MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
PUBLIC HEARING/REGULAR MEETING

CITY OF DELRAY BEACH
DELRAY BEACH, FLORIDA

MEETING DATE:	August 15, 2011
LOCATION:	CITY COMMISSION CHAMBERS
MEMBERS PRESENT:	John Miller, Mark Krall, Cary Glickstein, Craig Spodak, Al Jacquet, Clifford Durden
MEMBERS ABSENT:	Connor Lynch
STAFF PRESENT:	Mark McDonnell, Brian Shutt, and Denise Valek

I. CALL TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Miller at 6:00 p.m. Upon roll call it was determined that a quorum was present.

Change to Agenda:

The June 20, 2011 Minutes will be voted on at the September 19, 2011 meeting.

II. MINUTES

Motion made by Mr. Jacquet, seconded by, Mr. Durden and approved 6 to 0 (Mr. Lynch absent) to approve the Minutes of July 18, 2011 with the following addition to page 10, Board Discussion, third paragraph, insert after third sentence: "That is not what we are doing here we are not limiting the practice of faith and that case law has shown that even with aesthetics or local government reasons you can regulate certain things but you can't regulate someone's practice of faith."

III. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: None

IV. LAND USE ITEMS

A. Conditional use modification to allow interior conversion of two existing automotive service bays totaling 808 sq. ft. to accommodate expansion of the existing 592 sq. ft. (total 1,400 sq. ft.) Gasland convenience store, located at the southwest corner of NE 5th Avenue and NE 4th Street. Quasi-Judicial Hearing

Ex-parte Communications:

Mr. Jacquet stopped by and spoke to an attendant; however, he was not willing to speak with me. He asked if I worked for the City.

Mr. McDonnell entered project file no. 2011-135 into the record.

The action before the Board is making a recommendation to the City Commission on a Conditional Use modification to expand the existing 592 sq. ft. Gasland Convenience Store by 808 sq. ft. for a total of 1,400 sq. ft., pursuant to LDR Section 2.4.5(E).

The expansion entails converting two (2) existing automotive service bays to retail use at the gas station located at the southwest corner of NE 5th Ave. and NE 4th St. (398 NE 5th Ave.).

The subject property consists of the east 135' of lots 1 thru 3 (less the east 10' of Lot 1) of Block 97 of the Highland Park-Delray plat as recorded in Palm Beach County Official Records Book 23651, Page 1191.

The 0.43 acre property contains a gas station with four (4) pumps with eight (8) filling positions. The site also contains an existing 592 sq. ft. convenience store and two (2) automotive service bays totaling 808 sq. ft. The service station was constructed in 1961 in the CBD (Central Business District).

The request now before the Board is approval of a conditional use modification to allow conversion of the two (2) service bays to retail use for expansion of the existing convenience store.

Review by Others:

The subject project is scheduled to be reviewed by the Downtown Development Authority (DDA) on September 12, 2011.

The Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) recommended approval of the development proposal at their meeting of June 23, 2011.

Courtesy Notice:

Courtesy notices have been provided to the following associations that have requested notice of developments in their areas:

- Neighborhood Advisory Council
- Delray Citizens Coalition
- Del-Ida Park HOA

Public Notice:

Formal public notice is not given for a minor conditional use modification. If the Board determines that the proposed changes are significant and require a new conditional use application, then official notification will be provided to property owners within a five hundred foot (500') foot radius of the subject property. Letters of objection, if any, will be presented at the Planning and Zoning Board meeting.

Public Comments: None

Board Discussion:

Dr. Spodak advised his concern was with the sidewalk. You have a fairly sizable convenience store up against the neighborhood. There is a sidewalk that goes on the other side of the tracks from the other gas station (2nd and 4th). Mr. McDonnell advised the sidewalk runs from Cannery Row to Pineapple Grove Way to 3rd, and the railroad tracks and after that the sidewalk stops. Dr. Spodak advised we have an opportunity here to make it more pedestrian friendly for that area.

Mr. Glickstein inquired if the sidewalk easement is for the queuing area. Mr. McDonnell advised there is a 5 foot wide sidewalk easement. Mr. Glickstein if it was customary to build sidewalks in the right-of-way. Mr. McDonnell advised the question has been knocked around, and it is my understanding this application did not warrant that improvement because there is not a building addition.

Mr. Miller advised it will draw more traffic. Mr. Jacquet inquired if they currently had a conditional use approval. Mr. McDonnell advised this probably was annexed into the City. Mr. Jacquet advised the staff report indicated it was a modification for a conditional use. Mr. McDonnell advised he did not think it went through conditional use. When it is annexed in as a conditional use it is granted conditional use approval.

Mr. Jacquet advised that another item on the agenda changes some of the responsibilities of this Board and adding modification to conditional use that we are responsible to take action on. We don't currently have that power. Mr. McDonnell advised you currently have that authority. The addition you see is strictly housekeeping. I've brought applications before you previously that were modifications. This Board has authority to see it as minor and you make your recommendation and it goes before City Commission. Mr. Jacquet cited Item. V.A., (7) f. – Section 2.2.2.

Dr. Spodak inquired if there was a sidewalk that abutted the northern edge of the property. Mr. McDonnell advised we are asking for an easement. There are patches of pavement along 4th Street. Mr. McDonnell advised there is a sidewalk on every property except for Island Air and Gasland.

Mr. Jacquet inquired if we can put installing a sidewalk as a condition. Mr. Shutt advised we are going to get the easement if Island Air comes in for a sidewalk then we can complete the sidewalk. They are not modifying or changing the existing footprint of the building. The Development Services Management Group (DSMG) was correct in looking at it. We don't want it to become over burdensome.

Mr. Jacquet advised he would like a comment from the City Attorney to make him feel more comfortable. We don't have the authority to discuss modification of conditional uses, but we are recommending approval or denial of modification of a conditional use which has not been within our authority. Mr. McDonnell stated this is a housekeeping measure. We currently don't have the authority to approve or deny a modification to a conditional use. As worded, I have a concern whether we have current authority to approve or deny modification to a conditional use. Mr. McDonnell advised if you look at Section 2.4.5. there are various approvals, site plans, and elevations. The section on Conditional Use talks about Planning and Zoning as a minor modification to the conditional use. It is in the "approval of applications" chapter of the code. I can assure you it is in there.

Rule: The City Commission, by motion, after review and recommendation for approval by the Planning and Zoning Board may approve or reject a request for a conditional use.

Mr. Shutt advised, yes this board has the authority to make that recommendation to City Commission.

Mr. Miller advised on the north side there is a full sidewalk that goes through the residential area, and there is pedestrian access. Dr. Spodak inquired how much money

would we be talking about to put that sidewalk in. Mr. Glickstein advised it is peanuts regardless of the cost. Cost should not be a factor. If I were him, and someone asked to build a sidewalk I would be pushing back. What Mr. McDonnell is saying is reasonable. Nine out of ten cities put the sidewalks in.

Dr. Spodak advised they are changing the nature of the business. If you travel from Cannery Row then the sidewalk runs out. There would be more pedestrians travelling that area. Mr. Glickstein advised what you are saying is not unreasonable. I know in the past where you had things stop it has been the City's position consistently even in a residential area. There are safety issues for when you have sidewalks stop and there is nothing there. There is logic to waiting till you can finish it. In a perfect world the sidewalk would be best put it but it is overreaching.

Mr. Krall advised what they are going to have to do from a Site Plan Review and Appearance Board (SPRAB) point of view regarding landscaping and moving the bollards. Mr. Glickstein advised SPRAB might come down more heavily on that.

Motion:

Motion made by Motion made by Mr. Krall, seconded by Mr. Glickstein and approved 6 to 0 (Mr. Lynch absent) to move approval of the Conditional Use modification request for Gasland Convenience Store Expansion, based upon positive findings with respect to Chapter 3 (Performance Standards) and Section 2.4.5(E)(5) of the Land Development Regulations, and the policies of the Comprehensive Plan, subject to the following conditions:

1. The relocated sign in the northwest corner of the site shall replace the existing sign in the northeast corner of the sight which encroaches within the sight visibility triangle and shall be annotated on the approved plans. No more than one sign is allowed per frontage.

2. The "Gas Station Renovation Scope of Work" noted in the upper right hand corner of the site plan shall be modified for consistency with the proposed site and landscape plan to include the proposed new paving, resurfacing and restriping of the parking lot and installation of new landscaping.

B. Final subdivision plat to allow the creation of three single family lots for Little Wood Estates, located at the south end of NW 1st Avenue, between Woods Lane and Trinity Lutheran Church. Quasi-Judicial Hearing

Mr. McDonnell entered project file no. 2011-153 into the record.

The item before the Board is that of approval of a preliminary plat and certification of a final plat for a 1.08 acre residential development containing three (3) single-family lots to be platted as Little Wood Estates. The subject property is located on NW 1st Ave near Lake Ida Road and Swinton Avenue, north of Trinity Evangelical Lutheran Church. This plat is being processed pursuant to LDR Section 2.4.5(J), Major Subdivisions.

The 1.08 acre property is a replat of a portion of Lot 12, in Section 8, Township 46 South, Range 43 East, of the Map showing subdivisions of portions of Townships 45 and 46 South, Range 43 East, Plat Book 1, Page 4, of the public records of Palm Beach County, Florida. The property is undeveloped.

The City Commission approved the replat for this project on June 20, 2006, but the plat was never recorded. Pursuant to LDR Section 2.4.4(E)(5), if the final plat is not recorded within eighteen (18) months, the approval expires. Therefore, this Plat has been resubmitted for approval. Although minor modifications have been made, the re-submittal is essentially the same as the previously approved plat.

Ex-parte Communications: None

Review By Others:

The subject property is not located within a geographical area requiring review by the CRA (Community Redevelopment Agency) or the DDA (Downtown Development Authority).

Courtesy Notice:

Courtesy notices have been provided to the following groups and neighborhood associations:

- Neighborhood Advisory Council
- Delray Citizen's Coalition
- Lake Ida Property Owners

Applicant:

Mr. Michael Covelli, Covelli Design Associates, applicant, advised Mr. McDonnell covered the project very well. I will answer any questions you may have.

Public Comments: None

Board Comments:

Mr. Miller inquired if they will be moving with this soon. Mr. Covelli advised there are plans to move forward and build these houses now. The houses are consistent with the neighborhood.

Motion:

Motion made by Mr. Jacquet, seconded by Mr. Glickstein, and approved 6 to 0 (Mr. Lynch absent) to move a recommendation of approval to the City Commission of the Preliminary Plat and certification of the Final Plat for Little Wood Estates, by adopting the findings of fact and law contained in the staff report, and finding that the request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and meets criteria set forth in Section 2.4.5(J) (Major Subdivisions), Section 3.2.3 (Standards for Site Plan and/or Plat Actions) and Section 3.1.1 (Required Findings for Land Use and Land Development Applications) of the Land Development Regulations, subject to the following condition:

1. That all comments under the "Technical Items" section (Appendix "B") of the report be addressed prior to scheduling the plat for City Commission action.

V. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

A. City-initiated amendment to the Land Development Regulations (LDR), by amending Article 2.2 "Establishment of Boards Having Responsibilities for Land Development Regulations" and amending Section 4.4.6 "Medium Density Residential" (RM) to provide for housekeeping corrections to outdated references.

Mr. McDonnell entered the project into the file

The item before the Board is to make a recommendation to the City Commission regarding a city-initiated amendment to Land Development Regulations (LDRs) by amending Article 2.2 "Establishment of Boards Having Responsibilities for Land Development Regulations" and amending Section 4.4.6 "Medium Density Residential (RM) District" to provide for housekeeping corrections to outdated references pursuant to LDR Section 2.4.5(M).

Pursuant to Section 1.1.6, an amendment to the text of the Land Development Regulations may not be made until a recommendation is obtained from the Planning and Zoning Board.

Periodically, during review of the Land Development Regulations it is discovered that LDR text amendments were processed which changed section references and placement and where corresponding references to those Sections were not amended. Within Article 2.2 "Establishment of Boards Having Responsibilities for Land Development Regulations" the proposed amendment modifies and changes incorrect references to Section 2.2.1 "General Provisions"; Section 2.2.2 "The Planning and Zoning Board"; Section 2.2.3 "The Site Plan Review and Appearance Board" Section 2.2.4 "The Board of Adjustment"; and, Section 4.4.6 "Medium Density Residential (RM) District".

Comprehensive Plan Conformance - LDR Section 2.4.5(M)(5) (Findings) requires that the City Commission make a finding that the text amendment is consistent with and furthers the Goals, Objectives and Policies of the Comprehensive Plan. While the amendment does not specifically further the Goals, Objectives and Policies of the Comprehensive Plan, it is not inconsistent with them.

Public: None

Board Discussion:

Mr. Jacquet questioned on page 2, (E) (2), (3), and (4) why we no longer do a Local Evaluation and Appraisal Report (LEAR) report. Mr. McDonnell advised there is now an Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR). The EAR shall be conducted pursuant to criteria outlined in the "Procedures for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Plan" section of the Comprehensive Plan. No. (4) is not referring to the EAR it is referring to the capital budget.

Motion:

Motion made by Mr. Krall, seconded by Mr. Jacquet and approved 6 to 0 (Mr. Lynch absent) to recommend to the City Commission approval of the amendment to the Land Development Regulations Article 2.2 "Establishment of Boards Having Responsibilities for Land Development Regulations" by amending Sections 2.2.1, "General Provisions", 2.2.2, "The Planning and Zoning Board", Subsections (A), "Creation" and (E), "Duties, Powers,

and Responsibilities"; 2.2.3, "The Site Plan Review and Appearance Board", Subsection (D), "Duties, Powers, and Responsibilities"; 2.2.4, "The Board of Adjustment", Subsection (A), "Creation"; and Section 4.4.6 "Medium Density Residential (RM) District", Subsection (H), "Special Regulations", to correct outdated references therein by adopting the findings of fact and law contained in the staff report, and finding that the text amendment and approval thereof is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and meets the criteria set forth in LDR Section 2.4.5(M).

B. City-initiated amendment to the Land Development Regulations (LDR), by amending Section 2.4.6 (F) "Temporary Use Permit", to clarify the approval authority for uses under a tent.

The Above Item Has Been Postponed

VI. PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION ITEMS:

A. Consideration of Amendments to the Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) Plan

Mr. McDonnell advised the item before the Board is that of making a recommendation to the City Commission regarding proposed amendments to the Community Redevelopment Agency's (CRA) Community Redevelopment Plan as reflected in the attached amendment document.

The Community Redevelopment Plan establishes the projects and programs to be undertaken by the CRA in the coming years. The Delray Beach CRA's first plan was adopted in 1986 and has been amended several times since. The last amendment was adopted in December 2009. When formally adopted by the City Commission, this latest amended plan will supersede the current Community Redevelopment Plan.

Since the amended Plan does not include any projects or programs which require revisions to the Comprehensive Plan or the Future Land Use Map, it remains consistent with both. While many of the projects included in the Community Redevelopment Plan involve staff or financial participation by the City, applicable policies are already included within the Comprehensive Plan for City participation in these programs. Given the above, a positive finding can be made with respect to consistency with the Goals, Objectives and Policies of the Comprehensive Plan.

Review by Others:

The Community Redevelopment Association (CRA) Board reviewed the final draft of the amended Community Redevelopment Plan at its July 28, 2011 meeting. After a brief discussion, the Board approved the amended Plan and forwarded it to the City for adoption by the City Commission.

The Pineapple Grove Main Street (PGMS) Executive Board reviewed the amendments at its July 6, 2011 meeting and unanimously recommended approval with no changes.

The Downtown Development Authority (DDA) reviewed the amendments at its July 11, 2011 meeting and generally gave its consensus of the proposed amendment, but requested more emphasis on the timely implementation of parking improvements and business facility upgrades in the Osceola Park area. Their feedback has been incorporated into the proposed amendment.

This currently proposed amendment to the Community Redevelopment Plan includes the following changes. For specific information and details of the proposed changes, please refer to the attached Plan.

The West Atlantic Redevelopment Coalition (WARC) reviewed the amendments at its July 12, 2011 meeting generally gave its consensus of the proposed amendment, but recommended the addition of a new "economic diversity statement" to the program objectives of several sections, in order to promote CRA contracts with more minority-owned businesses located within the CRA District. The CRA board declined to include the statement in the proposed amendment.

Mr. McDonnell advised that Ms. Elizabeth Burrows, Marketing and Grants Coordinator, Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) is present.

Ms. Burrows advised Mr. McDonnell did a good job summarizing the report. A lot of the information has been updated. We received feedback from the Downtown Development Authority and their comments were pulled out and inserted into the proposed amendment.

Changes to Part IV, The Redevelopment Program, to:

1. Update information on current plans, projects and program descriptions:

   - SW Area Neighborhood Redevelopment Plan (1.3) – revised background, including updated status for infrastructure improvements, recreational facilities, community support facilities, and housing development
   - Osceola Park (1.5) – revision of background; updated objectives, project description and project schedule, including the promotion of CRA grant programs for area businesses, and a strategy for parking and business facility improvements in the CRA FY 2011/2012 Work Plan
   - Carver Estates Redevelopment (2.7) – revised section title, background, program participants and project schedule; project may be phased pending the availability of funding
   - West Settler's Historic District (2.8) – revised background; updated project status and funding sources
   - Cultural Loop/MLK, Jr. Drive (2.11) – revised background and project schedule
   - Community Activities Sponsorship (3.3) – revised program description and objectives to reflect recent modifications to program guidelines
   - Sports/Recreation-Based Economic Development Initiatives (3.11) – expanding the CRA's sponsorship of tennis tournaments to include other major sports- and recreation-based economic development initiatives

2. The addition of two (2) new projects:

   - Del Ida Neighborhood Improvements (1.7) – a beautification project for the four-block area along NE 2nd Avenue, between Lake Ida Road and George Bush Blvd.
   - Redevelopment of Old Library Site (2.12) – the redevelopment of the site consisting of the former Delray Public Library building, the current Chamber of Commerce building, and an adjacent parking lot

3. Update of eight (8) maps to reflect current conditions and potential future acquisitions (A.2, A.3, A.4, A.5, B.1, B.2, B.3, and C).

Mr. Glickstein advised the last date I saw on item 2.12 is 2008 regarding the transfer from the City ownership of the parking spaces and Chamber of Commerce to the CRA and shortly afterwards assigned the City's lease with the Chamber to the CRA, where does that project stand. Mr. Burrows advised the property is still under contract. It involves a lot of players (the CRA, the Chamber of Commerce and the developer), and the closing is scheduled by September 2012 and we anticipate construction would begin shortly thereafter. There may be some changes to the proposed site plan. As they stated they are ready and committed to the redevelopment of the site. They should be able to apply for some of the new economic incentives that have come on line. The Board confirmed that they can apply for any incentives that are available. Mr. Glickstein inquired if the developer was the original developer that won the RFP. Ms. Burrows advised yes.

Mr. Jacquet advised Ms. Burrows answered a lot of the questions he had. In Section #1.5 it states we have a higher per household number than elsewhere in the City, and a higher under 18 year population than any other area in the City. What are we planning on doing for are we building new parks or recreation facilities? Ms. Butler advised the general plan (CIP 2012/2013) the CRA may participate to fund improvements to the Curry Commons Park, and a general expansion of the 505 Teen Center on Federal Highway. A grant will be utilized for acquiring and improving that property. If it does go forward the CRA will be able to participate in funding some of those expansions.

Mr. Jacquet inquired why did the West Atlantic Redevelopment Coalition (WARC) review the amendments at its July 12, 2011 meeting generally gave its consensus of the proposed amendment, but recommended the addition of a new "economic diversity statement" to the program objectives of several sections, in order to promote CRA contracts with more minority-owned businesses located within the CRA District. The CRA Board declined to include the statement in the proposed amendment. Why did we choose not to include it?

Ms. Burrows advised the statement that came from WARC was to encourage and create economic diversity that are owned by contracting with local businesses located within the CRA district that are owned by minority women or individuals. When that was presented to the CRA Board one of the first things they pointed out with the CRA had contracts with various businesses whether it was redevelopment projects or services that the CRA receives professionally. The CRA uses a competitive bid process. They understood what the goals and desired results that WARC wanted to achieve but they felt that just a broad statement in the CRA plan was not the best way to go about it. The best way to achieve their results would be to implement a more specific strategy that would include educating the local minority owned businesses about the bid process and opportunities when they became available. It can be handled in house as opposed to a putting a broad sweeping statement into portions of the CRA plan.

Mr. Durden advised you said this could cause a problem if you put it in. Ms. Burrows advised it is not a problem. The CRA Plan is more of a project. A statement like this is more of how the day-to-day operations are handled by the CRA. The vehicle is not the CRA Plan. It was a lack of being aware of and able to qualify for these opportunities. Increase education and communication will be the focus. Mr. Durden inquired who made that assumption? Ms. Burrows advised it was a collective agreement that they came to after discussing it with the WARC Board members. Their ideas were fairly represented. Mr. Durden advised he doesn't understand how that would be an infringement on the day-to-day operations, and that you will give some preference. Ms. Burrows advised it is not an infringement on day-to-day operations; on the contrary, the CRA Board thought it would

increase communications with this particular population of businesses and business owners in the CRA district so it looks like in the future we will be implementing some kind of a strategy to increase communications. As far as the appropriateness of including a statement like this if it were included it would be more symbolic than anything. The Board thought it was a more practical approach to put something in motion. It is a more practical approach but does not outline a strategy. Because of the CRAs competitive bid process, there is no practical way to ensure that this happens without outlining a community strategy. It is not contrary that the CRA supports utilizing the services of local businesses with regard to CRA projects. The CRA was in favor of the results but they felt there was a better way to implement this. Mr. Durden mentioned it is good in words but what about action. Something along that line should be included in the Plan. Ms. Burrows advised they might have workshops for minority owned businesses so they can learn more about the bid process so they can compare better bids when the opportunities arise. The CRA will continue to move forward.

Mr. Jacquet inquired if the CRA will be educating minorities on how to participate in the bid process. Ms. Burrows advised the CRA will be working with the City.

Mr. Miller inquired when and if the beautification project goes forward in the Lake Ida area will it included islands in the side streets as discussed ten years ago. I would rethink that hard before you did that again, as you know how difficult it is to pull a trailer or boat or anything like that around those corners. Ms. Burrows advised this particular project is not proposed to go to any of the side streets such as 2nd Avenue. Dr. Spodak inquired if the MPO was current. Ms. Burrows advised we might be in line to receive a grant. Mr. Glickstein inquired if it would be on the schedule for 2012. Ms. Burrows advised it was moving forward.

Mr. Durden inquired in regard to Section 2.8, how does the plan deal with the financial position or acquisition of projects stated in the Plan. Ms. Burrows advised this section relates to the West Settlers Historic District as well as the Spady Museum. The CRA has acquired several properties in that area, and we have begun the redevelopment of them. The CRA has created a funding process that all of the non-profit partners go through. It is new in its first year. All of the non-profit partners have put together a very specific group of criteria to apply for the funds they are requesting.

Motion:

Motion made by Mr. Jacquet, seconded by Mr. Glickstein, and approved 6 to 0 (Mr. Lynch absent) to approve the proposed amendments to the Community Redevelopment Plan by adopting the findings of fact and law contained in the Staff Report and finding that the request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, as well as with the applicable requirements of F.S. 163.360.

VII. REPORTS AND COMMENTS:

A. Board Members

Parking Management Advisory Board (PMAB)

Mr. Krall advised at the last meeting they were hung up on Atlantic Ocean Club. Before I was on the Board they gave them eleven (11) in-lieu spaces that were going to be used for the office. They want to take off the office and convert the second floor to god knows what

and he will need another eleven (11) spaces. We never reviewed the plan at the meeting and will be scheduling a special meeting shortly.

Mr. Glickstein inquired if the Segway Tours were operating. Mr. McDonnell advised they came in for a Conditional Use for three different tour routes. It went before City Commission and Commissioner Gray had issues with the practice area.

Mr. Jacquet inquired after it was not approved is it normal for them to operate. Mr. Shutt advised the normal practice is they will comply with the ordinance and need to get Conditional Use approval. We could technically cite them but by the time we get them in front of the Code Board they will already have received approval. Mr. Shutt thought they were approved at the last City Commission meeting through a Conditional Use.

B. Staff

Meeting Dates for September

City Commission Meetings

Tuesday, September 6, 2011, City Commission Regular Meeting, 6:00 p.m., City Commission Chambers

Tuesday, September 20, 2011, City Commission Regular Meeting, 6:00 p.m., City Commission Chambers

Planning and Zoning Board Meeting

Monday, September 19, 2011, Planning and Zoning Board Regular Meeting, 6:00 p.m., City Commission Chambers:

1. Amendment to the Land Development Regulations Appendix “A” Definitions modifying the definition of restaurants.

2. Amendment to the Land Development Regulations Appendix “A” Definitions to add a definition for deli.

3. Amendment to the Land Development Regulations to define the spatial arrangement of uses in mixed-use developments.

4. Amendment to the Land Development Regulations Appendix “A” Definitions to provide a definition for bicycles and to Section 4.4.9 “General Commercial” and 4.4.13 “Central Business District” to allow the rental of electric motor assisted bicycles.

5. Conditional use request to allow the establishment of guided Segway tours for the Electric Experience at 1047 East Atlantic Avenue.

6. Final Subdivision Plat for Block 11, a proposed commercial development, located on the south side of SE 6th Street, between the Federal Highway pairs.

7. Consideration of a finding of consistency of the proposed CIP (Capital Improvement Plan) with the Comprehensive Plan.

VIII. ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

The undersigned is the Secretary of the Planning and Zoning Board and the information provided herein is the Minutes of the meeting of said body for August 15, 2011 which was formally adopted and approved by the Board on September 19, 2011.

Denise A. Valek

Denise A. Valek, Executive Assistant

If the Minutes that you have received are not completed as indicated above, then this means that these are not the official Minutes. They will become so after review and approval, which may involve some changes.