



**DRAFT**  
**MEETING MINUTES**  
**PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD**  
**COMMISSION CHAMBERS**  
**2020 WILTON DRIVE, WILTON MANORS, FLORIDA 33305**  
**MONDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2021 – 7:00 P.M.**

7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

**MEMBERS** **ATTENDANCE**

Richard Safaty, Chair	P
Peter Flint, Vice Chair	P
Don D'Arminio	P
Rudy Molinet	P
Michael Siemer	P
Tim Theisen	P
Roy David Walker	P
Jeb Shafer (alternate)	A

**Staff**

Mike Cirullo, Assistant City Attorney  
Roberta Moore, Community Development Services Director  
Evy Kalus, City Planner  
Brigitte Chiappetta, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Safaty called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**II. ROLL CALL**

Roll was called by Ms. Chiappetta and it was noted a quorum was present.

**III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

**IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**a. November 16, 2020**

**Motion** made by Board Member D'Arminio, seconded by Vice Chair Flint, to approve. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously (7-0).

**b. January 11, 2021**

1 **Motion** made by Board Member Molinet, seconded by Board Member Siemer, to  
2 approve. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

3  
4 Chair Safaty recognized City Commissioner Paul Rolli, who was in attendance at  
5 tonight's meeting.

6  
7 **V. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

8  
9 At this time Chair Safaty opened public comment.

10  
11 Community Development Services Director Roberta Moore advised that two comments  
12 addressing the Quasi-Judicial Item before the Board would be read at the hearing of  
13 that Item.

14  
15 Upon hearing no input, Chair Safaty closed public comment.

16  
17 **VI. QUASI JUDICIAL PUBLIC HEARING**

18  
19 Assistant City Attorney Mike Cirullo explained the Quasi-Judicial process, stating that  
20 those wishing to speak on any application should raise their right hand and be sworn in.  
21 Attorney Cirullo performed the swearing-in for the hearing.

22  
23 a. SP 19-07

24 Sabitry Investments, LLC  
25 1850 NE 26 Street  
26 Wilton Manors, FL 33305

27  
28 Jeff Stump, Agent, representing property owner Sabitry Investments  
29 LLC, is requesting site plan approval for the addition to an existing  
30 adult living facility located at 1850 NE 26 Street.

31  
32 Applicant

33 Jeff Stump, representing the Applicant, advised that the request would place an addition  
34 on an existing adult living facility which consists of two (2) structures, both of which are  
35 two (2) stories in height. The main structure facing 26 Street has a dining area, which is  
36 in disrepair and will be demolished. It will be replaced by a new dining area as well as  
37 offices and a conference room over the dining area. The property will remain within its  
38 existing footprint, with no changes aside from the rear elevation.

39  
40 Kamie Kadir, Applicant, stated that she would like the new dining room to be completed  
41 as soon as possible.

42  
43 Questions of Applicant

1 Board Member Siemer commented that a number of residents have approached him  
2 with concerns that the building's new offices might eventually be made into sleeping  
3 rooms, as the Site Plan shows they will include restrooms. Mr. Stump replied that  
4 restrooms are included in this office space so fewer facilities will be shared, which is of  
5 particular concern during the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic.

6  
7 Board Member Molinet noted that the Applicant's documentation states that the offices  
8 will not be patient rooms. Ms. Kadir added that the addition of patient rooms would  
9 require additional approval from the state of Florida. Director Moore confirmed that  
10 restriction of the rooms to office use is a required condition of approval.

11  
12 Board Member Theisen asked how construction and demolition crews would access the  
13 site, as well as how to mitigate potential effects of construction on neighbors, as there is  
14 little space between the subject site and neighboring properties. Mr. Stump replied that  
15 a walkway on the property is sufficiently large to use for the movement of equipment.  
16 The construction/demolition team will access the property from 19 Avenue.

17  
18 Board Member Molinet asked how the two (2-) story addition would be attached to the  
19 existing building. Mr. Stump stated that the addition would be semi-attached, with  
20 exterior walkways connecting it to existing structures.

21  
22 Board Member D'Arminio requested clarification of the Applicant's and representative's  
23 positions. Mr. Stump replied that he is the general contractor for the construction  
24 company selected to perform the work. Ms. Kadir is the owner of Sabitry Investments,  
25 LLC and has operated the facility for thirty (30) years. There are thirty-eight (38) rooms  
26 at the facility, none of which are currently used for office space.

27  
28 Board Member D'Arminio asked if this addition accompanied any changes to the  
29 facility's business plan. Ms. Kadir explained that the addition will include an upgraded  
30 nursing station and an office for the administrator. No structural changes to the existing  
31 facility are planned, although the building's exterior will be painted.

32  
33 Board Member D'Arminio recommended that painting the entire building be a stipulation  
34 of approval. Attorney Cirullo advised, however, that any Code issues on the property  
35 must be addressed through Code Enforcement. He further clarified that review of a Site  
36 Plan Application deals only with site issues, not uses. If a specific item is not required as  
37 part of the Site Plan, it is a Code issue. While the Board may feel the property is in need  
38 of enhancements or direction, these may not be included as conditions or requirements  
39 unless they are related to Site Plan approval.

40  
41 Vice Chair Flint pointed out that all four (4) restrooms, including the conference room,  
42 are equipped with shower facilities, which could contribute to the perception that the  
43 rooms would be used for another purpose. Mr. Stump stated that the shower in the  
44 conference room was added by the contractor "to make it uniform." He noted that this

1 facility can be removed if necessary. He felt it was appropriate to include showers in the  
2 other restrooms, as owners and staff sometimes shower before returning home. Vice  
3 Chair Flint asserted that the addition of showers seemed excessive and contributed to  
4 the perception that the rooms were being built for residents and not as offices.

5  
6 Board Member Molinet observed that before an office could be changed into a patient  
7 room, the business would have to go before Florida's Agency for Health Care  
8 Administration (AHCA) for approvals, as well as before the City for potential zoning  
9 changes. He noted that the dining room did not include a restroom or half-bath. Mr.  
10 Stump replied that a sink will be included in the dining area. Board Member Molinet  
11 advised that it is unusual to provide four (4) restrooms with showers in office and  
12 conference space, but no restroom in the dining area for patients or staff. Ms. Kadir  
13 clarified that there is an existing ADA-compliant half-bath between the kitchen and a  
14 storage area.

15  
16 Board Member Theisen asked if the restrooms in offices are also ADA-compliant. Mr.  
17 Stump replied that these restrooms will meet ADA requirements. Board Member  
18 Theisen asked for an estimate of what the provision of restrooms in the office spaces  
19 add to the overall cost. Mr. Stump estimated this at roughly five thousand dollars  
20 (\$5000) per restroom, or twenty thousand dollars (\$20,000) for all four (4) restrooms.

21  
22 Staff

23 City Planner Evy Kalus showed a PowerPoint presentation on the Application, which  
24 requests Site Plan approval for a two thousand three hundred fifty-eight (2358) square  
25 foot addition to an existing two (2-) story adult living facility. The existing buildings on the  
26 site were constructed in 1963. The property currently contains eighty (80) licensed beds  
27 for adults. The facility has been licensed since 2004.

28  
29 The existing two thousand forty-four (2044) square foot dining room and an existing  
30 shed will be demolished and replaced with a two (2-) story two thousand three hundred  
31 fifty-eight (2358) square foot addition that will contain a dining area for residents on the  
32 first floor and administrative offices on the second floor. The Site Plan also proposes a  
33 three hundred fourteen (314) square foot increase in building area. No new beds or  
34 sleeping rooms will be added to the facility as part of this proposed Site Plan.

35  
36 Staff has reviewed Article 20 of Code to determine consistency. This Article lists height,  
37 setbacks, floor area, and pervious/impervious requirements. The subject parcel is zoned  
38 Multi-Family (RM-16). The Site Plan meets all the requirements of Article 20.

39  
40 The existing facility includes nine (9) parking spaces on-site. Per Article 135-A.D.C4 of  
41 the City's Unified Land Development Regulations (ULDR), one (1) parking space per  
42 three (3) patient bed and one (1) parking space for every two (2) employees and staff  
43 members is required. As no patient beds or staff would be added as a result of the  
44 addition, no new parking spaces are required in conjunction with the Site Plan.

1  
2 To meet the landscaping requirements in Article 150 of the ULDR, ten (10) trees and  
3 two hundred (200) shrubs are required for the parcel. The landscaping plan proposes  
4 eleven (11) trees, four (4) of which would be new and the remaining seven (7) existing,  
5 as well as two hundred and one (201) shrubs. There are fifty-six (56) existing trees that  
6 will remain on-site but cannot be counted toward required planting, as they are not  
7 included on the City's approved planting list. Of the proposed trees and shrubs, sixty  
8 percent (60%) must be native flora.  
9

10 A ten (10) foot buffer is required abutting a street, with a five (5) foot buffer required at  
11 the rear and side common property lines. The ten (10) foot buffer cannot be provided  
12 adjacent to NE 19 Avenue without eliminating existing parking.  
13

14 Article 150-40-1 states that any parking lot in existence prior to April 22, 1997, such as  
15 the subject site, must attempt to meet fifty percent (50%) of the requirements of  
16 vehicular use areas regarding landscaping; however, if they cannot comply without  
17 eliminating parking spaces, they are asked to provide as much landscaping as possible.  
18 The lot is eighteen thousand four hundred and five (18,405) square feet in area, with  
19 sixty-eight percent (68%) currently impervious area. The Applicant has proposed  
20 reduction of the impervious area to meet the landscaping requirement. The remaining  
21 pervious area will include eleven (11) trees and two hundred and one (201) shrubs  
22 required by Code.  
23

24 Because the addition of landscaping would require the elimination of the nine (9)  
25 existing parking spaces, the Applicant has provided the minimum landscaping  
26 necessary to meet Code requirements without reducing this number of spaces. The  
27 proposed landscaping plan includes buffering along NE 26 Street, the rear of the  
28 property, and along 19 Avenue. A landscaping strip between the building and wheel  
29 stops is also planned, and landscaping around the dumpster area and generator will be  
30 provided.  
31

32 The City's Green Building Program requires all new and substantial development to  
33 comply with the requirements set forth in ULDR Article 170. "Substantial" is defined as  
34 additions or renovations to more than fifty-one percent (51%) of the property. The  
35 proposed addition does not meet this trigger percentage and is not required to satisfy  
36 the requirements of Article 170.  
37

38 Based on ULDR criteria, the Community Development Services Department  
39 recommends Site Plan approval for the subject property, subject to the following  
40 conditions:

- 41 • No new patient beds or sleeping rooms are proposed in the Site Plan
- 42 • All utilities serving the addition must be placed underground
- 43 • Landscaping requirements must be met for the proposed generator, LP tank, and  
44 dumpster enclosure at the time of permit

- A new air conditioning unit for the addition will be placed atop the building, and screening requirements for this equipment must be met, per Article 145-20-B, at the time of permit

City Planner Kalus advised that if the Applicant wishes to add patient beds or sleeping rooms to the facility, this would require new licenses from the City as well as another Site Plan approval process, as additional beds would trigger a change in the parking requirement. As stated by the Applicant and Director Moore, the Applicant would also require new licensing from AHCA.

#### Questions of Staff

Chair Safaty noted that the Application has also gone before the City's Development Review Committee (DRC), which recommended approval. It meets all Code requirements at this time.

Vice Chair Flint addressed sleeping rooms, asking if residents currently sharing rooms could be moved into the new rooms without triggering zoning review, as this would mean no new beds are added. City Planner Kalus explained that licensing does not apply to people, but to beds or sleeping rooms: should the new rooms become guest rooms, new licensing by both AHCA and the City would be required, as would new Site Plan review.

Director Moore added that the Site Plan identifies the rooms on the second floor as office space. Placing residents in spaces designated as office space would mean the Applicant is in violation of the Site Plan. She reiterated that Site Plan approval is specifically based upon the Site Plan provided by the Applicant.

Vice Chair Flint noted that the Applicant plans to add square footage to a site that already does not meet a number of zoning requirements. He pointed out that in the RM-16 zoning district, setbacks must be either half the building's height or ten (10) feet, whichever is greater. The density required by Code also shows each dwelling unit as one half-unit, which is greater than the density currently allowed by Code. Parking requirements, which would require one (1) space per three (3) beds, are not currently met. He concluded that he had spoken with a neighbor of the subject property, who did not express any concerns regarding the Site Plan.

Vice Chair Flint continued that certain information required by the Application was not present, including title, topographic survey, flood elevation certificate, and other material required by Code Section 85. He pointed out that the flood elevation is of particular importance for an adult care facility.

City Planner Kalus addressed the Vice Chair's questions, beginning with the parking requirement. While Code requires parking based on sleeping rooms and facility employees, the addition would not include any sleeping rooms, which means no new

1 parking spaces are required. The addition does not increase density, which would be  
2 affected by new beds or sleeping rooms.  
3

4 Regarding setbacks, the requirements in the RM-16 zoning district are seven point five  
5 (7.5) feet for the sides of the building or half the height of the building, whichever is  
6 greater. The building will meet side setback requirements for the addition.  
7

8 Vice Chair Flint asked what Code says about adding square footage to a nonconforming  
9 structure, as well as at what point the addition of square footage to this type of structure  
10 would end. City Planner Kalus stated that repairs, maintenance, and alterations to  
11 nonconforming structures are permitted as long as it does not reach the threshold of  
12 more than fifty percent (50%) of the property. While a portion of the building is being  
13 demolished and rebuilt, it is only a small portion of a much larger facility.  
14

15 City Planner Kalus continued that there are elements of the Application which are not  
16 always included in the Board members' backup materials, including financial  
17 statements, survey, and flood elevation certificates. The Applicant's tree survey is  
18 included in its backup information. Most surveys included are a combination of  
19 topographic and boundary surveys. If an application does not meet all requirements  
20 upon acceptance review, it is cannot be scheduled for DRC or Planning and Zoning  
21 Board review.  
22

23 Board Member Molinet requested further clarification of the approval process, asking if  
24 most of the issues discussed by the Board are also discussed by the DRC. City Planner  
25 Kalus replied that acceptance review ensures that an application includes proper  
26 documentation. The DRC members then ensure that the application meets all aspects  
27 of the Code. An application cannot be moved forward from the DRC without meeting all  
28 Code requirements unless an applicant is requesting a variance. Some applications go  
29 before the DRC multiple times.  
30

31 Board Member Theisen recalled that the Applicant had stated the office space cannot  
32 be rented to a third party in the future. City Planner Kalus advised that zoning only  
33 allows offices that are ancillary to the building's use. Renting the offices to another party  
34 would violate both zoning Code and local business tax receipts (BTRs).  
35

36 Board Member Theisen also addressed the Green Building Code, stating that the  
37 original Site Plan included three structures, which could meet the fifty-one percent  
38 (51%) area that would trigger compliance with this Code. City Planner Kalus pointed out  
39 that Code refers to development, not a structure or structures.  
40

41 Board Member Molinet asserted that the Planning and Zoning Board does not serve the  
42 same function as the DRC, which provides review of the types of issues currently being  
43 raised. He requested a response from the City Attorney on this matter.  
44

1 City Planner Kalus further clarified that Code refers to “all new or substantial  
2 redevelopment applications” rather than to a structure or project. Further interpretation  
3 of the Code would be left to the discretion of Staff: for example, her interpretation is that  
4 the Site Plan refers to one project, with the second building providing an ancillary use to  
5 the larger principal use of the development. Because the proposed renovation would  
6 affect less than fifty-one percent (51%) of the entire building, Green Building Code  
7 requirements would not be triggered. Director Moore added that she shared this  
8 interpretation of Code.

9  
10 Board Member D’Arminio addressed the Staff Report, which states the property  
11 currently contains an eighty-one (81) bed facility and the two thousand forty-four (2044)  
12 square foot dining area will be demolished. He did not feel this was correct. City Planner  
13 Kalus clarified that the existing dining room area is approximately one thousand twenty-  
14 two (1022) square feet in size. Board Member D’Arminio noted that the size of the  
15 dining room facility would more than double with the renovation.

16  
17 Board Member D’Arminio asked if density is defined by dwelling units only. City Planner  
18 Kalus confirmed this; however, in the case of adult living facilities, density is calculated  
19 differently, with two (2) sleeping rooms per dwelling unit. Further calculations were not  
20 made by Staff, as the renovation proposed no new sleeping or guest rooms.

21  
22 Board Member D’Arminio referred to the “intent and purpose” section of ULDR Article  
23 20, stating that the additional structure did not seem to apply to the overall intent and  
24 purpose of the site. City Planner Kalus explained that the site includes an existing use  
25 for which the addition would not change the use of the building.

26  
27 Attorney Cirullo addressed Board Member Molinet’s earlier question regarding whether  
28 or not the questions asked by Board members are germane to the Planning and Zoning  
29 Board process or should more appropriately be addressed by the DRC. He advised that  
30 these questions sought clarification of information in the Staff Report and understanding  
31 of Code. It is appropriate for the Board members to ask questions if an item arises that  
32 must be satisfied in order to approve the Site Plan.

33  
34 Board Member Molinet asked if this meant the Board should regularly question the  
35 DRC’s findings. Attorney Cirullo replied that the questions he had heard were not limited  
36 to items solely under the purview of the DRC. He added that there are no topics  
37 reviewed by the DRC about which the Planning and Zoning Board could not ask further  
38 questions: the Board is tasked with reviewing the criteria of an application and  
39 determining if evidence shows these criteria have been met. This evidence may be  
40 supplied by Staff Reports, testimony, the applicant, or members of the public. He  
41 concluded that DRC and Staff findings are considered to be evidentiary but not  
42 conclusive.

43  
44 Public Comments



1 At this time Chair Safaty opened public comment.  
2

3 City Planner Kalus read the following public comments:

- 4 • Michael Sweeney and Stefan Betts, 2517 NE 19 Avenue, own property adjacent  
5 to the Applicant, and requested that the Board deny the Application for the  
6 following reasons:
  - 7 ○ Notice of the proposed expansion and its review by the Board was not  
8 received until February 1, 2021
  - 9 ○ The proposed two (2-) story expansion does not meet the City's strategic  
10 growth and redevelopment standards, including maintaining a "small-town  
11 feel" and would intrude into the privacy of neighboring properties
  - 12 ○ The Application is not accurate, as shown in the detail on p.A-1, which  
13 portray the offices as the same size as residential rooms and include  
14 shower and restroom facilities
  - 15 ○ If no new beds or sleeping rooms would be added, the offices would not  
16 need full bathrooms or showers; neighbors are concerned that the offices  
17 could be converted to sleeping rooms in the future
  - 18 ○ Expansion of residential capacity is not welcome in the neighborhood due  
19 to previous behavior of residents
  - 20 ○ The actions and intentions of the facility's ownership should not be  
21 "rewarded" by approving the Site Plan, particularly with regard to the  
22 second floor space
- 23 • Joe Palant, 1800 NE 26 Street, was in favor of the proposed first floor renovation  
24 but not of any additional square footage or second floor construction; he also  
25 stated the following objections:
  - 26 ○ The building would not pass Code if parking is not added along with  
27 square footage
  - 28 ○ The facility's habitable units do not meet density requirements for the RM-  
29 16 district
  - 30 ○ If square footage is added, the entire building should be brought up to  
31 Code
  - 32 ○ The building is already large for its lot and would be much taller than the  
33 surrounding one (1-) story buildings
  - 34 ○ The facility appears to be preparing to make the proposed office spaces  
35 into future residential units due to the inclusion of bath facilities
  - 36 ○ The memo shared with neighboring residents states that the facility is  
37 licensed for up to seventy-two (72) units although it is an eighty (80) unit  
38 facility
  - 39 ○ Hearing of this Item should be postponed until summer so residents may  
40 express their concerns in person

41  
42 Board Member Theisen requested clarification of the notice provided to neighboring  
43 property owners. City Planner Kalus explained that the approval process includes  
44 multiple notices:

- 1 • DRC Agendas are posted one (1) week in advance of their meetings
- 2 • Signage is posted seven (7) days in advance of Planning and Zoning Board
- 3 meetings
- 4 • Mail notice is sent out seven (7) business days in advance of meetings
- 5 • Meeting Agendas are posted in local newspapers seven (7) business days in
- 6 advance of the meeting
- 7

8 Board Member Theisen asked what entity would be responsible for enforcing the use of  
9 office space in the four (4) new units, as well as how often inspections on adult living  
10 facilities are performed. Director Moore replied that when a property owner submits a  
11 new application to AHCA or amend their existing license, the City must sign off on its  
12 zoning. While she could not speak to the frequency of AHCA inspections, Director  
13 Moore noted that the City's Fire Department performs annual inspections. She offered  
14 to ensure that when the Fire Department inspects the facility, it can confirm that the four  
15 (4) new units are used solely for office space.

16  
17 Board Member D'Arminio commented that the notice signage placed on the subject  
18 property was partially obstructed by fencing. He asked if applicants are provided  
19 instruction on where notice must be posted on a property. City Planner Kalus stated that  
20 Staff posted this signage between the fence and the street. Photos of the placement in  
21 front of the fence were taken by Staff. Ms. Kadir advised that the sign had fallen to the  
22 ground and was replaced inside the fence by a neighbor.

23  
24 Mr. Stump addressed the concerns raised during public comment as follows:

- 25 • The building's height will not increase
- 26 • No additional impacts are expected to neighbors
- 27 • Rooms must be used for the purpose listed on the Application
- 28 • The facility is subject to regular inspection by the state, the Fire Marshal, the
- 29 Health Department, and other appropriate entities
- 30

31 Ms. Kadir confirmed that residents will take meals in their rooms during the dining room  
32 renovation.

33  
34 **Motion** made by Board Member Molinet, seconded by Board Member Theisen, to  
35 approve Site Plan 19-07 with the City's recommended restrictions of approval, as per  
36 the Staff Report.

37  
38 Board Member Molinet noted that the conditions listed in the Staff Report include a  
39 prohibition on any new patient beds and/or sleeping rooms. He requested that the  
40 phrase "either now or in the future" be added to this condition to address the concerns  
41 of the Board and the community.

42  
43 Attorney Cirullo asked if the addition of this phrase was intended to preclude the  
44 Applicant from ever going through the proper application process, at the City, state, and

1 other levels, to add patient beds. He advised that any such application would be  
2 required to go through appropriate channels in any case. It was determined that the  
3 **motion** would go forward without additional language.  
4

5 Vice Chair Flint pointed out that the two closest neighbors to the subject property both  
6 objected to the Application. He felt these concerns should be taken into consideration by  
7 the Board. He also expressed concern with the possibility of enforcement of the  
8 Application's conditions.  
9

10 Board Member Theisen commented that while he shared the Vice Chair's concerns, the  
11 Application satisfies all ULDR requirements, which means the Board is obliged to  
12 approve the request. Attorney Cirullo confirmed that this was correct.  
13

14 Vice Chair Flint requested further clarification of this statement from the Assistant City  
15 Attorney, recalling that throughout the presentation of the Application, Staff had referred  
16 more than once to "interpretations of the Code." Attorney Cirullo explained that the  
17 Board is asked to weigh the evidence presented to them and determine if the Applicant  
18 has satisfied all criteria. If there is an element of the testimony that a Board member  
19 believes has not been satisfied, that Board member may express this through his vote;  
20 however, there must be evidence within the record to support this denial. Any Board  
21 member may state the reason for his vote if he wishes.  
22

23 In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 5-2 (Vice Chair Flint and Board Member Walker  
24 dissenting).  
25

## 26 **VII. STAFF COMMENTS**

27  
28 None.  
29

## 30 **VIII. BOARD COMMENTS**

31  
32 Board Member Theisen asked if there is a time when an applicant might appropriately  
33 be asked to take an action not required of him or her, even though approval may not be  
34 contingent upon this agreement. Attorney Cirullo recalled that in previous years, the  
35 Board has adopted a number of complicated applications in which developers have  
36 been asked to work with the City. If community concerns are raised with the application,  
37 the Board may ask the applicant to agree to additional steps to address those concerns.  
38

39 Board Member Shafer requested information on the current condition of the sidewalk at  
40 the entrance of the Shoppes of Wilton Manors. Director Moore replied that the  
41 development order related to this issue is still valid, as the Governor's Executive Order  
42 extended building permit and development order expirations. She stated that she would  
43 reach out to the responsible party for an update. At last contact, the developer had

1 planned on moving forward with this improvement, but was delayed by the COVID-19  
2 pandemic.

3  
4 Vice Chair Flint observed that different information had been provided on the subject  
5 property of Site Plan 19-07 at different times, including the number of sleeping rooms.  
6 He pointed out that with two (2) individuals per sleeping room on the subject site would  
7 result in a density of ninety-three (93) units per acre. He felt this could demonstrate a  
8 willingness of the East Side Association, which had strongly opposed increasing density,  
9 to reconsider its stance on the density the Board had recently voted to approve.

10  
11 Vice Chair Flint continued that while the City Commission had raised the issue of  
12 economic impact in relation to increased density, there are no studies of this nature  
13 underway at present. The Vice Mayor had specifically asked for the impact of increased  
14 density on the City's tax receipts. Vice Chair Flint stated that he had prepared an  
15 analysis of all sites he felt were "in play" and shared this information with the City  
16 Commission and City Staff. He requested that this analysis be shared with the Board as  
17 well so they could see the impact of increased density on the tax base.

18  
19 Director Moore confirmed that with the Chair's approval, she would distribute the Vice  
20 Chair's study to the Board members. She added that the Land Use Plan Amendment  
21 application, on which the Board had recommended a density increase to one hundred  
22 (100) units per acre, had gone before the Commission, which also voted in favor of a  
23 density of one hundred (100) units per acre upon first reading. It was then transmitted to  
24 the state, which did not provide comments from any reviewing agency. A second  
25 reading of this Amendment will be scheduled in March 2021.

26  
27 Board Member D'Arminio recalled that at the January 2021 meeting, the Board had  
28 discussed the TOC-East, which Staff anticipated bringing before the Board in March.  
29 Director Moore replied that the Item has been sent to the City's engineering consultants  
30 for review and analysis. A proposal to increase the number of units in the TOC will go  
31 before the City Commission at their February 9, 2021 meeting. This can be tied with the  
32 TOC-East proposal and sent before the Commission as a single Item.

33  
34 Board Member D'Arminio also asked when the Board can expect further discussion of  
35 City parking requirements, on which they have held two (2) workshops thus far. Director  
36 Moore advised that she hoped to bring this Item back in March or April 2021. The City  
37 also plans to hold a Code rewrite workshop with the City Commission on February 18,  
38 2021. Another workshop on Article 30 will be held toward the end of February. Staff is  
39 still considering a possible density change for Planned Unit Development (PUD). If  
40 approved, it will be either part of the Code rewrite or a separate Ordinance.

41  
42 **IX. ADJOURNMENT**

43  
44 Upon motion duly made and seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 9:02 a.m.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11

**NEXT MEETING DATE: March 8, 2021**

[Minutes prepared by K. McGuire, Prototype, Inc.]

---

Chair

---

Date