

REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF
THE CONCEPTUAL PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE
OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS PLAN COMMISSION

A MEETING HELD ON:

May 8, 2024

Project Title: Pep Boys Redevelopment
Project Address: 375 – 425 E. Rand Road
Petitioner: Mitch Goltz
Address: GW Properties
2211 N Elston Ave, Suite 400
Chicago, IL 60614

Requested Action:

1. Planned Unit Development (PUD) approval to allow multiple principal structures on one zoning lot.
2. Preliminary and Final Plat of Subdivision approval to subdivide the property into four lots.
3. Rezoning from the R-1, One Family Dwelling District to the B-2, General Business District.
4. Special Use Permits to allow two restaurants with drive-throughs on the subject property.
5. Amendment to Rezoning Ordinance 94-057, to repeal certain approvals and conditions of approval.

Variations Required:

No variations identified at this time. Upon submission of detailed plans, certain variations may be required.

Attendees: Mitch Goltz, Pep Boys
Jay Cherwin, Plan Commissioner
John Sigalos, Plan Commissioner
Lynn Jensen, Plan Commissioner
Bruce Green, Plan Commissioner
Sam Hubbard, Planning Department
Dan Osoba, Planning Department

Project Summary:

The subject property is approximately 2.79 acres in size and consists of two parcels of land; the western side includes the former Pep Boys building and parking area and the eastern side includes the former Suburban Trim & Glass building as well as several accessory structures. The site has access to both Palatine Road on the south and Rand Road on the north.

The petitioner, Mitch Goltz of GW Properties, has proposed demolition of the Pep Boys building, along with the accessory structures on the Suburban Trim site, and redevelopment with three separate buildings. Two would be for single-tenant occupancy and designed for fast casual tenants including a drive-through component. The 3,340 square foot building at the south and fronting on Palatine Road would be designed for Guzman y Gomez, an Australian-based restaurant chain specializing in Mexican-style cuisine. The 2,024 square foot northern building that fronts on Rand Road would be occupied by Wendy's. The third newly constructed building would be approximately 6,000 square feet and is intended for multi-tenant occupancy. No tenants have been identified for this building. The Suburban Trim building would remain and undergo interior and exterior upgrades to retrofit for new occupancy by single or multiple tenants.

Access to the site would come from a right-in/right-out curb cut along Palatine Road and right-in ingress with full access egress via a singular curb cut along Rand Road. A total of 132 shared parking stalls are proposed on the site, including six ADA accessible stalls.

Meeting Discussion:

Mr. Goltz – Stated that they are the owners of the former Pep Boys and Suburban Glass buildings. The plan is to demolish the Pep Boys building and keep and renovate Suburban Glass building, and they are proposing a PUD with a total of four buildings on the site. They have commitments from a Wendy's, and they just completed a Wendy's in Crystal Lake that utilizes the new building prototype that would be proposed here. They have commitments from Guzman y Gomez as well, and they just developed one in Schaumburg. Guzman y Gomez is a Mexican themed restaurant based in Australia that is quickly expanding in the United States. A veterinary clinic will be proposed for part of the renovated Suburban Glass building and they are working with final tenants for the last building along Rand Road. In total it will be four buildings, one adaptive reuse and then three new buildings with cross access and parking. Improvements to the site will bring the property more into compliance. Utilities and landscaping will be upgraded. A few of the curb cuts will be closed on both Rand and Palatine Roads. Staff has been supportive of the plans thus far, we are eager to get started. Permits have been submitted for the demolition of the former Pep Boys building and we hope to be in front of Plan Commission in the near future.

Mr. Hubbard – Explained that the property is in two zoning districts, the Pep Boys site is B-2, but the Suburban Trim site is in the R-1 district, so one of the zoning actions will be rezoning of the Suburban Trim lot into the B-2 district. A PUD would also be required and the petitioner is proposing to subdivide the site into four lots. Each building will be located on its own separate lot of record through the subdivision process. As part of that zoning entitlement process, they will need to provide a draft of the covenants, conditions and restrictions for the subdivision that outlines the shared access rights and maintenance responsibilities for the common elements. Special Use Permit approval for a restaurant with a drive-through will be required for the Wendy's and the Guzman y Gomez. When the Pep Boy site was rezoned into the B-2 District in 1994, a condition of the rezoning required the site to be developed in accordance to the plans submitted as part of that application. Those plans are now obsolete because that building is going to be demolished, so that ordinance needs to be amended to remove that requirement.

Four main points for the Conceptual Plan Review Committee to consider, as well as the petitioner as they move forward:

1. This property is part of the Rand Road Corridor Beautification Plan. One of the recommendations of that plan is for a landscape median to be constructed on Rand Road. This could impact access on Rand Road. The plan currently proposes a right-in only heading south eastbound on Rand, but then full access for site egress. This may need to be changed to a right-in/right-out only in the future if that landscape median is implemented. IDOT review of the curb cut will be required, and IDOT may require a right in/right out regardless of the future plans for that median. The results of that traffic study will be needed to analyze this.
2. The property is part of the Bike and Pedestrian plan, which calls for a new multi-use bike path along both frontages. Sidewalks will need to be increased in width on both Palatine Road and Rand Road. Part of that enlargement may cause the sidewalk to encroach onto the private property, which would require an easement to be dedicated as part of the subdivision process.
3. One of the key issues that must be addressed is the facilitation of future cross connections to the east and west. The site must be designed to accommodate cross connections to both the east and west. When the properties to the east and west are redeveloped, reciprocal access can be granted and the cross connections can be implemented. The Guzman y Gomez building may need to be shifted a little bit south to create an area for a connection to the west, and perhaps the parking stalls on the east side of the site can be shifted or removed, and the drive isle may need to be adjusted slightly, to facilitate a future cross connection to the east. This is definitely something we will be looking for moving forward.
4. A detailed traffic and parking study will be required as part of the entitlement process, and must analyze onsite circulation, level of service for adjacent intersections, and stacking within the site and drive-throughs. Staff will be asking for tenant specific data from both Wendy's and Guzman y Gomez relative to parking demand at other comparable sites, which would augment any I.T.E. projections from the parking study. The study must analyze whether the site, two drive throughs plus about 12,000 square feet of commercial space, can accommodate parking and traffic will be adequately accommodated on adjacent streets. There could be a lot of traffic coming in and out of the site, and staff will need to take a close look at this moving forward. From a Code standpoint there is a 32-space surplus on the site. However, this is based on conceptual plans that lack detail and contain uncertainties as to the type of tenants that will occupy the site. If there are no restaurant uses within the 12,000 square foot

commercial spaces, parking is probably sufficient, but if there are any other restaurant uses that want to locate here, then it's going to eat up that surplus. The surplus was estimated without taking into consideration any outdoor seating areas, and when those are factored in, that will also decrease the surplus. We're generally supportive of this development, and would like to see this site be redeveloped.

Commissioner Green – Asked if the property to the west was the former Hillside Towing site.

Mr. Hubbard – Confirmed this to be true.

Commissioner Cherwin – Stated that his main concern was full access on Rand Road, which it sounded like will be addressed. It would be up to IDOT regarding the access, but the movements out of the site to head northbound would be difficult.

Mr. Goltz – Currently there are two curb cuts on Rand, there is a middle lane used for dual left turns. We will be pushing very hard with IDOT, the tenants cannot survive with two right in/right outs. We already have a right in/right out on Palatine Road. I would encourage the Village to consider the implications to properties if access gets further constrained. Landscape islands look nice, but a loss of business would be a factor if access goes from full access to right in/right out. Given that access on Palatine is already restricted, it was very important to have full access on Rand Road. We are hopeful that by consolidating some of the curb cuts, along with the varied hours of operation for the businesses, that projected traffic generation will not require access restrictions on Rand Road. While we do have some food users, the peak hours for them are not the same as the peak hours from the others. The 4,000 square foot veterinary clinic will not be open in the evenings. There will be a lot of upgrades to property, non-compliant areas of the site will be modified to comply with code, and we will do our best to adhere to Village code. They had reached out to the neighboring property owners and hoped to establish a joint development opportunity, but that was not possible. They will be a good neighbor to Gatsby's and wanted a good working relationship, however they are not looking to redevelop that site right now.

Commissioner Cherwin – So the Hillside owners are not cooperating on access at this time, but they will eventually come forward for approval of a development on their site. If zoning approvals are required, they would probably have to establish a connection to the petitioner's site property. Is that scenario where the Village would want the petitioner in this case to prepare the site in anticipation of enabling that future connection, regardless of whether right now there's an agreement in place?

Mr. Hubbard – Stated that was correct.

Mr. Goltz – They had looked a couple different layouts and find the best place for a connection to the west. They have to balance what works well for their tenants with the need for this connection. There is a sizable area along the Palatine Road frontage that would be a more logical spot for a future connection, as opposed to the connection being in middle of the property. We have offered to develop the Hillside site for them, but they're not sellers.

Commissioner Green – What is the push back from Hillside?

Commissioner Cherwin – Regardless of Hillside, it is likely that the Village will require them to allow the cross connection, so it would prudent for the petitioner to design the site to enable this future connection.

Mr. Goltz – Yes, and we can shift the Guzman y Gomez building to either facilitate this connection in front of that building or behind it. We can show some flexibility without having major interference on their desired layout.

Commissioner Cherwin – asked for clarification on Building C.

Mr. Goltz – Building C doesn't exist today and is a newly proposed building. Building D is currently the Suburban Glass building and it will be preserved and tenanted with the veterinarian clinic. For Building C we have been talking to a single tenant that could potentially have a drive-through, or it could be a pad for a building up to 6,000 square feet, and depending

on the final tendency it might be a 5,000 square foot building. The site plan shows a general block for where a building could go in this location. Ultimately both buildings could be shifted a little closer to Palatine Road, which would have benefit of opening up space in the middle of the site. We will work with staff and we have our engineers already talking to the Village engineers.

Commissioner Cherwin – Asked if staff was requesting easterly cross access as well, to connect to Gatsby's. Is the petitioner willing to make adjustments?

Mr. Goltz – Yes, however, variations to make this connection may be required. The best way to do this would be to move both buildings on the southern side of the site closer to Palatine Road. Sidewalk encroachments may be an issue. Some municipalities prefer to see buildings closer to the street, and if that was possible here, it would provide space for an access point north of the Palatine Road buildings that would go into the parking lot for Gatsby's. Understanding what the Village would allow will provide guidance to make adjustments.

Commissioner Cherwin – Stated that he was not overly concerned about traffic movements on Rand Road, it was more an issue of whether IDOT would allow it.

Mr. Goltz – They will rely on the findings of the traffic study, but initial analysis suggests full access would work given the existence of a dual left turn lane and the expected traffic volume from the development.

Commissioner Sigalos – Suburban Glass building is going to remain/remodeled, and will not affect Gatsby's?

Mr. Goltz – No impact to Gatsby's is expected. The overall development they are proposing came together when they originally had Suburban Glass under contract on its own. We ran some challenges; the lot lines are highly irregular and when we realized that the market wasn't giving us good feedback on the Suburban Glass site on its own, we found Pep Boys was coincidentally closing their location. We originally were going to use the Pep Boys building and demo the Suburban Glass building, but the Pep Boys building was too big and too deep and there are not many users that can pay the kind of rents that this building needs. So they decided to demo the Pep Boys building and start fresh. We are working on plans for the full renovation of the Suburban Glass building. It will look very different. They would like to explore with staff the possibility of renovating the Suburban Glass building while they go through the overall entitlement process. The veterinary clinic is very eager to get going as fast as possible, they have very long buildout.

Commissioner Sigalos – Asked if the cross access will have any effect on Gatsby's parking lot?

Mr. Goltz – No, we would only be designing their development to make a future connection to Gatsby's, but not actually making it at this time. Gatsby's may be losing parking stalls in other locations based on where the lot lines fall and how their parking is configured. Our intent is to provide the connections for future cross access, but not implement them right now.

Commissioner Sigalos – Thinks this is a good concept and just wants to ensure that nothing impacts the Gatsby's site.

Commissioner Jensen – I support what Mr. Goltz said regarding full access on Rand Road. He recalled what IDOT did on Central, west of Arlington Heights Road, where access was restricted and it killed 3 or 4 businesses there. I don't know that we have any say over IDOT, but we certainly should make the case because we had those people come before us and say they can't sell their land or find tenants. We now have a couple pieces of dead land.

Mr. Goltz – Referenced a couple locations where IDOT put islands in and access was cut off, and the impacts were very detrimental. Rand Road is your one of Arlington Heights most vibrant corridors. Beautification is great, but in this location it makes more sense to do it on the sidewalks. When medians are put in the street, it is guaranteed that tenants will suffer, and then sales tax will suffer

Commissioner Jensen – Thinks it is a good project and is supportive of the concept.

Commissioner Green – Asked if any development had been proposed on the Hillside site yet.

Mr. Hubbard – Responded that there was nothing proposed there yet.

Commissioner Green – Thinks it is a good concept and was being done right.

RECOMMENDATION

The Conceptual Plan Review Committee encouraged the petitioner to proceed forward with their application.

Bruce Green, Chair
CONCEPTUAL PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE
Kendra Maher, Recorder

**REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF
THE CONCEPTUAL PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE
OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS PLAN COMMISSION**

A MEETING HELD ON:

May 8, 2024

Project Title: Qargo Coffee
Address: 4 W. Rand Road
Petitioner: Sheeraz Khan
Address: 701 Brickell Ave, Ste 1550
Miami, FL 33131

Requested Action:

1. Amendment to PUD Ordinances (Ord. 70-003 and Ord. 80-008) to add a drive-through lane to the property.
2. Special Use Permit for a restaurant with a drive-through.

Variations Required:

No variations identified at this time.

Attendees: Sheeraz Khan, Qargo Coffee
Jay Cherwin, Plan Commissioner
John Sigalos, Plan Commissioner
Lynn Jensen, Plan Commissioner
Bruce Green, Plan Commissioner
Sam Hubbard, Planning Department
Dan Osoba, Planning Department

Project Summary:

The subject property is an existing pad site (formerly Olson Rug & Flooring) within the Arlington Plaza Shopping Center. The 4,200 square foot freestanding building was constructed as part of a Planned Unit Development (PUD) Amendment (Ord. 80-008) which amended the Arlington Plaza PUD (Ord. 70-003) to allow construction of two new freestanding buildings. The associated Site Plan was approved in 1985.

The petitioner is proposing to renovate the interior of the building for a new Qargo Coffee, which is a coffee restaurant chain that operates 14 locations nationally. This proposed location would be the first Qargo Coffee in Illinois. The interior renovations include restaurant seating for 70 customers, restrooms, coffee bar, food storage, and staff offices. The exterior improvements include a new drive-through lane, new façade materials, and tenant signage which will require a Design Commission application. The façade shall be designed to be compatible with the existing buildings within the shopping center and be consistent with the Village's Commercial Design Standards.

The proposed coffee restaurant will operate from 6:00 am to 8:30 pm Monday through Friday and from 6:00 am to 7:30 pm on Saturday and Sunday. The projected number of employees is 14 on two shifts. All delivery hours will occur during typical business hours. If proposed, the petitioner shall provide information on any outdoor eating/drinking spaces for this use. All outdoor eating areas shall comply with Chapter 28, Section 5.1-23 Outdoor Eating Cafes on Private Property.

Meeting Discussion:

Mr. Kahn – We would like to bring a coffee shop to the old Olsen Rug store. A big spot, about 4000 square feet. We were originally looking at splitting it and getting a second tenant, but the cost of splitting it decided to take the whole space, and if

we're able to add a drive through to this location. It's across from the Starbucks, and there is plenty of parking there. This location would be our flagship, the first locations in Illinois, and we have 16 planned in Illinois, and the AH would be our training location. Our hours would be similar to Panera and Starbucks nearby, we are looking at traffic patterns nearby. This franchise is out of Florida. The coffee beans

are sourced in Colombia helping to sustain industries. It is Italian coffee, Lavazza, we have a strong European population here, and good pastries coming from Italy as well too. This is something that we think will be a nice add-on to the area.

Mr. Osoba – the property is located within the Arlington Plaza Shopping Center, at 4 West Rand Road. It is an existing pad site in the center and the property is zoned B-2 in the general business district and designated commercial in the future land use in the Comprehensive Plan. The 4,200 square foot building was constructed as part of a PUD amendment to the Arlington Plaza Shopping Center, PUD in 1980 and the petitioner is proposing to renovate this building for Qargo Coffee and add a new drive-thru lane. The interior renovations include restaurant seating for 70 customers, restrooms, a coffee bar, and staff offices. All exterior improvements, which include some signage and exterior facade updates, would require Design Commission application for review. The proposal will require Plan Commission action for a PUD amendment to add the drive-thru lane to the property, and the special use permit for a restaurant with a drive-thru. An addition of the drive-thru would require the site circulation to be re-evaluated given the limited amount of space between the building and the adjacent rows of parking. The staff development committee review, staff found that if a drive-thru lane was added, the adjacent drive aisles on the southwest and southeast sides of the building would need to be reconfigured into counterclockwise one-way traffic. The existing 90° parking would need to be restriped as angled parking along this one-way drive, and the traffic and parking analysis that will be required with this redevelopment to evaluate the new circulation on site, as well as, the drive-thru queuing and trip generation. Staff found that the available parking within the Arlington Plaza Shopping Center is adequate for the proposed use, and all of the rest of the uses within the center. However, additional bicycle parking would be required by code. Staff is generally supportive of the PUD amendment and the special use permit as proposed based on the conditions that were listed in the staff report.

Commissioner Jensen – asked if there any other business in that mall that has a drive-thru, or will this be the first one?

Mr. Hubbard – Arby's is currently operating a drive-thru, a larger site is so it was able to sustain the minimum required drive aisles and have the drive-thru, whereas this site is a little bit tighter and closer to the street. If they integrate the drive-thru there then it could create some problems unless they change things.

Commissioner Sigalos – the existing building 4,200 square feet, which is pretty large remodel with a lot of indoor seating, it is kind of contrary to what Starbucks is doing getting rid of larger indoor seating and going to a drive-thru model. How do you know that this large area may or may not be used?

Mr. Kahn – we are positioning the back of the property to be offices, and then this location for our Illinois stores will be our training facility. It will give us more room for training staff, and hope that people will also go back to hanging out at this location. We want to be more a part of the community, and we will have two conference rooms inside that people can use if they need to have a private meeting.

Commissioner Cherwin – shared that it looks like a nice project. You mentioned other businesses in the area?

Mr. Kahn – I was one of the contractors at the Amazon station for delivering packages here the last four years. I was at the Skokie station before we moved here.

Commissioner Cherwin – I think good project. I mean, I don't see any issue with it.

Mr. Kahn – There are two things that I was hoping to challenge, and hopefully the Village would be open to. If a traffic study is necessary, could it be based off the Starbucks across the street having a drive through business and Arby's is block away? The other challenge was the grease trap, we are not frying any food. Everything else, we are good with and will comply. We are pretty good to go.

Commissioner Green – inquired with staff about the traffic study?

Mr. Osoba – typically for drive-thru we do see traffic studies as they go to Planning Commission. Given this is going to be a little bit of a site reconfiguration in terms of site circulation, and how one-way traffic flows, we feel that this would be warranted. You can certainly request a variance through the Planning Commission process that would have to be reviewed and go to Planning Commission. Generally speaking, the Village is seeking traffic studies for a drive-thru.

Mr. Hubbard – the grease trap would be a plumbing issue that the petitioner can take up with the building department.

Commissioner Green – I too think it's great project. It will be nice to bring some life back to that shopping center.

Public Comment

None

RECOMMENDATION

The Conceptual Plan Review Committee encouraged the petitioner to proceed forward with their application.

Bruce Green, Chair
CONCEPTUAL PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE
Kendra Maher, Recorder

REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF
THE CONCEPTUAL PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE
OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS PLAN COMMISSION

A MEETING HELD ON:

May 8, 2024

Project Title: CarMania LUV
Address: 533 S. Arthur Ave
Petitioner: Lukasz Guzy
Address: 533 S. Arthur Ave
Arlington Heights, IL 60005

Requested Action:

1. Land Use Variation to permit for Motor Vehicle Sales, Including Auxiliary Service within the M-2 Limited Heavy Manufacturing District.

Variations Required:

1. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 10.2-9, to allow tandem parking stalls.
2. Variation to waive the required parking analysis, unless provided with a formal Plan Commission application.

Attendees: Phil Gross, Attorney Carmania
Jay Cherwin, Plan Commissioner
John Sigalos, Plan Commissioner
Lynn Jensen, Plan Commissioner
Bruce Green, Plan Commissioner
Sam Hubbard, Planning Department
Dan Osoba, Planning Department

Project Summary:

The subject property consists of two platted lots approximately 20,245 square-feet in total size. The southern lot contains a 3,655 square-foot building occupied by Carmania. The northern lot is vacant land that contains a non-code compliant gravel parking lot where the auto repair business stores cars that are awaiting repair.

The petitioner is proposing to partially pave approximately 2,500 square-feet of the gravel parking lot with 15 tandem parking stalls for the storage of used vehicles that that would be marketed and sold on the subject property. The remaining portion of the gravel parking lot is proposed to be removed and replaced with grass. A small retaining wall is proposed along the front of the new parking lot facing S. Arthur Ave. No other improvements are proposed for the site or for the existing building.

The proposed hours of operation for the motor vehicle sales business are the same as the motor vehicle repair business: Monday – Friday from 9:00 am to 5:00 pm. The existing motor vehicle repair business includes four employees. The petitioner indicates that no new employees would be required to expand the operations of this business to include motor vehicle sales.

Meeting Discussion:

Mr. Gross – CarMania is an existing business, successful and doing really well with the site. There is a building where they do the car repairs, little office in the front, some parking in the front. There is a lot on the side, which is not being optimized right now. The character of the neighborhoods is mostly businesses with trucks and cars, so we are not really

asking for anything that is out of character. We would like to use the front of the lot for being able to park the vehicles that would be offered for sale. The lot could be paved, cleaned up, and see how this business goes with a possibility of expansion or leave it be.

Mr. Osoba – this property is located at 533 S. Arthur Avenue, just south of Northwest Highway. The two properties here are approximately half an acre in total size and zoned M-2 limited heavy manufacturing district, and designated commercial as in future land use by the Comprehensive Plan. The petitioner's business CarMania is currently operating an auto repair business on the property, but is proposing to expand the business to include used vehicle sales. The proposed this proposed land use, which is classified as motor vehicle sales including auxiliary service, is not permitted land use within the M-2 district, and would require land use variation. The northern portion of the lot is currently vacant and has gravel on it, and it includes non-code compliant and gravel surface. The Village has observed storage of vehicles on the site during the last several years, and additionally, the vehicles have been stored within the drive aisles of the existing parking lot and alongside the building. To remedy this code issue, the petitioner is proposing to partially pave this gravel area with approximately 2,500 square feet of parking area for 15 tandem parking stalls. The remaining gravel in the rear property would be proposed to be removed and replaced with grass. It should be noted that a variance request would be required with a formal Plan Commission application for tandem parking. As part of the formal application, the petitioner would need to explain how on-site vehicle storage will be managed to eliminate parking and/or storage on those grassy areas and drive aisles within the site, or whether an expansion of that paved area is needed to accommodate future demand for the business as the business grows. The petitioner is proposing a perimeter landscaping along south Arthur Avenue and along the northern property line to screen the property and vehicle storage from the roadway. Additionally, staff review noted that landscape islands with the tree are required at the end of each parking road, so all details are going to be required for landscaping as a formal Planning Commission application if submitted. Staff is generally supportive of the land use variations subject to those conditions that are listed in the staff report.

Commissioner Sigalos – what about the Japan auto sales, that didn't work too well for them.

Mr. Gross – this is going to be an ancillary business. It is not the main business. We believe that is a big difference. He has a lot of customers that come in that their cars are not in the best shape. He would like to get the dealer license so he could purchase and sell them.

Commissioner Jensen – suggested that the petitioner request a variance to have the bicycle rack removed from the plan, because it is not necessary in an industrial park.

Commissioner Cherwin – did not have any issues, good project that he would like to see the petitioner continue to be successful in their business and if this is something that is going help them more, move forward. Agreed with Comr. Jensen that it is not appropriate to put the burden of a bike rack on the petitioner.

Commissioner Green – Japan Sales upset everybody in the Village was the fact that he was parking cars on the right of way and everything else. That left a bad taste in everybody's mouth because of what he promised.

Mr. Gross – this is not what we are proposing. It will alleviate some of the issues because there's not going to be 15 cars for sale, and there is going to be local parking for this other business and customers and for the store.

Commissioner Green – Great project.

Public Comment

None

RECOMMENDATION

The Conceptual Plan Review Committee encouraged the petitioner to proceed forward with their application.

Bruce Green, Chair
CONCEPTUAL PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE
Kendra Maher, Recorder