



## MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD

January 12, 2021

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairperson Paul Ritz, Vice Chairperson Larson, Board Member Grundhoefer, Board Member Powell

**MEMBERS VIRTUAL:** Board Member Murphy

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Board Member Sampson, Board Member Wiggins

**STAFF PRESENT:** Assistant Planning Director Cannon, Historic Preservation Planner Harding, Assistant City Attorney Lindsay, Senior Planner Statler, City Administrator Keith Wilkins, Sustainability Coordinator Jackson, Network Engineer Johnston

**STAFF VIRTUAL:** Planning Director Morris, Inspections Services Director Bilby, Engineering Project Manager Hinote

### AGENDA:

- Quorum/Call to Order
- Approval of Meeting Minutes from November 10, 2020.
- **New Business:**
  - Proposed Amendment to the Land Development Code – Section 12-6 Tree/Landscape Regulations**
- Open Forum
- Discussion
- Adjournment

#### Call to Order / Quorum Present

Chairperson Ritz explained the Board was waiting for the fourth board member to arrive in order to have a quorum, otherwise, the Board would proceed with a discussion on the item. Chairperson Ritz called the meeting to order at 2:16 pm with a quorum present and explained the procedures of the partially virtual Board meeting.

#### Approval of Meeting Minutes

1. **Board Member Larson made a motion to approve the November 10, 2020 minutes, seconded by Board Member Grundhoefer, and it carried unanimously.**

222 West Main Street Pensacola, Florida 32502

[www.cityofpensacola.com](http://www.cityofpensacola.com)

## **New Business**

### **2. Proposed Amendment to the Land Development Code-Section 12-6 Tree/Landscape Regulations**

Chairperson Ritz introduced the item and the edit list which gave a summary of the sections edited. Assistant Planning Director Cannon presented the amendment provided by the Engineering Department for Section 12-6 which had been amended to streamline the review and enforcement process into one department, implementing a process that complies with Florida statutes, adding further protection of heritage trees and clarifying tree fund usage.

Chairperson Ritz emphasized this was a staff authored amendment. There had been discussions and workshops in the past, and Council had not heard, voted, or acted upon any landscape edit at this point. Today gave an opportunity to review and make edits. Board Member Powell asked about the city-designated arborist referring to the Mayor and when and who determined that. Chairperson Ritz advised that the Mayor being at the top of the organization can designate that person or delegate to staff. Board Member Powell was concerned that this would become political and asked if there was a process to take that out. Sustainability Coordinator Jackson explained the arborist had to meet a certain qualification. Assistant City Attorney Lindsay indicated typically the language would state the Mayor's designee; the legislature in passing a statute which pertains to tree removal on private property referenced the ISA Arborist as a person qualified to determine whether a tree should be removed; the City wanted to make sure whoever was assessing trees had at least that qualification. The ISA Arborist has a specialized process or training on whether a tree is dangerous enough to be removed or whether it could be pruned and what kind of risk is posed by the issue the tree presents (TRAQ Certification). Those persons are bound by a code of ethics which applies to their professional status. Since the City does not currently have this person on staff, he or she would be a consultant. Board Member Powell was satisfied with this explanation.

In Section 12-6-2(D), added a permit for pruning of heritage trees. Chairperson Ritz clarified that this review was for the existing ordinance; underlines indicated language added to the ordinance, and strikethroughs indicated current language omitted.

Section 12-6-2(F) added City-designated arborist.

Section 12-6-2(G) removed \$1,000.00 cap on undeveloped residential properties. Inspections Services Director Bilby explained this cap remained for developed properties; there is a replacement fee for \$400.00 per tree which cannot be replaced, and essentially, it will be more expensive to remove heritage trees.

Section 12-6-2(H) requires permits for pruning or removal of any tree(s). (Permit notification will be posted.)

Section 12-6-3(B) Reduced the requirements on parking facilities from 20 to 10.

Section 12-6-3(B)(1)(a), (B)(2)(c) and (B)(2)(d) referred to the City-designated arborist for responsibility.

Board Member Powell stated since the City did not have a designated arborist, what would happen when the ordinance was approved, and Assistant City Attorney Lindsay advised the City had an interlocal agreement with Escambia County who employs Jimmie Jarrett who has all the qualifications for an ISA Arborist; she would be asked for assistance. It was determined the City also has four environmental engineering firms (5-year contract) who have the capabilities and personnel on staff.

Section 12-6-4 added it would be reviewed by the City's designated arborist. Chairperson Ritz clarified that this section pertains to the Landscaping and Tree Protection Plan submitted to the City Inspections Services by a developer which will be reviewed by the City-designated arborist; this addition was added to prevent confusion and streamline the process.

Section 12-6-4(B) Landscape materials and trees must be installed before issuance of the certificate of occupancy (CO). Chairperson Ritz advised this requirement moved it to a more marketable timetable and reduced the amount of times Inspections was required to revisit the site. Board Member Larson advised once a person receives the CO, they take over their property and do what they want, so this would not be a concern.

Section 12-6-4(D) Notice must be given for removal of one heritage tree and signs shall be posted upon request for permit and remain posted for two (2) weeks. Further notice by the designated arborist will be given to the councilperson of that district. The sign shall be posted for two (2) weeks before the permit is approved.

Exception – tree is on occupied residential property and meets qualifications as diseased or weakened tree. Assistant City Attorney Lindsay advised the statute passed by Tallahassee removed some local authority to implement its own standards based on what the people of that area prefer. It was a statute imposed statewide which has created some conflicts. She wanted to make sure people did not think we were disrespecting that statute, and she placed specialized language to show we were trying to be consistent. It does not preempt each city from doing its standards but provides for an exemption or an exception for a property owner from local standards.

Section 12-6-5, 12-6-6(A)(4) Changed the names to City-designated arborist.

Section 12-6-6(B)(2)(c) Removed Planner and added Landscape Architect assuring we have someone looking at this on a regular basis.

Section 12-6-6(B)(2)(d) Changed to City-designated arborist.

Section 12-6-6(B)(3) Relocation of protected trees needs to be in writing from an independent certified arborist (designating what the professional should be).

Section 12-6-6(B)(4) Allows for deviations to species type to promote ecological diversity on site.

Section 12-6-6(B)(5) City-designated arborist.

Section 12-6-6(D) Trees shall be planted prior to Certificate of Occupancy being issued and selected from Appendix A or B with shade trees being encouraged.

Section 12-6-6(D)(2), 12-6-6(E), 12-6-6(E)(1) and (2), Section 12-6-6(F), 12-6-6(G), City-designated arborist will review.

Section 12-6-6(H) City-designated arborist - For heritage trees, adds provision for currently occupied residential property to remove or prune a heritage tree if documentation is provided of danger to person or property (in compliance with State statute). Chairperson Ritz explained for the moment, the Board was only dealing with the agenda item as it was placed online.

Section 12-6-7, 12-6-7(A)(2), 12-6-7(B), 12-6-7(C), 12-6-7(D) – City-designated arborist.

Section 12-6-7(F) – Pruning on residential properties do not require a permit unless it is a heritage tree (bringing us in compliance with State statute). Assistant City Attorney Lindsay advised that technically if the residential person has a heritage tree which their arborist indicates is dangerous, they would not need a permit. This was designed to protect heritage trees. In a test case, the property owner's own arborist admitted the heritage tree was healthy – it survived Hurricane Sally, so why would it have to be removed. We want to make sure we have an ISA Arborist who can provide us with insight that is

objective and not arbitrary. The idea of the statute is under those circumstances where the tree presents a danger, the property owner does not have to have a permit or give notice to anyone, does not have to visit with the City or talk about it, and not one single contact is required. The State statute does not respect a heritage tree either. It was determined there was no oversight on pruning a heritage tree, but a City-designated arborist could look at a tree before it is pruned, and this was an additional provision brought into the ordinance requiring the permit and oversight of the heritage tree. It was hoped this would give the public the opportunity to choose the City's arborist rather than pay more for someone else to perform the work; if they do prune contrary to this Code, they must have an ISA Arborist or landscape architect to provide documentation; this documentation must be defined since the legislature failed to define it, and there are no standards in place. Chairperson Ritz stated the Tree Risk Assessment Form would be added to determine the tree's condition. Board Member Grundhoefer asked if Gulf Power would be subject to this ordinance, and Assistant City Attorney Lindsay indicated over the last five years they had been in the process of trying to get more in control of rights-of-way to trim the trees; they have tried to purchase rights-of-way to trim without permission from property owners. Whether we can limit Gulf Power would be on a case-by-case basis on what rights they might have in that area.

Section 12-6-8, 12-6-9, 12-6-10(A), 12-6-10(A)(1), 12-6-10(A)(2), 12-6-10(A)(3), 12-6-10(B) – City-designated arborist

Section 12-6-10(C) Tree Planting Trust Fund – removed language on irrigation equipment – Funds shall be utilized for acquiring, planting, and maintaining trees, and in cases where necessary, other vegetation for public purposes - 50% match on grants up to \$5,500.00. Grant requests must be reviewed by EAB, City-designated arborist and City Council. Chairperson Ritz clarified this was an attempt to further clarify how those funds were to be spent.

Assistant City Attorney Lindsay further stated that the statute that would allow Gulf Power to have permission beyond what a regular property owner would have was in Section 163.3209 of the Florida statutes. They are supposed to follow the standards to prevent a tree from being killed or destroyed by virtue of the pruning. If the property owner felt the utility company did not follow those guidelines, the City could have an opportunity to address that.

Section 12-6-11 – Edits were made to the Appeals section.

Chairperson Ritz advised this covered the item which was published and stated the Board could edit the document and push it forward.

Section 12-6-2(D) would change the protected size of the tree identified by species in Appendix A which is four (4) times the minimum Diameter Breast Height (DBH) or greater. A Dogwood 16" in diameter would now be a heritage tree. Chairperson Ritz noted there would be a larger number of heritage trees with this ordinance in place. Board Member Grundhoefer stated we may need the language that protects trees that may not be 34" but he had a hard time with a Crepe Myrtle at 16" being classified a heritage tree. Chairperson Ritz pointed to the language in Section 12-6-2 "in all zoning districts" encompassing all of Pensacola, and it was determined to be the intent (city limits).

Section 12-6-4(D) Notice – The signs shall be posted by the applicant at their expense and shall remain continuously posted for two (2) weeks prior to the requisite building, site work, or tree removal permit is issued. The City's designated arborist will notify the councilperson in which district the permit has been applied for upon the receipt of the request. Board Member Larson indicated this would give anyone a chance once the sign

was posted to make their concerns heard.

Section 12-6-6(H) heritage trees – In the case of lot splits for single family and duplex uses, trees shall be evaluated to determine whether the lot split will have a negative effect on any heritage tree. A tree survey shall be provided to the Planning Services Department along with the lot split application, and the size of proposed lots shall be evaluated to determine if any heritage tree will be required to be removed as a result of the lot split.

Section 12-13-1 – Definitions enumerated – Lot, nonconforming added “preservation of heritage trees not subject to removal under this Code.”

Board Member Larson stated if the lot split determines the tree must stay, if someone wanted to construct a driveway on the other lot after it was split which damages the root system and the tree dies, who would be responsible since the tree was on the split. Inspections Services Director Bilby suggested if someone was creating a small buildable lot out of three lots, or making two or three lots from one, and it rendered the site of the heritage trees so it would fall within the foundation of the driveway of the house, there should be better consideration and oversight for the foundation before a lot split is granted. Chairperson Ritz indicated a house was removed and a lot split into three different lots; the heritage tree was in the right-of-way and remained. The homeowner created a curved driveway to accommodate the tree. Board Member Grundhoefer liked the fact the ordinance made it more difficult to remove a heritage tree whether splitting a lot or developing a property.

Appendix A Protected Tree List – Type B – added Long Leaf Pine (*Pinus Palustris*). Chairperson Ritz liked this addition since it was a native species.

Glen Miley, Biome Consulting Group and an ecologist, advised he had deep subject matter expertise and had participated in numerous public meetings and had met personally with the promoters of the changes. He had numerous consequential technical objections to the language of the document in the present form. He urged the Board to obtain guidance from experienced local practitioners before agreeing to codify this ordinance. He pointed out the term arborist in specific language limiting tree ordinance matters to holders of that particular credential alone, Section 12-6-2(F) pg. 3 and 12-6-6 (B)(3) pg.10. He indicated he was a professional whose qualifications greatly exceeded those of an arborist, but the proposed language would preclude him from practicing his profession in Pensacola. ISA created this position to certify tree trimmers; it in no way communicates competence. He urged the Board to reject the ordinance until a technical review by experienced local professionals could be completed. He explained his company was an ecological consulting firm and regulatory compliance firm, with staff holding advanced degrees in different areas of ecology, engaging in eco system identification, ecological restoration, and landscape level understanding, whereas an arborist can work as a tree trimmer for a period of three years and pass the test and obtain that certification. He indicated none of the materials coming out the public meetings with other professionals were reflected in the language proposed for change.

Assistant City Attorney Lindsay said this approach was never intended to be comprehensive by staff to address everything said in the workshops but more to streamline processes within the City so that we can begin to have a more consistent system of enforcement, but some of the things he said related to the list and how it should be evaluated as far as what species should be protected. Mr. Miley stated those were some of his concerns particularly pertaining to the heritage tree, how they are measured, who can conduct the survey, and the fact the appendix contains trees not existing in the city. Striking qualified professional and replacing it with an ISA Certified Arborist has

consequences for him professionally. Assistant City Attorney Lindsay advised there would be another workshop at the level of specificity he was referring to regarding the protected species. The reason for looking at the City-designated arborist was because of the statute which limits local governments' discretion, and the only other term that was used by the Florida legislature was landscape architect. Mr. Miley suggested an urban forester would be a superior professional to choose to accomplish those objectives. Assistant City Attorney Lindsay also shared that the thinking was to rely on the ISA Arborist because of the TRAQ certification and qualification and because that particular document was so much more detailed that they hoped it would elevate the analysis by ISA Arborists who the legislature has granted authority to determine that a tree is hazardous or dangerous. Mr. Miley stated the application of the larger profession incorporates perspective, concepts and additional skill sets that enhance that particular skill – he has that skill but not that credential. He felt his firm's service to the City would be far superior to a mere arborist. Assistant City Attorney Lindsay stated in the Code there were multiple decision makers involved in different departments across the city in assessing trees. The Building Inspections Director, Mr. Bilby, and the Sustainability Coordinator, Mark Jackson, worked together with other staff members and departments to identify a process that would allow one City employee, or until we have that employee, to help make sure that the process is consistent and appropriate; it was not about the substantive content on protection of trees and ecological evaluation which was his primary concern. This was a first step in the process, and at some point, there will be that deep dive to suggest the next step. The goal was to make sure that City employees had a consistent process internally, but we do want to get to the next stage.

Councilperson Myers was upset and thought the whole thing was a mess. Going back to August of last year, the City Council, not Sherri Myers, the City Council sent some amendments to the Tree Ordinance to Planning Board. Those amendments had to do with notice. Here we are six months later, and this Board has never acted on those recommendations that were sent to the Board. Sherri Myers acting as a City Council person does not have the authority to place items on the Planning Board agenda. It must come from the City Council, however, on October 13<sup>th</sup> the Board had on its agenda this item that dealt only with notice, not amendments to the Tree Protection Plan, just notice. However, in the background information you were given, it says a request was forwarded by City Councilwoman Sherri Myers to amend 12-6-4 of the Landscape and Tree Protection Plan. That is a mischaracterization of what was given to the Board. It was a recommendation given by the City Council. The Planning Board had 45 days pursuant to Ordinance 12-12-2(4) to act upon any matter referred to the Board shall be acted upon by the Board within 45 days of the day of reference until a longer or shorter period is specified. So, basically, we are here today. The items having to do with the amendments, having to do with notice have never come back to the City Council. What has happened is basically this whole issue as far as she was concerned was just a mess. So here we are and those amendments and recommendations have never been acted on and have never come back before the City Council. She believed that was a serious procedural problem. She did not know if she agreed with everything in this ordinance, especially now after listening to Mr. Miley, but wanted to know how an agenda item sent to the Board by the City Council became a sidenote to the Department of Engineers' ordinance they were proposing. She stated she had met with Mr. Bilby, Mr. Jackson, and Mr. Wilkins regarding this. It was her impression that today the Board was going to be acting on the amendments having to do with notice. That was her primary concern because she has acres and acres of forests in

her district that today if there was a permit issued for a landscape plan, that forest could be mowed down in a matter of days. She had seen this happen – 5 acres, 6 acres – in a matter of two days. Chairperson Ritz advised the Board was observing the 5-minute speaker limit, and she had used those 5 minutes. Ms. Myers asked the attorney how she was going to fix this problem with this not being returned to the City Council in 45 days – what was sent to the Board and not all of this other stuff regarding the arborist and all that. Assistant City Attorney Lindsay did not recall that there was a referral from the City Council, so she would need to go back to the record to see where she might have missed something. As far as the content regarding notice, there was discussion among the Board members, and she advised them, and we were also warned by a member of the Planning Board about the Statute 163.045 and whether we were allowed to require notices at all. Through the litigation on the Vickery Tree and what other cities are doing all over the state, she had been trying to brainstorm ways we can protect trees, incorporate the notice that is desirable, and still be consistent with Florida law. The Planning Board was warned by one of the members of the legislature of the Speaker's issues with local governments trying to continue to impose restrictions on property owners with regard to protection of trees. The struggle with trying to comply with the Florida statute has slowed her analysis down, and she asked for understanding as she tried to do her best, and if she had missed the Council item, she apologized and stated she would go back and determine how the error was made and be accountable to Councilperson Myers when that was determined.

Chairperson Ritz advised the Board had never ignored an agenda item and not voted on it. Councilperson Myers advised before hearing Mr. Miley, she was okay with what was being proposed, but she wanted to deal with notice since that was the most important issue which was sent to this Board; it was not comingled with other issues, and it should have returned to the Council even if the Board was still considering it or needed more time. What the Board was saying today was it could only vote on what the Engineering Department had presented, but the issue of notice had been given to the Board six months ago. Chairperson Ritz advised on the October 13, 2020 agenda, there was an item on which they voted, and once the Board votes, it is not physically carried to the Council. Councilperson Myers asked that an email be sent to her to indicate the process after the Board makes a decision on how it returns to Council. Assistant City Attorney Lindsay stated once the Board made a decision, the Planning staff forwarded that information to the Council for consideration in a memo as a part of Council's agenda. She offered to research to see what happened at that time. She recalled the Board was to look at the tree protection standards generally over time, and the proposal by Board Member Murphy had been on the agenda several times as a discussion item, separate and apart from the notice. The Florida legislature states we cannot require a property owner to come for a permit or we cannot insist they give notice to the public or to us under certain circumstances. We have been studying how we work around that statute. It has been argued that it preempts municipalities entirely, and she disagreed with that argument; she was still waiting on a decision from the 1<sup>st</sup> District Court of Appeal; she again stated she would research the item and furnish a more detail response as soon as she can get a definitive response to her question.

Board Member Powell advised the title of the ordinance states the intent of the Code is Section 12-6 tree/landscape regulations, streamlining review and enforcement into one department and process, assuring compliance with Florida statutes, protecting heritage trees, and funding oversight and not when notices will be given or determining what trees would be saved. Only this review was what the Board was considering and not ignoring

anyone's suggestions or any public input, but saying these are the things we control as the City of Pensacola which is the time it takes to get the permits done; no one was dismissing anything that was said before and those discussions have not stopped, and the information received has been placed on the agenda and acted on accordingly. What the Board was accomplishing today was making it easier and being more transparent, being more efficient and avoiding redundancy, showing we care about who will be making the decisions rather than having it in an ambiguous cloud. She did appreciate Mr. Miley's input about the terminology of an arborist, but we did need to get back to what this was really about which was written at the top of the ordinance. Assistant Planning Director Cannon advised there had been robust public involvement with workshops to address a presentation from Emerald Coast, and that had not gone away; the timeline was drawn out to engage the public and consider input from others, but today's meeting was to address the process.

Kelly Hagen, Vice President of the Sanders Beach Neighborhood Association, stated she was not here to present that board but as a private citizen. She had hoped this would be the moment to effect some real change and come away with an ordinance the city would be proud of. Her understanding of the intent of the staff in developing this ordinance was to streamline the administrative process and to clarify the structure of protocol and not to add protection to the heritage trees. She had several discussions with City staff, Council members, concerned citizens, as well as professionals in the field. The feedback she had received suggested we need a complete overhaul of the current ordinance which would require careful and thoughtful review. The popular opinion to obtain these changes would be for the Planning Board to initiate a series of Council-directed public workshops, including a panel of academic experts on the subject, bringing in the appropriate City staff, and hiring a professional facilitator to make sure everyone's ideas were heard. She clarified she was in favor of passing certain protections in the proposed ordinance since it does provide more protection than the current ordinance. She asked that the Board look at and possibly edit the protections on pg. 33 and clarify that a lot split should be altered in order to preserve a heritage tree if possible if a heritage tree was in danger. Regarding diameter of breast height, there are several species that will never reach 34" and she was not necessarily supporting Crape Myrtle as a protected species.

Chairperson Ritz advised the Board had conducted workshops in the past 12 months, however, with the current Covid situation, travel and attendance had been an issue.

Councilperson Brahier stated she had worked with Mr. Bilby, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Wilkins, Heather and Kelly, but she felt workshops were in our best interests, however, we want to protect as much as we can right now. If we say a City specialist has a minimum of an ISA Arborist standard, we could do that right away. Also, if a tree were split, the larger trunk at 4.5' above the ground would be the one that gets the diameter counted. This language puts some safety in place for other species while we work out the other issues. We will get a new provision in that if a person applies for a tree to be either cut down or trimmed and a sign is put up for two (2) weeks, it gives the public time for notification. When a person applies for a permit, a sign is put up for two (2) weeks and the councilperson notified, and it gives the public an option for notification. We can get some extra safety and precautions in here and streamline the City's process for the staff. She thanked everyone and felt this streamline would allow us to move forward in the best interest of these trees.

In explaining the lot split further, Chairperson Ritz stated if the lot split is legal exclusive of the heritage tree and meets all the other City criteria, it may be that it is flagged to say this is a heritage tree; nothing happens except to say that there is a heritage tree that could be

in a location that would require mitigation and would receive an evaluation when the paperwork is submitted. Evidence of this review will be provided to the citizen might be the verbiage that should be added.

Sarah Randolph chose not to comment. David Bush was concerned with the disappearance of the large heritage Oaks especially being destroyed by Hurricane Sally and contractors cutting them down as well. He advised East Hill was being destroyed by houses 30' wide and 60' tall with garages in the front, and this is not the old East Hill people remember.

Chairperson Ritz stated this was an advisory board and whatever the Board decided today would move forward as advice to Council, and the Board has always acted on an agenda item.

Regarding the lot split and heritage tree verbiage, Board Member Larson suggested changing the tone to a positive preservation purpose to preserve the trees in our area, and it must be proven that the tree must come down – instead of saying removal, say preservation with documentation. Board Member Grundhoefer felt this could be placed in every paragraph in every section which would turn a 50-page document into a 100-page document; he felt that would be redundant. Board Member Powell suggested we need to address the meaning when it is ambiguous. Assistant City Attorney Lindsay advised that the seed of this idea came about very recently, and the intent was to be able to deny a lot split if the split rendered a heritage tree necessary to be removed for the split to be approved. There needed to be some standard operating procedure created, maybe not in the ordinance itself. They wanted to hear feedback and had not had a long time to consider all the consequences; the language also reflects there are some heritage trees which are diseased and must be removed for safety. She explained this section was being wordsmithed. Chairperson Ritz advised when a citizen comes in for a lot split permit, there is a checklist to be completed which is part of the standing operating procedure. Sustainability Coordinator Jackson stated the intent was not to deny the lot split but to have it altered to preserve the trees.

Board Member Grundhoefer stated there were two issues: 1) change the language from arborist to a City-designated specialist with a minimal ISA Certification (Councilperson Brahier's concern); 2) a concern with notices (Councilperson Myers). Assistant City Attorney Lindsay stated emails determined that this Board did act on the request, and it was denied by the Board which the minutes support. Assistant Planning Director Cannon stated when that item came before the Board, it had two ordinances, one generated from the outside and one from staff. The Board made the decision to deny one and approve the other, bringing it back for revision and streamlining which is where we were today.

Board Member Grundhoefer offered if this passed Council, it would allow us to protect some trees which otherwise would be lost and felt it was the next step. It was determined if the ISA Certification were a minimum, Mr. Miley's credentials would exceed that requirement. **Board Member Grundhoefer made a motion to approve with the amended language for referral to Council, seconded by Board Member Powell. It was clarified the Board was adding the language describing the professional, and the motion carried unanimously.**

**Assistant City Attorney Lindsay asked for clarification on the vote. Board Member Grundhoefer amended his motion to include the amendments that were submitted in the memo from Sustainability Coordinator Jackson; it was seconded by Board Member Powell and carried unanimously.**

**Open Forum – None**

**Adjournment** – With no further business, Chairperson Ritz thanked the Board for its patience and adjourned the meeting at 4:33 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Cynthia Cannon, AICP  
Assistant Planning Director  
Secretary to the Board