

**BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
WEDNESDAY, MAY 11, 2011 – 6:30 P.M.
CITY HALL CITY COMMISSION CHAMBERS – 1ST FLOOR
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA**

Board Members	Attendance	Cumulative Attendance 6/2010 through 5/2011	
		Present	Absent
Diana Waterous Centorino, Chair	P	9	3
Michael Madfis, Vice Chair	P	11	1
Caldwell Cooper	P	12	0
Gerald Jordan	P	11	1
Karl Shallenberger	P	9	3
Henry Sniezek	P	11	1
Birch Willey	P	12	0
Alternates			
Mary Graham	A	9	3
Fred Stresau	P	11	1
Sharon A. Zamojski	P	7	2

Staff

Bob Dunckel, Assistant City Attorney
Terry Burgess, Zoning Administrator
Yvonne Blackman, secretary
Mohammed Malik, Chief Zoning Plans Examiner
B. Chiappetta, Recording Secretary, Prototype Inc.

Communication to the City Commission

Motion made by Mr. Sniezek, seconded by Mr. Shallenberger, to request that the City Commission direct the Planning and Zoning Board to hold a workshop regarding the placement of wind powered energy sources, and that all other boards in the City would be invited to attend. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Purpose: Section 47-33.1.

The Board of Adjustment shall receive and hear appeals in cases involving the ULDR, to hear applications for temporary nonconforming use permits, special exceptions and variances to the terms of the ULDR, and grant relief where authorized under the ULDR. The Board of Adjustment shall also hear, determine and decide appeals from reviewable interpretations, applications or determinations made by an administrative official in the enforcement of the ULDR, as provided herein.

Index

	<u>Appeal</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.	10-09	Housing Authority of the City of Fort Lauderdale	4	<u>2</u>
2.	11-08	Urbana Pelican Grand 1, LLC	2	<u>3</u>
3.	11-06	Joseph F. Quaratella	1	<u>4</u>
4.	11-09	Eglise Baptiste Bethanie	3	<u>6</u>
5.	11-10	Cyril D. Cohen	4	<u>9</u>
6.	11-11	Southport Retail	4	<u>10</u>
7.	11-12	Lima Family Trust	2	<u>12</u>
		For the Good of the City		<u>13</u>
		Communication to the City Commission		<u>14</u>

Call to Order

Chair Centorino called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m. She introduced Board members and described the functions of the Board and procedures that would be followed for the meeting.

Approval of Minutes – April 2011

The Board noted corrections to the minutes.

Motion made by Mr. Cooper, seconded by Mr. Jordan, to approve the minutes of the Board's April 2011 meeting. In a voice vote, motion passed 7 - 0.

Board members disclosed communications they had regarding items on the agenda.

All individuals wishing to speak on the matters listed on tonight's agenda were sworn in.

Rehearing:

1. **Appeal No. 10-09**

APPLICANT: The Housing Authority of City of Fort Lauderdale
LEGAL: "Dr. Kennedy Homes Plat", P.B. 15, P. 70, Block 1
ZONING: RMM-25 (Residential Mid-Rise Multifamily/Medium High Density)
ADDRESS: 1004 W. Broward Boulevard
DISTRICT: 4

APPEALING: Section 47-20.2.A (TABLE 1: Parking and loading zone requirements)

This is a Motion to have the Board rescind or vacate the variance that granted a reduction in the required parking for a residential development from 255 Parking Spaces to 149 parking spaces.

Mr. Robert Lochrie, attorney for the applicant, stated the terms of the parking had been dealt with through the site plan process and this request would clear up litigation filed regarding the Board of Adjustment's decision in April 2010.

Chair Centorino opened the public hearing. There being no members of the public wishing to address the Board on this item, Chair Centorino closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

Motion made by Mr. Madfis, seconded by Mr. Shallenberger, to approve the request to rescind the variance.

Mr. Willey recalled the amount of time the Board had dedicated to resolving the request, and asked what could be built once the variance was rescinded. Mr. Lochrie stated they had gone through the public purpose site plan approval process, which had been reviewed by the DRC, the Planning and Zoning Board and the City Commission, and the site plan now controlled the site. The Board of Adjustment would no longer have any control over the parking for the site plan. Mr. Lochrie explained that none of the buildings on the site, as approved, required a variance, so the variance was moot.

Mr. Lochrie described the process they had pursued to obtain agreement on the site plan and remarked that there had been extensive public input in the process. He added that there was still litigation pending regarding the Certificates of Appropriateness.

Under the current approvals, Mr. Lochrie stated the project was required to have 149 parking spaces. Mr. Willey said the original concept called for 255 parking spaces.

In a roll call vote, motion **passed** 7-0.

[Index](#)

2. Appeal No. 11-08

APPLICANT: Urbana Pelican Grand 1, LLC
LEGAL: All of Pelican Grand Beach Resort, a Hotel Condominium, according to the Declaration of Condominium recorded in official records Book 43208, Page 647 of the public records of Broward County, Florida, and more particularly described in

the application for a variance with the Clerk of the City of Fort Lauderdale Board of Adjustment
ZONING: RMH-60 (Residential High Rise/High Density District)
ADDRESS: 2000 N. Atlantic Boulevard
DISTRICT: 2

Appeal pursuant to ULDR Section 47-24.12 of City Staff's subsequent withdrawal of Staff's prior approval in 2009 of Pelican Grand Beach Resort's ("Pelican"). Administrative Review Application for a shade structure at the southeast corner of the property as an approved "shade structure" with "outdoor food service area" to be "utilized for special events" including "weddings, parties, brunches, fund-raisers, and private events". Pelican requests an interpretation of the ULDR and Temporary Use Permit pursuant to ULDR Section 47-24.12 for the continued use of the existing shade structure which is permitted use under ULDR Section 47-19.2.P "freestanding shade structures" and pursuant to ULDR Section 47-19.8 which permits hotels with more than 50 guest rooms to have "outdoor food service areas." Pelican maintains that Section 47-19.2.X requiring Site Plan Level III review of the outdoor food service area is inapplicable because 57-19.2.X applies to "Multifamily dwellings."

Appeal pursuant to ULDR Section 47-24.12 of City Staff's determination that Pelican's existing 11th Floor Decks can not continue to be used for "outdoor food service areas" pursuant to ULDR Section 47-19.8 Hotel Accessory Uses and request for the continued use of the existing 11th Floor Decks for outdoor food service areas.

[This item was heard out of order]

Ms. Stephanie Toothaker, attorney for the applicant, requested deferral for two months.

Motion made by Mr. Madfis, seconded by Mr. Jordan, to defer the item for two months. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

[Index](#)

3. Appeal No. 11-06

APPLICANT: Joseph F. Quaratella
LEGAL: "Coral Ridge Isles," P.B. 45, Bock 6, P. 47, Lot 1 and the East 4 feet of Lot 2.
ZONING: RS- 8 (Residential Single Family/Low Medium Density District)
ADDRESS: 1650 NE 60th Street
DISTRICT: 1

APPEALING: Section 47-19.1.H (Accessory buildings and structures-*Freestanding shade structures*)

Requesting a variance to permit an accessory structure with a 9 foot 4 inches corner side yard setback, where the Code states that no accessory use or structure shall be located on a corner lot within fifteen (15) feet of any side street property line.

**APPEALING: Section 47-19.2.P (Accessory buildings and structures-
Freestanding shade structures)**

Requesting a variance to permit a Free Standing Shade Structure with a zero (0) foot rear yard setback, where the Code requires a five (5) feet rear yard setback.

**APPEALING: Section 47-19.2.P (Accessory buildings and structures-
Freestanding shade structures)**

Requesting a variance to allow a Free Standing Shade Structure with gross floor area of 387 square feet, where the Code requires a maximum of 200 gross square feet in area for that portion of the structure protruding into the required yard area.

Mr. Joseph Ieracitano, general contractor for the applicant, stated the owner wished to retain part of the shade structure in the rear yard. He said they intended to remove the electrical and plumbing work. Mr. Ieracitano stated they had letters from the nearest homeowners, who did not object to the structure, which did not obstruct anyone's view. He admitted that the remaining structure would still encroach on the rear setback.

Mr. Ieracitano informed Mr. Dunckel that they had not removed enough of the roof in the rear to obviate the need for the variance.

Mr. Ieracitano explained to Mr. Cooper that the roof structure was asphalt shingles. He stated the hardship was the need for shade in the rear yard.

Mr. Shallenberger was concerned that future neighbors might object to the structure. Mr. Ieracitano suggested limiting the variance to the current homeowner.

Chair Centorino said she had visited the property and remarked that the structure was "on top of your neighbor ..." and it appeared very cramped. She asked if the structure could be cut further back.

Mr. Sniezek stated he did not recognize a hardship in this case. Mr. Jordan suggested cutting five feet from the roof where it was protruding into the rear setback. Mr. Ieracitano stated, "If that's our alternative, yes."

Chair Centorino opened the public hearing. There being no members of the public wishing to address the Board on this item, Chair Centorino closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

The Board discussed the amount the shade structure must be reduced to conform with the allowed encroachment into the setback.

Motion made by Mr. Jordan, seconded by Mr. Shallenberger, to approve the request regarding Section 47-19.1.H.

Mr. Cooper did not see the hardship and advised the owner to install a structure that would comply with the Code.

In a roll call vote, motion **failed** 4-3 with Mr. Sniezek, Mr. Cooper and Mr. Madfis opposed.

Mr. Ieracitano withdrew the requests regarding Section 47-19.2.P and Section 47-19.2.P.

[Index](#)

4. Appeal No. 11-09

APPLICANT: Eglise Baptiste Bethanie
LEGAL: Parcel "A", "Eglise Baptiste Bethanie," P.B. 149, P. 23
ZONING: CF-H (Community Facility-House of Worship)
ADDRESS: 2200 NW 12th Avenue
DISTRICT: 3

APPEALING: Section 47-25.3.3.d.iv.b (Neighborhood compatibility requirements-Wall requirements)

Requesting a variance to waiver the requirements of the CBS wall, where the Code requires that a wall shall be required on the nonresidential property, a minimum of five (5) feet in height and shall be located within and along the length of the property line which abuts the residential property.

Mr. Norman Jones from PDDS International, the design firm for the project, said the project abutted a residential area to the southeast. Along the south side, there were almond trees and heavy landscaping and at the church entry there was metal fencing with a six-foot tall hedge that made it difficult for neighbors to see onto the property. Mr. Jones said the intent of the request was to allow them to utilize a five to six-foot hedge instead of a wall where the property abutted the residential area. Mr. Madfis remarked that landscaping did not always survive, and this was why the Code called for a permanent structure.

Mr. Cooper noted that the existing chain link fencing was an eyesore. Mr. Jones stated the fence would be repaired or replaced as needed.

Mr. Cooper asked the church's hardship. Mr. Osler August, pastor of the church, stated they were building a \$2 million facility for the community and he wanted them to see it. Mr. Cooper asked what the difference would be between a six-foot dense hedge and a

six-foot wall. Mr. August stated the hedge would blend in with the landscaping but the wall would make the church look like a prison.

Mr. Jones informed Mr. Sniezek that the estimate to construct the over 1,000 lineal foot wall was \$87,000. Mr. August reiterated that the church did not want the wall because this would not blend in with the architecture and the neighborhood. He acknowledged that this might not constitute a hardship.

Chair Centorino opened the public hearing.

Mr. Kenneth Bascom, adjacent neighbor, said he had not been pleased when the pastor announced he was constructing the church, but he said the church blended in with the community. Mr. Bascom stated the chain link fence that separated his property from the church's property allowed him to appreciate the church property landscaping. He worried that he would feel "imprisoned" by a solid wall. Mr. Bascom stated the solid wall would represent a hardship.

Mr. Hollis Thomas, adjacent neighbor, said children played in the churchyard and the fence allowed the neighbors to keep an eye on the children. Mr. Thomas also feared that a criminal could hide behind the wall.

Ms. Gwendolyn Douglas, neighbor, did not feel landscaping would work because the church did not maintain all of the existing landscaping. She said criminals ran through the church property when Police chased them from nearby apartment buildings because there was no fence.

Ms. Judith Hodgson agreed with Ms. Douglas that the neighbors needed separation from the nearby apartments.

Ms. Norma Roberson, neighbor, agreed that the neighborhood had a problem with people running through the churchyard to commit crimes and elude the Police. Ms. Roberson stated the west side of the church property was her concern.

Ms. Shawn McCutchen, neighbor, said nearby homes had been burglarized.

There being no other members of the public wishing to address the Board on this item, Chair Centorino closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

Mr. Cooper asked if the church would agree to erect a six-foot steel picket fence from Mills Pond Park to the easternmost corner of the property, which neighbors could see through but would also keep undesirable people out. Mr. Sniezek said he would agree to this compromise.

Mr. Shallenberger said he would only vote for the variance if the steel picket fence suggested by Mr. Cooper were installed.

Mr. Jones asked if the Board would agreed to require the steel picket fence on the west side of the property. Mr. Shallenberger and Mr. Cooper stated the church must install either the picket fence or the wall.

Mr. Madfis said the Board might be willing to consider something other than a continuous concrete wall. He agreed the neighborhood might want to be able to communicate and have open access, but he acknowledged there was also a crime issue in the area. Mr. Madfis thought perhaps the south section of the western property border, where neighbors did not have an issue, could be relieved.

Mr. Willey agreed that often, the concrete wall requirement to protect residential areas brought up a sight issue. In this case, Mr. Willey said it did not seem that anyone wanted to hide the church or landscaping, people seemed to want visual contact. The issue was the crime problem. Mr. Willey felt Mr. Cooper's suggestion of the picket fence was a good solution and thought it would behoove the church to utilize that compromise. He acknowledged the cost, and thought a schedule could be established to erect the fence over a period of time.

Mr. Jones stated they would like to install the picket fence on the west side and also wherever there was an opening where people could enter the property, but he did not want to install fencing where a neighboring property already had one.

Mr. Jordan said he would not vote in favor of this unless the fence was installed around the entire property, perhaps leaving the wrought iron at the entryway on 12th Avenue.

Mr. Cooper clarified that he was talking about a six-foot fence with some type of decorative top that would make it difficult to climb, that met Code requirements for the spacing, with pickets.

Mr. Jones said the scope of work on the current project was phased and nothing had been designed for the western portion of the property. He said something could be done immediately to secure the west end to accommodate the neighbors. As the project progressed, they could gradually install the rest of the fencing.

Mr. Madfis said the entire project would be lengthy, and this could present a problem requiring an extension.

Mr. Dunckel advised the Board to approve the variance with the condition that a six-foot high, wrought iron fence with decorative features be used in lieu of the concrete wall. Mr. Jordan suggested using aluminum instead of wrought iron, but Mr. Cooper noted that steel was less likely to be cut up and stolen, and suggested steel.

Motion made by Mr. Shallenberger, seconded by Mr. Cooper, to approve the granting of a variance, conditioned upon the construction of a six-foot high steel picket fence with decorative features as required by the Code, in lieu of the concrete wall. The fence should be installed on the south side, from the edge of the canal, covering the complete south side and west side of the property. In a roll call vote, motion passed 7-0.

[Index](#)

5. Appeal No. 11-10

APPLICANT: Cyril D. Cohen
LEGAL: "Riverside Add Amend Plat," P.B. 1, P. 13, Block 18, Lot 4 and E 6.75 of ABUT VAC ALLEY DESC IN OR 13946/78
ZONING: RD-15 (Residential Single Family Duplex/Low Medium Density District)
ADDRESS: 621 SW 14th Terrace
DISTRICT: 4

APPEALING: **Section 47-3.2.B.1 (Nonconforming Structure)**

Requesting a variance to allow a previously conforming existing garage to be converted into a game room with a screened porch, where Code states that a nonconforming structure may not be enlarged or altered in a way that increases its nonconformity.

APPEALING: **Section 47-5-31 (Table of Dimensional requirements for the RS-8 District)**

Requesting a variance to allow an existing garage with a screened porch (converted to a Game Room with a screened porch) with a 2.8-foot side yard setback, where Code requires a minimum of five (5) foot side yard setback.

Mr. Cyril Cohen, applicant, stated the garage had been built to setback requirements in 1947 and could no longer be used as a garage because the alley formerly used to access it no longer existed. Mr. Cohen said the garage had been converted to living space by a prior owner and in 2008, Mr. Cohen had installed hurricane windows and shutters on the building.

Mr. Cohen said the abutting neighbor had sent a letter requesting the Board grant the variance. He stated the zoning on the property was multi-family but the structure was not being used as a second dwelling unit; it had been used as living space. Mr. Cohen said not granting the variance would deny him the right to use the space as permitted by the zoning and he would also lose tremendous value on his property. He said he was currently paying taxes on a multi-family property and the City was billing him as a multi-family dwelling for water, even though this was a single-family home.

Mr. Cohen related that in December 2010, the Board had heard a similar case and approved that variance 7-0.

Chair Centorino opened the public hearing. There being no members of the public wishing to address the Board on this item, Chair Centorino closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

Mr. Cooper asked staff for a definition of a “game room.” Mr. Burgess stated the Code did not have such a definition. He said a garage on the property could have a bathroom and air conditioning; it could not have a kitchen. Mr. Madfis said this seemed to comply, except for the existing non-conforming setbacks, with the requirements of an accessory dwelling unit. He said he did not believe this use was a more intensive activity than could take place in the same structure when it was a garage.

Mr. Cooper thought this looked like an efficiency, and wanted to know how they could stop this from becoming living space. Mr. Burgess said because of zoning and lot size, a duplex might be allowed anyway. Mr. Madfis said if this owner sold the property, they hoped that a new owner with the intention of renting the unit would apply for the proper permits and adjustments necessary to make it a proper two-family dwelling property.

Mr. Cooper was concerned that the wall-mounted air conditioner protruded even further into the setback, and asked if the Board wished to ask the owner to locate the air conditioner somewhere else. Mr. Cohen said he would move the air conditioner to the rear of the space if he had to move it. He remarked that the walls of the structure were very thick and it would be difficult, but he would be willing to move it if the Board required it.

Motion made by Mr. Cooper, seconded by Mr. Sniezek, to approve both requests, on the condition that the air conditioner unit was moved to anywhere the Code permitted, except the north side of the structure.

Mr. Cohen wondered if the Code would allow him to move it to any other space. Mr. Dunckel advised him to return to the Board to revisit this if the issue arose.

In a roll call vote, motion **passed** 7-0.

[Index](#)

6. Appeal No. 11-11

APPLICANT: Southport Retail
LEGAL: “Herzfelds Add to Lauderdale Harbors” P.B. 35, P. 22, W. 988
of S. 470 Less E. 175 of S. 150 and Less W. 150 of S 150. Blk. 6
ZONING: B-1 (Boulevard Business)
ADDRESS: 1489 SE 17th Street
DISTRICT: 4

APPEALING: Section 47-22.3.P (General Regulations–*Shopping Center or Strip Store Signs*)

Requesting a variance to permit an individual unit to have Ground sign in a shopping center, where Code does not permit individual free-standing ground signs in a shopping center.

APPEALING: Section 47-22.3.E (General Regulations – *Detached freestanding signs*)

Requesting a variance to permit an existing ground sign at 35 inches from the property line, where Code states that detached signs located within any zoning district abutting those trafficways subject to the Specific Location Requirements, Interdistrict Corridor Requirements as specified in Section 47-23-9 shall be located a minimum of twenty (20) feet from the property line of the lot or plot on which the sign is located, except for ground signs which shall have a five (5) foot setback, and shall not be located in the sight triangle.

Ms. Shari Dillard, ArtSign Company, displayed views of the existing monument sign that had been on the property since the 1980s. She stated there was no record of a permit for the original sign. The bank would change from Wachovia to Wells Fargo, and they wished to either use the existing sign or install a new one that was exactly the same size. Ms. Dillard stated the hardship was the visibility of the bank.

Ms. Keisha Deonarine, Wells Fargo Bank Manager, said their clients had difficulty locating the bank and they wanted to brand Wells Fargo in the Southport area. She displayed a photo of the sign and noted that the bank could not be seen from the 17th Street Causeway so they relied on the sign to alert customers to their location.

Mr. Mark D'Alessandro, Priority Signs, said this sign would be the only corporate identification on-site. He informed Mr. Cooper that the frame, base and concrete of the sign would stay the same.

Mr. Willey said he would find it difficult to agree to a variance for a sign that appeared never to have been permitted and "shouldn't have been there in the first place." Mr. D'Alessandro said they believed it had been permitted but there was no record of it.

Mr. Madfis noted that this area was very car-oriented, but there were hotels nearby and the opportunity for people to walk from a hotel to a shopping center on 17th Street. He said the scale of the sign was not human-friendly. Mr. Madfis said this was a very important street to the City and they should take the opportunity to do something better.

Ms. Deonarine stated she was representing her bank branch and her staff, not the multi-billion dollar Wells Fargo Company. She stated many tourists would not be aware of the bank location without the sign. Ms. Deonarine said the sign was critical to this branch.

Mr. Burgess explained to Chair Centorino that a five-foot tall sign with a three-foot base was permitted with a five-foot setback. A taller sign would require additional setback in the interdistrict corridor. The other issue was the shopping center sign restrictions, which did not allow individual signs.

Chair Centorino said she went by the sign every day, and she said, "The truth is, you would not know that bank was there were it not for the sign."

Mr. D'Alessandro pointed out that if it were too difficult to see the sign, someone looking for the bank would present a road hazard searching for it.

Mr. Sniezek said he might not approve of this if it were a new installation, but since the sign had been there for 20 to 30 years, and because the scale was small, he would support the request.

Motion made by Mr. Cooper, seconded by Mr. Jordan, to approve both requests. In a roll call vote, motion passed 7-0.

[Index](#)

7. Appeal No. 11-12

APPLICANT: Lima Family Trust
LEGAL: "Riviera" P.B. 6, P. 17, Block 1, Lot. 15
ZONING: RS- 8 (Residential Single Family/Low Medium Density District)
ADDRESS: 708 Riviera Isle Drive
DISTRICT: 2

APPEALING: **Section 47-3.2.B.1 (Nonconforming Structure)**

Requesting a variance to allow an existing carport to be enclosed, where Code states that a nonconforming structure may not be enlarged or altered in a way that increases its nonconformity.

APPEALING: **Section 47-5-31 (Table of Dimensional requirements for the RS-8 District)**

Requesting a variance to allow an existing carport to be enclosed, with a 3 feet 4 inches side yard setback, where Code requires a minimum of five (5) foot side yard setback.

APPEALING: **Section 47-5-31 (Table of Dimensional requirements for the RS-8 District)**

Requesting a variance to allow an existing carport to be enclosed, with a 24 foot 10½ inches front yard setback, where Code requires a minimum of twenty-five (25) foot front yard setback.

Ms. Nectaria Chakas, representing the applicant, displayed a photo of the existing carport, and noted part of the building had already been demolished with a permit, and staff had advised that the structure could not be enclosed until they resolved the non-conforming issue. Ms. Chakas stated the special circumstances were that the property and structure were very old and the owner wished to remodel the property to make it more in keeping with other homes in the area.

Ms. Chakas displayed the site plan, and explained they were 1'8" short on the north side and 1 ½" short on the front side.

Ms. Chakas stated this was the minimum variance necessary for reasonable use of the property. She said the area of encroachment on the side yard amounted to only 5.5% of the overall setback and the front yard encroachment represented .08% of the front yard setback.

Ms. Chakas stated they had obtained letters of support from nine neighbors. The only condition was from the neighbor adjacent to the north, who would be most affected by the variance. He asked that there not be more than 12" extending off the roof. Ms. Chakas said the applicant was willing to stipulate to this condition.

Mr. Madfis did not feel this use would present a dramatic increase in activity.

Motion made by Mr. Madfis, seconded by Mr. Jordan, to approve, with the condition that the roof overhang would not extend more than one foot from the exterior on the north side.

Ms. Chakas informed Mr. Cooper that the building would be used to house a car, and could accommodate two cars.

In a roll call vote, motion **passed** 7-0.

Report and for the Good of the City

[Index](#)

Regarding the Board's previous communication to the City Commission regarding wind turbines, Mr. Shallenberger said the Commission had given this issue to the Utility Advisory Committee [UAC]. He stated that committee could "say yeah or nay to wind turbines; they are not going to be able to say where they are situated," which had been the Board's real concern.

Mr. Cooper was also concerned about this issue and noted that decisions could take time to come out of the UAC and the Board of Adjustment had indicated they wanted some resolution on the issue by their June meeting. Mr. Shallenberger felt the UAC would engage in debate regarding alternative energy sources, which was not what the

Board had requested. He said they would need to revise their deadline for resolution of the issue.

Mr. Madfis felt the Planning and Zoning Board should hold a workshop with staff on this issue. Mr. Willey agreed with this idea.

Motion made by Mr. Willey to ask staff to call for a workshop on the issue. Mr. Willey later withdrew his motion.

Mr. Dunckel advised the Board to send a communication to the Commission asking them to direct staff to hold a workshop.

Mr. Stresau felt the issue should have gone to the Planning and Zoning Board, not the UAC. He pointed out that the UAC could not advise on placement of wind turbines.

Motion made by Mr. Madfis to request that the City Commission direct staff to set up a workshop with the Planning and Zoning Board and the Board of Adjustment to address the issue of alternative energy wind turbines. Mr. Madfis later withdrew his motion.

Mr. Shallenberger thought the UAC should also be involved, since the Commission had already assigned them to discuss this. Mr. Madfis said the Sustainability Advisory Board [SAB] should be involved as well, and amended the motion to include the UAC and any other board that felt an applicable relationship.

Mr. Sniezek suggested the Planning and Zoning Board should be the lead, and any other boards should be invited.

The Board and Mr. Dunckel discussed a possible deadline for the workshop and determined not to include this in the motion.

Communication to the City Commission

[Index](#)

[Discussed under Good of the City]

Motion made by Mr. Sniezek, seconded by Mr. Shallenberger, to request that the City Commission direct the Planning and Zoning Board to hold a workshop regarding the placement of wind powered energy sources, and that all other boards in the City would be invited to attend. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Board of Adjustment Minutes

May 11, 2011

Page 15

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 9:18 p.m.

Chair:

Diana Centorino

Attest:

ProtoType Inc.

A digital recording was made of these proceedings, of which these minutes are a part, and is on file in the Planning and Zoning offices for period of two years.

Minutes prepared by: J. Opperlee, Prototype Inc.