

MINUTES
January 15, 2013
Community Development Committee
City of Batavia

Please **NOTE:** These minutes are not a word-for-word transcription of the statements made at the meeting, nor intended to be a comprehensive review of all discussions. They are intended to make an official record of the actions taken by the Committee/City Council, and to include some description of discussion points as understood by the minute-taker. They may not reference some of the individual attendee's comments, nor the complete comments if referenced.

Chair Brown called the meeting to order at 7:30 pm.

1. Roll Call

Members Present: Chair Brown; Aldermen Sparks, Chanzit, Clark, Atac and Stark

Members Absent: Vice-Chair Wolff

Also Present: Mayor Schielke; Ald. Volk, O'Brien, Tenuta, and Dietz (via Conference Phone); Joel Strassman, Planning and Zoning Officer; Jeff Albertson, Building Commissioner; Scott Buening, Community Development Director; Bill McGrath, City Administrator; Gary Holm, Director of Public Works; Noel Basquin, City Engineer; Drew Rackow, Planner; Jason Bajor, Assistant City Administrator; and Jennifer Austin-Smith, Recording Secretary

2. Approve Minutes for November 13, December 11, 2012 and CDC/City Services Joint Meeting Minutes for December 15, 2012

Motion: To approve the minutes for November 13, December 11, 2012 and CDC/City Services Joint Meeting Minutes for December 15, 2012

Maker: Stark

Second: Clark

Voice Vote: 6 Ayes, 0 Nays, 1 Absent
Motion carried.

3. Items Removed/Added/Changed

Discussion on Ordinance 13-06 was moved to number 4 on the agenda. There was no objection to this move by the Committee.

4. Ordinance 13-06: Variance for a Covered Front Porch Setback, 610 Ritter Drive (Joel Strassman 1/11/13)

Strassman reported that Dan and Stephanie Lambert, owners of the house under construction at 610 Ritter Drive are seeking approval for a variance from Section 4.101.K in the Zoning Code. This is the section that allows covered porches on single family residences to project up to six (6) feet into the required front building setback area. The variance seeks to allow use of the foundation that projects up to nine (9) feet into the 30 foot front building setback area for the covered front porch.

During the design phase of the residence, the Lambert's architect met with City staff and reviewed the porch projection allowance. The Lamberts state that due to a misunderstanding, the residence was designed with a porch that projects eight (8) feet into the front setback area. The building permit application included conflicting information on the configuration of the foundation for the residence and porch. The building permit was issued based on the surveyor-prepared foundation plan that did not include the porch foundation and its non-compliant setback. City staff erred in not requiring the surveyor to prepare a replacement foundation plan to show the porch and its setback. The Lambert's state that due to another misunderstanding, the foundation contractor poured the porch foundation beyond what the approved plans showed. The porch foundation now projects up to nine (9) feet, resulting in their applying for the three (3) foot porch setback variance.

On January 9, 2013 the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) held the public hearing for the requested variance. Attorney Mark Valley, representing the Lamberts, urged the ZBA to view the request openly, and not to limit their consideration to the findings in the Zoning Code. Mr. Valley stated that those findings are from State law and may not be relevant to the Lambert's situation. Mr. Valley also opined that there would be no real impact to the neighborhood with a porch closer to the property line since the porch would be setback from the street by not only the proposed 21 foot setback, but by the sidewalk and parkway too.

Mr. and Mrs. Lambert addressed the ZBA citing the care they had taken in designing a quality residence to fit into a neighborhood of uniquely designed residences. The residence's architectural style, including the front porch details, was their own design. Mr. Lambert showed drawings of how the design of the porch roof support columns would be compromised as needed to support a larger roof overhang if the foundation needs to be moved back. In addition to the steep financial impact a change to the foundation would create, Mr. Lambert explained that the porch roof trusses had been manufactured and would need to be changed if the foundation is to change, resulting in another substantial cost.

Two (2) neighboring residents spoke in favor of the Lambert's proposal noting that there would be no impacts to area. Three (3) letters from neighbors supporting the proposal were entered into the record.

The ZBA acknowledged its responsibility to review the variance in light of the findings for approval for a variance specified in the Zoning Code and commitment to adhere to them. The ZBA complimented the Lamberts on the design of the residence. The ZBA added that even if it would like the residence to be built using the existing foundation, being limited to the Zoning Code's findings will make it difficult to approve all the findings in the affirmative.

The ZBA's findings are listed in draft Ordinance 13-06. Specifically, the Board found in the affirmative for 2 of the 5 findings. Not being able to find in the affirmative for all of the findings, ZBA action effectively recommended the Community Development Committee (CDC) not recommend approval of the variance. The ZBA wanted the record to reflect its feeling that since the CDC may consider factors beyond those specified in the findings, it hopes the CDC recommends approval, and the City Council approves the variance.

Staff agrees with the ZBA's conclusion that with other factors being considered, the CDC can reasonably consider recommending approval of the variance. The CDC can take into consideration the fact that staff erred by issuing the permit. Additionally, both staff and the ZBA are sensitive to the financial impact removing and replacing the non-compliant portion of the foundation would cause. For these reasons, and the fact that there would be no negative impacts to the surrounding neighborhood, staff is supportive of the City Council granting a variance to allow the porch foundation to exceed the allowed front yard setback.

The CDC has the following 3 options:

1. In line with the ZBA recommendation, the CDC can recommend the City Council not approve the variance;
2. The CDC can recommend the City Council approve a variance to allow an eight (8) foot front setback for the porch foundation, as approved with the building permit issued (this would require removal and replacement of approximately 1-1.5 feet of the existing foundation of the porch foundation); or
3. The CDC can recommend the City Council approve the variance requested, to allow the existing porch foundation with a nine (9) foot projection into the front setback, rather than the allowed six (6) feet.

Staff recommends the CDC recommend option #3. While the ZBA could not consider factors such as the unintentional errors on the parts of the applicant's architect and foundation contractor, or staff error, the City Council can consider these. The Lamberts would incur considerable expense to correct a situation that, if completed with the existing foundation, would have no negative impact to the neighborhood.

Draft Ordinance 13-06 that is written having a CDC recommendation and City Council approval of the requested variance for a nine (9) foot front porch setback. Staff has included draft conclusions for the CDC in the Ordinance that would lead to a recommendation for approval.

Since the ZBA recommended denial, City Council approval of a variance will require a two-thirds majority of 10 yes votes. CDC action does not alter this requirement.

Mark Valley, 20 N Wacker Drive, representing the applicants, addressed the Committee. He thanked the ZBA for hearing their variance request last week. The ZBA were very engaged and understood the help that we were asking for. He understands that the ZBA were bound to the Findings of Fact and is assured that it is near impossible to find all of the findings in the affirmative for this situation. This is a compelling case for approving a variance. Nothing has been done intentionally and everything has been applied for in the proper manner. The Lamberts have saved for this house for a number of years and the applicant is doing a lot of the work himself. The house is an Arts and Crafts style house and any change to the plans would ruin the architectural integrity of the house. Valley explained that the foundation was poured and it goes four feet in the ground. It is not easy to take the poured concrete away and take the house back. Valley stated that this house is a long way back from the street and it is hard to tell that a variance is needed. He continued that the City Ordinance does allow for the porch to go into the

front setback by six feet. We are one to three feet beyond that. To change the style of the front of the house and to remove the foundation does not make any sense.

Dan Lambert, applicant, addressed the Committee. He shared that the house was designed in the Arts and Crafts style. Symmetry is a key element of the house. Changing the setback from the front porch would negatively alter the architectural integrity of the house. He explained that it is the five stone pillars in the front of the house that project slightly. He explained what would happen if the porch was moved back. The side elevation of the pillars would have a four foot overhang creating a teeter-totter effect. Currently, the porch is designed with exposed cedar beams. In order to support snow load with the pillars moved back the architect would have to add steel beams to the design. That would compromise the look of the house. Lambert shared that they spent two and a half years looking for a lot and a great design for their home. They have put a considerable amount of time and money into this project. This is the first house he has built and has learned a lot from this experience.

The Committee discussed the overhang, the permitted construction plans, the foundation plan, spot surveys, and when the staff error was discovered. Albertson was questioned how often after receiving a spot survey does he find errors. Albertson responded that this happens very rarely. He stated that in order to prevent future errors, staff has changed the procedures of reviewing permit plats. There will be at least two members of staff reviewing the construction plans prior to issuing a permit.

Clark shared that she is in support of the variance and so is Alderman Liva. He wanted her to share with the Committee that he is in support of the variance as well. Chair Brown acknowledged the ZBA on how well they handled the process. He stated that the ZBA did a nice job since they could not possibly pass the Findings in the affirmative and is glad that the ZBA handed off the variance request the way that they did. Brown requested that staff thank the ZBA for their process.

Motion: To recommend to City Council approval of Ordinance 13-06: Variance for a covered front porch setback, 610 Ritter Drive

Maker: Clark

Second: Stark

Roll Call Vote: **Aye:** Brown, Sparks, Chanzit, Clark, Atac, Stark

Nay: None

6-0 Vote, 1 Absent, Motion carried.

5. Discussion: Kirk Road and Wilson Street (Scott Buening 1/9/13)

Buening reported that this was land that was acquired by the City in 2010. There have been some development proposals on it but nothing was successful. The land was deeded to the City to be used for some sort of future purpose. The deed restriction has expired and we could use the land towards any purpose we would like to use it for. Staff would like some opinions on what we should do with the land. Staff feels that this land should be used as commercial property/sales-tax generating facilities. Staff is suggesting a gas station as a potential use of the property. However, Kane County has jurisdiction on Kirk Road so it is very unlikely to get a right-in and

right-out onto Kirk. Volk suggested that the City should make certain that potential buyers are aware of the access onto the site. Buening discussed the potential options the City could do with the land as listed in the memo addressed to the CDC.

The CDC discussed potential uses, deed restriction, configuring the site, and the bidding process. The CDC was in favor of option two: Direct staff to proceed with putting the property on the market by obtaining an appraisal for the land and posting a sign advertising the parcel for sale.

Motion: To direct staff to proceed with putting the property on the market by obtaining an appraisal for the land and posting a sign advertising the parcel for sale
Maker: Chanzit
Second: Stark

Discussion was held on the motion. Buening asked if the CDC would like to put any restrictions on the sale. He stated that the easiest and the best way to control what goes on the property is by placing a restrictive covenant on the property. The City Council could release the covenant if they found an acceptable use for the property. The consensus of the Committee was not in support of adding restrictions onto the sale.

Roll Call Vote: **Aye:** Brown, Sparks, Chanzit, Clark, Atac, Stark
 Nay: None
 6-0 Vote, 1 Absent, Motion carried.

6. Discussion: City Development Incentives (Jason Bajor 1/15/13)

Bajor stated that he would like the focus of tonight's discussion be based on the Façade Improvement Program and the Downtown Improvement Grant program. Future discussion will be made regarding micro-loans and the other programs.

Bajor stated that by hearing the concerns and suggestions made by the Committee, staff has returned with some suggestions for the Façade Improvement and the Downtown Improvement Grant programs. The following are the current provisions and recommended changes to the Façade Grant Program (i.e. external building improvements):

- Maintain the 50/50 match provision between property/business owner and the City.
- Maintain the minimum project budget of \$1,000 (i.e. minimum grant of \$500) but raise the maximum project budget amount from \$10,000 to \$20,000 (i.e. maximum grant of \$10,000).
- Property owner must be co-applicant with any business requesting assistance.
- Include an economic development assessment of the project's impact/value for the City Council's consideration prior to approval.
- Include tuck pointing as an allowable improvement for grant eligibility, however, under a one-time only provision.
- Include business signage as an allowable improvement for grant eligibility; with guidelines as to permitted and non-permitted signage types and a claw back/refund provision should the business close prior to a suitable time period.

The following are the current provisions and recommended changes to the Downtown Improvement Grant Program (i.e. internal building improvements):

- Maintain the 50/50 match provision between property/business owner and the City.
- Reduce the minimum project budget to \$1,000, down from \$2,500 (i.e. minimum grant of \$500) and also reduce the maximum project budget amount from \$50,000 down to \$20,000 (i.e. maximum grant of \$10,000).
- Include an economic development assessment of the project's impact/value for the City Council's consideration prior to approval.
- Restrict the allowable improvements for grant eligibility to permanent, code-related construction and remodeling (i.e. electric, plumbing, etc.).
- Property owner must be co-applicant with any business requesting assistance.

Bajor continued that an applicant would still be able to request funding under both grant programs within a single project as long as the improvements meet the applicable grant criteria (i.e. allowable internal and external improvements). However, applicants requesting amounts in excess of the single or combined grant amounts (\$10,000 or \$20,000) would be required to submit a TIF Assistance Application, and proceed through the associated financial review and analysis which would ultimately culminate into a Redevelopment Agreement being approved by the City Council.

Sparks requested clarification on a claw back for business signage. He questioned how one would collect on that if the business went out of business. Bajor responded that if the property owner is the applicant and the business left, staff is envisioning that the property owner would be responsible for some sliding scale value of the sign based upon a time-line that staff and the Committee feels comfortable with. Sparks asked why we would not consider a stand-alone program for signage. That way a minimum amount could be set a lot lower for businesses that want to do signs. Bajor stated that in terms of ease of administration, they felt that it could be included with Façade Improvement Program. However, staff could divide it out if the Committee feels that it is best.

The Committee continued discussion on tuck pointing. O'Brien questioned what the 'one-time only provision' entails. Buening responded that staff considered the timeframe left of the TIF and do not believe that a person would have to have a second tuck pointing during that fourteen year time-period. This allows the City to refrain from a maintenance situation.

The Committee discussed maintenance, project price limits, deadlines, and the program successes. Brown stated that several Committee members have requested from staff a report summarizing: how well this program has worked, what is the success of the program, are the businesses still in business, and what is the outcome of this and how it is important. Bajor responded that staff had sent out a memo to the CDC in December with quantitative information but not qualitative. Bajor gave a narrative to the Committee. He stated that all of the businesses are still in operation or have just started operation. None of the businesses have closed. The grant programs have been successful since they have made internal or external improvements to the

space and all of the businesses are up and running. The businesses are occupying space in our downtown and giving reasons for people to come and visit our downtown. Bajor offered to do a write-up on the qualitative information but suggested that the CDC revisit the December 11th memo and see where staff should go from there.

Bajor discussed with the Committee why he feels these types of grant programs are important for economic development. Buening added that the return from the grants is immense by increasing the property values, bringing in new tenants to the buildings, bringing in new revenue and offsetting tax liabilities. The grant programs allow the City to invest in the buildings, improve them, and make sure that the buildings do not deteriorate. There is a value to these buildings in the downtown area and the downtown is a special place. The grant programs help support and attract new businesses. Chanzit questioned if the business community is confused about our enthusiasm for the grant programs. He noted that there has been a lot of back and forth between the CDC and staff and he wondered if we are doing more damage by dragging this process on. Bajor responded that staff has had to have conversations with people who have wanted to submit an application for the grant programs. Staff has had to state that they would have to put applications on hold until the dialog has been completed.

Daniel Zedan, 804 Pottowatomie Trail, addressed the CDC. He shared that he is a business owner of Nature's Finest Foods currently located in Wayne Illinois. Zedan has been looking at opening a retail operation in Batavia. He started inquiring about what assistance might be available back in November. He also discussed this with St. Charles and Geneva. The building that he is looking at is at 4 East Wilson. He has been working with Batavia Enterprises to negotiate a lease. He has been made aware of the grants and has been on hold for two months to find out if there are going to be grants for the façade and the interior of the building. He is getting to the point that he will have to make a decision by the end of this month as to what he is going to do. He has not been able to get questions answered as to if he turns in the application now and starts construction would the application be considered retroactive. He is looking at a retail operation that would take up the entire main floor of the building and potentially moving his other business from Wayne to the same building later on.

Zedan addressed Chanzit's concern if the City is sending out the wrong message by dragging this process on. Zedan stated that he is very proud of Batavia and would like to move his business and his son's new business to this town. The uncertainty and the fact that he cannot get an answer make him seriously look at if he can wait any longer. As a small business owner, this grant could potentially make or break us coming into Batavia. The grants in any amount would be a big help, particularly since one of the businesses is a new business. When we are looking at putting capital into it and investing into Batavia, ten to twenty thousand dollars makes a big difference in what we want to do. He heartedly recommended that the CDC come to a resolution as quickly as possible so business owners like him can make decisions to move into your town.

The Committee directed staff to proceed with staff's recommendation to meet with MainStreet and the Chamber to come back to the CDC with a final conclusion. Chair Brown stated that we would like to pursue and continue on with these grants. The CDC was in agreement with Brown's statement. Nine out of the fourteen aldermen were in support of the grant programs. The CDC asked staff to report back to the committee with a final recommendation in two weeks.

7. Ordinance 13-01: Amending the Zoning Code Subdivision Regulations Regarding Driveways and Driveway Approaches (Joel Strassman 1/9/13)

Strassman reported that as requested by the City Council, the Plan Commission on December 19th held a public hearing to consider recommending the amending the City's Zoning Code to allow wider driveways and driveway approaches.

The Zoning Code regulates improvements on private property. For single family residences, driveways can be up to 14 feet wide for a one car garage. For larger garages, the driveway can be up to 18 feet wide at the property line and be up to 4 feet wider at the door opening. Driveways for other duplexes, multiple family residential, and non-residential properties must be a minimum of 14 feet wide for one-way traffic and 20 feet for two-way traffic. There is no stated maximum width.

The Subdivision Regulations addresses improvements in the right-of-way. The portion of the driveway in the right-of-way known as the "approach" or "apron" is limited to 22 feet wide at the curb or street pavement, and must narrow to 18 feet at the sidewalk or to 14 feet if the garage doors are more than 45 feet from the property line. There is no maximum width for approaches that do not lead to driveways beyond the right-of-way; however, curb cuts are generally limited to 22 feet wide.

In preparation for the public hearing, staff reviewed the existing zoning and subdivision controls and determined that the maximum driveway widths at the property line as stated in the Zoning Code and Subdivision Regulations are appropriate, however, other controls in both of those City Code Titles both could be refined to better regulate driveways. For instance, there is no maximum width for driveways for duplexes, multiple family residential, and non-residential properties. Also, driveways that do not lead to a garage are not regulated at all. Staff consensus was that overall, driveway widths allowed by the City Code are appropriate. While wider driveways may be beneficial to some homeowners, there are potential negative impacts to the City. First, wider driveways equate to more impervious surface that could impact storm water management. Second, wider driveway approaches would cost the City more to replace as part of road improvement projects. Wider approaches would displace parkway landscaping, an impact that would be magnified on cul-de-sacs.

At the public hearing, the consensus of the Commission was that allowing driveways on single family private property to be up to 2 feet wider than allowed now could be beneficial to homeowners. Staff has prepared illustrations to show the effect of the wider driveways. The Commission was against allowing wider residential driveway approaches, due to potential increased costs to the City and for the resulting loss of parkway landscaping. Regarding stormwater management, staff has begun to consider putting forth a Zoning Code amendment to control the amount of impervious lot coverage. Consensus was reached regarding staff recommended controls to non-residential driveways, including the cap of 40 feet wide and to allow for consideration of wider industrial driveways and driveway approaches through the administrative design review process. This process allows staff to consider factors such as difficulties of existing conditions that may warrant allowing a wider driveway or driveway approach.

Draft Ordinance 13-01 includes amendments to both the Zoning Code and Subdivision Regulations to implement the Commission's recommendations. Staff recommends the Committee recommend approval of draft Ordinance 13-01.

Strassman explained that a resident in Alderman Dietz's Ward wanted to widen their driveway approach. The subdivision regulations controlled that and would not allow for a wider approach. As an alternative, the homeowner considered widening the driveway but the resident is already at the maximum width allowed for the driveway. Strassman noted that staff did not decide on amending the Zoning Code solely for this one resident. They considered the situation holistically and decided that the Zoning Code could use some revisions. He added that he does not know if the resident would be in favor of the proposed changes to the code.

Dietz, via conference phone, explained to the Committee the reason behind the resident's request for a wider driveway. He stated that the driveway was built to wrap around a tree and now the tree has been removed. The resident would like to open up the driveway to straighten it out. It would look unappealing to keep the driveway as it is. Mayor Schielke added that from what he understands, the resident would like to fill in the gap that the tree removal has caused. The CDC reviewed a picture of the driveway via Google Maps and held a lengthy discussion regarding the Zoning Code amendments.

Motion: To recommend approval of Ordinance 13-01: Amending the Zoning Code and Subdivision Regulations regarding driveways and driveway approaches

Maker: Sparks

Second: Chanzit

An amendment was made to the motion by Alderman Atac:

Motion: To accept all of the Plan Commission's recommendations except for the increase in width of the driveways in the residential areas.

Maker: Atac

Second: Clark

Roll Call Vote: **Aye:** Atac, Clark

Nay: Brown, Sparks, Chanzit, Stark
2-4 Vote, 1 Absent, Motion failed.

Brown administered a roll call vote on the motion made by Sparks and was seconded by Chanzit:

Roll Call Vote: **Aye:** Brown, Sparks, Chanzit, Stark

Nay: Atac, Clark
4-2 Vote, 1 Absent, Motion failed.

Sparks requested that if this Ordinance is approved by Council that staff contact the resident and inform the resident what can be done.

8. Streetscape

Basquin reported that staff is going through the process of closing the River Street project. There are only three or four Change Orders left. The amount of money we have left under the project amount is 80K. The allowances that are left are 25K and the other one we have not used is the 123K from the unsuitable material that would have been used for both River and Houston Street. We are 20K into the contingency and have about 77K left. The gateway arch, railing, gate

to the alley, and newsboy alley are part of that amount. The CDC discussed the arches, newsboy alley, remaining change orders, and the curbs.

Basquin reported that when the plans were designed, the planters themselves were all supposed to be nominally six inches. He explained that the entire elevation of the curb to the street were supposed to be six inches. The actual design of the planters was supposed to follow the slope of the road. During the process of construction, the question came up regarding what staff would like to do with the planters. The designers informed staff that the planters would look better with the elevation being flat across and not being sloped with the pavement. Staff then agreed to make them all the same elevation going across. When that went through to the designers, they redesigned it without changing the elevation of the planters to take in the six inches. We now have the down slope side being taller. The designers stated that in order to get the six inches we would have to pay more to get the granite bigger. Staff was never given the opportunity to do that. Leopardo and the designers agreed upon a certain height for the granite and at the job site we were not able to get the six inches. Staff discussed the options with all the stakeholders. Since the granite was on site they installed the granite to what exists now, with the varying heights of the granite instead of having it six inches across. Staff is looking into this issue with the stakeholders and is trying to figure out how to move forward to get the minimum six inches. The CDC discussed the GMP documents. O'Brien stated his concern for not burying granite under concrete and soil. He noted that for safety concerns, the planters should be six inches nominal. Basquin stated that a discussion will be needed with staff and the aldermen regarding this situation. Staff will come up with a price to replace the granite to get the height to where we need it.

The CDC discussed granite cladding. Basquin stated that staff received pricing for the cladding at the front wall at El Taco Grande and the planter at Tusk. Basquin reported that granite cladding would be 39K, if we replace the caps to put granite on both sides of the wall with a wider cap it would be 66K. For the statue base, Basquin received an estimate of 22K to build the foundation. He will get other estimates for the CDC to review. The CDC discussed the statue base and the merit of concrete versus granite. Basquin recommended granite cladding for the statue base for the best aesthetic value but noted that the price is too high. Basquin stated that concrete would still look nice but not as nice as granite. Tenuta requested a memo with the costs and any additional information for the CDC to consider. She stated that it is unfortunate that we changed what was originally designed. Basquin stated that he will write up the numbers and report back to the CDC at the next meeting or the meeting after that.

Brown reported that Wilson Street is being bid on this week. Basquin stated that staff should have a number on Thursday as well.

Tenuta asked about the River Street light poles. Basquin stated that when the light poles were first installed no one noticed the orange peel on them. When the sun hits the light poles at dusk there is a very noticeable orange peel on several of the light poles. Staff spoke to the manufacturer regarding this. The representative of the company explained that the orange peel is up to the manufacturer's tolerance. Basquin explained to the representative that the paint does not reflect the paint chips that the City received at all. Possible solutions would be to paint the

poles in place, receive a credit or replace the poles. Basquin will be reviewing all of the poles to see how many have the severe orange peel on them.

9. Project Status Update

McGrath discussed TIF financials with the Committee. McGrath displayed a spreadsheet with the TIF financials for the CDC to view. He discussed each column with the Committee including: Reserves that we still have, tax revenues, other revenue, River:TIF, Houston:TIF, Wilson:TIF, ITEP, Interconnect, Wilson/River, Wilson and Net 113K, Ped Crossings, Water St (1st to Main TIF), Batavia Ave TIF, Grant Programs and Misc, Repayment to GF, Sub Total TIF, Available for Spending, and Reserves.

McGrath stated that there is only fourteen years left in the TIF. He added that discussion will have to be made on whether the cost of some of these projects make sense now and what we will do at the tail end of the TIF. Brown clarified that the spreadsheet displayed is the plan. Staff is seeking for input if anyone has an objection to the proposed plan. If not, staff will continue on with the plan. Brown continued that if someone comes to us with a great proposal we can adjust the plan. Currently, we do not have a great proposal. McGrath stated that staff feels that we are being directed to go ahead with Houston Street at the estimated cost we have now. The cost may grow because there is talk of getting an additional roadway or wider area for pedestrians.

McGrath noted that discussion on Water Street will have to be held at a later date. He explained that one issue staff has is that the block of Water Street is going to be part of the bridge corridor. We have to be mindful of to what extent we want to improve it now and later.

McGrath asked the Committee to consider where we would fit in other streets in the budget. There is no money allocated for sidewalks on Water Street from Houston up to Wilson. It is not a lot of money and staff will supply some estimates. Staff will add some safety sidewalk costs, add the bid amounts, and send this spreadsheet out to the Committee.

10. Other

Buening reported that Wal-Mart is under construction. The foundation is completed.

Chick-fil-A has a temporary Certificate of Occupancy. They plan to open February 7th.

11. Matters From the Public

There were no matters from the public.

12. Adjournment

There being no other business to discuss, Chair Brown asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:18pm; Made by Chanzit; Seconded by Atac. Motion carried.