

**City of Rolling Meadows
Planning and Zoning Commission
7:30 PM
July 7, 2020
APPROVED**

Motion to Open the Meeting

Chairman Rataiczky asked for a motion to open the July 7 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. Mr. Rataiczky moved to open the meeting and Mr. Fink seconded. Motion carried.

Roll call:

Presiding: Chairman Rataiczky

Present: Buckingham, Duvall, Sheehan, Sipple

Absent: Fink, L. Morrison, S. Morrison

Also Present: Rob Horne, Director Public Works; Jo Ellen Charlton, Assistant Director Public Works
Elizabeth Payne, Administrative Services Coordinator

Call to Order

Chairman Rataiczky called the meeting to order at 7:30 pm and declared a quorum.

Discussion ensued regarding the possibility and practicality of remote or mixed remote and in-person meetings due to the coronavirus pandemic.

Approval of Minutes

Chairman Rataiczky asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the June 2, 2020 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. Mr. Duvall moved to approve the minutes as written and Mr. Buckingham seconded.

Roll call:

Mr. Duvall: Yes

Ms. Sheehan: Yes

Mr. Sipple: Yes

Mr. Buckingham: Yes

Chairman Rataiczky: Abstain

Yeas – (5) – Buckingham, Duvall, Rataiczky, Sheehan, Sipple

Nays – (0) - NONE

Absent – (3) – Fink, L. Morrison, S. Morrison,

Abstain – (0) – NONE

Motion carried. Minutes approved as written.

Chairman Rataiczky asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the June 17, 2020 Planning and

Zoning Commission Special meeting.

Mr. Duvall noted that, with all the discussion about the Owl property at the last meeting, the intended use had not been emphasized enough. The intended use would not have much of an impact on the surrounding neighborhood. It was noted that the minutes could not be updated with these comments.

Mr. Buckingham moved to approve the minutes as written and Mr. Sipple seconded.

Roll call:

Mr. Duvall: Yes

Ms. Sheehan: Yes

Mr. Sipple: Yes

Mr. Buckingham: Yes

Chairman Rataiczky: Abstain

Yeas – (5) – Buckingham, Duvall, Rataiczky, Sheehan, Sipple

Nays – (0) - NONE

Absent – (3) – Fink, L. Morrison, S. Morrison,

Abstain – (0) – NONE

Motion carried. Minutes approved as written.

Upcoming Public Hearings: NONE

Pending Business:

1. **Text Amendment to define and regulate Adult-Use Cannabis Craft Grower Business Establishments and Adult-Use Cannabis Infuser Organizations as special uses in the M-1 and M-2 Zoning Districts in the City of Rolling Meadows, Illinois, City of Rolling Meadows, Petitioner.**

Chairman Rataiczky noted that the public hearing had been opened at the May 5, 2020 meeting, and was still opened.

Jo Ellen Charlton, 3600 Kirchoff Road, Rolling Meadows, IL was sworn in by Chairman Rataiczky.

Ms. Charlton noted that the City was requesting text amendments to regular adult-use cannabis craft growers and infuser organizations as special uses in the manufacturing districts. The state legalized medicinal cannabis uses in 2013, and Rolling Meadows modified its zoning code to allow it as well. Nature's Care was granted a Special Use by the City and a license by the state. The state then legalized adult-use recreational cannabis uses, and sales began January 1, 2020. The City of Rolling Meadows modified the zoning code to allow recreational use, and modified Nature's Care's Special Use to allow them to dispense adult-use cannabis as well. When the City code had been modified to allow the adult-use cannabis, staff had the benefit of the guidance of the Illinois Municipal League for all the new types of uses approved by the state. However, the City only approved dispensaries and cultivation centers, as staff did not know what the other uses would look like. This text amendment requests additional uses, specifically craft growers and infuser organizations, to be allowed. Potential petitioners have helped staff understand the needs and challenges of these specific types of uses. Craft growers are limited in size compared to cultivation centers, falling between 5,000 and 14,000 square feet of growing space. Infuser organizations modify grown product to what an end user might see. Transportation organizations have not been requested at this time, so the City will wait for an applicant.

Ms. Charlton stated that proposed regulations had been provided to the Commission in Ordinance form. Some highlights included distance requirements from certain sensitive uses, and additional location requirements. Single-use buildings would be required for this type of use, as opposed to allowing them in multi-tenant buildings, due to the need for security.

Ms. Charlton stated that staff had been working with an applicant regarding a potential craft grower in the Northwest Industrial Area, and a potential second had come forward, though they were farther behind in the process. State regulations require a minimum of 1,500 feet of separation between these types of businesses. City direction was to move forward with both through the Special Use process, and the state would have the final say on license distribution.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Chairman Rataiczky opened the meeting to commissioners' questions and comments.

Mr. Duvall asked if there would be retail sales in these organizations. Ms. Charlton confirmed there would not be.

Mr. Duvall recommended language regarding off-site parking agreements, and requiring such agreements to be in writing. Ms. Charlton noted that previous cases allowing handshake agreements had been because there had not been codified requirements. The updated zoning code would include language regarding off-site parking.

Mr. Duvall asked if each type of use would require its own special use permit, even if the uses were for the same organization. Ms. Charlton confirmed that would be the case. Parking would be considered as part of the special use application. Ms. Charlton suggested including language requiring off-site parking agreements in writing in the current text amendment, so any petitioners that come forward before the updated zoning code is adopted would be required to meet that condition.

Ms. Sheehan asked about the limit on adult-use cannabis establishments in the City. Ms. Charlton replied that any new petitioners would apply for their special use, and a text amendment to increase the number of allowed businesses at the same time. The number allowed would increase if the special use was granted, and remain the same if it was not.

Ms. Sheehan asked if the requirement for single-use properties was a state or City requirement. She would not want to limit the businesses coming in if a multi-tenant building would be acceptable for them. Ms. Charlton noted that she believed the requirement is in the state regulations, but she would need to check. Developers of these types of businesses also were not looking for units in multi-tenant buildings, both for security and air handling requirements. The restriction was in the model code the City used to develop its own.

Mr. Buckingham asked about what kind of business license would be required for these types of businesses.

Elizabeth Payne, 3600 Kirchoff Road, Rolling Meadows, IL was sworn in by Chairman Rataiczky.

Ms. Payne stated that a general business license would be required in this case, as required in the City Code of Ordinances. The City Council could change the business license requirements if they chose.

Mr. Buckingham asked about the timing of the licenses and zoning for a new applicant. Ms. Charlton indicated that the state would not process an application if the organization had not received zoning approval from the municipality. The special use approval would come first, then the state would authorize the license. The City would then issue building permits and business licenses.

Mr. Buckingham asked what the City code was modeled after. Ms. Charlton replied that it was modeled after the Illinois Municipal League. Minor modifications come forward through attorneys as the codes become more utilized.

Chairman Rataiczky asked what the rationale behind the 1,000 foot separation between adult-use cannabis businesses and sensitive uses, such as schools, might be. Ms. Charlton indicated that the requirements might be applied to multiple types of cannabis uses. The state might have made these requirements in order to allow the overall allowance to go through. These restrictions might be relaxed over time as impacts become more known.

Chairman Rataiczky asked for clarification if a single organization in a single building could act as both a craft grower and an infuser. Ms. Charlton confirmed that to be the case. She added that additional cannabis businesses could operate under the same business model, such as including a transportation organization.

Chairman Rataiczky asked if there was a limit to the number of adult-use cannabis licenses the City would allow. Ms. Charlton indicated that no express limits had been stated by the City, although the state had a maximum number of licenses they would grant. As the City was requiring text amendments to increase the number of allowed licenses, new licenses could be refused if the City was reaching a saturation point. Between the limited number of licenses the state was allowing and the separation requirements, it was not expected to reach that point. Chairman Rataiczky indicated that it seemed to be a good use for the Manufacturing district.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

Chairman Rataiczky opened the meeting for comments from the public. No members of the public came forward to comment.

Mr. Duvall made a motion to close the public hearing. Mr. Buckingham seconded. With a unanimous voice vote, the public hearing was closed.

Chairman Rataiczky discussed a prior case regarding parking issues at an adult-use cannabis business that had opened. Mr. Duvall reiterated that he would like to ensure requirements of written agreements for off-site parking arrangements. Mr. Sipple noted that the petition seemed to take previous challenges into account for future businesses. Chairman Rataiczky asked where the previous petition had gone wrong with parking. Ms. Charlton noted that medicinal centers had been placed into manufacturing districts, and adult-use locations looked to retrofit existing businesses, which were not built for retail parking. The petition had requirements built in for new construction with flexibility for existing structures that would be carefully vetted by staff. Requirements regarding offsite parking could be written into the Ordinance approving the special use, which the Planning and Zoning Commission would hear. Conditions not met would nullify the special use approval. The Commission agreed that existing language in the petition was acceptable given the discussion.

Mr. Buckingham moved, based on the submitted petition and testimony presented, that the Rolling Meadows Planning and Zoning Commission recommend to City Council approval of the text amendments permitting Adult-Use (recreational) Cannabis Craft Growers and Adult-Use Cannabis Infuser Organizations as special uses in the M-1 and M-2 Manufacturing Districts as prepared for the July 7, 2020 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.

Mr. Sipple seconded.

Roll call:

Mr. Duvall: Yes – all distance and parking requirements are in plain language,

Ms. Sheehan: Yes

Mr. Sipple: Yes

Mr. Buckingham: Yes – in furtherance of state law and existing ordinances

Chairman Rataiczky: Yes – good expansion into manufacturing

Yeas – (5) – Buckingham, Duvall, Rataiczky, Sheehan, Sipple

Nays – (0) - NONE

Absent – (3) – Fink, L. Morrison, S. Morrison,

Abstain – (0) – NONE

Motion Approved.

Chairman Rataiczky noted that this item will appear on the July 28, 2020 City Council agenda for first reading.

New Business – Public Hearings:

1. Preliminary and Final approval of a Plat of Subdivision for consolidation of two lots at 4280-4290 Kirchoff Road, R-1 Single Family Residence District, James Bielarz, Petitioner.

Chairman Rataiczky asked if proper notice was given, and if the file was in order. Staff indicated that was the case with one exception. One property owner was left off of the notification list provided to the petitioner by the Township. The petitioner attempted hand delivery, but persons present at the building would not sign acceptance of the notice. Petitioner has been made aware of potential remedies available if approval is challenged, up to and including renoticing all property owners and reholding the public hearing.

James Bielarz, 4290 Kirchoff Road, Rolling Meadows, IL was sworn in by Chairman Rataiczky.

Mr. Bielarz noted that he had purchased his current home in 2011. The person who he had purchased it from still owned the two properties to the east, and a deal was reached for Mr. Bielarz to purchase one additional vacant lot at 4280 Kirchoff Road. The petition was to consolidate to allow City water to be brought to 4290 Kirchoff Road from the existing b-box that had been located on 4280 Kirchoff Road, and disconnect the well except for irrigation purposes. Future construction may be proposed, such as an addition to the house or garage, but for the time being, bringing in City water was the only planned project.

Ms. Payne reiterated that the petitioner had followed proper notice procedures as far as possible. With remedies available, staff was comfortable moving forward with the petition.

Ms. Payne stated that the subject property was part of a subdivision in 2006. The two subject properties and the one immediately to the east had been two properties originally, and had been given approval to resubdivide into three with waivers of the subdivision regulations for the frontage along Kirchoff granted for two of the lots as part of that approval. The two lots to the east remain vacant, and the one farthest east is still owned by the original subdivider.

Ms. Payne stated that the petitioner purchased 4290 Kirchoff in 2011 and 4280 Kirchoff in 2018. He had intended to utilize the vacant property to connect to City water to the house on 4290, but was told at that time that he could not as they were different lots. The petitioner then began the process to consolidate the lots. The plat of subdivision has diligently worked with staff and the City Engineer to meet all requirements. Staff had a few minor modifications to be changed before signatures and recording. Notably, the City was requesting a five foot drainage easement along the west side of 4290. 4290 has a connection to the sanitary connection, but staff was unable to locate a permit or determine timing of connection. As such, some questions will need to be answered during the permitting process, such as status of the septic field. The owner would then also be responsible for water and sewer bills moving forward. When the subdivision of the three properties was completed in 2006, some public improvements were required, including storm water management. There is an existing eight inch PVC storm line parallel to the rear property line of 4280, and comes out to Kirchoff to the storm main on Kirchoff along the property line between 4280 and 4270. The line is not located in an easement, and is intended to be a private line maintained by the owner. The b-box that was installed at 4280 was sized at 1.5 inches. The size will need to be evaluated for appropriateness of the

sizing at permit, and the homeowner will be responsible for any needed modifications. The main purpose of the consolidation is connection to City water, and staff is requesting a condition minimizing impact on existing trees as the service line is extended. This can also be accommodated through permitting. The petitioner intends to keep the well, and there are requirements that will need to be met through permitting for disconnection of the well. 4280 previously contained a house and contains a curb cut, and staff is requiring that additional curb cut be removed and reset to normal curb and gutter.

Chairman Rataiczky asked for a motion to open the public hearing and enter all relevant materials and previous testimony into the public record. Mr. Duvall moved, and Mr. Buckingham seconded. With a unanimous voice vote, the public hearing was opened and the staff report, agenda materials and testimony were entered into the record.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Chairman Rataiczky opened the meeting to commissioners' questions and comments.

Mr. Sipple noted that the petition was acceptable as long as the petitioner was amenable to staff conditions. He asked if the petitioner would resubdivide in the future. Mr. Bielarz stated he was not planning and, and may even purchase the third property at some point as the existing owner was having difficulty selling and building. Mr. Bielarz provided some additional information on the well, and indicated it would be easily disconnected. Utilizing the well was costly and time consuming. Mr. Sipple suggested that the petitioner follow the advice of the City's sewer and water workers.

Ms. Payne added that the subdivision approval is requested to be both preliminary and final.

Mr. Buckingham asked what the remedies would be if the unserved property owner came forward. Ms. Payne noted that it would depend on the specific objection was, but the most extreme remedy would be to renounce all property owners and rehold the public hearing. Chairman Rataiczky noted that an additional option was to postpone the public hearing, but did not believe it would be necessary.

Mr. Duvall asked about intentions for Lot 3. Ms. Payne noted that Lot 3 is 4270 Kirchoff, and the petitioner does not own that lot. Chairman Rataiczky noted that the lot seemed unbuildable for a new home. Ms. Payne stated that it was possible to build depending on how it was done. No variations other than the length of the frontage were granted to the lot.

Chairman Rataiczky suggested upsizing the water service for potential future expansion. Ms. Payne reminded the Commission that the existing service would be evaluated at permitting.

Mr. Duvall made a motion to close the public hearing. Mr. Buckingham seconded. With a unanimous voice vote, the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Buckingham moved, based on the submitted petition and testimony provided, that the Planning and Zoning Commission recommend the City Council approval of the “James Bielarz’s Plat of Consolidation, prepared by Marchese and Sons, Inc. and dated August 8, 2019, subject to the following conditions:

- a. Corrections and conditions of approval outlined in the June 30, 2020 memo prepared for the July 7, 2020 PZC meeting with the subject line titled “James Bielarz’s Plat of Consolidation Review Comments, Required Corrections, and Conditions of Approval” to be made and/or included in the resolution approving the plat as indicated.
- b. The Final Plat of Resubdivision for Consolidation for James Bielarz shall become null and void unless it is provided in mylar form to the City for signatures, and recorded in the Office of the Cook County Recorder not later than six months after the date of City Council approval.
- c. No work shall begin until permits have been issued by the City. This includes connection to the water service and any other expansions, additions, or other improvements that may be planned for the future.
- d. Resolution 06-R-53 is hereby null and void where it grants exception for the lot width of Lot 2 (4280 Kirchoff Road). The Resolution is valid where it applies to Lot 3 (4270 Kirchoff Road).

Mr. Sipple seconded.

Roll call:

- Mr. Duvall:** Yes – substantial property improvement
- Ms. Sheehan:** Yes
- Mr. Sipple:** Yes
- Mr. Buckingham:** Yes
- Chairman Rataiczky:** Yes

Yeas – (5) – Buckingham, Duvall, Rataiczky, Sheehan, Sipple

Nays – (0) - NONE

Absent – (3) – Fink, L. Morrison, S. Morrison,

Abstain – (0) – NONE

Motion Approved.

Chairman Rataiczky noted that this item will appear on the July 28, 2020 City Council agenda for resolution approval.

- 2. Text Amendments to the Zoning Ordinance to Define and Regulate “Video Gaming, Accessory to Permitted or Accessory Restaurants or Bars”, “Video Gaming Café’s”, and “Video Gaming Establishments”, to authorize Video Gaming Cafes as special uses in the C-1, C-2, and C-3 zoning districts, and to modify parking requirements to provide that the category of “Restaurant/Brew Pub/Video Gaming Café” shall require 10 spaces per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area. City of Rolling Meadows, Illinois, Petitioner.**

Chairman Rataiczky asked if proper notice was given, and if the file was in order. Staff indicated that was the case.

Mr. Duvall made a motion to open the public hearing. Mr. Buckingham seconded. With a unanimous voice vote, the public hearing was opened.

Ms. Charlton stated that the state allowed video gaming in 2009, establishing regulations and taxes. Establishments with liquor licenses, truck stops, and fraternal organizations were allowed to apply. Many municipalities worked to establish regulations to allow them. Rolling Meadows did not initially allow such establishments. When they were allowed in 2018, the only regulation was through the liquor code. The original intent was to allow businesses video gaming to help recover after the recession. Some operators determined that, if the only requirement was a liquor license, then they could open small establishments based solely around video gaming. Original regulations were met with support from the Chamber of Commerce, and a hope that allowing video gaming would help local businesses and fill vacancies. Several businesses did come in and take advantage of the regulations, making the video gaming accessory to their main uses and fulfilling the intent of the regulations. Additional companies came in to create gaming cafes, which have the video gaming as primary uses and as little as possible to qualify for the liquor license.

Ms. Charlton noted that many discussions have been had at the Committee of the Whole since the original regulations passed. It was determined that proliferation of video gaming cafes could be addressed by a text amendment in the zoning code regulating cafes as a special use in certain districts. The Council spent multiple hours discussing this issue and potential regulations. The conclusion was that the new code needs to adhere to the intent to support existing businesses, accommodate the video gaming cafés for the revenue, and limit the number of cafes. Staff took discussion items and provided a potential text amendment that meets the needs of the City. The text amendment allows existing bars and restaurants to have video gaming as accessory uses as permitted uses, defines video gaming cafes and sets regulations for them as special uses in the commercial districts, and defines video gaming establishments.

Ms. Charlton stated that the City was processing modifications to both the zoning code and the liquor code. The Commission was not provided a copy of proposed liquor license regulations, as they would not be making a recommendation on them. She discussed additional regulations and standards for applications, such as separation requirements and space size requirements. The liquor code defines the standards by which video gaming cafes are identified. Additional improvements would also be required of video gaming cafes, such as screening refuse disposal and parking lot lighting. Based on existing cafes, and some that are in process, the City seems to be at the saturation point for video gaming cafes where existing bars and restaurants can continue to benefit. The number of available licenses is set at the number of cafes that we have or have in process. Additional requests for

available locations that meet can request licenses via text amendment to increase the allowed number.

Ms. Charlton stated that the Council has also discussed potential requirements for food offerings by the video gaming cafes. Higher quality and varieties of food attract a clientele that can provide better revenue streams for the City.

Ms. Charlton discussed the parking requirements. Video gaming cafes were added to existing regulations for restaurants and brew pubs.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Chairman Rataczyk opened the meeting to commissioners' questions and comments.

Mr. Buckingham asked if the concern about cafes was them drawing potential revenues away from existing businesses, or if there were additional concerns. Ms. Charlton replied that she did not believe there was additional concerns about criminality or policing. Primarily, the regulations are based on objections from existing businesses. The Council sought a balance between the existing businesses and the revenues generated by the cafes.

Mr. Buckingham asked who would determine if additional licenses would be granted. Ms. Charlton replied that new petitioners would seek a text amendment alongside their special use request, and the Commission would review them all and make recommendations to the Council.

Mr. Buckingham asked if there was concern about potential identifications of gaming cafes. Ms. Charlton stated that twelve identification standards were listed in the liquor licensing code. Meeting a certain number of those criteria would classify the potential user as a gaming café, and the petitioner would need a referral from the City Council before they would be allowed to seek a special use.

Mr. Buckingham asked about the liquor license code amendments. Ms. Charlton replied that those amendments would go directly to the City Council to be considered simultaneously with the zoning code text amendments. Mr. Buckingham requested additional information on the liquor code amendments.

Mr. Buckingham asked what had influenced the proposed code amendments. Ms. Charlton replied that she had drawn on her own experiences, as well as what surrounding communities were doing, and legal counsel had performed their own reviews.

Mr. Sipple stated that he was generally against the cafes, but appreciated the revenue streams. He appreciated the work that had gone into developing the regulations.

Ms. Sheehan asked about the definition of gross floor area. For video gaming cafes, it is the entire space, since the video gaming is the primary use. For existing businesses that have video gaming as an accessory use, the video gaming area is already included in their floor area.

Mr. Duvall asked about the separation requirements, and if it applied to only video gaming cafes, or if

it would apply to restaurants and bars. Ms. Charlton stated that the separation requirements do not apply to restaurants and bars.

Chairman Rataiczky asked if there had been a discussion about not allowing video gaming cafes. Ms. Charlton stated that it is too late to regulate the cafes out of the City, so the Council had the goal of defining and regulating these cafes to allow the City to have some control.

Chairman Rataiczky asked how surrounding communities were regulating these uses. Ms. Charlton stated it was fairly similar. Even those communities that do not allow it are considering video gaming, at least for existing restaurants to be more competitive. Chairman Rataiczky asked if nearby communities were restricting gaming cafes. Ms. Charlton stated that there were some.

Ms. Charlton provided the standards for identifying video gaming cafes provided in the liquor codes.

Mr. Buckingham asked if there was any data on who the current operators were in the City. Ms. Charlton indicated that some of them were local, and some only had one location, but others were from out of town that had multiple locations. It was also noted that many video gaming cafes, by convention or requirement is unknown, had a feminine name. These cafes tend to target women as well.

Mr. Buckingham asked if consideration had been given to requiring educational or precautionary material be put up. Ms. Charlton stated that it had not been part of the conversations she had been party to. There were possible state requirements, and advertisements about help lines.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

Chairman Rataiczky opened the meeting for comments from the public. No members of the public came forward to comment.

Mr. Buckingham made a motion to close the public hearing. Mr. Duvall seconded. With a unanimous voice vote, the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Duvall moved, based on the submitted petition and testimony presented, that the Rolling Meadows Planning and Zoning Commission recommend to City Council approval of the text amendments defining and regulating “Video Gaming, Accessory to Permitted or Accessory To Restaurants or Bars”, “Video Gaming Cafés”, and “Video Gaming Establishments”, to authorize Video Gaming Cafes as special uses in the C-1, C-2, and C-3 zoning districts, and to modify parking requirements to provide that the category of “Restaurant/Brew Pub/Video Gaming Café” shall require 10 spaces per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area.

Mr. Buckingham seconded.

Roll call:

Mr. Duvall: Yes – reasonable control of saturation

Ms. Sheehan: Yes

Mr. Sipple: Yes

Mr. Buckingham: Yes – reasonable regulations that strikes a sensible balance

Chairman Rataiczky: Yes – personally opposed to expansion of video gaming

Motion Approved.

Yeas – (5) – Buckingham, Duvall, Rataiczky, Sheehan, Sipple

Nays – (0) - NONE

Absent – (3) – Fink, L. Morrison, S. Morrison,

Abstain – (0) – NONE

Chairman Rataiczky noted that this item will appear on the July 28, 2020 City Council agenda for first reading approval.

Discussion Items:

1. Update on Status and Discussion of Remaining Issues and Final Timing for the Zoning Ordinance Update Project.

Ms. Charlton provided a background on the zoning code update. The Comprehensive Plan was adopted in 2019, as prepared by consultants Teska Associates. A major recommendation of the plan was to update and modernize the Zoning Code. The Council agreed and authorized staff to hire the same consultant to help update the code. It was intended to be completed early 2020, but the onset of the coronavirus pandemic pushed that back. Staff had again begun the process of processing the update. Previously, the consultant had provided sections of the code for review, and staff had brought items to the Commission for discussion. Staff had recently been able to review a full draft of the code. There have been a number of comments and back and forth with the consultant. The process was time consuming, but would be worth it in the end.

The City Council would like to see this project completed before the holidays. It was intended to have the code available for review as soon as possible prior to the August 19 meeting.

Under normal circumstances, the August meeting would be delayed by one day to the first Wednesday of the month due to National Night Out. This year, staff was proposing to have the meeting on the alternate published date of August 19 for a few reasons, including hoping to have the craft grower petitioner ready to move forward.

Additional revisions to the draft of the zoning code might be done prior to the actual discussion. Staff planned to provide minutes of all the meetings where the zoning code was discussed to showcase the direction provided to the consultants and ensure that direction was followed. Staff will provide a presentation at the August 19 meeting, hopefully by the consultant.

From there, it was hoped to have final approval by the Council in October. This schedule allowed some flexibility in the schedule if it were to be needed. Staff requested questions be sent in advance whenever possible, so that staff could respond at the meeting.

Chairman Rataczyk noted that the process had been long, but would be beneficial to the City and to the Commission.

Reports: Update of on-going projects and cases: NONE

Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Buckingham and seconded by Mr. Duvall. Motion carried by unanimous voice vote. The regular meeting of the July 7, 2020 Planning and Zoning Commission was adjourned at 9:40 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,



Elizabeth Payne
Administrative Services Coordinator
Community Development Division

Distribution:

Mayor
City Manager
Planning and Zoning Commissioners
Community Development Department
Clerk's Office

Minutes approved at the August 19, 2020 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting as written.