: HOWELL TOWNSHIP – REZONING

Current Zoning: AR/RSC: Agricultural Residential/Regional Service Commercial

Proposed Zoning: MFR: Multiple Family Residential

Section / Proponents: Section 27 / Chestnut Development/Steve Gronow

Township Master Plan:

The 2016 Howell Township Master Plan designates the subject parcel as Medium Density Residential. The Future Land Use Map and Strategy recognizes and encourages the continued development of residential property of varying styles and density based on intended character and function within the Township.

The Township's future land use strategy includes focusing higher density development along with commercial and industrial uses around M-59, Grand River, and the airport. The subject property is also located along the Shiawassee River Overlay that is intended to provide a natural 200 ft. buffer on either

side of the river which prohibits development and requires the protection of natural vegetation, wetlands, and flood plains. The Township Master Plan supports the rezoning and furthers the goals that have been established by the Township for residential development.

County Comprehensive Plan:

The 2018 Livingston County Master Plan does not direct future land use patterns or dictate development within the Township or surrounding area. A wider approach is evaluated when consideration is given to a potential rezoning and how it will affect land use from a county perspective based on current planning trends and best management practices.

The vacant parcel is located along M-59 and is in the general vicinity of other land that is master planned for low and medium density residential. The land use management strategies that are reflected in the county master plan seek to have a transition between land uses of varying intensity. We believe that the proposed rezoning to multiple family residential will act as a good transition between the airport commercial and lower density residential to the north and south and will allow for less invasive development to the Shiawassee River Overlay that is prevalent on this site.

Township Planning Commission Recommendation: Approval. The Howell Township Planning Commission recommended **Approval** of the proposed rezoning from AR 'Agricultural Residential' and RSC 'Regional Service Commercial' to MFR 'Multiple Family Residential' at the May 28, 2019 public hearing. The minutes reflect minor discussion on wetlands and a potential easement located on the property from residents and others.

Staff Recommendation: Approval. The request to rezone from Agricultural Residential and Regional Service Commercial to Multiple Family Residential is compatible with the Howell Township Master Plan and the 2018 Livingston County Master Plan.

Commission Discussion: Commissioner Anderson questioned whether or not this property is in the Airport approach zone. Commissioner Clum stated that the apartments are intended to be much like the Chestnut Development apartments located at Mason and Burkhart roads.

Public Comment: None.

Commission Action:

Commissioner Action: IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ANDERSON.
Motion passed: 3-2 (NAY IKLE, PROKUDA)

**H. PA-01-19: COHOCTAH TOWNSHIP PA 116 FARMLAND AGREEMENT:
Section 3, 40 ACRES, SCOTT AND CAROL HUFF.**

Commission Discussion: None.

Commission Comment: None.

Public Comment: No public comment.

Commissioner Action:

Commissioner Action: IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER CLUM TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER IKLE.
Motion passed: 5-0

8. OLD BUSINESS:

- A. Planning Commission Vacancy:** Director Kline-Hudson gave an update on the process to fill the planning commission vacancy. Interviews for the vacant position will be held on June 27th, 2019.
- B. Certificate of Service to the Family of Jim Sparks:** Director Kline-Hudson gave a brief report on the Board of Commissioners and County Planning Commission's recognition of Jim Sparks and his service to the Planning Commission. Jeanne Sparks, her son and Judy Paulsen were present to accept the recognitions.
- C. Adoption of 2020-2025 Livingston County Capital Improvement Plan:** Director Kline-Hudson noted that the plan was received and filed at the June 27 Livingston County Board of Commissioners meeting.

9. NEW BUSINESS: None.

10. REPORTS:

A. Staff Report:

Director Kline-Hudson briefly reported the following:

Planning Commissioners may notice some changes in the format of the agenda and minutes per the recommendations of the County Clerk in a correspondence entitled "Tips for Meetings and Minutes".

The June 12 Brown Bag Lunch on PFAS and water stewardship had excellent attendance with two County Commissioners present. A related PFAS forum will be hosted by U.S. Representative Elissa Slotkin on July 8th at the Jane Tasch theatre in Pinckney.

The County Planning Department has applied for a SEMCOG Planning Assistance Program grant to hire a consultant to work with County Planning and LivON on a Livingston County Trail Network Plan. There were lots of letters of support for this grant application and SEMCOG personnel encouraged County Planning to submit the application.

The hand-out from the first Livingston County MSU Extension series on marijuana was distributed.

11. COMMISSIONERS HEARD AND CALL TO THE PUBLIC: Commissioner Ikle suggested that Planning Department Staff organize a Planning Commission training on commission meeting procedures.

12. ADJOURNMENT:

Commissioner Action: IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:40 P.M., SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER CLUM.

Motion passed: 5-0