

**Plan and Architectural Review Commission Meeting
Monday, March 15, 2021
6:00 PM**

Minutes

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order by Meyer at 6:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Meyer, Crone, Stanek, Parker, Stone, Binnie, Miller, Alternates: Hicks, Brown.

ABSENT: None.

OTHERS: Clapper, City Attorney, McDonell

2. Review and Approval of Minutes

Plan Commission Draft Minutes – 2020-1012

Plan Commission Draft Minutes – 2020-1214

Plan Commission Draft Minutes – 2021-0111

Stone commented on the 2020-1214 minutes, item #4, Public Hearing for Conditional Use Permit for a change in Ownership for a restaurant located at 1170 W. Main. He stated two sentences down it talked about a conditional use permit for a Class C liquor license. He remembers it to be a Class B liquor license. Meyer asked McDonell if he could clarify liquor licenses. McDonell stated he will check the record. He asked the Plan Commission to give authority to his staff to change it to the correct class of alcohol license. McDonell stated there is a book on rules of liquor licenses and it will be better addressed on the next agenda item. However, McDonell said they would double check the application and the license. McDonell said this CUP isn't for a license but for serving alcohol by the glass. McDonell stated no motion is necessary and it will be handled by his staff.

Stanek made a motion to approve all three sets of minutes and seconded by Parker.

AYES: All via voice (8)

NAYES: None

3. Hearing of Citizen Comments

Clapper shared that a new Neighborhood Services Director will be starting on March 29, 2021. The individual has a lot of life experiences, which makes him qualified for the position; however, no traditional experience as serving as a planner or code enforcement professional. His name is Chris Bennett and he will be introduced in the very near future. He has been a member of the Rochester Village Board for the last 12 to 13 years.

4. Public Hearing

4a. Public Hearing for the Proposal of a Conditional Use Permit to Serve Alcoholic Beverages by the Glass at Grunzolio Pizzeria

Documents:

Grunzolio Conditional Use Permit Application

Meyer commented that there was an error on the item. It was supposed to read to serve beer

and wine by the glass and not alcohol beverages. McDonnell confirmed it is wine and beer and not liquor. McDonnell clarified the CUP is to serve alcohol by the glass and the Council will deal with the license. It is not a liquor license even though it may have been sent out in one of the notices to the neighbors. The CUP is to serve alcohol by the glass, but the license that has been applied for is a beer and a wine license.

The discussion was turned over to Jackie Mich from Vandewalle & Associates. Mich mentioned when the packet was scanned to the members, the middle page was not included in the packet. The property she talked about was a multi-tenant building in the B2 zoning district. It is located at the corner of Fremont and Main St. The applicant is Bart J. Kraus, who is proposing a dine in and carry out pizza restaurant in the building located at 108 S. Fremont St. The building is owned by Kraus and home to Bart J. Kraus Dentistry. The space that will be utilized by the restaurant is currently vacant. There would be a walk-up window on Fremont St. for take-out only. There are no changes proposed to the site plan. The applicant has acknowledged the operating hours would be somewhat limited and is only proposing Noon until 8:00 p.m., daily. They are proposing seating for 12 inside the building, with restrooms, and they are anticipating up to two employees, per shift. Mich did speak with the applicant regarding his intentions for the business. Mich would recommend conditional approval for the conditional use permit subject to the finding on the following page and subject to the following conditions. The conditions in her report are basically saying that we understand there are no modifications expected to be made to the site. If any changes are anticipated to the site, Kraus would have to come back to the City for approval. They are also asking the applicant to send a statement to the City clarifying they are not planning any changes to the site, which is what they discussed when they spoke on the phone. Mich then asked if there were any questions.

Stanek asked Mich where she was getting the operating hours. Mich said those were provided to her by the applicant. Stanek said they were not stated in their paperwork. Binnie stated he thought the hours of operation were in the application. Stanek commented that their website stated 2 p.m. to 7 p.m. McDonnell stated the applicant did indicate to someone at the City that his plan was 12 Noon to 8 p.m. McDonnell said that was of today, that was the indication.

Stanek asked if anyone was going to read the letter from Lowrich Rentals so that it is on the record. Clapper read the email from Lowrich Rentals, which is below.

From: Lowrich Rentals <lowrichrentals@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 25, 2021 10:30 AM
To: Brad MarquardKBMarquardt@whitewater-wi.gov>
Subject: Grunzolio Pizzeria

Hi Brad,

This is Jim Uhrich and I own 304, 310 and 314 West Main across the street from the dentist office/Grunzolio Pizzeria. I received the letter about the proposed alcohol beverage license. I feel the answer should be no.

The patrons would be students and I truly feel the chaos of the students drinking should be concentrated in the 100 and 200 blocks of the downtown area. My office is on the corner of Main and Fremont which was Mitch Simon's old office. I have security cameras that go from

Main Street all the way around to Fremont and to the back by North Street. I have drunk students on my porch at night, items like clothing and cell phones left on my porch, things stolen out of the yard and off the porch, people have tried to break in, I constantly have drunk students puking in my bushes in front of the building and urinating between the buildings, from Thursday to Sunday my yard has beer cans and white paper plates from the other pizza place next to Fanatico (when they were open). I've actually had students pull out full grown bushes in the front of the Alamo (310) and just throw them for no reason. They also threw rocks through the windows of the Alamo. My cameras have helped catch two drunk drivers that have come north on Fremont from the bars and taken out the stop lights and another one drove into the front yard. All of this in the last 2 years. I think approving a place that sells liquor in that location will be spreading it out too far. I can also see the front steps of Edward Jones being a place to stop and eat their pizza and leave their garbage there and along Main Street.

Thanks for accepting my opinion.

Jim

Meyer asked Clapper if there were any other letters or comments from the public. Clapper stated he did not receive any other information.

At this time, Meyer opened the meeting for any public comments and any other board discussions.

Binnie asked Mich to comment on what the Plan Commission members received from her that indicated at one point that this was going to be an outdoor, seasonal restaurant. Mich said there was a copy and paste error on the memo. It is an indoor restaurant with some indoor seating and a take-out window. They are not proposing any outdoor seating and they don't currently have a CUP to serve alcohol that's glass.

Binnie stated if the applicant was present that would be helpful to discuss with Kraus on whether he is willing to accept, as a condition, those hours being stipulated as 12 Noon to 8 p.m., or is there any possibility of wanting to expand them further, at any time. McDonell stated that Kraus informed the City staff today he was cooking tonight, so he could not be attending the meeting. Therefore, McDonell did not believe he was in attendance. Binnie asked if we could rely on the times stated as to the closing time of 8 p.m. McDonell stated it was an appropriate thing for the Board to rely on. If the gentleman wants to come in at a later date, for different times, he would be welcome to do that. Based on this record, McDonell said his answer would be, yes. Binnie doubts that this information went out with the public notice. Mich did not believe it did in the notice that was published. Binnie thinks that the nearby property owner may have had a different perspective if he had seen that the intention was to close at 8 p.m. The kinds of offenses he referred to are typically occurring after midnight and specifically happening at bar closing time. He doesn't envision a great deal of student imbibing at the establishment before 8 p.m.

Stanek commented that she was under the impression that the City has a set number of alcohol permits. McDonell said that is for liquor licenses and Class A, such as at Westsider and the sale of bottles of liquor, and that sort of thing. Those are limited as well as are the actual sale of bar licenses. There is no limitation of beer and wine licenses.

Stanek also commented that she has received a lot of complaints from people about the garbage, loudness, rudeness, and the general overall look of the City being dirty from residents. She thinks it is something Clapper and Council Members need to be aware of. She certainly appreciates how well Lowrich Rentals takes care of their properties. The City certainly has other owners who don't do that. We shouldn't under estimate what Lowrich is saying. She said we certainly need to pay attention to this because the residents are paying attention.

Miller commented if Lowrich knew that it was only beer and wine and the closing hour, he may have thought differently about it. Miller stated it was his understanding that the beer and wine consumption would be inside the building only and not as a take-out item. That would eliminate people picking up a pizza and walking down the street with a beer in hand.

Parker stated in the past they have had an additional condition put on that they review the permit in a year or two, if there are problems. Stanek also thought that at the time the establishment is closed that the area of the establishment is supposed to be cleaned up. Parker stated they did that with restaurants on the westside, in the past. Stanek thought on Whitewater St. as well since that was an issue. Parker stated yes, he believed so.

Stone stated in regards to the letter that was sent in. He appreciates the people taking the time to email. He thinks there are some pretty serious things that have happened in that block that he was not aware of. He does feel bad for the property owners that have had these problems. He thinks limiting the hours and drinking is inside only should help. Stone also commented with what Parker said with the review. Every time we see this they typically add that conditional use runs with the business owner/applicant and not with the land. Any change in ownership in the future would require the new owner to apply for a new CUP, as a condition of approval.

Crone agreed that it is not a good idea to serve liquor at the walk-up window. If you are getting pizza and a beer and know it might be closed, you are going to be sitting on a curb or sit at the library eating your pizza and drinking anything you may have gotten from the store. Because it's so close getting into the residential area, he doesn't think it's wise to have any kind of take-out liquor. He thinks if you buy it in the store, you should have to consume it in the store/restaurant.

Meyer stated that he agreed with Stone that it should just go with Kraus and not be transferred over. He also said that every time we get a business like this that has opened up, they have always granted everyone the same hours that everyone else operates. There is pizza joint just down the street, that is a block and one-half away, is operating under certain hours. He doesn't think it's fair that this applicant would have to come back in and re-apply for changing his hours. It should just be granted that he operates under the same hours that every other business is operating under. They are not letting people carry out. It should be just what it is.

Miller feels like the answer to this is for consumption inside the building only. If you pick up a pizza you are not going to be taking a bottle of beer out with you or a bottle of wine. It is for consumption in the building. It's not like going to the gas station and buying a six-pack and driving away.

Binnie had to say differently about the hours. In fact, there have been occasions where the

Board has asked an applicant if they would be willing to specify particular hours. Stanek stated they did this with Casual Joes. Binnie agreed with Stanek. Stanek said it was because they had residential homes around it. Meyer asked what the operation hours were at Casual Joes. Binnie stated not more than they requested. Stanek thought it was 9 p.m. or 10 p.m.

Miller stated the hours for a license are set by the State of Wisconsin. Since then they have gone what the State license has been. If they want to close earlier, that's up to them. However, if they want to stay open an extra hour one day, they can also do that as well. The State law stipulates the hours you can serve. Meyer also commented that a patron might come in at 8 p.m. and that Kraus would have the option of serving them or kicking them out. Meyer believes he should have that option to be able to do that if he so chooses.

At this time, Meyer asked again if there were any public comments. There were no public comments and Meyer closed the session to the public.

Crone stated students walk down Main St. with beers and are drunk from the bars walking back are causing problems. This would not necessarily stop that. He thinks the difference is if you have a warm piece of pizza, in your hand, and a beer you are not going to be walking, you are going to be loitering on that block. Its close enough downtown, but it is residential. Again, Miller stated they are not serving alcohol to go out on the streets. It is for consumption inside the building only. He stated if you are picking up a pizza, you are taking the pizza out with you and not the beer. Crone stated that is what he would like to stipulate. Crone asked Mich if this would allow people to walk up to the take-out window and carry out pizza and beer. Mich said it wasn't stated and she didn't specify it in the memo. She is hearing from the board to only allow pizza to be taken out at the take-out window. That could be a condition they add to the CUP. Meyer stated that is something that they could definitely say. However, he said they should be granted the same privileges that every other business owner has in the downtown area of the City.

Parker asked Mich about the conditions of approval. Is this for consumption of beer and wine inside the building only? Mich stated, yes. They cannot drink alcohol in the street. Parker did remember asking one of the bars on Main St. to go around after bar time and clean up the neighborhood a little bit, such as sidewalks. Parker thought they could do the same thing with this CUP, if there is a concern. He stated as far as the hours, etc., he agrees with Meyer and perhaps adding another hour or two. The board could also ask for a one-year review if there have been problems.

Stanek believes this was something of concern because some of the information was not in their packets, which always raises questions. This is also one of the CUPs that is going to be approved while they are in between a planner for the Neighborhood Services Office. In the past, while not having a person in that position, issues have been dropped. Stanek agrees with Meyer about this business having every right to sell pizza. She was concerned about the alcohol at the walk-up window because it wasn't stated. The letter addressed a whole bunch of other stuff of great concern to her and that's why she wanted it mentioned. She does not have any problems granting this CUP.

Meyer stated he is out and about in different cities at 3:30 a.m. – 5 a.m. These cities have their City crew out cleaning their streets in the downtown area. It is not up to the businesses. It's the

City that takes care of those issues. It is part of what they do and that's why they promote this. They are clean as a whistle. He feels it should not be on the business owners. It is something that needs to be addressed by the downtown area. We are trying to get business into the City and therefore, we need to set the same playing ground as everyone else has. He said we have had these issues for years.

Crone wanted one more clarification from Mich. The last thing she mentioned was that her recommendation was that they can't drink in the streets. He wanted to clarify that they can't purchase alcohol at the walk-up window. Mich stated she will reiterate what she heard from the Plan Commission state about what conditions should be added to the CUP. Language will be added stating that the CUP would be reviewed every year, to confirm that it is operating as expected, and if there were problems the City would be able to revoke the CUP, if needed. She heard someone say that they typically limit the CUPs to that owner and that it wouldn't run with the property. She also heard that the City have a requirement that the property owners clean up the site at the close of business, and wanted to stipulate that beer and wine cannot be consumed on the street and cannot be purchased from the take-out window. Only pizza can be purchased from the take-out window.

Binnie stated he would not agree to reviewing the CUP every year. If the board wants to be consistent, he doesn't feel the board has been requiring a review every year. He feels this CUP will be far less problematic than an actual tavern setting. For starters, he moves to approve the CUP with the planner's recommendations, which would include all of the recommendations except for an annual review. Mich also added these conditions are live stipulations and were not included in her report but would now be added. Binnie stated that would mean the planner's report conditions along with the Board's conditions and Mich agreed. Miller then seconded the motion.

Meyer asked McDonell if it's legal to drink alcohol or consume alcohol on the streets of Whitewater. McDonell stated, no it's not. You cannot be on public property, such as a public street or a sidewalk or it would be an open intoxicant's charge and it would be prosecuted. This would be different if a CUP allows for an outdoor seating area with the proper license. Outdoor on private property is okay as well.

McDonell wanted to make sure the Board knew what they were voting on. He did not hear any hours as part of the condition unless those are in Mich's report. There were no hours of operation limitation other than State law. He asked Binnie if he understood the motion correctly. Binnie stated he didn't hear much support for the hours as part of the condition so that's why he left it out. McDonell just wanted to make sure that was not part of it. Binnie stated if someone wanted to make an amendment he would consider whether or not to support it. He didn't think it was going to happen.

Stone said he supports the closing time of 8 p.m., since it is right in a residential area. He believes he may be in the minority for that idea.

McDonell stated to be clear there is a CUP that this Board is talking about tonight, and tomorrow night there is a meeting for an alcohol license granted by the City Council. Part of the City Council's grant will be a description of the premises, which also includes whether it is allowed outside or not. This Board can make part of their conditional use grant condition that it

be allowed or not allowed for service of alcohol outside. If they did not want any alcohol served to tables outside the premises, that should be indicated as part of the conditional use. This would totally be a separate matter in front of the Council whether they would allow it as well.

Binnie stated it's such a small property he can't envision the possibility of that being requested. Stanek commented that the outside dining would have to be on the sidewalk because there isn't any other space.

Meyer stated that Binnie was up for amending it and Meyer is not sure what the hours Casual Joes operates under. If this Board does anything, Meyer believes Kraus should be granted the same hours as Casual Joes without having to come in for a change. That was Meyer's opinion on that topic.

Crone stated he liked Meyer's idea, whether it's alcohol or not. He thinks staying open until 1 a.m. is the start of the activity shifting into more of that direction. Crone would like to see some kind of hours in it. Meyer stated that Casual Joes is surrounded by residential housing. They did okay the hours, so he would grant Kraus the same courtesy.

Binnie stated it would be an unusual condition when a different owner took over at Casual Joes and doesn't know if that was included in the CUP as he doesn't recall. Then again, the nature of the business changed considerably from the original. Stanek said Casual Joes' website said take-out ends at 8 p.m., but doesn't really know. Crone stated it also says they close at 9 p.m. Meyer stated if we let Kraus close at 9 p.m. and let the other two pizza places that are a block and one-half away keep operating, it is not fair. Stanek thought it's fair because they don't have residents right across the street from them. Meyer stated they have residents upstairs. Miller stated that about 90% of the housing around the pizza places are students. Most of the housing around Casual Joes is residential.

Stanek asked if they were making this more complicated than it needed to be. Meyer said it's not complicated. They have granted beer and wine for Pizza Hut and others on the west side. To pick Kraus out and say they are going to restrict him is not right. Meyer said they have to be consistent in their decision making. Meyer is fine with the other pizza joints that are selling beer and wine. If he wants to change his hours after six months because his pizzas are good, it's not fair to him that he would have to come in go through this process again to get a couple of extra hours. He should be allowed to be open the same amount time as everyone else, plain and simple!

Stanek thought Miller addressed the confusion about being able to carry out pizza and beer at the take-out window and Mich has already made that clear.

Crone said he agrees and disagrees with Meyer. He wants to be as consistent as they can. There is a difference in neighborhoods, even though it is only two blocks away from downtown. The people that live downtown know it's going to be loud. The people that live in that area maybe assume it's going to be loud, to a certain extent, but there is a difference. He thinks they can justify different treatment because it is a business decision to choose to open on Fremont St. rather than opening right downtown. He believes it does warrant different bar hours than downtown.

Meyer commented to Crone that this is not a bar. It is a family restaurant. It is going to be a completely different setup than everyone was thinking, that they were going to be serving alcohol and it was going to be a bar. Kraus wants to customers to be able to enjoy a beer or a glass of wine just like all of the other places in town. He just needs the same fair shake that all of the other pizza places have as well. There are five of them down the street that have the exact same thing, and he should be offered the same thing as well. It is not a bar, it's a restaurant. It is no different than going downtown at 7 a.m. and having a mimosa at a restaurant.

Mich added that she is under the impression that this use is probably going to be just fine, especially if they are closing at 8 p.m. She just wanted to note that part of the reason she assumes these serving alcohol uses are conditional use permits is because it is not unilaterally always the same in every location. The Plan Commission does want to reserve the right to say it depends and design different conditions based on the different operating plan of the business, the location, and the neighbors around the use. That is part of the reason why it is not permitted by right, as standard conditions for every restaurant. That is part of the reason they are talking about it today.

Miller stated the reason why the State of Wisconsin set a limit on the drinking outdoors was because years ago they had islands. One town had to close at a certain hour and another one could stay open an extra hour. It would stop people from traveling back and forth. The State set specific hours for people that served alcohol and they set the hours. Miller said that is what Meyer is trying to say. If you are letting one stay open and not the other, you are then creating an island and it's not fair to that person. That is why they actually created the State laws the way they did.

Binnie said they would not have even considered this being a concern if it wasn't for that one communication that they received and that person didn't have a full understanding of what the current plan is for this business. He is not convinced that area is so substantially different from the downtown that it requires special regulation. Binnie did call the question.

Meyer did agree with what Miller had to say. Meyer just wants the playing field even for all of the businesses they have trying to get into this City.

Stone asked if there was a motion. Stanek said Binnie made the motion and it was seconded by Miller.

Stone wanted to make sure they all knew what they were voting on. McDonell read the motion again. His understanding was the motion was to grant the CUP with Mich's recommended conditions and also the following conditions. The CUP is granted to the owner and not to the property, so it will not run with the property and it runs with the owner. There will be a requirement that the site will be cleaned up at the close of business, and alcohol cannot be purchased at the take-out window. Crone stated he thought not taking alcohol off the premises was added as well. McDonell said that was not stated. He wanted everyone to know that a Class B alcohol license, like this one, you could buy a six-pack of beer and carry it out, but it cannot be opened. He stated that wine is a little different. He believes the rule with wine is that you cannot really buy a bottle of wine, but if you partially drink one it could be sealed and taken with the individual and that is under the license. McDonell stated this CUP is wine that is

sold by the glass. Meyer asked about the motion and stated there was nothing said about the hours. He would then amend the motion to say that the hours of operation are to be consistent with the rest of the comparable businesses in the downtown area and Miller seconded the amended motion. McDonell said that Miller is 100% right. It is a State law that they cannot say the hours that alcohol is to be served, only the amount of time that the business is open can be regulated. McDonell's understanding of the motion is that there is no, other than what the State law provides, hours of operation regulation in the CUP. The State Statute will be the one that governs all of those businesses.

Meyer asked to go over the motion and the amended motion again. McDonell gave Mich the opportunity to review the motion again. Mich stated the motion was to approve the CUP with the Planner's conditions, plus the following additional conditions. The CUP be limited to the owners, so it doesn't run with the land, the site shall be cleaned up at the close of business, alcohol cannot be purchased from the walk-up window, and the amendment about limiting the hours of business to be consistent with comparable businesses in the area. McDonell stated that would not be in order. He thinks the hours should just be left off. It is basically regulated by State law when serving alcohol. Meyer agreed with McDonell. Meyer asked Binnie if he was still going to keep the motion with the amendment. Binnie stated that he believed the City Attorney has ruled the amendment to be out of order. McDonell stated the condition, as he understood it, wasn't so much as a condition as by operation of law that there would be a limitation on the sale of alcohol. He doesn't know if anyone intended to say that anything other than what the other businesses are governed at is what the alcohol law says. There are a number of other businesses and they are all governed by the alcohol law. He doesn't think it really needs to be a condition unless he was misunderstanding it. He doesn't think it was a condition, rather a statement. Binnie stated he would speak against the amendment. There is no need for it whatsoever. Silence indicates they are going with the State law. McDonell commented he believes that Meyer has agreed to take it out and that it was not one of the conditions. Crone asked if he was talking about the hours of operation. Meyer stated, yes. Meyer stated if we are going by State law, Kraus would be able to serve alcohol until 1 a.m., and McDonell added they could be open as long as they want.

Binnie stated he made a motion that already assumes what is being talked about and he called the question a long time ago. He believed an amendment is out of order after the question is called for technically. Meyer asked to go over the motion one more time so they know what they have. McDonell stated it his understanding there is a motion to approve the CUP. The conditions included the conditions stated by the Planner, the CUP would be granted to the owner and not run with the property, the site would be cleaned up at the close of business, and alcohol cannot be sold or purchased from the take-out window. McDonell asked Binnie if that was his motion and Binnie agreed and it was seconded by Meyer.

AYES: Meyer, Binnie, Miller, Parker, Stanek, Stone. NOES: Crone ABSENT: None

- 4b. **Subject: Conditional Use Permit for Changes to Signage at Burtness Chevrolet, Buick, GMC Documents:**

Burtness Conditional Use Permit Application

Mich stated this a CUP for business signs. The reason it is coming before the Plan Commission,

and why they need a CUP, is because they would like to have more than one wall sign. Under the new ordinance, only one wall sign is permitted per site. They currently have three wall signs and they would like to have a total of five. This is for Burtness Chevrolet on Main St. They have current wall signage that states Buick and GMC. They would like to take those down and replace them with a number of wall signs so they have one that says Burtness, Chevrolet, Buick and GMC. There is also a service sign that is expected to be maintained. The new sign ordinance regulates the signage total square footage based on the length of the building façade. The existing building façade length is 130 linear feet and they are permitted up to one square foot of signage for every linear foot of the building façade length. They are proposing, with all five signs, to be at 127.12 square foot of signage and therefore, meeting the requirement. They are not proposing any lighting for the signage. The only lighting would be ambient light from the lights of the parking lot or other lights onsite. Mich recommends the Plan and Architectural Review Commission grant conditional approval for the five wall signs. She also has no additional conditions to suggest.

At this time, Meyer opened to public and board comments.

Binnie stated he thought it was a reasonable proposal. His only question to Mich was about granting conditional approval. He stated it would only be conditional if they put any conditions on and Mich did not have any conditions. Mich stated, correct and thanked him for the clarification.

Stone commented that he appreciated the diagram in the packet, which indicated the existing picture of it and then below the new signs in place. It was very helpful.

Meyer proceeded to close the public comment session, at that time, and went back to the board for further discussion.

Parker asked Mich if this met the new ordinance now. Mich stated, yes that is correct.

Miller moved for approval and seconded by Stanek.

Binnie stated since the sign company was online originally, and if in fact they have been waiting all of this time, do they have any comments they would like to make. There were no comments at that time.

AYES: Stone, Stanek, Parker, Crone, Miller, Binnie, Meyer. NOES: None. ABSENT: None.

5. Information

Items: Documents:

February Violation
Fire Report February 2021

Mich did not have any additional information at that time.

6. Possible Future Agenda Items

Stone requested the new TIDs might be coming on the Plan Commission agenda for discussion and possible advisory comments to the City Council. It is a way to keep them informed. It's

another way to get public participation.

Meyer requested on next month's agenda they discuss bringing back these meetings from virtual to back downtown. They have been put to 75% through the businesses with the State and the kids are going back to school. He would like to have this added to the agenda for next month to see what everyone thinks. Stanek stated the Common Council, at their last meeting, voted to keep meetings virtual through June 30th. Meyer asked what the reasoning was at that time. Stanek stated to make sure everyone is vaccinated and it's safe to get back together, she was guessing. Meyer stated he would still like to put it on the agenda so it can be discussed.

7. Next Regular Plan Commission Meeting

April 12, 2021, at 6:00 pm

8. Adjournment

Parker moved to adjourn the meeting at 7:30 p.m. and seconded by Miller.

AYES: all via voice vote (8)

NAYES: None

Respectfully submitted:

Alison Stoll, Administrative Assistant
DPW