

**BIRMINGHAM CITY COMMISSION /
PLANNING BOARD JOINT WORKSHOP SESSION MINUTES
JUNE 19, 2017
DPS FACILITY, 851 SOUTH ETON
8:00 P.M.**

I. CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mayor Mark Nickita called the meeting to order at 8:00 PM.

II. ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Mayor Nickita
Mayor Pro Tem Harris
Commissioner Bordman
Commissioner Boutros
Commissioner DeWeese
Commissioner Hoff
Commissioner Sherman

Scott Clein, Planning Board Chairman
Stuart Jeffares, Member
Bert Koseck, Member
Janelle Whipple-Boyce, Member
J. Bryan Williams, Member

ABSENT: Robin Boyle, Member
Gillian Lazar, Member
Lisa Prasad, Member
Daniel Share, Member

ADMINISTRATION: City Manager Valentine, City Attorney Studt, Deputy Clerk Arft, Building Planning Director, Ecker, Director Johnson

III. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

Mayor Nickita explained that this is a workshop session to discuss and evaluate various planning issues, with the intent to create an Action List for the Planning Board. City Manager Valentine added that more discussion will be needed on each item by the City Commission. The priorities will be determined by the Commission at a future meeting.

A. RENOVATION OF COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES

Planning Director Ecker explained that there are three boards that review building improvements consisting of the Planning Board, the Design Review Board and the Historic District Commission. The Zoning Ordinance establishes the review process for new construction and renovation of existing buildings. However, the Zoning Ordinance is not clear as to the extent an existing building can be renovated before it is deemed new construction, and the ordinance is not clear as to what specific changes trigger site plan review. Site plan reviews go to the Planning Board. If the building is in the historic district, it will also go to the Historic District Commission. If it is a design change only to an existing building, it would go to the Design Review Board. This issue came up particularly with the Audi building because they had not changed the footprint, it went to the Design Review Board. The question is should there be

a clarification made to some of the ordinance language to determine how much of a renovation to an existing building is a renovation, or when it becomes new construction or a new building. She noted that this is not the first time for this issue.

She also suggested clarifying what exactly is a design change vs. a site plan change. In the past, a site plan change has been interpreted as a change in the footprint in the building or square footage, but it is unclear in the ordinance. Would the City like to see the review procedures amended for new construction and/or the renovation of existing buildings, both in terms of which boards review those actions and also whether there needs to be clarification on what constitutes renovation of an existing building, and where the line is drawn between that and new construction. Also, does the Commission wish to see a distinction or clear definition as to what constitutes a site plan change and what constitutes a design change.

Commissioner Sherman suggested it would be wise to have more of a review than what we have now.

Mr. Jeffares asked about dramatic changes in use. Ms. Ecker responded that would require an application for an occupancy permit and any building permits needed. The Building Department would route the plans to the other departments. The Planning Department would look at the use to confirm it is an approved use, and at parking to confirm it met the parking requirements. If there are no exterior changes to the building, it does not need to go to a board for planning review, according to the current ordinances.

Mr. Koseck asked if the Design Review Board look at things such as site issues, pedestrian flow, trash, pickup, access, etc. Ms. Ecker said the DRB focuses more heavily on the design and the signage than the site issues. They do discuss the site issues, but not as much detail as the Planning Board and have input.

Mayor Pro Tem Harris asked for specific examples when the ordinance did not require a site plan review and the project later was thought to have needed to have site plan review. Ms. Ecker said the Audi building was an example of one that had concern expressed as to whether it needed a site plan review as well, but no changes were made to the layout of the site, access, etc. The Wachler building and the McCann building were other examples. A site on Cole Street was required to also go for site plan review, because changes were proposed to the parking lot and dumpster.

Commissioner DeWeese said the difference between design review and site plan review is not understood, and thinks it would be useful to have those defined and explained. He said that is also true of renovation and new construction. He added that site plan review considers internals, layout of other buildings around to see the interconnections between them, while Design Review does not look at as much, and so at a certain scale, it becomes important for site plan review.

Mayor Nickita said this is most evident in downtown overlay where we have specific requirements. The Surnow building is an example where we need the expertise of the Planning Board and the review that deals with specifics for a project of that sort. Maybe during the process, a recognition of the extent is clear, and if it is very minor and not much change, then it can be overlooked because we do not want to create difficulties when they are not there. We do not always know in the beginning of a project how big it might become. He thinks the

Planning Board should have some type of review to be certain the project adheres to the City's guidelines.

Commissioner Bordman expressed concern about what happens when a project turns out to be more involved than originally thought. She is unsure that our ordinance could even address a situation like that without causing problems for the builder.

Ms. Boyce said it becomes more of a planning issue when an extensive renovation matched with a change in use occurs. She would like the Planning Board to have the opportunity to review it to make sure all of the issues are addressed.

Mayor Nickita said there seems to be solid support for reviewing this further and identifying a plan of action to address having a further review than we have done in the past. The intention is not to create another level of regulation, but we have to make sure we have the proper checks and balances.

Mr. Valentine said this issue will be added and brought back to the Commission.

B. COMMERCIAL PROJECTIONS ONTO PUBLIC PROPERTY/ ARCHITECTURAL ALLOWANCES

Ms. Ecker explained that Chapter 98 implies that awnings, balconies, marquees, and canopies are permitted to project over the public right-of-way, but does not clearly state that they are permitted. They are to comply with Chapter 22, which are the Building Code regulations. The question has that arisen is should it be clarified in the Zoning Ordinance which, if any projections are permitted, and to address the height, projection or permitted materials for architectural features projecting into the public right of way.

Mayor Nickita added that the property line is the building face, so anything that projects beyond the building face is technically over City property. When the projections are a bit atypical or if they take on other forms, it becomes more difficult. Ms. Ecker said while we have a review process, we do not have a hard and fast regulation as to how far it can project.

In response to Commissioner Hoff, Ms. Ecker said we could potentially determine a size of how many inches a projection could protrude into the right of way, and if the location on the building would impact how far it could protrude.

Commissioner DeWeese said some of these projections are pleasing to the eye and are pedestrian-friendly, so the key may not be to define exactly how much, but maybe a minimum which would trigger a review standard.

Mr. Koseck said it is worth more study and investigation and development of some criteria or measurement.

Mayor Nickita said this issue is worthy of another layer of review to incorporate clear guidelines.

C. RAIL DISTRICT BOUNDARY REVIEW

Ms. Ecker explained that recently the Rail District boundaries were created and defined by the City Commission. The question has come up whether some other properties on the west side of S. Eton and/or the North Eton Plaza on N. Eton should be added to the district. The district

allows Bistro establishments to be operated on any of the properties with a Special Land Use Permit.

Commissioner Hoff noted that both of the properties mentioned are transitional zones, and are close to residential. She suggested that they could be classified in a transitional zone.

Mr. Koseck noted that the Rail District is not a zoning district, and a transitional zone is a zoning classification. Ms. Ecker agreed, and compared it to an overlay district. The Rail District is a map that is incorporated into the Zoning Ordinance that delineates where the Rail District is. She added that all of the properties in the district do not share the same zoning.

Ms. Boyce commented that this issue does not seem to be a priority.

In response to Mayor Nickita's question, Ms. Ecker said she has not seen any requests or interest from the areas for inclusion in the district. Mayor Nickita added that all commercial or non-residential in the area is in the rail district, except for the two areas.

Mayor Pro Tem Harris asked if there have been any inquiries from the properties to apply for a Bistro license. Ms. Ecker said there have been none.

Commissioner Bordman suggested that the properties could be zoned transitional within the Rail District since there are various zoning classifications within the district. The parcel north of Maple is on Eton, and is in the same position relative to residential that the rest of the Rail District as outlined is in relation to residential. She does not like to see the parcels in question have no identity.

Mr. Williams noted that the Whole Foods area was made part of the Rail District at a later time, which enabled Whole Foods to apply for a Bistro license.

Commissioner Sherman suggested this is a low priority to move forward. It is something that could move forward at a later date if we see there is going to be some type of marketing program or a possibility of developing the properties to conform with the properties in the area.

Mayor Nickita said it is unusual that the two properties are not included, but the consensus is that it can be considered at a lower level. It is something to consider in the future.

D. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT LICENSE BOUNDARY REVIEW

Ms. Ecker explained that this issue came up over the past year. The Economic Development License boundary includes mostly properties along the Woodward corridor that the Commission at the time felt were the properties that needed a push forward in order to see some redevelopment occur. The area also now includes Maple Road just to the east of Woodward. The Stand and Triple Nickel have been developed as a result of the district. We have had interest from others who do not fall in the district at this point. She asked if there is interest in changing the boundaries for this district or not. Ms. Ecker added the benefit of being included in the district is the ability to transfer a liquor license from another municipality.

Mr. Jeffares is in favor of looking at this.

Commissioner Hoff said the Economic Development license does not have as many restrictions as the Bistro license, and because of that, she is not in favor of expanding the Economic

Development license boundary. By expanding the area, it would bring it closer to residential, areas she feels would be better suited for a Bistro license.

Commissioner DeWeese feels we need more control of it. Currently, we are seeing Bistros getting out of hand. He agrees with Commissioner Hoff, and suggested there maybe is an intermediate step.

Commissioner Sherman said the City does have control, as a Special Land Use Permit is required. This may be another tool to encourage something that would not otherwise be done.

Commissioner DeWeese clarified that his concern is about size, scale, and appropriateness.

Mayor Pro Tem Harris asked how challenging is it for a business to obtain a liquor license if it is not in an area for a Bistro license or economic development license. Ms. Ecker does not have the specifics on that, but the owner would have to obtain an existing quota license, which are rarely for sale, and are expensive.

City Manager Valentine clarified that the investment triggers the ability to obtain the license, then the applicant must purchase the license.

Commissioner Boutros said he thinks it is worth consideration.

Mayor Nickita suggested that a revision is in need of further review to see if it has merit. There are areas in the Triangle District that could use some incentive for development.

E. BISTRO ALLOWANCES AND RESTRICTIONS

Ms. Ecker said there has been concern expressed over the size of Bistros recently. She explained that a Bistro is defined as a restaurant with 65 seats or less, with no more than 10 of them at a bar, with a full service kitchen, low key entertainment, tables that must line the storefront, and outdoor dining. The biggest issue has been how much is too much outdoor dining. The intent when Bistros was started was to encourage outdoor dining, but it was not apparent at the time how far owners would look for creative opportunities to expand the outdoor dining. She suggested clarifications as to maximums, location, enclosures and the building code issues such as energy code, fire suppression might be needed. Parking needs are also a big concern.

Mayor Nickita added that the original concept for Bistros was just in the downtown area and that has changed. Once the area expanded to the Triangle area and Rail District, it changed the circumstance because of parking and available outdoor space.

Commissioner Bordman suggested considering different rules for different areas. The needs are different. Perhaps part of the study should be whether to have the exact same requirements in each of our districts.

Commissioner DeWeese suggested we need an intermediate level that applies in different situations. He considers this a high priority issue.

Mr. Koseck suggested that we should study the materials used and also the intent.

Commissioner Hoff agreed it is time to review the Bistro ordinance. It has developed differently than what was planned.

Mayor Nickita commented that it is time to review the ordinance.

F. RENTAL PROPERTY CONSIDERATIONS

Building Official Bruce Johnson explained short-term basis rentals. The City does have a rental ordinance for dwellings. The ordinance does not differentiate as to length of rental period. The department has become aware of a handful of homes that are being offered on the internet as vacation homes. There could be a potential issue such as number of different people coming and going in the neighborhood. There are a couple of homes that have not registered as rentals, and his department has communicated the City's requirement. There is a proposed Senate bill that would prohibit local government from regulating these homes. The City could not place any further restrictions on a short-term rental as it would on any other single family home in the district. The City could not prohibit short-term rentals of homes. The ordinance works well for typical rented dwelling units, but the short-term rentals may create unique complaints or concerns from either noise, people coming and going, and we may want to review the City Code to consider any legal restrictions needed.

Mr. Jeffares confirmed with Mr. Johnson that room rentals fall under our current ordinance.

In response to Commissioner Boutros' question, Mr. Johnson said he does not believe a homeowner knowingly tries to skirt the ordinance, and that it is a question of being unaware of the existence of our ordinance.

Mayor Pro Tem Harris commented that this seems to be a new trend, and thinks it would be worthy of some study to get ahead of some issues that might surface.

Commissioner Hoff asked if we would have any control over these type of rentals in light of the proposed Senate bill if passed. Mr. Johnson responded that if it passes, the City would have no control over those rentals.

Commissioner DeWeese is in favor of looking at this when Mr. Johnson has the time to devote to investigation and research.

Mayor Nickita agreed.

G. RETAIL DEFINITION REVISION

Ms. Ecker explained that the issue is the type of uses permitted on the first floor of the Redline Retail District. These are the streets designated on the zoning map with red lines. Primarily the streets are Old Woodward, Maple, Hamilton, sections of Pierce, Willits. In that area, the current ordinance calls for a retail use in the first 20 feet of depth, which comes from the 2016 plan. The plan recommended that retail be in the first floor for the first 20 feet of depth, and it had a definition for retail. The exact language was taken from the 2016 plan and adopted into our ordinance.

What we have to look at now is, was there enough clarity in the type of definition for retail and the associated definitions. Currently, retail is defined in the ordinance but it includes commercial. Commercial is then defined in the ordinance, and it includes personal services. Personal services is not defined. We did not vary from the 2016 plan because the author of the

plan did not recommend we define it so we did not, but things change and over time, we have different uses that have come up that have tried to get into the downtown. They want to be in the downtown and they fall under this definition of personal services because we have not defined it, and they have been able to get in on the first floor spaces. The Commission has directed the Planning Board to come up with the temporary relief mechanism to change the wording of the overlay district, and to add a definition for personal services and to look at specifically taking the quasi-office type use out of being a permitted use in the Redline Retail District downtown. The Board set a public hearing for July 12th to consider the temporary relief measures that the Commission sent to them. The Board has been studying the issue of retail and the use downtown that the Commission sent to them last year; specifically, how do we define it and how has it changed. That was the bigger picture, comprehensive issue. Specifically with regards to the Redline Retail and having a temporary relief valve, that is what they set the public hearing for on July 12th.

In this case, is there interest by the Commission to direct the Board to conduct a study session to review the intent of the Redline Retail District as proposed in the 2016 Plan and evaluate whether the current application of personal services is consistent with what the intent was in the 2016 plan.

The interpretation has been that a personal service is any type of service that a person can walk in and ask and pay for that service and get that service. The business has to be open to the public so a person off the street has to be able to walk in. It is that gray. A firm selling a marketing service or website designs is a quasi-office use. Maybe these types of uses were not envisioned at the time the 2016 plan was written. We are not sure what the intent of the 2016 plan was with regards to those. Businesses have been able to get in under the definition of personal services because they are open to the public and people walk in and buy their services. The argument is that they are offering personal services. Without a definition, it is difficult to clarify and draw the line as to what constitutes personal services and what doesn't.

So the definition of personal services that is up for consideration right now was arrived at by looking at other jurisdictions and what they defined as personal services. The most common use was that personal services dealt with the care of a person or their clothing, such as tailors, salons, facials, tanning places, shoe repair, anything dealing with the person or their clothing. If that definition was adopted that would very clearly specify that only those types of personal services would fall under commercial and therefore, the quasi-office type uses that we are seeing that are almost more business-related services would not fall under permitted uses in the Redline Retail district. So it is clarifying what would be permitted, and do we want to look at the intent of the 2016 plan and some of these uses that may or may not have even been conceived of at that time.

Mayor Nickita said there are two questions. The bigger question is concerning the state of potential uses that may be available now that were not available years ago. The other question is a question that came from the Building Official which is a matter of logistics on how Mr. Johnson does his job. When he gets a set of plans, he has to determine if it is allowed under our ordinance or not allowed under our ordinance. Ordinances become gray sometimes and projects look for clear identification. We had this issue with the dormer issue being unclear. There were a number of questions whether or not they fit within our ordinance. Mr. Johnson asked for clarity in the ordinance because it was unclear for him to do his work. The Board and Commission quickly took a look at it, and we found a solution to clear up a gray area that was there. The garage house issue was the same. They were done because there was a loophole

in the ordinance that created difficulty for the building staff to clarify. Over time, people interpret the ordinances differently or the interpretation gets grayer. The personal use term is too gray to identify for clarity from a legal perspective for approval. It seems like there is a misunderstanding as to what is being asked of the Planning Board. This is a clarification; we are not changing the ordinance.

The larger question brought up is the Redline Retail area accommodating uses of the day, or should it be reviewed. That is a separate issue and can be done at a different time. The issue at hand is can we help the Building Department do its job.

Commissioner Bordman understands that the problem is that we do not have a definition for an essential aspect of the Zoning Ordinance. As to the effect it might have on the Redline district or the other aspects of the Redline district, we should study it, but it can be done over time. Perhaps we make it a top priority over time. But we have an immediate issue that must be examined. Birmingham is a dynamic City and we get proposals all the time, and if our Building Official cannot address those issues right now while they are coming in, that is a problem. This creates a situation for the employees to be put in an awkward position to make a decision. She agreed that both issues should be addressed quickly. They are connected issues, but they are separate.

Mr. Williams said the distinction was not made at the time this came to the Board. One of the issues the Board is grappling with is adopting a proposed solution without a permanent or expiration date. Temporary measures tend to be permanent if they are not replaced. If we are going to have a solution here that is appropriate, we have to put a time frame on it, which would force us to prioritize it. He is quite confident that the landlords are furious because they do not understand the distinction being made tonight, nor did he.

Commissioner Sherman said it is clear that the Board received direction that was unclear, and that is what we are trying to do now. He said the idea of having a study session of what the intention was of the personal service uses under the 2016 plan is a very good next step, even before the Public Hearing. He suggested moving the July 12th Public Hearing to a date certain, have a study session to narrow the definition down a little bit, and then have the Public Hearing. When the Commission prioritizes these items, it is the Commission's job to give the Board priorities with expectations and timelines. He agreed that something should not be temporary and then allowed to become permanent.

Commissioner Hoff favors creating a personal service definition. She agrees we need a definition of personal service and then we will decide what to do with it, but we are not at the point of asking the Board to amend anything.

Commissioner DeWeese was concerned about community service also. In terms of community service, there are certain governmental units that are independent of the City that can come in regardless of our ordinances, and he didn't want it exclusionary. We need clear definition and clear intent of what our Master Plan has been trying to achieve and what works for walkable communities.

Mr. Klein said he has just heard two opinions that we kind of slow the bus, and do not have any real conversation on actual changes to the ordinance, but simply provide definitions. What he heard originally was that the Commission wanted the Board to make changes to the ordinance. He thinks that is where the confusion came, because the Board was in the middle of its study of

retail. He thought he was all clear. He would like clarity on what the Commission's goal is here.

Mayor Nickita said the idea was to make sure the Board has the ability to study this personal service determination and be able to clarify that and put off the Public Hearing until the Board is able to do that.

Commissioner Sherman said the motion was passed 4-2 to have the Public Hearing and make changes, and to define the term. There was some discussion as to what the term actually meant. The comments heard from Commissioners Hoff and DeWeese were minority opinion. The majority opinion was what you understood and articulated.

Commissioner Boutros said the message sent to the Board was different from what the intention was.

Commissioner Bordman expressed concern about the postponement in that it will be mistaken to mean take all the time needed, rather than getting this done as quickly as possible. There needs to be some direction on this idea of postpone and study.

Mayor Nickita thinks the intention driving this to begin with was Building Department staff needing help and that it is needed it sooner than later.

Commissioner Hoff commented that we should move forward on definition before July 24th. She thinks that it is still reasonable.

Mayor Pro Tem Harris said the majority position was for definition of personal use only and not a definition of community use.

Commissioner Sherman said his original comment was to postpone the Board's July 12th Public Hearing to shortly thereafter to give time for a study session.

Mr. Williams clarified that it has been suggested that Board open the July 12th Public Hearing, postpone it to a date certain, then begin study session of the personal service definition.

Mayor Nickita said this is not to be a broad review of the downtown, but recognize that ordinances become unclear and situations change. The idea is to take the Redline Retail district as a next step with current day market conditions and identifying where it could be strengthened with the intention of making it a pedestrian, walkable place is a valid thing to do, but it is not to be done when we look at personal service.

Ms. Ecker said she understands that they are to postpone the Public Hearing, focus on the personal services definition only. She asked to confirm the Commission does not wish the amendment to Article 3, Section 3.04(C)(6) right now.

Commissioner Sherman said that the ordinance amendment is still going to be the discussion at the Public Hearing, but in order to get to that point, the Board has to first study the personal services definition to incorporate it into the amended ordinance. That is what the Public Hearing is about. Ms. Ecker noted the Public Hearing was noticed for the amendment of Article 3, Section 3.04 and the personal services definition. She asked if the Commission wants the Planning Board to come up with a personal services definition and send that to the Commission

first. She noted that the motion as passed directs the Board to consider the definition of personal services and Article 3.04 to exclude personal services from the Redline Retail District. She asked if the Commission still wants both of those together. Commissioner Sherman confirmed, and believes that is what was discussed. Then it will come to the Commission for a Public Hearing.

City Manager Valentine said if the Board provides the definition, the ordinance has to be amended. It has already been noticed that way. The process is being separated somewhat to add the additional review of the 2016 plan on what the intent is, and then discuss the definition.

Ms. Ecker clarified that the Commission wants the Board to postpone the Public Hearing to a later date, and focus on the definition of personal services only. Then hold the Public Hearing for the ordinance amendments and the definition. Commissioner Sherman explained that it is one ordinance. Mr. Valentine said the resolution that was passed included the definition, so it is all one action by resolution of the Commission.

Commissioner Hoff stated she did not think the Board was going to amend the Downtown Birmingham Overlay standards to exclude community and personal services when we do not know what the personal service definition is. Mr. Valentine clarified that the resolution that passed had a subsequent amendment added which stipulated that the definition of personal services be included when it comes back the Commission.

Commissioner Sherman said the Commission recognized that it made no sense to amend it without a definition of personal service. The Commission is asking the Board to come back with a definition of personal services and the change incorporated into the ordinance as a recommendation.

Commissioner Hoff clarified the May 8, 2017 resolution adopted by the City Commission specifically stated* to exclude community and personal service uses. ~~It is very specific to exclude them.*~~ Commissioner Sherman clarified that the Board has to define it. We need a definition to know what those are.

Commissioner Boutros asked what would happen if the Board does not have a definition in time for the July 24th Public Hearing. Commissioner Sherman noted the Commission does not have a hearing on July 24th, and that the Commission asked that the Board report back to the Commission that date.

Mr. Valentine said he will follow up with the Board with written communication outlining what was discussed tonight, so there are no questions going forward.

Mr. Williams requested that Mr. Valentine address if the Board is to include or exclude personal services.

H. SHARED PARKING CONSIDERATION;

Ms. Ecker explained that the discussion tonight will center on shared parking and parking standards for private developments. Both were previous directions from the Commission last June and also when the Ad Hoc Rail District Committee recommendations were reported. It included a recommendation to encourage shared parking.

The Planning Board conducted a study of shared parking. The ordinance currently includes a provision for shared parking. The Planning Board has encouraged applicants to consider shared parking over the years, and it has not been something that most have been willing to do.

The recommendations from the Planning Board are:

- Parking calculations that would not require an applicant to hire a parking consultant. A standardized table has been included which takes into consideration all of the variables of the use, and provides a chart with parking requirements.
- Not include a requirement to record on title. When changes occur in use of a property, the Building Department forwards the plans to the Planning Department which will look at the use and the parking requirement.
- Offer zoning incentives, such as extra square footage, reduced landscape requirements, etc., in exchange for recording on title.

The Board discovered that no community mandates shared parking, but many were examples where incentives were offered and the process was streamlined.

The Board has refined the draft ordinance language and instead of setting a Public Hearing, it was decided to add it to the discussion tonight to get the Commission's input.

Commissioner Bordman would like to know how successful the communities have been with the parking calculations, and what kind of problems they encountered.

Commissioner DeWeese said it is useful for future consideration, but not a priority at this time. To the extent possible, he suggested we should make it easier for applicants to develop the properties.

Commissioner Hoff asked if shared parking agreements would be required for approval. Ms. Ecker said the proposed amendments would not require that. The property owner would have an obligation to the City to notify of a change in use and the parking reduction would be null and void if the notification was not made. In the case of a sale of a property, Ms. Ecker said if the use did not change, it would not be an issue. If the use did change, a notification would be required. Commissioner Hoff expressed concern when both parties no longer agree to the shared parking agreement. Ms. Ecker noted her concern.

Ms. Boyce noted she was on the Ad Hoc committee and recalls that the committee talked through some of these concerns. Her impression is that this could be accomplished fairly easily, and would like to be able to do it.

Mayor Nickita agreed and said it is quite important where we want to encourage development more. Parking is a concern, so as much as we can use shared parking, the better.

Ms. Ecker explained that the issue has been raised to alleviate parking concerns. The Board has been studying this issue over the last several months, and the question is now, does the Commission wish to see an expedited review by the Board of the parking requirements for private developments.

Commissioner Bordman said it sounds like the Planning Board has a heavy schedule now. While it is a worthwhile area of study, but she does not know about expediting it. She feels the Board has more urgent needs at this time.

Mr. Clein agreed with Commissioner Bordman and said that a review of parking is a large endeavor.

The consensus agreed that this is too large a topic to undertake at this time. It also is part of the upcoming Master Plan.

I. PLANNING BOARD ACTION LIST REVIEW

Ms. Ecker discussed the Action List and the items completed and still in progress.

Commissioner Hoff would like to see the Bistro ordinance review included.

Mr. Valentine said the Action List will be brought back as an action item so the Commissioners can determine the priorities and adopt it.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Paul Ceckorian, Fairfax resident commented on the definition of personal use.

Mr. Richard Share, building owner on W. Maple, commented on restrictions.

Mr. Bedros Avedian, building owner on W. Maple, commented on retail changes.

Mr. Brian Najor, commented on personal use definition.

Mr. Matt Furlow, commented on retail challenges.

Mr. James Eshaki, commented on personal services and the ordinance process.

Mayor Nickita explained the process.

V. ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 PM.

Cheryl Arft
Deputy Clerk

*As amended on July 24, 2017.