

TOWN OF LONGBOAT KEY
PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

FEBRUARY 21, 2017

The regular meeting of the Planning and Zoning Board was called to order at 9:00 AM by Chair Jim Brown.

Members Present: Chair Jim Brown; Vice Chair BJ Bishop; Secretary Ken Schneier; Members Leonard Garner, Stephen Madva, George Symanski, Mike Haycock

Also Present: Maggie Mooney-Portale, Town Attorney; Alaina Ray, Planning, Zoning & Building Director; Maika Arnold, Planner; Steve Schield, Planner; Donna Chipman, Office Manager

AGENDA ITEM 1
PUBLIC TO BE HEARD
Opportunity for Public to Address Planning and Zoning Board

Gene Jaleski, Cedar Street, discussed an advertisement on page 6 of the Longboat Key News against Chair Brown. He wished to put on the record that he had no knowledge of this advertisement, or who had placed the advertisement. He deplored the introduction of negative advertisements into the election process. He continued with commenting there was a need to have more residents involved in community services. The Town should foster a more inviting environment for people to serve.

AGENDA ITEMS 2 AND 3
CONSENT AGENDA

MR. GARNER MOVED APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 17, 2017, REGULAR MEETING, AS WRITTEN, AND SETTING THE FUTURE MEETING DATE FOR MARCH 21, 2017. MS. BISHOP SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

AGENDA ITEM 5
ORDINANCE 2016-32, AMENDING CHAPTER 158, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT

Pursuant to published notice, the public hearing was opened.

Alaina Ray, Planning, Zoning & Building Director, reviewed the ordinance pointing out:

- The Planning & Zoning (P&Z) Board heard the ordinance during their January meeting and requested additional information on heights
- On January 23, 2017, the Town Commission indicated that they would like to open it up for the P&Z Board to consider heights within the PUD
- At the board's direction, staff drove the island and performed a visual survey and researched heights of existing buildings
- Based on this survey, increased setbacks, dense vegetated buffers, and building placement and design seem to have the greatest impact for minimizing visual mass and scale of buildings, regardless of height
- Reviewed illustrations of buildings showing their height and setback from Gulf of Mexico Drive

Mr. Schneier asked how many feet counted as a 'story.' Ms. Ray responded a 'story' was habitable space; if it was able to be occupied on the first floor, then it was considered a 'story'; five stories over parking, the parking would be considered first floor, but not counted as a story. Mr. Symanski noted his confusion, because he had previously questioned how height was defined in the Code, and staff responded if height was allowed on the gulf side, the building might be 11-17 feet higher. Ms. Ray explained when discussing a building being 50 feet in height, for example, it was measured from base flood elevation (BFE) and parking was typically below BFE. Mr. Symanski pointed out when the board was discussing height, the building was actually higher, because of the parking, and asked why they were not discussing it as actual height. Ms. Ray pointed out the ground was not zero and may be a different number due to sea level. Staff did not measure from the ground, but from the Mean High Water Line (MHWL). Mr. Symanski believed that was misleading for a layperson. Ms. Ray agreed that a layperson might not understand; however, the requirement to measure from the flood elevation was a requirement of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

Steve Schield, Planner, noted the minimum lot on the island might be at 3 or 3.5 feet, and on the beach discussing 7-10 feet was the typical elevation of a beachfront lot. Someone could add additional ground due to fill; the building never changes, because it was always measured from the FEMA elevation. Mr. Symanski questioned how tall could the actual building be. Ms. Ray responded it would vary, because the MHWL varied. Chair Brown explained there were fixed items, such as MHWL, and the height required to build above it is fixed and varied in zones. He pointed out that on the beach, the FEMA height was 17 feet in most areas, and the height above that was allowed – there was always a fixed height above the MHWL, and it will vary depending on the actual grade of the ground. Mr. Symanski commented his point was if they were measuring setback from the height of the building, it was not really the height of the building, because the building could be taller. Ms. Ray commented that if the Board wished to impose a setback two and half times the grade, they could specify that in the ordinance. Mr. Garner noted the Board was discussing something that was developed

by the federal government for distance above the flood line. The flood line was a measurement from, not the land, but from the level of the water line.

Mr. Schneier suggested that if the Town knew what the building's usable height was, then they could add ten feet, and when discussing the 2.5 times the height of the building, he did not feel the extra 10 feet would be a material factor. Chair Brown responded there was a lot of variation in building heights that have been built over the island, but since current codes have been adopted, if they leveled every building and rebuilt to the zoning district, every building along Gulf of Mexico Drive would be at the same level. Mr. Symanski was comfortable if the advertisements and staff reports for the hearings on submittals stated the applicant was asking for 'x' feet, but the actual height (with the flood height) was 'x' feet. Ms. Ray pointed out that site plans showed the height from the MHWL, from at-grade, and from the first habitable floor. She also noted that FEMA has a habit, on occasion, of changing the flood elevations. Ms. Ray continued with her PowerPoint presentation.

Ms. Ray discussed that certain older buildings were built on the beach area, which was no longer allowed; a newer building would be set back further from the water. She referred to Slide 11, PUD Height and Setbacks, pointing out that staff would recommend, if the board allowed the increased height, that they require greater setbacks along Gulf of Mexico Drive to prevent the 'corridor' effect. They would also recommend enhanced vegetation along Gulf of Mexico Drive, because visually, the setback and buffer made a significant difference to the character of the island. Chair Brown questioned whether that was something that should be done. He commented if the Board was going to have a zoning district and going to say they would allow a certain height, then they should allow a certain height. He was the one that suggested the 80 foot height, and the reason the Board was discussing existing buildings that were already at the maximum height, maybe even greater than due to grandfathering, was there were units with eight foot ceilings, and the Board would like to allow them to have some increased ceiling height. He still believed, if they were going to say it was not compatible, they should not have that much height in that district. Mr. Garner agreed, because compatibility in this type of situation, the circumstances were different, and if use this compatibility as a guideline, they would discourage the opportunity for redevelopment. He believed anything that limited development, or redevelopment, to the surrounding buildings was incompatible with what the Board was trying to accomplish.

Discussion ensued on:

- When the board started the review, there were a number of non-conforming properties; the board was not trying to define a zone, but a larger envelope into which particular zones could be created
- Most PUDs are flexible and did not impose a lot of limitations; most were fairly open to what could be asked for, and each project essentially becomes its own district, but established through the public hearing process and memorialized to that PUD approval

- An applicant would not be able to come in and develop a PUD on a smaller site; they would have to have certain acreage and square footage, along with complying with other restrictions and guidelines for a PUD
- Whether it could be construed to be a Bert Harris violation if the height was revised – if the applicant requests to go into a PUD, then it would not be a violation; however, if someone redeveloped and did not ask for a PUD, there would not be a restriction on this same site
- If someone requested a PUD, whether they were giving away their Bert Harris rights; Maggie Mooney-Portale, Town Attorney, replied no and explained they could still have a different Bert Harris claim, but if applying for a PUD for additional flexibility they were availing themselves of that new zoning on their own volition; the Town was not taking anything from them legislatively or through a zoning act

Mr. Garner believed at some point the board was straying away from what a PUD could do; it was meant for larger parcels where the structure of the Codes could be modified, and the criteria that would be imposed on a smaller site, might not apply to a larger site. Ms. Ray explained the proposed language would concentrate the height toward the center of the property; smaller properties would not be able to utilize, because they would not be able to obtain the additional height, could not meet the setbacks, etc. The property was too shallow. There was language provided in the proposed ordinance for the Town to consider a smaller setback for those properties through a hardship. Mr. Symanski questioned the variance standard. Attorney Mooney-Portale reviewed the criteria outlined in Section 158.029 and read into the record. Mr. Symanski asked what the Town Commission would be reviewing; was there a standard that stated the purpose was to allow redevelopment of properties with the same. Ms. Ray discussed writing certain criteria for that property. Mr. Symanski noted they would have to define 'reasonable use.' Ms. Ray responded 'reasonable use' is typically the use that was provided in that zoning district.

Mr. Schneier agreed they need to move away from variance language, pointing out that 3-4 of the seven criteria addressed compatibility to aspects of the zoning district of which the property was a part. Ms. Ray referred to the language on page 8 of 32 of the ordinance, and commented that staff could revise to state, "waivers to this required street setback may be granted if the Town Commission determines that the waiver shall not be contrary to the public interest." The Town Commission would have latitude as to why they are doing it, how they are doing it, the distance, etc. Mr. Symanski believed one of the criteria for a PUD was to preserve the number of tourism units. Ms. Ray explained one of the main purposes of this PUD was to allow those properties that were non-conforming to density to memorialize their density and become conforming. Chair Brown discussed T-3 and T-6 zoning. Ms. Ray responded if the developer was utilizing a PUD, everything was defined with the approval documents. Chair Brown commented there were areas west of Gulf of Mexico Drive that would not be able to meet the setbacks and questioned whether the Town should review as possibly a different zoning category with different criteria. Ms. Ray noted it would not be a different zoning category, because the PUD could accommodate that.

The following discussion ensued:

- The point of the change was to try to accommodate the revitalization of properties that were non-conforming, and why would the Board impose a requirement, such as the 2.5 times setback, that the Board knows from the start would not work for many of the properties the Town wishes to revitalize
- One of the things staff was asked to review was how to prevent a 'canyon' effect
- Should be giving flexibility for each zone; provide room for Town Commission and owner to work out for that lot
- Originally the PUD ordinance did have that flexibility, but staff was requested to bring back limitations based on direction from the Board and Town Commission, which was the reason they were seeing less flexibility now than in the original document
- did the Town want those properties to be redeveloped and allow that flexibility; one criteria was the waiver was necessary to accomplish the Board's goal to recreate the same number of units – in another part of the ordinance, if a tourism use, they had to keep the same number of tourism units
- it could be stated that, "If the Town Commission determined the waiver met the intended purpose of the district"
- suggestion to state, "encourage redevelopment of existing
- Whether the Board was saying some properties should not go into a PUD, but retain their existing status through the voluntary rebuild; there might be instances, where someone applied for a PUD, and the Town Commission determined it was not appropriate
- Staff discussing the process for obtaining approval for a PUD noting there would be properties that would not be appropriate for a PUD

Chair Brown asked if staff were comfortable with the current variance process, or did the Board need to work on that issue. Attorney Mooney-Portale explained the body of variance law was very particular to the hardships; if there are pieces and parts that the Board liked and would like to incorporate, then she encouraged that. She would rather see them use the language discussed versus cross-referencing. Mr. Garner mentioned that if the Board took the variance code and tried to revise for this situation, and trying to add as an additional option, that was not what it was intended for; creating a PUD had nothing to do with variances.

Ms. Ray discussed the building setback language in Section 3. Mr. Symanski referred to the low-rise motel type structures on shallow lots and asked if the Town wanted them using flexibility. Ms. Bishop responded there were other criteria that those lots would fail to meet, such as the Erosion Control Line (ECL), the setback from Gulf of Mexico Drive (GMD), Open Space requirements; it made it impossible for those properties to come in under a PUD. They could come back in a voluntary rebuild to improve their facility. Ms. Ray explained if properties came in under any scenario, they would not be two stories on-grade, but significantly higher. The footprint would not be able to change much; however, under the voluntary rebuild, they would be able to rebuild with what was existing under the cubic content. Ms. Bishop pointed out that modifying those setbacks

to accommodate buildings on narrow properties was not the vision of the Town residents.

Mr. Haycock pointed out that in the last three months the Board has gone full circle, but he wished to understand what has been done. Staff originally presented a flexible PUD, and for three months, they have established criteria, but now the Board was stating that should be removed and allow open PUDs on a case-by-case basis, which he believed he was comfortable with, but where did the Board get the criteria they wanted. He asked if the Board removed the restrictions, what would be the process that would still allow the Board to ensure what was built was consistent with what was wanted by the public. Mr. Schneier discussed an example of keeping a structure at two usable stories, and raising the property up ten feet, so it was 30-35 feet from the ground, and moving all the parking underneath, and applying the setbacks at 2.5 times the height. He believed there could be a more compatible structure. Ms. Ray noted that could be done under a PUD, but if they chose to rebuild under the voluntary rebuild, the Town could not require enhanced buffers, but only what was required under the code; under a PUD, the Town could require certain things, because they were drafting the development regulations for that property. Ms. Bishop commented she was not sure if she heard whether the Board concurred with Mr. Haycock's comments. She was not comfortable with the restrictions not being included in a PUD, and believed restrictions were critical. She noted it was much easier to function when there was criteria that people understood. Chair Brown agreed; he was not ready to give up restrictions.

Chair Brown referred to the language in red in the draft ordinance and wondered if that was sufficient criteria for a final decision to be made at the Town Commission level. He discussed there had been a number of questions about the traffic issue, and he was going to suggest to the Town Commission they place the remaining tourism units on hold until such time the Town determined the impacts from the re-opening of the Zota hotel (f/k/a/ Hilton Hotel) and other larger projects.

Mr. Symanski voiced concern with the language provided in Section (3), page 8 of 32 of the ordinance, related to Building Setbacks. He believed it should be revised.

The Board recessed from 10:25 am – 10:37 am to allow staff time to review and revise the language.

Ms. Ray reviewed the revised language in Section (3), Building Setbacks, concerning the waiver, suggesting the language be revised to state, "*Waivers to this required street setback may be granted if the Town Commission determines that the waiver is necessary to meet the intent of the Comprehensive Plan and this chapter to enable redevelopment of properties that are nonconforming to density and is in the public interest.*" She explained that as part of the process to develop the PUD for that property was if they wished to have less setback, the Town could require additional vegetation. She noted staff had also made a minor revision in that same paragraph that, "each building must have a minimum street setback of at least 2.5 times the overall height of the building."

Discussion ensued as follows:

- Belief that vegetation was something to emphasize to some extent; an example would be the Publix property, where the buffer was considerably enhanced; however, there was a need to continue to emphasize vegetation or screening
- Referring to the proposed ordinance, how 'enable redevelopment' would be defined – redevelopment of existing units, or what their base zoning allowed, whichever was submitted, the Town allowed rebuilding to the existing density
- Currently, a developer would have to build within their cubic content and other parameters defined in a voluntary rebuild
- Smaller parcels would still have to meet other requirements, such as 'shadowing' effects, side setback issues, ECL, and provide 50 percent open space

There was consensus to accept the revised language in Section (3) as presented by staff.

Attorney Mooney-Portale commented she was not clear about the 'enable redevelopment' asking if it were for those properties with a non-conforming density; that would be her only question for clarification. If so, it should be written in or was it to enable redevelopment of all properties as opposed to properties that were non-conforming as to density. Mr. Garner suggested if the Board was going to have an allowable redevelopment, as far as density, it should include a requirement that it be no more than what existed or less. Ms. Ray explained the ordinance did state that as a maximum. **Following discussion, there was consensus to add language after 'enable redevelopment' to state, "redevelopment of properties that are non-conforming to density."**

Mr. Symanski asked if there were properties that would need this flexibility to accomplish the zoning on the property. Ms. Ray pointed out there were existing properties that were non-conforming as to setbacks, lot coverage, etc., and likely would not be able to redevelop and meet those requirements, but might be able to obtain a variance. Attorney Mooney-Portale commented the only other alternative was referencing the Opportunity Areas. Ms. Ray suggested adding, in the waiver language, "meet the intent of the Comprehensive Plan and this Chapter". She also suggested removing 'or' from subsection (D)(1)(a) on page 8 to state, "whether the proposed increased height is compatible with surrounding areas and/or is consistent with the character of the surrounding area."

Mr. Symanski questioned the language, "the additional setback shall be equally split between the two sides." Ms. Ray explained if the required setbacks were 30 feet on each side, but they wished to go up in height, which would require the addition of another 30 feet in setbacks, the question from the previous meeting was whether it was applying 30 feet to both sides or split. The way it was written in the ordinance the 30 feet would be split, so instead of 30 foot setbacks on both sides, they would have 45 foot setbacks on each side.

Discussion continued on setbacks as follows:

- Why not use the language that if there was an increase in the side yard or setback, that they would be applied in such a manner that they were equal on both sides; whatever the total side yards were existing, plus additional, be split on two sides of the building
- Suggestion to state, “the increased setback shall be applied between the building with the increased height and both property lines”
- The setbacks can be no less than the maximum required on all sides
- The area in question was how to address when the building was the same exact distance from the property line; if the additional setback requirement was 30 feet, did the town want the extra 30 feet on both sides, or split it so there was 15 feet and 15 feet
- Not sure if 2-for-1 for height was a good idea, but why not state, “the increased setback shall be applied between the building and the side property line” and remove the next sentence
- In Section 3, Building Setbacks, following the language related to the 2.5 times height, there was reference to a vegetative buffer along GMD; suggestion to remove the reference to GMD, and replace with ‘street’ buffer, since there were properties that were not located on GMD
- Page 11, requirement for ‘shadow plans’ and whether there was a standard; it was required in the past, typically in winter months; required of the Hilton Hotel property, whose plans showed a couple of times per day
- Depending on the time of the year, the ‘shadow plan’ would vary; staff noted winter months were used, because the sun was at lowest point
- Concern with Page 19, related to MUC zones, where it had been frequently asked about the language that implied someone could apply for a MUC, and which should be reviewed by staff – page 20 (C), where permissible, and whether that was for existing properties wishing to modify; the language referenced only those properties already zoned MUC
- Page 29, Section 158.069, bottom of page related to wetland, there was a contradiction with the next sentence, because it states 15 percent – staff had struck through that sentence as it tied into the previous sentence regarding “in other types of...”
- Whether the board was stating the wetlands, and landlocked parcels, were not included in open space, or can be calculated as a percentage

Chair Brown referred to page 31 of 32 of the ordinance, Section 158.071, Proposed Land Uses, and asked what ‘recreational uses’ meant. Ms. Ray responded it was carried over from the existing code. Steve Schield, Planner, discussed an example being the Zota Beach Resort pointing out the pool was part of the hotel’s recreational facilities, and they were allowed a certain percentage that allowed the restaurant; the pool would not be deducted from that percentage, nor would the running track, or the weight room. Ms. Ray commented it would not be counted against the tourism square footage that was allowed in calculating the floor area ratio. Chair Brown noted there was a lot of similar language that was confusing. Ms. Ray commented it stated ‘shall not be included in the square footage computation of non-commercial areas. Attorney

Mooney-Portale read the definition of 'recreational uses' into the record. Ms. Ray noted that adding square footage in the language spoke to how this part of the code was applied.

Chuck Whittall, Unicorp International, Inc., explained he had met with over 1,000 residents of Longboat Key within the last few weeks. He heard the complaints about traffic; and heard the requests to reduce the height of the buildings. He was asking to not limit structures to eight stories; for removal of the requirement from the PUD that an applicant had to maintain the current tourism density on the property; and requested inclusion of language that the PUD could draw from the tourism unit pool. He noted that in the event the referendum did not pass, he would not be able to redevelop the Colony Beach & Tennis Resort property. He would be forced to remain with the underlying zoning on the property, which would limit them to 137 condominiums and have to pull from the tourism pool. He suggested the Board could state they had to maintain no more than 'x'. There was debate on the setback requirements and that they should have flexibility.

Amy Shuman, Unicorp International, Inc., discussed providing flexibility of development; that no two pieces of property were created equal, which was shown in staffs presentation; and, that it was difficult to place restrictions on a PUD, when each property would be different.

Gene Jaleski, Cedar Street, encouraged the Board to slow down and engage the public on this subject. He discussed the overlay at Whitney Beach Plaza; that they might have people suing, or demanding, Bert Harris Act rights; the need to address each neighborhood as a unique entity; a stipulation that they must maintain a percentage of tourism; and, failure to calculate in Vacation Rentals By Owner (VRBO) and AirB&B units, which may exceed this level. Concerning the 'shadow plan,' they may exceed the 'shadow plan' if they used the winter solstice as a measurement – even though the Hilton Hotel had cast a shadow on the adjacent property, the plan was approved.

No one else wished to be heard, and the hearing was closed.

Mr. Schneier referred to the density provision of the PUDs (page 8 of ordinance) and asked if it was intended that the existing use, or permitted use, include the provision to apply for the 'floating' tourism units. Ms. Ray responded this PUD zoning district, as currently written, allowed for the application of the remaining 165 pool units. She mentioned that in order to happen, the Town would need to change the section of the code that dealt with the tourism pool; it currently stated that existing PUD overlays may be eligible based on their underlying zoning district. The section would need to be modified if the Board wished for someone to apply for one of these PUD zoning districts and allow them to ask for the pool units. Chair Brown wished to clarify that staff was stating that if an applicant chose to use the PUD process, they could not request from the pool units. Ms. Ray pointed out that under the existing code, someone that developed under the PUD process was eligible for the pool units; however, under the new district, they could not pull from the pool units. Chair Brown commented they needed to revise to delete the conflict in the code. Attorney Mooney-Portale explained

the adoption of what was before the Board needed to be read in the context of this – the same provision referenced in Section 158.180, which talked about what eligible properties were that could pull from the pool. Chair Brown questioned where it stated the new PUDs were not eligible. Ms. Ray commented this was a new zoning district. Chair Brown believed the section should be revised to include the new zoning district.

Mr. Symanski pointed out that on page 2 of the staff report there was reference to whether a PUD could be altered. Ms. Ray responded there have been multiple questions of whether the Board, or Town Commission, wished to continue to allow people to apply for additional density; questions whether this ordinance would be essentially invalidating. The point of the staff report, and if the Town wished to remove the provisions, they would need to remove two sentences, and the remainder of the PUD would be valid. Chair Brown asked if the voters approve the ability for the Town Commission to consider additional density, it did not mean the Town Commission would, but they would consider it on the criteria set up in the zoning code. He asked if staff was suggesting removal of that section and not allow referendums. Ms. Ray replied the question was whether the ordinance would be invalidated if the Town Commission decided to remove the ability to ask for additional density, and the answer was no, there would simply be two sentences that would need to be removed. Mr. Symanski reviewed slide 13 of the PowerPoint (Policy Question: Is there still a desire to consider additional density to encourage redevelopment?) commenting he did believe it was a good idea as the applicant should be allowed to ask, and the Town Commission should be allowed to consider.

There was consensus to not remove the last two sentences in Section 158.063(D)(2) that refers to requesting additional density and referendum.

Chair Brown mentioned there was discussion, both ways, of whether the Board was reducing the restrictions (height, setbacks, side yards, etc) that were currently in the proposed codes for PUDs. He was in favor of leaving the restrictions, because the alternative would be allowing anything without limits as long as they received approval.

There was consensus to not remove restrictions.

Mr. Schneier questioned where that left the height issue. Ms. Ray replied at 80 feet. Chair Brown asked the Board if they wished to leave the height at 80 feet, or add only for buildings that want to increase ceiling heights. Mr. Garner believed it belonged and should stay with the understanding that it was 80 feet above BFE. Ms. Bishop concurred with Mr. Garner noting this was not about one project, but the entire island. Chair Brown asked if the Board would agree that 80 foot be allowed if it was reasonable; otherwise, it would be set at 65 feet or less.

There was a 6-1(Mr. Symanski did not agree) consensus to retain the 80-foot restriction as written.

Mr. Schneier referred to the density issue, and if there was a need for a separate ordinance for the 250 tourism unit rule, it should be specified in the density portion of

the PUD that it was included. Ms. Ray pointed out it would have to be clarified in the other section. She commented if the Board wished to include the ability to ask for the 250 units, staff would need to prepare a separate ordinance for the distribution of tourism units. Discussion concerning Section (2), Density and Lot Coverage, resulted in a recommendation to revise the last sentence to state, “*applicants may also apply for additional tourism units from the tourism pool as provided for in Section 158.180.*”

MS. BISHOP MOVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF ORDINANCE 2016-32, AS AMENDED. MR. GARNER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Brown raised the issue of whether the P&Z Board wished to recommend, or suggest, to the Town Commission of placing the remaining tourism pool units on hold in order to determine whether traffic would be impacted by the completion of the larger projects currently under construction. Mr. Garner believed there was a structure in place that worked well and did not see why things should be placed on hold, because the community had to vote on it. Mr. Haycock and Ms. Bishop agreed. Mr. Symanski commented that if an application was submitted, they should be able to count the units that were approved, or able to be built, not just the ones that were built.

MOTION CARRIED ON A 6-1 ROLL CALL VOTE: BISHOP, AYE; GARNER, AYE; BROWN, AYE; HAYCOCK, AYE; MADVA, AYE; SCHNEIER, AYE; SYMANSKI, NO.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

STAFF UPDATE

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 11:48 am.

Ken Schneier, Secretary
Planning and Zoning Board