MINUTES
SPECIAL PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
April 22, 2021

Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairperson Mary Loch, who delivered remarks outlining procedures for the evening's meeting which, due to the disaster declaration related to Covid-19 and public health concerns, is being conducted by video conference. She described the Plan Commission's function and provisions for public comment at the meeting, listed the meeting topics, and introduced participants Trustee Liaison Bill Enright, Community Development Director Staci Springer, Planning Manager Kelly Purvis, Planner Katie Ashbaugh and Recording Secretary Barbara Dutton.

Roll call commenced. Present: Chairperson Loch and Plan Commissioners Lloyd Berry, Laura Brown, Angela Fanella, Tracy Heming-Littwin, John Mulherin, David Rodemann and Jamie Vondruska. Absent: Plan Commissioner Mohammed Saeed.

Adoption of Emergency Allowance of Remote Participation by the Plan Commission

A motion to allow remote participation in the meeting was made by Commissioner Heming-Littwin, and seconded by Commissioner Mulherin. The motion carried with seven (7) yes votes and zero (0) no votes as follows: Commissioners Heming-Littwin, Mulherin, Berry, Fanella, Rodemann and Vondruska, and Chairperson Loch voted, "yes." Commissioner Brown did not enter a vote.

Public Comment Non-Agenda Items

Eighteen-year Village resident Rick Scheck praised work put forth to develop the Comprehensive Plan.

Approval of March 18, 2021 Plan Commission Meeting Minutes

Commissioner Mulherin moved to approve the draft minutes of the March 18, 2021 Plan Commission meeting; seconded by Commissioner Vondruska. The motion passed with seven (7) yes votes and (0) no votes as follows: Commissioners Mulherin, Vondruska, Berry, Fanella, Heming-Littwin, Rodemann, and Chairperson Loch voted "yes." Commissioner Brown did not enter a vote.

Approval of March 25, 2021 Plan Commission Meeting Minutes

Commissioner Mulherin moved to approve the draft minutes of the March 25, 2021 Plan Commission meeting; seconded by Commissioner Rodemann. The motion passed with eight (8) yes votes as follows: Commissioners Mulherin, Rodemann, Berry, Brown, Fanella, Heming-Littwin and Vondruska, and Chairperson Loch voted, "yes."

A Pre-Application to discuss the potential Minor Subdivision for the Property Located at 919 Ellynwood Avenue

Staff Introduction

Planner Ashbaugh reviewed the process for the potential subdivision of the property at 919 Ellynwood Avenue into two lots, necessary to allow for development envisioned – specifically, constructing a second house. She described the subject property, which is located on the south side of Ellynwood Avenue just north of the railroad tracks, is zoned R1 and carries two property identification numbers. She explained that, under contiguous ownership, the property is defined as one zoning lot (and for which, such a split and development requires public review). Approximately 150 feet wide and 26,653 SF in area, the property has a single-family home on the eastern half. The proposed split would render the resultant lots substandard per Zoning District requirements, and in comparison to surrounding lots in the District: Lots to the east, west, and across the street all meet size requirements for the R1 District. Because spot zoning is not allowed, Planner Ashbaugh explained, changing the zoning to R2 (a designation with a 66-ft.-width requirement applied nearby) is not an option. The rural streetscape, she noted, presents costs for extending the sanitary sewer to both lots. Planner Ashbaugh summarized, the Petitioner seeks feedback as to whether the Plan Commission would endorse the proposed sizes of the two lots and their compatibility with the surrounding properties; sees hardship in meeting minimum R1 standards; and would support relief from regulations governing underground utilities, street lights, trees, and road features.

<u>Petitioner's Presentation</u>

Nick Ftikas (of Stafford and Lockwood Ltd.), counsel to Petitioner Mike Decker, said that the proposed split to create two 75-ft.-wide lots from one 150-ft. wide lot would leave the subdivided lots short of the technical requirements for an R1 lot, but pointed to R2 lots to the west that he said are held to "a slightly smaller standard" of 66 feet. He argued that the proposed split would maintain consistency in both width and area with these. Mr. Decker related that he bought the property during the pandemic and was told he wouldn't have an issue with his plan to build. He learned that this is not the case and is hoping an exception can be made. He stressed that he would be willing to cooperate to make the lot physically buildable.

Commissioner Rodemann asked if the west part of the lot has any services, such as a septic field, to serve the existing house, to which Mr. Decker said that to his knowledge, "No." Commissioner Rodemann further wondered if extended sanitary lines to both would have to go "hand in hand." Mr. Ftikas responded that he believes this to be correct. Commissioner Heming-Littwin asked if the existing house has a septic field. Mr. Decker said it has a septic tank. Planner Ashbaugh said that the house is connected to water, but sewer would need to be extended to serve both lots. In follow up to a suspicion voiced by Development Director Springer, Planner Ashbaugh clarified that the sewer main can't be extended without a lift station, but that the challenge posed would need further engineering review. Commissioner Brown asked if the Petitioner would redevelop both lots. Mr. Decker replied, just the vacant lot, and said that the exiting house will stay. Commissioner Heming-Littwin asked if sewer would be expected to be extended to the second lot. Planner Ashbaugh indicated it would need to serve both properties and that engineering would need to be evaluated – with regard to terrain – so that Public Works could recommend the best solution. Commissioner Heming-Littwin asked if a lot split would cause any setback issues with the existing house. Citing setback calculations, Planner Ashbaugh said the existing house, which is currently non-conforming, would be conforming if the lot was split. Chairperson Loch asked about setback relative to the existing house to the west. Mr. Decker, figuring a buffer of 14 feet, noted that a new house could be configured to be amenable. Planner Ashbaugh emphasized the need for vehicle maneuverability in a driveway.

Commissioner Discussion

Commissioner Mulherin said he can't justify the proposed rezoning of this property to the neighbors, and that as logical as the subdivision might be, he doesn't know that it meets any hardship standard, and noted that the action is for the purpose of investment. Asking what is to stop others from trying to do the same thing, he said he could not support the Petitioner's request. Commissioner Heming-Littwin concurred, adding that people choose to live in that neighborhood because of the larger lots. Chairperson Loch said she concurs also, and suspects concurrence among the Commission. The Petitioner thanked for the Commission for their feedback.

Public Hearing to consider a Zoning Text Amendment and a Special Use Permit to allow a co-working office with business events at the property located at 411 N. Main Street

A motion to open the Public Hearing to consider a Zoning Text Amendment and a Special Use Permit to allow a co-working office with business events at the property located at 411 N. Main Street was made and seconded by Commissioners Heming-Littwin and Mulherin, respectively. The motion passed with eight (8) yes votes and zero (0) no votes as follows: Commissioners Heming-Littwin, Mulherin, Berry, Brown, Fanella, Rodemann and Vondruska, and Chairperson Loch voted, "yes."

Staff Introduction

Village Planner Katie Ashbaugh and Planning Manager Kelly Purvis, 535 Duane Street, were sworn in. The former reviewed the Public Hearing notice undertaken, and referenced the associated pre-app held on March 18, 2021. She reviewed the location on the east side of Main Street, just north of Hillside, in the C5A Central Retail District, adjacent to C5B zoning, across the street from C5A, and near R2 residential. She referenced the 2001 Comprehensive Plan objective to continue to create a pedestrian-oriented environment, and related that the subject property is a 5,350 SF building that housed the former McMae's restaurant and has two apartments on the upper floor. The Petitioners, she continued, operate in a business in Park Ridge of the type they envision for the 411 N. Main property. She reviewed associated amenities of the proposed business to be called "Brick & Mortar." She noted that there is no minimum parking requirement for the use, which is expected to include networking events. Planner Ashbaugh displayed photos conveying the "industrial aesthetic" of the Park Ridge operation, as well as conceptual floor plans – indicating a possible recording studio in the basement – for the proposed Glen Ellyn location. The Petitioners, she explained, are seeking a Zoning Text Amendment to add "co-working office with business events" to the C5A list of Special Uses and to obtain a Special Use Permit. Commissioner Fanella asked if the rooftop space depicted would be open or enclosed. Planner Ashbaugh replied that the Petitioner didn't clarify this, and suggested the question be directed to them.

Petitioner's Presentation

Petitioners Andrew Nast, 11 N. Northwest Hwy., Park Ridge, IL, 60068 and Adam Clabaugh, 616 S. Delphia Ave., Park Ridge, IL 60068, were sworn in. Mr. Nast stated that Brick & Mortar would like the rooftop – which, he said wouldn't be enclosed – to be usable space, but would work within confines imposed by the Village. Commissioner Vondruska observed what looked to be a lot of mechanical equipment on the roof, and asked about the recording studio mentioned. Mr. Nast said Brick & Mortar would like to move the rooftop equipment around, and that the recording space would be a podcast booth. Commissioner Berry asked what treatment is envisioned initially for the façade. Mr. Nast said that a modern aesthetic is applicable to the brand and concepts but that Brick & Mortar is "nimble" and would seek input from the "Appearance Committee." Chairperson Loch pointed out that the Plan Commission *is* the" Appearance Committee," but wondered what Staff might have advised. Planning Manager Purvis clarified that the petitioners are seeking approval of the text amendment and special use, prior to developing formal plans for the exterior renovations. These, she noted would be presented to the Village at a later date.

Commissioner Rodemann asked what "business events" might look like. Mr. Nast responded that typical events would range in form and size, naming networking as a function, adding that Brick & Mortar would be looking to bring in speakers that could benefit the community; he listed potential topics, and said he hopes for experts that could contribute to an "incubationesque-type of platform." Commissioner Rodemann pressed for more details. Mr. Nast said activity would not be "band playing on the rooftop" (unless that is what the Village wants) but rather 10-20 people and business focused type events. He pointed out that Brick & Mortar would have a significant investment in the property, which it would aim to protect. Commissioner Rodemann asked, in light of these plans, why a description of a modified Special Use is even needed. Planning Manager Purvis explained that Staff believed one was warranted given the substantial volume of events expected and the possession of a liquor license; in other words, the operation is "not just an office." Commissioner Rodemann asked if it would be considered a social club. Planning Manager Purvis replied, this is not necessarily the case, but that it would be a co-working office space that does entertain business events, as well.

Exclaiming that he didn't recall a liquor license being mentioned in the Pre-App, Commissioner Mulherin presented his law firm as an example of a business hosting a social event. Chairperson Loch said she didn't remember mention of a liquor license either, but Commissioner Heming-Littwin recalled discussion distinguishing between licenses for selling alcohol as opposed to having liquor onsite and being served. Commissioner Mulherin didn't think just serving alcohol was a licensed activity. Community Development Director Springer, 535 Duane Street, Glen Ellyn, was sworn in. She recollected that discussion focused on a "BYOB"-type license, and noted that there are no extra liquor licenses to be had in the Village. While one could be created to fit Brick & Mortar's approach, she said she is unclear as to intention of the Petitioner with regard to alcohol. Commissioner Mulherin stated that introducing this proposition "just brought in a hornet's nest." He said that he likes the business model described, but suggested that liquor licensing presents a concern. Mr. Nast stated that Brick & Mortar is not interested in getting a liquor license at this time, to which Commissioner Mulherin advised, "Drop it." Commissioner Heming-Littwin asked the Petitioners if they'd spoken to any business owners in the neighborhood. Mr. Nast said, "Yes," and that a restauranteur was "thrilled" with Brick & Mortar's concept and anticipated a synergistic relationship. Planning Manager Purvis asked for clarification on "happy hour" events, of which she assumed alcohol would be a part. Mr. Nast said happy hours were "not really a make or break" for the concept, but wondered if these would be a possibility.

Director Springer, who said that Brick & Mortar members would not be able to park in the customer-only parking spaces, stated that this is the first time she's heard of the rooftop activity. Such, she said, is similar to back patio activity, hence noise and hours of operation are matters of concern. But, because the Code only has a requirement for outdoor patios adjacent to residential, she suggested conditions for hours of operation be added to any approval of the Special Use. Seeking a starting point for determining hours, Commissioner Fanella asked what hours of operation had been established for the Pedway. Director Springer stated that these patio hours are until 10 on weeknights (Sunday-Thursday) and 11 p.m. on weekends (Friday and Saturday). Planner Ashbaugh interjected that there is a variety of ways to regulate outdoor spaces, listing zoning and via liquor license approaches, but that nothing in her research is relevant to rooftop activity in the downtown. Director Springer thought the Village would probably take a zoning approach.

Sworn in, Meredith Hannah, Village Economic Development Coordinator, 535 Duane Street, commented on parking: She stated that the Police said that Enclave members (a similar downtown use) would have to park in the lots, blue dot spaces or other parking locations in the downtown besides on-street spaces, a policy that would also apply to Brick & Mortar. Referring to "specific, unique" examples of liquor licenses, Ms. Hannah said the Village would need to understand what type of liquor license Brick & Mortar is interested in, and see if there is a license classification that already meets that need or if a new classification would need to be created. Commissioner Fanella related that she has attended events at a boutique at which drinks were served and wondered if the host had a license. Ms. Hannah stated that a distinction lies in whether an event is private or public, the former not needing a license. Director Springer noted that a function open to passers-by might be catered by a licensed, insured enterprise. Chairperson Loch asked whether a liquor license would be needed in the case of Brick & Mortar members serving themselves alcohol or hosting a get-together. Mr. Nast said liquor onsite is not imperative, and that the business is successful in Park Ridge without happy hours. He said a quarterly gathering – a few bottles of beer on a Thursday afternoon – would be nice, but for an event would look to a local restaurant to provide service. Reiterating that pursuing a liquor license can be problematic, Commissioner Mulherin advised the Petitioner to avoid doing so, and to keep such out of Brick & Mortar publicity, as well as to study the prospect with legal counsel and the Village if they ever do decide to seek a liquor license. Referencing his facility management experience relative to alcohol in office buildings – where beer or wine have been complimentary, limited to two drinks, with an attendant present – Commissioner Berry wondered if Brick & Mortar envisioned speaking events at which members and perhaps their invited guests would enjoy wine and appetizers, and asked if the Petitioner anticipates selling alcohol or just allowing it on the premises. Mr. Clabaugh replied, if anything, it would be the latter, with – if possible – members enjoying a beer on Brick & Mortar during an hour during which members can get to know one another. Commissioner Vondruska sought clarity as to whether Staff had indicated that BYOB would be acceptable on occasion. Director Springer asked if such activity would require a BYOB license. Economic Coordinator Hannah stated that is the case, citing a liquor license that had been created for hosting 12 or 24 events a year. Commissioner Berry asked if a stipulation could be added to the proposed language, saying that for anybody that is going to use the new definition of co-working space any serving of alcohol is subject to Village and Liquor Commissioner approval. Director Springer indicated that it is automatically included, so if the Commission *didn't* want alcohol associated with the Co-working Use, such language would have to be added to the definition, though she thought this seems restrictive since all other offices have the ability to get liquor licenses if they want. Commissioner Heming-Littwin asked if Brick & Mortar people would be expected to use Central Business District employee parking. Economic Development Coordinator Hannah said this was her understanding, as well as pointed out that commuter lots along the tracks are free and open to anyone after 11 a.m. Director Springer also noted that space in the parking structure and in the lot will be available after a certain hour.

Public Comment

None.

Commissioner Heming-Littwin moved to close the Public Hearing; seconded by Commissioner Mulherin, the motion passed with eight (8) yes votes and zero (0) no votes as follows: Plan Commissioners Heming-Littwin, Mulherin, Berry, Brown, Fanella, Rodemann and Vondruska, and Chairperson Loch voted, "yes."

Commissioner Discussion

Commissioner Heming-Littwin stated that the biggest issue she has is with the proposed rooftop space, because of the apartments in close proximity, and suggested that a condition be placed restricting rooftop use to early hours. Thinking that the Petitioner would still have to go before the Village for approval to improve the rooftop space, Commissioner Vondruska wondered if this concern might be covered by language in the draft motion for the project. Chairperson Loch said she would be fine with the rooftop being used for business functions until 8 p.m.; Commissioner Heming-Littwin agreed, but said she would like to see parameters that distinct from restaurant seating requirements. Noting that the floor plans provided are conceptual and not expected to be attached to the ordinance, Planner Ashbaugh explained that the Commission isn't necessarily approving a rooftop space, since only use is being considered, and that standard conditional language in the motion for approval – which doesn't specify floor plans – dictates that use must conform to testimony. Commissioner Heming-Littwin thought language referring to outdoor space above ground level would be helpful, since guidance only exists for ground-level space. Agreeing with her concern, Commissioner Mulherin suggested language stipulating that hours of use of any outdoor space be established by the Village. Chairperson Loch said that would be fine. She then asked who is assessing the façade design. Planning Manager Purvis explained that façade plans would come before the Plan Commission for exterior approval and, that at this point, the Commission is only considering zoning approvals. Commissioners present expressed comfort with the Zoning Text Amendment and the Special Use Permit sought.

Commissioner Heming-Littwin moved for the following:

After conducting a public hearing and deliberating on the request of Andrew Nast and Adam Clabaugh of Brick & Mortar, LLC of the property at 411 N. Main Street for approval of a Special Use Permit to allow a co-working office with business events, the Plan Commission hereby makes the following findings of fact:

1. The proposed will be harmonious in accordance with the general objectives, within the objective of the Comprehensive Plan or Zoning Code.
2. The proposed project is designed and shall be maintained so to be harmonious and appropriate in appearance with the existing and intended character of the general vicinity.
3. The proposed use will not be hazardous or disturbing to existing or future neighborhoods.
4. The proposed will be served adequately by existing public facilities.
5. The proposed use will not create excessive additional requirements at public cost for public facilities.
6. The use will not include activities, processes, materials, equipment or conditions of operation that will be detrimental to any persons or property or the general welfare.
7. The project will have vehicular approaches because it doesn't have any.
8. The project will not increase flood damage.
9. The project will not result in the destruction or loss or damage of natural, scenic or historic features.

Therefore, the Plan Commission recommends that the Village Board approve a Special Use Permit in accordance with Section 10-10-14 of the Glen Ellyn Zoning Code to allow a co-working office with business events at 411 N. Main Street subject to the following conditions:

A. That the co-working office with business events use, to be known as "Brick & Mortar" substantially conform with the testimony presented at the Plan Commission public hearing on April 22, 2021; and
B. In the event of the use of outdoor use above grade level, hours of use would need to be established by the Village prior to use of the outdoor space.

Seconded by Commissioner Mulherin, the motion passed by roll call vote, with eight (8) yes votes and zero (0) no vote as follows: Plan Commissioners Heming-Littwin, Mulherin, Berry, Brown, Fanella, Rodemann and Vondruska, and Chairperson Loch voted "yes."

<u>A Public Hearing to consider a Zoning Variation to allow the removal of two parking stalls on the property located at 486 Pennsylvania Avenue to allow outdoor seating</u>

A motion to open the Public Hearing to consider a Zoning Variation to allow the removal of two parking stalls on the property located at 486 Pennsylvania Avenue to allow outdoor seating was made and seconded by Commissioners Mulherin and Rodemann, respectively. The motion carried with eight (8) yes votes and zero (0) no votes as follows: Commissioners Mulherin, Rodemann, Berry, Brown, Fanella, Heming-Littwin and Vondruska, and Chairperson Loch voted "yes."

<u>Staff Presentation</u>

Planning Manager Purvis and Community Development Director Staci Springer, 535 Duane Street, Glen Ellyn, were sworn in. Planning Manager Purvis stated that the Petitioner, owner of restaurant and pub Two Hound Red, is seeking a variation from Zoning Code Section 10-4-17-2(G), to allow 15 parking stalls where 45 would be required for a restaurant use, though due to a parking provision in the C5B District, only 30 are mandated on the site. A variation to allow 17 parking stalls on the property was previously granted in 2017. The subject property, she stated, is located on the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue, between Glenwood Avenue and Main Street, and is surrounded by residential to the north and commercial properties to the east, west and south. The property, she continued, is approximately .42 acres and formerly held Schmid's Pharmacy, which was renovated to accommodate Two Hound Red, which can seat 135 guests. The property currently has 13 perpendicular parking stalls on the east side of the site and 4 parallel spaces on the west side of the lot. Original renovation plans for the restaurant specified an outdoor rooftop dining space, subsequently found to be infeasible due to the cost of installing an elevator to meet ADA requirements.

Planning Manager Purvis stated that part of the hardship presented in the Petitioner's application centers on the narrow sidewalks, which don't allow adequate space for a clear pedestrian path and outdoor dining. The Petitioner, she said, has noted that two public parking lots are in walking distance of the restaurant, and is proposing removing two parking stalls to make room for an outdoor dining area with an awning, concept illustrations for which she displayed. She pointed out planned barrier spots, and drew attention to an accessible route that needs to remain free and clear of obstructions. She displayed an image of current outdoor seating (as arranged during COVID), and listed suggested conditions of approval – including maintaining the drive aisle – for the variation requested to allow for a more permanent structure.

Commissioner Rodemann asked if plans for the structure call for lighting and heating, or whether it is merely a temporary structure. Relating that the Petitioner intends to install concrete foundations for the awning structure, Planning Manager Purvis said it is definitely more of a permanent-type structure. She stated that she hadn't discussed heating with the Petitioner, but said lighting is planned. The Commissioner asked what the accessible path serves. Development Director Springer stated that it is supposed to be from the accessible parking spaces to the front door, but she thought it has been established as a safe path of travel, as well, for anyone parking in the lot to get from the parking spaces to the building, and is also a path of travel for people leaving the building in an emergency situation. Commissioner Heming-Littwin asked what would be used to protect diners. Planning Manager Purvis stated that concrete barriers were suggested by staff and noted that the barriers would need to be more substantial in nature.

Petitioner's Presentation

Sworn in, Tim Rodine, 486 Pennsylvania Avenue, explained that to expand outdoor dining in COVID times, the Petitioner is looking to eliminate two parking spots they don't see used as often. Two Hound Red, he stated, is looking to offer three-season dining, but he said he wouldn't envision anything more than the plastic-type enclosure to keep out rain and cold, and added that the Petitioner has no plans to make the space fully enclosed. He thinks that the available public parking is adequate for the restaurant's limited operating schedule, and asserted that the proposed takes potential rooftop dining to the ground floor, further away from nearby residences.

Public Comment

None.

Commissioner Heming-Littwin moved to close the Public Hearing; seconded by Commissioner Mulherin, the motion passed with eight (8) yes votes and zero (0) no votes as follows: Plan Commissioners Heming-Littwin, Mulherin, Berry, Brown, Fanella, Rodemann and Vondruska, and Chairperson Loch voted “yes.”

Commissioner Discussion

Observing that the Petitioner is handicapped in outdoor seating by the size of the sidewalk, Commissioner Rodemann articulated that the proposed plan is a “smart move.” He stated that he is not overly concerned by the loss of two parking spaces, since the restaurant is near to public parking. He added that he is a little concerned about the appearance of concrete barriers, but said that protection of diners is essential. He thought planters might perhaps be an alternative solution. Commissioner Berry said he is supportive of the proposal, citing as an example of a flexible enclosed dining approach a Chicago restaurant with which he is familiar. Commissioner Vondruska voiced support of the proposed plan, saying it would visually benefit the side of the building for which it’s proposed.

Commissioner Heming-Littwin moved for the following:

After conducting a public hearing and deliberating on the request of the petitioner, Jon With, for approval of a Zoning Variation to allow 15 parking stalls on the property at 486 Pennsylvania Avenue where 45 parking stalls are required for a restaurant use, the Plan Commission hereby recommends approval based on the findings of fact, as discussed or amended at the Plan Commission public hearing on April 22, 2021, which are hereby incorporated into the Motion by reference as though fully set forth herein, and a copy of which will be attached to the minutes of this meeting and kept on file as part of the permanent records of the Village. The Plan Commission makes this recommendation of approval with the following conditions:

1. That the project be constructed in substantial conformance with the plans and testimony presented at the Plan Commission public hearing and before the Village Board of Trustees;

2. That all outstanding items from the original remodeling project permit be closed out prior to the issuance of a building permit for the awning structure.

3. That the barriers surrounding the outdoor dining area include landscape plantings.

4. That all tables, chairs, barriers and parts of the awning remain within the limits of the existing parking spaces.

5. That no obstructions shall be permitted in the accessible route.

The motion carried by roll call vote, with eight (8) yes votes and zero (0) no vote as follows: Plan Commissioners Heming-Littwin, Mulherin, Berry, Brown, Fanella, Rodemann and Vondruska, and Chairperson Loch voted “yes.”

Other Business

None.

Trustee's Report

Liaison Bill Enright recognized the effort put forth to develop the Comprehensive Plan. He reported that the document is currently under review by the Board, which appreciates the work done to produce it.

Chairman's Report

Chairperson Loch wished good luck to Planner Ashbaugh, who is set to leave her post with the Village for a planning position in Evanston.

Staff Report

Planning Manager Purvis related that she has nothing to schedule for the next meeting date. Community Development Director Springer gave updates on the Village Garage and the Apex apartment building projects. She reported that May 1st is the scheduled opening of the former, for which she listed parking area designations and pedestrian access routes from the garage to downtown streets. The latter, she said, is in the pre-cast phase. She said a portion of the Apex public parking garage is to open before the apartment building is constructed.

Adjournment

Chairperson Loch adjourned the meeting at 9:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Dutton-Thomas
Recording Secretary

Reviewed by Planning Manager, Kelly Purvis