

**FINAL  
MINUTES  
BLOOMINGTON PLANNING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING  
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 24, 2018 4:00 P.M.  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CITY HALL  
109 EAST OLIVE STREET  
BLOOMINGTON, ILLINOIS**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mr. David Stanczak, Mr. Kevin Suess, Mr. John Protzman, Ms. Megan Headean, Mr. Eric Penn, Mr. Mark Muehleck, Mr. Tyson Mohr, Ms. Megan McCann, Chairman Justin Boyd

**MEMBERS ABSENT** Mr. Thomas Kreiger

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Ms. Katie Simpson, City Planner; Ms. Izzy Rivera, Assistant City Planner; Mr. Bob Mahrt, Community Development Director, Mr. John Houseal, Houseal Lavigne & Associates, Ms. Jackie Wells, Houseal Lavigne & Associates.

**CALL TO ORDER** Chairman Boyd called the meeting to order at 4:00 PM. Mr. Mahrt called roll, and a quorum was established with nine members present.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** none

**MINUTES:** The Commission reviewed the minutes from the September 12, 2018 regular meeting. Mr. Stanczak motioned to approve the minutes, seconded by Mr. Penn. Motioned was approved by voice vote.

**REGULAR AGENDA:**

**Z-24-18 Public hearing, review and action on a comprehensive amendment to the Bloomington Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 44 of the Bloomington City Code, initiated by Resolution 2018-54.**

**Z-25-18 Public hearing, review and action on map amendments to the Official Zoning Map for multiple properties in the City of Bloomington, initiated by Resolution 2018-54.**

Chairman Boyd introduced the case. He stated the hearing would be open to hear comments from public. Review of the drafts may continue to the next scheduled meeting in December in order to give the Commission and the public an opportunity to review. He stated the second case, which is directly related to the first one, will deal with the map amendments. Ms. Simpson will have a presentation for both cases.

Ms. Simpson stated her presentation contained a brief summary of the process, some changes and staff recommendations. She stated zoning is not the same as planning. Zoning is a tool that can be used to implement plans. The update to the zoning code will help promote the goals of the Comprehensive Plan, which is why it is important to align the Zoning Code with the Comprehensive Plan. The last update to the Zoning Code was completed in 2006. Since that

time, the City adopted its Comprehensive Plan, and modern technologies have emerged such as wind energy, thus requiring an update to the Zoning Code. The update is also being done to clarify procedures and improve the structure and usability of the document. The update will make it more user friendly for staff, the public, and developers. The text amendment helps accomplish goals from the Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Simpson spoke on 3 specific goals: neighborhoods, downtown and sustainability.

Ms. Simpson stated that the preservation of neighborhood character is a goal from the Comprehensive Plan the zoning ordinance revision addresses. Ms. Simpson explained that the consultants analyzed single family residential districts, and based on the existing lots size for the R-1B, Medium Density Single Family Residence District they found approximately 1,358 lots with sizes that do not meet the minimum lot size requirement. She explained that the consultants are proposing revising lot dimensions to reflect what is on the ground for the single family districts. The lot size would decrease from 10,000 square feet to 7,000 square reducing by 97% the non-conforming lots. The consultants also looked at the R-1C, High Density Single Family Residence district and found that 5,400 square feet is the ideal lot size. This allows for the majority of the non-conforming lots to be brought into conformance, and preserve neighborhood character by maintaining a density of 8 homes per acre, which is supported by the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Simpson explained that the proposed draft preserves neighborhood character in another way by updating the general provision standards to clarify fencing and screening requirements, to establish clear prohibition of barb wire fences and dumpster screenings, and clarifying transitional yard requirements. The Comprehensive Plan states that better buffers and transitions should be put in place between the heavy industrial and manufacturing uses that are surrounding the Constitution Trail. The draft document proposes allowing some residential uses as conditional uses in the manufacturing district, such as multifamily homes. These are uses that could function as a transition between the manufacturing the single family homes. Ms. Simpson explained that this may be appropriate in some locations and not appropriate in others, and that can be managed with a conditional use permit.

Ms. Simpson explained the update makes progress towards downtown development, another goal in the Plan. The Comp Plan calls for a healthy downtown that has a diverse mix of uses. These include retail, housing, employment, office, entertainment, and continue to promote a walkable downtown. She stated that staff looked at how to preserve the character of the downtown business district, which has many strengths that should be maintained and encouraged such as mixed-use buildings, clear storefronts with big windows, continue to promote artist in the downtown, and look at setbacks to ensure new development is compatible with existing developments. The consultants proposed establishing a downtown central district. Ms. Simpson showed the Commissioners a map and boundaries that are proposed for this district and explained that the Downtown stakeholders vetted the boundaries. She stated the consultants recommended establishing downtown transition districts, which would support the core. The D-2, Downtown Transition District boundaries were established around empty lots and parking lots, which break up the walkability of the downtown core and central district. Ms. Simpson noted that some parts of the D-2 district are also identified as future D-1 District, an extension of the central downtown business district, if they were ever developed.

Ms. Simpson spoke about the alignment of the updated ordinance with the Comp Plan in regards to health and safety. The draft proposes more robust regulations for the screening and landscaping requirements with input from local landscapers as well as the City of Bloomington Forester. Ms. Simpson summarized a few updates to the regulations which include incorporating Illinois native species, adding storm water detention requirements, and incorporating impervious pavers as a possible detention strategy. Ms. Simpson explained encouraging local food production and sustainable practices are also two objectives in the Comprehensive Plan pertaining to health and safety. She stated that there have been many discussions with the Planning Commission and as a Community about what some of the regulations could look like. Ms. Simpson explained that regardless of the final adopted text, the objective is to adopt sound policy that encourages sustainable development and does not, as an unintended consequence, discourage sustainable practices. For example raising chickens in a way that does not harm neighbors encourages chicken raising as a sustainable practice. Good policy can promote good practices which can make people happy and they then support the good policy, the opposite can be said for bad policy, Ms. Simpson explained, which will make people want to change it.

Other revisions in the proposed draft ordinance include updating the regulations, procedures, and structure of the ordinance to make it more user friendly, and provide graphics that help illustrate those procedures as well. The graphics have not been added to the drafts published online. Ms. Simpson stated that there have been several outreach events, starting with presentations to the Planning Commission and followed by a meeting with developers seeking input on the usability of the ordinance. The Realtors' Association, Downtown Task Force, DBA, Cultural District Commission and Downtown Business Owners were all consulted during the process. Ms. Simpson presented a timeline showing multiple newspaper and radio publications. Ms. Simpson stated that staff is listening along with consultant, and have taken the feedback received and incorporated it into the drafts. The current draft, dated October 15, 2018, is different than the draft introduced to the Commission in July.

On October 10, 2018 the City of Bloomington had an open house with downtown business owners as well as with the general public. Staff received comments and feedback which have been provided to the Commissioners in spreadsheet format. Some updates include clarifying that residential units should be located on the second floor in the downtown core, allowing two family units in the downtown transition district, allowing live-work spaces on the second floor in the downtown core, and permitting groomers in the D1, D2, and D3 downtown district. Another revision involved changing the parking ratios for specialty food stores and grocery stores, a recommendation linked to looking at the definition of specialty food stores which are permitted in the downtown area. Ms. Simpson explained that given the feedback received during the public question and answer session staff and the consultants have removed the recommendation to consolidate the R-1H and R-4 districts. The district would remain as they have been established and no other changes to these districts are proposed. Lastly, a final change that came from the question and answer session involved clarifying the language and strictly prohibit roosters.

Ms. Simpson outlined the map amendment changes and explained that the map reflects four significant amendments. The first change includes eliminating the W-1, Warehouse District, and rezoning those properties to M-1 Manufacturing District. She stated that there are not many

properties zoned W-1, these properties are contiguous to manufacturing districts and the uses permitted in the W-1 District are compatible with the M-1 district. The second change involved establishing three Downtown Districts. Ms. Simpson stated that the B-3, Central Business District for downtown is approximately 26 blocks, which is too large to be able to promote the downtown as a continuous, walkable area. The proposed amendments reflect the creation of three new downtown districts, D-1, D-2, and D-3, to replace the B-3 district. The third amendment involves eliminating the C-3, Community/Regional Commercial district, and rezoning these properties to B-1, General Commercial District. The last major change reflected shows eliminating the C-2, Neighborhood Shopping District and rezoning those properties to B-2 Local Commercial District. Ms. Simpson reviewed the districts, their similarities and other aspects of each with maps, pictures and other illustrations. She stated that as new development occurs or redevelopment happens, the revised updated zoning districts would be applied. Ms. Simpson stated that a list of staff comments are included in the Planning Commission packet and she asked the Commission to support incorporation of those comments into the draft document. Ms. Simpson explained that the Zoning Board of Appeals also provided comments on the Administrative Procedure section (Division 17) and that staff supports the incorporation of these comments as well. Ms. Simpson provided staff's favorable recommendation for the map amendments with the exception of the R-1H properties and a few properties on the fringe of the downtown which currently have a GAP zoning.

Chairman Boyd thanked staff for collecting and incorporating feedback. Mr. Protzman asked what the border of the downtown would be. Ms. Simpson demonstrated the border with a map for the Commission. Mr. Mohr referred to a staff comment to delete a section in the draft zoning ordinance. He asked what the motivation was behind eliminating the right to appeal to City Council when there were less than 5 members present in the Zoning Board of Appeals section. Mr. Boyle stated the current code stated a petition rejected by 5 members or less can be appealed to City Council. He explained that the City Council asked staff to solicit feedback from the Zoning Board of Appeals on the draft ordinance. He summarized that the Zoning Board's role is as a quasi-judicial body. He stated that the ZBA is concerned that they are applying standards that City Council has given them to apply in administrative and quasi-judicial procedures, and then when they make a decision to deny an application, their decisions are appealed through a political process to City Council rather than an administrative or judicial process. The ZBA is requesting that their decision become final, since the decisions are undergoing a judicial review process.

Chairman Boyd asked if the appeal process would become more costly to the applicant. Mr. Boyle stated that filing a court case is generally more costly than appealing to City Council. Fees could be waived, but there is a process that petitioners would need to go through for that. Chairman Boyd asked if the consensus from the ZBA was that their decisions are made based on standards and facts, and appealing to City Council would be appealing to the political or emotional side of the issue. Mr. Boyle stated that is a fair statement, he stated that, legally, there are some communities that allow the ZBA be the final decision makers. Mr. Stanczak stated the decisions on variances could have been made because there were not enough members present to get a diverse analysis of the situation, and not having the right to appeal to City Council would force the petitioner to go to court, simply because there were not enough members present. Mr. Boyle stated there are many arguments and things to consider when making this decision. Mr.

Mohr stated he thinks City Council may have an opinion on this subject and he thinks it is important to highlight this and make them aware of the Zoning Board's concerns. Mr. Boyle stated the Commission could make a decision on this or no decision, and send it to City Council with a recommendation.

Mr. Mohr stated there was a comment about appointments to the Historic Preservation Commission and whether the same language would be applied to the ZBA and Planning Commission. Mr. Boyle stated that it will be added to all the commissions to avoid imbalance. Mr. Mohr proceeded to review the proposed staff comments. He stated another section was removed for Historic Preservation in regards to applications. Mr. Boyle explained that when an application is ruled on, there are three possible options: yes, no, or under process. Mr. Boyle explained the concerns are that the statement does not represent the application process and the possibilities to change the application decision in less than two years. Mr. Mohr stated that there is a bullet point being added that states that "destruction of property values", he asked if the word "destruction" is used in this type of situation. Mr. Boyle stated this words comes from the Illinois LaSalle standards for map amendments and is standard language. Mr. Suess asked what the procedure is for today. Chairman Boyd stated there will be discussion after the public hearing and then several things can happen, he suggests a clean version that staff can come back with in December. Mr. Boyle stated that staff would like to make the drafts public prior to the public hearing in December.

Chairman Boyd opened the public hearing. Chairman Boyd requested testimony. Chairman Boyd swore in Lina Wombacher 108 Lucerne Drive Bloomington, IL. Ms. Wombacher thanked the commission for their time. She stated she lives in the Waterford Estates, which has no restrictions for fences. She lives in a duplex and her rear yard faces county property. She described a chicken coup that she can see from her rear yard while she is sitting in her patio. The chicken coup is unkempt, and wrapped in a blue tarp in the winter. She stated that there are other yards that abut other rear yards and having standards that can protect the homeowners from an unsightly situation like hers is important. The families that move into Waterford Estates do so for the schools and other amenities, not to be farmers, she stated. She stated she has fruit trees, and asked that if bee hives are close, would they migrate to her trees and then go back to their hives. She shared concerns for her grandchildren. Ms. Wombacher stated that bee hives are not appropriate for residential uses.

Chairman Boyd swore in Jeff Henry, 1316 E Washington St. Mr. Henry stated he is a local bee keeper and said that states and local municipalities are encouraging bee keeping as a sustainable resource. The draft ordinance could be telling local beekeepers to move their bee hives, which can be detrimental to the bees, he said. Moving a hive two feet in any direction could be detrimental to the population of the hive. In beekeeping classes, he explained, they are encouraged to strategically place hives to protect them from wind, winter and water and to have the hives moved now could be detrimental to the hive. He is suggesting and requesting that the local beekeepers be grandfathered in and not have to move their hives because they have been strategically placed in their current locations. He does not want to send the wrong message when other cities and states are assisting others to fund beekeeping as a sustainable environmental friendly hobby. Mr. Suess asked how the bees could be kept in their own yard. Mr. Henry stated bees will fly for 3 miles in any direction. They will fly to available nectar

source, and return to the hive. Bees do not want to sting people because they will die. Mr. Mohr asked staff if there is any grandfathered process in place. Mr. Houseal stated an amortization process could be put in place for hives. If a process is adopted, Mr. Houseal explained that the hives would be considered noncompliant if they are not moved. Mr. Houseal stated it would be more difficult to inventory who has an established hive since the City does not currently track this information. Mr. Henry stated there are other mechanisms like Drift Watch which keep track of hives in the community. Hives are registered with the state, and the location is outlined. For environmental purposes, Drift Watch is in place to assist farmer or pest control know where hives are and alert owners to protect their bees before they spray pesticides. Mr. Houseal stated he understand there are other mechanisms in place, however the City does not track where hives are located. Ms. Headean asked if there have been complaints from neighbors about his bees, if so how did he address this. Mr. Henry stated that he spoke with some neighbors before getting a hive. The neighbors that he did speak with were all in favor and enjoy the honey they are able to get now.

Chairman Boyd swore in Anna Ziegler, McLean County Farm Bureau, 2242 West Gate Drive Bloomington, IL. Ms. Ziegler asked when the definitions in Division 16 would be completed. Mr. Boyd stated they were in this current draft. Ms. Ziegler asked for more time so that the public can review the definitions. She asked once the draft is approved, which body would make final adoption. Mr. Boyd stated City Council would make final decision, and final adoption.

Chairman Boyd closed the public hearing. He would entertain a motion to suspend the hearing until the next Planning Commission meeting on December 12, 2018 at 4PM. Mr. Protzman motioned to suspend the hearing and continue until a date certain, seconded by Mr. Stanczak. The motion was approved on roll call 9-0, with the following votes cast in favor on roll call: Mr. Protzman—yes; Mr. Stanczak—yes; Mr. Seuss; Ms. Headean—yes; Mr. Penn—yes; Mr. Muehleck—yes; Mr. Mohr—yes; Ms. McCann—yes; Chairman Boyd—yes.

Chairman Boyd opened the floor for discussion. Mr. Seuss asked how many hives people can have. Ms. Simpson stated the section about hives was 44.10-5. Mr. Houseal stated 2 hives for an acre is allowed, and an additional hive can be added for each additional half acre. These standards were considered after conversations with the Illinois Beehive Association and staff. Mr. Seuss asked how many beehives people normally have. The Commission had a discussion about beehives and the point that it becomes a business, while in a residential district, since the residence part of a residential area comes first. There is no set number but hives are an accessory use to a principle use. Further discussion on the challenges of grandfathering in hives or an amortization process, and time that will be given to existing hives to be moved to the right location. It was also established that a homeowner's association rules to not have hives will take precedent over the zoning code.

The Commission discussed making motions to include certain changes in the draft in order to give staff and the consultant guidance for the next draft.

Mr. Mohr started a discussion on beekeeping and chickens. Concerns about these uses locating in residential areas are still coming up. He suggests leaving the draft as is, and seeing how the final draft does at the next phase with Council. Chairman Boyd agreed and stated the draft on

bees and chickens has come a long way. Ms. Headean asked how much feedback staff has received on these issues between those who are pro-bees and pro-chickens and the concerned citizens. Mr. Houseal stated it is typical for interest groups to mobilize. Input was taken into consideration from local beekeepers and Illinois Beekeeping Association. Residents' concerns were also taken into consideration and therefore a balanced code was drafted that would be a compromise and balance for both sides. Written feedback was also provided in the packet for the Commissioners.

Discussion on Chickens continued. Mr. Mohr stated he had concerns about how the draft deals with chickens. Chickens are not typically found in neighborhoods like bees are, and there are concerns with predators and other issues that come with chickens. He suggests removing the chickens section, and beginning a more focused conversation on chickens and perhaps provide standards on chicken coups design. He is suggesting removing chickens entirely from the code and review further after the bulk of the draft is passed. The Commission discussed the chicken ordinance, removing it or creating a more restrictive ordinance. Discussion on what the Comprehensive Plan states, which does not explicitly list permitting chicken keeping but rather recommends addressing alternative food sources. Mr. Houseal stated there could be more robust standards that are added to chickens and making the use a special use, therefore petitioners would need a public hearing and Council approval prior to being allowed to have chickens. The neighbors would be notified prior to the public hearing, and they would have the opportunity to speak on the matter. Mr. Houseal mentioned there are communities with ordinance on chickens, however it is not an exact science. He recommends rolling out the chicken ordinance slowly and see how the community handles chickens. The Commissioners discussed adding this use as a special use to address all the concerns about chicken keeping. Mr. Protzman asked what parameters would be in place for the special use. Mr. Houseal stated the standards are already in the draft in regards to chickens. Mr. Protzman stated he would like to see tougher standards for those who would like to keep chickens, he does not have suggestions as the time. Mr. Houseal stated his team would look into more standards. Ms. Headean suggested having a special use for bees if the use for chickens would also be a special use. Bees could be more of a safety issue for neighborhoods. There was brief discussion on the impact that the special use permits would have on staff resources. Mr. Houseal explained that the process would be more time consuming and more costly for staff. Mr. Houseal stated bees exist and they are part of the ecosystem, chickens are a different aspect that would be introduced in residential areas as they do not normally exist in nature. The Commission discussed the standards that petitioners would need to meet in order to be considered for a chicken coup. Ms. Simpson stated the general special use standards would apply as well; the petitioner would have to show that the proposed use is not detrimental to the neighbors, to property values, and that the petition complies with the other standards mandated by the ordinance. Mr. Mahrt clarified the difference between an existing lawful special use and a nonconforming use, and stated that if Beekeeping was permitted as a special use, the existing beekeepers could be classified as a lawful special use.

Chairman Boyd entertained a motion on the discussion about chickens. Mr. Mohr motioned to change the use of chickens to a special use. Seconded by Mr. Muehleck. The motioned was approved on roll call 9-0, with the following votes cast in favor on roll call: Mr. Protzman—yes; Mr. Stanczak—yes; Mr. Seuss; Ms. Headean—yes; Mr. Penn—yes; Mr. Muehleck—yes; Mr. Mohr—yes; Ms. McCann—yes; Chairman Boyd—yes.

Ms. Headen motioned in section 44.10-11, that staff reduce the number of chickens in section A to 2 chickens. No one seconded the motion, the motion died, and no further action was taken.

Chairman Boyd discussed section 44.4.4C1 which has recommendations for 2 covered parking spaces per dwelling unit. Ms. Simpson stated staff was asked by Habitat for Humanity to consider revising this section, since they are concerned that would be considered costly for infill development of homes. Mr. Houseal stated many communities required closed parking spaces not just covered and that it can be done in many different ways. Chairman Boyd opened discussion on whether or not the Commission should be enforcing how many parking spaces are required. Mr. Protzman stated property size, and square footage should all be considered. This would also affect a car port or pad and garage size. The Commission discussed requiring two parking spaces and covered parking or not. Staff recommended keeping the off street parking standards.

Chairman Boyd motioned to remove the covered parking requirement portion but keep the minimum parking requirement from section 44.4.4C1. The motion was seconded by Mr. Protzman. The motion was approved on roll call 9-0, with the following votes cast in favor on roll call: Mr. Protzman—yes; Mr. Stanczak—yes; Mr, Seuss; Ms. Headean—yes; Mr. Penn—yes; Mr. Muehleck—yes; Mr. Mohr—yes; Ms. McCann—yes; Chairman Boyd—yes.

Chairman Boyd opened a discussion with Mr. Mohr on parking for single-family dwelling units. He stated that there is a requirement of 2 parking spaces, however there are many other options for travel now, which may reduce the number of needed parking spots for residential units, such as ridesharing. He suggests the trend is going down for the number of cars per dwelling unit, and he does not think that the Code should require developers to provide two parking spots.

Mr. Mohr motioned to retain the 1 space requirement for new single family dwelling units. Seconded by Mr. Stanczak. The motion was approved 9-0, with the following votes cast in favor on roll call: Mr. Protzman—yes; Mr. Stanczak—yes; Mr, Seuss; Ms. Headean—yes; Mr. Penn—yes; Mr. Muehleck—yes; Mr. Mohr—yes; Ms. McCann—yes; Chairman Boyd—yes.

Chairman Boyd along with Mr. Mohr opened a discussion on bicycle parking. The discussion was in regards to the code that reads that if more than 10 bicycle parking is added the parking should be covered. He stated the covered bicycle parking requirement could deter developers from including bicycle parking if there are requirements like enclosures. Mr. Mohr stated the definition of bike rack needed to be reviewed. Staff stated the definition was updated to include at least 2 bicycles. Mr. Mohr suggested that the definition could be clarified further to what it means and what a bicycle rack can hold. Mr. Houseal stated the racks have changed over the years, and they will clarify in the definitions further.

Mr. Mohr motioned to remove the covered bicycle parking requirements in Section C7. Seconded by Ms. McCann. The motion was approved 9-0 on roll call with the following votes cast in favor: Mr. Protzman—yes; Mr. Stanczak—yes; Mr, Seuss; Ms. Headean—yes; Mr. Penn—yes; Mr. Muehleck—yes; Mr. Mohr—yes; Ms. McCann—yes; Chairman Boyd—yes.



Mr. Mohr stated he received landscaping feedback from a local landscaper Mr. Bellas. He asked if the City Forester reviewed the landscaping requirements. Ms. Simpson stated that the City Forester reviewed the landscaping requirement as well as the feedback from Mr. Bellas. The feedback has been incorporated into the staff recommendations included in the packet and staff also responded to Mr. Bellas. Mr. Mohr added that the term “gravel mulch” was a term that Mr. Bellas was not familiar with, perhaps another term could be used. He also had concerns with the parking requirement table. He suggests that the section is improved and is clearer and gives more guidance. He stated the parking table could be revisited at a later date. He has some suggestions to tweak the parking requirements. Further discussion on the parking table to clean up and reduce the size of the table was suggested. He suggested removing the redundancy of the statement to allow the Community Development Director decide. Mr. Houseal stated he will go through the table and look for areas to clean it up. Mr. Mohr suggested that parking is based on square footage, he suggests fewer options for square footage or combining square footages such as rounding-up a 70 square foot requirement to 100 for simplicity. There was further discussion on cleaning up the table and the formulas that have been used to come up with the existing standards. Mr. Mohr stated there are also use specific parking standards such as bowling alleys, for consistency he suggested that those can be converted to a square footage requirement. He also suggests revisiting the per employee standards for parking. Mr. Houseal stated the ones that are in the code are specific because they are unique such as police stations. Mr. Mohr asked that staff and consultants take second review of those standards.

Mr. Boyle stated that some of the staff suggestions that have been made for Division 17 Section 16 had not been added to the October draft. He wanted to let the Commissioners know what the Legal Department had added as suggestions. There were no fines or penalties added. The ordinance now suggested there could be jail time, he stated in his time working with the City of Bloomington there have not been a jail time cases. Legal is suggesting removing that language. There are maximum fees but no minimum fees. Legal is suggestion some language for that section as well and that best practices are taken. In addition to the fines, there is injunctive relief available, they are not going directly to fines, and they hope to find the solution for the problem with the least amount of process. The goal is to give clear compliance times. Ms. Simpson stated the draft from 10-15 includes the legal fines section. Mr. Houseal stated they will be reviewing the sections as well to ensure that all staff comments are incorporated.

Mr. Boyd stated the public hearing will continue on December 12, with an updated draft that will be available in advanced. Mr. Houseal stated that he would get that draft to staff. The public hearing will be reopened to the public for questions or comments.

Mr. Houseal stated for case Z-25-18 the map is the physical changes that have been made in the code as defined and outlined by the presentation about the downtown and other districts that will be combined. The map amendment will be tabled as well so the public can continue to review and the changes that have been suggested will be made and updated the map.

Mr. Stanczak motioned to table case Z-25-18 to December 12 at 4PM. Seconded by Mr. Protzman. The motion was approved 9-0 on roll call with the following votes cast: Mr. Protzman—yes; Mr. Stanczak—yes; Mr. Seuss; Ms. Headean—yes; Mr. Penn—yes; Mr. Muehleck—yes; Mr. Mohr—yes; Ms. McCann—yes; Chairman Boyd—yes.

**OLD BUSINESS:** None

**NEW BUSINESS:** None

**ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting adjourned at 6:03 p.m. by unanimous voice vote; motioned by Ms. Headean. Seconded by Mr. Mohr.

Respectfully submitted,  
Izzy Rivera,  
Assistant City Planner