



PLANNING SERVICES

THE UPSIDE of FLORIDA

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD**

**June 13, 2017**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Paul Ritz-Chairman, Danny Grundhoefer, Jared Moore, Nina Campbell, Kurt Larson

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Kyle Owens, Nathan Monk

**STAFF PRESENT:** Brandi Deese, Assistant Planning Services Administrator, Leslie Statler, Planner, Victoria D'Angelo and Helen Gibson, CRA, Don Kraher, Council Executive

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Mick Novota, Greg Worley, Robert Rice, Dax Campbell, Diane Mack

**AGENDA:**

- Quorum/Call to Order
- Approval of Meeting Minutes from May 9, 2017
- Request for ROW Vacation of the 1000 Block Avery Street
- Request for ROW Vacation of the 700 Block Commendencia Street – Ferry Landing Project
- Request Variance Approval for the 700 Block Commendencia Street – Ferry Landing Project
- Request Aesthetic Approval of 700 Block of Commendencia Street – Ferry Landing Project
- Request for Preliminary Plat Approval for River Birch Subdivision
- Request for Preliminary Plat Approval for Girard Place Phase I Subdivision
- Consider Amendment to LDC Section 12-2-6 Residential/Office Land Use District
- Consider Amendment to LDC Section 12-12-8 Regulation of Patron's Dogs at Permitted Food Service Establishments
- Consider Amendment to Eastside Neighborhood Plan
- Open Forum
- Adjournment

**Call to Order / Quorum Present**

Chairman Ritz called the meeting to order at 2:03 pm with a quorum present. He gave instructions to the audience on the rules and procedures of the Board.

**Approval of Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Larson made a motion to approve the May 9, 2017 minutes, seconded by Mr. Grundhoefer, and it carried unanimously.

**Request for ROW Vacation of the 1000 Block Avery Street**

Mr. Dax Campbell, Campbell Construction, is requesting to vacate the portion of the right-of-way of Avery Street directly adjacent to his property at 1011 Fairnie Avenue and the properties located at 1015 Fairnie Avenue and 1717 N. 11th Avenue.

EVERYTHING THAT'S GREAT ABOUT FLORIDA IS BETTER IN PENSACOLA.

222 West Main Street Pensacola, FL 32502 / T: 850.435.1670 / F: 850.595.1143/[www.cityofpensacola.com](http://www.cityofpensacola.com)

The applicant indicates the reason for the request is to enable him to have a somewhat symmetric parcel and to allow him to install a privacy fence along the new rear property line. The applicant is only interested in the portion which abuts his property. He has indicated the remainder of the right-of-way could be equally divided between the property owners of 1015 Fairnie Avenue and 1717 N. 11th Avenue. He has indicated both abutting neighbors are in agreement with the request; however, both have signed with contingencies. In initial discussions the rationale for this request was that the applicant could gain additional square footage in order to split the lot and construct two dwellings instead of the one dwelling currently permitted by code. There is a potential for future variance requests to the Zoning Board of Adjustment, which would be self-created by this present request.

Dax Campbell explained they wanted to make the property more symmetrical and install a privacy fence. Both adjacent property owners were in agreement. He explained the contingencies were that he no longer use the easement in the future and install a fence across it. Chairman Ritz asked how the adjacent property owners would maintain their access, and Mr. Campbell advised at the moment he was not aware they were maintaining it. Mr. Joel Campbell explained the easement was like a road they drive in to access the rear of their house. On the Fairnie property, the neighbor does not have access to Fairnie Avenue, so they drive around to Avery and come in the back way. He advised when they demolish the home and rebuild, they will use the front entrance on Fairnie to access the property. Chairman Ritz pointed out at the present time the property belongs to Pensacola and is used by the neighbors who abut it. Since this would allow public property to be placed in the hands of a private individual, how would the Board become satisfied that Mr. Bell and Mr. Broadley (neighbors) still maintain access, and that all citizens are treated fairly. Dax Campbell stated on the rear corner of the property, he would be constructing a fence. When the neighbors access the easement, they turn in before the corner, and this would not impede their access. Ms. Campbell pointed out this is public property being handed over, and would it make more sense to address this as an individual vacation of right-of-way just for the portion needed? Ms. Deese advised that we don't typically vacate portions of rights-of-way for a variety of reasons. It is shown as 20' wide, which means each property owner would get half. Mr. Campbell would get the entire portion because his property abuts the right-of-way on the north and the south.

Mr. Grundhoefer explained the Board needed a legal description to show how the neighbors' contingencies for access were met. Chairman Ritz pointed out those contingencies needed to be clearly resolved. Dax Campbell asked for clarification on what the Board required, and Chairman Ritz advised some kind of legal description/survey from a licensed firm was needed. Even if Mr. Bell and Mr. Broadley were not present and they signed the legal description/survey, with the fence location indicated, the Board would have a much easier time accepting and approving the vacation. Ms. Deese explained the Board could table the item but she would recommend the Board specify the length of time instead of being bound to the 45-day requirement. **Mr. Grundhoefer made a motion to deny as presented without prejudice, seconded by Ms. Campbell, and it carried unanimously.**

#### **Request for ROW Vacation of the 700 Block Commendancia Street – Ferry Landing Project**

Chairman Ritz advised since his business was involved with this project, he recused himself from the discussion and voting on the item.

The Port of Pensacola is requesting to vacate the portion of the right-of-way of Commendancia Street directly adjacent to properties owned by the City of Pensacola, including the Port of Pensacola. Although the application indicates this is a request to vacate Pine Street, the proposed area has been identified as the 700 Block of Commendancia Street by the appropriate City departments. The applicant indicates the reason for the request is to enable this portion of the existing right-of-way to function more as a driveway between the proposed Ferry Landing ticket concession building and the parking area accommodating the passengers. As such, it provides more direct access to the users. The City of Pensacola is the sole adjacent property owner to this section of Commendancia Street.

Steve Popal of Atkins Engineering addressed the Board along with Robert Rice of Bullock Tice Associates. Though the ferry landing itself is confined to the rectangular block to the south of the proposed vacation area, it is supported by the existing large parking lot to the north, and approximately 100 parking spaces would be allocated to the ferry passengers coming to and from the ferry facilities. The right-of-way area would become a pedestrian area and a vehicular drop off for passengers. The building has been located closer to the right-of-way to have more queuing and storage space for passengers on the water side. In the long term, there is potential for an additional building to the east.

Mr. Grundhoefer asked if Pine Street would be changed, and Mr. Popal advised it would remain as is, but the building itself would fall within the 60' street right-of-way. Mr. Grundhoefer confirmed the building did not meet City codes because it was in the right-of-way. He asked if the City had ever reduced the right-of-way width, and Ms. Deese stated the City typically does not favor vacating portions of the right-of-way especially in this situation, and that was not the request routed through the utility providers and appropriate departments. Mr. Grundhoefer stated his concern was that it could turn into most anything, but it was City property. Chairman Ritz offered that the portion to the south (the building) was owned fee-simple by the City, and the right-of-way was owned by the citizens. Mr. Popal stated the fee-simple parcel was the same parcel as the northern parking lot – not subdivided. **Mr. Larson made a motion to approve, seconded by Mr. Moore, and it carried unanimously with Chairman Ritz abstaining.**

#### **Request Variance Approval for the 700 Block Commendencia Street – Ferry Landing Project**

The Port of Pensacola is requesting a Variance of 33.0 feet to reduce the required minimum building setback for structures adjacent to a bulkhead from 30 feet landward of the bulkhead line to 3.0 feet waterward of the bulkhead to accommodate an open-air shelter for ferry passengers. The ferries will be loading passengers at the terminal end of the Commendencia slip adjacent to the proposed sun/weather shelter. The design professionals have maintained a concise footprint while planning for future growth and expansion. However, given the limited space for the development adjacent to the boarding area and the nature of the intended use, the open-air shelters are proposed to be closer than the minimum setback allowed within the district. It should be noted the structural members of the shelters do not extend waterward of the bulkhead line; the roof extends beyond this vertical plane. Mr. Popal stated the reason for the variance was to provide shelter for queuing approximately 300 passengers waiting for the ferry boats. The space between the shelter and building is a general gathering area, open structure, and allows for a promenade along the water. Mr. Grundhoefer stated the Board had already approved the location, the look, and architectural character. **Mr. Moore made a motion to approve, seconded by Mr. Larson, and it carried unanimously with Chairman Ritz abstaining.**

#### **Request Aesthetic Approval of 700 Block of Commendencia Street – Ferry Landing Project**

The Port of Pensacola, is requesting aesthetic approval for the Ferry Landing Project. This project was considered by the Planning Board for preliminary approval at the May 9, 2017 meeting and approved with consideration being made for more permanent materials that would have lower maintenance. Mr. Moore wanted to review the suggested changes. Mr. Rice explained they had designed the building with wood veneer cladding and an EFIS cladding, so the white depicted on the drawings was an EFIS system, basically a clad foam system, with natural wood paneling. The Board felt these materials were not as durable, so in keeping with the design, they modified the EFIS to an insulated metal panel. The wood veneer is a cementitious fiber panel board rather than natural wood. The screen walls on the roof and below the finished floor, and the screen wall around the mechanical yard will also be cementitious hardi board panel.

Ms. Deese clarified the applicant was seeking final approval for the building and the open-air shelters which would move forward to City Council.

Mr. Popal indicated the sunshades for the high roof are a first bid option, and the second bid option is the canopy at the water's edge. The sunshade aluminum louver system is built in the high roof, and if they were removed, the opaque roof would remain. **Mr. Moore made a motion to approve as presented, seconded by Mr. Larson. Ms. Campbell noted the item was amended to include the main building. The motion then carried unanimously with Chairman Ritz abstaining.**

#### **Request for Preliminary Plat Approval for River Birch Subdivision**

John and Connie Bowman, Our Family Property LLC, have submitted a request for Preliminary Plat approval for "River Birch" subdivision. The proposed development, identified as the 7100 blk of Spanish Trail, is a 3.93-acre parcel located on the east side of Spanish Trail, north of Creighton Road and immediately adjacent to the north of Gull Point Community Center. The site is currently vacant. The proposed subdivision is located within the R-1AA zoning district and has a FLUM designation of MDR, Medium Density Residential. The density allowed within the zoning district is 8.7 units per acre with the lots adhering to the regulations within Table 12-2.2. Per the application, the proposed subdivision consists of 6 lots. However, the actual plat indicates 4 lots are being created and depicts 3 new lots, measuring at least 40 feet in width, and 2 drainage easements contained within the remainder of the parent parcel. Additionally, the developer has requested Administrative Variances to reduce the rear building setback from 30 feet to 28 feet. The developer has opted to pay into the park escrow in lieu of dedicating a park.

Chairman Ritz noted that the fire hydrant had been addressed.

Jason Rebold addressed the Board and stated the plan was to subdivide, and the large parcel would be Phase II, and they were not sure what they were going to do with it. Chairman Ritz addressed the rear setback from 30' to 28' and was concerned if neighbors nearby have that same requirement for them, here the large parcel is being subdivided with a request for the rear setback to be reduced by 2' which others in the neighborhood might not have as their benefit but was requested in this item. Ms. Deese explained it was for transparency and was actually permitted by the LDC, so not a variance to the actual property which would go to the Board; it would be administratively handled. She advised the LDC permits staff to grant administrative variances of 10 percent up to 2', whichever is less. Chairman Ritz explained the Board was reviewing the preliminary plat and would see the final. Ms. Campbell stated given the comments from the City, all the requirements had been met. Mr. Grundhoefer asked if R-1AA had a 50' minimum requirement on the street, and this was a variance to that. Ms. Deese clarified the lot width requirement was 40' and the comments he referred to were based on engineering which is a different regulation because of the corner parcel. Mr. Rebold stated because there were over 4 lots, Engineering required retention, so the drainage easements would be ponds for the three lots. As Lot 4 was developed, the ponds would be relocated to the downstream side. **Ms. Campbell made a motion to approve the preliminary plat, seconded by Mr. Grundhoefer, and the motion carried unanimously.**

#### **Request for Preliminary Plat Approval for Girard Place Phase I Subdivision**

Rebol-Battle & Associates has submitted a request for Preliminary Plat approval for "Girard Place" subdivision, a townhouse subdivision. The proposed development, formerly identified as 302 W. Romana St, is a total of 1.62 acres located on the eastern portion of the City block bounded by S. Reus Street (east), W. Romana Street (south), S. DeVilliers (west), and Hilary Street (north). The initial phase under consideration with this application is .92-acres in size. The site is currently vacant. The proposed subdivision is located within the C-2 zoning district, the Governmental Center District (GCD) overlay district, and has a FLUM designation of B, Business. It is also located within the Dense Business District. The density allowed within the zoning district is 135 units per acre with the lots adhering to the regulations within Table 12-2.7.

The application under review contains 11 lots in addition to the remainder of the parent parcel. Although the project will contain open space, the developer has opted to pay into the park escrow in lieu of dedicating a park to the City.

Chairman Ritz indicated Rebol Battle had provided the Board with revised materials.

Jason Rebold presented to the Board and explained this was the first phase of a townhome project as a subdivision which allows a fee-simple mortgage, with 11 lots being the first phases of the project. The second phase would be plotted on the north side of the property on the Hilary Street right-of-way.

Chairman Ritz noted the private drainage easement along Romana Street. Mr. Rebol stated because the lots are fronting an existing city street right-of-way, they were required to address the stormwater on this property, providing drainage at the foot of the driveways in order to route it to retention ponds.

Mr. Rebol clarified that the first phase had been presold, and rest of the parcel would be the second phase.

Ms. Campbell explained that the ARB voted 4 to 1 to approve with comments, and the project went before the Council. Ms. Deese stated the applicant then appealed the decision, and Council voted to overturn the ARB decision. Even though the applicant received approval from the ARB, they received approval with comments which were substantial enough in the developer's mind that the project could not go forward. He filed an appeal which is allowed by the LDC. Most of the discussion was centered around the comments that the building move forward toward the property lines so that a car could not be parked within that area, which eliminated the guest parking, and the developer said this made the project not feasible. She indicated she had not seen any renderings coming through ARB nor through Mr. Rebold's office that displayed any parking in the rear. She stated if the plat meets technical standards, the Board is obligated to approve. The aesthetic review process had been completed through the ARB. Mr. Rebol advised the applicant wanted to go through ARB first before the platting began.

**Mr. Moore made a motion to approve the preliminary plat as submitted with the revised version, seconded by Ms. Campbell. The motion carried 3 to 2 with Mr. Larson and Mr. Grundhoefer dissenting.**

#### **Consider Amendment to LDC Section 12-2-6 Residential/Office Land Use District**

Mr. Mick Novota is requesting the Board consider amending the Land Development Code as it relates to the land uses allowed within the R-2 zoning district, specifically barber shops and hair salons. The Ordinance was modified in 2016 to allow these uses as permitted within the district subject to their location along a 4-lane roadway. The applicant is requesting the Board consider changing this language to identify the roadway classification rather than the physical characteristics of the roadway.

Chairman Ritz asked if the designation "major urbanized collector or larger roadway" was a State of Florida transportation document. Ms. Deese stated it would be up to the City's transportation engineer.

Mr. Mick Novota explained they bought the property on A Street and found out about the 4-lane language later. The property has an office building, a warehouse, and parking and has always been commercial. He had a request to place a high-end beauty salon in the corner building. He did confer with the city engineer to find out how to proceed without a commercial variance. Through his research, he found that people did not like beauty salons in their neighborhoods.

Chairman Ritz stated in considering Garden at A Street, this location would suffice for this type of occupancy. Also, if they changed the underlying language of the Code, there were other locations where this would take effect - the far reaching effect of this agenda item.

Mr. Grundhoefer asked for the commercial uses in R-2. Ms. Deese stated getting into the more commercial uses would include childcare facilities, private clubs and lodges, boarding and lodging houses, bed and breakfast, dormitories, office buildings, hospitals, clinics, nursing homes, schools and educational institutions, libraries, community centers, social service homes or centers, banks and financial institutions, studios, and any accessory uses related to those above. Mr. Mick Novota advised the property was a dentist office at one time. Mr. Grundhoefer suggested barber shops and salons did not seem foreign to the other types of uses.

Ms. Deese stated the retail selling of products would fall under accessory, so it would have to maintain an accessory use and not consume the business (beauty supply house). She advised this is one of those uses that is often presumed to be allowed, but when you look at the Code, it is not permitted within the R-2 District. It was determined that “major urbanized collector or larger roadway” was based on traffic counts. Ms. Mack reminded the Board that one year ago she addressed the Board when Buddy Page pleaded for barber shops and beauty salons to be included in R-2 because a realtor selling the property at 9<sup>th</sup> and Cross did not perform the due diligence to read the LDC, noting the permitted uses before selling the property. This couple who bought the property put thousands of dollars in renovating it before realizing a beauty salon was not allowed. The request was denied initially by the Board but later approved by Planning Board and Council with the 4-lane roadway designation because of the hardship which was pleaded by the property owners. She explained if you were a real estate broker for 25 years, you should know to do the due diligence and read the LDC. She advised ordinances are laws, and we want laws to be clear and unambiguous. The ordinance was changed to allow barber shops and beauty salons in R-2 on 4-lane roadways. She emphasized that if you feel as a Board that we have reached the point that barber shops and beauty salons should be included in R-2, make it universal but not before you notify the affected people that you are looking at that change. The other alternative is that Mr. Novota does not need to have the Board change things citywide since he can ask for rezoning, and there is commercial zoning across the street.

Mr. Grundhoefer asked Ms. Mack to explain her opposition to the beauty salon versus other types of businesses. She stated it had nothing to do with services offered but the business operation parameters – operating within fixed hours. Beauty salons are not limited to 3 or 4 stations and have extended hours of operation.

Ryan Novota, Transportation Engineer, appeared before the Board and referred to the 2001 city document which defined an urban and minor and major urban collector for reference. He pointed out A Street had the volume for a 4-lane road. He stated personally, he wanted this amendment to happen, and professionally, he did not have an issue with it.

Ms. Campbell suggested this felt a little like a conflict of interest since Mr. Ryan Novota was speaking as the City Transportation Engineer. Given Ms. Mack’s comments, she asked if Mr. Ryan Novota would consider requesting commercial zoning at this location. Mr. Ryan Novota stated it would be a cost to pursue that and a delay. When they received the latest proposal to install a salon, he did not know of the restrictions. Ms. Campbell stated one of the things she liked about an individual going through the process of rezoning, was the Board would not have to do what they were asking them to do for this item. Chairman Ritz stressed the request would have a citywide effect. He explained that we try to avoid language that requires research beyond the LDC, so if this 2001 document does exist, the citizen who brought it forth was the City Engineer who knows it exists. Mr. Ryan Novota explained that barber shops and hair salons were the only ones exempted from the R-2 which seemed wrong to him.

Ms. Mack stated it should be clear to the applicant that when this was changed to 4-lane roadway, R-2 did not allow barber shops or beauty salons, and this was in effect when Mr. Novota bought this property. If the City did a re-evaluation of the map in 2017, based on traffic volumes, might that not include more roadways? **Mr. Moore then made a motion to deny, seconded by Ms. Campbell. The motion carried 3 to 2 with Mr. Larson and Mr. Grundhoefer dissenting.**

#### **Consider Amendment to LDC Section 12-12-8 Regulation of Patron’s Dogs at Permitted Food Service Establishments**

On May 11, 2017, City Council referred to this Board for recommendation a proposed ordinance amending Section 12-12-8 – Regulation of Patron’s Dogs at Permitted Food Service Establishments. This amendment includes the removal of the requirements to have a physical barrier, removal of “patron” as one receiving a Notice to Appear or Civil Citation, and inclusion of the ability to allow enforcement via Chapter 13.

Chapter 13 includes Code Enforcement through a special magistrate as an option instead of all violations being routed through the court system.

Ms. Deese explained the amendment language was developed by Council staff. Chairman Ritz pointed out he encounters dogs on the sidewalks frequently and asked for a synopsis of the changes. Mr. Kraher, Council Executive, explained this requirement was on the business and not on the patron visiting the business. Council felt it should be the business that was held responsible for violations. The business has within their purview to say we don't have a permit yet, so you can't have your dog here. Chairman Ritz clarified that the business would then police their own customers. Mr. Kraher stated this would follow the state statute required by the Department of Health, and the restaurants have to meet those requirements. The inclusion of Code Enforcement would make it easier than sending through the court system. Ms. Campbell asked if a permit process was in place. Mr. Kraher advised there is a permit process in place which runs through the Planning Department and then proceeds to the City Council for approval. He stated currently there are four or five permits issued. Ms. Deese advised they were seeing more applications submitted recently to bring businesses into compliance with the Code. Mr. Grundhoefer asked about the barrier. Mr. Kraher pointed out the Code requires that some type of physical barrier be placed, but that requirement is not within the state statute. It was added at some point. Questions began to arise in defining a barrier, and Council wanted this removed since it was not required by the state.

Chairman Ritz stated as a person, he liked the idea of putting Code Enforcement in charge to go after the property owner to police their property. Ms. Campbell pointed out the \$25,000 liability insurance requirement. Chairman Ritz appreciated the fact that a permit process exists. Mr. Larson explained that if the businesses wanted more customers with dogs, they would have to follow the rules. Mr. Grundhoefer pointed out the Board was asked to approve the removal of the barrier language and to allow the magistrate to enforce it. Ms. Deese clarified that the State of Florida Statutes actually refer to this issue, and in order to even allow dogs to be at restaurants, the City has to adopt some form of code and requirements. So the fact that they are having to go through this permitting process is the only way that it is permitted by the State. The City is not imposing restrictions through this ordinance, but is actually being more lenient and allowing it to occur through this ordinance. She pointed out there were three amendments - the removal of the physical barrier, the removal of "patron" and the inclusion of Chapter 13. **Mr. Larson made the motion to approve the sample ordinance. It was seconded by Mr. Grundhoefer, and it carried unanimously.**

#### **Consider Amendment to Eastside Neighborhood Plan**

Staff has received a request from Mrs. Helen Gibson, CRA Administrator, for this Board to recommend to City Council the adoption of an amendment to the Eastside Neighborhood Plan Element of Urban Infill and Redevelopment Plan. This amendment establishes a time certain for a period of forty (40) years, beginning in 2005 and terminating in fiscal year 2045. Mrs. Gibson has asked that the Board find that the proposed Plan amendment conforms to the Comprehensive Plan for the City of Pensacola. She advised the CRA staff would like for Planning Board to recommend that City Council adopt an amendment to that Urban Infill Redevelopment Plan which provides that all community development activities financed by Tax Incremental Revenues (TIF) in the Urban Infill and Redevelopment area shall be completed by that 2045 year, and that it is in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan, so it expands from the initial request from just the Eastside Neighborhood to the Urban Infill and Redevelopment Plan.

Ms. Gibson advised that in 2000, the Planning Board recommended the approval by City Council of an amendment to the Future Land Use element of the Comprehensive Plan to approve the establishment of boundaries of the Urban Infill Redevelopment area. The purpose of that designation has to do with revitalization of blighted and high poverty areas of the city. At that time, the Planning Board also recommended that the Council also approve adoption of the Urban Infill and Redevelopment Plan. She explained the reason that they have asked that the recommendation be changed slightly was because the Eastside plan was subsequently added to the Urban Infill and Redevelopment Plan by City Council. So it is one component of the Urban Infill and Redevelopment Plan. The Planning Board recently found that this plan did conform to the City's Comprehensive Plan. At this point, the plan did not contain a time certain for completion of all revitalization activities within the district. It has been determined that per the statute, we are now required to have a time certain for completion of all activities. She advised Council is considering an ordinance adding that provision which will require that all activities be concluded within 40 years as allowed by the statute. She explained they were asking the Planning Board provide a recommendation to City Council that they approve this amendment to the plan adding that time certain and reconfirm the fact that this plan is in keeping with the City's Comprehensive Plan.

**Mr. Larson made a motion to approve, seconded by Ms. Campbell.** Mr. Grundhoefer asked if there were specific goals or just a time frame. Ms. Gibson stated there were specific projects identified within the plan, based on funding, to help the infill areas. She indicated grant funding was limited, and there was still work to be accomplished which will depend on resources available. **The motion then carried unanimously.**

**Open Forum** – Mr. Ryan Novota wanted to address the item concerning barber shops and beauty salons and wanted to bring a proposal to the Board to help clarify this issue. It was stated that it was a possibility that roads would have increased in volume and to change their designation. He wanted to know if the Board would consider proposing a list of roadways outside the 4-lane, to consider they are major roadways with high traffic volume which would solidify the locations that were affected. Chairman Ritz stated he would not be agreeable to that because as soon as you begin listing roadways based on road volume, if they change up or down, it represents a change which the Board could not keep track of. If traffic patterns change and A Street drops by 60%, that which we allowed then is no longer valid. He pointed out that Section W looked like an addition to the ordinance and not an existing edit. Ms. Deese stated it was an addition to the ordinance and highly opposed; the applicant at the last minute interjected the 4-lane language which enabled it to be approved by a 3-2 vote. Mr. Ryan Novota stated it implied the revision had catered to one event. Ms. Deese stated the barber and beauty shops were allowed in the RNC zone but not permitted in the R-2 zone. She advised the only way you can have a barber or beauty shop in a residential area is through a home occupation permit which limits it to one chair. Mr. Ryan Novota began questioning the Board about specific locations. The Chairman explained the Board was not here to answer those type of questions. Ms. Deese instructed Mr. Ryan Novota to send specific addresses to her and she would be glad to research it.

Ms. Mack advised in 2010, Council adopted an ordinance for doggie dining, but did not include a permit process. She explained this ordinance has not been enforced until this year because with Code Enforcement it is complaint driven. She admitted that she did complain as a matter of principal.

On another matter, Mr. Larson asked if the antenna on A Street at the church met the design standards put forth by the Board. Ms. Deese stated she would verify Council's approval did uphold the comments from the Board and would send an inspector to look at it.



**Adjournment** – With no further business, Chairman Ritz adjourned the meeting at 4:09 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'BCD', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Brandi C. Deese  
Secretary to the Board