MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD
September 18, 2018

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Paul Ritz, Nathan Monk, Kurt Larson, Nina Campbell, Danny Grundhoefer

MEMBERS ABSENT: Jared Moore

STAFF PRESENT: Brandi Deese, Assistant Planning Services Administrator, Leslie Statler, Planner, Helen Gibson, CRA Administrator, Victoria D'Angelo, Assistant CRA Administrator, Robbie Weekley, Inspections, Johathan Bilby, Building Official

OTHERS PRESENT: Don Kraher, Council Executive, Christian Wagley, Nannette Chandler, Bill Weeks, John Bullock, Ann Hill, Teresa Hill, Peggy Lehane, James Vickrey, Martin Gonzalez, Julie Sloan, Doug Baldwin, Marcie Whitaker, Fred Gunther, Matthew Newton, Wayne O'Hara, Alistair McKenzie, Kelly Robinson, Rand Hicks, Ryan Wiggins, Tony McCray, Jennifer Fleming, Michael Thiel, Marlene Parker, Deborah, Monroe, Steven Shelley, Jerry Levins, Evan Robertson, Scott Remington, Jimena Caballero, Glenn Parker, Fred Jackson

AGENDA:

- Quorum/Call to Order
- Approval of Meeting Minutes from June 12, 2018 and June 26, 2018 Workshop.
- New Business:
    1. Consider Variance request for 351 W. Cedar Street – Blue Wahoos Signage
    2. Consider Aesthetic approval for 351 W. Cedar Street – Blue Wahoos Signage
    3. Request for Preliminary Plat Approval – Gadsden and 7th Subdivision
    4. Request for Preliminary and Final Plat Approval – Gabriel Estates Subdivision
    5. Consider Amendment to LDC – CRA Urban Design Standard Overlay
- Adjournment

Call to Order / Quorum Present

Chairman Ritz called the meeting to order at 2:01 pm with a quorum present and covered Board procedural instructions for the audience.

Approval of Meeting Minutes

Mr. Larson made a motion to approve the June 12, 2018 and June 26, 2018 workshop minutes, seconded by Ms. Campbell, and it carried unanimously.

New Business

Consider Variance request for 351 W. Cedar Street – Blue Wahoos Signage

Northwest Florida Professional Baseball is requesting a variance for 351 W. Cedar Street for signage to name the stadium. The variance request is 550 square feet from the maximum permitted signage of 50 square feet. The Waterfront Redevelopment District permits 10% of the linear building frontage up to a maximum of 50 square feet per street. This item is under consideration with New Business Item 2.

Scott Remington presented to the Board and stated the team did not necessarily concur with the opinion of City staff that this request required a variance, but they decided to honor the request. He provided a copy of the lease agreement with the City containing an excerpt of the use agreement and a copy of the entire use agreement along with a copy of the second amendment for naming rights to the stadium. For the purpose of wayfinding, they felt this was the proper signage for the stadium. Chairman Ritz pointed out they were requesting 10 times the size of the allowed area, but felt there was some validity in the size because of the facility's location from the road.

Mr. Bullock, who could see the signage from his home, had no objection to the signage, and since there was no representation from the other neighbors, felt they also had no objections. But he asked that the Board only grant the variance as requested and not make any ruling or judgement on the use agreement. He explained they would object to a neon "Vegas" type signage.

Mr. Gunther disagreed with the assertion that the team had the rights to advertising within the stadium which gives them the right to hang a massive sign on the exterior without approval of the Planning Board. He explained they were not exempt from zoning requirements as a result of this agreement. He pointed out the LDC for the Waterfront Redevelopment District under conditions and safeguards provided in subsection 12.12.2A, which is essentially the same requirements the Zoning Board of Adjustment uses for special circumstances and conditions which are not self-created. The hardships in this case were the design and location of the stadium and the street trees; the team signed off on the design of the stadium which was self-created, and the signage was ten times the requirements of that district size and not the minimum variance to make possible the reasonable land use, building and structure.

Mr. Remington advised he was not asking the Board to make a legal ruling on the use agreement, but he did agree they had not heard of any disagreement with the residents in the neighborhood. He emphasized this was a special circumstance since this was the only stadium and was covered under the special circumstances of the variance laws; they also felt the sign was reasonable. Chairman Ritz advised the Board was not ruling on the lease or legal agreement.

Mr. Larson asked about the materials and what the sign would be replaced with when it became weathered. Mr. Remington stated they had not contemplated replacing it at this time. Chairman Ritz confirmed if the sign was replaced, it would return for a new aesthetic approval. Mr. Larson asked what if the buildout continued and another building was built in front obstructing the view, and Mr. Remington explained that going forward, they would return to the Board for variance approval. Ms. Deese confirmed that the scoreboard and temporary advertising was not included in the same section and pointed to page 15, subsection F of the contract stating that "All advertising shall conform to all laws including without limitations City ordinances regulating advertising" and that this Board was considering a variance since it was deemed necessary. Mr. Grundhoefer asked why they felt they were exempt, and Mr. Remington explained their interpretation was that other portions differentiated between advertising and signage, and they thought this was wayfinding signage versus advertising third party products or services. He explained they did not have a discussion with the City until the sign was already installed and would have come to the Board sooner if they had known the City would take this view.

Ms. Campbell advised signage had been an ongoing topic for downtown Pensacola and asked about proper notice. Ms. Deese confirmed postcard notices were sent to every property owner within 500', an ad posted in the newspaper as well as a sign was posted on the property. To her knowledge staff had not received any calls on this request other Mr. Bullock inquiring of the agenda posting.

Ms. Campbell pointed out the sign was now in an affixed position and in moving forward, was concerned with the message the Board was sending. Mr. Remington explained they wanted to be a good partner with the City and pointed out they paid $225,000 per year to display their name on it. He advised the sign was possibly posted in March/April, and the complaint was received in June. Ms. Deese confirmed the sign was up for approximately a month before a complaint was made, and City staff did want to investigate the water intrusion and stucco warranty before coming to the Board. Ms. Campbell inquired as to the life expectancy, but Ms. Deese explained the Board could not make conditional variances. Chairman Ritz confirmed if this variance was approved, the size was good until they go larger, and aesthetics approval would come back to the Board. Ms. Deese confirmed the sign was vinyl applique on a backer board which was screwed into the building façade. Mr. Remington pointed out the naming rights in the agreement were good for another four years when new negotiations would be held over the use agreement. He stated when the lease came up for negotiation, the City could require the signage to be smaller.

Mr. Monk stated if the sign had come to the Board earlier, he would not have approved the design, but would probably have moved for a larger sign for visibility. He recalled when the naming rights conversation occurred and walked away thinking it extended to the inside and outside and was confused about why the sign was not up sooner. He was concerned in setting a precedent but understood Mr. Remington's misunderstanding. Mr. Larson asked if the build-out occurs and the sign is no longer adequate, what would the plan be? Mr. Remington advised they would like to see a community sponsor or major employer put their name on the stadium with signage you would more typically see (not internally illuminated) which could be taken down and replaced easily.

Getting into the aesthetic discussion, Mr. Grundhoefer considered this signage a more temporary billboard sign and appreciated the effort to get a sponsor to place a more elegant sign appropriate for the stadium. He asked if it could be treated as a temporary sign for a year until they get a sponsor for a permanent sign. Ms. Deese pointed out there were 100 to 150 screw holes and by definition it was clearly a permanent sign. Mr. Remington asked if the decision could be tabled for one year. Ms. Deese confirmed the Board could table for 45 days unless another date is specified by the Board, but there is a violation of no building permit. The Board would need to postpone for a date specific, but this might impact Building Inspections. Mr. Monk asked if it was a violation and the Board tabled it, being aware of it and it flies off, what would the liability be? Ms. Deese advised that the Board had been made aware of it, and a permit had not been issued. Mr. Monk stated technically the Board could approve the size and not the aesthetics.

Mr. Larson made a motion to approve as submitted for size, and Mr. Monk seconded. Mr. Monk asked if the Board approved the size, he did not believe counsel was prepared to answer all of the questions on aesthetics; this could be moved to the next Board meeting giving them that opportunity. Mr. Remington stated if the Board had an up and down vote on the size, and it was successful, assuming the aesthetics was denied, he wanted to know what size he would be dealing with in order to return with the aesthetics. Chairman Ritz confirmed the motion was for 120" x 720" which was the current size of the sign.

Mr. Levins was not a fan of variances, but there was already a sign designating Community Maritime Park. He pointed out tourists coming down for the summer go down Palafox, and you can tell from the road that this location is a baseball stadium.

Chairman Ritz then called for the vote, and it carried unanimously.

Consider Aesthetic approval for 351 W. Cedar Street – Blue Wahoos Signage

Northwest Florida Professional Baseball is requesting aesthetic approval for signage at 351 W. Cedar Street in order to name the stadium. This signage has been installed and photos of the signage on the building were provided. This item is under consideration with New Business Item 1.

Mr. Remington stated the sign was not in the Blue Wahoos font for readability purposes and thought it was playful and served its purpose. Chairman Ritz observed Kazoo and the background were both blue, and the aesthetic was not good.

Mr. Grundhoefer restated the sign was billboard like, banner like and felt they could come up with a much nicer sign which would depict the quality of the organization and what the city is about. Mr. Monk restated he felt there was a need for a really big sign and recalled the discussion of the details of the Community Maritime Park signage; he did not favor the look of the current sign.

Mr. Monk made a motion to postpone; Chairman Ritz stated a motion to deny would be more definitive and it would unapproved aesthetically and would fall back to staff to enforce that decision. Ms. Deese again advised in Subsection (d) "Any matter referred to the Board shall be acted upon by the Board within 45 days of the date of reference unless a longer or shorter period is specified." Mr. Remington felt postponing might be a good idea from the perspective that it would give them time to work with staff. Ms. Deese stated in considering the time it would take for a redesign, the next Board meeting of October 9th would not get the applicant time for design and felt the November 13 would be more appropriate. She also pointed out that there would be no notices required by the LDC for the aesthetic approval. **Mr. Monk made a motion to postpone to the November 13, 2018 meeting of the Board. Mr. Larson seconded the motion.** Mr. Remington stated for the record, they were not waiving any rights they have under the use agreement, but they wanted to be good partners and neighbors. **The motion then carried unanimously.**

Request for Preliminary Plat Approval – Gadsden and 7th Subdivision

Rebol-Battle & Associates has submitted a request for Preliminary Plat approval for Gadsden and 7th Subdivision located at the southeastern corner of Gadsden Street and 7th Avenue.

The proposed Preliminary Plat consists of 5 lots that are 30 feet in width. This property is zoned OEHC-1, Neighborhood Commercial District, which does not require a minimum lot width or a minimum square footage. However, this district does restrict development on the parcels to a maximum of 50% lot coverage. This zoning district only requires a side setback (no front or rear setbacks) and that has been correctly indicated on the plat.

The Final Plat has been routed through the various City departments and utility providers. The comments received to date were provided. The developer has opted to pay into the park escrow in lieu of dedicating a park within the project.

Mr. Robertson presented to the Board and indicated all the residential units would face 7th Avenue with access provided off Gadsden through the rear. Chairman Ritz stated that if these homes were built, it would be an improvement over the existing rougher looking landscape. He explained the final plat approval would return to the Board. Mr. Grundhoefer asked with a 50% lot maximum, what would be the footprint, and Mr. Robertson indicated the structures would be two-story with an attached garage. Ms. Deese clarified the buildable square footage could be 1600 sf for single story. Mr. Robertson also stated their intentions were to keep as many trees as possible. **Mr. Grundhoefer then made a motion to approve, seconded by Ms. Campbell, and it carried unanimously.**

Request for Preliminary and Final Plat Approval – Gabriel Estates Subdivision

Rebol-Battle and Associates has submitted a request for Preliminary and Final Plat approval for the parcel located at 5760 San Gabriel Drive. The applicant is proposing a detached single family development for the 0.53 acre site to be named Gabriel Estates Subdivision. This parcel is the former site of the Scenic Heights swimming pool.

The proposed Preliminary & Final Plat consists of 4 lots fronting on San Gabriel that vary in size with typical proposed lot size of .15 of an acre. Each of the lots meet the regulations required by the R-2 zoning district (Residential/Office) including setback requirements. The southernmost lot (lot 1) has been parceled out separately in a 30 foot wide lot due to an existing utility easement of 30 feet.

The Preliminary and Final Plat has been routed through the various City departments and utility providers. The comments received to date were provided. The developer has opted to pay into the park escrow in lieu of dedicating a park within the project.

Ms. Deese explained the LDC allows for the combination of preliminary and final approval with four lots or less, and subdivision approval does not require notification. Mr. Robertson stated the utility easement was already dedicated. Chairman Ritz pointed out the neighborhood was built in the 60s and 70s with driveways in the front and garages on the right or left side of the homes, and it might look odd for the driveways to be located in the rear. Mr. Grundhoefer explained it would look odd to have garages in the front with the existing garages located to the side.

Ms. Deese explained the subdivision review was technical and if all the provisions in the LDC were met, the Board was obligated to approve it. Ms. Campbell asked how sidewalks would be handled, and Chairman Ritz explained the sidewalk would be in the right-of-way and not on their property. Mr. Monk was concerned with voting for something when residents were not prepared for the new subdivision. Mr. Grundhoefer offered this development was right for this neighborhood. **Mr. Larson then made a motion to approve, seconded by Ms. Campbell, and it carried unanimously.**

Consider Amendment to LDC – CRA Urban Design Standard Overlay

Ms. Deese informed the Board of several printed emails, and there were some emailed to the Board and staff during the meeting which were not printed. Ms. Victoria D'Angelo presented to the Board and indicated they had incorporated the Board's modifications, and Ms. Marina Khoury was on the phone to assist with clarifications. Ms. Khoury addressed windows on frontages being proportional and looked at the character of the CRA areas which were more vertical in design. The bicycle racks would be perpendicular with a 56 centimeter but converted to inches. She clarified review procedures including language for stormwater requirements as well as language that required additional drawings be provided to ensure meeting the established guidelines. They also modified the language for the rear setback of accessory buildings to be reduced from 5' to 3' and modified principle building setbacks from 5' to 3' as well. They modified the language to permit rear setbacks to a minimum of 20' for single family detached and duplexes on lots 30' or wider as well. Porches would not be required on single family detached and duplexes; they added definitions of porches, stoops and building grades and materials required for the CRA area.

Ms. Gibson emphasized that the CRA had presented and worked with the community since January with week-long charrettes and receiving 20 pages of comments and responding to each one. They did their best to accommodate everyone that they could in keeping with the ordinance. She advised this was a light touch of form-based code. She restated that design guidelines work well by defining existing character, with authenticity making a place endearing.

Chairman Ritz then called for input from the audience with a 5 minute time limit.

Mr. Weeks stated imagine receiving a postcard in the mail on Saturday for charrettes beginning on Monday to discuss design guidelines for a CRA Overlay District. On Wednesday, it went from guidelines to standards, the difference being a guideline is "should" and a standard is "must." In this meeting just now Ms. Gibson also referred to these as design guidelines. Imagine if you had received those same postcards, and the CRA had said there would be four nights of meetings, and when we are finished, we will tell you what you can and cannot do with your property; there might have been a better turnout. He stated this exercise had been a poor attempt to push mandates on people that they never asked for, and government should work at the will of the people. With the CRA designation, one side of East Hill will have restrictions. He did not ask to be in the Urban Core CRA and bought in that neighborhood because it was not North Hill; he did not want someone telling him what he could or could not do with his house. He bought a house in East Hill because nothing looked the same. He had asked how much this would add to the cost of a home and was told they were not addressing that. These standards would come with a cost, and these requirements were written by people who don't live in the city of Pensacola or the CRA. Taking a blanket approach and lumping everything south of Cervantes in one pot is not the way to accomplish this.

The reason the Urban Core CRA was developed was to eliminate blight – stick to that, get that accomplished, and the work is completed. He stressed more government oversight is not needed to put onerous restrictions on private property rights.

Ms. Chandler used to send out the East Hill newsletter and had met with 100+ people who would be affected by this overlay. She stated some parts were just too onerous for some people. Substantial modifications on page 4 D (a) states existing homes would not have to be modified unless there was a substantial modification requested according to the Florida Building Code. She quoted the definition of substantial improvement as equaling 50% of the market value of the structure before the improvement has begun. She asked who would determine the market value of the property, and would there be a review board for this with an appeal process since some repairs are time sensitive. With new construction, an elevated foundation is a 20-30% increase in construction costs; the guidelines require an 18" elevation and do not adhere to ADA requirements. Windows and muttons also need clarification along with an appeal process.

Mr. Bechtol was furious with these guidelines, but his address was not in the questioned zone. He believed what happens in the CRA would be a stepping stone. He pointed out it was none of his neighbor's business what he does to his property and not the City's unless they are the landlord.

Mr. Monk stated the Board dealt with this for nine months with notices and newspaper articles. Chairman Ritz reminded the audience to remain quite during the civil discourse. Mr. Monk explained he was a proponent for people speaking at public meetings, but this information had been dealt with. His interpretation was this effort was designed to protect the integrity of Pensacola, actually protecting minorities and the culture of the neighborhoods. He felt this was a positive thing for the community, but wanted the meeting atmosphere to be taken down a notch. Chairman Ritz stressed the citizens had the right to speak to the agenda item for 5 minutes.

Ms. Munro stated she was not a part of this neighborhood, but this same process had been pushed by a small group of people. She questioned who initiated the overlay process – the citizens or the CRA – was it being pushed for one neighborhood at a time. She questioned who wrote the rules and who would enforce them, and how could you write rules for such a wide range of style, architecture and age; were existing structures only grandfathered until a hurricane, and then they face the cost of needed repairs. Some of these same requirements had been requested in her neighborhood, and they were trying to get ahead of the game in order not to lose property rights.

Chairman Ritz instructed the audience to address the agenda item, and if they mentioned other locations not in the overlay zone, he would take time to remind them they were referencing a property not within the agenda item, however, they could address those properties in open forum.

Ms. Sloan stated she had her house for 12 years and shared a driveway with her neighbor. A new owner purchased the house next door and told her renters they were removing the shared driveway to build a two-story house. She was hoping the overly could help her protect her home. She was interested in the overlay but needed more information on what the limits were. Ms. Gibson stated the shared driveway concept was done historically and was recommended under the overlay to prevent driveways on the front of homes. Remodeling her garage in the future would not be prevented by the overlay. She also advised they used the State Building Code deliberately for the substantial modifications requirements; if you improved 50% or more of the home value, then the overlay requirements would be necessary. The overlay was to encourage new construction to blend in with the character of the older homes. Mr. Monk advised people in the community brought this subject forward and attended the scheduled meetings and also took into consideration the negative materials that came forward which gave way to changes in the document.

Mr. Gunther pointed out supporters of the overlay had stated repeatedly that the urban designed overlay was Phase I of implementing a form-based code for Pensacola, and he believed objections from the audience today were pertinent regardless of their address.

His major concerns with the overlay were (1) there was no process to obtain a variance to many of the new requirements – the ZBA can only grant a variance for height, area, size of structure, size of yards and open spaces. (2) Grandfathering is allowed for projects in the works and (3) permitting for construction will become more difficult (page 2 of letter to Ms. Morris) regarding submission of colors. Why request a list of items already controlled by the LDC to be added to the site plan before it is submitted. As far as the variances, those limitations were created by the Florida Statute, and after learning the process cannot be changed, he was convinced the only reasonable action by the Board would be to recommend removal of everything you cannot request a variance to or just deny the entire overlay altogether. He asked that the Board adhere to its traditional process – non-Board members should not be allowed to openly participate in the Board discussion and talk over Board members when an idea immerges with which they disagree (during Board only discussion).

Mr. McKenzie is not affected by the overlay but discovered it was part of a form-based code. What he had not heard in the meeting was any evidence based reasons why we should not have this. He suggested checking out the hundreds of cities in the United States who have put these in place. They work, they benefit the citizens economically, they benefit property values, they benefit the developers for an easier process, and they give certainty to investors and economic equity to people. He recommended looking at Charleston and Chattanooga and encouraged approving the overlay. (Board member Larson left the meeting.)

Ms. Fleming did not live in the overlay district but wanted to buy a lot in that location and asked if notification was sent to home owners within the boundary indicating what the Code says. Ms. Gibson indicated 3x5 cards could not include exactly what the Code states, however, there were numerous opportunities for people to view it on the City's website with a link to everything being proposed. The overlay as proposed has been posted to this website since April and returned to the Planning Board in June with those iterations presented today. Ms. Gibson advised there would be no postcards, but there would be a legal ad for the next public hearing. Regarding styles, Mr. Grundhoefer stated this district was not historic. Ms. Fleming asked if approved, what the next step would be. Chairman Ritz advised if approved today, it would proceed to City Council. Ms. D'Angelo clarified if approved, it would proceed to the CRA October meeting, then to a public hearing at the October Council meeting, then to the second reading and adoption at the November Council meeting. Ms. Gibson stated the intent of the way the overlay was written was to be very specific though not restrictive. The way it was envisioned to be implemented would be by the permitting staff who would have a checklist of all the overlay requirements which would also be available to any applicant. It would not have to be submitted to any boards, eliminating recent challenges to ARB due to ambiguous language. Chairman Ritz again emphasized there were no design styles in the overlay.

Mr. O'Hara stated he wished he could have given his 5 minutes to Ms. Chandler. He was concerned this was a slippery slope which would cause time and expense for those who want to develop in the downtown area. It would be hard to get developers to come in when you add another layer of guidelines, and these overlay guidelines were weighted toward residential development. The "shall" versus "should" issue was also concerning. More people are downtown, and traffic is becoming an issue, and these guidelines discourage driveways, allowing people to park in the front of their homes which means they park on the streets. He encouraged some sort of grace period prior to this going into effect since people are wanting to purchase and develop property now, and it is a lengthy process.

Mr. Wagley advised this was part of a national trend to protect the character of communities, and many cities have these similar standards. He stated this was the most public process of any LDC change, and he was happy to stay and answer any questions after the meeting. The City's CRA guiding document says form-based standards are necessary. DPZ was not from here and had no stake in it, but applied their professional knowledge in exploring the neighborhoods and capturing the DNA to write a code to protect what exists. He offered parking on the streets actually slowed traffic. Also, with a simple checklist, there would be no waiting for board approval which would keep bureaucracy down.

Ms. Lahayne who lives in East Hill found the attitude of the Board to be a little harsh. She stressed her lifesavings were in her home, and she along with her neighbors did not get a notification. She wanted to give her time to Ms. Chandler, but was instructed this was her time to address the Board. Chairman Ritz advised according to procedures, the speakers could not give their time to another person. He offered if he lived in the affected area and someone offered an idea which would capture the character of where he lived, as an architect he would tend to accept that. He also stated in looking at North Hill and Pensacola, he did not see many vacant properties, with North Hill having more stringent rules; people do go to places with codes like this. He stressed this has been an open process with many charrettes and clarified that the postcards were mailed to property owners of record listed on the tax rolls and not to the street address.
Ms. Gibson stated with regard to the CRA established in 1984, there was no intent to add any additional phase to this for other areas of the city. The CRA boundaries are from the waterfront to Cervantes Street, from 17th Avenue on the east, and to A Street on the west.
Chairman Ritz offered change by itself is not bad, and the change of this ordinance was to capture the character of Pensacola. The idea of the form-based code was to create the livable-walkable city, and in this case, the consultant was also trying to capture character and DNA of Pensacola, and he appreciated it from that standpoint. Developers would rather have rules to follow and a checklist from which to operate to assure their projects are approved. This Board has had the consensus in the past to support this ordinance. The revisions dealt with requests and comments coming from the public meeting in June. Mr. Grundhoefer remembered reviewing the entire document, making revisions and voting in favor of the ordinance, and the Board was ready at that time to recommend it to City Council. He explained he had not changed his position. He had also received several letters and emails in support and none in opposition.
Mr. Monk made a motion to approve as it stands, seconded by Mr. Grundhoefer. Ms. Campbell stated her only comment was that she was also supporting this ordinance. She advised she also lived in the ARB review district, and was leaning toward postponing this only because so many felt they were not informed. Chairman Ritz noted some citizens who spoke did not own property in the overlay zone which was why they did not receive notification. Mr. Grundhoefer received phone calls stating all the people in East Hill were up in arms because this would be a stepping stone to getting these requirements in East Hill, which could not be further from the truth. Through the same charrette system, the residents of East Hill could decide not to support this ordinance. Mr. Monk stressed the Board had done its part. Belmont DeVilliers began this conversation long ago, and a lot of homes had been torn down in the meantime, and the character of Pensacola was already changing and shifting. If people wanted to continue to object, they could do so at City Council, but now it was time to move on to the next phase. Ms. Campbell noted citizens had another vehicle with which to respond. **The vote then carried unanimously.** Chairman Ritz explained the ordinance would now proceed to City Council in October.

Open Forum – Chairman Ritz asked that the audience not speak to an agenda item which had already been decided. Mr. Monk exited the meeting which left the Board with no quorum.

Adjournment – With no further business, Chairman Ritz adjourned the meeting at 4:56 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Brandi C. Deese
Secretary to the Board