

**MINUTES
GREEN BAY PLAN COMMISSION
Monday, November 9, 2015
City Hall, Room 604
6:00 p.m.**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Maribeth Conard–Chair, Tim Gilbert-Vice Chair, Sid Bremer, Ald. Jerry Wiezbiskie, and Heather Mueller

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Tim Duckett

OTHERS PRESENT: Kevin Vonck, Paul Neumeyer, Stephanie Hummel, Ald. Chris Wery, Ald. Mark Steuer, Charles Smith, Sara Villalobos-Deida, Omri Deida, David O'Brien, Jim Krumpos, James Harrison and Dan Pamperin

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Approval of the minutes from the October 26, 2015, Plan Commission meeting

A motion was made by S. Bremer and seconded by T. Gilbert to approve the minutes from the October 26, 2015, Plan Commission meeting with the following underlined revisions on Page 2.

S. Bremer asked that the Plan Commission minutes, on Page 2, 1st paragraph, be changed to read the following: A blocking diagram was also attached within the meeting packet regarding the buildings various function and roof levels.

Motion carried.

COMMUNICATIONS:

OLD BUSINESS:

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Request by Ald. C. Wery to amend the Comprehensive Plan to create a "Stadium Entertainment District" bordered by Ashland Avenue, Lombardi Avenue, Holmgren Way, and the border with Ashwaubenon.

K. Vonck stated this area has been an area of interest for economic development and planning and has transitioned over the last few years from an industrial area to more hotels and restaurants. There was talk about bringing in a consultant for development in the area. The two areas of concern are the future land uses that would be acceptable and pedestrian safety and circulation as there are currently no sidewalks. They are hoping to hire a consultant in early spring to come up with a strategic plan for the area. Some of the changes would include zoning, comprehensive plan amendments, land use and physical layouts. Planning staff has recommended continuing to work on the request and report back to the Plan Commission with a progress report in 3 months.

Ald. C. Wery commented he was pleased with the direction this request is going and hopes to see the area tie in together with the Village of Ashwaubenon Packer plans.

A motion was made by T. Gilbert and seconded by Ald. J. Wiezbiskie for Planning staff to continue working on the request and report back to the Plan Commission with a progress report in 3 months. Motion carried.

2. Request by Ald. C. Wery to create "overlay zoning" for the "Stadium Entertainment District" to specifically exclude adult entertainment establishments.

K. Vonck stated this item ties in with the agenda item #1. Planning staff is recommending this request be received and placed on file. This item was brought before the Plan Commission a few months ago. He assured the Plan Commission that when it comes to adult entertainment establishments, there is a process in place so that no adult entertainment establishment can come into the City of Green Bay without getting City Council approval. In terms of an "overlay zoning" the addition of an overlay zoning does not necessarily add an additional layer of approvals, but rather shifts the process for which the property owner receives approval.

S. Bremer stated she wanted clarification regarding the zoning area and zoning maps as to where an adult entertainment district was allowed in this particular area. K. Vonck clarified for S. Bremer the existing conditions and current code for an adult entertainment district. A small conversation then ensued between S. Bremer and K. Vonck regarding "spot zoning" and the legality of "spot zoning". S. Bremer then asked if the Plan Commission accepts staff's recommendation, to receive and place on file, that placing the request on file does not mean the item is forgotten about, but rather it is there to be referred to. K. Vonck stated that was correct. M. Conard then confirmed that they cannot say that adult entertainment is not allowed in the City, but can say that it is not allowed within certain districts and distances from certain areas. K. Vonck stated that was correct and that everything is looked at on a case by case basis. Ald. J. Wiezbiskie then asked if "spot zoning" is illegal. K. Vonck stated it is not legal, however, it would not hold up in the courts, as it may not be what is best for the community as a whole.

A motion was made by H. Mueller and seconded by S. Bremer to receive and place on file a request by Ald. C. Wery to create "overlay zoning" for the "Stadium Entertainment District" to specifically exclude adult entertainment establishments. Motion carried.

3. (ZP 15-22) Discussion and action on the request to authorize a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for a Transient Residential use located at 1074 Langlade Avenue (a.k.a. 1074-1076 Langlade Avenue), submitted by Charles Smith, property owner. (Ald. C. Wery, District 8)

P. Neumeyer stated this is a request for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for a transient residential use at 1074 Langlade Avenue; the property is currently a two-family use. The Comprehensive Plan calls for low density residential for the area and the current zoning is compliant with the Comprehensive Plan. Staff has found the proposed use to be compliant with development standards found in the Zoning Code for Transient Residential uses. The applicant did conduct a neighborhood meeting, as required by the development standards. Staff has received several letters of support regarding this request, which are included within the meeting packet. The owner of 1083 Langlade is opposed to the request; however, she would remove her objection if others in the neighborhood were in support of the request.

This is the 13th transient residential request; nine (9) have been approved and three (3) denied. The three that were denied have been outside of the Shadow Lane area. The current policy established by the Plan Commission, regarding transient residential uses, does not address transient uses requests much beyond the Shadow Lane area. Affected property owners were

notified of the request. Planning staff is recommending approval of the request with the conditions that the applicant is in compliance with development standards found in Chapter 13-1602(j) of the Green Bay Zoning Code and that the CUP shall expire if the applicant no longer resides at the 1076 Langlade.

S. Bremer asked if there were at least 24 people that were notified within the 200 ft. area. P. Neumeyer stated yes. She then asked if there were any other letters of objection. P. Neumeyer stated just the phone call on today's date. She also wanted to know if the owners of the three tenant letters of support are support of the request as well. P. Neumeyer stated that the owners were notified, but did not hear from them. S. Bremer then asked if the policy guidance was actually voted on. P. Neumeyer stated that he would have to go back and clarify that information. M. Conard stated she does remember seeing the information but didn't remember if there was a vote.

M. Conard suspended the rules for Public Comments.

Ald. C. Wery stated he is happy that these are taken on a case by case basis. This property had been a problem property in the past. However, the new owner has fixed up the home and now lives there. He is in favor of this request.

Charles Smith – 1076 Langlade Avenue: C. Smith stated he is the owner of the duplex. He handed out an additional letter of approval from a neighbor for his request. He gave a brief history of acquiring the duplex and fixing it up. He stated he was not finding the right people to rent to, so they are trying the transient use. They do use a private advertising agency to list their duplex. They have had great luck finding people to rent to and would like to continue. He is willing to work with P. Neumeyer and the Plan Commission and showed Commissioners a flyer he would be handing out to neighbors in case any issues or problems arise, they can contact him directly.

Sara Villalobos-Deida & Omri Deida – 1080 Langlade Avenue: S. Deida stated that she and her husband own the house next door to C. Smith and have lived there since 2008. She stated that the house prior to C. Smith buying the property was a mess. They constantly had issues with the people who lived there and there were many police calls and felt unsafe in their neighborhood. They couldn't ask for a better neighbor at this time with C. Smith and there have been no issues since.

M. Conard returned the meeting to regular order of business.

Ald. J. Wiezbiskie stated although the home is located "off the beaten path" like other transient uses have been approved, Shadow Lane, he has issues with the fact that they have been operating as a transient use without a CUP and is this going to set a precedence in our City for all bad rentals, that we turn them into transient houses.

M. Conard does agree that this is an unusual spot compared to previous approvals. However, there have been people they have turned down and it would be hard for her to approve this one when they have turned down others because they were not as close to the Shadow Lane homes that they have voted for in the past. This would fall in with the others that they have not approved. If they approve this use, what do they say to all the other owners who came in and were told no because they were too far away.

S. Bremer stated she does share the same concerns as Ald. J. Wiezbiskie. She stated that she has settled on the notion that Shadow Lane, specifically the side adjacent to Packer stadium, is the area for TRP's to be allowed. This then raises issues about "spot zoning". The two things that would make a difference here is we have a person that is occupying half of the house, and that he would be present if there are people renting. The second being strong support and no objections from the neighbors, except for the homeowner who stated that if the neighbors are OK with it, then she is too.

T. Gilbert stated he is happy with the improvements made and the fact that it is owner occupied. However, he still feels it is a bad precedent to be setting. With the denial of two transient uses outside the Shadow Lane area, and approving this one, could "open a can of worms". He will not be able to support this request.

M. Conard asked P. Neumeyer if there is a room tax on Transient homes. He stated yes, that there is a prorated fee that has to be paid annually. She then asked if Door County, for example, where people rent out their homes, have special rules in place or is that something that cities, or the area in general, allows everyone to do.

A conversation then ensued regarding Bed & Breakfasts (B&B) and TRP's as B&B's are owner occupied and both pay hotel tax. It was asked if this TRP could be changed to a B&B as it is owner occupied. P. Neumeyer stated it was better to leave this request as a TRP.

Ald C. Wery stated this might be a great opportunity as it will be owner occupied and also the fact that there is so much support from neighbors.

Ald. J. Wiezbiskie asked if this would be just for Packer games. C. Smith stated that they rented the home out last year about 12-15 times for Packer games as well as other major events going on in the City. However, they will do what is recommended by the Plan Commission. K. Vonck then stated that transient houses can be used for other events, not just Packer game days.

Ald. M. Steuer stated one of his main concerns is the renting of the property and the owner is not there due to one reason or another. His second concern would be if he sells his property, what guarantee would there be of someone coming in having the same feeling. P. Neumeyer stated the CUP will be issued to C. Smith. If he does not own the property, the CUP ceases and is not transferrable.

M. Conard confirmed with P. Neumeyer that you just can't rent out your property without it running through the City and creating a TRP. P. Neumeyer stated the ordinance is set up so that if you are renting less than 28 days, you would need to obtain a CUP.

Ald. J. Wiezbiskie asked if an area was designated for TRP's when they were making changes to the TRP policy. P. Neumeyer stated no, and that they were more concerned about saturation in the area. TRP's are allowed throughout the City within the R1 District.

A conversation ensued among Commissioners, P. Neumeyer and K. Vonck regarding the saturation of TRP homes in the area of Shadow Lane and taking over the neighborhood. The TRP's that were denied outside of the Shadow Lane area were getting to be at a non-desirable saturation level. S. Bremer believes this request does not pose such risk. Ald. J. Wiezbiskie asked S. Bremer if this would be the start of the influx of going further into the neighborhoods and starting exactly what they have been trying to prevent. She stated no, due to it not being site specific, which might raise questions about "spot zoning".

P. Neumeyer stated the CUP does not run with the life of the property, but the ownership of the property. There are conditions added and development standards in place to make this fit into the neighborhood. M. Conard stated she does not have an issue with this, but would hesitate greatly in denying any TRP's that come in here after this gets approved and could not deny anyone a TRP based on it being possibly "creeping" into the neighborhood. M. Conard does think a precedence will be set if this is passed. Also discussed was why transient houses are looked at as being a negative impact to a neighborhood versus a positive impact.

K. Vonck stated that the CUP is one of the best tools to set up the TRP's to include hours of operation and distance to another TRP. The leverage options are endless and in the Commissioner's control.

T. Gilbert feels that if there are too many short term residents, it can take away from the sense and the cohesion of neighborhood needs. S. Bremer suggested that more work should be done on the general policy guidelines. The things to think about or add would be saturation and limiting the south side to no more than 50 percent.

A motion was made by S. Bremer and seconded by H. Mueller to authorize a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for a Transient Residential use located at 1074 Langlade Avenue (a.k.a. 1074-1076 Langlade Avenue), due to support of the neighbors and residence of the petitioner, subject to the following conditions:

- a. Compliance with the Development standards found in 13-1602(j), Green Bay Zoning Code.
- b. The conditional-use permit shall expire if the applicant no longer resides at 1076 Langlade Avenue.

Motion tied 2-2. (Noes: Ald. J. Wiezbiskie, T. Gilbert) (Abstained: M. Conard)

It was suggested by Commissioners to bring back the TRP Guidelines and to discuss the issues pertaining to density requirements, precedents, and how TRP's are alike or differ from B&B regulations as an agenda item.

4. (ZP 15-23) Discussion and action on the request to amend the previously approved Planned Unit Development (PUD) for Grand Central Station to modify monument signage standards located at 1593 East Mason Street, submitted by David O'Brien, Bayland Builders. (Ald. Tim De Wane, District 4).

P. Neumeyer stated this is a request to amend a recently approved Planned Unit Development (PUD) at 1593 East Mason Street. Staff did agree that it was reasonable to have additional signage on East Mason Street because of multi-tenants and lack of signage on Bellevue Street and Kimball as they are residential in nature.

The ordinance specified a smaller monument sign of 24 sq. ft. per side, length of approximately 8 ft. and an overall height of 6 ft. The request tonight is to increase that sign to 40 sq. ft. per sign panel. The new sign does present some issues as far as aesthetics and for traffic purposes. The new sign does meet the basic zoning standards, however, the City's Traffic Engineer felt there was an obstruction with that size of a sign. A revised sign proposed by the applicant includes a pole sign with 8 ft. of under clearance and two tenant panels for a total of 48 sq. ft. Affected property owners were notified of this request. Staff indicated that they had concerns about the size of the recently proposed sign. S. Bremer asked if they denied this request, they are still

allowing the smaller monument sign as that is part of the PUD. P. Neumeyer stated that was correct. She then asked if he was making further recommendation that the sign be placed in a way sensitive to the property owners, which was not part of the original PUD. P. Neumeyer stated that was correct.

M. Conard suspended the rules for public comments.

David O'Brien – 3323 Bayridge Ct: D. O'Brien stated that on August 6th, with the preliminary draft of the PUD, he received an e-mail from P. Neumeyer stating that all signage for the current project should be regulated according to Chapter 13-2010. He verified with P. Neumeyer if that was the sign ordinance, P. Neumeyer stated yes. He went on stating the sign dimensions that were submitted on the site plan on August 6th had never changed. He was then informed that he was not allowed to put up that size of a sign, from the original plans, and doesn't know when the signage dimensions changed. He stated he was not notified of the changes to the draft site plan.

M. Conard asked P. Neumeyer if a notice was sent. P. Neumeyer stated that a digital copy of the changes was sent to D. O'Brien. She then asked if anything was returned or anything indicated that they had not received it. P. Neumeyer stated no.

D. O'Brien stated that they are now coming back tonight to ask for the original size sign, which he thought was already approved, until he was told differently. M. Conard stated that the main problem with the size they want is that it causes traffic vision concerns. When the ordinance was adopted, a smaller sign was chosen due to traffic vision concerns.

D. O'Brien is arguing that he did not know the dimensions of the sign had changed and that they had remained the same since the draft site plan and that it only had to fit within the sign ordinance. He stated he received the final PUD on 10/16/2015 and the project had started in April.

A conversation ensued between Commissioners, D. O'Brien, and P. Neumeyer regarding the size and placement of the sign. The original size they requested would probably have been denied as it would have been a traffic hazard and a smaller sign would have been requested. D. O'Brien stated the sign would have met the size for the "vision triangle". The only requirements that the sign would not have met would have been looking to the west and the 445 ft. site clearance, but if you pull out farther you can see around the sign.

Jim Krumpos – 1575 E. Main Street: J. Krumpos stated that it would affect his driveway and his neighbor's driveway. The sign is too close to the road and is too big for the area. He stated he does not have an issue with the pylon sign as it is on a post and is not a solid wall. He was opposed to the sign that was being proposed tonight and would be even more opposed to the bigger sign.

Dan Pamperin – 396 Talus Ct: D. Pamperin stated that the plans that everyone has are the sign measurements used to go build and have built and the dimensions were always going to be 40 sq. ft. He went out to stake the sign and there was an issue. He stated he came up with the pylon sign as an alternative for the site. The post sign has an 8 ft. clearance and is 6 ft. wide and 12 ft. in height. The taller the sign the larger the actual sign needs to be for it to be visible. The sign is not supposed to be an LED sign but a changeable message center.

S. Bremer asked P. Neumeyer why the sign has to be larger if the overall sign is taller. D. Pamperin stated that as things get taller it shrinks in size as far as visibility. S. Bremer thinks this sign will resolve the safety issue, however, does not like the aesthetics of the sign, especially the message center at the bottom of the sign, and asked if there was a way to shorten that portion of the changeable sign. D. Pamperin stated that can be done, making the message portion a 2 ft. x 4 ft. instead of a 4 ft. x 6 ft. D. Pamperin then went over the final dimensions with the Commissioners, 18 ft. sign with 8 ft. of under clearance and the overall signage of 6 ft. x 10 ft. with a non LED changeable message center.

M. Conard returned the meeting to regular order of business.

K. Vonck briefly discussed the difference between the maps and sign images that have been displayed during both Plan Commission meetings and City Council meetings and the actual ordinance. He did say the ordinance would prevail over what sign was approved; however, the Plan Commission can amend the PUD.

A discussion then continued regarding the sign dimensions. S. Bremer stated that with the new sign, the tenant panels would be a total of 24 sq. ft. which is the total amount allowed in the PUD and therefore have increased the square footage by 2.5 times.

T. Gilbert does not have an issue as well as Ald. J. Wiezbiskie and M. Conard. P. Neumeyer then reminded Commissioners that since this is an ordinance, they would need to direct staff to draft an amended ordinance and bring it to City Council. He also stated they may want to consider further review by the City's Traffic Engineer as he has not seen the new sign and dimensions. M. Conard asked P. Neumeyer if this would change the whole ordinance to change one sign. P. Neumeyer stated yes.

A motion was made by Ald. J. Wiezbiskie and seconded by T. Gilbert to amend the previously approved Planned Unit Development (PUD) for Grand Central Station to modify monument signage standards located at 1593 East Mason Street, with the condition that staff draft an amended PUD and have the City's Traffic Engineer review and approve the amended sign. Motion carried.

S. Bremer called for an amendment regarding the dimensions of the sign. The new dimensions would be 8 ft. in height and 6 ft. across. D. Pamperin stated that they could take the original 10 ft. by 4 ft. sign, and stack them and make it a pylon sign. This would give the sign the following dimensions, 5 ft. wide and 8 ft. tall with an overall height of 16 ft. with an 8 ft. under clearance. Motion carried.

5. (SP 15-03) Discussion and action on the request to declare the city property located at the corner of S. Monroe Avenue and Mason Street as "city surplus", submitted by Mark Budzinski. (Ald. Tim De Wane, District 4)

S. Hummel stated this is a request for city property on the corner of S. Monroe and the on-ramp to Mason Street to be declared "city surplus". The original request came in from an adjacent property owner to declare half of the area as surplus property to attach it to his parcel to expand his parking. After further review, Planning staff and Public Works staff both feel the entire area should be declared as surplus. The other adjacent property owner was contacted and supports the request and would be interested in purchasing the property. The property would remain as public right-of-way if he decides not to purchase the property at this time. There are a number of utilities in the area such as sewer, water, and traffic easements. The surplus property would

not be buildable. The access point will not change with the expansion of the parking area. Affected property owners were notified of the request and no objections were received. Staff is recommending approval of the request subject to the conditions that are listed within the meeting packet.

S. Bremer questioned the green space that would be taken out. S. Hummel stated that there would be just a small section taken out for the parking expansion; however, they would be required to have some sort of landscaping added. Since the other area is deemed unbuildable, not much of that green space would be lost.

A motion was made by T. Gilbert and seconded by H. Mueller to declare the city property located at the corner of S. Monroe Avenue and Mason Street as "city surplus", subject to the following conditions:

- a. The City of Green Bay shall retain a permanent limited easement for any traffic signal control and street lighting equipment that exists on the parcel.
- b. The City of Green Bay shall retain an easement for existing storm sewer.
- c. No vehicular access to a public street shall be allowed from area declared surplus.
- d. All environmental liability shall be the requestor's responsibility.
- e. The City of Green Bay Water Utility shall retain an easement for an active water main that exists on the parcel.

Motion carried.

6. (ED 15-02) Discussion and action on the request to discontinue an already partially discontinued 6 ft. utility easement located at 1923-1935 Main Street, submitted by Garritt Bader, GB Real Estate Investments, LLC. (Ald. A. Nicholson, District 3)

S. Hummel stated this is a lot that has already been divided and is now being further divided into three additional lots. The area is zoned for Commercial and is compatible with the Comprehensive Plan. Part of this 6 ft. unused easement was discontinued in the 90's. There is a small portion left. The petitioner is looking to remove the easement for redevelopment. Affected property owners were notified with no objections received. There are no utilities in the area. Planning staff is recommending approval of the request.

A motion was made by H. Mueller and seconded by Ald. J. Wiezbiskie to approve to discontinue an already partially discontinued 6 ft. utility easement located at 1923-1935 Main Street. Motion carried.

INFORMATIONAL:

7. Discussion on the request by the Plan Commission to revisit the notification process to affected property owners as it may relate to comprehensive plan amendments and zoning petition requests.

P. Neumeyer stated the Plan Commission asked that this item be revisited. He briefly went through the notification process. Prior to the changes, individual residences were not noticed for Comprehensive Plan amendments and were notifying residents via State Statute requirements which are a public notice in the newspaper. Due to the Grand Central Station issue (GCS), the notification process was changed for comprehensive plan amendments. In June of 2013 the notification process for Zoning Petitions was amended from 100 ft. to 200 ft., which has been in use since that time. P. Neumeyer then displayed an example of the notification letter and map that is sent out to the property owners. Also notified are the

Aldermen, the applicant, Neighborhood Association and any affected BID's. This has been a very successful process. Included in the meeting packet are notification policies from local communities (June 2013), an updated list for the cost of distributing the letters and a list of pros/cons, as requested from Commissioners. P. Neumeyer went through the list of pros/cons for options to notice property owners. Planning staff feels that the current notification process is sufficient. If the Commission does feel strongly about going to a larger area, that can be accommodated by staff.

M. Conard asked, referring to the Rebekah Odd Fellows Campus, if there was some way the language can be changed from 200 ft. around that particular parcel to 200 ft. around the entire campus as part of the 200 ft. radius included as part of the Odd Fellows Campus.

P. Neumeyer stated that because the site is under two different owners, and the zoning is for a particular piece of property, it needed the 200 ft. radius around the parcel. P. Neumeyer stated he understood the issue about the 200 ft. radius still being on the same property and no neighbors were then notified. At that point the Alderman for the area should be contacted.

Ald. J. Wiezbiskie stated he would hope that a red flag like this would prompt staff to contact the Alderman for that district. P. Neumeyer stated that at that point they would contact Alderman and possibly expand the notification area.

T. Gilbert stated he agrees that the 200 ft. is an ample notification area. However, when you get into the area where the lot sizes are larger, maybe think about doubling the notification area; for example if the lot is 10,000 sq. ft., doubling the notification area to 200 sq. ft. or if the lot size is 30,000 sq. ft. going to 300 sq. ft.

H. Mueller then asked if at that point wouldn't the Alderman get involved. P. Neumeyer stated that was correct. Ald. J. Wiezbiskie stated that it would come back to the Alderman and let them assess the area and see how many residents it would be reaching rather than strictly using measurement. P. Neumeyer stated that it is staff's responsibility to flag those types of issues and report it to the Alderman for the area. S. Bremer then asked if this would include notification for Zoning Petitions as well. Ald. J. Wiezbiskie stated yes.

S. Bremer stated they could do a similar notification policy like the one Wausau, WI is using, which is 100 ft. minimum and 300 ft. maximum; with wider areas used when there is a "high profile" item, a potentially controversial item, or discretion of staff. She mentioned she would like to have a 200 ft. minimum and a 400 ft. maximum and instead of "discretion of staff" have limited notice beyond the petitioner. She is a little worried about having the Aldermen involved in every zoning question/issue. She would like to give the Planning staff the trust to expand the size if necessary depending on likely controversy or limited affected parties beyond the petitioner. P. Neumeyer stated if the issue is controversial, staff would most likely be talking to the Alderman.

S. Bremer stated that in terms of pros/cons she really supports increasing the notification area with the flexibility of increasing it further if needed. Even though there may be a slight increase in cost, time and money, it will also have the effect of making better informed Planning Commission decisions. It will also cost the Planning Commission more time to hear the input from a wider range of people. M. Conard stated she does like the fact that the Aldermen are being informed and are able to increase the notification area if necessary.

S. Bremer stated she would like to see staff bring something back based upon what was discussed this evening and would like to see the notification area expanded. She then asked what the rest of the Commission thought about the flexibility for Planning staff. They were all in agreement. P. Neumeyer then asked S. Bremer when they would want the 400 ft. notification to be used. S. Bremer stated the 400 ft. notification would be used if the subject site is over 3 acres or if it involves controversy, and minimal notice to affected parties beyond the petitioner. P. Neumeyer stated the item can be brought back to the next meeting with a draft of the notification area policy.

OTHER:

Director's Update on Council Actions

K. Vonck reported the following information:

- Common Council will be meeting tomorrow, November 10, 2015. The requests for the rezoning for the 1200 block of S. Webster Avenue and Amending the BID Handbook will be presented.

SUBMITTED PETITIONS: (for informational purposes only)

A motion was made by S. Bremer and seconded by T. Gilbert to adjourn. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 8:29 p.m.