MEETING MINUTES

PLAN COMMISSION

Wednesday, February 26, 2020
7:00 P.M.

Evanston Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, James C. Lytle Council Chambers

Members Present: Peter Isaac (Chair), Carol Goddard, George Halik, Brian Johnson, Andrew Pigozzi, Jane Sloss

Members Absent: Jennifer Draper, John Hewko

Staff Present: Scott Mangum, Planning and Zoning Manager
Meagan Jones, Neighborhood and Land Use Planner
Brian George, Assistant City Attorney

Presiding Member: Chair Isaac

1. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM

Chair Isaac called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M. Ms. Jones called the roll and a quorum was established.

2. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES: Minutes will be available at the next Plan Commission meeting.

3. NEW BUSINESS

A. Planned Development
1555 Ridge Avenue 19PLND-0108
Thomas Meador, applicant, submits for Special Use for a Planned Development to construct a 5-story, 68 dwelling unit multi-family residence with 57 off-street parking spaces in the R6 General Residential District. The applicant seeks site development allowances for: 1) A 3 ft. setback along the north property line where 15 ft. is required for dwelling units, 2) No landscaping where a 10 ft. transition landscaped strip is required along the north property line, 3) A 10 ft. X 25 ft. loading space with 1 ft. rear yard setback where a 10 ft. X 35 ft. loading space with a 3 ft. rear yard setback is required. In addition, the applicant may seek and the Plan Commission may consider additional Site Development Allowances as may be necessary or desirable for the proposed development.

APPROVED
Ms. Jones provided an overview of the project characteristics, explaining the design changes that occurred between the Design and Project Review (DAPR) meeting and what is presented before the Commission.

Chair Isaac opened the hearing to questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Pigozzi inquired about specific changes included within the condition for approval. Ms. Jones replied that this requirement applies to requested change from the Design and Project Review (DAPR) Committee, many of which have been addressed. This includes reconfiguring the rear parking and loading, adding a ground floor unit and adjusting the facade design of the building.

Commissioner Halik asked about review at DAPR and if the Committee will see the project again. Ms. Jones responded that DAPR will review the project prior to issuance of a building permit for a final review, which is standard practice.

Chair Isaac inquired about the parking lot and the provisions made for a building on Oak Ave. that leased spaces in the lot. Ms Jones explained that prior to the applicant submitting a planned development application, a variance was approved by City Council in October of 2019 for that building, 1570 Oak Ave., so that the required 57 parking spaces could be leased at a location greater than 1,000 ft. from the building.

Talar Berbarian, attorney for the applicant, introduced the development team: the property owner, Thomas Meador of the Michigan Avenue Real Estate Group, Braedy Bulman and Jean Dufresne of Space Architects and Michael Werthmann of KLOA. Mr. Meador provided an overview of the proposed building, explaining that the group was focused on a segment of the population that does not want high-rises. There is a greater focus on interiors and fewer amenities. He stated that there is no need to max out the zoning or charge high rents. The average age of tenants in their buildings is older. This building is intended to have on-site management and 24/7 maintenance. He then explained how the project aligned with the City’s Comprehensive and Downtown Plans.

Mr. Dufresne provided details on the building, describing the landscaping, general site plan, typical floor plan and the addition of solar panels on the roof. He then explained the updates made to the building façades following DAPR review and comments from the Historic Preservation Coordinator and provided general building characteristics.

Ms. Berbarian reviewed the project’s requested site development allowances. She explained that the building north of the site has a significant setback so the proposed 3 ft. setback along the north property line will still provide a good amount of distance between buildings. She then explained that the typical truck size used for buildings of this use is less than 25 ft. so the loading berth size of 10’ X 25’ is appropriate. Ms. Berbarian then reviewed changes made to address DAPR comments and proposed public benefits.
Chair Isaac asked for questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Halik asked what the ground floor windows facing the parking were made of. Mr. Dufresne responded that the windows are an obscured glass at the garage areas. Commissioner Halik then asked what would happen if the building to the north is torn down, if there is no light and vent setback how will that be guaranteed for the proposed building? Mr. Dufresne responded that the building height is lower and the 3 ft. building setback provides space for light and ventilation. He added that the living space on the north side of the building has more of a setback behind the balcony.

Commissioner Sloss asked if the building façade would be a cast stone cladding. Mr. Dufresne confirmed that it would be.

Commissioner Pigozzi asked where the previously proposed columns were located on the building, if they went all the way to the building roof and then asked why they were removed. Mr. Dufresne responded that there were different iterations of the façade and most recent changes were done due to Historic Preservation recommendation.

Commissioner Johnson asked if utilities would be relocated or power lines buried. Mr. Dufresne responded that they will not be relocated but will need to be upgraded in size. Ms. Berbarian added that the City stated that there is no need to relocate the ComEd poles but the applicant will work with the City and ComEd to relocate those poles if needed.

Chair Isaac asked if the garage entry will have an overhead door and what the path to elevators will be. Mr. Dufresne replied that there will be an overhead door with side access doors by each. Move-ins/Move-outs will be coordinated to assist in circulation through the site. Chair Isaac then asked if there was a plan for deliveries. Mr. Dufresne replied that deliveries will likely occur on Grove Street. Ms. Berbarian stated that they will be happy to instruct the building manager to discourage that and visitor spaces may be used for this purpose. Deliveries may include re-use of the loading area. The proposed bump-out curb was added to discourage double parking at the intersection.

Chair Isaac announced that a written request for a continuance can be submitted by a resident residing within 1,000 ft. of the subject property to rebut testimony provided. He then asked for questions from the public. Clarification on the process was requested and a brief discussion followed on the requirements and meeting process.

Mr. Michael Filipick asked for clarification on postcard mailings and the current number of parking spaces and visitor parking spaces. Mr. Isaac responded that there will be no additional mailing and the continuance date voted on at this meeting will count as notification for that meeting. Ms. Jones answered that the current number of parking spaces in the surface parking lot is greater than the number of spaces that were a part
of the Major Variation that was approved. Ms. Berbarian then responded that there are 2 proposed parking spaces that will be in the rear parking area.

Ms. Libby Hill of Bird Friendly Evanston stated that the Mayor’s Monarch Pledge may conflict with bird friendly measures and asked if the applicant intended to have fritting on the windows. Mr. Dufresne responded that there will be a treatment to the glass that is not seen by people but will deter birds from hitting the glass. This will be applied to the outside of the windows.

Mr. Daniel Polos asked if there are any sun-studies showing how shadows may affect adjacent buildings. Mr. Dufresne responded that had not been done. They looked at a comparison of the units and took them into consideration. Actual living spaces of units adjacent to the building to the north are set back. Mr. Polos then asked if there would be any rooftop access to which Mr. Dufresne replied that there will not be access for residents. Rooftop solar panels will be installed with a stair access for maintenance.

Mr. Marnie Levinson inquired if any of the Commissioners or the applicant had attempted to park on Grove St, describing the difficulty and that fire and police departments use Grove Street for access. She then asked for more consideration of deliveries.

Mr. Charles Austin asked for clarification on what type of residents would be living in the spaces and how the variance requirements were created. Ms. Berbarian stated that the variances requested are largely minimal in comparison to most planned developments in the City. Site Development allowances are permitted to be requested by applicants. She then explained that more attention was paid to the landscaping along Ridge Ave. and Grove St. Mr. Austin stated that the setback seems counterintuitive if the objective is to maximize living space. With the address on Ridge, deliveries will likely occur there, how will that be handled. Ms. Berbarian responded that if needed the address can be changed. They would also be happy to instruct the building manager that deliveries will be directed to Grove or rear parking area.

Mr. Werthmann added that the development is a transit oriented development which reduces the volume of traffic generated. The existing parking lot currently has 126 parking spaces, the new development will only have 57 parking spaces, so fewer vehicles will exist. The proposed bump-out curb extension will slow down turning. Mr. Austin did not feel his concern was adequately addressed.

John Cleave questioned the City not wanting to use the dock for deliveries. Ms. Jones responded that during the DAPR meeting there was concern of too many uses for the loading dock creating conflicts. There was also concern of vehicles stopping on Grove Street as well.
Ms. Diana Durkes inquired about loading and delivery spaces, entry to the garage, and access for the fire department. Ms. Jones stated she cannot speak for the fire department but they were able to review the plans and did not have concerns at the time. Discussion is ongoing with how to direct traffic to the proper location. Mr. Dufresne clarified the garage entry.

Ms. Durkes then asked about the ADA parking space on Grove Street and under-used parking definition saying it would be a better benefit to the City not just financial, comprehensive plan designation. She then asked if there had been any thought given to existing parking leases. Mr. Werthmann responded that it likely would not be removed. Mr. Meador stated that underutilization refers to the best use for the community and what plans designate for the space. Ms. Berbarian responded that a variance had been granted for the required parking for 1570 Oak Ave. Additional existing parking spaces are not required. If this developer does not build on the site there will likely be another developer down the line. The 2009 Downtown Plan and Comprehensive plan encourage development of this site.

Ms. Katie Rahn asked what the projected rents and lease lengths were. Mr. Meador responded leases are for 12 months at a rate of $1800 - $2200 per month for studios, $2400 - $2600 per month for one bedrooms and $2800-$3200 per month for two bedrooms. Parking will be an additional $100 per month. Ms. Rahn then asked if the applicant would commit to work in Alexander Park. Mr. Meador stated that the team is working with the City’s Public Works staff to determine the park’s needs.

Chair Isaac then opened the hearing to public comment.

Mr. Gerald Gordon stated that he counted 62 parking spaces on the lot at 4:00pm, where will those vehicles go? The City is also raising meter costs and post office workers park in the lot and will need to find new parking spaces. He added that the 3 ft. setback from the north property line is small and puts the development too close to the existing building and the smaller loading dock does not meet zoning requirements. He then stated that if the trash is left out it may attract vermin as is seen near the Holiday Inn. He stated that this project should not have been brought before the public but worked out between the developer and the City to comply with zoning regulations.

Michael Filipick stated that he has concerns regarding congestion and that the planning for the building is not practical for 68 units. With regards to the north setback, he asked why the residents to the adjacent building should be impacted. He hoped that the 25 ft. loading zone would be adequate and that the existing handicapped space should be left alone. A 4-story building would be adequate and that the existing handicapped space should be left alone. A 4-story building would be adequate, setbacks should be respected and more visitor parking should be in place. The Commission and developer should work together for a “win-win” development
Daniel Polos stated that 2 visitor parking spaces is not enough and that visitors have to be reminded to not park in the existing parking lot. Adding more visitor spaces would be good as would a 4-story building.

Marnie Levinson agrees that someone would build on the site, however, she does not want the stress of finding additional parking spaces for her and her wife. The residents in the area want to be heard.

Charles Austin stated that he also recognizes that someone will build on the site. He feels that the variances requested are too high. This site is near a historic district. Other sites within the district must maintain certain requirements and the building should follow zoning.

John Cleave voiced concerns for the neighborhood and concerns of the building location near lot lines. He added that the nearby King Homes is converting to apartments. The proposed building will transform the neighborhood and the development should be made smaller and the review process move slower.

A request for continuance was received from Dan Durkes, a property owner within 1000-feet of the subject property.

Commissioner Goddard made a motion to continue the hearing to the March 11, 2020 Plan Commission meeting. Seconded by Commission Halik. A voice vote was taken and the Commission voted 6-0, to continue the item to the March 11, 2020 meeting

Ayes: Isaac, Goddard, Halik, Johnson, Pigozzi, Sloss
Nays:

A short recess occurred and the meeting reconvened at 8:45pm

B. Subdivision & Major Adjustment to a Planned Development
1619 Chicago Avenue 19PLND-0059
The applicant, Horizon Realty Group, submits for a subdivision and Major Adjustment to a Planned Development in the D4 Downtown Transition District. The requested adjustment will increase FAR from 3.15 to 4.2, increase parking spaces from 32 (23 on-site, 9 leased) to 38 (all leased off-site), and a decrease in total number of units from 205 to 186 (includes 65 dwelling units). No new site development allowance will be needed.

C. Planned Development
1621 Chicago Avenue 18PLND-0112
The applicant, Horizon Realty Group, submits a planned development application to construct a 19-story apartment building with 240 units, 85
subterranean parking spaces, and approximately 3,540 sq. ft. of ground floor retail space in the D4 Downtown Transition District. Site development allowances are being requested for: 1) a building height of 211 ft. 8 in. where 105 ft. is allowed), 2) an FAR of 11.62 where a maximum of 5.4 is allowed, 3) 240 dwelling units where 54 is maximum is allowed, 4) 85 parking spaces where a minimum 185 is required, and 5) 1 short loading berth where 2 short loading berths are required. In addition, the applicant may seek and the Plan Commission may consider additional Site Development Allowances as may be necessary or desirable for the proposed development.

Mr. Scott Mangum provided an overview of the proposed subdivision, describing the existing Merion development, which includes a 2013 addition, and what zoning characteristics would change as a result of the subdivision. No physical changes would occur to the existing Merion residences. Mr. Mangum then gave an overview of the proposed planned development to be at the site currently consisting of a one-story commercial building.

Chair Isaac asked for questions from the Commission to staff. Hearing none, he asked the applicant to provide their presentation.

The applicant, Mr. Jeff Michael of Horizon Realty Group, then provided an introduction of the development team including Danny Michael who is the founder of Horizon Realty Group, Tim Kent of Pappageorge Haymes, Michael Werthmann of KLOA, David Meek of Becker Guerian and Jonathan Perman, the public affairs strategist for the project. Mr. Jeff Michael provided an overview of history Horizon Realty Group and of the existing development with the Northshore Hotel Residence celebrating its 100 year anniversary. Horizon Realty Group are long term owners of the site and choose to keep the site for seniors. The proposed development is intended to keep a “senior campus” feel with synergies between the new and existing buildings. The new development will have access to the amenities in the existing buildings. He added that the site is underutilized and there is a demand for additional housing for seniors. The development is expected to generate $1.6 million in recurring tax revenue and will provide a substantial amount of money for the affordable housing fund.

Mr. Tim Kent then spoke about the development details. He described the existing site and its surroundings and stated that, once built out, the new building will act as a continuation of the existing buildings and their function. He stated that the design of the building is intended to be understated and complementary to existing development with the massing being broken up as the building height increases. He then described the building materials and façade. Mr. Kent then described the 1st floor plan which includes retail space, "back of house" uses and a porte-cochere which provides access to the lobby, the below-grade parking levels and a space for pick-ups/drop-offs off of Chicago
Avenue. He briefly reviewed the floor plans of the additional levels and described the parking which provides .35 parking spaces per dwelling unit.

Mr. Jonathan Perman spoke providing some general demographic information including that Evanston’s population has been largely the same since the 1950’s and the proposed development will add .5% to the population. He explained that there is demand for senior housing. He added that available parking is 1.2 parking spaces per unit with a .9 parking space per unit demand. He then described the proposed porte-cochere, explaining that it is safer than the narrow shared alley and takes deliveries and pick-ups/drop-offs off of the street. He added that there are a number of existing curb cuts on the block and along the existing bike path and the City does not have a formal policy on curb-cuts. Mr. Perman then briefly reviewed the fiscal impact study and stated that the project fits the character of the block, and stands with Comprehensive Plan's goals for increased housing for seniors. He finished stating that the public benefits proposed meet the site development allowances and the project is a fiscal win.

Chair Isaac stated that there is the opportunity for residents living within 1,000 ft. of the site are able to submit a written request for continuance. None was submitted. He then opened the hearing to questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Halik stated that he understands breaking down the massing and even though building across the street is taller, it looks lighter. He then asked if the applicant had considered a lighter colored base and darker color for the tower as this might give a different impression regarding the size. Mr. Kent replied that that option had been looked at and is being considered. He added that earlier iterations of the project had been taller and thinner. Mr. Halik stated that a lot of the concern is with the height of the building but not having a squat building.

Commissioner Sloss stated that statements were made that the provided benefits are inherent to the development and asked if there had been any consideration of additional public benefits? Mr. Michael stated that the development team believes that they aligned and exceeded what has been done and are proportional to what is proposed. They are open to considering other public benefits.

Commissioner Halik inquired about what the Mather parking ratio is. Mr. Michael responded that he was not certain of the ratio for that development. Mr. Danny Michael stated that transportation is provided at the existing Merion development and the same is intended for the new building. He added that most of the existing residents do not want to deal with cars so transportation is provided.

Mr. Mangum stated that there are 169 units and 139 parking spaces at 1727 Oak which is limited to people 55 years of age and up. Mr. Perman stated that the development team would be open to renting additional spaces at the Church Street garage if they find additional parking is needed. Chair Isaac referred to the earlier statistic regarding 1.2
parking spaces per unit provided and a point .9 space per unit demand. The proposed building proposed .35 per unit.

Mr. Werthmann stated that the .9 parking space per unit demand statistic is for all of downtown versus for just a 55+ population which tends to not have the same demand. Chair Isaac then pointed out that the proposed building is not being restricted to 55 and over. Mr. Michael added that there is 50% vehicle ownership in all of the 28 buildings Horizon Realty Group owns. The building will target an older population through marketing.

Commissioner Goddard expressed concerns regarding the height. She understands the need to have a certain number of units to justify the investment risk for a mixed-use development and wondered if the building were not for seniors would there be no need for the height? Mr. Michael replied no and revenue needed is based on the number of units and leasable spaces. The margin begins to get too tight. Mr. Meek added that the below grade parking added a significant cost and the porte-cochere creates a loss of leasable space.

Commissioner Johnson inquired about the current alley conditions. Mr. Michael responded that the alley is largely commercial use and is both narrow, congested and in disrepair. Additionally, turning radii would be tight even before factoring in snow. He added that the Davis Street Fishmarket space is currently empty but added to congestion when it was open. Mr. Perman then pointed out the safety of the porte-cochere versus crossing existing bike lanes multiple times if the entry were off of the alley.

Commissioner Johnson then asked if there would be more congestion created with one loading berth versus two which would enable delivery vehicles into a loading berth instead of stopping in the alley. Chair Isaac added to the question, revisiting the statement regarding tight turning radii and inquired how wide the proposed loading berth is and if turning studies had been conducted. Mr. Kent confirmed this had been done and delivery and trash vehicles are able to make that turn. He then stated that the dashed line in the diagram is the required size, the actual space is larger and a door can be chosen which enables easier entry.

Commissioner Johsnon asked if there is anything suggesting senior building use of loading is more or less. Mr. Michael replied that turnover is typically less in senior buildings with a retention rate of 80%. They also typically have fewer items. Residents would be able to use the Merion’s loading.

Commissioner Halik asked if the retail space would also need loading and if an additional dock would work. Mr. Michael replied that it can be looked at.
Chair Isaac stated that delivery and loading appears to be in a restricted part of the alley and asked what the plan would be for retail deliveries. Mr. Kent responded that a 2nd loading dock may work and that there is a doorway south of the proposed loading dock that is an exit only door and not meant to be an access door that could be used for deliveries. He added that there are 4 to 5 commercial tenants in the existing building; the new building would only have one so delivery amounts would likely be lower.

Chair Isaac asked how many existing spaces are behind the current commercial building. Mr. Michael responded that there are 18 spaces with additional spaces leased at the Church Street garage. Mr. Danny Michael stated that currently many of those spaces are used by the commercial tenants in the one-story building which would be removed should the proposed development be constructed.

Chair Isaac then asked how many current tenants of The Merion have cars. Mr. Michael responded less than 10.

Commissioner Pigozzi stated there are a number of high-rises dealing with deliveries. Mr. Michael stated that the porte-cochere will keep much of these deliveries on-site and off of the street. Mr. Werthmann responded that only smaller vehicles will use the porte-cochere. Larger vehicles will use the loading dock.

Chair Isaac then opened the hearing to questions from the public.

Mr. Bob Froetscher asked if a model was run that would meet the zoning requirements and if so what did it show and why was it not used. Mr. Michael replied that many models had been run but did not meet the rate of return in relation to the risk and fiscal needs. Mr. Froetscher then asked if the applicant knew the existing zoning and if they assumed they could get the City to change the zoning. Mr. Michael responded yes they knew the zoning but did not assume the zoning could be changed. The development is part of a greater vision for the properties.

Ms. Libby Hill stated that a letter was sent to the applicant with questions including if the building will comply with LEED 55 standards and asking for clarification on the balconies and if the lower level glass will reflect greenery. Mr. Kent responded that they intend to comply with LEED 55 standards, that balconies will be wrought iron and that the lower levels will comply with LEED 55 standards.

Chair Isaac opened the hearing to public comment.

Mr. William Brown, a member of First United Methodist Church which has been in existence since 1870, stated that only with this project has there been an issue and there is not one member of the church board that is comfortable with what is proposed; requests show no regard for zoning. The building will begin to create a canyon effect with the building across the street and the alley is bad now and will likely be worse with
the proposed development. He finished by saying that members of the adjacent Church will be vocal in opposition and encouraged the Commission to be thoughtful.

Ms. Martha Rudy stated that Mr. Perman’s comment of no one disagreeing with the project is false and there are many who do not support the proposed development. She expressed that fear tactics are being used in order to get approval for the site development allowances. She added that the east alley was a de facto borderline for downtown with a promise of no taller buildings being built east of Chicago Avenue; if a zoning change is needed then that should be done.

Mr. Bob Froetscher stated that the building height and number of dwelling units are his main concerns as both are well above maximum permitted amounts. Other buildings on the block are 8 or 9 stories with a transition established. He added that he and other residents expected the density to be adhered to and that the carbon footprint would not be an issue if there was not as much density. He then stated that developing housing to fill the City parking garages does not make sense. Chicago is losing residents but Evanston is ok. Do not be confused by “hand waving”. 

Ms. Ellen Feldman expressed that the zoning requests are a major issue and the east side of Chicago Avenue is not the Chicago lakefront. The building is not in scale or context with the rest of the neighborhood. The area is zoned to be a transition district. Ms. Feldman added that in her building at 522 Chicago Ave there are a number of older residents and most own vehicles. Her building has two garages with a 1 to 1 ratio of units to parking spaces. More density would make exiting her building garage difficult. She then recalled that the original plan was over 30 stories, then was reduced to 14 stories and is now 19 stories.

Chair Isaac closed the public hearing and the Commission began deliberation.

Commissioner Halik stated that there are positive things about the theme, planning, the porte-cochere and possible additional loading dock. He suggested that the applicant still consider shading and color of the building materials. He added that he considered both sides of Chicago Avenue for the massing, although the zoning district changes in the middle of the street. The zoning requests are an issue and a rezoning of the property should be considered as the proposed allowances are too large.

Commissioner Johnson agreed with Commissioner Halik and stated that he likes the project. It is a transit oriented development that will bring potential shoppers but he cannot vote in favor of the project due to the zoning and the large ask for the site development allowances. Allowances should be granted for small variances. A zoning change should be sought.

Commissioner Sloss stated that she generally agrees and that there is a lot being asked for in context of a variance.
Chair Isaac stated that there can be an argument made regarding the parking as the building will be geared towards older residents but he feels the parking is still inadequate. The amount of units is not appropriate.

Commissioner Goddard stated that she has not seen such a large scale building proposed with such a small amount of return. The previous proposal was significantly smaller than this and proposed significantly more in public benefits.

Commissioner Pigozzi stated that he felt the 1555 Ridge project was mediocre but was better than the existing parking lot. He then expressed that the design for the proposed Merion development is as good as he has seen but not as tall as the Park Evanston. He stated that it is expensive to construct below-grade parking and that the developer has made that effort. He recalled other projects and mentioned that the building on Elgin Road started off with a good design and as the zoning issues got whittled away the design suffered. He stated that he hoped that the Commission could find a way to approve the project and that the staff report does not provide a rationale for denial.

Mr. Mangum responded that rationale is provided within the staff report, relating to the building height, number of units, FAR, and lack of parking (though below grade parking is good) as well as the lack of public benefits in relation to the site development allowances being requested. It does not align with existing plans. Commissioner Pigozzi stated that recommendations have been inconsistent.

Chair Isaac stated that the property is served by an alley. He would like to move access traffic to the alley but does like the idea of the porte-cochere and does not view it as a negative aspect of the project.

Commissioner Halik stated that recommendations should be based on plans that are in place, giving the proposed Emerson Street rezoning as an example. Though he was in agreement, he did not think the rezoning should occur based on existing plans for the area.

Chair Isaac asked if the applicant would like to move forward, withdraw the application from the meeting or come back at a later meeting date with changes to the design elements. A discussion then followed regarding possible options for the applicant. The applicant opted to look at making revisions and return to the Commission at a future meeting date. Due to the need to possibly revise zoning documents and provide notice, it was recommended that the applicant come back for the April Plan Commission meeting. The applicant requested to come back to the April 8th Plan Commission meeting.
Commissioner Goddard made a motion to continue this item to the April 8th Plan Commission meeting. Seconded by Commissioner Pigozzi. A voice vote was taken and the motion was approved, 6-0.

Ayes: Isaac, Goddard, Halik, Johnson, Pigozzi, Sloss
Nays:

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Isaac acknowledged that this is the last meeting for Commissioners Goddard and Pigozzi and thanked them for their service. There was no public comment provided.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Goddard made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Pigozzi seconded the motion.

A voice vote was taken and the motion was approved by voice vote 6-0. The meeting was adjourned at 10:58 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
Meagan Jones
Neighborhood and Land Use Planner
Community Development Department