

**CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA
REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
CITY COMMISSION CHAMBERS
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE**

**WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 2005
6:30 P.M.**

<u>Board Members</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	<u>Cumulative Attendance</u>	
		<u>From 1/19/05</u> (P)	(A)
Mary C. Fertig	P	9	1
Alan Gabriel	P	9	1
James McCulla	P	10	0
Charlotte Rodstrom	P	9	1
Judith Hunt	P	9	1
Maria Freeman	P	10	0
Edward Curtis	P	8	2
Rochelle Golub	P	3	2
Catherine Maus	P	5	0

Planning Staff: Jim Koeth, Principal Planner
Don Morris, Acting Zoning Administrator
James Cromar, Planner III
Michael Ciesielski, Planner II
Yvonne Redding, Planner I

Legal Counsel: Sharon Miller, Assistant City Attorney

Court Reporting Service: Jamie Opperlee/Margaret Muhl (D'Alessio)

**NOTE: ALL INDIVIDUALS WHO PRESENT INFORMATION TO THE BOARD
DURING THESE PROCEEDINGS AFFIRM TO SPEAK THE TRUTH**

Chair Alan Gabriel called the meeting to Order at approximately 6:32 p.m. and all rose for the Pledge of Allegiance. He then proceeded to introduce the Board.

Jim Koeth, Principal Planner, proceeded to introduce staff that were present at tonight's meeting.

2. One Condos/Peter Sordjan 74-R-05

Request: Site Plan Review Level III/Waterway Use/
Yard Modifications/RMM-25
5-Story Residential Multi-Family
Development**

Legal Description: Lots 1 and 2, of "Island No. 4, Nurmi Isles,"
According to the plat thereof, as recorded in
P.B. 24, P. 43, of the Public Records of Broward
County, Florida

General Location: Southwest corner of Isle of Venice
directly north of Las Olas Boulevard

Chair Alan Gabriel announced that staff requested that this matter be continued until November 16, 2005.

Motion made by Maria Freeman and seconded by Catherine Maus to continue Case 74-R-05 until November 16, 2005. Board unanimously approved.

Chair Alan Gabriel announced that the next scheduled Planning and Zoning Board Meeting would be Wednesday, November 16, 2005. He advised that a workshop was scheduled for tomorrow, October 20, 2005, in connection with the evaluation of the EAR Report at 6:30 p.m.

Chair Alan Gabriel then proceeded to explain the procedure that would be used during tonight's meeting.

Chair Alan Gabriel asked the Assistant City Attorney to explain the term quasi-judicial.

Sharon Miller, Assistant City Attorney, explained that quasi-judicial matters were treated similar to a Court hearing. Individuals were sworn in and could be cross-examined. All evidence presented would be part of the record, along with the case file from the planners and City staff. She further stated that such information would be used as the basis for the Planning and Zoning Board to decide whether the application met the criteria according to the ULDR.

1. **Exotic 2501, LLC**

80-R-05

Request: Site Plan level III/Waterway Use**

Legal Description: Lot 12 in Coral Ridge Properties according
to the P.B. 28, P. 8 of the Public Records of
Broward County, Florida

General Location: West side of Federal Highway and North of
the Middle River

Chair Alan Gabriel announced that this matter was quasi-judicial.

The Board made the following disclosures: Rochelle Golub stated that she had been to the site. Charlotte Rodstrom stated that she had been to the site, and had also spoken with neighbors across the canal. Catherine Maus stated that she had spoken with Robert Lochrie. Judith Hunt stated that she had been to the site. Mary Fertig stated that she had been to the site. Alan Gabriel stated that he had spoken with Robert Lochrie.

Robert Lochrie, attorney for the applicant, stated that this was a familiar site on North Federal Highway, and was north of J. Alexander's and south of the Ruth Chris Steakhouse. He stated that a florist had previously been at this location but the building was razed, and the application before this Board tonight was a request for approval of a 7,300 sq. ft. retail building with two retail bays.

Mr. Lochrie explained that the site plan had gone through some changes due to concerns raised by the City's Planning Department. He proceeded to explain the location of the subject site and showed a map of the area. He stated that one of the concerns of staff was in regard to a pedestrian connection from the south side of Federal Highway going across the Bridge, and up along the west side of Federal Highway. He explained that modifications were made to address such concerns. He further stated that another concern raised by staff was that a portion of the building was a wall, and staff requested that glass framing be included and wrap around the corner of the building. He added that there was extensive landscaping at the site and that there would be a 20' buffer around the site.

Mr. Lochrie stated that the height of the building would be 40', but there was some concern about a portion of the building that was an architectural design. He proceeded to show the subject area on the rendering. He then explained that portion of the building was lowered, and a sign was deleted from that part of the property. He stated that the project would have two signs, one for each of the retail tenants. He explained that they incorporated additional glass at the corner, extensive landscaping, and an addition of architectural features facing south and west. He explained that they looked very closely at the neighboring properties. He added that a massing study was done and it indicated that the building was in keeping with the adjacent structures. He stated that they felt this building was of a superior design. He stated that they considered adding additional landscaping to assist in shielding back-house operations. He stated that staff and DRC felt that landscaping would be a better alternative than a wall at the location.

Yvonne Redding, Planning and Zoning, stated that this was a retail business consisting of one-story. She stated that the height of the building would be 41.5' and 150' was permitted in that zoning district. She continued stating that they are providing the 30 parking spaces as required by Code. She explained the District was B-1 zoning, and that they had a commercial land use. She added that signage had been reduced, and landscaping was increased along the waterway in order to shield the neighbors across the waterway. She stated that no comments had been received from anyone in the subject area. She further stated that the project did comply with neighborhood uses, along with the waterway use, and they would provide the 20' landscape buffer from the bulkhead. She added that a minimal walkway was added in the landscape area which was permitted by Code at the discretion of this Board.

Rochelle Golub asked if staff approved of the location of the driveway at the site. Ms. Redding confirmed, and explained that Tim Welch and the Traffic Engineer approved it.

Chair Alan Gabriel proceeded to open the public hearing. There being no individuals who wished to speak on this matter, the public hearing was closed and discussion was brought back to the Board.

Charlotte Rodstrom asked what type of roof there would be on the building. Mr. Lochrie explained that the roof would be made of red tile. Charlotte Rodstrom thanked the applicant for complying with staff's requests, and stated that she felt the design was very good, and she appreciated the additional landscaping. Mr. Lochrie stated that a lot of landscaping was added and some of the parking area was replaced with trees, but they still were meeting the parking requirements set by Code.

Motion made by James McCulla and seconded by Judith Hunt to approve the application as submitted per staff's recommendations. Roll call showed: YEAS: Ed Curtis, Maria Freeman, Mary Fertig, Rochelle Golub, Judith Hunt, Catherine Maus, James McCulla, Charlotte Rodstrom, and Alan Gabriel. NAYS: None. Motion carried 9-0.

3. MK&M Development, LLC/Croissant Park Townhomes 60-R-05

Request: Site Plan Level III Review/Three (3) Cluster Dwellings (RD-15)**

Legal Description: Lots 7, 8 and 9, Block 68, "Lauderdale", according to the Plat recorded in P.B. 2, P. 9, of the Public Records of Dade County, Florida

General Location: West side of SW 4 Avenue, South of SW 16 Street

Chair Alan Gabriel announced that this matter was quasi-judicial. The Board made the following disclosures: Mary Fertig stated that she had been to the site. Rochelle Golub stated that she had been to the site. Charlotte Rodstrom stated that she had also been to the site.

Robert Vick, architect, stated that this site was zoned RD-15, and they were doing a 3-unit cluster development. He continued stating that adjustments had been made to the project due to comments made by DRC. They attended the Croissant Park Association in September. He explained that they met all ULDR requirements. He explained further that they had chosen the Mission style and selected those design details due to the existing architecture in the neighborhood. He explained that the roofs consisted of clay barrel tile and there would be casement windows. He stated the homes would be taller than the single-family units in the area, but the neighborhood had been rezoned for higher density. He reiterated that this neighborhood was in transition.

Michael Ciesielski, Planning and Zoning, stated that the neighborhood consisted mainly of single-family homes, along with some duplexes and apartments. He further stated that the applicant had provided a narrative addressing the requirements for a cluster development and neighborhood compatibility and that the applicant had provided context plans to assist the Board in determining compatibility in terms of scale and mass. He added that the project had been reviewed by DRC and all comments had been addressed.

Mr. Ciesielski stated that staff was proposing the following conditions if this Board approved the application:

1. Provisions satisfactory to the City Attorney shall be made for a 5' recordable easement along the front and rear property lines for use by the owners of the dwelling units.
2. The applicant must have a recorded Maintenance Agreement for the common areas.
3. Subject to Final DRC approval.

James McCulla asked for some further clarification of a recorded Maintenance Agreement.

Mr. Ciesielski explained that the agreement would be recorded and the owners of the cluster homes would have to agree to maintain the subject area.

Jim Koeth, Planning and Zoning, explained that it would be indicated on the plans prior to final DRC approval. He further stated that one would have to cross another's property in order to perform maintenance on the site. James McCulla clarified that this would not be requiring a standard of maintenance for the development per se. Mr. Koeth confirmed and stated this was a standard requirement.

Rochelle Golub asked about the 5' area to be used by the residents, and what was its purpose. Mr. Ciesielski stated it was his understanding that would be the access area available to all the residents.

Sharon Miller, Assistant City Attorney, stated that it referred to the easement area. Mr. Ciesielski further clarified that a Maintenance Agreement would be recorded among the owners of the property. He added that the 5' width was required by Code.

Don Morris, Zoning Administrator, stated that it is similar to the townhouse developments in the area. He continued stating that there was a requirement that all residents were to have access to the rear of the property. He stated that easements were put in place so individuals could navigate around the property. He clarified that this would be an access easement, along with the Maintenance Easements.

Rochelle Golub asked why there was not an easement along the sides. Mr. Koeth explained that there was an easement along all four sides of the site. Rochelle Golub stated that staff's conditions only listed easements for the two sides. Mr. Koeth explained that the easements would be added from the front to the rear on all sides.

Charlotte Rodstrom asked if the 5' was a minimum requirement. Don Morris stated that this was the minimum requirement.

Chair Alan Gabriel proceeded to open the public hearing.

Joe Russell, 16th Street – Croissant Park, stated that he was opposed to this project. He stated that individuals in their neighborhood were concerned that even though it was a single-story aging neighborhood, there were about \$1 Million worth of improvements made to the homes in that area during the last five years in order to make them more attractive and pleasant to live in. He stated that practically every house in the area that went up for sale was torn down and replaced with a two-story house, along with some

duplexes. He explained that such structures were changing the look and feel of the neighborhood. He stated the residents were opposed to this project, and they requested that this Board consider this application very carefully and deny the request.

Linda Davis, 1516 SW 8th Avenue, stated that many improvements were made to the neighborhood. She stated that it was her understanding that cluster homes were permitted, but she felt that a three-story home was not compatible with the community. She stated that she opposed the proposed development.

Kent Kohlberger, 611 SW 16th Street, stated that he understood the neighborhood was developing, but he believed a three-story structure was not compatible with the existing structures in the area. He stated that they were at a cross roads now, and this Board had to make a decision whether to permit three-story structures and change the look of the neighborhood. He stated that he was opposed to this development.

Sandra McCarthy, 15th Street, stated that she was opposed to the proposed three-story development. She stated that it was sad to think they might start looking like Victoria Park.

Dennis Hearing, 515 SW 16th Street, stated that he did not approve of a three-story structure for the neighborhood. He stated that he was only permitted to build a 6' fence for privacy. He asked for some further clarification of the RD-15 District and what was permitted.

Jimmy Koeth explained that it was based on land use and zoning designation for density purposes, and could not exceed 15 units per acre.

Maria Freeman asked if there was an active homeowners association in the area. Mr. Kohlberger confirmed and explained that they had not received notice about this project. Maria Freeman asked why the project had not been presented to the homeowners association.

Mr. Vick explained that a presentation had been made to the homeowners association and he had a letter from them. He further stated that the letter did not state if the Association was in favor or against the proposed development.

Ms. McCarthy stated that she had not attended the meeting when the 15th Street project had been presented, but she did not think the project on 4th Avenue had been presented at all.

Mr. Russell further stated that he was a member of the Homeowners Association and explained that there were more people present tonight than what attended the Association meetings. He explained further that the agenda for their meetings normally was published one week after the meeting had been held. He stated that regardless of the Homeowners Association's position in regard to this matter, there were 20 individuals present this evening who were opposed to the proposed project. He stated that they also had letters from about 19 other people who could not attend this meeting, but were also opposed to the subject property.

Charlotte Rodstrom asked if more density was permitted in the subject area due to Code changes. She added that this was the maximum of what could be built, and the developer could build something smaller that would be more compatible with the neighborhood.

Catherine Maus asked what triggered neighborhood compatibility. Don Morris stated that cluster developments were required to comply with neighborhood compatibility. He stated that the zoning district did not permit townhouses. Catherine Maus asked if neighborhood compatibility requirements had been submitted to the Board. Mr. Ciesielski explained that the one-page narrative attached to the plans was the response from the architect in reference to Section 47-25.3 regarding neighborhood compatibility.

Mary Fertig asked if any consideration had been given to the elementary school in the area which was consistently on the over-crowded School Board list. Mr. Ciesielski stated that it was included in the adequacy requirement, and therefore, had to be responded to by the applicant. He referred the Board to the applicant's response to Section 47-25.2 referencing schools.

Mr. Koeth further stated that typically the School Board asked for notification if there was a change in land use or a zoning change where density would change. He stated that this was not a zoning request. He explained that the School Board also had to be notified in regard to Downtown projects in the RAC.

Mary Fertig stated that last month the Board heard a case where the applicant had stated that there would be no additional impact and was empty land. She asked again if consideration was given regarding the impact to the neighborhood schools. She stated they would be tripling the amount of residents, and the school population could be increased.

Chair Alan Gabriel stated that the applicant could be sent before the School Board for review to determine if mitigation would be required. He stated that could be a condition required by this Board for approval.

Mr. Koeth stated that typically the School Board had not asked to be notified in regard to these types of projects. He reiterated that such a condition could be added to the Board's approval.

Mary Fertig further asked if this was the area where units had been allocated from last month. Mr. Ciesielski stated that he did not believe that it was in this area, and they previously were referring to Flex Zone 56 in the Harbordale area. Mr. Koeth stated that staff would check on the matter and advise the Board.

Mr. Vick stated that he believes the homeowners speaking this evening meant to speak in regard to the next case on tonight's agenda. He explained that this street was a four lane highway and not a residential street. He added that there were other 3-story buildings in the area which contained more than two units. He stated that this type of structure was not new to the area. He explained that this street was being used as a hard connect

between SR 84 and the Downtown with residents of single-family homes backing out of their driveways onto a four-lane highway. He stated that the City wanted to raise the density in the area so people would not have to back-out into commercial traffic. He stated that their development had a contained road on site. He stated the next case on tonight's agenda was also in this neighborhood. He stated that this project was on the perimeter of the neighborhood. He stated that there were three-story structures existing in Colee Hammock and Victoria Park.

Charlotte Rodstrom stated that she felt the residents were concerned that these three-story units would be abutting one-story structures. She stated that she would not be opposed to a 1 ½ story or two-story structure. Mr. Vick remarked that a precedent had been set in the area with the other existing three-story structures.

Ed Curtis asked what was the speed limit in the area. Mr. Vick stated that the speed limit was 35 mph and 15 mph during the time the school zone was in effect.

Judith Hunt asked what would be the price range of the proposed homes. Mr. Vic stated that the homes would sell between \$550,000 and \$600,000.

Mary Fertig asked if the side yard setback on the south side was 5'. Mr. Vic confirmed. Mary Fertig asked if that would be next to the one-story structure. Mr. Vic stated that there was not going to be a 3-story building in that portion. He stated that if a single-story residence was built at the site, it would be 35' in height. He stated that the same requirements were being met as with a single-family dwelling. He further stated that for every foot above 22', the building had to be set back 1'.

There being no other individuals who wished to speak on this matter, the public hearing was closed and discussion was brought back to the Board.

Motion made by Maria Freeman and seconded by James McCulla to approve the application as submitted. Roll call showed: YEAS: Maria Freeman, Judith Hunt, James McCulla, and Ed Curtis. NAYS: Mary Fertig, Rochelle Golub, Catherine Maus, Charlotte Rodstrom and Alan Gabriel. Motion failed 4-5.

4. G.A. Markus/Croissant Park Townhomes

61-R-05

Request: Site Plan Level III Review/Five (5) Cluster Dwellings (RD-15)**

Legal Description: The West 88.30' of the East 198.30' of Lot 2, Esmonda Terrace, according to the amended Plat, thereof, as recorded in P.B. 16, P. 14, of The Public Records of Broward County, Florida

General Location: South side of SW 15 Street, West of SW 6 Avenue

Chair Alan Gabriel announced that this matter was quasi-judicial. The Board made the following disclosures: Mary Fertig stated that she had been to the site. Rochelle Golub stated that she had been to the site. Charlotte Rodstrom stated that she had been to the site.

Robert Vick, architect, asked if this matter could be deferred until the applicant could meet with the Homeowners Association.

Motion made by James McCulla and seconded by Maria Freeman to defer this matter until the Board's December meeting. The Board unanimously approved the motion, excluding Judith Hunt who opposed.

5. City of Fort Lauderdale/Fire Station 53/88

126-R-05

Request: Public Purpose Use/Fire Station GAA**

Legal Description: A parcel of land being a portion of Tract 1, F-X-E Plat, according to the plat thereof, Recorded in P.B. 119, P. 4 of the Public Records of Broward County, Florida

General Location: South of NW 62 Street, North of the Executive Airport – Foxtrot Taxiway, between NW 28 Way And NW 10 Terrace.

Chair Alan Gabriel announced that this matter was quasi-judicial. The Board had no disclosures to make regarding this matter.

Fernando Blanco, Engineering Department of Fort Lauderdale, stated that Fire Station 53 was an existing station and built in about 1976 but is in terrible condition. He continued stating that Fire Station 88 was built in 1984. He stated that due to the age of the buildings and the fact that they are too small to house today's firefighting equipment and meet staffing requirements, the Fire Department wants to combine the facilities into one new facility located on the Executive Airport property. He added that the building would be designed to house the City's emergency operation center, along with the Fire Department's Hazardous Materials Unit, and training facility. The architecture would be modern contemporary that would match the existing Airport Administration Building adjacent to the property. He explained that the City was asking for relief from some sections of the ULDR to make this facility operational at the site. He stated that the Sections of the ULDR in question are 47-18.26(f), 47-14.30, and 47-19.5. He proceeded to show renderings and elevations of the building, and its relation to the existing building.

Mr. Blanco explained that modifications had been made to the plans distributed to the Board in regard to the building elevation and the site plan. He proceeded to show the Board the new plans. He explained that a chiller unit had been added to the rear of the building for the air conditioning and heat system.

Judith Hunt reminded the Board that applicants were not permitted to make changes prior to submission to the Board. She felt that this applicant should be treated the same

and in a fair fashion. Therefore, she believed this matter should not be heard this evening. She stated that the Board would not be hearing the case if the applicant was a private sector developer.

Chair Alan Gabriel asked the applicant to explain what changes were made so the Board would be able to make an educated decision.

Mr. Blanco stated that the only thing added to the site plan was the chiller unit at the rear of the facility. He explained that the rest of the façade remained the same, along with the landscaping and parking layout. He explained further that the compressors were originally placed in the rear. He further stated that the footprint was the same.

Judith Hunt stated that if the Board permitted this applicant to make such changes, then other applicants that have similar changes should be permitted to do the same. This way everyone would be on an equal playing field.

Charlotte Rodstrom asked how long had they been working on the design and drawings for this particular station. Mr. Blanco explained that they had begun working in May or June of this year. He stated the change was done a few weeks ago after meetings with the plumbing and mechanical consultants.

James McCulla asked if the unit would be visible to the public. Mr. Blanco explained that it would face the Airport and would be separated from Cypress Creek by about 600' to 700', and would not be visible from any roadways.

Rochelle Golub asked if the emergency generator would be located at the same location with the chiller unit. Mr. Blanco stated that it was shifted to the west in order to make room for the chiller unit.

Motion made by James McCulla and seconded by Judith Hunt to defer this matter until November 16, 2005 at 6:30 p.m. The Board unanimously approved, excluding Rochelle Golub and Maria Freeman who opposed the motion. Motion passed 7-2.

6. Laurence A. Maurer

169-R-04

**Request: Site Plan Level III with Allocation of Flexibility Units
1121 East Broward Boulevard – RO**

Legal Description: Frank Stranahan's Subdivision, Block B, Lots
5 and 6, P.B. 2, P. 63 (D)

General Location: Northwest corner of East Broward
Boulevard at NE 12 Avenue

Chair Alan Gabriel stated that this matter had not been listed as quasi-judicial, but he believed it was. Therefore, he proceeded to ask the Board for their disclosures. Catherine Maus stated that previously she had met with the applicant and the architect for this project. Mary Fertig stated that she had been to the site. Rochelle Golub stated

that she had been to the site. Charlotte Rodstrom stated that she also had been to the site.

Gus Carbonell, developer, stated that this project consisted of a four-unit multiple family development located at the northwest corner of Broward Boulevard and NE 12th Avenue. He stated that the site was presently occupied by two structures that were being used as professional offices. He further stated that this project was considered a mixed-use development, and the Board would have to assign the four flexible units that were necessary. He stated that they had met with the Victoria Park Association who was in favor of the project. He added that they had also entered into an Agreement with the School Board in connection with the impact this project would have on the area schools. He stated that NE 12th Avenue was being developed with townhouses. He explained that directly north of this proposed development was a 3-story apartment building, and to the west were commercial developments, and to the east was mixed development.

Mr. Carbonell stated that each unit would have a two-car garage with two additional guest parking spaces, along with one additional guest spot. He stated that since they were on a corner lot, three units would have their garages facing 12th Avenue, and the other unit's garage would be off the existing paved alley. He stated that the 25' frontage along Broward Boulevard would be completely landscaped. He stated that all Codes were being met, and he felt this project would be an asset to the community.

Michael Ciesielski, Planning and Zoning, stated that he was presenting this case for James Cromar who was out ill at this time. He went on to state that the applicant would be constructing a residential townhouse development consisting of four residential units in commercial zoning with the allocation of residential flex. He stated that the proposed development was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, and all DRC comments have been addressed.

Mr. Ciesielski stated that if the Board approved the proposed development, staff was recommending the following conditions:

1. The applicant will provide documentation of an agreement with the Broward County School Board regarding potential impacts for public school facility planning through a recorded restrictive covenant prior to final site plan approval.
2. Site plan approval must be valid as provided in ULDR Section 47-24.1(n).
3. Final DRC approval.

Rochelle Golub asked about the flex units that would have to be approved. Mr. Ciesielski stated that units had to be allocated since it was a commercial zone and residential units had to be allocated.

Jim Koeth stated that the land use was commercial and to put residential in that area flex units had to be allocated. He stated that he did not know from which flex zone the units were to be taken.

Chair Alan Gabriel proceeded to open the public hearing. There being no individuals who wished to speak on this matter, the public hearing

Motion made by Maria Freeman and seconded by Catherine Maus to approve the application as submitted. Roll call showed: YEAS: Judith Hunt, Catherine Maus, James McCulla, Ed Curtis, Maria Freeman, Mary Fertig, Rochelle Golub, and Alan Gabriel. NAYS: Charlotte Rodstrom. Motion carried 8-1.

“For the Good of the City”

Judith Hunt stated that she thought they should establish some type of criteria for when the School Board should be contacted.

Sharon Miller stated that she would like the opportunity to review the Interlocal Agreement that exists between the City and the School Board in order to determine when the City is legally permitted to require a developer to appear before the School Board.

Chair Alan Gabriel stated that the agreement stated that “the City was required to provide for review whenever a development or change will affect schools.” He felt it was intended to be broader than what the City was doing.

Sharon Miller stated that she believed the City sent all the development permit requests that increase residential units on a property. She stated that she would review the agreement. She believed they decided whether the City was to be involved or not. She further stated that there was nothing on the City books about imposing fees or meeting certain requirements.

Mary Fertig stated that she was concerned about this matter. She continued stating that the Board had this conversation about one year ago. She stated that they could do as little as required, or the City could be conscientious and look at every project. She did not want the City schools to be overcrowded and make the students fight for desks to sit in. She felt if the City was to be pro-active, then they needed to make sure the children had schools to go to. She stated if they could not document that they were going to have new dwellings that could produce students, then they were not going to see enough seats built in the community. She felt this should be a top priority. She stated that she intended to bring this issue up in connection with every project brought forward. She felt the City’s requirements should be as stringent as possible because schools are overcrowded in many cities.

Sharon Miller stated that she would review the issue and if something stronger needed to be created, then the matter would have to go to the City Commission to have a policy set.

Maria Freeman asked if such reviews would take place before coming before this Board. Sharon Miller stated that the legal opinion would be brought to the Board by the next meeting.

Mary Fertig stated that this needed to be done quickly because building was being done quickly. She stated it was good to have a general description supplied for the properties coming before this Board, but asked if they could also have the legal address supplied. James McCulla stated that sometimes there was not a legal address for the properties.

Jim Koeth reminded everyone of the workshop scheduled for tomorrow, October 20, 2005. He asked if those individuals who could not attend, Marc LaFerrier will contact them within the next week to find out if they had anything to add.

Motion made by Charlotte Rodstrom and seconded by Maria Freeman to adjourn the meeting.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:00 p.m.

CHAIRMAN

Alan Gabriel

ATTEST:

Margaret A. Muhl (D'Alessio)